

# **DRAFT REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT PLAN**

**HEARING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, 29 JANUARY 2013**

**MINUTES OF THE AUCKLAND TRANSPORT HEARING PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY, 29  
JANUARY 2013 IN THE LEVEL 15 MEETING ROOM, AUCKLAND COUNCIL CIVIC  
BUILDING, 1 GREYS AVENUE, AUCKLAND COMMENCING AT 9.00 AM**

---

**PRESENT:** Cr Mike Lee (Chairperson)  
Mr Paul Lockey  
Mr Peter Clark  
Mr Mark Lambert

**IN ATTENDANCE:** D Osbourne: Senior Transport Planner Strategy and Planning  
S Milner: Public Transport Operations Principal Network Planner  
A Cross: Public Transport Network Planning Manager  
M Stewart: Senior Consultation and Engagement Officer  
Communications and Public Affairs  
G Perillo: Administrative Assistant Communications  
S Pihema: Public Affairs Advisor  
S Simiona: Hearing Secretary

The Chairperson opened the Hearing, welcomed those present, introduced the panel members, and outlined the proceedings for the Hearing.

**1. DRAFT AUCKLAND REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT PLAN - RECEIPT OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS**

1/2013

**MOVED** by Cr Mike Lee:.. Seconded Mr Paul Clark,

That the written submissions in respect to the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan be received.

**CARRIED**

**2. HEARING OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS**

**9.00 am Waitemata Local Board (Submission 900)**

Pippa Coom and Christopher Dempsey on behalf of the Waitemata Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Supported the vision and outcomes of the draft Plan. Considered that they set an appropriate direction for the development of Auckland's public transport system over the next ten years.

- Supported the farebox recovery policy that aligns with the national 50% recovery rate target to be achieved through growing patronage and carefully managing service costs rather than increasing fares
- Supported infrastructure investments that promote walking and cycling. Stated that (Policy 5.6) should be strengthened through the provision of cycle parking at stations and future interchanges, and through investigation into the provision of other infrastructure (i.e. bikes racks on front of buses). New Lynn Station is a good example of quality cycle parking facility.
- Recommended referencing the Auckland Plan's carbon dioxide emissions reduction target and detailing the way in which the Plan will help achieve this target (e.g. lower emissions buses and a shift to alternative fuels when such technology is cost-effective).
- Stated that implementation of the draft Plan should not impede Auckland Transport in taking urgent action to ensure all bus shelter infrastructure is fit for purpose.
- Stated that the Board supported the submissions from the Auckland Blind Foundation, and Auckland Services of Disabilities.
- Suggested that the incorporation of a bike rack on the Auckland Airport bus service buses would also be a good tourist industry investment.

Ms Coom and Mr Dempsey responded to questions from the Panel Members.

### **9.10 am Albert-Eden Local Board (902)**

Tim Woolfield on behalf of the Albert Eden Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Stated that the Board agree in principle with the policy framework, the key policy areas and objective.
- Primary concerns of the Board relate to the impact of stage boundaries and the potential increase in stage fares that will be required to ensure revenue is not reduced.
- Stated that fare stage boundaries can have undesired consequences, impacting on commuters travelling some distance to park in residential streets close to a fare boundary will no doubt continue.
- Recommended a comprehensive ticket fare analysis project based on distance and not fare stage boundaries prior to implementing the new bus routes. This should include a minimum and maximum fare based on a sliding scale distance-based fare.
- Stated that the transition hubs for buses and trains will require careful consideration. Supported initiatives to make the passenger experience as painless as possible especially when transferring from one service to another.

Mr Woolfield responded to questions from the Panel Members.

### **9.20 am Orakei Local Board (892)**

Ken Bagley on behalf of the Orakei Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Suggested that the plan should show greater detail on which modes will account for the 140 million trip target.
- Greater transparency around the net cost of the CRL should be included.
- Disturbing to note that the Orakei Local Ward has very little coverage (Tamaki Drive and Remuera Road are the only routes appearing in the proposed frequent service network).
- Residents have consistently asked for smaller buses that more suitable for narrow established streets.
- Orakei Residents have very limited access to the rail without inclusion of an additional rail station in the Purewa Valley “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.
- Infrastructure: indicative designs of the type of amenity that will be constructed at key transfer points should be included in the Final ARPTP.
- Support greater transparency around the publicising of the cost to ratepayers of subsidising public transport.
- The Board asked for support of the various proposals advocated by Orakei Local Board to be included in the Long Term Plans put forward by Auckland Transport.
- Stated that the Board would like to see the completion of the walkway/cycleway from St Johns to Parnell alongside the rail line without having to negotiate complexities of who owns the land.

