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10. 2018 Schedule of Meetings

Present
Cr Steve Lowndes (Chair), Mayor Craig Rowley, Mayor Donna Favel, Mayor Graham Smith, Cr Kerry Stevens, Cr Mark Alexander, Cr Mike Davidson, Cr Peter Scott, Mayor Winton Dalley, and Mayor David Ayers

In Attendance
Phil Dean (NZ Police), Jill Atkinson (Director, Strategy & Planning)
1. **Welcome**

The Chairperson welcomed everyone to the meeting

A special acknowledgment was made to Jill Atkinson who was congratulated for 12 years of association with the Committee. Jill was thanked for her guidance, good relationships and governance. Members wished her well for her future endeavours.

Members congratulated Steve Lowndes (Environment Canterbury, Chair) and Peter Scott (Environment Canterbury, Deputy Chair) for their recent appointments.

**Apologies**

Apologies were received from Mayor Winston Gray and Jim Harland.

2. **Conflicts of Interest**

No conflicts of interest were declared.

3. **Minutes of Meeting – 25 August 2017**

Resolved

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee

1. Confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 25 August 2017 as a true and accurate record and that the minutes be adopted.

Cr Alexander / Mayor Dalley

CARRIED

4. **Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising.

5. **Strategic Items**

5.1 **Draft Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan**

Refer to supplementary paper, page 3

Sam Elder gave a summary of what had been signalled as the new Government’s immediate priorities, which would be reflected in the redrafted Government Policy Statement on Land Transport. Members noted the most significant changes would be made by Government at a later date. The proposed draft Regional Land Transport Plan was consistent with the current signalled changes.

The Committee discussed and agreed to add an additional sixth priority area in the Regional Land Transport Plan on environmental impact. Therefore, the proposed investment priorities would be:

1. Travel time reliability
2. Accessibility
3. Condition and suitability
4. Safety
5. Resilience

5.2 **Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan – Significance Policy Review**

*Refer page 15 of the agenda*

Lorraine Johns provided an overview of the key proposed changes to ensure the Significance Policy remained fit-for-purpose.

A key change was to make the Significance Policy more flexible to ensure that all relevant considerations could be taken into account when making decisions. Significance, for the purposes of public consultation, would be determined on a case by case basis.

**Resolved**

**That the Regional Transport Committee:**

1. Approve the revised Significance Policy for inclusion in the consultation draft of the Regional Land Transport Plan.

Chair Lowndes / Cr Davidson

**CARRIED**

5.2.1 **Draft Regional Land Transport Plan for consultation**

*Refer to supplementary paper*

Lorraine Johns continued to outline the key proposed changes to the Regional Land Transport Plan, some of which the Committee had already agreed in principle.

Lorraine noted that the next draft of the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport might not be issued prior to February 2018, when it was proposed that consultation on the draft Plan commence.

Delaying public consultation later than February was not recommended, particularly as the draft Plan currently reflected the Government priorities that had been signalled to date.

Therefore, the following timeframes were recommended:

- Public consultation (for written submissions), mid-February to mid-March 2018
- Consideration by the Regional Transport Committee, May 2018
- Final Regional Land Transport Plan to Council and NZTA, June 2018

It was determined that a sub-committee consisting of three Committee members (Chair Lowndes, Cr Davidson and Cr Alexander) would report back to the Committee on submissions and changes to the Plan.

**Resolved**

**That the Regional Transport Committee:**
1. Note the Minister of Transport has signalled the intention to amend the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018-2021 to reflect the Government’s immediate priorities (though the most significant changes will be incorporated in the GPS at a later date following its issue).

2. Note that on 24 November 2017 the NZ Transport Agency consequentially extended the deadline for submitting Regional Land Transport Plans from 30 April 2018 to 30 June 2018.

3. Note that the attached draft Plan is largely consistent with the signalled changes to the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, although changes to the Plan may become necessary once the revised draft is released and there may be a window of opportunity to incorporate additional investment proposals to reflect the signalled priorities, particularly related to: public transport, reducing environmental impact and supporting mode neutrality.

4. Agreed to include environmental impact as an additional (sixth) priority area in the Regional Land Transport Plan, reflecting the new priorities signalled by the Government for inclusion in the Government Policy Statement.

5. Note that final bids for transport activities by territorial authorities are not due with the NZ Transport Agency until 16 December 2017. Changes to the draft programme of transport activities may still be required after this date, if territorial authorities make changes to their programme of works as they go through their long-term planning processes.

6. Agree in principle to the proposed changes to the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan, with final agreement to the changes to be sought following public consultation on the draft Plan.

7. Note that public consultation on the proposed changes is required in accordance with the Significance Policy in the current Regional Land Transport Plan.

8. Agree to release the draft Regional Land Transport Plan for public consultation for a four-week period in early 2018, with only written submissions invited as part of the consultation process (no oral hearings).

9. Note that consultation will likely take place before the Regional Transport Committee next meets, and ideally from mid-February to mid-March 2018, but this will depend on when the draft Government Policy Statement is re-released.

10. Agree that the Chair of the Regional Transport Committee may approve further changes to the draft Regional Transport Plan prior to public consultation, in particular following the re-release of the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018-2021 and any changes territorial authorities make to their transport programmes.

11. Note that a copy of the consultation draft and summary of any further changes made will be emailed to Regional Transport Committee members before the consultation period begins.
5.3 Regional Transport Scorecard

Refer page 21 of the agenda

Darren Fidler introduced the regional transport scorecard noting the following:
- The scorecard reflected the agreed strategy map.
- Be aware of time lags, ie: not all data was available quarterly as some metrics were only available annually.
- There will be seasonal variations.
- The scorecard identified trends over the last 5-10 years.
- Statistics could be influenced by a commodity change, eg: for Canterbury it could be coal via rail.
- The scorecard is a tool that assists in identifying questions that should be asked. It also monitors progress on outcomes. Targets may also be identified going forward.

Members suggested that a subset of the measures would be useful, reflecting the Regional Transport Committee’s key priorities, and a drillable version to district level (where this makes sense and the data is readily available).

Resolved

That the Regional Transport Committee:

1. Note an outline of the Regional Transport Scorecard was discussed at the meeting of 25 August 2017.

2. Note that the scorecard has now been populated with data.

3. Provide any remaining feedback on the Scorecard to Environment Canterbury by 5pm, Friday, 15 December 2017.

4. Note that ongoing development and refinement of the Scorecard is anticipated post-implementation, including the identification of a subset of critical measures for the Regional Transport Committee.

Chair Lowndes / Cr Davidson
CARRIED

5.4 Freight Modal Shift

(Refer page 29 of the agenda)

Darren Filder presented for the findings of Phase One of the freight modal shift research.

Phase One was about understanding the scale of the opportunity for freight modal shift

During discussion it was noted:
- 50% of freight into Canterbury from Auckland was via rail/ship
- 75% of freight movement by weight was within Canterbury
- For manufactured and retail goods, only 50% arrived into Canterbury by road but 85% left Canterbury by road
- Some of the data on freight movements within Canterbury were highly dependent on how a trip was defined (eg: if a truck stopped for 15 minutes it may be to pick up or drop off freight, or it may be to get a coffee)
- Long distance freight movements via rail/ship still required short distance trucking for the first/last mile as the majority of freight destinations were not accessible by rail or sea
- By weight, air freight was a negligible proportion of the total freight task in Canterbury (but was significant by value). Drones (with a current carrying capacity of 60kg were therefore unlikely to impact bulk movements)
- Data on heavy vehicles, especially trucks on local roads was needed to supplement the NZTA state highway counts.

It was questioned whether rail lines could have a multiple use, eg: guided buses (ie: dedicated corridors).

Members expressed interest in the potential for upcoming technology development to support the intended outcomes, in addition to a more conventional mode shift approach.

Darren advised Environment Canterbury will be liaising with the South Island Regional Transport Committee Chairs Group to look at undertaking Phase 2 of this work at a South Island wide scale.

**Resolved**

**That the Regional Transport Committee:**

1. **Note the scale of opportunity available in Canterbury for freight mode shift identified through Phase One of this project, and set out in this paper.**

2. **Note we are planning to go to market for Phase Two of the modal shift research, which will include in particular:**
   - obtaining more detailed data on origin and destination of freight of moving within Canterbury
   - identifying the economic, environmental and social benefits of increasing use of rail, sea and air
   - Identifying barriers to mode shift, including capacity constraints
   - identifying technological developments (including new modes, consolidated international shipping, intermodal technologies) that are likely to impact on freight movement, and the nature and extent of the impact that these challenges could have
   - identifying and assessing potential regulatory levers to incentivise freight mode shift from road to rail and coastal shipping.

3. **Provide feedback on the recommended scoping and progression of Phase Two of the investigation into freight modal shift in Canterbury by 11 December 2017.**

4. **Note that the Committee previously agreed to scope this work in collaboration with the South Island Regional Transport Committee Chairs Group, and that before progressing to Request For Proposal we will liaise with that Group to identify what components of this work the Group would like to progress at a South Island level.**

Cr Smith / Mayor Favel
CARRIED
5.5 **Regional Transport Committee Strategic Programme Update**  
*Refer page 35 of the agenda*

Sam spoke to this agenda item, there were no further questions.

6. **Variations**  
*Refer page 37 of the agenda*

6.1 **Variations to Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan**

Lorraine Johns advised both Waimakariri and Mackenzie District Councils were seeking variations for their LED street lighting programmes. The variations were not significant.

**Resolved**

That the Regional Transport Committee:

1. Notes that the following activities are proposed as a variation to the Regional Land Transport Plan
   a. Waimakariri District Council LED Street Lighting Renewal Programme
   b. Waimakariri District Council Increased Earthquake Funding for 2015-18 Programme.
2. Deems the requested variations to be non-significant.
3. Agrees to vary the Regional Land Transport Plan adding the proposed activities to Appendix A ‘Activities included in the Canterbury Land Transport Programme’.
4. Recommends these variations to Environment Canterbury.

Cr Scott / Cr Stevens  
CARRIED

7. **Updates**

7.1 **Regional Road Safety Working Group Report**  
*Refer page 41 of the agenda*

Mayor Ayers introduced this report. During discussion it was reported that the central focus for Canterbury police at present was road safety. There was also a heavy focus on enforcement, restraints, drugs, distraction and speed. Particular attention would be paid to looking at the cause of crashes, especially if involving tourists.

**Resolved**

That the Regional Transport Committee:

7.2 Transport Officers Group Report

Refer page 45 of the agenda

Lorraine Johns reported on the Transport Officers Group (TOG).

Resolved

That the Regional Transport Committee:


Mayor Favel / Mayor Smith

CARRIED

8. South Island Regional Transport Committee Chairs Group’s Submission on Low Emissions Economy

There were no further questions from the Committee to this report; however, comment was made on the importance of taking into consideration environmental impact, global warming and climate change.

Resolved

That the Regional Transport Committee:

1. Note the submission by the South Island Regional Transport Chairs Group on the Productivity Commission inquiry into a low-emissions economy.

Mayor Ayers / Cr Davidson

CARRIED

9. Correspondence

9.1 AJF Wilding

Lorraine Johns advised that Mr Wilding had requested that the Committee consider his letter outlining a number of issues. The Committee was also provided with a copy of the Chair’s response to Mr Wilding.

Resolved

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Joint Committee:

1. Note the letter from Mr Wilding and response to Mr Wilding.

Chair Lowndes / Cr Davidson

CARRIED

10. 2018 Schedule of Meetings

Timing of future meetings was discussed at the Mayoral Forum where it was recommended Canterbury Regional Transport Committee meetings be moved to 4.00pm on the Thursday before the Mayoral Forum. This would ensure due consideration could be given to transport
UNCONFIRMED

matters. There was general consensus to trial the new timing and staff were requested to schedule in the meeting dates for 2018.

Resolved

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Joint Committee:

1. Agree to trial the new time of 4.00pm, Thursdays (the day before the Mayoral Forum) for future Canterbury Regional Transport Committee meetings.

Mayor Smith / Mayor Rowley
CARRIED

11. General Business

There was no general business.

12. Closure

The meeting closed at 4.10pm.

Confirmed

Date: ____________________ Chairperson: ____________________
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Title

Monitoring progress towards regional transport outcomes

Purpose

1. To update the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) on the monitoring of progress towards regional transport outcomes.

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee:

1. Discuss the attached report summarising progress against regional transport outcomes.

2. Note that the full Regional Transport Scorecard will be tabled at the meeting on 1 March 2018.

3. Note that at each meeting, we will focus reporting and discussion on a particular thematic outcome.

4. Note that we are focusing on safety as the thematic outcome for the meeting on 1 March 2018.

Context

2. On 1 December 2017 the RTC finalised the Regional Transport Scorecard, which establishes appropriate measures to track the RTC’s progress towards the strategic outcomes in the following Strategy Map agreed by the RTC:
3. We expect to publish the Scorecard on Environment Canterbury’s website by April 2018.

4. Given the number and variety of strategic objectives and associated indicators in the Regional Transport Scorecard, the RTC suggested both:
   - reporting to the RTC on a smaller subset of measures, to keep track of particular outcomes
   - making available a drillable version of statistics to district level (where this is helpful and data is readily available).

**Proposed approach to monitoring and reporting at quarterly RTC meetings**

5. In light of the RTC’s feedback we propose the following approach:
   - Focusing in depth on a key thematic objective and associated set of indicators at each RTC meeting as follows:
     - Enabling freight growth at RTC meeting of 1 December 2017
     - Road safety at RTC meeting of 1 March 2018
     - Passenger & active transport at RTC meeting of 24 May 2018
• Reduce congestion and improve journey time reliability at RTC meeting of 6 September 2018.

• At each meeting, we will provide a one-page snapshot of the four key outcome areas
  o Safe, healthy and connected communities
  o Economic development
  o Environmental sustainability
  o Resilience

These outcome areas broadly align with the thematic objectives above.

• Provide RTC members with a copy of the full Regional Transport Scorecard so members are able to look more closely at any areas of particular interest for their territorial authorities. This will include a “red-amber-green” for each metric which will indicate whether metrics are trending in the desired direction, not changing significantly, or trending in the wrong direction. There will be separate “red-amber-green” indicators to reflect short and long-term trends. For example, crash data has a long term downward trend (green) which has stalled over the last year.

