

# Local Boards Submissions

## Contents Page

Sub #	Local Boards	Page
902	Albert-Eden Local Board	2
884	Devonport-Takapuna Local Board	2 - 3
885	Franklin Local Board	3 - 4
901	Great Barrier Local Board	4
886	Henderson-Massey Local Board	4 - 5
887	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	5 - 6
583	Howick Local Board	6 - 7
883	Joint Trusts	7
888	Kaipatiki Local Board	7 - 8
889	Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board	8 - 10
891	Manurewa Local Board	11
890	Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board	11 - 12
892	Orakei Local Board	12 - 13
893	Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board	13 - 15
894	Papakura Local Board	15 - 16
895	Puketapapa Local Board	16 - 22
896	Rodney Local Board	22
897	Upper Harbour Local Board	22 - 23
898	Waiheke Local Board	23 - 24
899	Waitakere Ranges Local Board	24 - 25
900	Waitemata Local Board	25 - 26
903	Whau Local Board	26 - 28

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
902	<b>Albert-Eden Local Board</b> Peter Haynes (Chairperson), Tim Woolfield (Board Member)	<p><b>Principles</b>                      We agree in principle with the policy framework, the key policy areas and objectives as detailed on Page” ix”</p> <p>There are two primary concerns appreciating that the detailed design is to come.</p> <p><b>1. Stage Based Fare structures</b>                      While the simplification of stages is welcomed, the primary concerns relate to the impact of stage boundaries and the potential increase in stage fares that will be required to ensure revenue is not reduced as a result of these stage fare areas increasing in size significantly.                      The ARPTP has detailed targets to meet in terms of “farebox” recovery of 50% (Section 6.9, Page 50). It is unlikely that this would be met if the one stage remained at \$1.90 under the new regime.                      Fare stage boundaries can have undesired consequences and although the simplification of the boundaries would reduce this, the impacts on commuters travelling some distance to park in residential streets close to a fare boundary will no doubt continue.                      The recommendation is that a comprehensive ticket fare analysis project based on distance and not fare stage boundaries be undertaken prior to implementing the new bus routes. This should include a minimum and maximum fare based on a sliding scale distance based fare.                      This would encourage both shorter and longer trips and should therefore reduce the number of vehicles on the road while increasing both the patronage and revenue obtained from these services. It is felt that without a holistic and fresh approach to this the farebox recovery targets will not be met without a significant rise in the stage fare price which based on the larger stage fare areas, would be very negatively received by many existing patrons. Analysis of key existing routes will be invaluable in determining this approach e.g. City to Mt Roskill via Mt Eden and Dominion Roads.</p> <p><b>2. Transition Points</b>                      The transition hubs for buses and trains require careful consideration. We appreciate that AT have already raised this as an issue with the Local Board and we support such initiatives to make the passenger experience as painless as possible especially when transferring from one service to another. [end]</p>
884	<b>Devonport-Takapuna Local Board</b> Chris Darby (Chair), Chris Dee (Senior Local Board Advisor)	<p>(Note: Devonport-Takapuna Local Board have also expressed interest in having input into the development of the Network plan)</p> <p>The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board (The Board) appreciates the opportunity to submit to Auckland Transport (AT) on the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan (Draft ARPTP) and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- supports the overall direction as outlined and staged implementation of the Plan, with the North Shore implementation being rolled out in 2014-15</li> <li>- supports the underlying concept in the Draft ARPTP of providing a Frequent Service Network with a minimum frequency of 15 minutes for Rapid and Frequent categories of service and 30 minutes for connector services.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Board supports in principle the concept of connector services, but stresses that for these to be effective, all bus services must be faultlessly reliable and punctual. The Board asks that in developing the new network AT considers carefully and addresses any shortcomings to the public transport infrastructure that could work against a reliable service operating.</li> <li>2. The Board supports the concept of integrated ticketing and integrated fares for all modes (Ferry, bus and rail) and the roll out of the HOP programme as quickly as possible.</li> <li>3. The Board is particularly concerned about the omission of ferries in the fare zone structure. It notes that ferry users pay premium fares and in some cases (Devonport and Stanley Bay services) do not enjoy the subsidy that train and bus users do, yet they are a critical and integral part of the integrated public transport network. It therefore asks that ferries be included in the fare zone structure on the same basis as other modes of public transport.                      The Board strongly urges that Policy 4.3 is amended to include ferries in the zone-based fare structure, rather than continuing the current point-to-point fare structure proposed in 4.3 (c).</li> <li>4. The Board reminds AT that the Auckland Plan identifies lower Devonport and the Devonport and Stanley Point foreshore as part of the City Fringe. It asks therefore that the zone structure applying to the City Centre and City Fringe areas of Parnell, Ponsonby, Newton and Freemans Bay should also apply to the Devonport city Fringe area. The two sides of the Waitemata Harbour within the city Fringe should have a completely integrated public transport network with overlapping zones.</li> <li>5. The Board also points out that Takapuna is one of Auckland’s Metropolitan Centres. Bus journeys to and from the City Centre to Takapuna are similar in duration and distance to those to centres such as Newmarket. It asks therefore, that AT consider overlapping the City Centre zone to include Takapuna.</li> <li>6. The Board supports the proposed policy of providing safe public transport access for school students to and from their zoned and/or nearest school (Policy 7.3). The Board notes that the education sector places a major burden on the city’s road network, and suitable public transport solutions must be found to encourage students to use public transport, not just to and from school, but at other times as well. The Board points out that if using public transport for younger people, that habit will continue throughout life, thereby underpinning the sustainability of the public transport network.</li> <li>7. The Board notes the success of the City, Inner and Outer Link services and urges AT to consider a “Shore Link” service connecting Takapuna, Smales Farm / hospital, Wairau valley, Glenfield, Highbury, Northcote and back to Takapuna. Takapuna is a key Metropolitan Centre and will be a major source of employment and leisure for residents across the North Shore and beyond in the near future. There has been considerable investment of public money in Takapuna to build the Metropolitan Centre and the Board considers that it is important to have public transport arrangements that reflect this and provide easy access to this centre for communities west of the motorway.</li> <li>8. The Board notes that the draft ARPTP does not appear to consider the positive impact of public transport solutions on relieving congestion on local roads. It suggests that AT consider this issue more carefully, especially in regard to the Devonport peninsula (Lake Road), the Esmonde Road corridor, and in regard to strengthening east-west connections.</li> <li>9. Further, the Board asks that AT think carefully about ensuring buses are appropriately sized for the passengers carried. It notes that many local services in suburban streets appear to have buses too large for the number of passengers carried, and too large for many narrow local streets.</li> <li>10. The Board asks that AT consider operating more frequent services to specific destinations outside the hours of 7am to 7pm, to cater for the customers and employees of anchor businesses working 24</li> </ol>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
884	<b>Devonport-Takapuna Local Board</b> Chris Darby (Chair), Chris Dee (Senior Local Board Advisor) #884	<p>hours per day, 7 days per week. Hospitals would be an obvious example of such a business. The board notes the reference to targeted services and asks AT to consider the needs of shift workers specifically.</p> <p>11. The Board asks AT to ensure planning for suitable terminus facilities happens in tandem with planning for the public transport network, as the provision of suitable sheltered terminus facilities is an important part of the overall experience of public transport.</p> <p>12. The Board asks that AT consider carefully where passengers embark and alight, and understand the reasons why. The Board asks that route planning and optimisation particularly considers the location of major employers before those routes are confirmed. The Board notes that AT is considering establishing a specific forum to hear from and consider Local Board submissions, strongly supports that proposal and requests that AT consider clustering submissions by geographical areas.</p> <p>The Board understand that there will be further discussion with the Board in mid-2013 about the details of the network plan. It asks AT to ensure that the Board is consulted about those details.</p> <p>The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board wish to appear in support of this submission.</p> <p>Devonport-Takapuna Local Board</p>
885	<b>Franklin Local Board</b> Mr Andrew Baker (Chairperson), Jane Cain (Local Board Advisor)	<p>Feedback on the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2012</p> <p>The Franklin Local Board welcomes the opportunity to present the following feedback on the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) for your consideration.</p> <p>1. The Franklin Local Board supports the general direction of the draft RPTP, providing an integrated and simplified network structure, with fewer direct routes and more frequency than the current system.</p> <p>However, the Local Board wishes to make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the draft RPTP is focused on the frequent service network, and does not adequately address connector or local services.</li> <li>- as the frequent service network does not extend to Pukekohe, a clear indication of how connector and local services will serve Franklin is needed. The services should be simple, affordable and meet people's needs.</li> <li>- the proposal is inconsistent with the Auckland Plan's identification of Pukekohe as a large satellite town and a transformation growth project. The frequent service network does not extend to Pukekohe and therefore future growth will not be adequately supported.</li> <li>- there is no proposal in the draft plan for the deployment of electric trains to Pukekohe. However, the Local Board understands that this is currently under discussion by Auckland Transport, and would support a decision by Auckland Transport to electrify the fleet travelling to and from Pukekohe. It would be prudent economically to be synchronised with the current electrification of other parts of the fleet, and would help support future growth in Franklin.</li> <li>- in order to meet the targets for increased usage, public transport must be made accessible and be pleasant to use. Retaining diesel trains to serve a growing community will not provide an efficient service or a pleasant travel experience, therefore electric trains should be used to service Franklin.</li> <li>- the public transport network needs to support the growth outlined in the Auckland Plan which requires 55,000 extra houses in the south. The Rural Urban Boundary (RUB), under development as part of the Unitary Plan, provides for growth between Drury and Pukekohe. There is a disconnect between the proposed RUB and the draft RPTP in providing transport infrastructure to support these growth areas.</li> <li>- a connection with the Waikato District is not included in the draft plan. The Local Board wishes to advocate that Auckland Transport engages with Waikato District council and Waikato Regional Council regarding a connecting service to the Waikato Region from Pukekohe.</li> <li>- the Local Board requests an investigation into a southern link from Manukau Station to Pukekohe. With such a link, Manukau will be more accessible to Franklin residents as an employment destination with an option to use public transport to commute. It will also enable Franklin residents to access the retail precinct and other attractions in the Manukau area more readily.</li> </ul> <p>2. The Franklin Local Board supports the new fares and ticketing policy, including the use of a single ticket across different modes of transport and a shift to a zone-based system.</p> <p>The Local Board has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the new policy for a 50% for the farebox recovery ratio is supported, but should be balanced with affordability and ticket prices should not increase to a level where public transport becomes unaffordable and therefore has reduced patronage.</li> <li>- the Local Board requests that the 50% recovery rate is achieved, wherever possible, through growing patronage and managing costs rather than fare increases.</li> <li>- a system of turnstiles or similar barriers at stations is required so that people have to buy a ticket as the recovery of fares is important to meet the recovery rate.</li> <li>- a greater level of detail is required on the proposed fare charges within zones to assess the impact on local residents. Franklin will be four zones away from centre of Auckland city, and there is no information on how the boundaries for the zones have been set. There should be a further assessment on what the impact of fares within zones will have on affordability to users versus the use of private vehicles and the associated costs (eg parking).</li> </ul>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
885	<b>Franklin Local Board</b> Mr Andrew Baker (Chairperson), Jane Cain (Local Board Advisor) #885	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HOP cards should be available for purchase from other places such as Council service centre, cafes etc, as well as ticket machines at railway stations.</li> <li>- concession tickets, such as the day rover and ten trip tickets, should be available for purchase from the ticket machine at Pukekohe station rather than only from the Papakura ticket office, requiring a change of train. This increases journey times and ultimately, will decrease patronage. Pukekohe should have the same fare options as others.</li> <li>- the Local Board supports the removal of concessions for GoldCard holders for the afternoon/evening peak period as this is consistent with the rest of New Zealand, but opposes the removal of concessions for tertiary students.</li> <li>- should the GoldCard peak concessions be retained, the Local Board advocates to Central Government to investigate the impact this will have on ratepayers if the NZTA funding is withdrawn (currently split 50/50 with Auckland Council) and the cost is wholly funded by Council.</li> <li>- the Local Board wishes to be kept informed and to have input into proposals to change concessionary fare schemes through the review.</li> </ul> <p>3. Improvements to the interchange facilities supporting the new network structure are supported, with the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Pukekohe Railway Station upgrade and the Park and Ride interchange are included in the Regional Land Transport Programme for construction in FY14/15 and Drury Railway Station and Park and Ride for FY17/18.</li> <li>- these facilities are urgently needed to support growth and help ease congestion. They should be brought forward for construction at an earlier date.</li> </ul> <p>4. Targeted Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- targeted services appear to be urban focussed, and there is no provision for the rural/urban interface such as Beachlands and Maraetai.</li> <li>- school children living rural areas and attending a school in an urban area, such as Beachlands, are reliant on the Ministry of Education to provide a bus service. Timetabling for such school services should be integrated with existing or new public services for use by all. This may require extra services at peak times.</li> </ul> <p>5. Local Routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Franklin Local Board Plan requests bus services that directly link outlying communities with train services in Pukekohe or Papakura, as well as services to and from and through towns and villages.</li> <li>- engagement prior to proposed route changes has been poor to date and needs to occur at an earlier stage, prior to local services being changed or deleted.</li> <li>- a local route to Waiuku is needed, and further discussions on the preferred option for the route should take place with Auckland Transport.</li> <li>- the Local Board also requests further engagement with Auckland Transport to develop local routes and improve the frequency and accessibility of public transport options in Franklin, in order to support the growth identified in the Auckland Plan and Unitary Plan.</li> </ul> <p>6. General Comments</p> <p>Adequate engagement with the Local Board has not been undertaken by Auckland Transport prior to development of the draft RPTP. The Local Board remains unconvinced that a high level there is sufficient desire within Auckland Transport to engage with them. Further engagement is requested, particularly with regard to development of local routes and the alignment of these areas identified for growth.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Andrew Baker</p>
901	<b>Great Barrier Local Board</b> Paul Downey (Chair), John Nash (Relationship Manager)	<p>The Great Barrier Local Board would like to see the establishment of a subsidised public bus service for Great Barrier Island. There is no formal, timetabled and regular public bus service at present. Fuel prices on Great Barrier are very high and many people have no cars. The island's low socio-economic status, and small far flung communities make travel very difficult for locals. Visitors too, in particular the large numbers who arrive over the summer holidays, are disadvantaged by the lack of a bus service.</p> <p>A service running up and down our main highway from Tryphena in the south, to port Fitzroy in the north, and connecting with ferries and flights would be a logical starting point. Provided ticket costs were reasonable, the Board feels such a service would be well supported. When Great Barrier's population was much larger, bus services connected with fast ferries were operated successfully.</p> <p>The Great Barrier Local Board sees a bus service as a key element to its economic revitalisation agenda and would therefore like to work with Auckland transport to investigate the feasibility of such a service with a view to a limited service being trialled.</p>
