

*Market Research
You Can Action*



PETER GLEN
RESEARCH

*Telephone (04) 564-4525
Fax (04) 564-4528
Mobile (0274) 914-330
P O Box 31-397
LOWER HUTT
e-mail:
peter.glen@xtra.co.nz*

**MARKET RESEARCH REPORT:
REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY REVIEW**

- REPORT SUMMARY -

*Report prepared for
Greater Wellington Regional Council*

March 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

| | <u>Page No.</u> |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 2. Research Objective | 3 |
| 3. Method | 4 |
| 4. Response Rates | 6 |
| 5. Profile of survey participants | 7 |
| 6. Timing | 8 |
| 7. Summary of Findings: | 9 |
| 7.1. Ease, reliability and safety of travel in the greater Wellington region | 10 |
| 7.2. Impact of the region's transport system on the environment, air quality and climate change | 11 |
| 7.3. Changes that the public would like to see to the region's transport network | 13 |
| 7.4. Perceived value/preparedness to pay for the changes | 15 |
| 7.5. Investment in roads versus public transport | 18 |
| 7.6. The purposes of travel and the extent to which cost is a consideration with regard to the travel | 19 |
| 7.7. The relative importance of specific considerations in regional travel | 22 |
| 7.8. Awareness of the Regional Land Transport Strategy | 23 |
| 7.9. The impact of public transport on business decisions | 24 |
| 7.10 Conclusion | 25 |

1. INTRODUCTION.

The Regional Land Transport Committee (RLTC) is currently reviewing the Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS). The draft RLTS for public consultation was released in late-2006.

As part of the consultation exercise, it was planned that a telephone survey would be conducted, to obtain direct feedback from residents of the greater Wellington area. This was deemed important to get a valid understanding of residents' views and attitudes towards the strategy and its key components.

Both residents and business stakeholders were, therefore, surveyed in a way that allows differences between the groups to be identified.

The research commenced after the initial publicity on the draft RLTS, as this would help ensure greater awareness of the strategy among respondents.

Peter Glen Research was commissioned to conduct the survey, the results of which are presented in this report.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE.

The overall objective was to proactively obtain the views of a representative sample of the region's population (residents and businesses) on:

- key transport issues for the region
- key elements or components of the strategy
- balance between proposed PT and roading investment
- personal priorities in relation to the transport network
- willingness to pay more

3. METHOD.

3.1. THE RESIDENTIAL SAMPLE

3.1.1 Overall approach

The research was undertaken by way of a telephone survey, among a randomly selected sample of 800 residents 14+ years of age who live in the greater Wellington region. The survey was administered by way of a structured questionnaire that was developed in consultation with client (copy appended).

3.1.2. Sample structure

Interviews were spread throughout the greater Wellington region in accordance with population distribution, in order to recruit a representative cross-section of the public. That is:

| AREAS COVERED BY: | Total population 2001 Census | % | Sample n=800 |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| Kapiti Coast District Council | 42,477 | 10.0 | 80 |
| Porirua City Council | 47,370 | 11.2 | 90 |
| Wellington City Council | 163,824 | 38.7 | 309 |
| Lower Hutt City Council | 95,478 | 22.5 | 180 |
| Upper Hutt City Council | 36,372 | 8.6 | 69 |
| South Wairarapa District Council | 8,742 | 2.1 | 17 |
| Carterton District Council | 6,849 | 1.6 | 13 |
| Masterton District Council | 22,617 | 5.3 | 42 |
| TOTAL | 423,729 | 100.0% | 800 |

3.1.3. Sample selection

Respondents were recruited for the research by way of random telephone enrolment, using the local telephone directories as the sampling frame. Up to three calls were made to establish contact with each randomly selected respondent, thus preserving, as far as practicable, the random integrity of the survey. Where more than one person qualified per household, the interview was undertaken with the person whose birthday fell next.

The survey was conducted throughout weekday evenings and weekends, in order to reach a representative cross-section of the population.

