TCC/Traffic Ops Report – Review checklist

If using an external consultant to prepare the report and plan, the AT reporting officer is responsible for the items in blue and the consultant is responsible for the remainder.

Item numbers with a star (and in red) will result in a rejection of the report and/or plan if the item is not correct. Item numbers without the star risk rejection either during review or by the TCC. All items should be checked to avoid delays during the review or TCC process.

Report

Cover Sheet

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1\* | Does the title information match the information on the title page of the report? |  |
| 2\* | Are the reviewers’ and preparers’ names, titles, and division/department (internal)/company (external) completely filled in? (Note: the review date is filled in by the TCC Secretary and there is no date for the preparers’ information.) |  |
| 3\* | Is there a WBS shown? A WBS should be used, but where there is no WBS, the cost code is acceptable. |  |
| 4\* | Is there a DRP number shown? If the proposal will not go through DRP, the number is labelled N/A. Do not delete this line. The ENG/RC line should be deleted. |  |
| 5\* | For development reports, is there an ENG/RC number shown? The DRP line should be deleted. |  |

Title Page and General Document Info

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6\* | Is the report the most recent version of the template? |  |
| 7\* | Is it the correct TCC/Traffic Ops template for the type of report? |  |
| 8 | Is the Local Board name(s) correct? |  |
| 9\* | Are all the affected Local Boards listed? |  |
| 10 | Are all street names spelt correctly, including the correct “Road”, “Street”, “Drive”, “Avenue”, etc, spelt out in full? |  |
| 11 | Are all abbreviations described in their first occurrence? |  |
| 12 | Do they include all streets being resolved in the report? It’s acceptable, when there are too many streets being resolved to fit on one or two lines, to show only the primary street(s). If that is the case, use the primary streets that are the purpose of the report and the remainder (gen. side streets) can be included in the phrase “and surrounding streets”. |  |
| 13 | Is the suburb correct? |  |
| 14 | Are all the proposed restrictions and controls represented? If there are too many controls for one or two lines, it’s acceptable to show only the primary ones. The remainder can be described with a blanket term, e.g., “and pedestrian facilities” or “and existing controls”. |  |
| 15\* | Is the reporting officer an AT staff member? |  |
| 16 | Is this the correct reporting officer? |  |
| 17 | Is the reporting officer’s title included? |  |
| 18\* | Is there a report ID? |  |
| 19 | Has the ID been confirmed against Transport Controls’ ID tracking spreadsheet? |  |
| 20 | Are all the text boxes deleted? |  |
| 21 | Are all the notes in red deleted? |  |
| 22 | Are the page numbers consistent for the whole document? There can’t be any blank pages or gaps in page numbering. |  |
| 23 | Does the report *avoid* mentioning any personal information, including names of individuals and company names? |  |
| 24 | Does the report *avoid* including links to any external documents or websites? |  |
| 25 | Does the report *avoid* mentioning any internal processes (TCC, LGOIMA, ELT, CRM, etc)? |  |

Project Purpose

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 26 | Is the Location table filled in with all the relevant information from Future Connect? |  |
| 27 | Is the road a cul-de-sac, over-dimension route or over-weight route and is this shown in the report? |  |
| 28 | Is the road a narrow road (7.0m or less in width) and is this mentioned in the report? |  |
| 29 | Is the road within a parking zone and is this mentioned in the report? |  |
| 30 | Is the road vesting information included in the Location table for development reports? |  |
| 31 | Does the proposal include a reference to the drawing? |  |
| 32 | Does the drawing number in the report match the drawing number in the plan? |  |
| 33 | Are there any nearby traffic controls and do they need to be included in the report? (If they predate AT and there is no identifiable resolution for them, they should be captured in the report with a clear statement that an engineering evaluation finds them reasonable and appropriate as is.) |  |
| 34 | Is the approval date for the departure from standards given (where a departure was needed)? |  |
| 35 | Does the safety section demonstrate how the proposal improves (or at least, doesn’t degrade) safety? |  |
| 36 | Are there other strategic documents that apply to the proposal? |  |
| 37 | Does the do-nothing option predict the consequences of not approving the traffic controls? |  |
| 38 | Have all practicable options been assessed? |  |
| 39 | Is there an analysis of all options resulting from Local Board comments? |  |
| 40 | Is there an analysis of all substantive comments from the consultation? |  |
| 41 | Is there an engineering assessment of the proposal? |  |
| 42 | Is the preferred option clearly identified as such? |  |