886	<b>Henderson-Massey Local Board</b> Vanessa Neeson, JP (Chairperson) Wendy Kjestrup (Local Board Advisor) & Brett Lane (Democracy Advisor)	<p>Below is the feedback from Henderson Massey Local Board on the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan. They are also going to do a joint submission with the Trusts Stadium</p> <p><b>Resolution number HM/2012/19</b></p> <p>MOVED by Member P Chan, seconded Member WW Flaunty:</p> <p>That the Henderson Massey Local Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Receive the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan Consultation with Local Board report.</li> <li>b) Provide the following feedback on the draft Regional Public Transport Plan:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The Henderson Massey Local Board notes that 79% of its residents travel out of the local board area for work which significantly contributes to traffic congestion in the region. The Board supports public transport as the most sustainable method of reducing traffic congestion in the Auckland region.</li> <li>ii) Fares for west Auckland should be in Zone Two to provide consistency with fares charged on the North Shore</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
886	<b>Henderson-Massey Local Board</b> Vanessa Neeson, JP (Chairperson) Wendy Kjestrup (Local Board Advisor) & Brett Lane (Democracy Advisor) #886	iii) The plans for the Te Atatu bus exchange do not allow for the safe and convenient transfer of passengers from the Te Atatu Peninsula bus stop to busses travelling to Henderson or New Lynn on the other side of the north western motorway. iv) Extensive community consultation is necessary before deciding on the location of the Te Atatu ferry stop. v) The Board supports the extensive provision of park and ride facilities, with an emphasis on provision outside the major centres. vi) Shuttle buses should be used on the more remote bus routes. vii) The Board advocates for west Auckland's transport projects to be moved forward as the west will be experiencing significant growth during the period covered by the plan. viii) The Board supports a dedicated bus way down the north western motorway from Westgate to the city. The proposed route of the busway along side the rail corridor from the city to Lincoln Rd duplicates the service offered by the rail line and still leaves a sizeable catchment of people without car competitive access to a RTN. ix) There is a need for a bus route past Trusts Stadium in Central Park Dr, Henderson, specially for large events. The board will work with trust Stadium to prepare a joint submission on this matter. x) The Board supports the use of the rail corridor as a potential green asset. xi) Hop cards should charge by the distance travelled rather than by arbitrary zones. xii) The Board endorse protection of the Onehunga to Avondale rail corridor as this could be an important alternative route across Auckland and reduce congestion on both the southern motorway and the south western ring route. c) Delegate authority to the Chairman and Transport Portfolio Holder to approve the final wording of the submission. <b>CARRIED</b>
887	<b>Hibiscus and Bays</b> Mandie Van Dyk (PA / Liaison), Leigh Randovan, Ellen Barrett	<b>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board</b> <b>SUBMISSIONS ON THE DRAFT AUCKLAND REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT PLAN 2012 - 28 NOVEMBER 2012</b> The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board appreciates the opportunity to make submissions to Auckland Transport (AT) on the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2012 (Draft ARPTP). The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board would like to provide comment as requested on the 10 policy areas identified in Chapter Six of the Draft6 Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan.  <b>1. Network Structure</b> While we support a network of connected frequent services we do not want it to come at the expense of our current well patronised direct linkages within the North Shore. We also agree that council should be promoting land use policies that support our public transport network.  <b>2. Integrated Service Network</b> We agree with the importance of having simple integrated services that connect people with where they want to go. We support the view that services should respond to identified customer needs such as our current 881 service that was created to meet a recognised need and because of its success, it has been significantly extended to meet demand. We support coordinated services being provided for special events as they have proven to be very popular and well patronised in our area. We would like to see some current special services extended. In particular, we would like to see the Nightrider service being extended from Albany station to our new park and ride facility at Silverdale.  <b>3. Service Quality</b> As well as developing realistic achievable timetables that are reliable and dependable we believe that they should also be timely. In the next stage we need to ensure that our residents still have choices that allow them to travel from a to b via the most direct route. We are concerned that timetabling might mean that a simple journey i.e. from Browns Bay to Takapuna might require a commuter to interchange at least 2 times. In the example we were given even if the services between Browns Bay and one of the stations was every 15 minutes (blue) or 30 minutes (green) and the waiting time for an ongoing bus was up to 10 minutes with a further 15 – 30 minute wait at the station to interconnect to Takapuna, this trip would take well over an hour more than twice the current time taken. While connections should be easy, convenient and attractive they should also be timely. Unfortunately, the extreme congestion around the bus stations at peak times will add even more time delay. Overseas studies have clearly shown that people do not like interchanging between buses and other modes of transport. This could become a real barrier to our future uptake of public transport. It would also appear to be counter to policy 3.2, which aims to improve travel speeds to provide a service, which is competitive with car travel. We agree however with the policy that all vehicles and vessels should be of the highest standard and that service delivery is monitored and continuously improved upon. Buses are extremely efficient and affordable mode of transport for people to use, we need to build on this especially for our community as this, and ferries are the only modes of transport we have available for us.  <b>4. Fares and ticketing</b> We totally support integrated fares and zones across all bus, rail and ferry services. We agree with the implemented zoned based fare structure suggested. We endorse the simplification of the range products available and are pleased to see the proposed flattening of the fare zones in the northern area. However, we would like to see the current fare zone to Albany being extended to the new Silverdale station once it is up and operating. We believe that this will incentivise commuters to stop and park and take the bus from Silverdale rather than continue to Albany.  <b>5. Infrastructure</b> We agree totally that there should be a high standard of transport infrastructure that supports the service. We look forward to working together to develop the Silverdale park and ride station and to provide other park and ride facilities at appropriate sites along the extension of the existing route from Albany to Orewa. Where possible we would like to see integration of public transport with cycling and walking opportunities i.e. our Te Ara Tahuna walkway/cycleway. Damage to infrastructure: We plan for pedestrian friendly and attractive areas in towns/villages e.g. use of pavers and cobble stones in road infrastructure. Large buses cause damage and sinking (evident in Browns Bay). I'd suggest we say more about the use of smaller buses and shuttles  <b>6. Customer Interface</b> A simple and visible customer interface is essential for any public transport system. We agree that you must provide a wide range of information channels for customers to plan their journey using both internet and hard copies. It is really important that all information is aligned. While the tool of real time passenger information could be useful, we frequently hear complaints about the inaccuracy of the information given which frustrates commuters. Although we now provide a range of customer feedback channels we often receive complaints that people do not believe their issues have been listened and addressed.

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
887	<b>Hibiscus and Bays</b> Mandie Van Dyk (PA / Liaison), Leigh Randovan, Ellen Barrett #887	<p><b>7. Assist the transport disadvantaged</b>  We support the provision of a network that is accessible and safe for everyone and especially for vulnerable users. We agree that public transport services should meet the needs of individual and isolated communities. In this respect, we would like to see a better service being provided to link our many retirement villages within our local board area with shops and other services. Many of the residents no longer have their licences and with sometimes failing health find themselves very vulnerable and requiring support. We would like to see an extension of the current trial due to take place in the Warkworth area. We agree that concessionary fares should be provided for the transport disadvantage and other target groups like full time students and the elderly. We are disappointed to see in the latest fare changes that the discount students receive has been reduced.</p> <p><b>8. Procurement and commercial services</b>  We support the new procurement system and the move to provide consistent high quality service across all transport providers and all routes.</p> <p><b>9. Funding and prioritisation</b>  We believe there is the ability to get better value for our money from our existing public transport funding. We support an increase in the level of farebox recovery because we believe it should be as user pays as it can be. We believe this can best be done by managing demand efficiently and effectively and building patronage wherever possible. The introduction of integrated ticketing and integrated fares will certainly encourage this patronage growth. We also need to continually look at introducing new routes that are viable and profitable and meet peoples needs e.g. the 881 service.</p> <p><b>10. Monitoring and review</b>  An excellent and effective public transportation system must undertake regular and continuous monitoring, reporting and acting upon measures such as reliability, operating subsidy per passenger kilometre, farebox recovery ratios passenger numbers and growth and customer satisfaction.  While patronage numbers are slightly decreased on other modes the busway keeps showing a huge increase in patronage numbers. We have a very successful model that we need to build on. It is also important that we recover the patronage data for the busway, data on the busway is only limited to the Northern Expressway service only.</p> <p><b>11. Other</b>  * We would like to see increased ferry services to Gulf Harbour particularly an off peak service being provided with bus linkages.  * Want better services across the North Shore as well as improved linkages across the Auckland region.  * Smaller and more economical buses used on feeder loop services  * Would like Northern Express service to extend beyond Britomart and service the tertiary institutions, Auckland hospital and terminate at Newmarket. Over the years surveys have clearly shown most users would like to directly access points west of Wellesley Street. They do not want the added cost in time and money of connecting to another service to get there.  * The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board asks AT to consider the options for having WiFi access on all public transport facilities to further encourage uptake of PT services.  * Interchanging (changing from one bus to another) will create greater safety issues as most passenger accidents, incidents or even death, occur when entering or alighting from buses. The elderly, mothers with children, and unsteady people especially dread getting to or leaving their seats. "One bus" routes are essential.  * The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board is concerned that discussion documents show significant routeing changes and the loss of service to areas such as Aberdeen Road, Campbells Bay. The principal of Campbells Bay Primary School has expressed concern that it appears his school will not be served by any bus services other than school buses.</p>
583	<b>Howick Local Board</b> Steve Udy (Chair, Transport), Michael Williams (Chair, Howick Local Board), Lynda Pearson (Local Board Democracy Advisor)	<p><b>Howick local Board submission to the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan</b></p> <p>The Howick Local Board welcomes the opportunity to submit on the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan.</p> <p>The Howick local Board wishes to speak to its submission at preferably a South Auckland venue.</p> <p><b>Initial Comment</b>  The Howick local board represents Auckland's largest ward in terms of population (130,000), and has two of the city's major business precincts, East Tamaki and Highbrook. Our population is spread across the major urban areas of Howick, Pakuranga, Botany, and Flat Bush, which as a whole is designated East Auckland for planning purposes by Auckland Transport. We would contend that the East has been overlooked for far too long when it comes to resolving transport issues (both public and private), and our business precincts have inadequate transport links (private &amp; public). We have Pakuranga Road as one of the busiest roads in New Zealand, and heavy vehicles that use both bridges over the Tamaki estuary equalling that of the harbour bridge on a daily basis. As a result we have traffic gridlocks regularly around Pakuranga and Panmure. Public transport is caught in this gridlock and routes are circuitous and long. Some areas are difficult to reach i.e. Highbrook, Middlemore Hospital. As a consequence Howick residents MUST rely heavily on private transport. And to this end the Howick Board is pleased to see progress with AMETI. It must be acknowledged that any improvements to public transport services for Howick will be dependent on the completion of critical AMETI projects. This is obviously reflected in the "Draft Plan" as timing of improved public transport initiatives for East Auckland is proposed late 2015.</p> <p>The public transport high point for Howick to date has been the success of the ferry service to Auckland City from Half Moon Bay. However with over 700 passengers a day now using the service, and demand growing all the time, the makeshift ferry terminal and poor parking can't continue, and remedying this critical public transport initiative MUST proceed 2013/14. Given the success of the Half Moon Bay ferry service, the Howick Local Board sees ferry transport benefiting both employment centres and residential areas of Howick. i.e. Half Moon Bay, Glen Innes (Point England) Panmure, and Pakuranga to East Tamaki/Highbrook . Howick, Pine Harbour to Auckland.</p> <p>With the current success of the Half Moon Bay Ferry service. We see the same success reflected in the Pine Harbour service (Beachlands/Maraetai). This service is playing a pivotal role in expanding residential nodal development. The service travels 22 times a day passing Howick, St Heliers, and Kohimarama. Extending this service to wider communities must be a consideration for future regional public transport planning We also need to learn from the parking problems we are experiencing right now as a result of the success of the Half Moon Bay Ferry Service and plan well in advance for adequate "park and ride" facilities as AMETI opens up other public transport options for Eastern commuters.</p> <p><b>Submission Feedback</b>  1) The Howick Board strongly supports the direction of a public transport network to one that is simpler and more connected with expanded frequency of service. We support the 7am -7pm "all day" proposal but ask what is planned for weekends and public holidays? We note that after hours (7pm onwards) high demand networks will extend to 30 minute frequency we feel this may need another look as people</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
583	<b>Howick Local Board</b> Steve Udy (Chair, Transport), Michael Williams (Chair, Howick Local Board), Lynda Pearson (Local Board Democracy Advisor) #583	<p>are working longer, or on shifts these days. When considering a more simplified network the Howick Board would like to emphasise the need to carefully ensure school links to new routing plans are given full consideration. A major disincentive to use public transport to and from Howick has to be lack of frequency and lack of time efficiency. We don't think making connections will be an issue once AMETI is complete ( post 2015 )</p> <p>2) We would strongly support the zonal and integrated (HOP card) fare system with no penalties for transfers. However as Howick will be very dependent on ferry services till 2015 and perhaps beyond. We do not agree that ferry fares remain outside the zonal fare system as it is particularly unfair to Howick commuters for whom the ferry is the only form of efficient public transport for the foreseeable future. AT must look at ways of offsetting the reported higher operating costs of ferries so that fares integrate into the zonal process.</p> <p>3) In summary, if Howick is to benefit from any improved public transport initiatives, then transport / roading issues need to be prioritised. Any delay with the AMETI project will have significant ramifications for Howick impacting on transport issues across the ward. East West connection is also a critical issue for Howick and has significant potential public transport as well as commercial benefits. While we strongly support the frequency, and zonal and transfer proposals they will have little impact on public transport to and from Howick until the AMETI project is complete.</p> <p>4) The Howick Board wishes to be involved in local bus service consultation. While a related subject is the current need for more bus stop shelters on popular routes. Adequate numbers of suitable bus shelters needs to become a service standard as anticipated patronage grows.</p> <p>Steve Udy            Transport Chairman, Howick Local Board</p>