3.1.4. The interviews

Interviews were administered by way of a structured questionnaire. The interviewing was conducted by a team of experienced interviewers employed by Peter Glen Research, who were each fully briefed on the specific requirements of the project.

3.2. THE BUSINESS SAMPLE.

3.2.1. Overall approach

This survey was also undertaken by way of telephone interviewing, among a sample of 100 business stakeholders. The interview was again administered by way of a structured questionnaire (copy appended).

3.2.2. The sample

A random selection of stakeholders were drawn from business and telephone directories, using a set of random number tables to select the sample. The sample was spread throughout the greater Wellington region.

3.2.3. Interviewing

The selected respondents were initially contacted during the day (normal business hours) and asked to participate in the survey. An appointment was made to call the respondent back to complete the interview, where required. The call-back interview was made at a convenient time to the respondent (i.e. daytime or evening); for example, some respondents requested to complete the interview outside normal work hours.

As with the residential sample, up to three calls were made to reach each randomly selected respondent, before replacement.

The interviews were conducted by experienced members of Peter Glen Research's field team, who were fully briefed on the specific project requirements.

4. RESPONSE RATES

(a) The Contact Rate

85% of the random telephone numbers initially selected for sampling yielded an effective contact. That is, using up to three contact attempts where necessary, we were able to establish contact with someone on the selected number and obtain either an interview or a refusal.

| THE CONTACT RATE | <u>TOTAL</u> | | <u>RESIDENTIAL</u> | | <u>BUSINESS</u> | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|-----|--------------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Contact could be established | 1,239 | 85 | 1,098 | 84 | 141 | 93 |
| Contact could not be established | 217 | 15 | 206 | 16 | 11 | 7 |
| TOTAL | 1,456 | 100 | 1,304 | 100 | 152 | 100 |

(b) The Effective Response Rates

A total of 1,239 effective contacts were necessary to draw the total sample of 900 survey respondents (800 residential and 100 business). That is, an effective interview was obtained at 72% of the numbers on which contact was established. To summarise:

| THE RESPONSE RATE | <u>TOTAL</u> | | <u>RESIDENTIAL</u> | | <u>BUSINESS</u> | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Effective interviews | 900 | 72 | 800 | 73 | 100 | 71 |
| Refused interview | 194 | 16 | 169 | 15 | 25 | 18 |
| Selected household member/business person could not be reached after appointment was made | 74 | 6 | 67 | 6 | 7 | 5 |
| Other reasons for non-completion | 71 | 6 | 62 | 6 | 9 | 6 |
| TOTAL EFFECTIVE CONTACTS | 1,239 | 100 | 1,098 | 100 | 141 | 100 |

The refusal rate of 16% was a little lower than usual for a general population survey, indicating that the topic of regional transport generates interest among the people of the greater Wellington area.

5. PROFILE OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

The random sampling procedures utilized in the survey resulted in a representative cross-section of the public being interviewed. This is reflected in the following demographic profile of survey participants.

5.1. THE RESIDENTIAL SAMPLE

| PROFILE | | TOTAL |
|--|--------------------|-------|
| Base: | | 800 |
| | | % |
| (a) GENDER: | | |
| | Male | 47 |
| | Female | 53 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |
| (b) AGE: | | |
| | 14 – 29 years | 21 |
| | 30 – 39 | 14 |
| | 40 – 49 | 17 |
| | 50 – 59 | 16 |
| | 60+ | 17 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |
| (c) ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME (PRE-TAX) | | |
| | Up to \$30k | 22 |
| | Over \$30 - \$50k | 19 |
| | Over \$50 – 70k | 16 |
| | Over \$70k | 32 |
| | Don't know/refused | 11 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |

