

## Summary of feedback on Regional Public Transport Plan Discussion Document, 16 March 2010

### 1. Introduction

Feedback has been summarised according to the consultation questions asked in the Discussion Document.

### 2. Section 1 – Introduction

#### 2.1 Do you have any comments on the matters this RPTP addresses or does not address? Please explain.

**East by West Ferries:** Suggest Greater Wellington should wait until central government has confirmed the changes to the PTMA.

**Hutt Valley DHB:** Should clearly highlight the length of time the document is for.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Would like to see mention of inter-regional cooperation to develop rail connections between Palmerston North & Wellington and the flow on effect of rail connections between Otaki and Wellington.

**Mana Coach Services:** The Minister for Transport has clearly indicated that the PTMA (2008) is under review, and changes will be made. Mana believes that because Greater Wellington does not have to adopt a new RPTP before 31<sup>st</sup> December Greater Wellington has time to wait and see what the legislative changes are likely to be. Mana requests that Greater Wellington postpones until after these legislative changes have occurred.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** The RPTP addresses the basics, but does not pay heed to initiatives which could be put in place in the future to support the goal of relieving congestion by encouraging more people to use public transport.

**NZ Bus:** The purpose and statutory requirements of the RPTP will change when the revised PTMA is enacted. NZ Bus strongly urge Greater Wellington to put the RPTP on hold until 1<sup>st</sup> July 2010 because of the pending legislative changes to the PTMA. The definition of “route” could be adopted from the PTMA working party’s definition. The definition of “unit” is likely to be defined in the revised PTMA. With regard to matters taken into account NZ Bus suggests that further discussion needs to be had around the funding cap outlined in the GPS.

**NZTA:** An important measure of value for money could be the achievement of a national farebox recovery ratio of no less than 50 percent in the medium term. The NZTA will wish to work collaboratively with regional councils to achieve goals like this. Further detail was provided on farebox recovery requirements. NZTA noted that the PTMA review is currently underway, however NZTA is pleased that Greater Wellington has continued with the planning cycle. If changes need to be made in light of the review, then this can be done at the appropriate time.

**Porirua City Council:** Public Transport in the Wellington region needs to be viewed as a triangle as opposed to a “Y” and cross links need to be provided between the Hutt Valley and Porirua, for example State Highway 58.

**PW:** Would like to see more detail in the final copy.

**Regional Transport Committee:** The RPTP discussion document is well aligned with the existing 2007 RLTS and proposed RLTS 2010-2040. The discussion document provides a robust platform to develop a new RPTP that will give effect to the public transport service components of the RLTS.

**Tramways Union:** Suggests that the tendering model allowing private operators to deliver public passenger services is flawed, and that the RPTP needs to recognise this.

## **2.2 Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to commercial public transport services?**

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** There is not enough information given in 1.3.2 to be able to have an opinion on the controls being used.

**NZ Bus:** Notice periods of 65 days for variations and registrations are far too long and will see customer demand not being met in a timely manner. NZ Bus suggests that there is a need for 90 days notice periods for service withdrawals for both commercial and contracted services. The RPTP should compare network performance against other metropolitan regions. The RPTP should acknowledge the role of NZTA in setting farebox recovery requirements as well as the role of commercial operators to offer special fares as per Greater Wellington’s fare structure.

**Hutt Valley DHB:** Supports Greater Wellington’s efforts on the minimum notice period to ensure basic services are trustworthy and reliable.

**PW:** Supports the proposed approach to notification. Agrees with the language “...unless we otherwise agree” so long as Greater Wellington will only agree if the change doesn’t adversely affect passengers. PW would like to see more emphasis on controls, not less, to ensure operators have less of a say.