883	<b>Joint Trusts</b> Linda Smith, Wendy Kjestrup & Brett Lane	<p><b>Joint Trusts' Submission:</b>            The Trusts Arena in Henderson is one of Auckland's busiest sport and entertainment facilities, and a leading multi-use facility in New Zealand and yet it is not serviced by public transport at all. 80% of The Trusts Arena's 650,000 annual users are school children, but as the children need to be driven to the stadium by an adult with a car, access to the Arena facilities is inequitable. The Trusts Arena should be included on public transport routes to be consistent with Directive 1.1 of the Auckland Plan which specifies actions to 'put young people first and consider their wellbeing in everything that we do.'</p> <p>The Trusts Arena is also an important event venue for the Auckland region, contributing thousands of bed nights each year. Traffic effects limit both the size and number of events that are able to be held at The Trusts Arena. Consequentially The Trusts Arena is unable to be used to full capacity, which represents inefficient use of a major regional asset. Buses are chartered by The Trusts Arena to transfer event attendees, but this detracts from the returns Regional Facilities Auckland can expect from each event.</p> <p>The Henderson Massey Local Board requests The Trusts Arena be included on regular bus routes, so it can be equitably accessed by the community, and that public transport is available for the attendees of major events at The Trusts Arena</p> <p>-----</p> <p><b>Draft Regional Public Transport Plan consultation with Local Boards</b>  <b>Resolution number HM/2012/19</b>  <b>MOVED by Member P Chan, seconded Member WW Flaunty:</b>            That the Henderson Massey Local Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Receive the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan Consultation with Local Board report.</li> <li>b) Provide the following feedback on the draft Regional Public Transport Plan:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The Henderson Massey Local Board notes that 79% of its residents travel out of the local board area for work which significantly contributes to traffic congestion in the region. The Board supports public transport as the most sustainable method of reducing traffic congestion in the Auckland region.</li> <li>ii) Fares for west Auckland should be in Zone Two to provide consistency with fares charged on the North Shore</li> <li>iii) The plans for the Te Atatu bus exchange do not allow for the safe and convenient transfer of passengers from the Te Atatu Peninsula bus stop to busses travelling to Henderson or New Lynn on the other side of the north western motorway.</li> <li>iv) Extensive community consultation is necessary before deciding on the location of the Te Atatu ferry stop.</li> <li>v) The Board supports the extensive provision of park and ride facilities, with an emphasis on provision outside the major centres.</li> <li>vi) Shuttle buses should be used on the more remote bus routes.</li> <li>vii) The Board advocates for west Auckland's transport projects to be moved forward as the west will be experiencing significant growth during the period covered by the plan.</li> <li>viii) The Board supports a dedicated bus way down the north western motorway from Westgate to the city. The proposed route of the busway along side the rail corridor from the city to Lincoln Rd duplicates the service offered by the rail line and still leaves a sizeable catchment of people without car competitive access to a RTN.</li> <li>ix) There is a need for a bus route past Trusts Stadium in Central Park Dr, Henderson, specially for large events. The board will work with trust Stadium to prepare a joint submission on this matter.</li> <li>x) The Board supports the use of the rail corridor as a potential green asset.</li> <li>xi) Hop cards should charge by the distance travelled rather than by arbitrary zones.</li> <li>xii) The Board endorse protection of the Onehunga to Avondale rail corridor as this could be an important alternative route across Auckland and reduce congestion on both the southern motorway and the south western ring route.</li> </ol> </li> <li>c) Delegate authority to the Chairman and Transport Portfolio Holder to approve the final wording of the submission.</li> </ol> <p>CARRIED</p>
888	<b>Kaipatiki Local Board</b> Richard Tong (Senior Local Board Advisor)	<p><b>KAIPATIKI LOCAL BOARD SUBMISSIONS ON THE DRAFT AUCKLAND REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT PLAN 2012</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Kaipatiki Local Board appreciates the opportunity to make submissions to Auckland Transport (AT) on the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2012 (Draft ARPTP).</li> <li>2. The Kaipatiki Local Board would like to express its appreciation to the officers of the public transport section of AT who have gone to considerable lengths to make themselves available to address board members' queries on the Draft ARTP and for their openness in advising that Kaipatiki is one of the more complex areas of Auckland from a public transport planning perspective.</li> </ol>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
888	<b>Kaipatiki Local Board</b> Richard Tong (Senior Local Board Advisor) #888	<p>3. The Kaipatiki Local Board would very much appreciate receiving either copies of the submissions to AT on the Draft ARPTP from Kaipatiki residents or any analyses based on local board areas, especially on the North Shore, before the board speaks to its submission. This response will allow the board to fine tune its submission to ensure that we are reflecting the views of Kaipatiki residents and allow us to isolate any common themes or differences of opinion across the North Shore which might be best resolved by discussions at a local board level.</p> <p>4. That the Kaipatiki Local Board notes that AT is considering establishing a specific forum to hear from and consider local board submissions and strongly supports that proposal and requests that AT consider clustering submissions by geographical areas.</p> <p>5. The Kaipatiki Local Board supports the underlying concept in the Draft ARPTP of providing a Frequent Service Network with a minimum frequency of 15 minutes for Rapid and Frequent categories of service and 30 minutes for Connector services.</p> <p>6. The KLB welcomes the inclusion of the ferry network into the integrated PT network plan and is particularly pleased that the Beach Haven Ferry service will provide alternative PT options for our residents who live the furthest distance from the motorway and bus way connections.</p> <p>7. The Kaipatiki Local Board supports the concept of integrated ticketing and the roll out of the HOP programme, but strongly believes that staging and pricing should apply equally across all modes of public transport, bus, rail and ferry, and that ferry passengers should not be singled out as receiving proportionally less subsidy than bus or rail passengers.</p> <p>8. The Kaipatiki Local Board asks Auckland Transport to offer a more direct bus link between the North Shore and the University of Auckland and AUT city campuses via the Port motorway exit/entrance.</p> <p>9. The Kaipatiki Local Board asks AT to reconsider the plan which identifies Highbury as a public transport interchange both because it is not well suited as an interchange and would further burden Onewa Road but also because KLB considers Northcote to be a better location. Kaipatiki Local Board has come to this decision based on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Northcote is likely to experience significant residential intensification as the Unitary Plan gives effect to the compact urban city model in the Auckland Plan and also because Auckland Council and government agencies have substantial landholdings in Northcote on which to develop an effective interchange.</li> <li>ii. Northcote is near to the Akoranga campus of AUT, four schools, a large retirement complex and North Shore Hospital</li> <li>iii. KLB is actively promoting a Northcote Sports Precinct to coordinate the facilities planning for over 20 sports clubs which operate in this area.</li> <li>iv. An interchange at Northcote could relieve pressure on Onewa Road which is currently at or near capacity during peak times</li> </ul> <p>10. The Kaipatiki Local Board asks AT to emphasise East-West linkages in its future plans to emphasise that Takapuna is a major Metropolitan Centre and will be a major source of employment and leisure for Kaipatiki residents in the future. There has been considerable investment of public money in Takapuna to build the metropolitan centre and KLB considers that it is important to have public transport arrangements that reflect this and provides easy access to this centre for communities living on the west of the motorway.</p> <p>11. The Kaipatiki Local Board asks AT to integrate planning for public transport with the general planning for road upgrading/roadworks to emphasise the growing importance of the East –West linkages.</p> <p>12. That the Kaipatiki Local Board supports the proposed additional bus route connection between Glenfield and Beach Haven via Kaipatiki Bridge.</p> <p>13. That the Kaipatiki Local Board supports initiatives which will increase public transport accessibility to all busway stations on our eastern boundary.</p> <p>14. The Kaipatiki Local Board asks Auckland Transport to consider offering a more direct bus link between the North Shore and the University of Auckland and AUT city campuses via the Port motorway exit/entrance.</p> <p>15. The Kaipatiki Local Board asks AT to integrate planning for suitable terminus facilities for North Shore commuters in Auckland's CBD with all planning for the public transport network as these facilities are an import part of the overall experience of public transport.</p> <p>16. Kaipatiki considers that there are a limited number of dedicated services which warrant separate attention outside of the feeder service and interchange model on a case by case basis. For example, a dedicated service to/from the two campuses of Auckland University and AUT from Kaipatiki would attract considerable patronage and the short hop from any central terminus to the campus precinct mitigates against changing buses.</p> <p>17. The Kaipatiki Local Board asks Auckland Transport to consider the options for having WiFi access on all public transport facilities to further encourage uptake of public transport services.</p> <p><b>Kaipatiki Local Board</b> 28 November 2012</p>
889	<b>Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board</b> Rina Tagore (Senior Advisor), Peter Skelton (Chair)	<p><b>Draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2012 - Submission from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board</b></p> <p>The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board promotes the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of current and future communities in our local area. One of the priorities for the Board's three year plan is to 'ensure our area is well connected'. Therefore the Local Board has considered the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) and submits the comments as outlined below.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board notes and generally supports Auckland Transport's (AT) vision and outcomes as stated in the draft Auckland RPTP. Both the Auckland Plan and the Local Board Plan highlight the improvement of public transport as a key priority, to enable the transformation of our community by connecting our people to their schools, places of employment and centres of business both within and outside our local area.</p> <p><b>A. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board notes and supports the following objectives/ initiatives from the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan:</b></p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
889	<p><b>Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board</b>  Rina Tagore (Senior Advisor), Peter Skelton (Chair) #889</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improve, upgrade, and expand public transport infrastructure and services.</li> <li>2. Upgrade the public transport fleet to provide modern, accessible, low emission vehicles across the entire network.</li> <li>3. The board supports the proposed service network structure built around a core network of frequent services, with services on rail supplemented by high-frequency bus routes connecting major centres. In particular the board supports a frequent service network that will deliver a 15-minute service operating 7am-7pm, complemented by feeder services to rail stations, local services, peak-only services, and services catering for specific market needs.</li> <li>4. Implement an integrated fares and ticketing scheme across all bus, rail, and ferry services as a means to simplify the use of public transport across the various modes of public transport and promote increased patronage.</li> <li>5. Proposed improvements to service quality: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. New and upgraded local infrastructure including buses, bus shelters, seating, interchange terminals to encourage new patronage to public transport</li> <li>b. Improving the number of local connections to the rapid transit network for better connections both locally and regionally.</li> <li>c. Ensure good access to quality public transport information</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. That fares are set at a level that encourages mode shift, recognise the needs of the transport disadvantaged, and provide for a financially viable public transport system.</li> <li>7. Ensure that Auckland Transport strongly commit to community and stakeholder involvement in service planning as the key to unlocking the potential of this plan to enable Auckland to better utilise public transport.</li> <li>8. Support monitoring and review requirements of the fares and charges and the Farebox Recovery Rate (FRR) targets to quantify whether areas of high deprivation are further disadvantaged by fares and FRR policies.</li> <li>9. The proposed Public Transport Operating Model (PTOM) will deliver on the vision of the RPTP but fails to address groups it identifies as being “transport disadvantaged” as defined by the Public Transport Management Act (PTMA) - “people whom (Auckland Transport) has reasonable grounds to believe are the least able to get to basic community activities and services (for example, work, education, health care, welfare, and food shopping”</li> </ol> <p>Therefore, Auckland Transport should better reflect in the document how:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Access to public transport for high deprivation communities it identifies as being “transport disadvantaged” is supported within– Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Otara-Papatoetoe and Manurewa.</li> <li>b. “Transport Disadvantaged” (as noted on page 117 - Appendix 5: Transport disadvantaged assessment within high deprivation communities such as Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Otara-Papatoetoe and Manurewa, though not limited to those areas) are clearly identified and defined as a group in the RPTP;</li> <li>c. Auckland Transport will respond to low income earners being supported or subsidised to better afford and access public transport to meet their needs.</li> </ol> <p><b>B. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board DOES NOT support the following and would like to make the following comments:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Any changes to the SuperGold Card entitlements. The status quo for the use of the SuperGold card holders be maintained to encourage senior members of our community: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. To maintain active and healthy lifestyles. The support encourages use of public transport by older people and contributes to the public health in the community.</li> <li>b. To minimise isolation of older people who are more dependent due to reduced mobility.</li> <li>c. To support seniors (e.g. grandparents and caretakers) to play a supporting role within their extended families as caretakers for young people, particularly Maori, Pacific communities, and migrant and refugee communities.</li> </ol> <p>Auckland Transport has an opportunity to be innovative by looking at social return on investment beyond the cost/benefits analysis of this subsidy; and to support the long-term public good in supporting community wellbeing.</p> </li> <li>11. Fare structure based on the proposed zone charging system. The information regarding the zone charging was unclear as to how it would be implemented, but was interpreted as follows:  A fare would be charged when initiating travel within a zone. When a zone boundary is crossed, then an additional zone charge would be applied for that stage of the journey and subsequently until termination of total journey. If travel were confined within a single zone, then only one single zone charge would be applicable.</li> </ol> <p>Utilising this approach, this would therefore penalise our community and other communities living in close proximity to the zone boundaries and further:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This will impact on the travel choices of our communities due to the additional fare charge if travelling north compared to travelling east or south – Shopping at Sylvia Park (additional fare from Otahuhu) or Shopping at Manukau (further distance and travel time but within the same fare zone)</li> <li>b. In an area of high deprivation, where education and employment are key issues, the proposed zone charging system will penalise local students and workers through higher fares for studying or working in other areas of the region such as central Auckland or North Shore where key educational and commercial districts are located (Auckland University, Auckland CBD, Massey University, North Shore, etc)</li> <li>c. This further creates an environment for areas south of the central zones to be viewed as undesirable places to live. Living in these areas will literally mean that you will have to pay more to travel north for schools, work, major events and facilities – Zoo, Museum, MOTAT, Pasifika and less for travelling south – Manukau.</li> <li>d. Further, the proposed fare zones place additional disadvantage on communities living in the southern area. This move is in contradiction to the intent of The Southern Initiative, a place-based development initiative in the Auckland Plan for a transformational shift in these areas.</li> </ol>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
889	Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board Rina Tagore (Senior Advisor), Peter Skelton (Chair) #889	<p>e. Reduce the efficiency of the proposed network structure as patrons actively alter travel patterns and choose to remain within their fare zones.</p> <p>Utilising the fare structure to influence travel choices is a useful tool, but only when key travel destinations are distributed throughout the region. In the current situation, the majority of the key destinations are in and around central Auckland, and therefore will disadvantage those living outside the central zones, particularly those in the south and west who are required to pass through two zones to get to the city zone.</p> <p><b>Alternative Fare system</b></p> <p>A distance or concentric zone charge based from the travel start (initiation) point would provide a more equitable fare charging system that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote fiscal equity for public transport use.</li> <li>• Lessen the impact on commuters public transport decision making – Shop at Sylvia Park vs Manukau</li> <li>• Promote increased patronage across the entire network as opposed to maintaining travel within your zone.</li> </ul> <p>12. The Farebox Recovery Rate (FRR) of 50 percent within 3 years may have a detrimental impact on our community for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. The impact of the increasing FRR target from 46 % to 50% will have on fares and charges would exclude local residents due to reasons of affordability.</p> <p>13. The proposed staging of the Frequent Service Network (FSN) route within the local area because it does not prioritise a key connection from Favona Road to the Otahuhu Area. This key route is proposed in the plan for inclusion by 2022. The area is currently under-serviced by public transport and has very few options for commuters. The connection from Favona Road to the Otahuhu area is of high priority to the local board and the board would like that it be brought forward in funding and implementation.</p> <p><b>C. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board would like to note the following issues which were not included in the plan specifically, and request that these be addressed and considered for inclusion in the relevant sections of the final plan:</b></p> <p>14. That accessibility is not addressed through subsidies for disability communities alone. It is necessary to incorporate principles of universal design and inclusion into practice at an early stage through the design and procurement processes of the PTOM:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Design for mobility and movement of scooters, wheel chairs, mobility tools,</li> <li>b. Bigger in print, more legible, higher contrast signage</li> <li>c. Buses and trains have been designed with these needs taken into account.</li> </ol> <p>Further, that applying principles of universal design, will enhance accessibility for people in different life-stages, not the 'disabled' alone. For instance, seniors, mothers with push chairs/prams, etc.</p> <p>15. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) is an accepted methodology in urban design. Auckland Council invests resources in carrying out CPTED assessments and the consequent recommendations must be taken into account when designing and developing transport hubs and park and ride facilities. This is critical for southern areas where crime and safety are a major concern for our communities. Locations that require priority attention are: Māngere Town Centre, Otahuhu Train Station and Māngere Bridge.</p> <p>16. That Auckland Transport include PTOM contract requirements for the inclusion of opportunities for youth employment and/or training opportunities to align with the transformational shifts of the Auckland Plan – 'to dramatically accelerate the prospects of Auckland's children and young people.'</p> <p>17. That a new park and ride facility be investigated for the Otahuhu Train Station, proposed interchange station for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The provision of a park and ride, along with the proposed bus/train interchange would further enhance the site as a key southern transport hub.</li> <li>b. Unlike other sites along the southern train route, it is in industrial zone which lends itself to a park and ride with access to both State Highway 1 and 20 within close proximity via Walmsley Road and Kahu Street.</li> <li>c. There is capacity at this location to cater for future increased demand.</li> </ol> <p>18. That Auckland Transport take into account priorities in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu's Draft Area where feedback from community consultation has clearly shown public transport and infrastructure as one of the key themes of priority.</p> <p>19. The Local Board also wishes to draw attention to the issue of the electrification of the line to Pukekohe referenced in Appendix 1.B but not indicated in figures 5-2 to 5-6. Whilst this proposal is an important element in planning for the southern growth area, the board believes it is not as critical to implement in the next 10 years as the southern rail spur from Manukau, which does not appear to be shown or referenced at all in the Plan. The southern rail link from Manukau is important because of the sub-regional relationships between centres in The Southern Initiative area. Delivery of this network improvement would help to support the complementary growth of Manukau and its neighbouring metropolitan centres; therefore, its omission should be rectified.</p> <p>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board looks forward to a dialogue with Auckland Transport and wishes to speak in support of this submission.</p> <p>The Board would prefer to attend hearings in the southern area of Auckland.</p> <p>Peter Skelton, Chairperson Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