5.2. THE BUSINESS SAMPLE

| PROFILE | | TOTAL |
|---|---------------------------------|-------|
| Base: | | 100 |
| | | % |
| (a) GENDER: | | |
| | Male | 49 |
| | Female | 51 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |
| (b) INDUSTRY SECTOR: | | |
| | Retail/wholesale | 14 |
| | Manufacturing | 11 |
| | Engineering | 9 |
| | Automotive | 9 |
| | Building/construction | 10 |
| | Hospitality/tourism | 10 |
| | Recreation | 3 |
| | Transport | 8 |
| | I.T./Communications | 6 |
| | Financial | 5 |
| | Professional services | 6 |
| | Public sector | 6 |
| | Other | 3 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |
| (c) No. OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES IN WELLINGTON REGION: | | |
| | 0 – 5 | 33 |
| | 6 – 10 | 15 |
| | 10 – 15 | 16 |
| | 16 – 20 | 9 |
| | 21 – 30 | 3 |
| | 31 – 50 | 6 |
| | 51 – 100 | 12 |
| | More than 100 | 6 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |
| (d) ANNUAL BUSINESS TURNOVER: | | |
| | Up to \$100,000 | 9 |
| | Over \$100 - \$250,000 | 12 |
| | Over \$250 - \$500,000 | 7 |
| | Over \$500,000 - \$1 million | 17 |
| | Over \$1 million - \$2 million | 12 |
| | Over \$2 million - \$5 million | 6 |
| | Over \$5 million - \$10 million | 11 |
| | Over \$10 million | 13 |
| | Undisclosed | 13 |
| | TOTAL | 100% |

6. TIMING.

Fieldwork for the survey was carried out from late-November 2006 to late-January 2007, with no interviewing being conducted over the Christmas-New Year period.

7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.

7.1. EASE, RELIABILITY & SAFETY OF TRAVEL IN THE GREATER WELLINGTON REGION

Respondents were asked to rate these attributes for different modes of transport. Their ratings were made on a scale of one to ten, with 10 being ‘*very positive*’ and 1 being ‘*not at all positive*’.

The overall results, shown in Table 2 of the Detailed Tables, suggest that opinion varies widely. Past experience has shown that a rating of 9 or 10 can be considered ‘*high*’, a score of 6 to 8 can be regarded as ‘*moderate*’, and a rating of 5 or below is generally reflective of a ‘*low*’ score.

The average (mean) ratings that emerged among the **residential** respondents suggest that travel in the greater Wellington region is regarded as moderately good on the attributes concerned. That is:

| RESIDENTIAL (n=800) | Ease of Travel | Reliability | Safety |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|--------|
| Private motor vehicle | 6.7 | 7.7 | 7.5 |
| Train | 6.7 | 6.5 | 7.8 |
| Bus | 6.5 | 6.4 | 7.4 |
| Cycle | 5.3 | 6.2 | 4.3 |
| Walking | 7.2 | 7.8 | 6.6 |

Cycling, however, rates comparatively low for ‘*ease of travel*’ and ‘*safety*’.

A similar picture emerged among the **business** respondents, although they rated private motor vehicles a little more positively, and public transport marginally lower for ‘*ease of travel*’ and ‘*reliability*’.

| BUSINESS (n=100) | Ease of Travel | Reliability | Safety |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|--------|
| Private motor vehicle | 7.3 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Train | 6.1 | 6.3 | 8.1 |
| Bus | 6.1 | 6.1 | 7.5 |
| Cycle | 5.8 | 5.9 | 4.1 |
| Walking | 6.3 | 7.0 | 6.0 |

7.2. IMPACT OF THE REGION'S TRANSPORT SYSTEM ON THE ENVIRONMENT, AIR QUALITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Respondents again used a ten-point scale to rate the level of impact that they perceive the region's transport system has on each of these factors. The results can be summarised as follows:

7.2.1. THE ENVIRONMENT

The majority of respondents considered the region's transport system has a 'moderate' level of impact on the environment. However, considerably more business respondents regarded the level of impact as 'high', compared to the ratings given by the residential sample.

| THE ENVIRONMENT | Residential (n=800) | Business (n=100) |
|--|------------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| A high level of impact (rating 9 or 10) | 14 | 23 |
| A moderate level of impact (rating 6 to 8) | 51 | 48 |
| A low level of impact (rating 1 to 5) | 35 | 29 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 6.3 | 6.8 |