Engagement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 43 | Does the internal consultation show a result for all affected parties? |  |
| 44 | Does the report justify why a particular internal group was not consulted for any parties that were skipped? |  |
| 45 | Does the report state how and when the internal parties were consulted? |  |
| 46\* | Does the outcome of the internal parties match the comments discussed below? (If a team had a comment, then the outcome needs to be “concerns addressed below”.) |  |
| 47 | Is all the internal feedback shown? (Internal feedback can be separated into accepted and rejected comments with detailed discussion limited to the rejected comments.) |  |
| 48 | Does the report include a response to the internal feedback? |  |
| 49 | Is the LB’s response given? (support, object to, or raised no objection) |  |
| 50\* | Is the Local Board feedback shown? |  |
| 51\* | Does the report include a response to the Local Board feedback? |  |
| 52 | Does the external consultation show a yes/no result for all affected parties? |  |
| 53 | Does the report justify why a particular external group was not consulted? |  |
| 54 | Does the report state the name of the business/community group that was consulted (e.g., Heart of the City / Bike Auckland / Taxi Federation, etc)? |  |
| 55 | Does the external consultation show the numbers? How many letters were sent (people consulted), how many responses received, how many in support, how many opposed, and how many were neutral. |  |
| 56\* | Is all the external feedback shown? (External feedback can be grouped into and discussed as categories rather than individual comments where it would exceed about one page of text as individual comments.) |  |
| 57\* | Does the report include a response to the external feedback? |  |
| 58 | If a tree, building or infrastructure element affects the location of a control, is this discussed? |  |
| 59\* | If there was a bus shelter being proposed, does the report show that we meet the LGA, section 339 requirements for consultation? In other words, did the consultation letter to a property owner affected by a bus shelter clearly state their rights pertaining to the shelter? |  |
| 60 | If it has been longer than six months since the consultation close out, has the public been notified of the delay? Is this information included in the report? |  |
| 61 | Is there a clear reference to how the consultation was closed out (via letter, email, phone call, etc), when it was closed out and with whom it was closed out? |  |
| 62 | Is there a clear reference whether the parties received a copy of the final plan and an explanation why their comments were or were not included in the final plan? |  |
| 63 | Does the close out show whether any further comments were received after the consultation was closed out? |  |