## **3. Section 2 – Public transport in the Wellington Region**

**NZTA:** NZTA recognises the discussion document is well aligned with the 2006 Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS). However the link between the Government Policy Statement (GPS) and this document is very limited, and briefly touched on in s2.2.1. NZTA recommends that there should be a more positive statement linking to the wider strategic context including the GPS and RLTS. Feedback regarding Table 1 (p12) & Table 2 (p14): Capex & Opex should be separated out to reveal the operating subsidy Greater Wellington is expecting from NZTA; Other Operations needs an explanation or footnote; The difference between “improvements expenditure & capital expenditure” needs to be explained; The possibility that Rail Track Access Charges will increase needs to be discussed or footnoted; NZTA believes that farebox revenue should be itemised, with estimates for commercial fare revenue. This is an item required by the Public Transport Management Act which we believe should also be shown in the Discussion Document; “Loan funding”, “Debt repayment”, and “Cash items” should be

explained or footnoted as the amounts are substantial and it is not immediately obvious what they comprise; With some contingencies around Track Access Charges and the NLTP subsidy it is unlikely that the Net funding required will be \$0. This implies certainty which is rarely achievable.

**Porirua City Council:** Notes that the Greater Wellington 10 year plan shows the regional rate for public transport usage doubling, however the Government subsidies are decreasing by 60%. To balance this out the targeted rate rise is proportionally high, and greater than what Porirua City Council was aware of. Porirua City Council questions how equitable this is, and would like to see a clearer explanation on how transport rates apply and any reason for differences between councils.

#### **4. Section 3.1 – Delivering public transport services in the region - Overview**

##### **4.1 Do you have any comments on the role of public transport and Greater Wellington's role in funding public transport?**

**Hutt Valley DHB:** Access to basic activities and services must be equally prioritised alongside the public transport role of providing congestion relief.

**Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce:** The Hutt Valley Chambers major interest is to ensure that people can get to and from their workplaces by public transport. The two reasons for this is to lower the number of cars on the road and provide an alternative to private passenger transport for those unable to afford it. This is covered adequately under section 3.1.2

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Kapiti lacks the provision of a basic network and recent reviews of this have resulted in greater coverage at the expense of frequency in usual routes.

**MM:** This is a narrow view of why public transport exists. Greater Wellington is remiss in ignoring the contributions public transport makes to economic growth, transport safety, users risk, and environmental sustainability. Greater Wellington should be exploring research in these areas and applying it to the RPTP.

**Porirua City Council:** Porirua City Council would like clarification around the proposed targets and formula on p16/17 for residents having access to public transport.

**PW:** This is too narrow. The focus needs to include the social and economic benefits too. However PW likes the approach to a transport network which includes the non-commuter routes, as they support the commuter routes to work effectively.

**Trans-Action:** The RPTP is too narrow. Emphasis on congestion relief overlooks the goal of encouraging greater and wider use of public transport. This will be achieved by providing a frequent and reliable off peak service.

#### 4.2 Do you have any comments on how the needs of the transport disadvantaged are being considered?

**Hutt Valley DHB:** Suggest that there needs to be greater scope for the transport disadvantaged in relation to fare protection. Suggests that Greater Wellington needs to do an impact analysis on fare increases in low income/high deprivation areas.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Kapiti Coast District Council hope that Greater Wellington continue to administer the Super Gold Card scheme because of the positive impact it is having on the elderly population of Kapiti. Kapiti Coast District Council commends Greater Wellington's work towards making targeted, demand responsive services in Paekakariki, and Otaihanga. Kapiti Coast District Council would suggest that greater provisions are made for the transport disadvantaged during emergency scenarios. For example when buses replace trains ensuring that the deaf are able to understand the instructions for them to transfer from trains to buses.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** It is good to see a comprehensive list of the transport disadvantaged and that special heed has been paid to the physically disadvantaged.

**Porirua City Council:** Supports the ongoing administration of the Super Gold Card by Greater Wellington and any potential threat to this scheme should be met with a contingency plan to support travel subsidies for pensioners.

**PW:** If the elderly are listed students should be also. The logic applied to students should also be applied to the elderly as there are those with access to private transport, or who are able to use public transport effectively.

**Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association (VUWSA):** VUWSA contends that tertiary students should be considered transport disadvantaged and provide a lot of supporting evidence. Their main points are that tertiary students are avoiding public transport due to cost, currently borrow to live, are less likely to be able to drive, and are less likely to afford to run a vehicle. They suggest that this would provide comparability between Auckland and Wellington as studying destinations. They also suggest the integration of Snapper and Student ID cards.