Report for meeting of 1 March 2018

6. The RTC agenda for 1 March 2018 includes a discussion on road safety and accompanying paper which reports on the state of road safety in Canterbury.

7. Attached to this paper is a one-page snapshot of the four key outcome areas, and the full Regional Transport Scorecard will be tabled at the meeting on 1 March 2018.
An accessible, affordable, integrated, safe, resilient and sustainable transport system for Canterbury.

Wellbeing
Long term trend in wellbeing is downwards although leveling off in last survey.

CO2
CO2 emission long term trend increasing but has leveled off over last year.

GDP/Capita
Strong economic growth, long term trend in freight growth positive with dip in 2016/2017, little change in visitor guest nights.

Incident Duration
Number of road closures and durations increasing.
Canterbury Regional Transport Committee

Information Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Endorsed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1 March 2018</td>
<td>Darren Fidler, Principal Strategy Advisor</td>
<td>Sam Elder, Programme Manager, Environment Canterbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title

RTC Work Programme Update – freight mode shift and resilience

Purpose

1. To update the Regional Transport Committee on work to implement the Transport Workstream of the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy (CREDS).

2. This update focuses on work on freight mode shift and resilience.

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee:

1. Note that this paper updates the Regional Transport Committee on work to implement the Transport Workstream of the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy.

2. Note that work is focusing on the freight mode shift and resilience projects.

3. Note that separate papers have been provided on monitoring progress toward regional transport outcomes, as well as the review of the Regional Land Transport Plan.

Work Programme Update

Overview

3. This update focuses on two projects supporting the objectives in the Canterbury Regional Transport Strategy Map of optimising freight modes and improving the condition and suitability of assets:

- Optimising freight mode shift

We are developing an RFP, as set out below, to obtain more detailed information and analysis on the opportunity for mode shift in the South Island. The South Island Regional Transport Committee Chairs Group will be asked to co-fund the next phase of this work at their upcoming meeting. The ultimate deliverables will be a report....
identifying and evaluating possible optimal mode splits for freight in the South Island, and the development of an action plan to facilitate movement towards a recommended optimal mode split.

- **Transport resilience stocktake**
  A project plan has been developed (outlined below) and Environment Canterbury met with the CDEM Lifelines Steering Group in February 2018, to inform them of this work and check we are aligned and not duplicating work. Following this, we commenced stage one of the project, which is to collate all existing information.

**Freight mode shift**

4. The RTC has agreed that a key priority is to investigate the opportunity for freight mode shift. The South Island RTC Chairs Group has agreed in principle to progress this work across the South Island, and the Canterbury RTC has endorsed this approach.

5. Phase 1 comprised a preliminary assessment of the potential scale of the opportunity for optimising freight mode split both in Canterbury and across the South Island. This work indicated that there is a significant proportion of freight currently being moved longer distances to, from and through Canterbury that it may be commercially viable to move by rail or coastal shipping.

6. The preliminary analysis of tonnes of freight being moved to, from and within Canterbury highlighted that approximately 73% of this freight in tonnes was within Canterbury and therefore travelling relatively short distances. The Ministry of Transport has since made data on tonne-KM available which we have now analysed. This indicates that when KM travelled is taken into consideration, the freight moving within Canterbury makes up only 15% in terms of tonne-KM. This significantly lower proportion is due to the relatively short distances that most freight travels within Canterbury (for example between distribution centres and retailers within Greater Christchurch).

7. Of the tonne-km incurred by freight moved within Canterbury (15% of the total tonne-km incurred moving to, from, or within the region):
   - 98% is by road
   - 2% is by rail

8. For the tonne-km incurred by freight brought into Canterbury (57% of the total tonne-km incurred moving to, from, or within the region):
   - 38% is by road
   - 33% is by rail
   - 29% is by coastal shipping

9. For the tonne-km incurred by freight leaving Canterbury (28% of the total)
   - 78% is by road
   - 18% is by rail
   - 5% is by coastal shipping
10. For the tonne-km of freight travelling through Canterbury (without Canterbury being the origin or destination of the freight)

- 63% is by road
- 37% is by rail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Within Canterbury</th>
<th>To Canterbury</th>
<th>From Canterbury</th>
<th>Through Canterbury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal shipping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Phase 2 requires more detailed analysis through an RFP to understand the benefits and barriers to mode shift. This will help inform what role Environment Canterbury and other South Island Regional Councils can take in encouraging/facilitating this mode shift, and the extent (and conditions under which) mode shift may be possible.

12. The primary outcomes that this RFP seeks to achieve will be:

- Identification and evaluation of possible optimal mode splits for freight in the South Island
- Development of an action plan to facilitate movement towards a recommended optimal mode split. This will include establishing clear accountabilities and monitoring metrics to confirm whether, and to what extent, an optimal mode split is being achieved, including benefit realisation.

13. The South Island RTC Chairs Group will be asked to co-fund the next phase of this work at their upcoming meeting, and we will report back to the RTC on progress at the RTC meeting on 24 May 2017.

**Joint transport resilience stocktake with NZTA**

14. The North Canterbury earthquakes highlighted the vulnerabilities of Canterbury’s transport network and the associated cost of disruption. Knowledge of the resilience of the transport network in Canterbury is fragmented, with no overarching plan to identify and address risks.
15. The purpose of this work is to undertake a stocktake of the transport networks in Canterbury to understand the level of risk and potential disruption to a range of users of the Canterbury Transport network, and the extent to which this can be mitigated. A diagram of the four phases of this project is appended, showing them as:

I. Information stocktake

II. Dependency mapping

III. Infrastructure stocktake and gap analysis

IV. Create action and monitoring plan.

16. The first phase of this work has commenced and is focused on gathering all relevant information. There is a significant amount of work in progress that relates to the resilience of the transport network in Canterbury and a broader piece of work is being undertaken by the CDEM Canterbury Lifelines group across all utilities, including transport. There is a need to understand the work that is occurring in order to:

- avoid duplication of resources
- identify gaps in knowledge
- identify areas of known risk where no mitigation strategy is in place, and
- co-ordinate an action plan across different parties.

17. We expect this phase one of this work to be finished in June 2018, by which time work on phase 2 (stakeholder engagement to gather dependencies will also have commenced).

18. Environment Canterbury are working with NZTA to progress this work.

Other items to note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collaboration alignment and advocacy</td>
<td>At the next South Island Regional Transport Committee Chairs Group meeting, the Chairs will consider the work on freight mode shift, resilience, and the revised draft GPS if released by then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enable evidence-based decision-making</td>
<td>An update on monitoring and the Canterbury Regional Transport Scorecard has been provided under the item on progress toward regional transport outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integrate land use, transport and hazards planning</td>
<td>Progress on review of Regional Land Transport Plan is outlined in a separate paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve condition and suitability of assets</td>
<td>Progress on the resilience project is outlined above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Passenger and active transport

The Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee and Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee members were briefed on the Public Transport Future Business Case on 6 and 13 December 2017. The Committee is preparing a draft Regional Public Transport Plan due for release in March/April 2018.

6. Optimise freight modes

Progress on freight mode shift project is outlined above.

7. Improve road safety

A discussion on road safety is on the agenda, and an accompanying paper has been provided.

8. Reduce congestion and improve journey time reliability

Approved organisations have submitted their firm bids for transport activities for the NLTP 2018-2021, and final bids for their continuous programmes.
Appendix: The four proposed stages for the resilience stocktake project

- **Information stocktake**
  - Collate projects and data which incorporate information regarding the resilience of the transport networks in Canterbury
  - Continued engagement with organisations involved in resilience projects (such as Lifelines, CDEM, NZ Transport Agency, local councils)

- **Dependency mapping**
  - Establishing the key stakeholders (communities/organisations) in the resilience of transport networks
  - Establishing the level of dependency on the reliability/level of service required by these stakeholders from the transport network
  - Establish the level of risk to this level of service/reliability from key hazards to the transport network (likely to be earthquake, tsunami, extreme weather events (snow, flooding), coastal inundation, crashes)

- **Infrastructure stocktake and gap analysis**
  - From the previous two steps, identify where there are:
    - gaps in knowledge regarding the risk to level of service (for example the risk of a bridge failing)
    - Identified areas of risk to the level of service without a suitable mitigation strategy (this may include provision of viable alternate routes, reducing the risk of failure, reducing the impact should failure occur, reducing the response and recovery time to reinstate an appropriate level of service)

- **Create action and monitoring plan**
  - Identify the costs and benefits (who pays) of appropriate mitigation plan
  - Establish the appropriate organisation to take ownership and monitoring of the mitigation plan
Canterbury Regional Transport Committee

Information Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item number</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1 March 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author: Lorraine Johns, Principal Strategy Advisor

Endorsed by: Sam Elder, Programme Manager, Environment Canterbury

Title

Regional Land Transport Plan update

Purpose

1. To:

   a) Update the Regional Transport Committee on the review of the Regional Land Transport Plan

   b) Update the Committee on the release of the revised draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport

   c) Formalise the proposal that a sub-committee of the Regional Transport Committee report back to the Regional Transport Committee meeting on 24 May 2018 with recommendations arising from public consultation on the proposed changes to the Regional Land Transport Plan.

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee:

1. Note that submissions are open on the draft Regional Land Transport Plan.

2. Note that a revised draft Government Policy Statement is due to be released in March 2018.

3. Note that the consultation draft of the Regional Land Transport Plan is broadly consistent with information released to date by the Government about the likely changes.

4. Agree that a sub-committee of Councillor Peter Scott (Chair), Councillor Mike Davidson, Councillor Mark Alexander, and Jim Harland report back to the Regional Transport Committee with any recommended changes to the Regional Land Transport Plan following public consultation, on 24 May 2018.
Review of Regional Land Transport Plan

2. On 1 December 2017, the Regional Transport Committee approved the draft Regional Land Transport Plan for public consultation, subject to the addition of environmental impact as a sixth priority area. This change was made and a revised draft Plan was circulated to Committee members in February 2018.

3. Consultation on the proposed changes to the Regional Land Transport Plan opened on 22 February 2018 and will close on 22 March 2018.

4. At the meeting of 24 May 2018, the Committee will be briefed on the matters raised through consultation (as outlined below, a sub-committee of the Committee has been established to report back to the Committee and provide recommendations).

5. It should be noted that the NZ Transport Agency is currently reviewing the State Highway Improvement Programme at the direction of the Government and this could potentially result in some changes to the programme of works proposed by the Agency in the draft Regional Land Transport Plan. The Committee will also be briefed in May 2018 regarding any changes proposed by the Agency to the programme of works as a result of this review, or alternatively by any councils as a result of their Long-Term Plan processes.

Update on revised draft of Government Policy Statement on Land Transport

6. On 20 November 2017, the Minister of Transport, Hon Phil Twyford, wrote to councils to signal the Government’s new priorities for the revised draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) that will be released in 2018 (letter appended). The RTC was briefed on these priorities and how the draft RLTP aligned with them, on 1 December 2017.

7. The Minister of Transport has since written again to councils on 15 February 2018. He advised that a revised draft GPS would be released in March and consultation would take place over the following month. He also advised that:

- Fully reflecting the Government’s vision will be a longer-term process that officials need to scope, and this will likely involve engagement with the transport sector later in 2018
- The current GPS framework will be retained
- Investment priorities will change, and from a strategic priority perspective, the GPS will propose investment to achieve a land transport system that:
  - Is a safe system, free of death and serious injury
  - Improves access to move towards more liveable cities and thriving regions (with an emphasis on public transport, walking and cycling)
  - Ensures the land transport system enables better environmental outcomes (in particular reducing carbon emissions by increasing use of walking and cycling, providing frequent and affordable public transport, and supporting...
rail and sea freight – lower emissions options like electric vehicles and bio-fuels will also be key)

- Delivers the best possible value for money.
- The draft GPS will also include themes, which will likely be:
  - A mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions
  - Incorporating technology and innovation into the design and delivery of land transport investment
  - Integrating land use and transport planning and delivery.
- It may be necessary to introduce a new activity class for investment in mass transit.

8. We consider that the consultation draft of our RLTP aligns with the further signals provided by the Government, in particular, the four national priority areas outlined in the preceding paragraph, as follows:

- **Road safety, accessibility** (including providing active and passenger transport options), and **environmental impact** are three of the six priority areas in our draft, RLTP
- **Value for money** is a priority outcome.

9. At this stage we do not propose any changes to our draft Regional Land Transport Plan, but we will provide the RTC with further advice once the revised draft GPS is released.

**Establishment of sub-committee to report on public consultation**

10. On 1 December 2017, the Regional Transport Committee determined that a sub-committee consisting of three Committee members (Chair Steve Lowndes, Councillor Mike Davidson and Councillor Mark Alexander) would report back to the Committee on submissions and changes to the Plan.

11. It is proposed that Councillor Peter Scott take the place of Chair Steve Lowndes on this panel, and that Jim Harland also be invited to be a member of the Panel.

12. The sub-committee will report back to the Regional Transport Committee on 24 May 2018, with any recommendations for changes to the draft Plan following public consultation. The Committee will be asked to approve the changes to the Plan by way of variation at this meeting. The Canterbury Regional Council will then be asked to approve the variation at the council meeting on 21 June 2018 for submission to the NZ Transport Agency by 30 June 2018.
Tēnā koutou,

Thank you for your engagement with the Ministry of Transport over the past 18 months to help inform the development of the Government Policy Statement on land transport 2018 (GPS).

I understand that you are currently developing your Regional Land Transport Plans (RLTP), and the direction of the GPS is key to this process. It is a high priority of mine to ensure the GPS is reviewed quickly and reflects this Government’s policies so that you have the certainty you need to finalise your RLTPs.

The priorities of this Government, which I have asked Ministry officials to revise the GPS to take account of, include:

- giving public transport greater priority in cities and expanding the public transport system to support new housing and interregional commuting
- increasing the use of rail to enable efficient passenger and freight use
- supporting regional development
- increasing support for active modes – walking and cycling
- delivering health, safety and environmental improvements
- reducing the environmental impact of transport
- mode neutrality in freight transport planning.

