

From: kusal ekanayake <kusalekanayake@yahoo.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, 26 March 2018 1:58 p.m.
To: Mailroom Mailbox
Subject: LTP Feedback submission
Attachments: Transport LTP Plan - Submission.pdf; Feedback form.pdf

Hi Ecan,

Attached to this email should be the feedback form and the supporting document. This feedback submission is only in reference to the transport funding changes on behalf of Christchurch Youth Council, the Youth Reference Group for Sustainable Transport and Youth Voice Canterbury.

Please let me know if you need any more information.

Kusal Ekanayake

Long term Plan Submission on behalf of Christchurch Youth Council, Youth Voice Canterbury and Youth Reference Group for Sustainable Transport

Main messages:

- From the provided options, option 2 (with the no fare increase) had the most support overall.
- Option 4 (providing an alternative) was preferred over all other options with the incentive of not cancelling the 6 proposed bus routes.
- Option 4 alternatives include:
 - Running the 6 bus routes at during current peak times only.
 - Encouraging people to take the bus and increase patronage via lower fares.
 - Change fare prices according to specific buses/times of day i.e. peak times.
 - On call buses to medical centres or hospitals (if the Burwood hospital route is cut).
 - A new bus service in the summer that would transport people to the beach.

Background on our organisations:

Christchurch Youth Council (CYC)

The Christchurch Youth Council (Rūnaka Taiohi o Ōtautahi) is dedicated to advocating for a strong youth voice in Christchurch. We aim to provide young people with the avenue to have their say. We aim to create a community where the youth voice is as valued as all others in the community.

- 2400 likes on facebook
- 34 members

Youth Voice Canterbury (YVC)

Youth Voice Canterbury are all for championing the fact that young people exist, they are inheriting tomorrow, and they have a voice that can be as loud as anyone else. We champion youth participation by contributing to collaborations, panels and projects and advocating and presenting on youth participation, engagement, and why it is important to get young people involved.

- 1100 likes on facebook
- 251 members in the network

Youth Reference Group For Sustainable Transport (YRGST)

The Youth Reference Group for Sustainable Transport focuses on ensuring young people get their voice heard in matters related to sustainable transport in the Christchurch area. We are a reference group that was formed as an Environment Canterbury initiative to increase the involvement of youth in matters regarding transport. We are also passionate about sustainability and encouraging the use of sustainable transport options. We focus on reducing barriers for young people around using sustainable transport in order to increase patronage and reduce our environmental impact.

- Over 40 members
- A member of the Public Transport Advisory Group

The following information was collected over two events, both were open to youth from the public:

- Kai + consultation was an event organised by Environment Canterbury and CYC which gave young people the opportunity to come and provide feedback with the assistance of Environment Canterbury Councillors and staff. It was held at Ecan.
- LTP - Transport submission workshop was held at the Youth Space a week after Kai + Consultation. This workshop focused on building on from the points suggested from the previous event. This event organised by the YRGST with the support of YVC.

Option 1

Key findings:

- Was preferred over option 3, but not over option 2.
- When asked about the positives and negatives of this option young people determined that:
 - A positive was spreading the weight of the shortfall across both fares and rates could be considered a fair option.
 - Increasing fares was seen as negative.

The price increases were viewed as a potential barrier for young people that might stop them taking public transport. This decrease in affordability is also particularly relevant for young people who are travelling between zones. As with option 3, an increase in fares was deemed as a counter-intuitive decision given the overall goal of the public transport system is to have people shift away from private transport and towards public transport.

Option 2

Key findings:

- This was the most preferred option of the 3 due to the fare not increasing.
- Out of the 3 options this was considered the best that may help increase patronage in the future.

This option received the majority of positive feedback largely due to the fares staying at the same price. Young people suggested that Ecan should be trying to increase patronage and option 2 out of the 3 provides the best potential for doing so by encouraging more people to use the bus due to low prices. With the fares not increasing, young people who are not able to drive/choose not to drive or do not have access to other transport options will not be forced to pay more for a service which is supposed to be encouraged.