### 5. Section 3.2 – Integrated public transport network framework

#### 5.1 Do you have any comments on the layered service approach in section 3.2.1? Do you support this approach? Why?

**East By West Ferries:** Want the Wellington Harbour Ferry Service (WHF) to be given higher priority and listed as QTN.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Hopes that this ARTA based model can be applied in Wellington, and that it doesn't just result in improvements in Wellington City because of its high priority, and that improvements are made in Kapiti too.

**MM:** The service level structure looks reasonable; however some thought should be given as to how this should be presented to passengers so that they know what level of service they can expect in accordance with Objective 1. This could be achieved through a logical and coherent numbering system. Express routes especially should be prefixed with "x" so that the differentiation is obvious.

**NZTA:** Recognises the link seen in the layered service approach between ARTA and Greater Wellington. NZTA believes that these similarities will help to deliver a national feel for public transport.

**NZ Bus:** Supports this approach. However they argue that services to Seatoun, Wilton, Roseneath, Naenae, Kingston, Mairangi, Southgate, Houghton Bay, Strathmore, and Khandallah are well patronised and should be considered QTN. Figure 2 should be amended to show LCN services. Greater reference should also be given to the Network Review and outline the objectives of the review. Targeted Services for commuter services should be classified as QTN and LCN with extra capacity given at peak times, and using a more direct route. The definition of RTN refers to running services through to the airport, but no services that go to the airport are mentioned elsewhere.

**Porirua City Council:** Supports the layered service approach, but advocates for an RTN on SH58 linking Porirua to the Hutt Valley and vice versa. Porirua City Council strongly supports the ideas of integration with land use objectives and integration between modes, including integrated fares and ticketing.

**PW:** Agrees with the RTN in principle, however it should be displayed to show how rail and bus are used together to achieve it. The RTN description should also refer to this. Also it should highlight that it is possible to move off the RTN onto the QTN and LCN without transferring services.

**Trans-Action:** RTN, QTN, LCN, and TS are a reasonable set of categories, the use of trunks and branches would be a better analogy to ensure passengers fully understand the level of service they're receiving.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** The approach is good.

## 5.2 **Do you have any comments on the proposed minimum and target service levels in section 3.2.2? Do you agree with the service levels proposed? Why?**

**Hutt Valley DHB:** If patronage is low due to poor service, low income of passengers and other related factors then service levels will become caught in a "vicious cycle" causing these routes to decrease. Suggests doing the reverse and aiming to improve services first before cutting them.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Would like to ensure that the Raumati Rail Station is provided for, as well as the station at Lindale.

**MM:** The service level guidelines need to be tighter. 15 minutes at least should be the frequency for the RTN. Rail passengers should expect equitable frequency with bus passengers. The RTN should be frequent and reliable enough to not need a timetable.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** We agree with the targets. It is important to have a viable service outside peak times otherwise passengers will gravitate towards using their cars when catching the bus is not convenient.

**NZ Bus:** The minimum service levels are below current service levels and NZ Bus is wary of the possibility that this could be used to cut services. To counter this NZ Bus suggest that the minimum service levels are raised to current standards, as well as

instigating targets for service levels as funding allows. NZ Bus questions the affordability of weekend services on all LCN routes, even though they support it.

**Porirua City Council:** Porirua City Council would like to see further analysis about the broader effects of this suggestion. For example the peak time RTN provisions will have an effect on traffic flows with increased rail crossings, i.e. the crossings at Mana, Plimmerton, and Steyne Avenue. Section 3.2.2 paragraph 1 appears to indicate that it is the service that drives the hierarchy, not the hierarchy that drives the service. This comment weakens the philosophy of this document.

**PW:** Suggests three different targets, the target to aspire to, the target not to fall below, and short term targets to keep working towards. The minimum target levels are too low, and indicate cuts to current service levels. There also needs to be lower triggers for when service levels are increased as this is the most important TDM measure. Finally fare recovery should be a trigger rather than a minimum.

**Titahi Bay Residents Association:** Suggests that evening services should be reinstated, and bus shelters should be installed at previously indicated locations on TBRA's submission to Greater Wellington dated 26/04/2009.

**Trans-Action:** There should be a focus on higher service level goals to promote public transport as an alternative to private cars. Defaulting to the minimum doesn't suggest a positive outlook.