Many of these priorities can be reflected within the current GPS framework, and I have asked the Ministry of Transport to work to achieve this as soon as possible.

I am expecting a revised GPS by the end of 2017, and this will be made available as an engagement draft for you all to consider in early 2018.

There are some priorities that may require more fundamental changes to the scope of the GPS, and also result in changes to local, regional and national planning processes. For example, exploring how rail investment is incorporated within the GPS and the National Land Transport Fund will be the focus of ongoing work.

The process for any fundamental changes to the scope of the GPS is still to be determined, but won’t form part of GPS 2018 that will be released next year.
I am conscious of the need to issue a GPS as soon as practicable, given its importance in influencing transport investment. To help you advance your RLTP development in advance of the GPS 2018 being released, I suggest you consider the areas of Government focus listed above to guide your thinking.

The importance of central and local government collaborating with regards to investment in our transport system cannot be understated and I look forward to working with you as we implement an integrated, multi modal transport system.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Hon Phil Twyford
Minister of Transport
Tena koutou,

As you know, the Government Policy Statement on land transport (GPS) is central to investment decisions across the land transport system. It provides guidance on how over $3.5 billion of New Zealanders' money is spent through the National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) each year. It also provides signals for spending of a further $1 billion each year on land transport through local government investment. Through the GPS, the Government ensures that the revenue raised delivers the best possible land transport system (infrastructure and services) to support the needs of New Zealanders and the country’s economic growth and productivity.

In November 2017, when I wrote to you, I noted that work was underway to develop a new GPS 2018 and I indicated the new priority areas. We have been very conscious that the GPS is central to your planning, and the impact that investment direction in the GPS may have on your work.

I have asked officials to prepare a draft GPS for my consideration in late February 2018. This will enable engagement to begin in March 2018, for around a month.

This Government’s vision for transformation is considerable. Reflecting the scale of that transformation in this GPS was not going to be realistic within the time available. Fully reflecting our vision will be a longer term process that officials need to scope, and this will likely involve engagement with the sector later in the year.

In the meantime, and focussing on GPS 2018, I wanted to share some of the detail of what is likely to be in the engagement draft of this GPS, with the intention that this information will support your planning.

Firstly, we are retaining the current GPS framework – so the structure of the document will look familiar to you. It will continue to have strategic priorities, six objectives, themes, results, reporting, funding levels and activity class information.

Investment priorities will, however, change. From a strategic priority perspective, the GPS proposes investment to achieve a land transport system that:

- is a safe system, free of death and serious injury – New Zealand roads, speeds, vehicles and user behaviours are a long way from what is required to achieve our aim of a land transport system that is free of death and serious injury. There needs to be increased efforts across the system to significantly reduce death and serious injury on our roads

- improves access to move towards more liveable cities and thriving regions – the GPS focusses on how transport can enhance the well being of people and the environment and significantly shift to providing more investment in public transport, walking and cycling

- ensures the land transport system enables better environmental outcomes – we are committed to reducing carbon emissions from transport by substantially increasing the use of lower emission modes, such as walking and cycling,
providing frequent and affordable public transport, and supporting rail and sea freight. Lower emission transport options, like electric vehicles and bio-fuels, encourage efficient network and speed management is also key to this priority area

- delivers the best possible value for money - value for money in transport will deliver the right infrastructure and services to the right level at the best cost. This consideration needs to take into account the full range of benefits and costs over the whole of the life of the investments.

The draft GPS will also include themes. The themes include broad issues that support the effective delivery of the strategic priorities and objectives. The themes influence how the results should be delivered to ensure the best transport solutions for New Zealand are achieved. The following themes are likely to be included in the GPS engagement document:

- a mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions
- incorporating technology and innovation into the design and delivery of land transport investment
- integrating land use and transport planning and delivery.

Currently, the funding information, including activity class funding ranges, are under development. I expect the ten activity classes in the current GPS are likely to remain the same. However, I am considering how signals for investment in mass transit can be provided, and a new activity class may be required. Activity class funding ranges are being reprioritised to reflect this Government’s priorities for transport and will be included in the draft GPS for engagement.

Following engagement, feedback will be considered and revisions made. In line with the Land Transport Management Act 2003, I intend to consult with the New Zealand Transport Agency Board, before releasing the final GPS before 30 June 2018.

I look forward to hearing your feedback following the release of the draft GPS. I hope these signals help you better understand the direction of GPS 2018 and help inform your planning.

Yours sincerely

Hon Phil Twyford
Minister of Transport
Title

Road safety in Canterbury

Purpose

1. To:

- outline key facts and trends about road safety in the Canterbury region
- outline key issues that have been identified by the Regional Road Safety Working Group
- advise the Regional Transport Committee of a request from central government that the Committee consider developing a Regional Speed Management Plan for the Canterbury region
- advise the Regional Transport Committee of work that is progressing on road safety and speed management, and seek agreement to report back to the Regional Transport Committee on the case for a Regional Speed Management Plan.

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee:

1. Note that concerns have been raised by the Regional Transport Committee about declining road safety trends, as captured on the new Regional Transport Scorecard.

2. Note that Environment Canterbury has initiated a project to ensure we understand and are responding to the current state of road safety in Canterbury.

3. Note that the Associate Minister of Transport has written to all councils seeking a renewed focus on road safety, and in particular, an acceleration of the implementation of the new Speed Management Approach.

4. Note that in this context, we have been asked to consider the benefits of a Regional Speed Management Plan.
5. Note that the Associate Minister of Transport has also indicated she will hold a national Road Safety Summit this year, potentially in April.

6. Note that Environment Canterbury will work with the Regional Road Safety Working Group to progress work on road safety and the preparation of a Canterbury view to inform the proposed national Road Safety Summit.

7. Agree that the Regional Road Safety Working Group explore the case for a Regional Speed Management Plan and report back to the Regional Transport Committee on 24 May 2018.

Road safety is a priority in the Regional Land Transport Plan

2. Road safety is a key priority for the Regional Transport Committee, and it is a longstanding priority in the Regional Land Transport Plan.

3. The Regional Transport Committee supports the current national Safe System approach to road safety, which is premised on safe roads and roadsides, safe speeds, safe vehicles, and safe road use, as outlined below.

4. We understand work on the next Road Safety Strategy is to be progressed over the next 12-18 months, including considering whether the “Vision Zero” framework is appropriate for New Zealand.

Project to improve road safety outcomes in Canterbury

5. The Regional Transport Scorecard has indicated there is a worsening short-term trend in road safety outcomes in the last full 2016/2017 fiscal year, with this trend continuing
through the latter half of 2017 and the start of 2018. Following concerns discussed by the Regional Transport Committee, Environment Canterbury has initiated a project to:

- ensure we understand the current state of road safety in Canterbury using consistent data, analysed using a consistent methodology, and including sub-regional differences and how we compare nationally
- identify and agree on the key issues the region is facing, taking account of local differences
- identify the interventions that are currently in progress or planned, and what further interventions are needed, as well as how interventions are prioritised and their effectiveness monitored. While this paper does not consider this matter, some examples of the types of road safety initiatives occurring in Canterbury are provided in appendix one.
- Consider how we can work together to develop and implement interventions that will improve road safety outcomes, including whether a Regional Speed Management Plan could benefit the region. As part of this we also propose looking at the benefits of regional consistency for interventions other than speed management (for example, surfacing treatment and curve alignments).

**Letter from the Associate Minister of Transport**

6. In December 2017, the Associate Minister, Hon Julie Anne Genter, wrote to councils to instigate action to improve road safety in New Zealand (see attached letter).

7. We have been asked to:

- consider how to accelerate the implementation of the new speed management approach (see [https://nzta.govt.nz/safety/speed-management-resources](https://nzta.govt.nz/safety/speed-management-resources)) to ensure there are safe and appropriate speeds on local roads
- in considering the safety priorities in our Regional Land Transport Plan, identify the actions that have the greatest enduring effect on road safety in the Canterbury region
- identify any barriers Canterbury councils face in progressing road safety outcomes, including funding.

8. NZTA has convened an internal working group to look at supporting local councils with accelerating the implementation of the new speed management approach, particularly focusing on the Waikato, Auckland and Canterbury regions as they are where the highest road safety benefits will be achieved from speed management.

9. NZTA has indicated that Canterbury’s views will be considered as part of this work.

10. NZTA has also asked the Canterbury region to consider the benefits of a Regional Speed Management Plan.
Problem definition

11. We have developed an initial problem definition based on the key facts and trends identified to date, and issues raised by territorial authorities. We expect that the problem definition will evolve as work progresses.

12. Key issues appear to be as follows:

- The number of deaths and serious injuries on Canterbury roads is unacceptably high (see figures 1 and 2 below) and we need to collectively identify how we can improve and align the approach across our region to lower this number. It is important to distinguish the number of deaths and serious injuries from the number of crashes. Consistent with NZTA’s approach, we are seeking to reduce the severity of crashes rather than the absolute number of crashes.

![Figure 1: Number of crashes in Canterbury between 2013 and 2017](image1.jpg)

![Figure 2: Deaths and serious injuries in Canterbury and New Zealand between 2013 and 2017](image2.jpg)

- It can be difficult for territorial authorities to access both data and analysis of that data. However, quality information is needed to identify the highest safety risks and how investment can be most effectively targeted to improve safety outcomes.
There is a general concern about the degree to which safe and appropriate speed limits are in place across Canterbury. However, under the current bylaw requirements, change would require communities to support lower speed limits. Reduced speed limits can improve vehicle throughput in congested conditions, but would typically result in increased travel times, including for road freight (though note that the Regional Transport Committee is exploring the opportunity to shift freight from road to rail and coastal shipping).

There is a need to ensure co-ordination and alignment between organisations, to ensure we are working toward the same objectives and to reduce inconsistency for road users as they cross district and regional boundaries, and to ensure we are consistent in our use and analysis of data and information.

Insufficient funding has been identified by a number of councils as a barrier, though with improved access to data and high-quality analysis of that data, we may be better positioned to prioritise and target investment using existing resources.

**Road safety in Canterbury**

13. The following general trends have been identified, based on data for the period 2007-2017:

- For the fiscal year 2016/2017, 41 people were killed in road crashes in Canterbury, and 321 people were seriously injured. These numbers are similar to 2015/2016 (41 deaths and 316 serious injuries), after a long term downward trend from a peak in 2007/2008 (56 deaths and 374 serious injuries).

- The majority of fatal and serious injuries occurred in Greater Christchurch and, in particular, in Christchurch City. In 2016/17, 73% of all fatal and serious injuries occurred in Greater Christchurch, and 47% occurred in Christchurch City. However, for fatal injuries alone, in 2016/17 only 17% of fatalities occurred in Christchurch City, and 54% in Greater Christchurch.

- With respect to cycling fatalities, 74% of crashes which resulted in a cycling fatality over the last 10 years were in Christchurch City. In addition, 40% of cycling fatalities over the ten years occurred in 50km/hour zones, 20% in 80km/hour zones, and 21% in 100km/hour zones.

- 83% of all crashes in Canterbury involved a car, with 57% only involving cars. The remaining 17% involved trucks, motorcycles, cyclists, and other forms of transport.

- Since 2007, crashes resulting in deaths or serious injuries have been attributed to a range of causes. Approximately 30% of crashes have a single cause, 45% have two causes and 25% have three causes or more:
  - Poor observation features is the leading cause (37% of crashes), with failure to give way/stop and poor handling also featuring highly (28% and 25% respectively). Alcohol and speed (19% and 16%) also feature as significant causes since 2007. In
2017, poor observation and alcohol were the leading causes (34% and 31% respectively). The majority of crash causes have been steady or declining with the exception of alcohol and excessive speed which have been increasing as causes of crashes over the last five years.

- Of the crashes involving alcohol, 36% also include excessive speed as a cause, and 41% include poor handling. Only 2% of crashes involving alcohol have no other contributing cause. Of the crashes involving excessive speed, 42% also include alcohol as a cause, and 52% include poor handling.

- In 2017, the social cost of all crashes in Canterbury was estimated to be around $570 million.

**Abley Transport Consultants report on road safety in Canterbury**

14. Environment Canterbury is working with NZTA to increase understanding of the state of road safety in Canterbury. NZTA has commissioned Abley Transportation Consultants to assist with data extraction and analysis to identify key road safety issues and trends for Canterbury.

15. This work is not yet complete, but a draft of the report is attached to this paper which:

- provides information about regional trends in road safety.
- identifies key road safety issues for Canterbury territorial authorities based on high level analysis of the available data.

16. A table summarising the issues identified for each territorial authority is provided in appendix two.

17. This report has been referred to the Regional Road Safety Working Group for consideration as part of the work on road safety that is proposed in this paper.

**Issues raised by the Regional Road Safety Working Group**

1. Members of the Regional Road Safety Working Group were asked to provide preliminary views on issues they are experiencing, in particular, in relation to speed management.

2. The key issues raised are summarised below.

**Safe and appropriate speeds**

- We need to improve matching of the road environment to an appropriate speed limit. There is a particular concern that many rural roads are not suited to the default open road speed limit of 100km/hour and should be 80km/hour consistent with international standards. In addition, the new Speed Management Guide indicates that 80 and 40 are safe and appropriate speeds for our rural and urban networks (which can be contrasted with the current default limits of 100 and 50).
Figure 3 below shows the percentage of corridors in each territorial authority which are in alignment with the Safe and Appropriate Speed (SASS)\textsuperscript{1} and the average percentage for New Zealand. The analysis shows that Christchurch City and Mackenzie District have a much higher percentage of roads which align with the SAAS compared to other areas. The Kaikoura District also has a relatively high percentage, but all other areas are below the national average.

![Figure 3: Percentage of Corridors where Posted Speed Limit equals the Safe and Appropriate Speed](image)

- Signage can be problematic, particularly approaching urban areas. There seems to be a trend of posting multiple speed limits successively, which can create confusion about the appropriate speed.