Mr Bagley responded to questions from the Panel Members.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**9.45 am** The Chairperson adjourned the Hearing until 11.00 am.

**11.00 am** The Hearing reconvened.

### **11.00 am Waiheke Local Board (898)**

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

- Supports the general thrust of the RPTP especially a network approach to making an integrated PT system that is more efficient and effective thereby increasing patronage.

- Supports simple fare structure (zones) and integrated ticketing. However, regional zoning and integrated ticketing should not exclude Waiheke.
- Stated that buses receive a subsidy as an incentive to move commuters out of their cars and that this policy should apply regionally without exception. Waiheke buses are only subsidised in the evenings.
- Stated that 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. Requested clarity and certainty in regard to wharf tax to ensure that the Waiheke wharf tax is used for Waiheke Local Board wharves and not used to subsidise other wharves in the Auckland Region.
- Stated that big ambitions come with big price tags and that Council's overall borrowings are set to almost double to in the next 5 years, without even providing for the City Rail Loop.
- Britomart is Auckland's foremost transport interchange. Its position needs to be strengthened in light of conflicting priorities in the City Centre Masterplan and Waterfront Plan to pedestrianise this area.
- Stated that the Down Town Ferry Terminal and Auckland Wharf area is an example of poor interchange arrangements. The situation is chaotic, longstanding and calls for remediation.
- 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 3.30 pm and 6.30 pm to allow for the evening commute. After 6.30 pm the SuperGold card concession should continue.
- Concerned that taxis are hard to access at Queens Wharf for Waiheke ferry patrons that have either a physical disability or a sight impairment.

Ms Holmes responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 7)

### **11.15 am Great Barrier Local Board (901)**

Paul Downie on behalf of the Great Barrier Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- The Board would like to see the establishment of a subsidised public bus service for Great Barrier Island.
- Stated that there is no formal, timetabled or regular public bus service at present and that many residents do not have car/s. The island's low socio-economic status, and small far flung communities make travel very difficult for locals.
- A service running on the main highway from Tryphena to Port Fitzroy, and connecting with ferries and flights would be a logical starting point.

- The Board sees a bus service as a key element to its economic revitalisation agenda.
- Requested that Auckland Transport work with the Board to establish public transport services on Great Barrier Island. Would also like to see a public transport service from the North Shore Airfield into the Auckland CBD as many residents use this particular service when commuting to Auckland.

Mr Downie responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 8)

### **11.25 am Robert Coup (415)**

Robert Coup spoke to his written submission and in particular:

- Disappointed to see the continued existence of monthly passes. Season passes distort behaviour and force consumers to make an upfront decision which may cost them later.
- Stated that fare capping rewards the user by ensuring that they pay no more than the fare associated with traditional periodical product via the establishment of daily, weekly or monthly fare caps. (e.g. London capping system with Oyster).
- With Auckland now moving to integrated ticketing, we can extend the concepts of fare capping further. Suggested that Auckland Transport automatically cap fares on a rolling daily, weekly, and monthly basis, based on peak/off-peak and zones travelled. This would guarantee that the user gets the 'best' deal, just as if they could accurately predict their travel over an entire month. Don't need to make decision upfront.
- Auckland Transport already provides Google Transit feeds for distributing timetable information to external organisations. These data feeds and interfaces need to be supported and extended: Make sure the data feeds are as reliable, complete, and up to date as the Auckland Transport website and planner.
- Open licensing of transit information. Auckland should be a leader in this space, and leverage as much development and technology from overseas as we possibly can.

Mr Coup responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 9)

**11.37 am Camilla Abernathy-Ardern**

Camilla Abernathy-Ardern spoke to her submission and in particular:

- Stated that if the connections were viable and reliable this would be an excellent plan.
- That an integrated card and cash fare system is a very good idea. Expecting to make money or break even is unrealistic.
- Stated that Auckland Transport needs to re-adjust the five day working week time table from Monday to Friday to a seven day a week time table as the five day working week from Monday to Friday has long gone.
- Would like to see the bus drivers receive a salary that depicts the stressfull work that they undertake on a daily basis.
- *Poem attached to submission*

Ms Abernathy-Ardern responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 10)

**11.49 am Carl Rosel (230)**

Carl Rosel spoke to his submission and in particular:

- No written comments provided.
- Expressed concern about the timetable for the Inner and Outer Link bus service, suggested that the timetable be more realistic as sometimes more than one bus of the same service arrives at a bus stop at the same time and at othertimes the wait is extensive. People become extremely frustrated and take their frustration out on the bus driver when a delayed bus finally arrives.