891	<p><b>Manurewa Local Board</b> Angela Dalton (Chairperson), Madelon de Jongh</p>	<p><b>Submission Manurewa Local Board on the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan</b> The Manurewa Local Board promotes the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of current and future communities in the Manurewa area. Therefore the Local Board has considered the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) and submits the comments below.</p> <p><u>Introduction</u> The Manurewa Local Board notes and generally supports Auckland Transports (AT) vision and outcomes as stated on page 15 of the draft Auckland RPTP. Both the Auckland Plan and the Manurewa Local Board Plan highlighted the improvement of the public transport as a key priority. It is therefore pleasing to see that AT has taken up the challenge and propose in this draft RPTP a number of improvements to Auckland's public transport system over the next few years. However there are a number of issues which raise questions about the effective outcome delivery which are set out below.</p> <p><u>Network Structure and the Integrated Service Network</u> Due to the high level nature of the Plan and the very regional focus that AT has taken in the design of the network, it is unclear whether customer needs will be met in an equitable way across the region: - Creation of a "frequent service network" implies that in some areas customers will have more complex journeys than at present, as there will be a need to transfer between services. - For the Manurewa community and its different neighbourhoods, direct linkages with economic hubs like the Auckland [A]irport and Wiri industrial area are missing. - For people who live in the Gardens it takes a long time to get to the fast or rapid network as there is no direct link to Manurewa town centre. A fast east-west connection seems not to be included in the new network.</p> <p>The Manurewa Local Board therefore questions if this new network will be able to provide uncompetitive travel times, reduce waiting and connection times and achieve the desired mode shift as envisaged by AT in designing this new network.</p> <p><u>Fares and Ticketing</u> The introduction of integrated tickets and fares is generally supported. However the Manurewa Local Board fears that the HOP technology may act to exclude sectors of the population. It is noted that monthly passes and single trip cash fares will continue to be available but that those preferring cash transactions will in effect be penalised as they will pay full price for journeys. This would apply particularly to less frequent travellers, potential new customers and truly affect the poorer communities in South Auckland. It will also create a larger group of transport disadvantaged and one of the priorities within the draft RPTP is to improve access for those groups and communities.</p> <p>To ensure equitable access to discounted ticketing options, AT should continue to use High Street retailers within local areas to sell passes and HOP Cards. It would be a detrimental step if these were only available at the larger interchanges or through the internet.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure and Customer Interface</u> Development of good timetables and online travel information is essential. Due to the need to transfer between different services, irregular users who are not familiar with the services may find it confusing and be deterred from using public transport. This would create a negative outcome from that desired, ie achieving increased passenger numbers and increasing public transport mode share. The provision of good travel and service information at stops and interchanges throughout the network will therefore be critical to ensure that the customer feels comfortable in planning their journey.</p> <p>Within the draft RPTP it is set out that the Park and Ride facility in the Manurewa area will be expanded. The Manurewa Local Board generally supports this. However, there are currently problems with street prostitution and theft in that particular area and concerns about safety and security will need to be addressed for a Park and Ride facility to be more widely used.</p> <p>Although it is a policy of AT to integrate public transport with cycling and walking, no details have been given within the draft Auckland RPTP as to how AT is giving effect to this policy.</p> <p><u>Funding and Prioritisation</u> AT recently has adopted a new farebox recovery policy. This new policy aims to increase the contribution of user fares to operating costs from the current 44.3 per cent to around 50 per cent over the next three years. The Manurewa Local Board would be concerned if, in order to reach this target, the fares would increase at a faster rate than inflation. As AT is aiming to attract more public transport users this new farebox recovery policy might have a dampening effect on passenger growth.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> The Manurewa Local Board is looking forward to a constructive dialogue with Auckland Transport on the matters raised above.</p> <p>The Local Board wishes to speak in support of this submission and would prefer to attend Hearing in the South Auckland area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Angela Dalton Chairperson Manurewa Local Board</p>
890	<p><b>Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board</b> Stephen Lindfield (Senior Local Board Advisor)</p>	<p><b>File Reference CP2012/19298</b></p> <p><b>Resolution number MTSFP/2012/10</b></p> <p>MOVED by Member SD Randall, seconded Member AB Verrall: a) That the report on the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan be received</p> <p>b) That the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board give the following feedback on the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan:</p> <p>i) The Board welcomes and in principle supports the strategic direction contained in the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport.</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
890	<p><b>Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board</b> Stephen Lindfield (Senior Local Board Advisor) #890</p>	<p>ii) In particular the Board supports the significant change in approach which will see current public resource used to connect bus and rail public transport in a way that improves frequency along major routes, but also increases the ease of connection between more destinations.</p> <p><b>Fares and fare boundaries</b></p> <p>iii) The Board generally supports the approach to simplify the zonal boundaries across Auckland.</p> <p>iv) The Board does not support the current North and South Zones as they appear inequitable and will mean that fares will be higher to reflect this. To this end the board requests that both the North and South Zones be split at Constellation Drive and Manurewa respectively.</p> <p>v) The Board requests that the transition zone between the Isthmus Zone and The South Zone currently at Onehunga be extended to cover Onehunga and Mangere Bridge so as to discourage unnecessary travel from the south across the Manukau Harbour Bridge and to reflect the school enrolment zones in the area. Infrastructure development</p> <p>vi) The Board supports increasing the provision of park and ride at the Glen Innes station, contained in appendix six of the draft plan.</p> <p>vii) The Board requests that given its role as a major interchange in the new plan that priority be given to the upgrading of the bus interchange at Glen Innes, with particular focus on integration with the shopping centre, safety of access to the rail station and layout of the bus stops.</p> <p>viii) The Board requests that the eventual co-location of the bus interchange and rail station at Onehunga be planned for, as a matter of priority, and that Auckland Transport works on making this part of the long term programme in the RLTP.</p> <p>ix) The Board reiterates its view that the Tamaki Train Station should be reinstated, and believe that this should be given priority.</p> <p>x) The Board requests that the Draft RPTP provisions around cycling be expanded significantly given the important role cycling can play at expanding the reach of rail stations and bus stops in the network.</p> <p>These provisions should include requiring interchanges to provide a prescribed minimum of cycling facilities which allow the storage of cycles. The Board further supports further investigation into making greater provision for the carriage of cycles within the public transport network, particularly on buses.</p> <p><b>Accessibility issues</b></p> <p>xi) The Board strongly supports the proposed policy which gives concessionary fares for the young, students, disabled and older persons.</p> <p>xii) The Board strongly requests that the existing use of Gold Cards during afternoon peak should continue, with a preference for this subsidy to be funded in the same way as which it is currently funded. Monitoring and Performance</p> <p>xiii) The Board welcomes the proposed approach towards ensuring better service on the public transport network. The board requests that all data collected on the performance of the public transport network be made publicly accessible in a way which is visible, easily accessed and transparent. [end]</p>
892	<p><b>Orakei Local Board</b> Ken Baguley (Traffic Spokesman for Orakei), Willemien Thom (PA / Liaison)</p>	<p><b>SUBMISSION TO AUCKLAND TRANSPORT</b> <b>From ORAKEI LOCAL BOARD Re Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan</b> <b>GENERAL COMMENTS:</b></p> <p>The Orakei Local Board represents a population of 81100 residents (as at 2009) residing in 27762 households who generate approx \$110million of rates revenue for the Auckland Council out of a total rate take of approx \$1.374billion – i.e. 8% of rates are derived from the Orakei Ward.</p> <p>The Regional Land Transport Programme indicates that Public Transport Infrastructure is expected to cost \$200 million in 2013/2014 with no definable project applicable to the Orakei Local Board area.</p> <p>Table 2-2 indicates that Public Transport Services has a budget of \$305.381million in 2012/2013 to service 70 million public transport trips. i.e. there is a raw cost of \$4.36per trip although it is understood that rail trips are subsidised to a far greater extent than bus trips.</p> <p>The Auckland Plan identifies a target to increase public transport trips from 70 million to 140 million by 2022. Table 2-2 also indicates that the annual cost of Public Transport Services will increase over the 10 years to 2023 from \$305 million per annum to \$362million (average over years 4-10) which will reduce the raw cost per trip to about \$2.59 per trip if transport trips can double to 140 million with a 19% increase in costs. The Auckland Regional Transport Plan should show greater detail on which modes will account for the 140 million trips.</p> <p>Rail boardings totalled 10.9million in 2012 (DARPT para 3.2) and although the DARPT does not include any expected numbers for rail in 2023, the annual cost of supporting the CRL based on anticipated number of users is a major concern. Greater transparency around the net cost of the CRL should be included in the final copy of the Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan.</p> <p>With these numbers as the background it is disturbing to note that the Orakei Local Ward has very little coverage in the ARPTP i.e</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tamaki Drive and Remuera Road are the only routes appearing in the proposed frequent service network</li> <li>The proposed all day service network does show additional services that will be of interest to the residents of the Orakei Ward although we understand that the ARPTP is only focussed on the “Proposed frequent service network” at this stage.</li> <li>Bus routes shown on the “Proposed frequent service network” and routes detailed in Appendix 1.A indicate that services along Tamaki Drive and Remuera Road are part of services that are through routes such as Benson Road to Howe Street and New Lynn to Glen Innes. In various consultations with residents over the Orakei Board Annual Plans and Tamaki Drive Master Plan, residents have consistently asked for smaller buses that more suitable for narrow established streets. With Tamaki Drive in particular, the Orakei Local Board has continually advocated for smaller buses working to a 10/15 minute</li> </ol>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
892	<p><b>Orakei Local Board</b> Ken Baguley (Traffic Spokesman for Orakei), Willemien Thom (PA / Liaison) #892</p>	<p>timetable exclusively along Tamaki Drive from the CBD to St Heliers. The OLB believe that such a service should be included in the “Proposed frequent service network”.</p> <p>d. The south eastern rail route goes through the Orakei Ward however the residents of the Orakei Ward have very limited access to the rail without inclusion of an additional rail station in the Purewa Valley (aka Selwyn Station) connected to the local areas by feeder bus services. The OLB believe that the “Selwyn Station” should be included as a future rail station to be constructed within the timeframe of the ARPTP. Feeder bus services to the Orakei, “Selwyn” and Remuera stations should then be included in the “Proposed all day service network”.</p> <p><b>COMMENTS re OBJECTIVES AS DETAILED IN CHAPTER 6:</b></p> <p>6.1 Integrated Service Network - simple, integrated services that connect people with where they want to go The OLB support this objective and request that the technology providing integrated ticketing must cater for passengers using feeder bus services from the introduction of Integrated ticketing.</p> <p>6.2 Service Quality - a convenient and reliable public transport network using modern vehicles. The OLB support this objective and believe that more frequent services with smaller buses should be used where appropriate to satisfy this objective.</p> <p>6.3 Fares and Ticketing - a fares and ticketing system that attracts and retains customers, while balancing user contributions against public funding The OLB support this objective and as noted in the General Comments above, are extremely concerned at the cost to ratepayers of subsidising public transport when many residents of the Orakei Ward have very restricted access to the rail network in particular.</p> <p>6.4 Infrastructure - a high standard of public transport infrastructure that supports service provision and enhances the customer experience The OLB support this objective subject to receiving details of the “Proposed all day service network”. We would also like to view indicative designs of the type of amenity that will be constructed at key transfer points and suggest that this illustration should be included in the Final ARPTP.</p> <p>6.5 Customer Interface – simple, visible and intuitive customer information and services The OLB support this objective subject to receiving details of how the interface with customers will work and receiving confirmation that the interface will incorporate the latest technology such as APPS on cellphones with interactive contact with service providers.</p> <p>6.6 Assisting the Transport Disadvantaged - improved accessibility for communities and groups whose needs are not met by the regular public transport system The OLB support this objective</p> <p>6.7 Procurement and Commercial Services – a procurement system that supports the efficient delivery of public transport services The OLB support this objective and encourage Auckland Transport to use this restructure as a means of increasing local employment opportunities, particularly in relation to feeder bus services.</p> <p>6.8 Funding and Prioritisation - effective and efficient allocation of public transport funding The OLB support greater transparency around the publicising of the cost to ratepayers of subsidising public transport and advocate for this cost to be shown as a separate line item on annual rate notices.</p> <p>6.9 Monitoring and Review – a system of monitoring and review that supports continuous improvement The OLB support annual monitoring and review of the ARPTP.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION:</b> The Orakei Local Board commend Auckland Transport for developing a plan that could radically change the way people utilise public transport to move around Auckland but note that the Orakei Ward is largely excluded from gaining any benefits until such time as more readily available access to the rail network is provided via an additional station in the Purewa Valley together with feeder bus services.</p> <p>The Orakei Local Board is concerned that the ARPTP has been prepared without consideration of the Tamaki Drive Master Plan or Corridor Management Plans for Tamaki Drive, Kepa Road and Remuera Road or the effect of AMETI developments on the Eilerslie Panmure Highway.</p> <p>The implementation of a public transport system that requires people to change buses/modes to get from one place to another is supported although the devil will be in the detail and issues such as bus/train reliability and comfort of the amenities at transfer points will ultimately dictate how well this concept will be accepted. With the residents of Orakei ward being amongst the highest paying ratepayers in Auckland and the large cost of subsidising public transport that falls on the ratepayer the Orakei Local Board advocate for initiatives as outlined in this submission to be incorporated in the final version of the Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan.</p>