### 5.3 Do you have any comments on how public transport service levels are built up and the proposed priorities in section 3.2.3? Do you think the priorities are correct or do you want to suggest changes? Please explain.

**Hutt Valley DHB:** Potential decreases in funding may result in reduced service levels during off-peak time. Off-peak users are often those most dependent on public transport and will be the most affected.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Is the Kapiti Plus scheme being extended to include Waikanae, and will it come at the expense of other services to fund it? Kapiti Coast District Council hopes that efficient frequent services are developed to connect with new rail services at Waikanae and Paraparaumu without cutting the frequency of other services and routes elsewhere in the district.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** Greater Wellington's role in car pooling should be reflected. Park and Ride could be extended to bus services to hub centres like Kilbirnie and Johnsonville.

**NZ Bus:** Suggest that priorities are not flexible enough and that formulae should be used to calculate where and how new services are trialled, i.e. "where average loading per bus trip in a [ ] minute period exceeds [ ], frequency will be increased to [ ]." These formulae could also be used for determining which services to reduce and for the reallocation of resources.

**PW:** Disagrees with priorities. Instead proposes the following: a) Deliver the minimum plus any TS for the transport disadvantaged; b) Achieve the short term targets; c) Add further services according to their TDM effect.

**5.4 Do you have any comments on the proposed priority public transport network in section 3.2.4? In particular do you have any comments on the corridors proposed? Please explain.**

**Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce:** The Melling Line should be included in the priority public transport network as it is used by a significant number of people to commute to their employment at peak times.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Otaki needs to be included as a RTN as it is growing strongly and should be regarded as a regionally significant centre.

**MM:** a) The RTN goes to the hospital and the airport (a welcome move), but neither of these sections of route appears as RTN in the services defined in appendices (which, strangely, include no services to the airport at all); b) The marked QTN goes to Newlands, and between Karori and Massey University via VUW, but neither of these sections are in the appendices as QTN; c) Places like Seatoun and Lyall Bay are in the appendices as on the QTN, but don't appear on the map; d) Lower Hutt is a regionally significant centre and should be on the RTN, but I could see no proposals to achieve this (eg through the Melling-Waterloo rail link, studied some years ago); e) The Wairarapa Line should be part of the regular network with defined standards, not TS.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** The role of taxi's and their ability to use dedicated bus lanes should be included.

**NZ Bus:** NZ Bus would like to see the RPTP include a "master plan" for bus priorities in the region. NZ Bus also submit that Greater Wellington's policy around school buses being local are inefficient and won't stop students attending non-local schools.

**Porirua City Council:** Would like to advocate again for the East/West link on SH58. Also there needs to be greater linkage between Whiteria & WelTec (this suggestion is backed by Whiteria), as well as Keneperu and Hutt Hospital.

**PW:** The RTN should include the Lower Hutt CBD. The map should include ferries and their role. PW suggests the use of light rail or fast busses between Melling and Petone via Lower Hutt. The QTN should include major suburbs and PW would like to see numbers of residents to back this up. The TS should include LCN for new suburbs above Upper Hutt and an LCN from the surrounding areas to Masterton. Requests further discussion around the development of the RTN and alternative routes through Cuba or Taranki Street to avoid the Basin Reserve.

**Trans-Action:** Supports the clear network framework, however it should be designed to be optimal over the long term, as opposed to classifying the current routes. The RTN should include Lower Hutt CBD. Light rail should be used in the golden mile. Major suburbs like Seatoun, Kingston, and Wilton should also be included within the priority network.

**5.5 Do you have any general comments on the proposed integrated public transport network framework?**

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Kapiti Coast District Council is assuming that as Otaki was not recently reviewed it would be included in the next Kapiti service review scheduled in 2013?

**PW:** If we are referring to s3.2.5 it is confusing. If we're suggesting that we might well ignore all this and do something different it isn't appreciated. If Greater Wellington keeps the incredibly low standards in this document PW is against the idea of "over-supply" being responded to by cutting standards.

## **6. Section 3.3 – Description of services**

### **6.1 Do you have any comments on the way we propose to describe the services proposed to be provided?**

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** This description makes sense.