Option 3

Key findings:

- This was the least preferred option out of the 3 presented.
- This was not seen as a viable option for increasing bus usage.
- This option affected young people the most.
- This option provides a potential safety concern.

This option received the majority of negative feedback as the young people questioned did not believe that increasing the fares would be a viable long term solution. If Ecan's longer term goal was to increase bus patronage increasing bus fares would discourage potential patrons from taking the bus in the future. Not only would it discourage young people, but it would also change their mentality towards the normality of buses meaning their future children may not grow up in an environment where they are encouraged to take the bus. Some young people then went on to discuss how the bus system should be as appealing as possible with an emphasis on motivating more people to take the bus to help bridge the current shortfall. This option could additionally pose a safety concern for young people. For instance, if the price becomes unaffordable young people may have to put themselves in more dangerous situations like walking home at night when they would usually rely on the bus to provide a safe ride home.

Option 4

Key findings:

- This focused on retaining the 6 bus routes.
- Running the 6 proposed bus services only at peak times.
- Adding new temporary bus routes during certain times of the year (i.e. summer beach buses, school holiday buses).
- Adding an on call van to transport people to the hospital.
- Consideration of lowering fares to encourage bus usage.

Alternative suggestions include the continuation of the six bus routes with the intent that all the bus routes run only at their current peak times. These peak times can be re-evaluated at a later date to see if any changes in usage has occurred to ensure that profit is maximised. There was a large concern around people within the community being potentially cut off and isolated due to the removal of the buses, a compromised solution was popular solution for young people. From the information provided by Ecan staff, the current proposed bus routes to be cut only took in account the overall money earned back as opposed to money earned during certain times of the day, the thought being that if certain buses run during certain times of the day (i.e. school start/finish) then low demand times could be skipped to save money.

With the shortfall being partially due to patronage not making it's ideal percentage of money back overall, some young people questioned posed the idea that Ecan should try a different approach. Rather than increase bus fares Ecan should lower fares to encourage more people to use the bus.

Another suggested option was introducing a new temporary bus service over the summer which would take people to popular summer destinations such as beaches and bays. These short term buses could provide a solution for making a high percentage of money back as they run only during peak seasons and would provide a service that is not currently provided. This could help ease the parking space congestion at these busy summer spots. An extension on this idea was to run a temporary bus service during school break times to help young people move around the dispersed region that is Canterbury.

Also, if the buses that navigate towards vital areas such as the hospital or other medical centres are to be cut then it was suggested that an oncall van/bus service should be provided to ensure people for can make the journey to and from the hospital safely.

There was also a suggestion that since young people tend to not have the choice of whether they can drive or bus due to the lack of other options if fare prices did rise, not having them rise for young people could provide a solution. Given this lack of options aside from public transport this increases the vulnerability of young people posing a safety risk. This solution would avoid this potential risk and not discourage usage among the young people of Canterbury.

24/03/18

Kusal Ekanayake & Bethany Baker
Youth Reference Group for Sustainable Transport
With support from Christchurch Youth Council and Youth Voice Canterbury

Youth Space
122 Lichfield Street
Christchurch 8011

022 687 8297
kusalekanayake@yahoo.co.nz.

2. Public Transport Options

Public Transport is one of the programmes in the Transport and Urban Development portfolio. For the first year of the Long-Term Plan 2018-28 we are proposing changes to the Public Transport programme as outlined in the Consultation Document. (on page 14)

To make comment on the Public Transport proposed changes please complete the selection panel below.
To make comment on the the whole Transport and Urban Development portfolio, please go to Q7.

Options

Please review the options in the Consultation Document and indicate which option you support: (please select one answer)

Option 1 – A combination of routes, fares and (targeted) rates changes: small fare and rates increases, reduced Total Mobility subsidy and six routes discontinued.