Recommendations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 64 | Do the recommendations include everything that is proposed or should be proposed? |  |
| 65\* | Do the labels in the recommendations exactly match the labels in the plan? |  |
| 66\* | Is each label unique? There should be one label per control (for those controls that use labels). There should not be any repeated label numbers and no gaps in the label numbering. |  |
| 67\* | Do the street names in the recommendations exactly match the street names in the plan? |  |
| 68 | Are the street names spelt correctly, including the correct “Street”, “Road”, “Avenue”, “Drive”, etc? |  |
| 69 | Is the avoidance of doubt language at the end of the clause and is the punctuation of that text correct? |  |
| 70\* | Does the drawing number exactly match the drawing number in the plan? (Including correct sheet number, if relevant.) |  |
| 71 | Is the important information – street name(s), label(s), operating time conditions (where applicable) – in bold type? |  |
| 72\* | Are the time and day restrictions included in the recommendation where needed? (bus lane; transit lane; restrictions to the stopping, standing, or parking; clearway; loading zone; paid parking; small PSV stand; school bus stop; etc. all can apply the restriction during certain times of the day) |  |
| 73\* | Do the time and day restrictions match the information shown in the plan? |  |
| 74\* | Are the class of vehicle/activity restrictions included in the recommendation where needed? (special vehicle lane; shared path; loading zone; authorised vehicle parking; specified vehicle class parking; etc. all can limit the restriction to certain classes of vehicle or activity) |  |
| 75\* | Do the class of vehicle/activity restrictions match the information detailed in the plan? |  |
| 76\* | Have all potential conflicts between two (or more) recommendations been avoided? I.e., there is no overlap in operating time conditions, etc. |  |
| 77\* | For the TCC report, are the layout of lanes, parking place(s), and no stopping off the roadway clauses included? |  |
| 78\* | For the Traffic Ops report, are the layout of lanes with no mandatory turning controls and no stopping off the roadway clauses included? |  |
| 79\* | Are the revocation and coming into effect clauses included? |  |
| 80\* | If any recommendations are revoking a restriction or control, is the proper coming into effect clause for the revocation included? |  |
| 81\* | Does the coming into effect clause for the revoked control(s) reference the proper clause(s)? |  |
| 82 | If any recommendations are revoking a restriction or control, does the clause reference any condition under which the original control operated (i.e., at all times)? The revocation clause does not need to and should not specify any conditions. |  |
| 83\* | For temporary road works, is the start date of the resolution no earlier than the Monday after the TCC meeting at which the report is carried? |  |
| 84\* | For a parking zone, is the savings clause included *and does it cover all* controls that need to be maintained in the zone?? |  |
| 85\* | Does the parking zone recommendation include the proper revocation clause (i.e., does it correctly reference the savings clause)? |  |
| 86\* | Do the recommendations reference the correct AT bylaw/Council bylaw, or LGA74 section and TCD clause? |  |
| 87 | If included, does the recommendation for mobility parking reference clauses 19 and 20 of the AT traffic bylaws? If the area is Council property, does the recommendation for disabled parking reference both clause 9 and 10 of the Auckland Council traffic bylaws? |  |
| 88 | If a special vehicle lane is on two streets at an intersection (in other words, does it merge or diverge at an intersection), is each street resolved separately? Special vehicle lanes are assumed to continue through an intersection, but if they merge or diverge on separate approaches to an intersection, they need to be resolved separately for each street. |  |
| 89 | Do the recommendations avoid using ‘P’ for a label? |  |
| 90 | Do revoked labels begin with ‘R’? (Revoked controls use the label of the control with an ‘R’ as the first element of the label, e.g., RA1 is revoking a NSAAT control.) |  |
| 91\* | Do Council car parks and Council roads use Council recommendations referencing the correct clauses in the Council Bylaw? |  |
| 92\* | If the proposal is *not* on the road reserve, does AT have the delegated authority to resolve the proposed controls? |  |
| 93\* | If so, are the correct bylaws being referenced? |  |

Authority

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 94\* | Does the report refer to the correct Authority (There may be more than one) |  |
| 95\* | If the standard Authority text does not apply (i.e., it’s a non-AT road), is the appropriate delegation document referenced? The information should include title of document, date of approval, who approved the document and the authority under which they could delegate the authority to us to resolve. |  |
| 96\* | Is the decision maker (gen. Traffic Operations Manager) consistent throughout the report (cover sheet, title block, Authority, and recommendations)? |  |

Style

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 97 | Is the line spacing consistent throughout the report? |  |
| 98 | Are the margins consistent throughout the report? |  |
| 99 | Is the font and font size consistent throughout the report? |  |
| 100 | Is the spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax correct? |  |
| 101 | Are the dates given in the 1 January 2024 format? |  |
| 102 | Is the punctuation in any bullet point list(s) correct? |  |

