

1. Corrections, edits and clarifications

Comment	Response
<p>In Tables 2, 5.2 and 10.3 it is unclear what the "Total Capex" line refers to, and neither the line items nor the totals in these tables seem to be consistent with the figures in Table G.1, p 125.</p>	<p>Addressed in Rev 1.3</p>
<p>The map in Figure B.1 is a partial picture of the current passenger network. To give a full understanding of the comprehensive nature of the network, I suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - changing the number of tracks between Wellington and Kaiwharawhara from 3 to 2; - changing the number of tracks through Kaiwharawhara from 3 to 4; - adding the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o loops on the Johnsonville Line, o all stations that are not currently shown; o passenger operating facilities, eg turnbacks, depot, workshops, stabling, platforms; o freight facilities, eg ferry terminal, freight terminal, sidings, loops; o heritage network facilities, eg at Plimmerton, Paekakariki, Carterton and Pahiatua. 	<p>Majority of comments addressed in Rev 1.3 (however, a detailed network diagram is not considered appropriate at this level)</p>
<p>In table B.4.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kaiwharawhara has 4 platforms, not 3; - if the two platforms at Redwood are to be treated as separate stations I suggest that they should have their different km figures shown; and all carparking is east of the line, accessible from "West" only by crossing the line; - Levin, Shannon and Palmerston North have shelters; - Matarawa and Solway have platforms; - the term "Flag Only" needs explanation; - it is unclear what "Bus intergration" (sic) means: I suggest that it would be useful to identify stations with scheduled bus connections; - many stations apart from Wellington have cycle storage; - it is unclear why the number of platforms at terminal stations is not given. 	<p>All items addressed in Rev 1.3</p>
<p>It is unclear whether the terms EMU, DMU, multiple unit or unit refer to cars or sets, eg on pp 14, 30 and 135 the fleet of Matangi trains is described as 48 EMUs, but 96 EMUs on pp 21 and 29 (and 90 on p 109). In conventional railway terminology an EMU is a fixed-consist set made up of a number of cars, so the conventional (and unambiguous) description of this fleet is 96 cars, configured as 48 EMUs. Similarly, the Ganz Mavags are 88 cars, 44 EMUs or units. I suggest clarifying similar references, eg on pp 14, 15, 17, 21, 29, 38, 43, 49, 52, 56, 65, 69, 70, 95, 109, 110, 116 and 135.</p>	<p>All items addressed in Rev 1.3</p>
<p>Specific detailed comments about individual pages are given below:</p>	