- Cost could be a significant barrier to the implementation of the new Speed Management Approach as additional budget will be required to change speed limits, noting that the current speed limits were set in accordance with the previous Rule, so ratepayers may consider further expenditure unnecessary. Community consultation is an important part of speed limit changes, but the associated bylaw process can be complex.

**A need to focus on all the components of the Safe System approach**

- While speed management is a very important lever for improving road safety outcomes, we cannot lose sight of other important levers and initiatives, in particular, the other components of the Safe System Approach. There is a concern that road safety education has been declining in the Canterbury region with a reduction in road safety coordinators and expertise in this area, as well as a reduction in NZTA funding, making it more difficult for Road Controlling Authorities to maintain this role. Education is not a short-term response; rather it brings about change over a longer period.

\textsuperscript{1} The Speed Management Guide issued by the NZ Transport Agency sets out procedures for calculating a Safe and Appropriate Speed (SAAS) for a corridor.
• Improvements to driver training have been made, but there is scope to improve outcomes through use of compulsory professional training.

Issues transcend district and city boundaries

• Some issues transcend district and city boundaries, and there may be a need for a national approach. For example, the question about whether there should be a default rural speed limit of 80km/hour and urban residential street speed limit of 40km/hour, should be considered on a national basis. Ultimately, the speed environment should align with the One Network Road Classification (ONRC) and the approach needs to be consistent across geographical boundaries – the public should not experience different speed limits as they travel around the country through similar road environments. Police speed tolerance is also a component of the speed picture, and effectively lifts the speed limit above the posted speed, which may also be higher than the safe and appropriate speed.

• Safety cannot be entirely separated from other transport outcomes. There are examples of safety improvements that can have negative impacts on travel time and vehicle operating costs and thereby potentially an overall low cost-benefit ratio, depending on how this is determined. However, the Regional Transport Strategy Map set out in the paper on monitoring progress towards outcomes, shows how a number of objectives such as freight mode shift and increased public transport support road safety outcomes. Guidance and amendments to NZTA funding criteria to prioritise the value of human life would also assist with resolving trade-offs and undertaking cost-benefit analysis.

• There is a need for more collaboration across organisations charged with developing and implementing road safety initiatives, including a greater degree of collaboration and information-sharing between NZTA and local councils. The Regional Transport Committee co-ordinates work in other areas and is well positioned to facilitate region-wide collaboration. Some examples of the importance of collaboration are as follows:
  o There needs to be a simple way of making sure that organisations are working toward the same objectives and outcomes, and that initiatives compliment and align. This may also assist with decisions when organisations must choose between focusing on several low-cost potential safety improvements or a small number of high-cost initiatives that may be more effective
  o Interventions with an enduring impact need to be addressed at a cross-agency level to increase effectiveness
  o There has been some excellent work in national benchmarking of attitudes towards cycling within regions, including regular updates to monitor progress. This is a good example of central government providing a service on the scale that individual councils would not be able to deliver as effectively individually. A similar exercise would be valuable for understanding the attitudes and knowledge to road safety within the main regions and nationally, with some profiling of how attitudes vary between key demographics
  o More generally, central government may be able to support access to and high-quality analysis of safety data (in particular, for smaller councils), as well as making suitable technical expertise available, to assist with effectively targeting investment.
Other key points

- Land use change - Rapid expansion of urban areas into rural areas alters road use and requires progressive and constant changes to speed limits.

- Penalties – Need to ensure deterrence strategies, including penalties and enforcement, are effective. For example, an ongoing issue arises around cellphone use and other distractions while driving, as well as poor restraint use (e.g. no demerit points). Also need to ensure Police and local government actions are aligned – if we were to have an agreed regional strategy with clear goals, then enforcement action should support this strategy.

Regional Speed Management Plan

3. We understand that the Government would like regions to consider whether a Regional Speed Management Plan could support better road safety outcomes. Regional Speed Management Plans are currently being progressed in Auckland and the Waikato, which alongside Canterbury, are the Government’s priority areas.

4. A Regional Speed Management Plan would provide the Regional Transport Committee with a mandate to align speed management at the regional level. We propose exploring the benefits and challenges of a Plan, and whether it would address some of the key problems identified above, in particular, whether it could:

- ensure a consistent approach to speed management across the region, and thereby avoid confusing road users with different approaches when they cross geographical boundaries

- enable alignment of any investment proposals in regional speed management plans/road safety plans/activity management plans with the Regional Land Transport Plan

- Create economies of scale for a step-change approach to speed management planning, across technical analysis, engagement and consultation

- Provide a forum for collaboration with the community, other regions, and central government, and offer an option of formal consultation, once, on a broader, longer-term regional plan (this would not preclude more localised engagement as appropriate)

- Assist key sector partners so they do not have to engage individually with each Road Controlling Authority on all matters.

5. The Chair of the Regional Road Safety Working Group indicated support for a Regional Speed Management Plan at the Group’s meeting on 8 February 2018. Some members saw this as an opportunity to bring about consistency and alignment, as well as ensuring the road environment in total supports the speed limit being considered. Some cautioned that there is a need to avoid adding another layer of process.

6. The benefits and challenges of a Regional Speed Management Plan need to be thoroughly considered before a Plan can be recommended. Speed management is an
important part of road safety, but other levers are also important. At this stage it is recommended that a Plan be explored in the context of the broader work on safety, and that we also consider the benefits of regional consistency for interventions other than speed management.

Benefits of improving the status quo

7. Work to improve safety outcomes across the region could result in a lower severity of crashes (and thereby a lower impact on individuals, their families and communities), based on the following factors:

- greater understanding of risks and interventions needed due to improved access to quality data and analysis, and therefore a better ability to target investment
- better alignment of objectives and outcomes across parties so interventions complement and align as we are all working toward the same goal
- establishment of safe and appropriate travel speeds across the network/region, including from greater match between road environment and speed limit
- greater acceptance of speed management by road users
- greater user awareness of the road environment.

Next steps

8. As the immediate next step for this work, Environment Canterbury is working with the Regional Road Safety Working Group to prepare a Canterbury view on road safety which will focus on identifying the key issues we are experiencing in Canterbury and what may be needed to address them. As part of this work it is proposed that the Regional Road Safety Working Group consider and report back to the Regional Transport Committee on a Regional Speed Management Plan for Canterbury.

9. In her letter, the Associate Minister of Transport indicated she will hold a national Road Safety Summit with local and regional councils (we understand this may be held in April 2018). This work will also be useful input to the Road Safety Summit.
Appendix One: Examples of safety initiatives in Canterbury

NZTA

- NZTA and the Safe Roads Alliance are working on SH1 Ashley to Belfast, Rakaia to Ashburton, and Rangitata to Timaru Safety Improvements. These projects are intended to identify the crash issues on these routes and investigate the options to reduce the number of deaths and serious injuries. Options being investigated include speed management, installation of safety barriers, and improved delineation and intersection improvements.

- Safety initiatives are also included in the low cost/low risk improvements category. This includes work to address the key safety risks on the Canterbury Highway network (run off road crashes and intersection crashes). Projects will include guardrail installation, audio tactile profile (rumble strips), intersection improvements, and signage and delineation improvements.

Waimakariri District Council

- Tram Road Safety Improvements - Improvement associated with land use development:
  - Traffic volumes are increasing on Tram Road as a result of increasing numbers of residential properties in the area serviced by Tram Road. Traffic volumes on Tram Road near the motorway have increased by an average of 4.5% per annum since 2012. Intersection improvements (which included signalisation / roundabouts, traffic islands, slip lanes, seal widening, and roadside hazard minimisation).

- Rangiora Woodend Road Various Improvement associated with land use development
  - Growth in Rangiora and improved access to SH1 at Woodend likely to result in increased traffic on Rangiora Woodend Road. Upgrade of this road identified as a "Core Project" in NZTA's SH1 and 71 - Greater Christchurch North Programme Business Case. This work will include intersection improvements, seal widening, roadside hazard minimisation, and minor geometric improvements.

Christchurch City Council

- Christchurch City Council ran the 'Kick Start' motorcycle safety event in October. Close to 2,000 people attended and there was strong engagement in the various safety demonstrations on the day. It was organised alongside neighbouring councils, Police and Ride Forever trainers. There are known behaviours that can substantially reduce risk for motorcyclists, so really specific education presented in a way that the audience likes to receive it works well in this context.
### Appendix Two: Report from Abley Transportation Consultants – summary of issues identified for territorial authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial Authority</th>
<th>Key safety issues based on high level analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ashburton             | • Loss of control on the straight in a rural speed environment is significantly higher than the national average. Possibly suggestive of a fatigue-related crash problem.  
• Crossing (with no turns) at urban intersection.  
• Loss of control and crossing (no turns) at rural intersections.  
• Pedestrian crashes midblock in an urban speed environment. |
| Christchurch City     | • Right turn against, right turn against at urban intersection  
• Cycling crashes are significantly over-represented  
• There is no clear trend for urban midblocks. As such, a targeted (rather than themed approach) is recommended for the high risk corridors identified at [https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/detailed-collective-risk#Canterbury](https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/detailed-collective-risk#Canterbury).  
• Rural intersections focus should be on crossing (no turns) and right turn against crashes.  
• Pedestrian crashes are slightly over-represented. |
| Hurunui               | • Loss of control crashes on corners (midblock).  
• Head on crashes.  
• Motorcycling crashes. |
| Kaikōura              | • Loss of control crashes on corners and straight roads between intersections in a rural speed environment.  
• Head on crashes.  
• Motorcycling crashes. |
| Mackenzie             | • Loss of control crashes on corners and straight roads between intersections in a rural speed environment.  
• Head on crashes between intersections in a rural speed environment. |
| Selwyn                | • Crossing (no turns) at intersections in a rural speed environment.  
• Loss of control crashes on corners and straight roads.  
• Head on crashes between intersections.  
• Crossing (no turns) and merging/crossing (vehicle turning) at intersections in an urban speed environment. |
| Timaru                | • Crossing (no turns) at intersections in an urban speed environment.  
• Pedestrian safety between intersections in an urban speed environment.  
• Loss of control crashes at and between intersections in a rural speed environment. |
| Waimakariri           | • Loss of control crashes on corners and straight roads between intersections in a rural speed environment.  
• Crossing (no turns) at intersections in an urban speed environment.  
• Merging/crossing (vehicle turning) at intersections in a rural speed environment.  
• Pedestrian safety between intersections in an urban speed environment.  
• Motorcyclist safety.  
• Cyclist safety. |
| Waimate               | • Loss of control crashes on corners and straight roads between intersections in a rural speed environment.  
• Head on crashes between intersections in a rural speed environment. |
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1. Introduction

Abley Transportation Consultants (Abley) were commissioned by the NZ Transport Agency to produce a road safety report for the Canterbury Region. The purpose of the report is to identify key road safety issues for the region and for each Territorial Authority. This will help inform the actions of the Regional Transport Committee.

For the purposes of this report, the Canterbury Region includes Ashburton District, Christchurch City, Hurunui District, Kaikoura District, Mackenzie District, Selwyn District, Timaru District, Waimakariri District and the Waimate District.

Crash data has been obtained from NZ Transport Agency’s crash analysis system (CAS) database for the period 2013-17. CAS includes all crashes involving injury and non–injury for which Police reports have been completed and forwarded to the NZ Transport Agency. It should be noted there is a chance that some crashes that occurred in November and December 2017 may not have been captured in CAS given the timing of this report.

Data has been separated for urban and rural (open) roads throughout this report because each has a distinctly different pattern of crashes. In this report urban roads are defined as those with a speed limit of 70 km/h or less.

The severity of a crash is determined as the most severely injured casualty in the crash. Injury severity is classified as fatal, serious, or minor as follows:

- **Fatal**: Injuries that result in death within 30 days of a crash.
- **Serious**: Fractures, concussion, internal injuries, crushing, severe cuts and lacerations, severe general shock necessitating medical treatment, and any injury involving removal to and detention in hospital.
- **Minor**: Injuries which are not serious, but which require first aid, or cause discomfort or pain to the person injured, e.g. sprains and bruises.
2. **Regional Crash Analysis**

This section considers the short-term (last five years) trends for the Canterbury Region as a whole, and for each Territorial Authority (TA). A five-year crash analysis period is considered best practice when undertaking crash analysis as it provides a reasonable time period for analysis while not including data which may be out-of-date. A five-year period is also the standard used for economic evaluation of crash reduction benefits. Longer analysis periods can be useful for understanding crash patterns at a detailed level (e.g. a single intersection or corridor) where traffic volumes are low and crash occurrence is rare. The analysis undertaken in this report is high-level (where a larger amount of data is available) so the standard 5-year analysis period is considered best for this purpose.

Regional analysis includes a comparison of crash trends with population growth, and identifies trends related to specific crash types and behavioural factors.