Mr Rosel responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 11)

**11.58 pm Karen Brown (441)**

Karen Brown spoke to her submission and in particular:

- Stated that if the connections were viable and reliable this would be an excellent plan
- Stated that integrated ticketing in Auckland is well overdue. However, asked that Auckland Transport to please not use this as an excuse to dramatically increase prices.
- Asked that Auckland Transport do not make the bus fares under the proposed zonal fare system too expensive. Stated that it is surely better to make them as cheap as possible, in order to encourage people to regularly use the transport system.

- **Simpler Connected Network:** particularly pleased to see "reduced waiting times" in this list. Stated that this would be fantastic.
- Expressed disappointed that the Outer Link bus is not included in the intended 2016 network. Stated that this is an appreciated and well-used service and should not be discontinued.
- Reestablishment of the Waterview feeder bus with a route to Avondale Train Station would be great.
- How about using current technology and linking feeder bus and train by GPS? The feeder buses would not have to be large ones
- D3 at Britomart is a wind trap. Could be improved by adding more shelter.
- Wish list:
  - More regular buses;
  - Keep fares low;
  - Comfortable and safe buses;
  - Integrated ticketing; and
  - Vastly improved bus shelters and seating.

Ms Brown responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 12)

### **12.05 pm Cycle Action Auckland (588)**

Barbara Cuthbert on behalf of the Cycle Action Auckland spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Stated that to achieve transformational change in transport behaviour, bikes must be considered as a serious transport mode, an integral component of the public transport system. PT users need options other than driving to an interchange when it is too far to walk.
- That enabling PT users to ride a bike to their nearest frequent service interchange will dramatically increase the interchange catchment.
- That encouraging PT users to cycle to interchanges requires simple and relatively low cost actions:
  - Sufficient secure, sheltered, close and visible bike parks at each frequent service interchange;
  - Bike racks on every bus;
  - Cycle lanes leading to and from each frequent service interchange; and
  - Direct off-road cycleways.

- Easier and less expensive to add cycle infrastructure when installing new trains, remodeling transport interchanges or road intersections etc., than it is to retrofit it at a later date.
- Requested that Auckland Transport states specifically that bike transport will be integrated into the RPTP.
- Requested that the RPTP includes in Policy 5.6 – actions:
  1. allocation of sufficient and significant resource and funds to support these vulnerable and valuable members of the transport community: and
  2. actual details and a schedule for the infrastructure and activity that is planned as part of Policy 5.6.
- Would like to see the final Regional Public Transport Plan including recognition of Public Bikes as a Public Transport mode, and implementation of a Public Bike Hire Network.

Ms Cuthbert responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 13)

### **12.20 pm Tamaki Drive Protection Society Incorporated (401)**

Juliet Yates and Dr Peter Harwood on behalf of the Tamaki Drive Protection Society Incorporated spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- That the Society is neutral towards the proposed network.
- It serves persons living close to the network, but does not include new routes to access persons who face a long hilly walk to a bus.
- Higher frequency will benefit current bus travellers. To attract persons who currently must use cars there must be a large increase in park and ride facilities. Unclear from the Draft Plan if this is intended, or where such facilities will be located.
- That no account is taken of routes for taxis or for a system of minibuses.
- Stated that it is unclear if all passengers disembark at local Interchanges or if they only disembark from Connector Routes and then catch the Frequent Bus into the city.
- There is no indication of whether the new system will require a greater public subsidy, or reduce the amount of public subsidy.
- Stated that vulnerable routes have not been identified. Alternative routes for the connector buses or transport solutions should be devised for all vulnerable routes, for example: Tamaki Drive is prone to road closures
- Network Interchanges: Where will intermediate and local interchanges be located? Will these require additional land for facilities in villages and centres such as St Heliers, Mission Bay or Glen Innes? What will the facilities include?