The results disclosed by the demographic sub-groups, in Table 3 of the Detailed Tables, reveal a similar range of ratings across the regional population base. However, it is interesting to note that slightly higher levels of impact were recorded, on average, among:

- women 6.5 (compared to men 6.1)
- the 30 to 59 year age group 6.6 (compared to younger residents 6.1 and older residents 6.0)
- residents from higher income households, i.e. \$50k+, 6.7 (compared to lower income households 6.1)

7.2.2. AIR QUALITY

When considering the impact of the region's transport system, both the residential and business samples rated the air quality in the Wellington region quite positively. To summarise:

| AIR QUALITY | Residential (n=800) | Business (n=100) |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| Very good (rating 9 or 10) | 33 | 39 |
| Moderately good (rating 6 to 8) | 54 | 46 |
| Low (rating 1 to 5) | 13 | 15 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 7.6 | 7.6 |

7.2.3. CLIMATE CHANGE, GREENHOUSE GASES AND CARBON DIOXIDE LEVELS

When respondents thought specifically about the impact that the region's transport system has on these factors, the residential respondents gave a similar overall rating to those expressed for the environment in general. However, the business respondents tended to rate the level of impact more highly. That is:

| CLIMATE CHANGE, ETC | Residential (n=800) | Business (n=100) |
|--|------------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| A high level of impact (rating 9 or 10) | 11 | 39 |
| A moderate level of impact (rating 6 to 8) | 55 | 47 |
| A low level of impact (rating 1 to 5) | 34 | 14 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% |
| Average (mean) rating | 6.2 | 7.6 |

7.2.4. OVERALL

The overall results suggest that while the majority of people in the greater Wellington area regard the region's transport system as having a 'moderate' level of impact on environmental factors, air quality is still regarded as 'moderately good'. However, businesses in particular are more aware of the impact that the transport system is having on climate change, greenhouse gases and carbon dioxide levels.

7.3. CHANGES THAT THE PUBLIC WOULD LIKE TO SEE TO THE REGION'S TRANSPORT NETWORK

7.3.1. THE SUGGESTED CHANGES

Respondents were asked to nominate (up to) “*three things relating to the region’s transport network*” that they would like to see changed. Their replies were very wide-ranging, as can be seen in Table 6 of the Detailed Tables.

However, to summarise, it can be noted that the wide range of responses can be classified under the following broad headings, to obtain a sense of where attention focused.

| PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POINTS MADE | Residential | Business |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| | % | % |
| (a) PUBLIC TRANSPORT | | |
| Improvement to trains/rail network | 26 | 16 |
| Improvement to bus services | 14 | 18 |
| Public transport in general | 13 | 11 |
| | 53 | 45 |
| (b) OTHER | | |
| Roading | 22 | 27 |
| Cycling-related suggestions | 10 | 10 |
| Reduce vehicle use (e.g. car pooling, discourage cars in CBD and heavy traffic) | 6 | 7 |
| Environmental factors | 5 | 4 |
| Walking-related suggestions | 1 | - |
| Other | 3 | 7 |
| TOTAL POINTS MADE | 100% | 100% |

Overall, the major area of focus was for improvement to public transport. This accounted for 53% of the total requests made by the residential respondents and 45% of the total requests made by the business participants.

Other improvements were, however, also given emphasis, with the ‘*roading*’ category being most frequently mentioned. As revealed in the Detailed Tables, ‘*roading*’ covered a wide range of suggestions, including the upgrading of roads, prioritising Transmission Gully, improving the safety of roads, installing roundabouts, reducing the time taken on road works, and various other suggestions.