893	<p><b>Otara-Papatoetoe</b> Neil Taylor (Senior Local Board Advisor)</p>	<p><b>Submission on Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2012</b> Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board and makes the following submission on the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> The Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board generally supports the vision and outcomes as stated in the draft Auckland RPTP. These align with the Auckland Plan. The local board particularly supports the improvement of public transport as a key priority to enable the transformation of our community by connecting our people to their schools, places of employment and centres of business both within and outside our local area.</p> <p><b>Proposals specifically supported by the local board</b> The board supports the proposal:</p> <p>1. Improve, upgrade, and expand public transport infrastructure and services</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
893	<p>Otara-Papatoetoe Neil Taylor (Senior Local Board Advisor) #893</p>	<p>2. Upgrade the public transport fleet to provide modern, accessible, low emission vehicles across the entire network</p> <p>3. Implement an integrated fares and ticketing scheme across all bus, rail, and ferry services as a means to simplify the use of public transport across the various modes of public transport and promote increased patronage.</p> <p>4. Improve service quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New and upgraded local infrastructure including buses, bus shelters, seating, interchange terminals to encourage new patronage to public transport</li> <li>- Improving the number of local connections to the rapid transit network for better connections both locally and regionally.</li> <li>- Ensure good access to quality public transport information</li> </ul> <p>5. Set fares that encourage mode shift, recognise the needs of the transport disadvantaged, and provide for a financially viable public transport system.</p> <p>6. Ensure that Auckland Transport commits to community and stakeholder involvement in service planning as the key to unlocking the potential of this plan to enable Auckland to better utilise public transport.</p> <p>7. Monitoring and review of the fares and charges and the Farebox Recovery Rate (FRR) targets to quantify whether areas of high deprivation are further disadvantaged by fares and FRR policies.</p> <p>8. The board supports the proposed service network structure built around a core network of frequent services, with services on rail supplemented by high-frequency bus routes connecting major centres. In particular the board supports a frequent service network that will deliver a 15-minute service operating 7am-7pm, complemented by feeder services to rail stations, local services, peak-only services, and services catering for specific market needs.</p> <p>9. The board supports the objectives for service reliability, especially that each trip should leave on time and arrive at (or very close to) the scheduled time.</p> <p>10. The board supports the general approach in Appendix 5 to identifying the “transport disadvantaged” as defined by the Public Transport Management Act: “people whom (Auckland Transport) has reasonable grounds to believe are the least able to get to basic community activities and services (for example, work, education, health care, welfare, and food shopping)”</p> <p>However, the RPTP needs to make clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That low socio-economic communities in South Auckland, such as Mangere-Otahuhu, Otara-Papatoetoe and Manurewa are all “transport disadvantaged”. The plan should name these areas.</li> <li>- How, specifically, it will support access to public transport by “transport disadvantaged” communities</li> <li>- How low income earners can be supported or subsidised to better support affordable public transport access to meet their needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposals specifically opposed by the local board</b></p> <p>11. The board opposes any changes to the SuperGold Card entitlements. The status quo for the use of the SuperGold card holders should be maintained to encourage retired members of our community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To maintain active and healthy lifestyles (public health benefits)</li> <li>- To minimise isolation of older people who are more dependent due to reduced mobility and limited income</li> <li>- To support seniors (grandparents and caregivers) to play a supporting role within their extended families as caretakers for young people, particularly Maori, Pacific, migrant and refugee communities.</li> </ul> <p>The board suggests that the RPTP should look beyond the cost/benefit analysis of this subsidy and support the long term public good in supporting community wellbeing.</p> <p>12. The board opposes a fare structure based on the proposed zone charging system. The information regarding the zone charging was unclear as to how it would be implemented, but was interpreted as per the following:</p> <p>A fare would be charged when initiating travel within a zone. When a zone boundary is crossed, than an additional zone charge would be applied for that stage of the journey and subsequently until termination of total journey. If travel were confined within a single zone, then only one single zone charge would be applicable.</p> <p>This would penalise our community and other communities living in close proximity to the zone boundaries and further:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This will impact on our communities’ travel choices due to the additional fare charge if travelling north compared to travelling east or south.</li> <li>- In an area of high deprivation, where education and employment are key issues, the proposed zone charging system will penalise local students and workers through higher fares for studying or working in central Auckland where key educational and commercial districts are located (Auckland University, Auckland CBD, etc)</li> <li>- This further creates an environment for areas south of the central zones to be viewed as undesirable places to live.</li> <li>- Reduce the efficiency of the proposed network structure as patrons actively alter travel patterns and choose to remain within their fare zones.</li> </ul> <p>Utilising the fare structure to influence travel choices is a useful tool, but only when key travel destinations are distributed throughout the region. In the current situation, the majority of the key destinations are in and around central Auckland, and therefore will disadvantage those living outside the central zones, particularly those in the south and west who are required to pass through two zones to get to the city zone.</p> <p><b>Other proposals raised by the local board</b></p> <p>The following issues were not noted in the draft plan, but the board requests that they be addressed and considered for inclusion in the relevant sections of the final plan:</p> <p>13. The Board asks that the disability community’s needs are not only addressed through subsidies, but through the design and procurement processes of the PTOM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Design for scooters, wheel chairs, mobility tools,</li> </ul>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
893	<p><b>Otara-Papatoetoe</b> Neil Taylor (Senior Local Board Advisor) #893</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bigger print, more legible, higher contrast signage</li> <li>- Buses and trains are designed with everyone’s movement needs taken into account.</li> </ul> <p>14. The Board asks that Auckland Transport include contract requirements for the inclusion of opportunities for youth employment and/or training opportunities to align with the transformational shifts of the Auckland Plan – ‘to dramatically accelerate the prospects of Auckland’s children and young people.’</p> <p>15. The Board asks that consideration be given to improving pedestrian access to Papatoetoe station, especially by providing pedestrian over-bridges or other grade separated access across the busy roads around the station. Quicker, safer pedestrian access to the station would increase passenger numbers and expand the station’s catchment area. Bus stops on busy roads might similarly be considered for over-bridges, including some along Great South Road.</p> <p>16. The Board asks that the plan provide for the construction of a Puhinui Station Park and Ride. This could significantly increase the catchment served by Puhinui station.</p> <p>17. The board asks that consideration be given to improving access to and from the south to Manukau station via a new south facing rail link between the Manukau spur and the main trunk, to improve connectivity and frequency to Manukau rail services.</p> <p>The board wishes to speak to this submission. We would prefer to attend a hearing in South Auckland.</p>
894	<p><b>Papakura Local Board</b> Hine Joyce-Tahere (Chairperson), Karen Gadowski (Senior Local Board Advisor)</p>	<p>Papakura Local Board promotes the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of current and future communities in the Papakura area. The Local Board has considered the draft Regional Public Transport Plan (the “Plan”) and submits the comments outlined below.</p> <p>The Board is concerned that the public was not given an adequate amount of time to respond on this important strategic document. It is hoped that more realistic consultation timeframes will e adopted by Auckland Transport in any future policy and programme development.</p> <p>The Local Board notes the following vision and objectives, as set out on page 15 of the Plan:</p> <p><b>Vision</b> An integrated efficient and effective public transport network that offers a wider range of trips and is the mode of choice for an increasing number of Aucklanders.</p> <p><b>Outcomes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Services that align with future land use patterns</li> <li>- Services that meet customer needs</li> <li>- Increased passenger numbers</li> <li>- Increased public transport mode share</li> <li>- Improved value for money</li> </ul> <p>These vision and outcomes are supported by the Local Board and it is considered that they set and appropriate direction or the development of Auckland’s public transport system over the next ten years. It is therefore important that the Plan sets out clear actions and proposals to support delivery of the outcomes.</p> <p>There are a number of issues which raise questions about effective outcome delivery and these are dealt with at paragraphs 1 to 9 of this submission.</p> <p>1. The Local Board is concerned that the Plan may not adequately support Papakura’s development as a Metropolitan Centre and Takanini’s role as a town centre. Whilst it is appreciated that the Plan covers a 10 year period, the timescales involved with the provision of transport infrastructure require that some thought be given to the longer term if services are to truly align with future land use patterns. More specific comments are made in the following paragraphs.</p> <p>2. The Board does not believe that the network as proposed will offer real transport choice to the many people who work and shop in Papakura, which in turn will not support its transformation into a second tier centre within the Auckland Plan hierarchy (first tier being the City Centre). Figures 5-3 to 5-6 to illustrate Papakura as a “minor Interchange” located on the periphery of the frequent service network, with only limited connectivity back to the town from its surrounding hinterland. It is submitted that Papakura is more than a “minor” interchange and this is evidenced by the large numbers of residents requiring Park and Ride spaces. The Plan should recognise this and make specific provision for extending the existing Park and Ride to enable the station to cater for the current need and future increasing demands. To complement this, it is essential that connecting bus services are made more frequent in order to aid journey planning and ensure effective and reliable transport choice in the rural area.</p> <p>3. Whilst an extension to a new station at Drury is shown this is not well connected by bus services into the wider area. Although a Park and Ride facility is proposed at the new station, this will not necessarily support Papakura’s centre, as passengers are just as likely to travel through the town and on to destinations further afield. Notwithstanding the Drury proposal, it is vital that Papakura’s Park and Ride is extended to enable the station’s role as an interchange to be strengthened.</p> <p>4. The Plan does not recognise the significant growth to the east of Takanini and does not indicate the proposed new station at Walters Road. The new station is vital if increased (new) passenger numbers and an increased mode share for public transport are to be achieved in this area. The location of the new station would also support Takanini’s role as a town centre. Frequent bus connections are required from the growth area to the existing and new stations and the town centre.</p> <p>5. Furthermore, the Plan does not recognise the major change that is being planned for as part of the Unitary Plan and Rural Urban Boundary proposals for a Southern Growth area. Over a 30 year period, the area to the south and south west of Papakura could accommodate up to 55,000 new houses and associated employment, schools, health and other infrastructure. The public transport network should begin to accommodate this future growth potential within the 10 year life of the Plan and enable Papakura begin to realise its step change as a metropolitan centre. The Board is concerned that the Plan as proposed sets a strategy in place which will restrict the scope for influencing detailed scheme provision and timing.</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
894	<p><b>Papakura Local Board</b> Hine Joyce-Tahere (Chairperson), Karen Gadowski (Senior Local Board Advisor) #894</p>	<p>6. Electrification of the line to Pukekohe is referenced in Appendix 1.B but not indicated in figures 5-2 to 5-6. Whilst this proposal is an important element in planning for the southern growth area, the Board believes it is not as critical to implement in the next 10 years as the southern rail spur from Manukau, which does not appear to be shown or referenced at all in the Plan. The southern rail link from Manukau is important because of the sub regional relationships between centres in the Southern Initiative area. Delivery of this network improvement would help to support the complementary growth of Manukau and Papakura as metropolitan centres; therefore its omission should be rectified.</p> <p>7. Figure 1-1 identifies the various related transport planning documents but the Plan does not seem to make further reference to how these other transport programmes integrate with the development of the public transport network. Neither does it deal effectively with the impact of electrification on existing road crossings or propose any grade separation. Even if this matter is addressed in a related transport document, for transparency and ease of public understanding it should also be cross referenced in the Plan. The Plan should fully clarify how the rail based elements of the network integrate with the road network.</p> <p>8. Due to the high level nature of the Plan, it is unclear whether customer needs will be met in an equitable way across the region. Creation of a “frequent service network” implies that in some areas customers will have more complex journeys than at present, as there will be a need to transfer between services. This may deter irregular users who are not familiar with the services and therefore may act against the desired outcomes of achieving increased passenger numbers and increasing public transport mode share. The provision of good travel and service information at stops and interchanges throughout the network will be critical to ensuring that customers feel comfortable planning their journey.</p> <p>9. The introduction of integrated tickets and fares is generally supported; however the Local Board is concerned that the HOP technology may act to exclude some sectors of the population. It is noted that monthly passes and single trip cash fares will continue to be available but that those preferring cash transactions will in effect be penalised as they will pay full price for journeys. This would apply particularly to less frequent travellers and potential new customers. To ensure equitable access to discounted ticketing options, Auckland Transport should continue to use High Street retailers to sell passes and HOP Cards; it would be a detrimental step if these were only available at the larger interchanges or through the internet.</p> <p>Papakura Local Board look forward to constructive dialogue with Auckland Transport on the matters raised above.</p> <p>The Local Board wishes to speak in support of this submission and would prefer to attend Hearings in the South Auckland area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Hine Joyce-Tahere Chairperson Papakura Local Board</p>
895	<p><b>Puketapapa Local Board</b> Richard Barter (Chair), Shirley Atatagi-Coutts</p>	<p>Acknowledging that Puketapapa Local Board has already outlined its aspirations about transport in our city and community in a submission on the Regional Land Transport Plan given to Auckland Transport in early 2012, the Local Board submits these additional comments on the proposed policy areas of the Regional Public Transport Plan</p> <p><b>POLICY AREA AND OBJECTIVE</b></p> <p><b>1. Network Structure</b> A permanent network of connected frequent services that supports Auckland’s future growth</p> <p>1.1 Provide a core network of frequent and reliable services Support the concept as long as the “reliable” can be guaranteed. Current services are not often seen as reliable</p> <p>1.2 Maximise access to the frequent network from the urban area Agree. The Local Board considers that this should also include access by bicycle, foot as well as feeder services.</p> <p>1.3 Provide connections to the frequent network Agree. These connections should include/cater for walking and cycling.</p> <p>1.4 Promote land use policies that support the public transport network Agree. This will have to be timed well with perceptible improvements to services.</p> <p><b>2. Integrated Service Network</b> Simple integrated services that connect people with where they want to go</p> <p>2.1 Provide a simple, layered network of public transport services Agree as long as it delivers efficiencies and not simply cost savings.</p> <p>2.2 Ensure good access to public transport services from all parts of the urban area Agree. The Board considers that enabling good access also includes providing for getting to the bus or train by bicycle, i.e. lockers or secure storage.</p> <p>2.3 Provide a public transport network that maximises the range of travel options and destinations available Agree. In Puketapapa it is currently hard to travel easily unless one is going in or out of the CBD.</p> <p>2.4 Enable timely and cost-effective service provision in developing urban areas Not sure how services in developing areas can be cost effective? What do you mean by identified?</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