- Suggested the introduction of feeder bus services to bus/rail interchanges.
- Requested that the RPTP take into account transport plans that Auckland Council have out in the public arena for public comment.

Ms Yates and Dr Harwood responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 14)

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**12.40 pm** The Chairperson adjourned the Hearing until 1.50 pm.

**1.50 pm** Hearing reconvened.

### **1.50 pm Bus and Coach Association New Zealand (518)**

Philip Manning on behalf of the Bus and Coach Association New Zealand spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Supports the concepts underlying the proposed network plan, in particular proposals to simplify the route structure and provide a core network of frequent services supported by lower frequency connector services, which together will provide an integrated network.
- Stated that implementation will require many existing users to change long-established travel patterns. The planning and implementation of changes will need to be handled with exceptional care and a real determination to ensure that the changes do not result in loss of patronage. Each individual service change should proceed only if there is a positive answer to the question “will this change save customers’ time or money?”
- That successful implementation critically dependent on the timely provision of high quality infrastructure. RPTP should include a detailed funding and construction programme for interchange facilities and bus priority measures.
- Supports in principle the proposal to transition to a zonal fare system, once AIFS bedded in. Zonal fares will be simpler for users, should encourage more patronage, and will be necessary to facilitate the simplified route structure.
- Noted however, that there is considerable uncertainty as to the effects of zonal fare system on farebox revenue. Policy 4.3 should include actions to set up joint process with operators to model the farebox revenues under different zonal fare scenarios, and from that to determine a new zonal fare structure and fares.
- Recommended that Policy 4.5 action ‘b’ be reworded to read “Conduct regular annual reviews of farebox recovery, using the formula set out in Appendix 4, to determine what fare adjustments are necessary to maintain farebox recovery targets”. The wording in the draft RPTP introduces extraneous factors.

- Suggested that the RPTP should go much further to ensure conformity with the provisions of the LTMA Bill.
- **PTOM:** identification of ‘like for like’ units is particularly important to our members. Concerned that the units proposed in the draft RPTP do not include units which are sufficiently ‘like’ to their current commercial services.
- Recommended that the draft RPTP is reviewed to ensure it meets as many as possible of the requirements of section 119 of the LTMA Bill, and includes a process (including consultation) and a timetable for incorporating any of those requirements which cannot as yet be met; that , the RPTP include a policy on the process for establishing units; and that this policy should provide for the identification of services which will make up ‘like for like’ units
- Suggested that Auckland Transport’s target for passenger boardings in 2022 represents a compound annual growth rate of less than 4% per annum. This seems rather unambitious, given recent patronage growth. The RPTP should incorporate ‘stretch’ targets.
- Opposed to Policy 3.4 action ‘a’ that Auckland Transport may require bus quality standards that are additional to those specified in NZTA’s ‘Requirements for Urban Buses’ (RUB). Different standards will undermine standardisation and negate the potential for cost savings.
- **Policy 5.3:** “appropriate access charges” for bus, rail and ferry facilities: Such charges are likely to result in an unnecessary and inefficient ‘money go round’. Comments also apply to charges in Policy 8.7 (customer service and information services).
- Stated that there is no legal basis for levying charges on exempt services without the consent of the operators concerned.
- **Policy 7.3:** Auckland Transport commitment to providing school bus services should be expressed more strongly.
- **Policy 8.4:** Oppose the proposal in action ‘d’ for all units affected by a network change to be re-tendered where agreement cannot be reached. Should include a mediation or arbitration process.
- Stated that different specifications of information are provided under Policy 3.6 and Policy 8.4 Bus and Coach Association objects to requirement to provide information on “service inputs” and “cost efficiency”.
- **Policy 8.3:** in addition to the exempt services which are listed, a considerable number of commercial school bus services in Auckland. These will presumably become exempt services once the new legislation comes into effect.
- That the formula set out in Appendix 4 for calculating farebox recovery ratio differs in detail from the formula set out by NZTA in its National Farebox Recovery Policy.

- That the concept of partnership between Auckland Transport and Operators along the line of the Public Transport Operating Model could be better reflected in the Plan.
- Would like to see more work undertaken around intergrated services.
- Stated that it is inappropriate that Auckland Transport has the right if agreement cannot be reached between all operators for operating services to be readvertise for those services.