7.3.2. ANALYSIS BY AREA, OF THE TOTAL POINTS MADE BY THE RESIDENTIAL RESPONDENTS

The main areas of focus were fairly similar across the greater Wellington region.

| PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POINTS MADE | TOTAL RESIDENTIAL Bases: 2064 | Kapiti 205 | Porirua 260 | Wgtn 794 | Lower Hutt 467 | Upper Hutt 186 | W'rapa 152 |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|----------|----------------|----------------|------------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| (a) PUBLIC TRANSPORT | | | | | | | |
| Improvement to trains/rail network | 26 | 30 | 38 | 18 | 32 | 34 | 14 |
| Improvement to bus services | 14 | 17 | 12 | 19 | 10 | 12 | 6 |
| Public transport in general | 13 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 16 | 9 | 19 |
| | 53 | 55 | 55 | 52 | 58 | 55 | 39 |
| (b) OTHER | | | | | | | |
| Roading | 22 | 26 | 23 | 21 | 15 | 23 | 40 |
| Cycling-related suggestions | 10 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 12 |
| Reduce vehicle use | 6 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 3 |
| Environmental factors | 5 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Walking-related suggestions | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| TOTAL POINTS MADE | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

However, it is interesting to note in the above table that:

- Improvement to 'trains/rail network' was given more specific emphasis by residents of Kapiti, Porirua, Lower Hutt and Upper Hutt, than it was by residents of Wellington City and the Wairarapa.
- Improvement to 'bus services' was sought by a greater percentage of the respondents in Wellington City.
- 'Roading' improvements were sought most strongly by the Wairarapa and Kapiti Coast residents.

7.3.3. THE NUMBER ONE PRIORITY

Respondents were asked to identify the number one priority out of the suggestions they had made. Their overall response closely mirrored the previous results, i.e.:

| No. 1 PRIORITY | RESIDENTIAL | BUSINESS |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| | % | % |
| (a) PUBLIC TRANSPORT | | |
| Improvement to trains/ rail network | 27 | 18 |
| Improvement to bus services | 16 | 20 |
| Public transport in general | 12 | 12 |
| | 55 | 50 |
| (b) OTHER | | |
| Roading | 24 | 30 |
| Cycling-related suggestions | 9 | 6 |
| Reduce vehicle use | 5 | 6 |
| Environmental factors | 5 | 4 |
| Walking-related suggestions | x | - |
| Other | 1 | 4 |
| TOTAL No. 1 PRIORITIES | 100% | 100% |

7.4. PERCEIVED VALUE/PREPAREDNESS TO PAY FOR THE CHANGES7.4.1. THE OVERALL RESULT

The *residential* respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they would be prepared to pay for the three changes they had identified, bearing in mind that the average household spends approximately \$115 per week on domestic travel. Their willingness to pay was checked at five price points, i.e.

| COST OF CHANGES TO AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SPEND (PER WEEK) | PREPARED TO PAY | | | | | TOTAL RESIDENTIAL RESPONDENTS |
|---|-----------------|----------|--------------|----------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| | Definitely | Probably | Probably Not | Definitely Not | Unsure | |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| \$100 | 5 | 14 | 17 | 62 | 2 | 100 |
| \$50 | 15 | 19 | 13 | 51 | 2 | 100 |
| \$25 | 32 | 20 | 7 | 39 | 2 | 100 |
| \$12 | 49 | 19 | 6 | 25 | 1 | 100 |
| \$6 | 62 | 15 | 3 | 19 | 1 | 100 |

The above table indicates that a majority of the residential population (52%) in the greater Wellington region would potentially be prepared to pay up to \$25 per week (average household spend) to achieve significant improvement in the region's transport network.

The *business* respondents were asked to rate the value of the improvements by relating them to a percentage increase in their current travel and transport costs.

| PERCENTAGE MORE PER WEEK (IN RELATION TO CURRENT TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT COSTS) | WOULD CONTRIBUTE THE PERCENTAGE STATED? | | | | | TOTAL BUSINESS RESPONDENTS |
|--|---|----------|--------------|----------------|--------|----------------------------|
| | Definitely | Probably | Probably Not | Definitely Not | Unsure | |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| 100% | 2 | 4 | 3 | 82 | 9 | 100 |
| 50% | 5 | 7 | 14 | 65 | 9 | 100 |
| 25% | 11 | 16 | 23 | 41 | 9 | 100 |
| 12% | 31 | 29 | 21 | 12 | 7 | 100 |
| 6% | 56 | 31 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 100 |

This again suggests that a majority of respondents see value in the suggested changes they identified, with a majority of business respondents (60%) potentially prepared to incur an additional 12% in travel and transport costs.