**Porirua City Council:** Greatest concern for Porirua City Council is the lack on public transport between Hutt Vally, Porirua, and Kapiti Coast. When will the future provisions for this be fulfilled? Shouldn't these links be defined as RTN. Why is Johnsonville, Petone & Kilbirnie seen as regionally significant centres? Johnsonville should be a QTN, not an RTN just because it has a rail line.

**PW:** Refer previous comments about the definitions of RCN, TS, QTN, and RTN.

**Titahi Bay Residents Association:** Suggests a circular route around Titahi Bay, including Te Pene Ave, for the weekends and public holidays.

### **6.2 Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to grouping of services into units?**

**MM:** The grouping of services is sensible but the sub-grouping doesn't seem to have the layered service structure in mind. For example routes 10 & 11 are QTN, however 10 falls well short of the requirements. 81/83/85 are QTN, but the 85 is of the same nature as other services defined as TS such as the 30, 31, 32.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** Grouping the services into units is logical.

**PW:** Groups should be between a place and the nearest hub which isn't Wellington. Favours hubs being major suburbs. Would like to see a broad discussion about network design rather than tweaking the existing design. Believes Johnsonville should be serviced by buses with easy transfer to rail for those heading further north.

### **6.3 Do you have any comments on the potential use of controls or other methods to require commercial services to comply with the service specifications?**

**Mana Coach Services:** The 100% bundling of commercial services within a whole route or unit is out of line with the Ministry of Transport who has recognised that there is a lack of fully commercial units when defined as 24/7 or 24/5.

**NZTA:** Takes a neutral stance on the use of controls but suggests that the Minister is indicating that the use of controls should be minimised.



## 7. Section 4 – Public transport objectives, policies and methods

### 7.1 Do you have any comments on the policy areas and proposed objective statements?

**Hutt Valley DHB:** OB1/3: Could include reference to frequent service.

OB7: The Transport Disadvantaged needs to be broader than just the elderly and children.

OB9: Could produce an unfair expectation of public transport and is concerned with what will constitute a reasonable proportion of operating costs.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Recognises that the objectives are well articulated, however the achievement of them is dependent on funding.

**Mana Coach Services:** OB 11: The Minister has indicated that he would like legislative change to be targeted at ways to develop commercial services, as well as achieving value for money through a competitive market for contracted services.

Referring to 4.2.4 “commercial registrations that ‘game’ the system”, Mana would like to know what is meant by this?

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** Objective 1.3 is an excellent objective which has a high priority for potential bus passengers when making transport choices. This objective would be watered down too much if it were replaced by proposed objective 3.

An additional objective relating to the number of passengers standing on peak-time journeys, one relating to driver safety, and one relating to future initiatives (like cycle racks on buses) would be useful.

**NZ Bus:** Suggests that this development be postponed until the new Operating Model is defined.

**Porirua City Council:** OB 4: “...services that goes some way to providing...” appears to be a disclaimer to not providing services that meet those needs. Greater service provision for links between tertiary campuses (particularly Whiteria and WelTec), as well links between Hutt and Keneperu hospitals should be covered under this objective.

OB 10: It would be better to adjust this objective to refer to the provision of information, as opposed to referring to the tool being used to achieve this objective, i.e. Metlink.

Porirua City Council supports the general approach to commercial registrations & the rest of the objectives.

**PW:** Strongly supports the development of clear objectives, policies, and methods.

**Tramways Union:** OB 3: To achieve this there needs to be better treatment for the drivers delivering the service. A solution to this is adjusting the tendering process to ensure minimum standards of wages and working conditions. Another factor for this objective is the way in which complaints are dealt with. There needs to be a

standardised policy for all operators to work by to ensure drivers are protected and public transport users are heard.

OB 6: Current infrastructure is inadequate, for example the southbound bus lane in Lambton Quay.

OB 7-9: Integrated ticketing needs to be of the highest standard, and concerns have been raised about the quality of Snapper. Increasing fares will result in decreased patronage and the reduced cost to the public can't come at the expense of the environment or the economy as public transport users return to the private car.

OB 11: The provision of a quality public bus passenger service will continue to be undermined as the cost of labour is the focus for the current tendering model. Tramways suggest that a regional collective agreement for bus drivers will help to ensure the quality aspect of the public bus passenger service will occur.