Mr Manning responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 15)

### **2.10 pm Stephen Greenfield, Auckland Transport Consultancy (470)**

Stephen Greenfield on behalf of the Auckland Transport Consultancy spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- That in so far as the draft plan has copied my proposal given to ARTA, the ARC, and ACC first in 2007, then to Auckland Transport and Auckland Council over the past 2 years of course I support it. It is absolutely unacceptable that it is taking so long to implement the basics.
- Stated that a simplified network with frequent regular schedules is absolutely imperative and an integral part of the SUPERMAXX proposal. SUPERMAXX is based on a 10 minute frequency on primary routes which offers a better service than your 15 minute suggestion while still overall reducing costs.
- That an integrated single ticket across all modes is absolutely essential.
- Totally opposed to the zonal system suggested in the RPTP. While it is an improvement on the current fare stage system it still keeps anomalies for people travelling short distances across zone boundaries.

Mr Greenfield responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Tracks No: 16 & 17)

### **2.22 pm Viaduct Harbour Holdings Limited (557)**

Trevor Daya-Winterbottom on behalf of the Viaduct Harbour Holdings Limited spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Stated that the physical route maps are at such a small scale that they are not readable. This makes the analysis of impact on Wynyard Quarter very difficult. More detailed route maps should be included in the proposal to match the descriptions in the appendices.
- Stated that although the Wynyard Quarter is shown as a major interchange location, but there is no diagram showing where or how this would operate.
- Stated that the number of bus routes that are proposed to pass through Wynyard Quarter should be significantly reduced.

- There should be an analysis of the 'route and frequency table' as the appendix shows 24 routes pass by Wynyard Quarter, with around 110 movements per hour in the peak direction, compared with 85 as at present.
- That the three access points to Wynyard Quarter onto Fanshawe Street, (Beaumont, Daldy and Halsey Streets) are critical to the successful development and operation of the Quarter. Any extraneous traffic should be avoided and unnecessary buses entering and leaving the Quarter fall into that category. If the standard maximum walk distance of 400m is adopted, then all buildings south of Madden Street could be serviced from buses in Fanshawe Street.
- Supports the proposed fares and ticketing policy.

Mr Winterbottom responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 18)

### **2.30 pm Auckland Greypower Association Incorporated (556)**

Anne-Marie Coury on behalf of Auckland Greypower Association Incorporated spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Supports the direction of the proposed Public Transport network with the following reservations.
- Benefits must be viewed in wider context of: senior's income capacity to participate and access services; central government's commitment or lack of it to funding. How access to centralised health services away from the central core can still be accessed by East -West direct services.
- Stated that communication strategies need to successfully engage with senior networks.
- That regarding the introduction of the HOP card, stated that it is the seniors who are struggling to cope with this change the most and that the publicity has not been directed at this age group. Requested better and more timely communication between Auckland Transport and Organisations for Seniors.
- That Newmarket Train Station toilets are off limits to people before they buy a ticket.
- That the growth of cycling has been held back by the lack of suitable transport infra-structure, such as racks on buses, and suitable vertical racks on trains.
- Vehemently opposed to any reduction in the SuperGold card subsidies. Any change will reduce patronage and have critical flow on effects socially, and in the health and community sectors, and even economically.
- Request that the Mayor's office develop a policy directive on the removal of the SuperGold card and student concessions.

- Stated that Auckland Greypower Association would like the term elderly throughout the Plan being removed and replaced with the word 'Senior'.

Ms Coury responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 19)

### **2.50 pm Margaret and Garth Harris (562)**

Margaret Harris on behalf of Margaret and Garth Harris spoke to their submission and in particular:

- The disadvantages of not being able to travel post 3.00 pm on the ferry to or from Waiheke. Stated that Waiheke residents totally reliant on the ferry.
- Stated that for Waiheke residents the transport plan which purports to improve the life of the residents of Auckland will in effect achieve quite the opposite for seniors if the post 3.00 pm concession is removed for ferry travel on the Waiheke route.
- Suggested that Auckland Transport negotiate a rate direct with Fullers that way the cost to Auckland Transport and Central Government should be less.