Pg24 - 24 carriages for Wairarapa are said to include the 6 SE carriages, but I could find no further reference to the conversion of the SE cars to this role, or the implications of lengthening Wairarapa trains or adding another train to the Wairarapa service.	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Pg34 - Following recent deceleration, the Wairarapa Line journey time to Masterton is 95 minutes, not 90.	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Pg39 - The paragraph about peak service capacity being constrained by the number of trains omits the SE cars (and there are 184 EMU cars, not 184 EMUs).	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Pg56 - Conflict between freight and passenger trains already happens: it is not "potential".	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Pg 48 - I suggest that it is made clearer that the changes to RS2 as compared with RS1 affect HVL only - the key assumptions listed for the other lines are the same as, not "over and above", RS1.	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Pg 54 - I suggest that it is made clearer that the changes to RS3 as compared with RS2 affect PPL only - the key assumptions listed for the other lines are the same as, not "over and above", RS2. It should also be made clearer that RS3 involves a reduction relative to both RS1 and RS2 in the number of trains per hour south of Plimmerton, from 8 to 6.	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Pg 58 - It is hard to see where many of the benefits of RS3 as compared with the other two scenarios come from, since for HVL RS3 and RS2 are identical, and for PPL RS3 is of lower benefit than both RS2 and RS1. (Tabulating the attributes of the different RSs might help clarify this point and the two points above.)	Addressed in Rev 1.3 through text. Tabulated qualitative benefits comparison covered in 10.1
Pgs 82/83 - A frequency of 20 minutes is not used on other off-peak services in the region, and I suggest 15 minutes, a regional bus standard, would be more appropriate.	15 min of peak frequency was considered but issues around maintenance (fixed & rolling stock), stabling etc rendered 20 minutes more favourable.
Since no investment is involved in increasing off-peak frequency, a BCR of 1.1 strikes me as being strong enough for implementation.	PPFM Profile for a BCR of 1.1 is Low. This is covered in 12.6
It is unclear why the off-peak option tested includes doubling the length of trains from the current 2-car norm.	Operational Decision Made by TMW during TWG meetings. Maintaining 4 car consists also reduces the amount of train splitting and forming during the shoulders.
Pgs84 to 87 - Some abbreviations used in the document are not included in the Glossary	All items addressed in Rev 1.3
Pg95 - Para B.3.3 does not mention the English Electric units owned by the Canterbury Railway Society and GW;	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Para B.3.5 does not mention The Overlander.	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Pg96 - The region's main-line heritage operators and facilities are not mentioned.	N/A
Pg97 - The abbreviation J is not explained.	N/A
Pg99 - I understand that Phoenix and Ferrymead are not used on JVL, because they are incompatible with the other units used on that line.	Correct however these trains can operate together (as a 4-car) on the JVL & HVL lines.
Pg121 - Should "Expected wait time is usually taken as being twice in-vehicle time" read "The value of expected wait time..."?	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Pg134 - Some works referred to in the text are not included in the References list, for example:	All items addressed in Rev 1.3

It would also be helpful if the References list was in alphabetical order.	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Figure 5.3, Table 11.1 and the figure on p 122 are hard to interpret or read when copied in monochrome, as in the papers for the RTC - for example, the diagonal blue line said to be in Table 11.1 is invisible.	Addressed in Rev 1.3
Can you provide further explanation on why Western Line can't have 10 min frequency.	The nature of the 'layered' timetable that is used throughout the Wellington network cannot sustain a 10 minute service frequency due to a combination of station spacings, stopping frequency and train operating speeds. Consequently the 'layered; timetable does not work for 10 minute train frequency. The main difference is that with RS3 there will be 2 trains per hour less (south of Plimmerton) than there would be with the RS1 and RS2 options.
The Plan refers to scenarios RS1 and RS2. The terminology is confusing. "Scenarios" means "possible alternatives" but in the plan they refer to Stages that may be delayed but they are not alternatives to each other. I suggest RS1 be called Stage 1, and RS2 be called Stage 2 or perhaps Probable Stage 2.	As the 'Scenarios' were developed it became apparent that they all had merit so they did essentially become stages, however they still represent alternatives because the stages can be chosen in different orders. The RS terminology is retained.

2. Multimodal integration

Comment	Response
There are a number of references to integration with other modes, eg "integrated with the broader transport network" (p 54), "effective and efficient multi-modal transfers" (p 62), but I could see no reference in the document as to how this integration would be achieved. For instance, there appears to be no mention of the extensive network of connecting bus services (except peripherally in Table B.4.2) and how that network would be affected by the proposed changes; and no information about upgrading interchanges, except for improving park & ride facilities. (The connecting bus network appears to be something of a blind spot for GW: I have pointed out on a number of occasions that its existence is almost completely unadvertised at the Wellington end, and this continues to be the case.)	Suggest that the details associated with full integration is a detailed activity that would be undertaken / considered in greater detail within the implementation plan. See discussion of an Integrated Public Transport Network Plan (section 1.6)
Re table D.3.1: - If light rail were to be introduced to the region the most effective and likely way would involve shared use of the heavy rail infrastructure, so I suggest that potential light rail projects such as extension through and beyond Wellington CBD should be included in the pre-feasibility section, as Melling-Waterloo already is. - The N2A measure to investigate improvements to pedestrian access to Wellington Railway Station is not included. Re table D.3.1:	Reference to N2A is made in D.4 but not specifically relating to pedestrian access.