**Existing Crash Trends**

**Canterbury Regional Analysis**

![Chart showing trend of people injured/killed in Canterbury Region from 2013 to 2017. Numbers are as follows:
- 2013: Minor 1308, Serious 310, Fatal 49
- 2014: Minor 1262, Serious 339, Fatal 38
- 2015: Minor 1257, Serious 298, Fatal 47
- 2016: Minor 1194, Serious 311, Fatal 31
- 2017: Minor 1131, Serious 340, Fatal 50
]
Social Cost of Crashes in Canterbury

- **2017**: $544.00 million
- **2016**: $526.00 million
- **2015**: $519.00 million
- **2014**: $513.00 million
- **2013**: $500.00 million

**Bars**:
- **Black**: Fatal Crash
- **Orange**: Serious Injury Crash
- **Pink**: Minor Injury Crash

**Crashes**:
- **2017**: 45 fatal, 279 serious, 834 minor
- **2016**: 45 fatal, 279 serious, 834 minor
- **2015**: 45 fatal, 279 serious, 834 minor
- **2014**: 45 fatal, 279 serious, 834 minor
- **2013**: 45 fatal, 279 serious, 834 minor
All injury crashes

- Canterbury
- NZ

Death and Serious Injuries

- Canterbury
- NZ
**Severity Ratio***

*Percentage of serious injury crashes (including that which resulted in death) to all injury crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
<th>NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Proportion of all injury crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
<th>NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Canterbury NZ*
**Detailed Crash Analysis**

**Speeds**

**INJURY CRASHES: CANTERBURY**
- Urban: 67%
- Rural: 33%

**INJURY CRASHES: NZ**
- Urban: 59%
- Rural: 41%

**Speed related crashes (Canterbury Region)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Note that a sharp increase in alcohol related crashes from July 2016 has been reflected in CAS nationwide. This has been identified as an issue associated with a new reporting methodology for NZ Police. To avoid misleading statistics, 2017 data has been removed from further analysis.
Safe Roads and Roadsides

**INJURY CRASHES IN CANTERBURY**

- Intersection: 55%
- Midblock: 45%

**INJURY CRASHES**

- Non-State Highway: 27%
- State Highway: 73%
**Canterbury Sub-Region Analysis**

### Injury Crashes in District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Region</th>
<th>Crash Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>3903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikoura</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaru</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimak</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimate</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of all injury crashes in Canterbury:

0% - 5% - 10% - 15% - 20% - 25% - 30% - 35% - 40% - 45%

% of injury crashes that were speed related:

60%

### Safe Speeds

% of injury crashes that were speed related:

Ashburton: 35%
Christchurch: 45%
Hurunui: 25%
Kaikoura: 30%
Mackenzie: 40%
Selwyn: 20%
Timaru: 15%
Waimak: 10%
Waimate: 25%
Safe People/ Behaviours

Safe Roads and Roadsides

High-Risk Curves

All roads in New Zealand have been analysed for out-of-context curves (OoCCs) through a project commissioned by the Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC). Curves are considered out-of-context when the speed of a typical driver is more than the speed required to comfortably negotiate a curve. Maps showing the location of out-of-context curves can be accessed via https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/. Where loss-of-control crashes are identified as a particular issue, this map is a useful tool for identifying locations with an elevated risk of loss-of-control crashes. These locations can often be treated with relatively low-cost interventions (signs, marking, resurfacing) and deliver good returns in terms of safety benefits.
3. **Speed Management**

The Speed Management Guide issued by the NZ Transport Agency sets out procedures for calculating a Safe and Appropriate Speed (SAAS) for a corridor. The procedure considers:

- the hierarchy of the corridor,
- whether it is a freight route,
- the traffic volume using the corridor,
- the land-use surrounding the corridor,
- the recorded crash history,
- the built standard of the road, and;
- the roadside environment (i.e. roadside hazards).

Once a SAAS has been calculated for each corridor, the posted speed limit is compared to the SAAS to determine if the corridor is in alignment or not. **Figure 3.1** shows the percentage of corridors in each TA which are in alignment with the SAAS and the average percentage for New Zealand. The analysis shows that Christchurch City and Mackenzie District have a much higher percentage of roads which align with the SAAS compared to other areas. The Kaikoura District also has a relatively high percentage, but all other TAs fall well below the national average.

*Figure 3.1*

Percentage of Corridors where Posted Speed Limit equals the Safe and Appropriate Speed

It is important to note that the analysis presented in this section is based on the original nationwide speed management assessment completed in 2016 using 2011-2015 crash data. That analysis is in the process of being updated. This update is expected to affect the results at a corridor by corridor level, but wholesale aggregate changes within a TA are not anticipated.
3.1 High Benefit Opportunities

Further analysis has also been undertaken on corridors where the posted speed limit is higher than the SAAS (i.e. out of alignment) to determine those corridors where speed management is a high-benefit opportunity. This analysis has been completed at a regional level i.e. Canterbury.

The analysis identifies that top 10% of high benefit speed management opportunities in each region. Of this 10%, half are corridors where speed management would make a demonstrable difference to road safety performance, and half are high-benefit opportunities (see Self-Explaining category below). The purpose of this analysis is to give a high-level strategy for implementing speed management measures on the most critical corridors first at a pace that is understood and accepted by road users, stakeholders and communities. The categories include:

- **Engineer Up** if travel speeds on the corridor are much higher than the SAAS and the road is economically important enough to justify improvements which will improve the road to a better standard where it can safely accommodate the current travel speeds.

- **Challenging Conversations** if travel speeds on the corridor are much higher than the SAAS but the criterion for Engineer Up is not satisfied. In this case, discussions about lowering speed limits are often challenging and may require extensive community consultation to achieve a good outcome.

- **Self-Explaining – Reduce Speed Limit** if current travel speeds are close to the travel speeds on the corridor at present. These roads may not yield much safety benefit, but they improve the credibility of speed limit settings and help explain roads better to visiting drivers.
The analysis indicates that speed management should be a high priority strategy in the Selwyn District, as well as Hurunui and Christchurch.
Length of Network (km) by SAAS

Length of Network (km) by Existing Speed Limit
4. **Territorial Authority Analysis**

4.1 **Overview**

This section identifies areas of road safety where the TA is underperforming compared to the national average. For specific/targeted interventions, [https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/](https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/) contains nationwide safety analysis for out of context curves and high risk motorcycle routes. High risk intersections, corridors and active road user heatmaps is also available on this site for some regions.

4.2 **Ashburton District**

**Analysis**

The following figures summarise:

- the total number of injury crashes recorded in the Ashburton District,
- the environments and location where injury crashes occurred,
- the main crash types occurring at urban/rural intersection and midblock locations, and;
- the proportion of injury crashes that involved vulnerable road users (pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclists).

This figure shows the number of people injured in crashes increased noticeably in 2014. Since then the number of deaths and injuries has remained relatively constant.
Social Cost of Injury Crashes in Ashburton

- **2017**: $30.00 (Fatal Crash), $20.00 (Serious Injury Crash), $10.00 (Minor Injury Crash)
- **2016**: $40.00 (Fatal Crash), $30.00 (Serious Injury Crash), $20.00 (Minor Injury Crash)
- **2015**: $30.00 (Fatal Crash), $20.00 (Serious Injury Crash), $10.00 (Minor Injury Crash)
- **2014**: $40.00 (Fatal Crash), $30.00 (Serious Injury Crash), $20.00 (Minor Injury Crash)
- **2013**: $20.00 (Fatal Crash), $10.00 (Serious Injury Crash), $0.00 (Minor Injury Crash)

### Injury Crashes

- **Pedestrian**: 17
- **Cycling**: 9
- **Motorcycling**: 22
INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: ASHBURTON

- Urban: 77%
- Rural: 23%

INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: NZ

- Urban: 41%
- Rural: 59%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: ASHBURTON

- Intersection: 61%
- Midblock: 39%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: NZ

- Intersection: 63%
- Midblock: 37%
### Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Type</th>
<th>Ashburton</th>
<th>NZ Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of control</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing (no turns)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merging/ crossing (veh turning)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn against Pedestrian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Midblock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Type</th>
<th>Ashburton</th>
<th>NZ Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Run off road (straight)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run off road (corner)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on撞直撞或侧撞</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with obstruction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear end</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Blue bars represent Ashburton data.
- Orange bars represent NZ Average data.
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Intersections

- Loss of control: Ashburton 20%, NZ Average 13%
- Crossing (no turns): Ashburton 13%, NZ Average 4%
- Merging/crossing (vehicle turning): Ashburton 4%, NZ Average 1%
- Right turn against: Ashburton 1%, NZ Average 7%
- Other: Ashburton 7%, NZ Average 10%

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Midblock

- Run off road (straight): Ashburton 65%, NZ Average 28%
- Run off road (corner): Ashburton 28%, NZ Average 6%
- Overtaking/lane change: Ashburton 7%, NZ Average 7%
- Head on: Ashburton 10%, NZ Average 13%
- Collision with obstruction: Ashburton 7%, NZ Average 7%
- Rear end: Ashburton 0%, NZ Average 0%
- Other: Ashburton 13%, NZ Average 10%
Summary

Based on the high-level analysis conducted, the following key safety issues have been identified for the Ashburton District:

1. Run off road crashes on straight roads in a rural speed environment is significantly higher than the national average. Possibly suggestive of a fatigue related crash problem.
2. Crossing (with no turns) at urban intersection.
3. Loss of control and crossing (no turns) at rural intersections.
4. Pedestrian crashes midblock in an urban speed environment.

To address the road safety risks in Ashburton, focus should be on further investigation of the issues behind the run off road on straight crashes in rural areas. Interventions may be physical (e.g. shoulder widening), operational (e.g. speed management) or educational (e.g. fatigue).

Crossing (no turns) crashes in both urban and rural intersections suggest intersection improvements that raise awareness of the Stop controls and/or improve sight distance along the main road could be beneficial intervention approaches.

Additional pedestrian crossing facilities through townships may help reduce the high proportion of crashes involving pedestrians crossing the road.

In addition, Ashburton should seek to increase the number of corridors that have a safe and appropriate speed limit. High Priority Speed Management Interventions for Ashburton include 66km of “Challenging Conversation” roads and 7km of “Self Explaining” roads. Consideration should also be given to improving delineation and markings at the 433 out of context curves.
4.3 Christchurch City

Analysis

The following figures summarise:

- the total number of injury crashes recorded in the Christchurch City,
- the environments and location where injury crashes occurred,
- the main crash types occurring at urban/rural intersection and midblock locations, and;
- the proportion of injury crashes that involved vulnerable road users (pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclists).

This figure shows the number of people injured in crashes in 2017 is a decrease of more than 10% since 2015.
Social Cost of Injury Crashes in Christchurch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Millions</th>
<th>Fatal Crash</th>
<th>Serious Injury Crash</th>
<th>Minor Injury Crash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Injury Crashes

- **Pedestrian**
  - Christchurch: 372
  - NZ: 73

- **Cycling**
  - Christchurch: 612
  - NZ: 73

- **Motorcycling**
  - Christchurch: 472
  - NZ: 73
INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: CHRISTCHURCH

- Urban: 89%
- Rural: 11%

INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: NZ

- Urban: 59%
- Rural: 41%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: CHRISTCHURCH

- Intersection: 52%
- Midblock: 48%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: NZ

- Intersection: 63%
- Midblock: 37%
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Intersections

- Loss of control: 171
- Crossing (no turns): 402
- Merging/crossing (veh turning): 296
- Rear End: 156
- Right turn against: 451
- Pedestrian: 141
- Other: 279

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Midblock

- Run off road (straight): 208
- Run off road (corner): 167
- Head on: 51
- Collision with obstruction: 157
- Rear end: 324
- Pedestrian: 200
- Other: 467
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Intersections

- Loss of control: Christchurch 31%, NZ Average 28%
- Crossing (no turns): Christchurch 23%, NZ Average 19%
- Merging/crossing (vehicle turning): Christchurch 26%, NZ Average 21%
- Right turn against: Christchurch 19%, NZ Average 20%
- Other: Christchurch 23%, NZ Average 22%

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Midblock

- Run off road (straight): Christchurch 60%, NZ Average 95%
- Run off road (corner): Christchurch 11%, NZ Average 33%
- Overtaking/lane change: Christchurch 10%, NZ Average 49%
- Head on: Christchurch 49%, NZ Average 48%
- Collision with obstruction: Christchurch 33%, NZ Average 10%
- Rear end: Christchurch 49%, NZ Average 48%
- Other: Christchurch 22%, NZ Average 10%

(Charts showing percentage of different movement types for injury crashes in rural intersections and midblock areas, with data for Christchurch and NZ Average.)
Summary

Based on the high-level analysis conducted, the following key safety issues have been identified for the Christchurch City:

1. Right turn against and crossing (no turns) crashes at urban intersection
2. Crashes involving cyclists are significantly over-represented, but this may be in part due to higher levels of cycling activity.
3. There is no clear trend for urban midblocks. As such, a targeted (rather than themed approach) is recommended for the high risk corridors identified at https://roadsafetyrisk.co.nz/maps/detailed-collective-risk#Canterbury.

To address the road safety risks in Christchurch, focus should be on safety at urban intersections. Red-light running behaviour is prevalent and should be addressed through physical (e.g. infrastructure elements), operational (e.g. signal phasing) or enforcement (e.g. safety cameras).

Few signalised intersections in Christchurch have fully controlled right turns, which contributes to the high level of right turn against crashes.

Measures to improve active road user safety are also encouraged.

In addition, Christchurch should seek to increase the number of corridors that have a safe and appropriate speed limit. High Priority Speed Management interventions for Christchurch include 117km of “Challenging Conversation” roads and 195km of “Self Explaining” roads and 9km of “Engineer Up” roads. Consideration should also be given to improving delineation and markings at the 350 out of context curves.

Note that although the urban and rural midblock locations have a high proportion of rear end crashes, this is not considered an area of priority as these crashes are unlikely to result in death or serious injury.
4.4 **Hurunui District**

**Analysis**

The following figures summarise:

- the total number of injury crashes recorded in the Hurunui District,
- the environments and location where injury crashes occurred,
- the main crash types occurring at urban/rural intersection and midblock locations, and;
- the proportion of injury crashes that involved vulnerable road users (pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclists).

This figure shows that the number of people killed and injured on Hurunui roads increased significantly in 2017. It is possible that this is a result of increased traffic levels of SH7 following the closure of SH1 through Kaikoura.
Social Cost of Injury Crashes in Hurunui

Injury Crashes

- Pedestrian
- Cycling
- Motorcycling

- Fatal Crash
- Serious Injury Crash
- Minor Injury Crash

- Hurunui
- National Average
INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: HURUNUI
- Urban: 77%
- Rural: 23%

INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: NZ
- Urban: 41%
- Rural: 59%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: HURUNUI
- Intersection: 12%
- Midblock: 88%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: NZ
- Intersection: 37%
- Midblock: 63%
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Intersections

- Loss of control:
  - Hurunui: 2
  - NZ Average: 2

- Crossing (no turns):
  - Hurunui: 2
  - NZ Average: 2

- Merging/crossing (vehicle turning):
  - Hurunui: 2
  - NZ Average: 2

- Rear End:
  - Hurunui: 0
  - NZ Average: 0

- Right turn against:
  - Hurunui: 1
  - NZ Average: 0

- Pedestrian:
  - Hurunui: 0
  - NZ Average: 0

- Other:
  - Hurunui: 0
  - NZ Average: 0

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Midblock

- Run off road (straight):
  - Hurunui: 3
  - NZ Average: 3

- Run off road (corner):
  - Hurunui: 0
  - NZ Average: 0

- Head on:
  - Hurunui: 1
  - NZ Average: 1

- Collision with obstruction:
  - Hurunui: 2
  - NZ Average: 2

- Rear end:
  - Hurunui: 2
  - NZ Average: 2

- Pedestrian:
  - Hurunui: 2
  - NZ Average: 2

- Other:
  - Hurunui: 0
  - NZ Average: 0

Hurunui vs NZ Average
Summary

Based on the high-level analysis conducted, the following key safety issues have been identified for the Hurunui District:

1. Loss of control crashes on curves (midblock). This is the clear major safety issue in the Hurunui.

Other issues are less pronounced, but focus could be directed towards:

2. Head on crashes; and

3. Motorcycling crashes

The loss of control crashes on curves could likely be addressed by improving the delineation and signage at the 736 out of context curves in Hurunui.