Mrs Harris responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 20)

### **3.00 pm Helen Jermyn, 50+Cycling (395)**

Helen Jermyn spoke to her submission and in particular:

- Stated that there is no mention of special provision on trains or buses for bikes would like Auckland Transport to incorporate provision of bike racks on buses and trains.
- That empty buses might be the result of scrapping or trimming youth and student concessions, plus the SuperGold card.
- Anxious that the public get the opportunity to comment on the proposed review of concession fares for youth and students and SuperGold card carriers.
- The bus route 007 from Pt Chevalier to St Heliers has been trimmed to stop at Ellerslie. This will mean that passengers coming from the Eastern Bays are facing a very long journey to get to Greenlane Hospital.
- Expressed concern that services from Helensville are not included in the Plan.

Ms Jermyn responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 21)

**3.10 pm Elisabeth Van Alkemade (552)**

Elisabeth Van Alkemade spoke to her submission and in particular:

- Agreement with the Auckland Grey Power Association Incorporated submission.
- The lack of convenient east to west routes or west to east routes. It should not take two buses from say Royal Oak to get to St Luke's or from Onehunga in the same direction.
- Noted that the 007 bus from Pt Chevalier is no longer available.
- Stated that at the Newmarket Railway Station the toilets could only be accessed for train passengers. Please sort out this irrational lack of availability of the toilets promptly.
- Stated that people will only use PT if it is frequent and reasonably priced.
- That it may be a good idea to route some bus traffic away from busy centres where stations are to facilitate the progress of buses which would be held up going through busy traffic hubs.

Ms Van Alkemade responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 22)

**3.20 pm Community and Social Issues Subcommittee, Auckland Greypower (584)**

Anne-Marie Coury on behalf of the Community and Social Issues Subcommittee, Auckland Greypower spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Supported the proposed network system and the Fares and Integrated ticketing but with the following reservations.
- Maintaining the SuperGold card transport subsidy, so seniors can travel from 9.00 am onwards, and into the evenings is an important provision to ensure social goals within the Auckland Plan are able to be realised and seniors access to health services guaranteed.
- Requested that the Mayor's office develop a policy directive on the removal of the concession.
- Requested that Greypower representatives across the region are able to have direct input at the Auckland Transport policy discussions established to review concession fares.
- Requested that more effort be put into accommodating cyclists needs by incorporating bus racks on buses and vertical racks in train carriages.
- There is a sense in which changes like the HOP card were introduced with no specific communication messages for seniors, and consequently they are the group least able to cope and requiring considerable assistance.

Ms Coury responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 23)

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**3.30 pm** The Chairperson adjourned the Hearing until 3.40 pm.

**3.45 pm** The Hearing reconvened.

### **3.48 pm Anthony Blaschke (463)**

Anthony Blaschke spoke to his submission and in particular:

- Stated that one aspect that has not been looked at is the welfare of the operating staff, that is, the bus drivers themselves.
- Expressed concern that NZBUS's workforce the drivers, have been constantly exhorted to give the best of themselves for the sake of the great vision that is Auckland Transport - yet the physical conditions and environment under which they operate has been and currently is so far from satisfactory that most drivers are not of a mind to contribute to this vision.
- Mr Blaschke agreed in general with the Plan.

Mr Blaschke responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 24)

### **4.00 pm Alan Bray (467)**

Alan Bray spoke to his submission and in particular:

- Advised that the 304 buses often run late, and that some bus stops do not provide seats or shelters.
- That buses need to travel cross country direct from e.g. Mangere to Pukekohe, to Henderson, to North Shore, to St Heliers (without changing buses).
- Stated that some bus drivers don't adhere to the time tables.
- Stated that SuperGold card holders should be able to use their SuperGold card 24/7.
- Asked why there is not a 'One Fare' for all. Stated that in Edinburgh you travel for £1.40 = 24/7, distance doesn't matter.

Mr Bray responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 25)

**4.10 pm Auckland Branch - Association of Blind Citizens of New Zealand (539)**

Mary Schnackenberg on behalf of the Auckland Branch – Association of Blind Citizens of New Zealand spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Supports the development of interchange facilities. Urges engagement with people with disabilities to ensure their logical, safe and effective design to meet the needs of all users. Appropriate wayfinding will be required to enable blind people to navigate through interchange centres.
- That no matter how accessible future PT might become, unless safe and smooth footpaths are provided together with safe road crossings, most blind and low vision residents will continue to stay at home. Recommended that Auckland Transport increases its resources for safe pedestrian access to footpaths and road crossings for the benefit of all Aucklanders. “RTS 14: Guidelines for Blind and Vision-impaired Pedestrians” provides best practice design and installation principles.
- That in principle, wherever electronic information is provided in print, then it should also be provided simultaneously by way of audio announcements.
- Requested all buses and trains have automated audio announcements of each upcoming stop
- Expressed frustration that efforts to have the journey planner made accessible have failed.
- Recommended a policy be established, through engagement with people with disabilities, for setting the maximum subsidy for total mobility trips. Current subsidy is not sufficient to meet 50% of the cost of a trip from Papakura to the CBD.
- Pleaded with Auckland Transport to develop a strategic plan of services for people with disabilities with implementation dates and costs.