**Titahi Bay Residents Association:** OB7/9: Fares should not be increased due to current economic situation.

OB1-6: Create a loop route throughout the day between 9am-3pm around the entire Titahi Bay area going both direction with enhanced service levels for the busy time period.

OB1-6: Retain the upper portion of the Pikarere Street service.

**Trans-Action:** Suggests meeting these objectives will be hard, even though the objectives are good. Suggests that the objectives should refer to how the public transport network will entice people out of their cars.

## 7.2 Do you have any comments on the explanations of the objectives? Is there anything you disagree with? Is there anything you would add?

**Hutt Valley DHB:** OB7: Strongly supported and requests that Greater Wellington use the RPTP to commit to advocating this.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** The explanations are good.

**NZTA:** Objectives should be prioritised and more clearly delineated. Examples for illustration are provided in submission.

**PW:** OB1: The network needs to include LCN and TS services. Needs to be broader than congestion and transport disadvantaged.

OB2: Needs to include interchange infrastructure quality.

OB3: Needs to be more comprehensive in terms of reliability and quality.

OB5: Supports adoption of NZTA standards but need them for rail and ferry too.

OB7: Greater Wellington needs to take control of fare system and ensure it works as a TDM system.

OB9: Would like to have a discussion with Greater Wellington about how fare recovery approach works.

OB11: Would like to talk with Greater Wellington about this.

**Titahi Bay Residents Association:** OB2-6: Should refer to Super Low Floor Buses at all times, no exceptions, for the Titahi Bay, Porirua East, Whitby, Paremata, and Elsdon areas.

**7.3 Do you have any comments on key policies that should be included with each objective?**

**Hutt Valley Chamber of Commerce:** To achieve Objective 5 HVCOG suggests modelling the success of the Valley Flyer service and the use of leather seats and free Wireless Internet to achieve increased patronage.

**Hutt Valley DHB:** There needs to be key policies on impact assessments when fare increases are under consideration, and the level of local involvement in service reviews.

**7.4 Do you have any comments on key methods for achieving any proposed policies and the identified objectives?**

**Hutt Valley DHB:** There needs to be methods around impact assessments when fare increases are under consideration, and local involvement in service reviews.

**7.5 Do you have any comments on how we should deal with other matters such as bus stop standards, infrastructure guidelines, Christmas timetable procedures etc?**

**Titahi Bay Residents Association:** OB5-6: All verges/berms should be replaced with safe concrete footpaths for entry/lighting of public transport.

**8. Section 5 – Monitoring and review**

**8.1 Do you have any comments on how Greater Wellington should identify, monitor and report on targets? Should we only report on those targets identified in the RLTS? Those in the LTCCP? Or should we look at a wider range of targets such as those reported in the Annual Monitoring Report?**

**Hutt Valley DHB:** The RLTS and LTCCP targets should be the minimum, with some key contributing targets. A range of indicators would help understanding around what lies beneath the targets.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** The report should be on the targets identified in the RLTS.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** It would be interesting to know whether data from the Snapper card usage is able to help more accurately identify passenger patronage patterns.

**PW:** If Greater Wellington has a target it should be measured and reported on. The targets need to be those that matter.

**8.2 Do you have any comments on how service reviews should be undertaken, particularly in regard to the integrated public transport network framework?**

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Due to recent service reviews in Kapiti a review of these processes should be undertaken to look for ways to improve them. Kapiti Coast District Council recognises these are vital, but that they could be less difficult.

**Hutt Valley DHB:** Communities should be given an increased level of involvement in the review of public transport services. Specific policy should force service reviews to demonstrate how changes will improve access to transport disadvantaged.

**Porirua City Council:** Both area wide and targeted reviews are necessary as there is a need to at both the layers and the areas.

**PW:** The overall network structure needs to be included.

**8.3 Do you have any comments on the proposed service review programme? Do you believe there is merit in linking area-wide reviews more closely with the RLTS corridor plan reviews? If yes, how?**

**Hutt Valley DHB:** Potential for linking area-wide reviews with the RLTS corridor plan reviews, however there is potential for local issues to be lost in the bigger picture.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Service reviews should be integrated with RLTS corridor plan review because of the dependency the reviews have on one another.

