

LATE PAPERS v.2

REGIONAL TRANSPORT COMMITTEE MEETING

THURSDAY, 8 AUGUST 2019

7.0 Extraordinary and Urgent Business

Canterbury Regional Transport Committee

Date of Meeting	8 August 2019
Author	Vivienne Ong Committee Advisor

Late Papers

Purpose

1. The reason why the item is not on the agenda is that the item was identified for consideration after the agenda was prepared.
2. The reason that consideration of these items cannot be delayed is to enable timely information to be provided to the Committee, particularly given that the next scheduled meeting (in November) is dependent on confirmation of Committee members following the election.

Recommendation

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee:

1. **Resolves, pursuant to section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to consider these matters at this meeting notwithstanding that they were not on the agenda for the meeting; and**
2. **Receives the items:**
 - a. **6.3 Canterbury RTC Submission – Road to Zero Consultation Document**
 - b. **6.9 Report: Advocacy for Low Emission vehicles and Attachment 1: Low Emission Transport Options, Letter to Minister**
 - c. **6.10 Variation to the Regional Land Transport Plan - Selwyn District Council**

Legal compliance and risk assessment

Section 46(A) of the Local Government and Official Information and Meetings Act:

7. *An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at the meeting if –*
 - (a) *the local authority by resolution so decides; and*
 - (b) *the presiding member explains at the meeting at a time when it is open to the public*
 - (i) *the reason why the item is not on the agenda; and*
 - (ii) *the reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6.3	Canterbury RTC Submission – Road to Zero Consultation document	... Page 1
6.9	Report: Advocacy for Low Emission Vehicles	... Page 25
	Attachment 1: Low emission transport options, letter to Minister	... Page 27
6.10	Variation to the Regional Land Transport Plan – Selwyn District Council	... Page 29

DRAFT Canterbury Regional Transport Committee Submission

Road to Zero

Consultation on the 2020-2030 Road Safety Strategy

Overview of Canterbury Regional Transport Committee submission

Dear Sir or Madam

The Canterbury Regional Transport Committee welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on *Road to Zero*, the 2020-2030 National Road Safety Strategy.

This submission represents the view of the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee, and it is noted that some territorial authorities within the Canterbury region are also individually submitting on *Road to Zero* with locally specific feedback.

The Committee commends the Government for proposing the adoption of Vision Zero and signalling the step change that is required to address the significant number of deaths and serious injuries occurring on New Zealand roads. The Committee is highly supportive of the approach signalled in *Road to Zero*, including the vision, principles, focus areas and list of actions.

Road to Zero rightly recognises that implementation is critical. *Road to Zero* indicates that while the focus of current strategy, *Safer Journeys*, is sound, there has been “insufficient leadership and sector capacity necessary for successful implementation”. The Committee welcomes *Road to Zero* as a step toward ensuring road safety strategy in New Zealand is data driven, and the right leadership, capability, capacity and funding are available to support implementation.

The Committee urges the Government to continue the same leadership and dedication shown in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018 and *Road to Zero* through to the action and resourcing that is required for successful implementation of Vision Zero.

The Committee would like to comment generally on the following key matters:

- **Funding needs to be addressed:** *Road to Zero* does not consider funding. The Committee queries whether a 40% target can be achieved within existing funding levels, particularly given the current severe shortfall in funding for the National Land Transport Programme. The Committee considers that *Road to Zero* should include discussion of the funding needed for successful implementation.