895	<p><b>Puketapapa Local Board</b> Richard Barter (Chair), Shirley Atatagi-Coutts #895</p>	<p>2.5 Ensure that services respond to identified customer needs Agree with the planned frequency levels.</p> <p>2.6 Maintain consistent levels of service in each service layer appropriate to demand Agree but am nervous as to the degree to which cost ceilings might result in service cuts.</p> <p>2.7 Enable timely and cost-effective service adjustments to meet demand Supported.</p> <p>2.8 Co-ordinate services for special events to help meet the needs of the event and reduce demands on other parts of the transport system [No comments supplied]</p> <p><b>3. Service Quality</b> A convenient and reliable public transport system using modern vehicles</p> <p>3.1 Develop realistic, achievable timetables that are reliable dependable Agree, they must also be produced in forms that are understandable to a wide range of users.</p> <p>3.2 Improve travel speeds to provide a service that is competitive with car travel Allowing taxis or other vehicles into bus lanes will not help this at all.</p> <p>3.3 Provide a reliable, punctual, customer-focused network of services As above, if the service is not reliable, people will not trust it.</p> <p>3.4 Ensure that all vehicles and vessels meet required standards Agree. Standards relating to, including on public transport should be raised including aspects such as ventilation – noting that some buses can have unpleasant odour. Strongly recommend that raising standards also includes looking at electric buses.</p> <p>3.5 Ensure that service agreements encourage good operator performance Important to also include targets for key problematic areas with high incidences of outage/incidences eg rail services</p> <p>3.6 Monitor and continuously improve service delivery Need sound success indicators are you using and important to develop baselines to measure against.</p> <p><b>4. Fares and Ticketing</b> A fares and ticketing system that attracts and retains customers, while balancing user contributions against public funding</p> <p>4.1 Implement a fares and ticketing system that supports public transport service integration Supported. Recommends prioritising this so it can be delivered soon.</p> <p>4.2 Provide integrated fares and ticketing across all bus, rail, and ferry services Supported. Recommends prioritising this so it can be delivered soon.</p> <p>4.3 Implement a zone-based fare structure with standard fares across bus and rail operators Recommend that the system be designed so that commuters can get off the bus on the way home, do some shopping then get back on without being penalised.</p> <p>4.4 Simplify the range of fare products available Support as long as it is equitable</p> <p>4.5 Maintain fares at a level that will achieve a farebox recovery ratio of approximately 50 per cent The use of the private motor vehicle is subsidised by a number of ways. This should be taken into account. Additionally the savings in other areas that are caused by the use of public transport should be taken into account before the fares are put up to recover costs. Refer to: <a href="http://www.increase-public-transport.net/fileadmin/user_upload/Procurement/SIPTRAM/Hidden_subsidies_final.pdf">http://www.increase-public-transport.net/fileadmin/user_upload/Procurement/SIPTRAM/Hidden_subsidies_final.pdf</a></p> <p>4.6 Provide incentives to use integrated tickets Agree. Sydney provides free travel in the weekends for family members of the commuter.</p> <p>4.7 Provide concession fares for target groups Concessions and incentives should not be limited to integrated tickets but should also include incentives to encourage people who do not normally travel by public transport to try it out.</p> <p>4.8 Provide off-peak discounts if these improve operational efficiency Agree</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
895	<p><b>Puketapapa Local Board</b> Richard Barter (Chair), Shirley Atatagi-Coutts #895</p>	<p>4.9 Ensure that all users pay the correct fare Agree</p> <p><b>5. Infrastructure</b></p> <p>A high standard of public transport infrastructure that supports service provision and enhances customer experience</p> <p>5.1 Integrate infrastructure and service provision Agree</p> <p>5.2 Provide well-designed transport interchanges on the frequent service network Agree</p> <p>5.3 Provide accessible customer-focused facilities appropriate to the public transport route and the immediate locality Accessibility considerations should cover disabled, people with young children and the elderly.</p> <p>5.4 Provide bus priority measures on key corridors Agree</p> <p>5.5 Provide Park and Ride facilities at appropriate sites Agree to provision but within limits. We do not want carparks covering Auckland just to enable the use of public transport. Refer to earlier comments about encouraging feeder services, walking and cycling to transport infrastructure.</p> <p>5.6 Integrate public transport with cycling and walking Agree</p> <p><b>6. Customer Interface</b></p> <p>Simple, visible and intuitive customer information and service</p> <p>6.1 Use customer feedback to continually enhance the product Agree</p> <p>6.2 Provide a consistent brand for Auckland Transport throughout the region Agree</p> <p>6.3 Provide a range of marketing material to attract potential customers Agree</p> <p>6.4 Provide a wide choice of information channels for customers to plan their journeys Agree. The London Underground map is a good example. Information should be user-friendly especially to minorities, non English speaking people and visitors.</p> <p>6.5 Provide real-time passenger information Agree</p> <p>6.6 Provide a high quality travel experience Agree</p> <p>6.7 Improve the connection infrastructure Agree</p> <p>6.8 Provide a range of customer feedback channels Agree</p> <p><b>7. Assist the Transport Disadvantaged</b></p> <p>Improved access for communities and groups whose needs are not met by the regular public transport system</p> <p>7.1 Provide a public transport network that is accessible and safe, particularly for vulnerable users Agree. The Board considers this should include security on routes at night.</p> <p>7.2 Provide transport services and facilities for customers whose needs are not met by the regular public transport network Agree. The Board considers this should include security on routes at night.</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
895	<p><b>Puketapapa Local Board</b> Richard Barter (Chair), Shirley Atatagi-Coutts #895</p>	<p>7.3 Provide safe public transport access for school students to and from their zoned and/or nearest school Agree</p> <p>7.4 Provide concessionary fares for the transport disadvantaged and other target groups Agree</p> <p>7.5 Support public transport services and facilities that better meet the needs of individual rural and isolated communities, taking into account value for money and local initiatives Agree</p> <p>7.6 Ensure that transport services and facilities account for socio-economic characteristics Agree. Areas of high deprivation and transport disadvantage may have a greater need for public transport options. The Board supports the proposal to work with agencies to promote understanding of the Smartcard and its associated benefits for low income and beneficiary households.</p> <p><b>8. Procurement and Commercial Services</b> A procurement system that supports the efficient delivery of public transport services</p> <p>8.1 Ensure the appropriate allocation of roles, responsibilities, and risk between Auckland Transport and operators, using the PTOM Encourage the use of local providers and local businesses vs. companies where profits are sent overseas. A wider range of benefits to Auckland must be taken into account when selecting providers and not just to be based on the cheapest bid.</p> <p>8.2 Ensure service continuity to the travelling public Agree</p> <p>8.3 Identify specific services that are exempt from PTOM contracts No comment</p> <p>8.4 Adopt a partnership approach to network planning and service changes Supports that a partnership approach can achieve consistency and considers a partnership approach can also benefit from building in consultation with community through Local Boards to enable feedback on network planning and service changes.</p> <p>8.5 Ensure that rail services procurement recognises the need to complete the transition to a fully electrified system Agree</p> <p>8.6 Manage the transition from current contracts to the future PTOM contracting environment Agree</p> <p>8.7 Ensure that exempt commercial services do not adversely affect the wider public transport network Agree</p> <p><b>9. Funding and Prioritisation</b> Effective and efficient allocation of public transport funding</p> <p>9.1 Improve value for money from existing public transport funding Improved value for money should not simply be about reducing costs but delivering more value and effectiveness that can be realised by commuters. Considers a regular review of service effectiveness and value for money is important.</p> <p>9.2 Increase the level of farebox recovery Consider an annual fare review and adjustment process does not always have to result in a fare increase. Improved service can also increase the numbers of users which means fares can be reduced without negatively impacting farebox recovery.</p> <p>9.3 Direct available funding to high priority activities Considers that improvements in areas of high deprivation should be considered 'high priority'.</p> <p>9.4 Encourage the development of new funding mechanisms for public transport The Puketapapa Local Board has outlined its views on alternate funding mechanisms for public transport. Please refer to a copy of this submission in Attachment 1</p> <p><b>10. Monitoring and Review</b> A system of monitoring and review that supports continuous improvement</p> <p>10.1 Undertake regular monitoring and reporting of service and system performance Agree</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
895	<p><b>Puketapapa Local Board</b> Richard Barter (Chair), Shirley Atatagi-Coutts #895</p>	<p>10.2 Regularly review and update the RPTP to account for changing circumstances Agree</p> <p>10.3 Ensure appropriate public consultation on future RPTP variations Support regular consultations.</p> <p>ATTACHMENT 1</p> <p>Puketapapa Local Board <i>Feedback on:</i> <b>Getting Auckland Moving – Alternative Funding for Transport Discussion Document Feb 2012</b></p> <p>Submitted by: Richard Barter Chair, Puketapapa Local Board Transport Portfolio Holder April 2012</p> <p>Q1. Do you agree that Auckland’s congestion problem is unacceptable? Yes.</p> <p>Q2. Do you agree that additional funds are required to address Auckland’s transport problems? Yes.</p> <p>Raising additional revenue and finding the right solutions to fund goes hand in hand. The region’s networks will continue to struggle to be efficient and effective until and unless car users have viable transport alternatives and the levels of public transport services increase. Some of these alternatives transport methods have environmental, health and economic benefits all of which contribute to the goal of making Auckland the world’s most liveable city. We acknowledge that the lack of investment in viable transport alternatives is part of the transport dilemma and this must form a key part of the solution.</p> <p><b>Incentivising Behaviour Change:</b> The current taxes don’t encourage behaviour change so will not help with congestion. We encourage research into funding mechanisms that will bring about positive behaviour change eg make public transport more appealing; encourage active modes of transport; encourage users to consider health and environmental benefits of their transport modes.</p> <p><b>Equity:</b> Some taxes penalise the poor more than the rich. The Board is encouraged to note that the <i>Council will take into account the ‘ability to pay’ on low income individuals and households when designing new funding tools 1.</i> (1 Ibid, p11)</p> <p><b>Spreading costs to future beneficiaries of infrastructure:</b> Costs must be spread to future users. The Council is encouraged to dialogue with the national government on finding cost-effective ways to assist this.</p> <p>Land use and environmental considerations: The question of the compact city idea must be taken into account. Currently the poor are being forced further away from the city centres and where the lack of public transport services mean they must use their cars. Good quality affordable medium density housing close to good public transport routes must be part of this question so that people have transport choices. Many of the problems Auckland faces today are due to a disconnect between land use planning and transport planning. In a recent article by Buttonwood published in The Economist magazine “Feeling Peaky: The economic impact of high oil prices 2” (2 <a href="http://www.economist.com/node/21553034">http://www.economist.com/node/21553034</a>), it is stated that we have reached the time when the cost of extracting oil is only going to increase. The environmental costs of fossil fuel based transport systems are routinely not factored into the cost of driving cars.3 ( 3 Doomsday warning from IEA boss By Mark Halper   April 26, 2012, 5:42 AM PDT <a href="http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/intelligent-energy/doomsday-warning-from-iea-boss/15367">http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/intelligent-energy/doomsday-warning-from-iea-boss/15367</a>)</p> <p><b>Macro-Economic Factors:</b> The traditional view on the use of private vehicles to get to work was challenged by the Department City and Regional Planning at Berkeley University in a paper titled “Transportation Market Distortions”4 (4 Litman, Todd (2006, p33) Transportation Market Distortions, Berkeley Planning Journal 19 (1), Department City and Regional Planning , UC Berkeley.). The writer has included the conclusion as he believes it is pertinent to the issue of the sense of entitlement that is widespread when it comes to the use of people’s cars. <i>“Efficient markets create harmony between individuals and society. Such markets internalize costs so society is not harmed when consumers increase their motor vehicle travel. Market distortions spoil this harmony. Current transport and land use markets are distorted in various ways that lead to economically excessive vehicle travel, impose external costs, and create conflicts. Although motorists directly benefit from the additional mileage, it imposes indirect costs that make most people worse off overall.</i></p> <p><i>These impacts are cumulative and synergistic (total impacts are larger than the sum of individual impacts). For example, underpriced parking not only increases parking facility costs, it also increases traffic congestion and accident costs, while underpricing road space increases parking costs and pollution emissions. Transport market distortions reinforce a cycle of increased automobile dependency, reduced consumer options, increased sprawl, and increased total costs. Market reforms can lead to more efficient transportation and land use patterns. Many transport problems are virtually unsolvable without reforms.</i></p> <p><i>Such reforms tend to be particularly beneficial to physically and economically disadvantaged people, who experience constrained options and high costs due to automobile-dependency. Analysing market distortions can be difficult and is somewhat subjective. Many distortions appear justified to individual decision-makers. Zoning laws, planning practices, and tax structures were created to achieve certain social objectives. Pricing incurs transaction costs. It is not possible to provide all travel options everywhere. Whether a particular distortion is a “significant problem” depends on perspective and assumptions. As a result, it may be infeasible to eliminate all transport market distortions, but efficiency can improve significantly with certain reforms that convert currently fixed costs into variable charges, internalize currently external costs, apply least-cost planning and investment practices, and create more multi-modal, accessible communities.</i></p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
895	<p><b>Puketapapa Local Board</b> Richard Barter (Chair), Shirley Atatagi-Coutts #895</p>	<p><i>These reforms would not eliminate automobile travel. Much driving provides benefits that exceed costs and so would continue in an efficient market. But a significant portion of driving consists of lower-value vehicle travel that consumers would willingly forgo if they were offered better transport options and demand were tested with prices. In a more efficient market, consumers would drive less, rely more on alternative modes, and be better off overall as a result."</i></p> <p>Q3. If Auckland is to adequately invest in roads and/or public transport it will require an additional \$10 billion over the next 30 years. What is your preferred mix of funding mechanisms for where this money should come from.</p> <p>We understand that the additional \$10 billion figure is based on a set of assumptions about what projects are required to get Auckland moving. These assumptions include significant sums for large roading projects<sup>5</sup> (5 Eg Penlink). We are concerned that little scrutiny has been given to the efficacy of some of these large projects especially in terms of impact on congestion and that as a result of that the \$10billion additional figure is possibly considerably inflated.</p> <p>The Board reserves its final position on the preferred mix of funding mechanisms until the final research is completed and accurate costs are determined. In the meantime, the Board supports thorough research into all possible options which will help inform the final decision. To inform the terms of reference for the research the Board asks that due consideration be given to the issues raised below including seeking that the social cost of all these options be considered.</p> <p><b>General rates</b> Currently tax and ratepayers irrespective of whether or when they use them carry the cost of roads. Rates are already a principal source of funds for local government. We agree with the Mayors caution that we need to always be mindful of issues of affordability and we prefer prioritising other alternative sources.</p> <p><b>Targeted rates</b> More could be done to capture the benefits of transport investment on land value. Much care would be needed to ensure mitigation is in place to minimise harm.</p> <p><b>Development contributions</b> -</p> <p><b>Tax increment financing</b> -</p> <p><b>New Regional fuel tax and road user charge / diesel levy</b> Regional fuel taxes are cheap to administer and spread the burden widely but often not equitably. They do not target the problem of congestion so further actions are needed. Petrol tax is the same whether one is using a road at a peak time or when it is empty which makes it an inefficient way to pay for building and maintaining roads if we are trying to deal with the problem of congestion.</p> <p><b>Tolling on new roads</b> -</p> <p><b>Road pricing on existing roads</b> It is our understanding that road pricing works well in environments where traffic congestion is high<sup>6</sup> (6 Anas, Lindsay 2011). To be accepted however it must be accompanied by good quality public transport options and good quality infrastructure that supports and encourages other alternative modes of transport such as walking and cycling. Congestion charging (with behaviour change in mind): Research<sup>7</sup> suggests that while it is accepted that congestion charging works, gaining public acceptance is difficult and will not be uniformly widespread (7 Rentziou, Milioti, Gkritza and Karlaftis (2011), Urban Road Pricing: Modeling Public Acceptance, Journal of Urban Planning and Development, Volume 137 (1)). In addition, the cost benefits will still favour the use of cars for some. Gaining public acceptance can be helped by a perception that the methodology is efficient and that the public can quickly enjoy transport choices. Charging should thus be done with the aim of encouraging positive behaviour change and facilitating better choices e.g. make it more appealing to users to take public transport (bus or train) to work.</p> <p><b>Additional car parking charges</b> Increasing the cost of parking is another cheap way to manage a strategy that targets congestion. These strategies along with congestion charging rated highest at a recent Earth Day Transportation Summit in Chicago, where transportation officials and stakeholders outlined a plan to improve residents' quality of life and protect the environment by strengthening transportation infrastructure.<sup>8</sup> (8 <a href="http://www.cnt.org/news/2012/04/26/celebrating-earth-day-by-discussing-dedicated-ways-to-fund-transit-funding/">http://www.cnt.org/news/2012/04/26/celebrating-earth-day-by-discussing-dedicated-ways-to-fund-transit-funding/</a>)</p> <p>Visitor taxes -</p> <p>Airport departure taxes -</p> <p><b>Other options to explore and evaluate capacity to contribute additional financing:</b></p> <p><b>Public Private Partnerships (PPPs)</b> PPPs have been seen as the way to expand the public purse, but there are many examples of these costing rate and tax payers much more in the long term than straight public funding vehicles. Some research<sup>9</sup> has pointed out a number of factors that should be taken into account if this path is to be entertained ie PPP's should be entered into for the right reasons with lack of public money not seen as a good reason. (9 Engel, Fischer and Galetovic (2011), Public-Private Partnerships to Revamp U.S. Infrastructure, The Hamilton Project, Brookings.) With regards to roading, combining the capital and operational costs in the same contract ensures a firm designs a solution that is cost effective to maintain as well as to build. Exhaustive cost benefit analysis is a given before this type of funding vehicle is</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