Plan

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 103 | If there are three or more sheets, is an overview plan included? |  |
| 104 | Does the plan follow the preference for *not* having multiple viewports on a single sheet? |  |
| 105 | Are the sheets ordered so they “read” from west to east or from north to south? |  |
| 106\* | Is there a North arrow or compass point? |  |
| 107\* | Does the North arrow/compass point generally point upwards? |  |
| 108\* | When the sheet is rotated so that the North arrow points generally upwards, is all the text right-side up (or close to right-side up)? When the sheet is rotated so that the north arrow faces upwards, there should not be any upside-down text.) |  |
| 109 | Is the legend specific to the project/sheet? A generic legend should not be used. |  |
| 110\* | Does the title block include report ID, street name(s), suburb, Local Board, description of the proposal, logo (AT and/or consultant), date, revision number, preparer’s information and drawing number? |  |
| 111 | Does the drawing number use the correct code to identify the company preparing the plan? |  |
| 112\* | Are the colours correct for the existing and proposed controls? (grey for existing and not resolved, black for existing and resolved, blue for proposed/new, and red for removed/revoked) |  |
| 113\* | Does the plan include property boundaries (grey), property addresses (grey), driveways (green), kerb lines (black, although new and removed kerb line should be in blue and red, respectively), road markings (in their proper colours), and the appropriate notes? |  |
| 114 | Is there a note stating that measurements are rounded to the nearest 0.5m? |  |
| 115 | When traffic control signs or markings are shown, is there a note stating that signs and markings are indicative only and may not reflect final positions? |  |
| 116 | If labels are not used, is the no stopping off the roadway note shown on all sheets of the plan? |  |
| 117 | Does the plan *avoid* hatched or coloured areas? (High-scale diagonal hatching or ISO concrete is acceptable for footpaths.) |  |
| 118 | Does the plan *avoid* showing: infrastructure (pylons, poles, cesspits, etc), trees, hatching, building footprints, impervious surfaces, tactile pavers, etc? It should *not* show any of these elements unless they affect the proposal and were discussed in the report. |  |
| 119 | If any or more of the abovementioned infrastructure elements, tree, building, etc affects the location of a control, is the element shown? |  |
| 120 | Does the plan *avoid* showing repeated measurements for a single control? (If it is a single control being resolved, only show the measurement in the label, not repeated along the dimension line. If there is more than one control along the dimension line, show all the running measurements.) |  |
| 121\* | Does the plan label revoked controls? Controls that are completely covered by the implementation of a new control are covered under the standard revocation clause. Controls not covered under the clause must be formally revoked/removed. |  |
| 122\* | Does the plan show *all* controls in the vicinity of the proposal? Whether or not the proposal/recommendation includes those controls, the plans must show everything. |  |
| 123\* | Are the labels correct? |  |
| 124\* | Do the labels have the correct measurement? |  |
| 125 | Are the labels consecutively numbered for each street? |  |
| 126\* | Are the labels shown in every sheet they appear in? |  |
| 127\* | Are the Points of Intersection shown? |  |
| 128 | Are any conditions that apply to a parking restriction shown? Generally, the parking sign itself isn’t shown, but the details of the control should still be included in the plan (just above/below the label). |  |
| 129\* | Do the conditions of the restriction match the conditions laid out in the recommendations? |  |
| 130 | Does the plan *avoid* showing parking control signs and repeater symbols followed? (If signs are the only indication of a traffic or parking control, the sign should be shown.) |  |
| 131\* | Are intersection traffic control signs (stop and give way) shown? |  |
| 132\* | Do the running measurements add up correctly? |  |
| 133 | Does the dimension line follow how the control is measured? If the measurement was taken in a straight line, the dimension line will be straight. However, if the measurement was done around an obstacle, like NSAAT markings around a side island, the dimension line needs to reflect the same curve as how the control was measured. |  |
| 134 | If there is a bus stop, is the stop to TDM standards? It is preferable to make bus stops TDM-compliant where it’s convenient to do so. |  |
| 135 | Are the special vehicle lane symbols shown according to TDM standards? |  |
| 136 | Are the special vehicle lane repeater symbols shown in the proper locations? It’s best not to show the repeaters, but the plan is acceptable with them as long as the proper note is added to the plan. |  |
| 137 | Does the special vehicle lane start and end at the appropriate point in the markings? |  |
| 138 | Is the plan uncluttered and simple enough for a lay person to read? Take out the dimension line numbers where there is only a single control being resolved. If the control follows TDM standards, lanes, lengths, and widths don’t need to be shown. (Where the control *doesn’t* follow TDM, show the lane widths and other necessary information.) |  |
| 139\* | Are the revoked/replaced controls shown on the same sheet(s) as the new/existing controls? If this makes the plan difficult to read, provide a second set of sheets for just the new/existing controls. |  |
| 140\* | Most TCC-decision controls, like parking restrictions, require a length. Most Traffic Ops Manager-decision controls do not. Have the *appropriate* measurements been provided? |  |
| 141 | Have all unnecessary measurements (such as TDM-compliant flush medians, turn lanes, and lane widths) been avoided? |  |
| 142\* | Do the join lines match? |  |
| 143\* | Do the join lines avoid obscuring or interfering with the legal information? |  |
| 144 | Is the plan scaled up high enough that all information is readable when printed as A4? |  |
| 145 | Does the plan show only legal information and *not* construction information? Construction information is irrelevant to an adjudicator who’s trying to determine the legality of a control. |  |