- **Actions need to be based on evidence:** The Committee welcomes the approach signalled in *Road to Zero* of basing the focus areas and proposed actions on evidence. However, there is little discussion of the specific problems the target assumes and prioritisation is sought into the long-list of actions without explaining which the evidence suggests will have the greatest impact on reducing deaths and serious injuries. The Committee suggests that where analysis supports the prioritisation of an action above other actions, this should be made clear.
- **Path to Zero:** The Committee welcomes the introduction of a practical target to drive action. The Committee suggests that *Road to Zero* also signal the timeframe anticipated for moving from a 40% reduction to a 100% reduction (ie Vision Zero).
- **Community buy in is essential:** The importance of community buy in cannot be underestimated. *Road to Zero* assumes a step change in attitudes without explaining how community buy in will be achieved. The Committee suggests this area could benefit from greater attention in the strategy.
- **Importance of national consistency for speed management:** The Committee urges the Government to consider national consistency for best practice speed management, including default speed limits for residential areas, schools, and state highways. The current approach is piecemeal, varying between territorial authorities, and is greatly dependent on public opinion. The safety of a journey should not change when people cross regional and sub-regional borders. The Committee would like to see central government taking a stronger leadership role in this area, including with respect to consultation on speed limit changes.
- **Greater emphasis on rural roads needed:** The Committee recommends increasing the emphasis in *Road to Zero* on local rural roads. It is important that these roads are maintained and enhanced.
- **Importance of partnership and local government role:** Overseas experience suggests that strong partnerships across central and local government, police and other emergency services are key to improve safety outcomes. The Committee considers that the importance of partnership should be explicitly recognised in the strategy's principles. Government investment decision making processes also need to have greater regard to the local priorities articulated in Regional Land Transport Plans.
- **Role of mode shift needs greater recognition:** The Committee considers that central and local government can also play a greater role in road safety by focusing on incentivising mode shift from Single Occupancy Vehicles to public transport as well as freight mode shift from road to rail and coastal shipping.

We want to know what you think

Road to Zero is a new plan to make roads and footpaths safer for everyone in New Zealand.

Road safety is a really important issue; too many people are being killed and injured on our roads every day.

We want to hear what you think about our plan to improve safety for everyone who uses our roads and footpaths.

Why are we doing this?

Most of us travel on roads and footpaths every day, to get to work, to the shops, and to visit friends and family.

We should be able to get places safely, and feel safe too.

We all need to follow the rules when we use the roads, but we know that anybody can make a mistake. So we need to make a safe road **system** to protect people when mistakes happen.

A safe system

A safe road system looks at all the things we can do to keep people safe, so that if they crash, they don't get badly hurt.

- Safe roads and footpaths
- Safe travel speeds
- Safe vehicles
- Safe road users

Our Vision

We want to make our roads safer so that no one gets hurt on the roads.

Our vision is a New Zealand where no one is killed or seriously injured in road crashes.

We want to aim for zero deaths and zero serious injuries on our roads

To what extent do you support this proposed vision?

Strongly oppose	Mildly oppose	Mildly support	Strongly support	I don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What was the reason for your rating? Do you have any other comments?

	Comment	Recommendation
1	<p>Road safety is a core priority for the Committee. The Committee does not consider any deaths or serious injuries on our roads acceptable.</p> <p><i>Road to Zero</i> indicates that the adoption of Vision Zero is more than aspirational. The Committee suggests consideration therefore be given as to whether a timeframe should be identified for achieving Vision Zero - see, for example, the approach recommended by the European Commission which includes a timeframe of 2050:</p> <p>https://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/what-we-do_en</p>	<p>The Committee recommends the Government consider specifying a timeframe for realising Vision Zero.</p>
2	<p>Capacity, capability and funding are fundamental to implementing Vision Zero. It is not just a question of the extent of resourcing that is needed to achieve the required change, but also what changes are needed to ensure we maximise value from existing levels of resourcing.</p> <p>Funding is a very important question in light of the funding constraints NZTA is under, which led to NZTA running a workshop series for councils across New Zealand to discuss how funding shortfalls would be managed. This raises a live question as to whether the capability, capacity and funding are available to implement <i>Road to Zero</i>.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends greater attention is given in <i>Road to Zero</i> as to how the strategy will be implemented, including addressing the issues of capability, capacity, and funding.</p>
3	<p><i>Road to Zero</i> identifies that there has been insufficient leadership and sector capacity necessary for successful implementation of <i>Safer Journeys</i>. <i>Road to Zero</i> has strengthening leadership, support and co-ordination as one of 14 actions. The Committee considers that this action underlies every other action as a precondition to success.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends that strengthening leadership, support and co-ordination is seen as a precondition of successfully implementing Vision Zero.</p>

Our Target

We will aim to reduce the deaths and serious injuries on our roads by **40%** in 10 years

We know it will take time to make the changes we need.

Last year, 377 people died in crashes on the roads. We think we need to lower the number of people being really hurt on our roads by 40% in the next 10 years.

That would mean that 150 fewer people would die in crashes in 2030 than they did last year.

➤ What do you think of this target?