7.4.2. PREPAREDNESS TO PAY, CROSS-ANALYSED BY RESPONDENTS' NO. 1 PRIORITY FOR DEVELOPMENT

The following table shows the total percentage of *residential* respondents who indicated that they would '*definitely*' or '*probably*' be prepared to pay at each price level. The table is cross-analysed to show how the result differs according to which improvement respondents regarded as their number one priority for development.

| COST OF CHANGES TO AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SPEND (PER WEEK) Bases: | TOTAL RESIDENTIAL 800 | NO. 1 PRIORITY FOR IMPROVEMENT | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | Public Transport 443 | Roading 194 | Other 163 |
| | % | % | % | % |
| \$100 | 19 | 18 | 23 | 17 |
| \$50 | 34 | 33 | 38 | 32 |
| \$25 | 52 | 51 | 56 | 50 |
| \$12 | 68 | 67 | 73 | 65 |
| \$6 | 77 | 77 | 80 | 73 |

The overall propensity to pay was similar across the priority groups.

A similar result emerged among the *business* respondents.

| PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT COSTS Bases: | TOTAL BUSINESS 100 | NO. 1 PRIORITY FOR IMPROVEMENT | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| | | Public Transport 50 | Roading 30 | Other 20 |
| | % | % | % | % |
| 100% | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 |
| 50% | 12 | 10 | 17 | 10 |
| 25% | 27 | 26 | 30 | 25 |
| 12% | 60 | 58 | 60 | 65 |
| 6% | 87 | 88 | 87 | 85 |

7.5. INVESTMENT IN ROADS VERSUS PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Respondents were asked the question:

“Given a limited budget, what do you think is more important for the region:

- investing in roads, to improve capacity, safety and reliability

or - investing in public transport, to improve capacity, quality, reliability and provide alternatives to car travel.”

On balance, significantly more respondents opted for investment in public transport. That is:

| WHICH IS MORE IMPORTANT? | Residential (n=800) | Business (n=100) |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| Investing in roads | 23 | 33 |
| Investing in public transport | 61 | 58 |
| Both equally | 16 | 9 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% |

This result was fairly consistent across the various demographic sub-groups (see Table 8(a) of the Detailed Tables).

Respondents were then asked to indicate the proportion of funding they would allocate to each option. This resulted in a slightly different result, as follows, although the weighting still leans toward investment in public transport.

| A PROPORTION OF FUNDING | Residential (n=800) | Business (n=100) |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | % | % |
| Weighted towards roads | 23 | 33 |
| Weighted toward public transport | 51 | 51 |
| Equally weighted (50:50) | 26 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% |

The specific proportions allocated by respondents can be examined in Table 8(b) of the Detailed Tables.

7.6. THE PURPOSES OF TRAVEL AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH COST IS A CONSIDERATION WITH REGARD TO THE TRAVEL

The survey participants were asked to nominate the main purposes for which they travel in the greater Wellington region. Respondents then identified how they make those trips and indicated to what extent the cost of the trip is a consideration in their selection of transport.

The results can be summarised as follows.

7.6.1. THE MAIN PURPOSES OF TRAVEL

The *residential* respondents were asked to identify the *two* main purposes for which they travel in the greater Wellington region. The percentage of respondents who nominated each category was as follows:

| PURPOSE OF TRIP | % NOMINATING |
|--|--------------|
| | % |
| Travel to/from work | 63 |
| To visit the shops | 41 |
| To visit friends/relatives | 37 |
| To attend sports or recreation | 15 |
| To travel to/from a place of education | 12 |
| To attend meetings/appointments | 8 |
| To take children to/from school | 7 |
| To attend church/place of worship | 2 |
| Other purposes | 15 |
| Average no. of 'main purposes' nominated | 2.0 |

The great majority of business respondents had knowledge of the types of transport mainly used by their organisation for the following purposes.

| PURPOSE OF TRIP | % NOMINATING |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| | % |
| Transporting goods and equipment | 94 |
| Travelling to business meetings | 96 |