<p>Transport 2000+ is confident that no such difference between rail and bus passenger destinations exists, or that if it does exist that a mode shift from trains to buses is occurring because of the grossly inadequate intermodal facilities at Wellington Railway Station. If a train to bus modal shift is a council policy objective, the plan should openly state that this is so. If this is not an objective, the rail plan should give a detailed assessment of how intermodal facilities at Wellington Railway Station can be improved to a satisfactory level. This assessment should include benefit/costings for remedies as has been done for other projects identified in the plan. Passenger volumes south of Wellington Railway Station are sufficiently high to support public transport southward on very short headways - as illustrated by the high peak hour pedestrian volumes on footpaths between Wellington Railway Station and Manners Street requiring widening of footpaths to cope with the numbers. Even if GWRC has instructed its officials not to consider light rail, the regional rail plan should at least detail how the intermodal connections with buses through the CBD can be made more adequate.</p>	<p><i>see above and 1.6 and 1.5</i></p>
<p>I support many of these comments: I would just like to emphasise that the "Reach" aspect of the plan needs expanding from its concentration on park-and-ride and extension into low-density corridors to include the encouragement of other ways other than driving of getting to the station, eg walking and cycling, and the existing but unmentioned feeder bus network, including the creation of high-quality bus/walk/cycle/rail interchanges, and extension along the region's highest-density corridor, through Wellington CBD.</p>	<p><i>Next level of detail beyond scope of RRP.</i></p>

3. Implementation

Comment	Response
<p>Taken a very brief look - seems very engineer-focussed. Need promotion, travel plans etc too.</p>	<p><i>This type of work will be promoted as part of the Implementation Plan</i></p>
<p>I am surprised that implementation of North-South Junction Stage 1 (cost just \$5 million) is not considered for another two years. GWRC previously identified and successfully lobbied for the opening up of the Kai Iwi tunnel north of Wanganui so that container freight could move better between Hawera and the port of Wellington by rail. Much container freight on the NIMT is now happily moved between Wellington and Palmerston North by road because of the limitations of the North-South Junction tunnels. It is silly that remedying this is a lower priority than the Kai Iwi tunnel.</p>	<p><i>Implementation Issue. Timeframe reflects when ONTRACK can physically undertake the works.</i></p>

4. Passenger safety

Comment	Response
Would like to see much more about personal safety e.g. subways but also on the train.	Detail specifications of 'Station Upgrades' and 'New / Refurbished Trains' projects will address these issues.
It is great that trains carry cycles free of charge but the capacity is very limited. What is a commuter to do if there is no room ? Wait for the next train ?	Operational Level Issue
Many stations have no capacity to store cycles. Those stations that do, require that you book a storage unit for a long period of time. There is no option for casual use such as those who are considering trying cycling to the station as part of their work commute, or those who wanted to take the cycle on the train but there is no room, or those who are making some other use of cycle and train.	Operational Level Issue

5. TODs

Comment	Response
Many stations could take a leaf from Waitakere and BUILD apartments/offices over/around the station - grounds - WITHOUT many car parks. Surveillance could be from balconies as well as mini-dairies/cafes. This would also bring in Capex.	These types of initiatives are part of the detailed scope development of station upgrades. Connections to town centres largely rely on local body town planning and urban form.
The rail plan makes no mention of the need for better interfaces between rail and other city activities, such as retailing at Johnsonville Mall or retailing in the Kaiwharawhara area. Kaiwharawhara Station could readily link with the rail ferry terminal but this is not mentioned let alone addressed. Pedestrian links between railway stations and major urban centres are either spectacularly poor (e.g. Porirua Station and Porirua CBD; Melling/Waterloo and Lower Hutt CBD) or barely adequate (e.g. Paraparaumu Station and Coastlands; Johnsonville Station and J'ville Mall/J'ville branch of The Warehouse). Will there be any connection at all between the new Waikanae Station and the Waikanae CBD? The rail plan needs to examine all of these connections in detail and provide remedies for them.	
The Plan also needs to address the issues of urban form, sustainability and transit-oriented development: the latter has potential to be a significant funding source.	
Other interfaces could include facilitating major office/retail/residential developments at or over railway stations. [Can we give examples of big profits for developers where they have done this overseas?] Stations at Porirua, Kaiwharawhara and elsewhere could become the focus for transit-oriented development, maintaining the region's compactness, and enhancing its efficiency and competitiveness with other regions (nationally and internationally) in accordance with GWRC's economic development strategies and objectives.	Should be addressed as part of both the Funding and Implementation Plans