Option 2 – As Option 1 but larger rates increase, no fare increase: larger (targeted) rates increase, no fare increase, reduced Total Mobility subsidy and six routes discontinued.

Option 3 – As Option 1 but larger fare increase, smaller (targeted) rates increase: minimal rates increase, larger fare increase, reduced Total Mobility subsidy and six routes discontinued.

Option 4 – none of the above. (Please provide comment/ideas for an alternative solution)

Comments:

Please refer to supporting documents for full comments

3. Freshwater Management

See page 6 of the Consultation Document.

Support/Oppose

Please select one of the following: (please select one answer)

I generally agree with the activity proposed for Freshwater Management.

I generally disagree with the activity proposed for Freshwater Management.

Comments:

4. Biodiversity and Biosecurity

See page 8 of the Consultation Document.

Support/Oppose

Please select one of the following: (please select one answer)

I generally agree with the activity proposed for Biodiversity and Biosecurity.

I generally disagree with the activity proposed for Biodiversity and Biosecurity.

Comments:

5. Hazards, Risk and Resilience

See page 10 of the Consultation Document.

Support/Oppose

Please select one of the following: *(please select one answer)*

I generally agree with the activity proposed for Hazards, Risk and Resilience.

I generally disagree with the activity proposed for Hazards, Risk and Resilience.

Comments:

6. Air Quality

See page 12 of the Consultation Document.

Support/Oppose

Please select one of the following: *(please select one answer)*

I generally agree with the activity proposed for Air Quality.

I generally disagree with the activity proposed for Air Quality.

Comments:

7. Transport and Urban Development

See page 13 of the Consultation Document.

Support/Oppose

Please select one of the following: *(please select one answer)*

I generally agree with the activity proposed for Transport and Urban Development.

I generally disagree with the activity proposed for Transport and Urban Development.

Comments:

8. Regional Leadership

See page 5 of the Consultation Document.

Support/Oppose

Please select one of the following: *(please select one answer)*

I generally agree with the activity proposed for Regional Leadership.

I generally disagree with the activity proposed for Regional Leadership.

Comments:

9. Revenue and Financing Policy

See page 16 of the Consultation Document.

Support/Oppose

Please select one of the following: *(please select one answer)*

I generally agree with the principles outlined in the Revenue and Financing Policy.

I generally disagree with principles outlined in the Revenue and Financing Policy.

Comments:

10. Rates

See page 16 of the Consultation Document.

Support/Oppose

Please select one of the following: *(please select one answer)*

I support the proposed total rates revenue increase of 4.5% for 2018/19.

I do not support the proposed total rates revenue increase of 4.5% for 2018/19.

Comments:

11. Supporting Policies and Strategies

Comments on any other policies or strategies in the full draft Long-Term Plan 2018-28 (see www.ecan.govt.nz).

Comments:

12. Meeting with Councillors to discuss this feedback on the proposed Long-Term Plan

(please select one):

- I would like to meet with Councillors in Christchurch
- I would like to meet with Councillors in Timaru
- I do not wish to meet with Councillors

13. Citizens' Panel

In 2018 we will be setting up a 'citizens' panel'. This will enable us to ask for input during the year from a cross section of the community. If you would be willing to be contacted about being part of the panel, please tick the box and provide your email address. Ticking the box now will not commit you to being on the panel.

Please select one of the following:

- I am willing to be contacted.
- I do not wish to be contacted.

Please write your email address:

Thank you

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback on the draft Long-Term Plan 2018-28.

If you have indicated that you would like to meet with Councillors, please ensure you have given us your contact email and/or phone number. We will be in touch after submissions close on 26 March.

Deliberations take place from 26 March with the final Long-Term Plan 2018-28 being adopted by Council on 21 June 2018.

(If you haven't already please ensure you also have your say on the Long-Term Plan for your local District or City Council).