7.6.2. MAIN TYPE OF TRANSPORT USED FOR EACH PURPOSE

Private motor vehicle has emerged as the main form of transport used for all categories of trips. However, public transport appears to be used extensively (by 20 – 30% of travellers) for commuting to work, a place of education, when visiting friends/relations and for attending meetings/appointments.

| PURPOSE OF TRIP | Private Motor Vehicle | Public Transport (Bus/train) | Active Mode (Walk/cycle) | Other | TOTAL |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-------|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| <u>RESIDENTIAL</u> | | | | | |
| Travel to/from work | 53 | 30 | 15 | 2 | 100 |
| To visit the shops | 72 | 10 | 14 | 4 | 100 |
| To visit friends/relatives | 67 | 20 | 10 | 3 | 100 |
| To attend sports or recreation | 69 | 10 | 17 | 4 | 100 |
| To travel to/from a place of education | 46 | 29 | 24 | 1 | 100 |
| To attend meetings/appointments | 60 | 20 | 20 | - | 100 |
| To take children to/from school | 73 | 6 | 19 | 2 | 100 |
| To attend church/a place of worship | 75 | - | 25 | - | 100 |
| Other purposes | 76 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 100 |
| <u>BUSINESS</u> | | | | | |
| Transporting good and equipment | 85 | - | - | 15* | 100 |
| Travelling to business meetings | 91 | - | 6 | 3 | 100 |

* Note: 15% of the business respondents indicated that goods and equipment are primarily transported by way of courier.

7.6.3. COST CONSIDERATION

Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which cost is a major, moderate, or minor consideration when choosing *how* to travel for each specific purpose. The results can be summarised as follows:

| PURPOSE OF TRIP | THE COST OF THE TRIP IS: | | TOTAL |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|
| | A major or moderate consideration | Minor/ not a consideration | |
| | % | % | % |
| RESIDENTIAL | | | |
| - Travel to/from work | 34 | 66 | 100 |
| - To visit the shops | 24 | 76 | 100 |
| - To visit friends/relatives | 38 | 62 | 100 |
| - To attend sports or recreation | 24 | 76 | 100 |
| - To travel to/from a place of education | 71 | 29 | 100 |
| - To take children to/from school | 32 | 68 | 100 |
| - To attend meetings/appointments | 31 | 69 | 100 |
| - To attend church/place of worship | 25 | 75 | 100 |
| BUSINESS | | | |
| - Transporting goods and equipment | 36 | 64 | 100 |
| - Travelling to business meetings | 19 | 81 | 100 |

Cost appears to be a significant consideration for one-quarter to one-third of travellers in most circumstances. It seems that these travellers stand to be influenced by the cost of public transport, relative to the cost of private motoring.

Perhaps not surprisingly, cost appears to be a significantly greater consideration for residents who travel to/from a place of education, probably because of the impact it has on their lower incomes.

7.7. THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS IN REGIONAL TRAVEL

The overall ranking that emerged from the *residential* respondents was as follows:

| CONSIDERATIONS | Very Important | Quite Important | Neither Important nor Unimportant | Not Very Important | Not At All Important | TOTAL |
|--|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Reliability of journey time | 56 | 34 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 100 |
| Convenience | 53 | 33 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 100 |
| Safety | 56 | 27 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 100 |
| Total journey time | 36 | 37 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 100 |
| Health benefits from physical activity | 43 | 24 | 14 | 11 | 8 | 100 |
| Air quality | 33 | 25 | 22 | 12 | 8 | 100 |
| Environmental impacts | 17 | 38 | 23 | 12 | 10 | 100 |
| Cost of the trip | 17 | 32 | 17 | 20 | 14 | 100 |

All of the factors are important to a significant proportion of the population, but some clearly gain higher consideration than others.