6. Journey Time

Comment	Response
<p>Rail Scenario A (RSA) will apparently reduce travel times on the Johnsonville line by 1 minute. Officials insist that no stations are marked for closure on the Johnsonville line and it is hard to see how line straightening could be used to reduce travel times. Can council officials please identify how they propose to improve travel times on the line? Given that difficulty in trains maintaining travel times is the primary reason for the 26-minute gap in the current 13-13-26 minute peak timetable, surely a 1 minute travel time saving could be implemented now to allow trains to run to a 13-13-13-13 minute timetable as it used to do reliably in the 1970s. That consistent 13-minute frequency made timetables irrelevant - passengers such as myself used to just turn up at any station and catch the next train that came.</p>	<p><i>JV Line works also cover line speed improvements as a consequence of the tunnel lowering project, also services would be withdrawn from Box Hill station.</i></p>
<p>The plan seems to put off journey time improvements, deeming them only necessary once TGM and other road improvements are completed, and the lines will have to compete with faster journey times for automobiles. What is the argument for this? Don't ordinary train users deserve faster commuting times? Only people who would otherwise drive? Faster services are an attractor, this is agreed. Isn't it good to provide faster services early to attract and retain more users? By attracting more users earlier it may make some road improvements less necessary, and will instead reinforce the need to invest in the rail network. The journey for an express service from Waikanae to Wellington, stopping at Paraparaumu, Paekakariki, Pukurua Bay, and Porirua, with an operating speed of 110kph on all parts of the line, acceleration and deceleration of 1.3ms⁻², and 30 second average loiter times at stops would take: 34.5 minutes. At 130 kph (perfectly reasonable on modern suburban services seen overseas) it would take: 29.7 minutes. But granted 130 kph operating speeds on all parts this line would take a lot more work. This is definitely attractive for a motorist otherwise facing a 50-60 minute journey. Whereas, the current 60 minutes to get to Waikanae is simply ridiculous. Trains <i>should</i> be faster than cars. And getting people out of cars and into trains when TGM opens will be harder than getting them out of cars now. So I feel this part of the plan is back-to-front and needs to be strongly reconsidered.</p>	<p><i>The pathway does promote the option for quicker journey times through RSA. It would be anticipated that as part of the 3 yearly review a detailed study would be undertaken to fully understand and establish what RSA would look like in reality. This level of feasibility investigation is considered to be completely outside the scope of the RRP. The outputs of pre-feasibility work have been included in the report.</i></p> <p><i>Note that the Base Case includes journey time improvements with Kaiwharawhara Throat improvements, double tracking to Waikanae, new trains, power signalling upgrades etc.</i></p>