- ☐ That target is too high
- ☐ It sounds about right
- ☐ That target is not high enough
- ☒ Don't know (more information is required about the analysis underlying the target)

If you want to write some notes about this target, you can do it here

	Comment	Recommendation
4	<p>The Committee commends the leadership shown by the Government in setting a target of a 40% reduction as a practical way of incentivising the change that is needed to set Vision Zero in motion.</p> <p>As <i>Road to Zero</i> does not comment in any detail on the analysis which underlies the target, it is impossible to know whether the target is too high or not high enough. It is noted that a 40% target takes us just below the level of fatalities that were occurring in 2013, just before fatalities began to increase again.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends more information be provided about the analysis underlying the <i>Road to Zero</i> target, including the specific actions and funding approach that has been assumed.</p>
5	<p>Road Controlling Authorities would be interested to know if the Integrated Intervention Logic Model used to derive the target could be applied regionally, with regional inputs, or even locally, to address specific road safety issues at a regional or sub-regional level.</p>	<p>The Committee also recommends regard be had to whether modelling could and should also be undertaking at a regional or sub-regional level.</p>

Our principles

Principles help us to make decisions and outline our values. We have proposed seven guiding principles for road safety.

(1) **We plan for people's mistakes**

We can plan for people's mistakes on the roads so that they don't hurt themselves or others when they happen.

To what extent do you support this principle?

Strongly oppose	Mildly oppose	Mildly support	Strongly support	I don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you have further comments on this principle?

	Comment	Recommendation
6	<p>It is not clear whether principles have been prioritised, but without otherwise saying, a priority in numerical order is implied. Planning for mistakes is important, but should not be first in order of magnitude of the principles.</p> <p>Greater emphasis is needed on providing better driver training so we can minimise the potential for mistakes to happen in the first place.</p>	<p>Principles 4, 5 6, and 7 are the strongest principles and the Committee recommends that they should be ordered as such.</p> <p>The Committee recommends greater emphasis on driver training to help avoid mistakes.</p>

(2) **We design our roads for human bodies**

Our bodies are strong, but they can only survive certain forces before they're injured. We will design our road system to protect people from high-speed crash forces.

To what extent do you support this principle?

Strongly oppose	Mildly oppose	Mildly support	Strongly support	I don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you have further comments on this principle?

None.

(3) We strengthen all parts of the road transport system

We need to improve the safety of all parts of the road system – safe roads, safe speeds, safe vehicles, and safe road users – so that if one part fails, other parts will protect people.

To what extent do you support this principle?

Strongly oppose	Mildly oppose	Mildly support	Strongly support	I don't know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you have further comments on this principle?

	Comment	Recommendation
7	The Committee strongly supports the retention of the safe system approach which involves the four pillars of road safety (speeds, vehicles, road use, roads and roadsides). A concern has been raised by local government organisations that funding has been largely focused on State Highways in the major areas. Improvements on local roads, including rural roads and provincial state highways are also required and specific targeted funding will be needed to make progress. The priority for local councils tends to be maintaining existing assets, and it can be difficult to fund road improvements.	The Committee recommends that <i>Road to Zero</i> recognise and respond to concerns that local roads and roadsides are not currently receiving sufficient investment.

8	<i>Road to Zero</i> does not define what constitutes a “safe road”. This should be made clear within the One Road Network Classification for each category of road.	The Committee recommends that a nationally consistent approach be taken to defining a “safe road”.
9	There is a concern that road safety education has been declining in some areas within the Canterbury region with a reduction in road safety coordinators and expertise, as well as a reduction in NZTA funding. This makes 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. The Committee notes that enhancing safety and accessibility of footpaths, bike lanes and cycleways should always be linked to driver education given the underlying causes of the majority of car/cycle and car/pedestrian crashes.	The Committee recommends that <i>Road to Zero</i> ensure sufficient weight is given to the importance of driver education.
10	In 2017, driver distraction was a contributing factor in 36 fatal crashes and 192 serious injury crashes across New Zealand (approximately 10%). The NZTA website indicates that anything that diverts a driver’s attention for more than two seconds can significantly increase the likelihood of a crash or near crash. Causes can include mobile phones, music devices such as iPods, driver information screens and GPS devices, food and drink, other passengers and scenery.	The Committee recommends that <i>Road to Zero</i> ensure that sufficient weight is given to the increasing importance of addressing driver distraction.

(4) We have a shared responsibility for improving road safety

We all have a part to play in making our roads safe.

To what extent do you support this principle?