The *business* respondents gave a slightly different order of priority, ranking ‘*safety*’ and ‘*cost of the trip*’ more highly.

| CONSIDERATIONS | Very Important | Quite Important | Neither Important nor Unimportant | Not Very Important | Not At All Important | TOTAL |
|--|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Safety | 61 | 33 | 1 | 5 | - | 100 |
| Reliability of journey time | 64 | 27 | 6 | 3 | - | 100 |
| Convenience | 57 | 28 | 12 | 3 | - | 100 |
| Total journey time | 40 | 27 | 12 | 9 | 12 | 100 |
| Cost of the trip | 24 | 25 | 12 | 13 | 26 | 100 |
| Health benefits from physical activity | 23 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 39 | 100 |
| Environmental impacts | 21 | 15 | 34 | 3 | 27 | 100 |
| Air quality | 18 | 18 | 22 | 6 | 36 | 100 |

7.8. AWARENESS OF THE REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY

44% of the residential respondents and 47% of the business respondents stated that they had seen or heard of the Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS).

The demographic breakdowns indicate that the RLTS has achieved greater awareness among:

- Men 50% (compared to women 39%)
- The middle and older age groups, 50+ years 57%, 30-49 years 38% (compared to the under 30s 22%)
- Residents of the territorial authority areas outside Wellington City, 48% average (compared to Wellington City 37%).

A variety of information sources have contributed to awareness, the most prominent being:

| SOURCE OF AWARENESS | Residential (n=351 aware) | Business (n=47 aware) |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | % | % |
| Summary document in letterbox | 38 | 15 |
| Local community newspaper | 22 | 15 |
| DominionPost | 23 | 9 |
| On radio | 17 | - |
| On television | 9 | 11 |
| Obtained a copy of the document | 9 | 13 |
| At work | 2 | 17 |
| On a website | 2 | 6 |

As is often the case when people are questioned about information sources, some respondents *incorrectly* attributed their awareness of the Regional Land Transport Strategy to television. This medium has *not* been used in the publicity campaign.

7.9. THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT ON BUSINESS DECISIONS

One-third of the business respondents indicated that access or availability of good public transport services affect staff recruitment. That is:

| PUBLIC TRANSPORT AFFECTS STAFF RECRUITMENT | Business (n=100) |
|--|---------------------|
| | % |
| A lot | 6 |
| A little | 26 |
| Not at all | 68 |
| TOTAL | 100 |

Over half the business respondents acknowledged that transport considerations have influenced the location of their businesses:

| TRANSPORT CONSIDERATIONS HAS INFLUENCED LOCATION | Business (n=100) |
|---|---------------------|
| | % |
| A lot | 21 |
| A little | 33 |
| Not at all | 46 |
| TOTAL | 100 |

7.10 CONCLUSION

The overall results reveal that a range of attitudes exist among the residents of the greater Wellington area, with regard to the ease, reliability and safety of travel in the region. Attitudes also vary widely regarding the impact that the region's transport system has on the environment. However, on balance, most forms of transport were rated '*moderately good*' on these counts by a majority of the public who participated in the survey.

Nevertheless, participants in both the residential and business surveys were able to freely express changes that they would like to see made to the region's transport network. A wide range of changes were suggested, but overall the main areas of focus centred on improvement to:

| | Residential | Business |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| | % | % |
| - The public transport system | 53 | 45 |
| - Rooding | 23 | 27 |
| - Cycling | 10 | 10 |
| - Reduce vehicle use | 6 | 7 |
| - Environmental factors | 5 | 4 |
| - Other | 3 | 7 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% |

The emphasis placed on the public transport system was confirmed when respondents were asked to specifically indicate the proportion of funding that they would allocate to roads versus public transport. That is:

| The proportion of funding should be weighted: | Residential | Business |
|---|-------------|----------|
| | % | % |
| - Towards roads | 23 | 33 |
| - Towards public transport | 51 | 51 |
| - Equally | 26 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% |

The report indicates that a sizeable proportion of the public might be prepared to pay for significant improvement to the region's transport network, although other members of the public may oppose this.

The survey also reveals that just under half of the public had seen or heard of the Regional Land Transport Strategy at the time of interview (December 2006 – January 2007). This suggests that there remains an opportunity to increase public awareness of the document.