7. Wellington CBD

Comment	Response
<p>The plan does not consider the possibility of extending rail services into the CBD via a tunnel or tram-train line.</p> <p>I understand many people see this possibility as extravagant, though I'm uncertain why it is anymore extravagant than large motorway proposals, the point is good planning should allow for this in the future should attitudes or demand require it.</p> <p>A designation should be made so that a route would be protected.</p>	<p>Outside Scope and Boundary of the WRRP. The main focus of the RRP was to optimise existing network.</p> <p>Based on recent work undertaken in Brisbane a proper Feasibility Study / Concept Study would cost in the order of \$10m. The Route Protection Study for the Auckland CBD Tunnel will be in-excess of \$5m and take in the order of 18 months too complete.</p>
<p>Rail Scenario B (RSB) looks at extending the reach of the network northwards from Waikanae into an area of low patronage at quite a high cost. Careful planning of intermodal connections of minibuses with trains is examined as it is considered essential if passengers are to use the service. It is therefore ludicrous that the rail plan makes no mention whatsoever of the existence of seriously unsatisfactory intermodal connections at the southern end of the network where patronage is at its highest. Even if GWRC has specifically instructed officials not to consider any rail transport southward from Wellington Railway Station, the rail plan warrants greater coverage of intermodal connections with buses at Wellington Railway Station (10,000s pax per day) than coverage of intermodal connections northward to Otaki and Levin (100s pax per day maximum quoted in plan).</p>	<p>Outside Scope and Boundary of the WRRP. The main focus of the RRP was to optimise existing network. See section 1.6 for network integration planning.</p>
<p>Council officials have asserted to me that there is ZERO demand for passengers arriving at Wellington Railway Station by train to continue their travel southward. The same officials also assert that there is such overwhelming demand for bus passengers arriving at Wellington Railway Station from the north wanting to continue southward, that every single bus arriving at Wellington Railway Station from the north continues southward through the CBD. Councillors need to challenge officials to reveal the data that demonstrates this phenomenal difference in the destinations of those travelling by rail as opposed to bus.</p>	

8. Station upgrades

Comment	Response
The report indicated that in RS1 the major stations including Upper Hutt, would be upgraded. Could you please advise the scope of the upgrading that is envisaged under RS1.	<i>A detailed scoping activity that will be undertaken as part of the Major Stations Upgrade Feasibility Study. However, the upgrade / modernisation of the station will be significant.</i>
Also better signage of where stations are from shopping centres e.g. Tawa, Hutt City.	<i>Outside scope - this is a Metlink operations matter</i>
Street reviews of 500m pedshed would be good too. Living Streets could even offer to do them, if funded.	<i>Outside scope</i>
Also the implementation of the accessibility audit of stations seems to have been missed.	<i>This work will be done as part of the station upgrade programme</i>
Thirst for Park & Ride can make station surrounds very unfriendly for active travel connection!	<i>Wayfinding / Access Hierarchy will be addressed during concept / detailed design for station upgrades</i>

9. Strategy

Comment	Response
One slightly new angle might be to challenge the unstrategic nature of the approach – that it starts from the premise that the current extent of the rail trackage is a given (despite talk of “reach” being a necessary quality the implications of this are ignored). Most importantly, there is no matching of mode to load – no admission that where a corridor promises an economical traffic density it should have the appropriate mode.	<i>The plan has concentrated on the utilisation of the existing corridor asset and is in line with the GPS for transport infrastructure (11.2.4). In addition, the scope and boundary of the report was developed in line with key stakeholders and funders.</i>
Also worthy of comment is the dissonance between the plan and urban sustainability considerations.	

10. Passenger information

Comment	Response
<p>A major bugbear for rail users (such as myself) is waiting and waiting at a station for a train to appear. Eventually it arrives but may not stop because it is now full, or so late. A vastly improved notification system is required. I am aware that some work on this is underway. However there is no mention in the Plan of any further work.</p>	<p><i>The Real Time Passenger Information Project is currently out for tender (Feb 09).</i></p>
<p>The handling of complaints is not mentioned. I have put in three complaints at Wellington Central railway station in the last year or so. Only the most recent one was responded to. One of the complaints last year went to Metlink. I received no response. Complaints are valuable customer advice and should be treasured and not ignored.</p>	<p><i>Operational Level Issue (TMW . GWRC)</i></p>