Ms Schnackenberg responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 26)

**4.25 pm Auckland International Airport Limited (543)**

John McShane on behalf of the Auckland International Airport Limited spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Acknowledged the need to protect for a future rapid transit route to and from the airport. Important to address the improvements to bus-based public transport that will be needed in the interim.
- Auckland Airport supports the Draft Plan’s overall approach to PT in Auckland.
- Supports the proposed integrated network structure. Passengers react well to a consistent, reliable, high frequency service. The Airbus service is a good example.

- That the Draft Plan needs to place greater emphasis on the role of the airport in the region's transport system. The growth of the airport will mean that, increasingly, public transport will need to focus on meeting demand for travel to and from the airport.
- That there is no recognition of the existing Airbus connection between the airport and the CBD in the descriptions of the frequent network in Chapter 5.
- Supports the concept of other frequent route(s) connecting the airport to other key centres such as Onehunga and Manukau, but further discussion needed on how they should operate.
- That there is no supporting connector services in the airport area over the next 10 years: suggested that this be revisited.
- Supports the decision to implement changes in south Auckland as Stage 1.
- Would like to see more information in the Plan about planned improvements to bus priorities on key routes to the airport (including Dominion Road, Mt Eden Road, SH20, and the proposed frequent route from Manukau to the airport).
- Stated that the arrangements for interchange facilities at Onehunga are unclear in the Plan.
- That the MUL is incorrectly shown around the Airport.
- Requested that further consideration be given to another express service being inline with the existing RTN.

Mr McShane responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 27)

#### **4.33 pm Catherine Harland (572)**

Catherine Harland spoke to her submission and in particular:

- Comments related to the effect that the network structure and the policies proposed will have on specific areas of service.
- Suggested that Auckland Transport seeks feedback on the proposed network structure as a whole, rather than on specific services and local routes. This would mean that once the whole network structure gains approval through this process, specific services will be designed to meet this, so service changes that don't fit this 'principled approach' will be eliminated regardless of localised impacts.
- Would like specific examples of localised impacts examined to ensure that the policy/network pathway being proposed does not result in substantial adverse impacts for specific communities.
- Example of the need for community/town centre connections to be maintained is bus service along Tawa Road in Onehunga servicing the Oranga area. Future routes will require transfers and means going backwards.

- Testing an overall network policy change as suggested, needs to involve evaluation of samples of different areas which have a lower socio-economic profile and related transport disadvantages. This would reveal whether the on-the-ground application of the policy will have a neutral, positive or adverse impact.
- Suggested investigation of Oranga/Onehunga and a sample of other lower socio-economic areas, and use findings to influence the wording of the outcomes and measures of the network policies.
- Requested that wording be included in the RPTP that allows in special circumstances, for a variation from the overall network framework.

Ms Harland responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 28)

**4.44 pm Adam White (417)**

Adam White spoke to his submission and in particular:

- Opposed on the grounds of the wonky economics involved. Auckland needs some major structural and effective changes for the network to work.
- That three rail loops are needed, not one sometime in the future. Buses do not cut it from key locations - it makes us look just average
- Stated that the system is discriminatory, when there is no reason for it to be.
- Need to change the buses - in a physical sense - for environmental reasons - and to make them more comfortable.
- Stated that as this whole exercise is a question of economics - why tag on socio-economics? The whole picture must have socio-economic outcomes and inputs or it is not a model but an ideology.

Mr White responded to questions from the Panel Members.

(Track No: 29)

**ADJOURNMENT**

4.56 pm The Chairperson adjourned the Hearing until 9.40 am on Wednesday, 31 January 2013 in P1 - Presentation Room, Ground Floor TelstraClear Centre, Smales Farm Office Park, Taharoto Road, Takapuna, Auckland.