Strongly
oppose

☐

Mildly
oppose

☐

Mildly
support

☐

Strongly
support

☒

I don’t
know

☐

Do you have further comments on this principle?

	Comment	Recommendation
12	The Committee considers that the community must start taking ownership of road safety. <i>Road to Zero</i> does not consider how a change in community attitudes could be	The Committee recommends that <i>Road to Zero</i> expressly consider

	achieved. To take action, the community needs to talk about the risks they are exposed to on the road. Research has just been completed on community attitudes in Canterbury and will be available on Environment Canterbury's website shortly.	how changing community attitudes can be achieved.
13	While the Committee agrees that road safety is the responsibility of all, the Committee considers that strong leadership from central government is vital, given that central government sets the fundamental policy settings for the road safety system, and also that many solutions have a national dimension or require a partnership approach. Overseas experience also suggests that very strong, focused partnerships to deliver safety outcomes across central government, local government, police and other emergency services, are key to improved performance.	The Committee recommends that the principles recognise the need for central government leadership and reflect a stronger call to partnership action.
14	Local government is a key stakeholder in road safety and partners with NZTA in funding road safety interventions. The Committee wishes to ensure the role of local government is adequately reflected in <i>Road to Zero</i> .	The Committee also recommends the development of action plans in partnership with Road Controlling Authorities that include more specific targets against which individual actions can be assessed.

(5) We do the things that will make a difference

We'll base our decisions on research and we review everything we do to make sure we are doing the things that will make the biggest improvements to safety.

To what extent do you support this principle?

Strongly
oppose

☐

Mildly
oppose

☐

Mildly
support

☐

Strongly
support

☒

I don't
know

☐

Do you have further comments on this principle?

Comment	Recommendation
---------	----------------

15	The Committee wishes to highlight the need for an improvement in access to quality data and analysis of that data. It can be difficult for Road Controlling Authorities, particularly in smaller councils, to access quality information and translate that information into interventions and evaluation of those interventions. If the interventions that fall out of <i>Road to Zero</i> are not data driven, we risk not achieving Vision Zero.	The Committee recommends that greater weight is given in <i>Road to Zero</i> to access to quality data and analysis of that data, as well as support Road Controlling Authorities.
16	There are many organisations that have data or information on road safety including Ministry of Transport, NZTA, NZ Police, ACC, health authorities and local government. <i>Road to Zero</i> needs to ensure that these parties are working in close collaboration so that the best possible evidence is available to support investment decisions. The use of new technology-based solutions is supported.	The Committee recommends greater collaboration led by central government to ensure the best possible evidence is available to support investment decisions.

(6) Our actions improve people's health, wellbeing and our places

Our roads are places where people meet, shop, and play. When we make decisions about road safety, we will also think about how to support healthier people and make towns and spaces that are nicer to live in.

To what extent do you support this principle?

Strongly
oppose

☐

Mildly
oppose

☐

Mildly
support

☐

Strongly
support

☒

I don't
know

☐

Do you have further comments on this principle?

	Comment	Recommendation
17	The principle as currently articulated does not recognise the important role of public transport in advancing road safety. Buses and trains are the safest vehicles in which people can travel. Multiple individual journeys being made with one professional driver reduces the risk of accidents as fewer car trips and vehicle manoeuvres reduce exposure within the network. Public transport also provides a viable, cost effective alternative choice to using a vehicle in circumstances where a	The Committee recommends amending the principle so it reads: "Our road safety actions support health, wellbeing and liveable places, and the uptake of public and active transport options".

	<p>person cannot drive safely. With an aging population, this will become more important by 2030.</p> <p>Increasing uptake of public transport is also a sustainable way of increasing uptake of safer vehicles, without relying on changes in technology and the vehicle fleet. There is a clear link between Travel Demand Management (TDM) and road safety, and this needs to be strengthened in Road to Zero.</p>	<p>The Committee also recommends ensuring that the role of public and active transport in increasing road safety is reflected in <i>Road to Zero</i>.</p>
18	<p>There is also an important link between freight mode shift (from road to rail and coastal shipping) – and road safety. The Canterbury Regional Transport Committee has supported the work of the South Island Regional Transport Committee Chairs Group to determine an optimised freight mode split and a copy of this report is available on Environment Canterbury's website https://www.ecan.govt.nz.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends that the importance of freight mode shift to road safety through removing heavy vehicles from the road, is recognised in <i>Road to Zero</i>.</p>

(7) We make safety a critical decision-making priority

We will treat safety as a high priority when we make decisions. Helping people to get places on time is important, but it should not be achieved at the expense of safety.