To improve the road safety performance as a whole, Hurunui should also seek to increase the number of corridors that have a safe and appropriate speed limit. Of the first priority speed management interventions, Hurunui has 139km of “Self explaining roads”, 135km of “Challenging Conversations” roads and 6km of “Engineer Up” roads.
4.5 Kaikoura District

Analysis

The following figures summarise:

- the total number of injury crashes recorded in the Kaikoura District,
- the environments and location where injury crashes occurred,
- the main crash types occurring at urban/rural intersection and midblock locations, and;
- the proportion of injury crashes that involved vulnerable road users (pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclists).

The 2017 figures for the Kaikoura District should be treated with considerable caution, as SH1 was closed for the majority of the year. Setting aside the anomalous 2014 year, the overall trend is one of improving safety performance in the Kaikoura District.

![Number of people injured/killed in Kaikoura](image-url)
Social Cost of Injury Crashes in Kaikoura

- 2013: $-$ to $2.00
- 2014: $4.00 to $6.00
- 2015: $8.00 to $10.00
- 2016: $10.00 to $12.00
- 2017: $12.00 to $14.00

Injury Crashes

- Pedestrian: 4%
- Cycling: 2%
- Motorcycling: 15%

- Kaikoura
- National Average

Fatal Crash
Serious Injury Crash
Minor Injury Crash
INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: KAIKOURA

- Urban: 24%
- Rural: 76%

INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: NZ

- Urban: 41%
- Rural: 59%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: KAIKOURA

- Intersection: 19%
- Midblock: 81%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: NZ

- Intersection: 37%
- Midblock: 63%
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Intersections

- Loss of control: 2 (Kaikoura), 2 (NZ Average)
- Crossing (no turns): 1 (Kaikoura), 1 (NZ Average)
- Merging/crossing (vehicle turning): 1 (Kaikoura), 1 (NZ Average)
- Rear End: 1 (Kaikoura), 1 (NZ Average)
- Right turn against: 0 (Kaikoura), 1 (NZ Average)
- Pedestrian: 1 (Kaikoura), 1 (NZ Average)
- Other: 2 (Kaikoura), 2 (NZ Average)

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Midblock

- Run off road (straight): 1 (Kaikoura), 3 (NZ Average)
- Run off road (corner): 3 (Kaikoura), 1 (NZ Average)
- Head on: 1 (Kaikoura), 2 (NZ Average)
- Collision with obstruction: 2 (Kaikoura), 1 (NZ Average)
- Rear end: 1 (Kaikoura), 0 (NZ Average)
- Pedestrian: 0 (Kaikoura), 0 (NZ Average)
- Other: 6 (Kaikoura), 0 (NZ Average)
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Type</th>
<th>Kaikoura</th>
<th>NZ Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing (no turns)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merging/crossing (vehicle turning)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn against</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Midblock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Type</th>
<th>Kaikoura</th>
<th>NZ Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Run off road (straight)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run off road (corner)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking/ lane change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with obstruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear end</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Based on the high-level analysis conducted, the following key safety issues have been identified for the Kaikoura District:

1. Loss of control crashes on curves and straight roads between intersections in a rural speed environment
2. Head on crashes
3. Motorcycling crashes

The loss of control crashes on curves could likely be addressed by improving the delineation and signage at the 143 out of context curves in Kaikoura.

To improve the road safety performance as a whole, Kaikoura should also seek to increase the number of corridors that have a safe and appropriate speed limit. Of the first priority speed management, Kaikoura has 52km of “self explaining” roads, 56km of “challenging conversation” roads.
4.6 Mackenzie District

Analysis

The following figures summarise:

- the total number of injury crashes recorded in the Mackenzie District,
- the environments and location where injury crashes occurred,
- the main crash types occurring at urban/rural intersection and midblock locations, and;
- the proportion of injury crashes that involved vulnerable road users (pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclists).

This figure shows that road safety performance deteriorated rapidly in 2017, with the number of people killed or injured 100% higher than 2016.
Social Cost of Injury Crashes in Mackenzie

![Bar chart showing social cost of injury crashes in Mackenzie over years 2013 to 2017. The costs are categorized into million dollars for Fatal Crash, Serious Injury Crash, and Minor Injury Crash.]

Injury Crashes

![Bar chart showing percentage of injury crashes for Pedestrian, Cycling, and Motorcycling. The chart compares Mackenzie's data with the national average.]

- Pedestrian: Mackenzie 6%, National Average 91%
- Cycling: Mackenzie 3%, National Average 91%
- Motorcycling: Mackenzie 11%
INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: MACKENZIE

- Urban: 8%
- Rural: 92%

INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: NZ

- Urban: 41%
- Rural: 59%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: MACKENZIE

- Intersection: 11%
- Midblock: 89%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: NZ

- Intersection: 37%
- Midblock: 63%
### Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mackenzie</th>
<th>NZ Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing (no turns)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merging/crossing (veh turning)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn against Pedestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Midblock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mackenzie</th>
<th>NZ Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Run off road (straight)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run off road (corner)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with obstruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear end</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Types</th>
<th>Mackenzie</th>
<th>NZ Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing (no turns)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merging/crossing (vehicle turning)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn against</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Movements Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Midblock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Types</th>
<th>Mackenzie</th>
<th>NZ Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Run off road (straight)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run off road (corner)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking/lane change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision with obstruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear end</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Based on the high-level analysis conducted, the following key safety issues have been identified for the Mackenzie District:

1. Loss of control crashes on curves and straight roads between intersections in a rural speed environment
2. Head on crashes between intersections in a rural speed environment

The focus should be on providing wider sealed shoulders, improved rest locations, more passing opportunities and better delineation of horizontal curves.

The loss of control crashes on curves could likely be addressed by improving the delineation and signage at the 279 out of context curves in Mackenzie.

To improve the road safety performance as a whole, Mackenzie should also seek to increase the number of corridors that have a safe and appropriate speed limit. Of the first priority speed management, Mackenzie has 56km of “self explaining” roads, 38km of “challenging conversation” roads.
4.7 **Selwyn District**

**Analysis**

The following figures summarise:

- the total number of injury crashes recorded in the Selwyn District,
- the environments and location where injury crashes occurred,
- the main crash types occurring at urban/rural intersection and midblock locations, and;
- the proportion of injury crashes that involved vulnerable road users (pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclists).

This figure shows that the number of people killed and injured in the Selwyn District tends to fluctuate annually, with no clear long term trend. What is immediately apparent compared to other districts, is the proportion of deaths and serious injuries to all injuries is very high in Selwyn.
Social Cost of Injury Crashes in Selwyn

Injury Crashes

Pedestrian
Cycling
Motorcycling

Selwyn National Average
INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: SELWYN
- Urban: 86%
- Rural: 14%

INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: NZ
- Urban: 59%
- Rural: 41%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: SELWYN
- Intersection: 59%
- Midblock: 41%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: NZ
- Intersection: 63%
- Midblock: 37%
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Intersections

- Loss of control: 4%
- Crossing (no turns): 18%
- Merging/crossing (veh turning): 10%
- Rear end: 0%
- Right turn against: 3%
- Pedestrian: 3%
- Other: 4%

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Midblock

- Run off road (straight): 5%
- Run off road (corner): 5%
- Head on: 1%
- Collision with obstruction: 3%
- Rear end: 1%
- Pedestrian: 4%
- Other: 11%

Selwyn vs NZ Average
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Intersections

Loss of control: 29% (Selwyn) vs 30% (NZ Average)
Crossing (no turns): 74% (Selwyn) vs 30% (NZ Average)
Merging/crossing (veh turning): 14% (Selwyn) vs 27% (NZ Average)
Right turn against: 2% (Selwyn) vs 5% (NZ Average)
Other: 0% (Selwyn) vs 5% (NZ Average)

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Midblock

Run off road (straight): 108% (Selwyn) vs 155% (NZ Average)
Run off road (corner): 15% (Selwyn) vs 32% (NZ Average)
Overtaking/lane change: 40% (Selwyn) vs 15% (NZ Average)
Head on: 22% (Selwyn) vs 22% (NZ Average)
Collision with obstruction: 12% (Selwyn) vs 32% (NZ Average)
Rear end: 3% (Selwyn) vs 22% (NZ Average)
Other: 0% (Selwyn) vs 5% (NZ Average)

Legend: Selwyn, NZ Average
Summary

Based on the high-level analysis conducted, the following key safety issues have been identified for the Selwyn District:

1. Crossing (no turns) at intersections in a rural speed environment. This is symptomatic of the grid nature of roads in the plain areas.
2. Run off road crashes on straight roads in rural speed environments. Possibly suggestive of a fatigue related crash problem.
3. Head on crashes between intersections
4. Crossing (no turns) and merging/crossing (vehicle turning) at intersections in an urban speed environment

Crossing (no turns) crashes at rural intersections suggest intersection improvements that raise awareness of the Stop controls and/or improve sight distance along the main road could be beneficial intervention approaches.

To address the midblock road safety risks in Selwyn, focus should be on further investigation of the issues behind the run off road on straight and head on crashes. Interventions may be physical (e.g. shoulder widening, passing opportunities), operational (e.g. speed management) or educational (e.g. fatigue).

The loss of control crashes on curves could likely be addressed by improving the delineation and signage at the 691 Out of Context Curves in Selwyn.

To improve the road safety performance as a whole, Selwyn should also seek to increase the number of corridors that have a safe and appropriate speed limit. Of the first priority speed management, Selwyn has 110km of “self explaining” roads, 163km of “challenging conversation” roads and 35km of “engineer up”.


4.8 Timaru District

Analysis

The following figures summarise:

- the total number of injury crashes recorded in the Timaru District,
- the environments and location where injury crashes occurred,
- the main crash types occurring at urban/rural intersection and midblock locations, and;
- the proportion of injury crashes that involved vulnerable road users (pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclists).

This figure shows the total number of people killed or injured in road crashes in Timaru is relatively constant year on year. The number of serious injuries has increased in the past two years.
Social Cost of Injury Crashes in Timaru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatal Crash</th>
<th>Serious Injury Crash</th>
<th>Minor Injury Crash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Injury Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Timaru</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycling</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: TIMARU

- Urban: 56%
- Rural: 44%

INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: NZ

- Urban: 59%
- Rural: 41%

TIMARU INJURY CRASH LOCATION

- Intersection: 60%
- Midblock: 40%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: NZ

- Intersection: 63%
- Midblock: 37%
Summary

Based on the high-level analysis conducted, the following key safety issues have been identified for the Timaru District:

1. Crossing (no turns) crashes at intersections in an urban speed environment
2. Pedestrian safety between intersections in an urban speed environment
3. Loss of control crashes at intersections in a rural speed environment
4. Run of road on straight and loss of control crashes on curves in a rural speed environment.

Crossing (no turns) crashes at urban intersections needs to be investigated further to determine if these are related to red-light running at traffic signals or involve mis-judgements at priority controlled intersections.

The over representation of midblock pedestrian crashes in urban areas points towards the provision of more and improved crossing facilities.

Loss of control crashes at rural intersections is suggestive of behavioural issues where excessive speed is typically a major contributing factor.

To address the midblock road safety risks in Selwyn, focus should be on further investigation of the issues behind the run off road on straight and head on crashes. Interventions may be physical (e.g. shoulder widening, passing opportunities), operational (e.g. speed management) or educational (e.g. fatigue).

The loss of control crashes on curves could likely be addressed by improving the delineation and signage at the 609 Out of Context Curves in Timaru.

To improve the road safety performance as a whole, Timaru should also seek to increase the number of corridors that have a safe and appropriate speed limit. Of the first priority speed management, Timaru has 88km of “self explaining” roads, 37km of “challenging conversation” roads and 9km of “engineer up” roads.
### 4.9 Waimakariri District

#### Analysis

The following figures summarise:

- the total number of injury crashes recorded in the Waimakariri District,
- the environments and location where injury crashes occurred,
- the main crash types occurring at urban/rural intersection and midblock locations, and;
- the proportion of injury crashes that involved vulnerable road users (pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclists).