895	<p><b>Puketapapa Local Board</b> Richard Barter (Chair), Shirley Atatagi-Coutts #895</p>	<p>entertained.</p> <p>There should be a transparent way to account for such projects that is open and transparent to scrutiny. This could also include having different bodies contracted to do the construction/ maintenance to avoid conflicts of interest 10. (10 Engel, Fischer and Galetovic (2011), Public-Private Partnerships to Revamp U.S. Infrastructure, The Hamilton Project, Brookings.) Lastly there must be flexibility in contracts to ensure that the public agency is able to ensure that the best interests of the public are kept uppermost throughout the term of the contract.</p> <p><b>Borrowing / Debt financing</b> (National Government) The capital cost of developing an efficient public transport system cannot be met by users in the short term - it has to be spread to future users. This needs to be done by borrowing which the government can do cheaply and should be asked to do so in order to meet the costs at the lowest price to taxpayers.</p> <p>While we are keen on protecting ratepayers from being exposed to high debt levels and borrowing linked to foreign interests, the Board sees it as worthwhile to investigate options such as the strategic use of publicly owned assets to underwrite the financing of major projects through debt financing. Infrastructure bonds have not traditionally been common in New Zealand, and in these times of economic hardship could be hard to sell.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure bonds / capital gains taxation</b> (National Government) One of the problems we face in New Zealand is a lack of capital gains taxation which encourages people to invest in property. If this was addressed, then the attractiveness of infrastructure bonds may improve. The above position on NZ taxation is an example of the way our economy is structured.</p> <p><b>Sale of Council assets</b> One Board Member recommends research into funding potential from selling excess or unneeded / unwanted council assets that may have very low return on investments. Funds from the sale of these assets can be invested in public transport.</p> <p>We acknowledge that some of the options noted above are mechanisms that falls within the remit of the national government and we encourage the Auckland Council to advocate to the government accordingly.</p> <p>R. Barter</p>
896	<p><b>Rodney Local Board</b> Bob Howard (Chairman), Raewyn Morrison (Local Board Democracy Advisor), Kathryn Martin (Senior Local Board Advisor)</p>	<p>Dear Auckland Transport Rodney Local Board Submission to the draft Regional Public Transport Plan Please find enclosed the following submission from the Rodney Local Board on the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan based on the Local Board's resolution from its business meeting on 12 November 2012:</p> <p>Resolution Number RD/2012/280</p> <p>MOVED by Member B Steele, seconded Member TP Grace:</p> <p>That the Rodney Local Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) provides the following feedback on the draft Regional Public Transport Plan; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The Rodney Local Board supports overall the concept and approach of the draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan.</li> <li>ii) The Rodney Local Board expresses its concern that the Regional Public Transport Plan will take a significant amount of time to implement.</li> <li>iii) The Rodney Local Board are generally supportive of the change to the fare structure.</li> <li>iv) The Rodney Local Board request that a single fare structure is investigated in the future eg on set fee for a journey from Orewa to Henderson or Orewa to Papakura.</li> <li>v) The Rodney Local Board considers that there should be consistency regarding the gold card policy eg the Kawau Island ferry service should be considered as part of the Auckland public transport network and should be eligible for gold card use.</li> <li>vi) The Rodney Local Board considers that ferries should be incorporated in the the Auckland Transport network as there is currently a difference in terms of fares and these should be more uniform.</li> <li>vii) The Rodney Local Board supports a Warkworth to Silverdale / Albany bus service.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Rodney Local Board would like to speak in support of this submission in the North Auckland area. T</p> <p>Bob Howard Rodney Local Board Chairman</p>
897	<p><b>Upper Harbour Local Board</b> Karen Marais (Local Board Advisor)</p>	<p><b>UPPER HARBOUR LOCAL BOARD SUBMISSION ON THE DRAFT AUCKLAND REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT PLAN 2012 - 30 NOVEMBER 2012</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Upper Harbour Local Board appreciates the opportunity to make a submission to Auckland Transport (AT) on the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2012 (Draft ARPTP).</li> <li>2. The Upper Harbour Local Board would like to express its appreciation to the officers of the public transport section of AT who have gone to considerable lengths to make themselves available to address board members' queries on the Draft ARTP.</li> <li>3. The Upper Harbour Local Board supports the underlying concept in the Draft ARPTP of providing a Frequent Service Network with a minimum frequency of 15 minutes for Rapid and Frequent categories of service, and 30 minutes for Connector services.</li> </ol>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
897	<b>Upper Harbour Local Board</b> Karen Marais (Local Board Advisor) #897	<p>4. The Upper Harbour Local Board welcomes the inclusion of the ferry network into the integrated public transport network plan and is particularly pleased that the Hobsonville Point Ferry service will provide alternative public transport options for our residents to connect to the city centre.</p> <p>5. The Upper Harbour Local Board supports the concept of integrated ticketing and the roll out of the HOP programme, but believes that staging and pricing should apply equally across all modes of public transport.</p> <p>6. The Upper Harbour Local Board requests that AT integrate planning for public transport with the general planning for road upgrading/roadworks to emphasise the growing importance of the West–North linkages between Westgate and Albany.</p> <p>7. The Upper Harbour Local Board requests that, where possible, the bus services in Hobsonville run on main routes/roads. Previously busses were diverted off of Hobsonville Road onto Oriel Avenue / Moire Road / Luckens Road due to the high volume of traffic. Subsequent to the completion of the motorway, the traffic volumes have decreased and warrant a review of the routes. It is requested that bus route 095X be transferred back onto the length of Hobsonville Road.</p> <p>8. The Upper Harbour Local Board requests that public transport routes take the development in the Hobsonville Corridor (NORSGA project) into consideration. Ensuring that the public transport system supports the increased residential and business development envisaged on Hobsonville Road and in Hobsonville Point.</p> <p>9. The Upper Harbour Local Board supports express busses lanes and requests that where these lanes are in use, that they are as clear of obstacles, such parking and speed reduction measures, as possible.</p> <p>10. The Upper Harbour Local Board requests AT to integrate planning for suitable terminus facilities for North Shore commuters in Auckland’s CBD with all planning for the public transport network as these facilities are an import part of the overall experience of public transport.</p> <p>11. The Upper Harbour Local Board asks AT to consider the options for having WiFi access on all public transport facilities to further encourage uptake of public transport services.</p> <p>12. The Upper Harbour Local Board would very much appreciate receiving either copies of the submissions to AT on the Draft ARPTP from Upper Harbour residents or any analyses based on local board areas, especially on the North Shore, this will allow the Board to reflect on the views of Upper Harbour residents and allow us to isolate any common themes or differences of opinion across the North Shore which might be best resolved by discussions at a local board level.</p>
898	<b>Waiheke Local Board</b> Jo Holmes (Deputy Chair), Janine Geddes	<p><b>Submission on the Regional Public Transport Plan by Waiheke Local Board</b>            Prepared by Jo Holmes, Transport Spokesperson, following consultation with Board members at our workshop on 22 Nov 2012            The Local Board supports the general thrust of the RPTP especially the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Investment that promotes a shift to public transport and away from cars consistent with the Auckland Plan</li> <li>* A network approach to making an integrated PT system that is more efficient and effective thereby increasing patronage.</li> <li>* Frequent service is the key</li> <li>* Simple fare structure (zones)</li> <li>* Integrated ticketing</li> </ul> <p>However, regional zoning and integrated ticketing should not exclude Waiheke.</p> <p><b>Areas of concern</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bus Services</li> <li>2. Wharf taxes</li> <li>3. Debt burden and affordability</li> <li>4. Transport Interchanges</li> <li>5. Disabled and Elderly</li> <li>6. Supergold Card</li> </ol> <p><b>1. Bus Services</b>            Buses receive a subsidy as an incentive to move commuters out of their cars and on to public transport. This policy should apply regionally without exception. Waiheke buses are only subsidised in the evenings.</p> <p><b>2. Wharf Taxes</b>            Waiheke PT is served by two commercial operators. Not only are there no subsidies for Waiheke ferry commuters, but there is also an additional wharf tax to pay for upkeep of the necessary infrastructure. Clarity and certainty needs to be given to Waiheke residents that their wharf tax is used for Waiheke LB wharves and is not being used to subsidise other wharves.</p> <p><b>3. Debt</b>            Big ambitions come with big price tags. Projects such as Watercare’s Central Interceptor sewage tunnel and AT’s rail electrification are already in the Auckland Plan with overall council borrowings set to almost double to \$8.8 billion in the next five years, without even providing for the proposed City Central Rail Link project. This will result in a debt per capita across Auckland of almost \$6000. In the 2017-18 year, the Auckland Plan reveals that its cost of finance (interest in other words) will be equivalent to more than 30 per cent of its rates revenue.</p> <p>If, as this Board has consistently argued, the massively optimistic growth rate in real GDP of 5% per annum in the Auckland region is not realised (and there is no indication that it will be especially given the continuing global financial crisis) then books cannot be balanced and Auckland is in danger of rushing headlong into bankruptcy.</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
898	<b>Waiheke Local Board</b> Jo Holmes (Deputy Chair), Janine Geddes	<p><b>4. Transport Interchanges</b>            Efficient PT integration can only be achieved with effective PT hubs. Britomart is Auckland's foremost transport interchange. This position needs to be strengthened in light of conflicting priorities in the City Centre Masterplan and Waterfront Plan to pedestrianise this area and convert it into a centre for outdoor events and coffee culture. Improving transport links is the paramount priority and other priorities, such as greater pedestrian use of roads via shared space, should be done using a staged approach after consultation with affected parties.</p> <p><b>5. Disabled and Elderly</b>            A submission has already been presented by the Disability Strategy Advisory group, of which Don is a member, but extracts bear repeating.</p> <p>* The Down Town ferry terminal and wharf area is an example of poor interchange arrangements. This area is where ferries, cruise liner passengers, buses, taxis, service vehicles and thousands of commuters compete for space. The situation is chaotic, longstanding and calls for remediation. People with disabilities are faced with an ever-changing circus of where to go. Staging major events such as the World Triathlon Championships and the Auckland Marathon compound the problem.</p> <p>* Ensure transport terminals and interchanges are accessible, have clear signage in plain language and incorporate quality audible directions. Avoid steps and/or provide well marked alternate access ways. Where practicable have conveyances arrive and depart from fixed locations. This is what "convenient" means to people with disabilities.</p> <p>* Internal configuration of conveyances to allow for safe and convenient accommodation of wheelchairs.</p> <p>* Real time passenger information systems at bus stops and train stations to be clearly audible and easily read. Extend the routes where this information is available at the press of a button, and improve the accuracy of real time information. High standards of crew training and retraining in recognising when assistance might be needed and how best to offer help will speed the processing of passengers and make journeys more convenient.</p> <p>* The inclusion of disability awareness training for staff in contact with customers is most welcome and must become standard practice. Customer standards should apply to all providers be they contractors or Auckland Transport staff.</p> <p>Many of these comments also apply to all users.</p> <p><b>6. Supergold Card.</b>            Usage times of the Supergold card are currently under review by NZTA with proposed changes to remove Supergold transport concessions after 3pm being driven by Auckland. The reason for subsidising anyone using public transport outside commuter hours is to encourage patronage of these services. The social benefits of the Supergold card have been well documented. If any change is contemplated then it should only be in the timing, say between 3.30pm and 6.30pm to allow for the evening commute. After 6.30pm the Supergold card concession should continue.</p> <p>[end]</p>
899	<b>Waitakere Ranges Local Board</b> Janet Clews (Transport Portfolio Holder), Denise Yates (Chairperson), Brett Lane (Democracy Advisor), Rachel Wilson (Senior Local Board Advisor - person to contact)	<p><b>Waitakere Ranges Local Board submission to Auckland Transport on the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan</b>            The Waitakere Ranges Local Board appreciates the opportunity to make a submission on the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan. The Waitakere Ranges Local Board provides the following feedback:</p> <p>i) Fares should be consistent and provide equity of access and affordability across Auckland</p> <p>ii) The Waitakere Ranges Local Board notes that 79% of its residents travel out of the local board area for work which significantly contributes to traffic congestion in the region. The Board supports public transport and active transport as the most sustainable methods of reducing traffic congestion in the Auckland region.</p> <p>iii) The Board notes that Mangere and Otahuhu are key work locations for Waitakere Ranges Local Board residents as well as destinations on the train lines such as New Lynn, Avondale, Henderson and the City. The proposed network system should look to actively support all of these employment related commuter journeys in reasonable timeframes.</p> <p>iv) That there should be a targeted approach to increasing public transport options for school students, including linking active travel (cycling and walking) to transport interchanges.</p> <p>v) The Board supports the extensive provision of park and ride facilities, with an emphasis on provision outside the major centres, noting that many locations in the Waitakere Ranges Local Board area are not served by public transport at all.</p> <p>vi) Shuttle buses should be used on the more remote bus routes.</p> <p>vii) The Board advocates for west Auckland's transport projects to be moved forward as the west will be experiencing significant growth during the period covered by the plan.</p> <p>viii) The Board supports a dedicated bus way down the north western motorway from Westgate to the city. The proposed route of the busway alongside the rail corridor from the city to Lincoln Rd duplicates the service offered by the rail line and still leaves a sizeable catchment of people without car competitive access to a RTN.</p> <p>ix) The Board supports the use of the rail corridor as a potential green asset that includes parallel cycleways within the corridor.</p> <p>x) Hop cards should charge by the distance travelled rather than by arbitrary zones. Short trips that cross from one fare zone to another should not incur a full zone fare charge.</p> <p>xi) The Board endorse protection of the Onehunga to Avondale rail corridor as this could be an important alternative route across Auckland and reduce congestion on both the southern motorway and the</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