**Porirua City Council:** Unsure if this suggestion is practical and believes it is likely to cause confusion.

**8.4 Do you have any comments on how we should undertake future RPTP reviews?**

**Trans-Action:** Future reviews should be from the network level down to specific issues. This is to ensure the focus on the integrated network.

**8.5 Do you have any comments on what should be included in the significance policy? We plan to ensure that the RPTP can be updated following each service review to incorporate outcomes of that review without triggering the significance policy. Do you agree? Why?**

**Hutt Valley DHB:** Comment dependent on local involvement in service reviews. However HVDHB suggests that major changes to service trigger the significance policy and minor changes do not.

**PW:** Changes that don't interfere with the network structure or service quality for an area shouldn't be included. Changes opposite to this should be.

## 9. Appendix 1: Role and function of public transport layers

### 9.1 Do you have any comments on the role and function of each layer?

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** The role of car pooling and any resulting decrease in congestion over time could be included. It would be good to see the trend for this mode tracked.

**Porirua City Council:** LCN Table, Operating Characteristics- instead of “May include timed connections...” replace with “*Will* include timed connections...”. RTN Table, Operating Characteristics – add a bullet point that reflects that stations should be located to serve the community they pass through.

**PW:** The role of the RTN needs to be an efficient core for the overall network. It should provide central and direct corridors for smaller routes to converge on. This is because people generally travel from other destinations to a major centre, not major centre to major centre.

## 10. Appendix 2: Public transport service groups (units)

### 10.1 Do you have any comments on the proposed grouping of services into units?

**Mana Coach Services:** The Ministry of Transport has made it clear to all stakeholders that the definition of a “unit” is still outstanding and will be defined in the Ministry of Transport’s soon to be released Operating Model, version 4. Mana believes this is another example of Greater Wellington looking to lock in changes and benefits in the face of imminent legislative changes.

**Mt Cook Mobilised:** Once the supermarkets in the MT Cook region are completed (2012) it would be useful to have services stopping as close to them as possible.

### 10.2 Do you have any comments on the grouping of trolley bus services?

**PW:** Shouldn’t be mode driven. Would like to see which routes will be mostly electric, and suggests the RTN should be.

### 10.3 Do you have any comments on the grouping of rail services?

**PW:** Rail and bus should be grouped together, and there should be rail through the CBD.

**Trans-Action:** This only reinforces that there is no continuous rail service past the Central Station through the CBD and beyond.

## 11. Appendix 3: Regular network service specifications

### 11.1 Do you have any comments on the proposed service specifications and in particular the proposed service types?

**Hutt Valley DHB:** Meeting minimum service levels for frequency and hours of operation is particularly important within higher deprivation areas where access to private vehicles is less.

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** None of the 6 bus services in G33 meet the minimum frequency and minimum hours of operation, even though 260/265 is listed as a QTN. G36 is the same. How does the RPTP work towards improving this?

**MM:** The proposals are essentially the current network with some shortfalls identified. How will it meet objectives 1 & 2? Some current routes aren't included here or in appendix 4, including the airport flyer, is this on purpose? Some of the "meets minimum" info is inaccurate, i.e. on Sundays the 43/44 doesn't meet the minimum hours of operation.

**NZ Bus:** There is a discrepancy between a route between Vic Uni and the CBD described as QTN, where as the Apx 3 describes all travel between these locations as LCN.

**Porirua City Council:** Refer comments made in the Porirua Bus Service Review RE lesser services for Titahi Bay.

## **12. Appendix 4: Targeted services specifications**

### **12.1 Do you have any comments on the proposed targeted service specifications?**

**Kapiti Coast District Council:** Supports the continued provision of Total Mobility. Through the Red Cross the Kapiti Community Shuttle Service has been linking Wellington Hospital and the Kapiti coast for over a year. It is based on the model being used in the Wairarapa that Greater Wellington subsidises. Likewise Otaki is attempting to get one up and running. Is the Wairarapa service administered under the RPTP Targeted Services? If not where does it fit?

**MM:** The Wairarapa line should be considered higher than TS since it is part of the core network. The same for some of its connecting bus routes also.