This figure shows the safety performance on Waimakariri Roads has improved in terms of the long term average. In the short term, safety performance has deteriorated over the last three years.
Social Cost of Injury Crashes in Waimakariri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatal Crash</th>
<th>Serious Injury Crash</th>
<th>Minor Injury Crash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Injury Crashes

- **Pedestrian**: 21%
- **Cycling**: 31%
- **Motorcycling**: 51%

### Waimakariri vs National Average

- **Pedestrian**: Waimakariri 21% vs National Average 8%
- **Cycling**: Waimakariri 31% vs National Average 12%
- **Motorcycling**: Waimakariri 51% vs National Average 14%
INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: WAIMAKARIRI

- Urban: 67%
- Rural: 33%

INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: NZ

- Urban: 41%
- Rural: 59%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: WAIMAKARIRI

- Intersection: 59%
- Midblock: 41%

INJURY CRASH LOCATION: NZ

- Intersection: 37%
- Midblock: 63%
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Intersections

- Loss of control: 9 (Waimak), 31 (NZ Average)
- Crossing (no turns): 14 (Waimak), 31 (NZ Average)
- Merging/crossing (veh turning): 1 (Waimak), 1 (NZ Average)
- Rear End: 9 (Waimak), 5 (NZ Average)
- Right turn against: 5 (Waimak), 8 (NZ Average)
- Pedestrian: 8 (Waimak), 7 (NZ Average)
- Other: 8 (Waimak), 7 (NZ Average)

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Midblock

- Run off road (straight): 8 (Waimak), 4 (NZ Average)
- Run off road (corner): 1 (Waimak), 7 (NZ Average)
- Head on: 7 (Waimak), 7 (NZ Average)
- Collision with obstruction: 13 (Waimak), 13 (NZ Average)
- Rear end: 23 (Waimak), 23 (NZ Average)
- Pedestrian: 5 (Waimak), 5 (NZ Average)
- Other: 8 (Waimak), 7 (NZ Average)
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Intersections

- Loss of control: 17% (Waimak), 28% (NZ Average)
- Crossing (no turns): 16% (Waimak), 25% (NZ Average)
- Merging/crossing (vehicle turning): 28% (Waimak), 13% (NZ Average)
- Right turn against: 25% (Waimak), 15% (NZ Average)
- Other: 25% (Waimak), 25% (NZ Average)

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Midblock

- Run off road (straight): 60% (Waimak), 53% (NZ Average)
- Run off road (corner): 9% (Waimak), 14% (NZ Average)
- Overtaking/lane change: 14% (Waimak), 10% (NZ Average)
- Head on: 10% (Waimak), 15% (NZ Average)
- Collision with obstruction: 15% (Waimak), 25% (NZ Average)
- Rear end: 25% (Waimak), 25% (NZ Average)
- Other: 25% (Waimak), 25% (NZ Average)
Summary

Based on the high-level analysis conducted, the following key safety issues have been identified for the Waimakariri District:

1. Run off road crashes on straights and loss of control crashes on curves between intersections in a rural speed environment
2. Crossing (no turns) at intersections in an urban speed environment
3. Merging/crossing (vehicle turning) at intersections in a rural speed environment
4. Pedestrian safety between intersections in an urban speed environment

Other issues are less pronounced, but focus could be directed towards:

5. Motorcyclist safety
6. Cyclist safety

To address the road safety risks in Waimakariri, focus should be on further investigation of the issues behind the run off road crashes in rural areas. Interventions could be operational (e.g. speed management) or educational (e.g. fatigue) or they could be physical (e.g. shoulder widening on straights, or improved delineation and signage that the 362 Out of Context Curves in Waimakariri.

The crossing (no turns) crashes at urban intersections should be investigated for any crash clustering.

Crashes involving vehicles turning at rural intersections is suggestive of a misjudgement in speed of vehicles with priority. Sight distances should be checked and consideration given to speed management measures to reduce both the likelihood and severity of these crashes.

Additional pedestrian crossing facilities through townships may help reduce the high proportion of crashes involving pedestrians crossing the road.

Of the first priority speed management, Waimakariri has 57km of “self explaining” roads, 68km of “challenging conversation” roads and 4km of “engineer up”.
4.10 Waimate District

Analysis

The following figures summarise:

- the total number of injury crashes recorded in the Waimate District,
- the environments and location where injury crashes occurred,
- the main crash types occurring at urban/rural intersection and midblock locations, and;
- the proportion of injury crashes that involved vulnerable road users (pedestrian, cyclist and motorcyclists).

This figure shows that road safety performance was poor in 2015 and 2015, with the number of people killed or seriously injured double that of any other years in the survey period.
Social Cost of Injury Crashes in Waimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatal Crash</th>
<th>Serious Injury Crash</th>
<th>Minor Injury Crash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Injury Crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Waimate</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycling</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fatal Crash
- Serious Injury Crash
- Minor Injury Crash

- Waimate
- National Average
**INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: WAIMATE**

- Urban: 15%
- Rural: 85%

**INJURY CRASHES BY SPEED ENVIRONMENT: NZ**

- Urban: 41%
- Rural: 59%

**WAIMATE: INJURY CRASH LOCATION**

- Intersection: 19%
- Midblock: 81%

**INJURY CRASH LOCATION: NZ**

- Intersection: 37%
- Midblock: 63%
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Intersections

- Loss of control: 2% (Waimate), 2% (NZ Average)
- Crossing (no turns): 1% (Waimate), 1% (NZ Average)
- Merging/crossing (veh turning): 2% (Waimate), 1% (NZ Average)
- Rear End: 0% (Waimate), 0% (NZ Average)
- Right turn against: 1% (Waimate), 1% (NZ Average)
- Pedestrian: 0% (Waimate), 0% (NZ Average)
- Other: 1% (Waimate), 1% (NZ Average)

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Urban Midblock

- Run off road (straight): 2% (Waimate), 2% (NZ Average)
- Run off road (corner): 0% (Waimate), 0% (NZ Average)
- Head on: 1% (Waimate), 1% (NZ Average)
- Collision with obstruction: 1% (Waimate), 1% (NZ Average)
- Rear end: 2% (Waimate), 1% (NZ Average)
- Pedestrian: 1% (Waimate), 1% (NZ Average)
- Other: 1% (Waimate), 1% (NZ Average)
Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Intersections

- Loss of control: Waimate 6, NZ Average 4
- Crossing (no turns): Waimate 1, NZ Average 1
- Merging/crossing (veh turning): Waimate 1, NZ Average 0
- Right turn against: Waimate 4, NZ Average 0

Movement Types for Injury Crashes - Rural Midblock

- Run off road (straight): Waimate 23, NZ Average 30
- Run off road (corner): Waimate 5, NZ Average 12
- Overtaking/lane change: Waimate 1, NZ Average 2
- Head on: Waimate 0, NZ Average 1
- Collision with obstruction: Waimate 2, NZ Average 2
- Rear end: Waimate 0, NZ Average 0
- Other: Waimate 0, NZ Average 0
Summary

Based on the high-level analysis conducted, the following key safety issues have been identified for the Waimate District:

1. Loss of control crashes on curves and run off road crashes on straights between intersections in a rural speed environment
2. Head on crashes between intersections in a rural speed environment

To address the road safety risks in Waimate, focus should be on further investigation of the issues behind the run off road crashes in rural areas. Interventions could be operational (e.g. speed management) or educational (e.g. fatigue) or they could be physical (e.g. shoulder widening on straights, or improved delineation and signage that the 628 Out of Context Curves in Waimate.

The reduce head-on crashes, the focus should be on providing wider sealed shoulders, improved rest locations, more passing opportunities and better delineation of horizontal curves. The specific locality of the head-on crashes should be investigated and forward sight visibility measured to see whether no overtaking line marking is justified.

Of the first priority speed management, Waimate has 80km of “self explaining” roads, 18km of “challenging conversation” roads.
13 December 2017

Tēnā koutou

I am writing to you and other councils seeking your support to work with me and take action to improve road safety in New Zealand.

As you will be aware, New Zealand’s road toll has risen over the last four years. The year-to-date road toll for 2017 has already surpassed the road toll for all of 2016. This is a significant concern for me and this government. I am particularly concerned about the safety of people using our roads coming into the summer holiday season.

I have been working with officials from the Ministry of Transport, the NZ Transport Agency and the Police, to ensure the government is taking action to address the rising road toll. I would also like to work in partnership with you to improve road safety outcomes across New Zealand. I welcome your views on this challenge and how we can address it.

I would like your support to take action as quickly as possible to improve road safety outcomes, in particular on the high-risk roads in your region. I encourage you to consider how you could accelerate the implementation of the new speed management approach, introduced earlier this year, to ensure there are safe and appropriate speeds on local roads.

I would also like to acknowledge the safety treatments local councils are making over summer as part of your existing work programme.

On 20 November 2017, my colleague, Hon Phil Twyford, Minister of Transport, wrote to all local and regional councils about the government’s focus for investment in the Government Policy Statement on land transport 2018 and how it might influence the development of your Regional Land Transport Plans (RLTPs). This includes delivering safety improvements.

In considering the safety priorities in your RLTPs, it will be important to identify the actions that have the greatest enduring effect on road safety in your region. For example, infrastructure investment or speed management, to treat high-risk roads in your region.

I have sought the NZ Transport Agency’s support to partner with you on these matters. I have asked that it address any barriers councils face in progressing road safety outcomes that are within its control, including considering its funding arrangements. I have also directed officials from the Ministry of Transport to look across the road safety system and ensure that the appropriate funding, policy and regulatory settings are in place to implement changes to improve road safety as quickly as possible.

If we are to improve road safety it is important that it is a joint process. I would welcome feedback on your approach to improving road safety in your region: Where have you experienced success? What barriers do you face to making further progress in improving road safety? I encourage you to get in touch with the Ministry of Transport to share your local road safety experiences.
In early 2018, I plan to invite you and other councils to attend a national road safety summit, where I will be able to hear from you directly on these matters and discuss how we can work more closely together to improve road safety outcomes in New Zealand. I will be in touch next year to confirm the arrangements for the summit.

I will be making an announcement on Sunday 17 December 2017 that will outline my intentions in this area, including the planned summit and to confirm my desire to engage with all parties to improve safety. I would be grateful if you hold this letter in confidence until this date.

I would like this engagement with you to form part of an ongoing dialogue on the development of a road safety strategy for New Zealand. I have directed the Ministry of Transport to start work on a new strategy, including considering whether the “Vision Zero” framework is appropriate for New Zealand. I would appreciate your ongoing input and support for that work over the next 12 to 18 months.

The government will also be running a range of publicity campaigns over the summer to communicate safe driving messages. I would encourage you to get involved and urge your communities to drive safely over the holiday period.

Please direct any of your correspondence to Brent Johnston, Manager Mobility and Safety, Ministry of Transport, at b.johnston@transport.govt.nz.

You can find key safety statistics for your region to support public communications at http://www.transport.govt.nz/research/roadcrashstatistics/regionalroadsafetyissues/.

I thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving road safety and look forward to working with you in taking action on this important issue.

Please forward this letter as appropriate to the Chair of your Regional Land Transport Committee.

Yours sincerely

Hon Julie Anne Genter
Associate Minister of Transport

Copy to:
Hon Phil Twyford, Minister of Transport
Chris Moller, Chair, New Zealand Transport Agency
Fergus Gammie, Chief Executive, New Zealand Transport Agency
Peter Mersi, Chief Executive, Ministry of Transport
Regional Road Safety Working Group Report

Purpose

1. To inform the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee (RTC) about the work of the Regional Road Safety Working Group (RRSWG).

Role of Regional Road Safety Working Group

2. The role of RRSWG is to advise the RTC on technical road safety matters, including identifying matters that require further investigation by the RTC and, in some situations, identifying matters that can be addressed by the RTC at the national level.

Recommendations

That the Regional Transport Committee:


Key Points

3. RRSWG met on 8 February 2018, with the draft notes from this meeting appended to this report. Items discussed at the meeting of concern and interest to the RTC include:

   • Road safety and the concern that our current speed limits do not match best practice

   • The upcoming Road Safety Summit that the Government will convene, most likely in April 2018

   • The establishment of an RRSWG sub-group to progress work on identifying the key safety risks in Canterbury and how agencies can collaborate to address these, as well as preparing for the Road Safety Summit.
Regional Road Safety Working Group – draft notes

Date: Thursday 8 February 2018
Time: 10.00am – 12:00 noon
Venue: Selwyn District Council

Attendees: Mayor David Ayers (WDC, Chair), Lomiga Vaeelua (HDC), Al Stewart (Police), Vaughan Lapsley (Police) Thomas McNaughton (CCC), Stephen Wright (CCC), Andrew Dixon (TDC), Daniel Naude (TDC), Jeremy Lambert (ADC), Kathy Graham (WDC), Lorraine Johns (ECan), Andrew Mazey (SDC)

Apologies: Jenny Dickinson (NZTA), Geoff Rhodes (ADC), Ken Stevenson (WDC), Darren Fidler (ECan)

Present Glen Koorey (Movement NZ), Glenn Bunting (NZTA), Adam Francis (NZTA), David Skelton (NZTA)

The meeting commenced at 10.05am

Summary of actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2018</td>
<td>Glenn Bunting and Lorraine Johns to liaise to draw together NZTA data and analysis for road safety in Canterbury</td>
<td>Lorraine Johns</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2018</td>
<td>Sub Committee established to work on speed management initiative, Road Safety Summit preparation, and proposal for a Regional Speed Management Plan</td>
<td>Membership set out in minutes of 8 February 2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 November 2017</td>
<td>Revise Terms of Reference and continue work on practical actions for RRSWG.</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury, All</td>
<td>On hold while work on speed management progresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 2017</td>
<td>The Group will revisit finalisation of the Road Safety Implementation Plan following the completion of work on the review of the Regional Land Transport Plan.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>On hold while work on speed management progresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 February 2017</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury to coordinate an investigation into the potential to engage a consultant to work with the Group and draft an intersection business plan for the region.</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td>On hold until further statistical information is gathered and analysed about road safety data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Welcome, introductions, apologies

Mayor David Ayers opened the meeting. Apologies were noted.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2017 were confirmed.

3. Presentation by Movement NZ, Dr Glen Koorey

Dr Glen Koorey from Movement NZ presented to RRSWG.