899	<p><b>Waitakere Ranges Local Board</b> Janet Clews (Transport Portfolio Holder), Denise Yates (Chairperson), Brett Lane (Democracy Advisor), Rachel Wilson (Senior Local Board Advisor - person to contact) #899</p>	<p>south western ring route</p> <p>The Waitakere Ranges Local Board requests the opportunity to be speak in support of its submission.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Janet Clews, Transport Portfolio Holder Waitakere Ranges Local Board</p> <p>Denise Yates Chairperson Waitakere Ranges Local Board</p> <p><b>Attached to Submission: DRAFT Regional Public Transport Consultation with Local Boards</b></p> <p><b>Resolutions from the Waitakere Ranges Local Board meeting, 28th November 2012</b></p> <p><b>That the Waitakere Ranges Local Board:</b></p> <p>a) Receive the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan Consultation with Local Board report.</p> <p>b) Provide the following feedback on the draft Regional Public Transport Plan:</p> <p>i) Fares for west Auckland should be in Zone Two to provide consistency and equity with fares charged on the North Shore</p> <p>ii) The Waitakere Ranges Local Board notes that 79% of its residents travel out of the local board area for work which significantly contributes to traffic congestion in the region. The Board supports public transport and active transport as the most sustainable methods of reducing traffic congestion in the Auckland region.</p> <p>iii) The Board notes that Mangere and Otahuhu are key work locations for Waitakere Ranges Local Board residents as well as destinations on the train lines such as New Lynn, Avondale, Henderson and the City. The proposed network system should look to actively support all of these employment related commuter journeys in reasonable timeframes.</p> <p>iv) That there should be a targeted approach to increasing public transport options for school students, including linking active travel (cycling and walking) to transport interchanges.</p> <p>v) The Board supports the extensive provision of park and ride facilities, with an emphasis on provision outside the major centres, noting that many locations in the Waitakere Ranges Local Board area are not served by public transport at all.</p> <p>vi) Shuttle buses should be used on the more remote bus routes.</p> <p>vii) The Board advocates for west Auckland's transport projects to be moved forward as the west will be experiencing significant growth during the period covered by the plan.</p> <p>viii) The Board supports a dedicated bus way down the north western motorway from Westgate to the city. The proposed route of the busway along side the rail corridor from the city to Lincoln Rd duplicates the service offered by the rail line and still leaves a sizeable catchment of people without car competitive access to a RTN.</p> <p>ix) The Board supports the use of the rail corridor as a potential green asset.</p> <p>x) Hop cards should charge by the distance travelled rather than by arbitrary zones.</p> <p>xi) The Board endorse protection of the Onehunga to Avondale rail corridor as this could be an important alternative route across Auckland and reduce congestion on both the southern motorway and the south western ring route.</p>
900	<p><b>Waitemata Local Board</b> Eman Nasser (Local Board Advisor), Pippa Coom, Christopher Dempsey</p>	<p>Feedback from the Waitemata Local Board on the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2012</p> <p><b>1. Introduction</b> The Waitemata Local Board welcomes the opportunity to provide its feedback on the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2012.</p> <p>The vision of the Waitemata Local Board is to foster and develop vibrant, connected and sustainable communities. The Board recognises the significant role that transport networks and services play to achieve this vision and the impact they have on communities – in living healthy lifestyles, shaping town centres and safely travelling to the places we want to be.</p> <p>The Board supports the Draft Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan (the draft Plan) that will transform Auckland's public transport system over the next few years and make a big contribution to achieving the vision of the Auckland Plan and the vision of the Waitemata Local Board.</p> <p>We wish to comment on a few elements of the draft Plan:</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
900	<p><b>Waitemata Local Board</b> Eman Nasser (Local Board Advisor), Pippa Coom, Christopher Dempsey #900</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The new public transport network</li> <li>* The farebox recovery policy</li> <li>* The walking and cycling policy</li> <li>* Vehicle emissions standards</li> <li>* Community consultation</li> </ul> <p><b>2. New public transport network</b> The Waitemata Local Board supports the draft Plan as a key initiative to achieving the Auckland Plan's public transport targets and significantly improving Auckland's public transport system. The Board's aspirations for an integrated and synchronised public transport that is easy to access, comfortable, affordable and runs on time is in accordance with what the draft Plan proposes. The implementation of a new public transport network for Auckland over the next three years with an integrated zone based fares system, free transfers between services, convenient connections and high frequency of services will transform our communities' view of public transport and the possibility of it becoming a 'mode of choice'.</p> <p>The vision and outcomes of the draft Plan are supported by the Board and it is considered that they set an appropriate direction for the development of Auckland's public transport system over the next ten years. It is therefore important that the Plan sets out clear actions and proposals that are informed by the community's input to support delivery of the outcomes.</p> <p><b>3. Farebox recovery policy</b> The Board supports Auckland Transport development of a farebox recovery policy for Auckland that aligns with the national 50% recovery rate target (required by New Zealand Transport Agency) to be achieved through growing patronage and carefully managing service costs rather than increasing fares</p> <p><b>4. Walking and cycling (Policy 5.6)</b> While the Board supports infrastructure investment which speeds up public transport services in comparison to driving, the Board also supports infrastructure investments that promote walking and cycling. The Board is pleased to see the draft Plan's recognition of the need to integrate public transport with cycling and walking (Policy 5.6). However, the Board recommends this policy should be strengthened further. This can be achieved through the provision of cycle parking at train stations, busway stations and future interchanges, and through investigation into the provision of other infrastructure (i.e. bikes racks on front of buses) as a way of extending the public transport customer base to people who would not otherwise catch public transport. There is a need to provide multiple options such as quality cycle parking at stations or along certain bus routes, and the ability to cycle to work and then catch public transport home in wet weather.</p> <p>It is anticipated that bikes racks on buses would be located on key routes where barriers exist that prohibit commuter cycling. This needs to be further investigated with cyclists and service providers.</p> <p>However, to encourage cyclists to use these facilities, they need to be designed well and incorporated into the new or upgraded facility from the outset. Design consideration include location close to entry point(s) with surveillance (casual and monitored), covered and potential lockable. New Lynn train station is a good example of quality cycle parking facility.</p> <p>In addition, there needs to be separated cycling infrastructure so that cyclists do not share bus lanes on high frequency routes, and driver training on road sharing should be compulsory.</p> <p><b>5. Vehicle Emissions Standards (policy 3.4)</b> A key target of the Auckland Plan is to reduce CO2 emissions by 40% from 1990 levels. As transport is the largest emissions sector in Auckland, reducing transport emissions by a similar amount will be critical to achieving this Auckland Plan target. The improved public transport network proposed in the draft Plan will help achieve the target by encouraging modal shift away from driving and onto public transport. This should also be supported by a fleet of PT vehicles that continues to reduce its environmental impact over time in a way that is cost-effective. Therefore, it is recommended the draft Plan references the Auckland Plan's carbon dioxide emissions reduction target and details the way in which the draft Plan will look to help achieve this target for example by proposing that lower emissions buses should be encouraged as well as a shift to alternative fuels when such technology is cost-effective.</p> <p><b>6. Community consultation</b> The Board supports the proposed programme of detailed consultation with local communities in 2013 and 2014 on individual routes and frequencies. And notes this should be undertaken in conjunction with the Board to build widespread support for the network.</p> <p>Whilst we do not envision the implementation of the draft Plan to happen imminently, this should not impede Auckland Transport in taking urgent action to ensure all bus shelter infrastructure is fit for purpose (i.e. paying passengers have access to dry bus shelters) and not wait for the implementation of the Plan.</p> <p>Finally, the Board supports Auckland Transport's inclusive process in developing such a comprehensive plan and would like to be kept informed and involved during the implementation phase.</p> <p>Board members Pippa Coom and Christopher Dempsey wish to speak to this submission at the hearing on the draft Plan.</p>
903	<p><b>Whau Local Board</b> Derek Battersby (Chair)</p>	<p><b>Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan Feedback</b></p> <p><b>Current issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Complex bus routes</li> <li>* Infrequent service</li> <li>* Many bus and train trips slow compared to private car</li> <li>* Buses travelling on congested road space</li> <li>* City centre centric service with connection issues to travel to other destinations</li> <li>* Full value not being made of existing bus and train stock</li> <li>* Need to increase fare box recovery rate</li> </ul>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
903	<p><b>Whau Local Board</b> Derek Battersby (Chair) #903</p>	<p>What is proposed:          Endeavouring to improve level of service to users while maximising existing infrastructure and finite resources.          * A core network of frequent services          * Focus in integration between services          * Efficient interchanges, high frequency services , simple integrated ticketing          * Services that connect people to where they want to go</p> <p><b>Whau Local Board Feedback</b></p> <p>Travel to work - While the city centre is key economic generator for Auckland many travel to work journeys are made to other destinations which are also significant economic activity centres. Many west Auckland residents they work in the industrial and manufacturing areas of Rosebank, Onehunga/Penrose, and the Auckland international airport precinct (Attachment A). The proposed network system should from the outset look to actively support this non-city centric employment related commuter journeys.</p> <p>Public transport to school - Another key competing use of roadways is the ferrying of children to and from school. There should there be a targeted approach increasing public transport options for school students for example loop buses from nearest train stations to colleges and major primary schools before and after school. Just as schools have “walking school buses” and “cycling trains” to support active travel the reach of these programmes should be supported in extending and linking in to transport interchanges.</p> <p>Events - The success of public transport to major events is seen to be beneficial in reducing pressure on transport infrastructure, what are opportunities for access to events that are not city centre or near based via free train or bus travel.</p> <p>Improve travel speeds Travel speeds of public transport need to be much more comparative compared to private vehicles. While a city centric trip via rail may currently be quicker than private car in just the journey time the punctuality is such that it creates doubts and the frequency is such that you need to mould your working day around offerings. For non centric travel such as Manukau to Henderson via train the journey is more than 1 1/2hours compared to 40 minutes by car. The need to take in many cases a less direct route due to the proposed network approach will create another perceived (an potentially actual) extension of complete travel time.</p> <p>Electronic and integrated ticketing increased frequency of services at interconnections along with increased bus priority measures are supported as having potential to improve travel times. More work will need to be done promoting the whole of time comparison between public transport and private vehicle once it is improved.</p> <p>At a simple timetabling level, are there opportunities to increase express or limited stop services on rail to reduce times for those who are not in the 10km city centre area?</p> <p>Timing of implementation: The western area bus services are scheduled to be implemented in 2015/16. It is unclear how this programme was identified. This delay does not seem to capitalise and integrate with the public transport development invested in New Lynn and the roading investment in the surrounding area. We submit that the process for setting the implementation phases and timeframe should be consulted on and a cost benefit analysis provided.</p> <p>Integration with land use changes – The network approach needs to support intensification and greenfield development but land use planning also needs to consider the public transport network design challenges. In the Whau the Span Farm area is an area where consideration of future land use needs take account of the public transport network planning.</p> <p>With regard to service growth and land use, a key question is what comes first in establishing a service - demand by statistics or opportunity through provision? It appears that a significant opportunity is being lost in not establishing dedicated bus corridors along the north western motorway between the city centre, past Rosebank Road and onto the emerging Westgate metropolitan centre. Shuttle buses services that link the rail to employment areas are a priority. A Rail to Rosebank shuttle link for workers is urgently required</p> <p>Fare box recovery 50% target (44% currently) – While the fare box recovery target is set nationally Auckland Council should research and monitor the whole of life cost benefit of public transport to the city and to the average resident along with comparative cost benefit analysis of private motor vehicles. Is there a revenue target that once achieved the fare box recovery margin may reduce as a driver. There should continue to be a change in the proportionality of the public transport investment with regards to revenue as current existing capacity in the system is maximised with relatively little extra outlay i.e. new train carriages will not be full from day one. Related to this is the fare box recovery model take into account the life of the assets and their role in increased revenue, is it more closely aligned with the capital or operational spend?</p> <p>With regards to equity in fares and the influence of fare box recovery the concept that the targeted recovery rate should be achieved as an average across whole network with some more economically viable areas supporting some areas that have lower rates of attainment e.g. rural services should have a lower recovery target than urban areas.</p> <p>Zone based fares – The proposed fare zones appear not to be equitable and look to disadvantage residents in the west and south. The current fare levels are seen as a barrier at the moment.</p> <p>How patron fares are managed on zone boundaries is also questioned, and the observation made that short trips also need to be affordable e.g. if just travelling 800m but transition one zone to next why pay twice as much ?</p> <p>Questions are also raised around the need to manage and encourage zone transition that is poly-centric not CBD-centric e.g. consider those who work in the south travelling from Zone 3 west to Zone 3 south.</p> <p>Out of Peak use - The Board supports concessions for out of peak use, seniors use, family group use, school holiday rates with 10 trip and monthly or discount prices also supported.</p> <p>Alternative funding streams for education use - An opportunity exists for AT to broker a deal with tertiary institutions and major employers around getting free use for students with this being incorporated into student fees or free use for employees as a work place benefit.</p>

Sub #	LOCAL BOARD	SUBMISSION
903	<b>Whau Local Board</b> Derek Battersby (Chair) #903	<p>Make public transport cheaper - The opportunity to reduce fares significantly should be investigated. Given the relatively fixed cost of the public transport operating system at the moment if fares were dropped by a third and this lead to a proportional increase in patronage taking up existing capacity in the system would not they offset one another?</p> <p>Time based Ticketing – To support non work travel and reduce costs for users, consideration should be given to tickets having a lifespan of say 2 hours. This is where a patron is able to travel by public transport to a destination and return within a limited set timeframe and only be charged for the initial trip in e.g. heading to a doctor’s appointment and home.</p> <p>Park and ride – It is proposed that opportunities should be locked in around park n ride areas to support their transition as the public transport network matures with AT and transport interchanges playing supporting role in town centre vitality. Park and ride was seen as being beneficial in the further reaches of the network but also were seen as having a role to support the near local community who were outside of walk up zone and not supported by a local network. Combined with Bus Transfer Stations these facilities are an important opportunity to create vibrant economic opportunities. The Avondale Rail station site is an important opportunity for immediate development as a Park and Ride with a medium term vision of transitioning to a purpose built Bus Transfer site / Park and Ride and in the long term to an economic hub.</p> <p>Real time passenger information – With frequent services of 15 minutes is a time table required? Brisbane City Council has a network of 'no timetable needed' high frequency bus services (at least every 15 minutes), known as Bus Upgrade Zone (BUZ) services. The information needed is about giving alternatives with regards to customer service such as the next bus/train has standing room only but the one after has seats available or there is a delay on this route but take this suggest alternative and you will connect and arrive around same time.</p> <p>Assisting the transport disadvantaged – Mobility and visual accessibility standards should be in place across all modes in network. Value for money should not be the primary driver in assessing services for rural and isolated communities. For remote areas greater use of park and ride should be made to better integrated opportunities between private car and public transport.</p> <p>Integrated planning between services and infrastructure – Land use planning should not only support interchanges between modes but also maximise the opportunity for interaction with associated retail/ commercial/ community/ residential centres. Transport interchanges should also enable the greater facilitation of walking and cycling from the surrounding community into the interchange.</p> <p>Bus priority measures –Bus priority lanes, lights, and other interventions to enable buses to reduce the impact of traffic congestion on travel times are supported.</p> <p>Patron satisfaction – There needs to be ongoing opportunity for public engagement around route changes and fare setting. AT needs to more widely promote and support customer feedback on service levels and satisfaction with public transport and establish an even more open practice such as a user’s panel to give input and feedback. There needs to be independence of evaluation beyond limited one time sampling.</p> <p>Bus drivers are seen as a window into the city. Bus drivers need to lead in area of customer service examples have been seen in San Francisco and Brisbane where the drivers appear to be more skilled in their driving and aware of passenger comfort, they are helpful and tourist friendly. With train inspectors if they are to stay get them out of florescent tops and into smart uniform with a name badge.</p> <p>New funding for public transport – Support the examination of potential new funding and financial mechanisms. What is opportunity for dogs on trains, bigger dogs require muzzle and get a fare.</p> <p>[end]</p>