- Movement NZ is a relatively new group and has been bringing together a number of organisations in the active mode space
- Movement NZ focuses on three key initiatives to improve road safety for active Kiwis – smart spending, sensible speeds and safe spaces
- Safer rural speed campaign – Movement NZ sent a letter in November 2017 to all councils
- There are plenty of active mode crashes in the region with particular hot spots (fringes on high population centres involve a lot of demand for active modes - this shows up in crash data)
- From 2013 to 17 there were 1270 active mode injury crashes, 30 fatalities, and more than 340 serious injuries
- On 80-100km/hr roads there were 84 active mode injury crashes and 41 fatal and serious active mode crashes
- Most of minor crashes in urban centres, but half of fatal crashes are on high speed roads
- Current speed limits as taken from the speed management maps in NZTA’s risk assessment tool showing speed limit around Canterbury indicate that we have mainly 100km speed limits as a default
- In terms of safe and appropriate speeds, most of those roads should be 80km/hour
- There are a number of options – raise or lower speeds, “engineering up/down”, or no change to existing limit
- A region-wide approach is suggested, using common principles
- Public engagement – focus on risk, have data and explain the link between speed and casualty rates. Also demonstrate a strategy that is considering all options, have answers to pre-empt usual concerns, and talk to everyone (not just motorists)

Comments and questions:

- Mayor David Ayers mentioned he would like to see a general assessment of roads throughout Selwyn District
- A question was asked as to whether there are preferred speed limits for roads where there are cycle trails. Dr Koorey suggested this depends on cross sections (for example if there are good shoulders – if there are not, 60km/hour might be more appropriate, but this depends on relative geometry)
• A question was asked as to whether we should go back to the 80km/hour default speed limit nationally to turn things around. Sweden reviewed rural road limits a few years ago – for every one that went up about seven were lowered. Sweden made 70 the default speed limit and if you wanted anything above that you had to justify it. Can start with coalition of the willing with a focus on individual areas, and conversations might eventually turn to making the default speed limit the lower limit
• Police want consistency throughout the country
• How important is better driver training?
• 87% of the national network does not align with safe and appropriate travel speed – we are out of step nationally.

Dr Koorey agreed to provide his presentation to the group

4. regional speed management opportunity, Glenn Bunting NZTA

Glenn spoke to the Group about the Government’s speed management initiative and made the following points:

• All Road Controlling Authorities would have received the letter from Julie Anne Genter – all RCAs have been asked to consider how to accelerate implementation of new speed management approach
• Speed fundamental to road safety and is a focus under the current government
• Three regions have been identified to accelerate implementation of speed management – Canterbury is the third highest region from an opportunity perspective of reducing deaths and serious injuries to make a step change in applying speed management approach. Adam Francis is the national co-ordinator focusing on addressing the Minister’s challenge and trying to understand what enthusiasm there is in the three regions for trying to achieve a step change. The Government would like to know what support and resources are required, what impediments exist, and what the appetite is for moving fast and applying the new speed management approach, at a regional level?

The following points were made in the discussion which followed:

• Mayor David Ayers indicated he was keen to see this go ahead
• There are opportunities to work toward a more consistent approach to start with – do we need to get there first before making a step change? For example, discussions around whether there should be a reduced limit on unsealed roads
• NZTA is working within the one Network Road Classification (ONRC) – ONRC is the starting point for calculating safe and appropriate speeds (efficiency)
• There is an opportunity to make sure the road environment in total supports the speed limit being considered
• Need to see more collaboration from NZTA with local authorities – a lot of work gets done and local authorities have to go searching for it – potential with better support to be able to market better at a local level. Need consistency and collaboration. Cannot base feedback on a couple of hundred people given size of region (ie better conversations on road risk).
• Proposed regional Plan can include technical things as well as engagement.
There was overall support for a regional approach – the statistics are not good for Canterbury and we need to do something - this initiative needs to go ahead.

A sub-group of ECa (Lorraine Johns), CCC (Thomas McNaughton), Timaru (Andrew Dixon), Police (Al Stewart), Waimakariri (Kathy Graham), Selwyn (Andrew Mazey), Hurunui (Lomiga Vaelua) and NZTA (David Skelton and Adam Francis) was formed to progress this work. The Sub-group will support the paper being prepared for the Regional Transport Committee meeting of 1 March 2018. NZTA will assist with gathering data and Glenn Bunting will work directly with Lorraine to do so. In addition, the Safe Roads Alliance are looking at roads around Christchurch. One of the primary things they look at is speed management and this could be a starting point for the sub-group.

5. Revised text on safety in the Regional Land Transport Plan, Lorraine Johns

Lorraine Johns outlined some changes to the text in the Regional Land Transport Plan on safety (primarily the addition of recent crash data). The Group more broadly discussed the need for data and analysis of data as follows:

- We need a better system to get data and we need more data. Jim Harland has indicated that NZTA will support this. The sub-group needs to pick up issues around access to data and interpretation of that data as well as work to prepare for the Road Safety Summit.
- Local road safety programme – needs to be developed collaboratively across highest benefit local authorities in the country - not just looking at data but analysing the data to understand where best to focus on addressing deaths and injuries
- Abley has developed an investment map tool, and this will help organisations collaborate to address road safety. NZTA will invite Abley to speak to the sub-committee. Glenn Bunting and Lorraine Johns will liaise to organise the collation of existing data and analysis of that data.
- A question was raised about resilience at intersections – for example if one sign is missing the impact this may have. There is a need for resilience at stop and give way control intersections and this could be a quick win (adding road markings or a few extra signs).
- NZTA indicated it is working with the Ministry of Transport on the next ten-year strategy to replace Safer Journeys, and this will take place over the next 1-12 months.

6. Intersection safety

- NZTA noted the information is all in mega maps
- The Police indicated that they do not target intersections as they want to see people driving well everywhere. A few years ago Police targeted intersections and it made no difference so they have gone back to the policy of general deterrence.

The meeting closed at 12 noon
Purpose

1. To inform the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee (RTC) about the work of the Transport Officers Group (TOG).

Role of the Transport Officers Group

2. The role of TOG is to advise the RTC on technical and strategic regional transport matters, and oversee, facilitate and coordinate the development of the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) (including any variations).

Recommendations

That the Regional Transport Committee:


Key Points

3. TOG met on 8 February 2018, with the draft notes from this meeting appended to this report. Items discussed at the meeting of concern and interest to the RTC include:

- The need for access to safety data and quality analysis of that data – there is also a gap in not being able to collect data on near misses
- Some minor changes to the wording of the section in the draft RLTP on investment priorities
- The proposed Weigh Right Rakaia variation
- Changes to the programme of activities in the draft RLTP that might be of significance.
Transport Officers Group – draft notes

Date: Thursday 8 February 2018
Time: 1.00pm – 3.00pm
Venue: Selwyn District Council

Attendees: Lorraine Johns (ECan, Chair), Mike Jacobson (CCC), Yvonne Warner (WDC), Brian Fauth (ADC), David Edge (HDC), Andrew Dixon (TDC), Lomiga Vaaelua (HDC), Steve Higgs (NZTA), Andrew Mazey (SDC), Darren Fidler (ECan), Scott McKenzie (MDC)

Apologies: Geoff Rhodes (ADC), Ken Stevenson (WDC)

The meeting commenced at 1.10pm

Summary of outstanding actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2018</td>
<td>Outline sub-groups and role</td>
<td>Lorraine Johns</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2018</td>
<td>Editorial changes to the draft RLTP investment priority text as outlined in the minutes</td>
<td>Lorraine Johns</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2018</td>
<td>Selwyn District Council to provide information about the Prebbleton Arterial CSM Related Upgrade Packages and Selwyn Co-ordinated Transport Upgrades</td>
<td>Andrew Mazey</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 August 2017</td>
<td>NZTA update on SHIP</td>
<td>NZTA</td>
<td>Standing item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Welcome, introductions, apologies

Lorraine Johns opened the meeting. Apologies were noted.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held 1 November 2017 were confirmed, with a minor spelling correction.

3. RTC work programme: Consultation on RLTP/significant changes to the programme of works

Lorraine Johns provided an update on the RLTP, in particular, that consultation would commence in the week of 19 February 2018 and would run for one month. Written submissions will be sought but there will be no oral hearings.
TOG discussed whether there were any significant changes to the programme of works, noting that the Christchurch City Council and NZTA programmes of works were more complex and Environment Canterbury has been working separately with the Council and NZTA to identify the significant changes.

It was noted that the TIO download for renewals and maintenance only covers three years, and this needs to be extended to ten years.

Lorraine canvassed a statutory interpretation issue with the requirement to provide information on expenditure from 2015-2025, when the NLTF period is 2018-2028. It was suggested that side by side graphs on expenditure and revenue could be used to display both of these time periods.

Selwyn District Council agreed to provide information about the Prebbleton Arterial CSM Related Upgrade Packages and Selwyn Co-ordinated Transport Upgrades, to explain how a number of projects in the current RLTP have been grouped under these two line items.

Lorraine advised that once all significant changes were identified to the programme of activities, General Counsel would be consulted to ensure the proposed consultation process was suitable given the nature of the changes. It was not anticipated that any changes would be controversial.

The Group also discussed the priority objectives in the Regional Land Transport Plan, agreeing that "vehicles" would be changed to “vehicle standards” under safety. A proofing error was also identified ("disbursement" instead of "dispersal").

It was also agreed that the safety priority text should include data on location (eg intersections and cornering).

Lorraine noted a sub-committee of the RTC has been formed to consider submissions and provide recommendations to the RTC, and that a sub-group of TOG will support this process. All TOG members are invited to be on this sub-group – those who are on it will need to be available to answer questions and assist with drafting the Officers’ Report, and ideally attend the RTC sub-committee meetings. All TOG members will be consulted on the draft Officers Report before it is provided to the Sub-Committee.

It was agreed that in addition to ECan, CCC, SDC and NZTA membership, WDC, HDC and TDC would also be involved in the sub-group.

4. RTC Work Programme update

Lorraine Johns circulated a summary of progress to date on key workstreams.

5. NZTA update on SHIP

Steve Higgs updated the group on progress on SHIP, noting that there could be some changes to the programme following the review, but there is no date yet for engagement (though this will be communicated as soon as there is).
The Ministry of Transport hopes to release the revised draft GPS in March 2018. Steve Higgs noted that the IAF would also need to be updated.

6. Draft RTC agenda for 1 March 2018

The draft RTC agenda for 1 March 2018 was circulated.

7. Road safety theme for next Regional Transport Committee meeting

The Group discussed issues with access to data and also quality analysis of that data, as the main problem. There are difficulties with extraction and interpretation.

It was also noted that classifiers are a lot cheaper than they used to be and increased uptake could be a possibility.

It was suggested that someone in NZTA or CCC (David Scarlet or Steve Parry) would be useful to review data and make sure it is accurate. It’s important to have someone who specialises in CAS involved in this work.

It was noted that NZTA have signalled that Safer Journeys will be replaced soon.

A concern was also made that the data does not acknowledge near misses and this is a gap – but there is no way to pick this up.

8. Variations – NZTA

Steve noted that a Weigh Right variation for Rakaia would be submitted for the RTC to consider on 1 March 2018.


Andrew Dixon spoke to this item and will lead the submission on behalf of the region.

10. Any other business

Yvonne Warnaar suggested making use of the Corridor Managers Group.

It was agreed Lorraine would summarise the sub-groups that have been established to support processes to date

The meeting closed at 3.00pm
Canterbury Regional Transport Committee

Variations to Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan – Weigh Right Rakaia

Purpose

1. To amend the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) pursuant to section 18D of the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA) by adding the “Weigh Right Rakaia” project into the programme of activities.

Overview

2. The Regional Transport Committee (RTC) may prepare a variation to its RLTP during the 6 years to which it applies if the variation addresses an issue raised by a review; or good reason exists for making the variation.

3. A variation may be prepared by the RTC at the request of an approved organisation or the New Zealand Transport Agency or on the RTC’s own motion.

4. The RTC must consider any variation request promptly.

5. The provisions of LTMA that apply to the preparation of a full RLTP apply with the necessary modifications to a variation of an RLTP. Consultation is not required for any variation that is not deemed significant in the criteria set out in the RLTP or that arises from the declaration or revocation of a State Highway.

6. The RTC may recommend that Environment Canterbury vary the RLTP. Final approval of the variation rests with Environment Canterbury.

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee:

1. Note that the following activity is proposed as a variation to the Regional Land Transport Plan
   a. Weigh Right Rakaia

2. Determine that the requested variations are not significant.
3. Agree to vary the Regional Land Transport Plan by adding the proposed activity to Appendix A ‘Activities included in the Canterbury Land Transport Programme’.

4. Recommend this variation to Environment Canterbury.

**Weigh Right Rakaia**

7. The project is part of a national Weigh Right programme which forms part of a wider compliance strategy, led by the NZ Transport Agency. The overall objectives are to increase compliance of operators on the network, and preserve both the state highway and local road assets through the reduction of illegal overloading.

8. The Rakaia facility is a new weigh bridge with highway speed screening to select vehicles approaching the weigh station. It is expected that property acquisition and establishment of the exact location of the facility will be carried out in 2017/18, hence the request for inclusion in the 2015 – 2018 RLTP.

9. Weigh in motion data has, for a number of years, recorded a level of overloading of some 10% of larger heavy commercial vehicles and some 6% of vehicles with load limits below 44 tonnes. Sampling of vehicle trip data indicates that some 25% of state highway heavy vehicle kilometres travelled are captured by the current inspection sites. This, plus the diverse nature of the locations of the weigh in motion sites, indicates a reasonable level of certainty that the overloading rate and the damage it can cause is occurring across the whole roading network.

10. The proposal is to incentivise increased use of self-monitoring, improve the level of detection of non-compliant vehicles with increased coverage of weigh facilities and to increase the effectiveness of detection using electronic screening and recognition of vehicles, and weigh in motion to target non-compliance.

11. The programme outcomes are reduced maintenance costs, by removing the viability of overloading, improved safety through increased stability of vehicles (30% of truck crashes are roll-overs) and improved freight efficiency by maximising the use of the network. A further benefit will be a reduction in lost time for compliant operators and the creation of a fairer freight handling market place.

12. The programme includes 12 sites around the country (two of which are in Canterbury – Rakaia and Glasnevin). The next stage for the Weigh Right Rakaia project will be implementation. The total project cost including administration is approximately $4.2 million.

Attachments:

1. Weigh Right – Location map
Legend
- Existing weigh in motion sites
- Existing weigh bridges
- Proposed weigh pit
- Proposed weigh bridges
- Proposed weigh in motion
- One Network Road Classification
- High Volume
- National
- Regional
- Arterial
- Primary Collector
- Secondary Collector
- High Volume (future)
- Label denotes a National site
- Existing weigh bridge
- New weigh bridge proposed

Weigh bridges and weigh in motion
Strategic network coverage

Item 7.1 Attachment 1