To what extent do you support this principle?

Strongly
oppose

☐

Mildly
oppose

☐

Mildly
support

☐

Strongly
support

☒

I don't
know

☐

Do you have further comments on this principle?

	Comment	Recommendation
19	<p>It is important that this principle is fully reflected in government funding frameworks and allocations. NZTA's Investment Decision Making Framework reflects this principle at a high level, but there is a question about the extent to which it has been practically implemented.</p> <p>Beyond reference to the Safe Network Programme, there is a question as to how road safety outcomes will be funded in amongst the other priorities in the Government Policy</p>	<p>The Committee recommends government funding frameworks fully reflect this principle and trade-offs with other objectives are explicitly addressed.</p>

	Statement on Land Transport and how trade-offs with objectives such as access and sustainability will be addressed.	
--	---	--

Do you have any other comments about any of our principles?

None.

Focus areas

Our five focus areas

- Safer roads and safer speeds
- Vehicle safety
- Work-related road safety
- Road user choices
- System management

There are five things we want to focus on.

1. Safer roads and footpaths, and safer speeds

We can make our roads and footpaths safer by separating fast moving cars from each other, and keep cars and trucks separated from pedestrians and bikes.

Safer speeds on the most risky roads will save lives, and make it less stressful for other people who are walking and biking or travelling with children.

To what extent do you support this focus area?

Strongly
oppose



Mildly
oppose



Mildly
support



Strongly
support



I don't
know



Do you have further comments on this focus area?

	Comment	Recommendation
20	<p>The Committee considers both infrastructure investment and speed management critical to achieving Vision Zero. The Committee is concerned that the recent emphasis on speed management is intended to compensate for insufficient infrastructure investment. As such, the Committee considers infrastructure and speed should be separated as focus areas. In some cases, roads of strategic importance may need engineering up rather than a change to the posted speed limit. However, in most cases, MegaMaps recommends a lowering of the posted speed limit, rather than engineering up. Some councils have concerns about whether adequate consideration has been given to engineering up roads of strategic importance.</p> <p>The Committee also considers that uptake of public transport services, as well as improved roading infrastructure and lower posted speed limits, need to be part of the investment response.</p>	<p>That infrastructure and speed be separated as focus areas, to ensure infrastructure investment receive proper consideration, and that service investment also be considered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focus area one: Investment in infrastructure and services• Focus area two: Speed management.
22	<p>As outlined under the principles section, funding for local road safety improvements has been lacking to date and there is a need for significant additional funding to address the poor crash record on rural local roads.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends that <i>Road to Zero</i> include more emphasis on road safety interventions on rural roads and how they can be resourced.</p>

2. Vehicle safety

Safer cars, buses, and motorbikes not only help drivers avoid crashes, but also protect people when crashes do happen.

To what extent do you support this focus area?

Strongly
oppose



Mildly
oppose



Mildly
support



Strongly
support



I don't
know



Do you have further comments on this focus area?

	Comment	Recommendation
23	Road to Zero notes the potential for autonomous vehicles to have an impact on road safety, but considers this kind of technology as likely to be outside <i>Road to Zero's</i> time horizon. There is a possibility that this does not adequately recognise the fast pace at which vehicle technology is changing.	The Committee recommends that the focus area on vehicle safety also considers the integration of autonomous vehicles within the fleet, alongside considering other potential technological improvements.
24	The Committee considers that the trade off with raising safety standards for vehicles entering the fleet, with sustainability, needs to be articulated.	The Committee recommends that <i>Road to Zero</i> articulate the trade off between raising safety standards for vehicles entering the fleet with sustainability.
25	The Committee supports safety initiatives such as including lifting minimum standards, retrofitting safety technology and removing unsafe vehicles from the fleet. The TSIG submission indicates that 45% of the existing vehicle fleet is at 1 star or lower. There is a need to provide greater public education on vehicle safety so that the public have a clear understanding of the safety of the vehicles they are driving or intend purchasing.	The Committee recommend <i>Road to Zero</i> include an action of educating the public on the safety rating of their vehicle - this could potentially be done by labelling as part of the current Warrant of Fitness test.
26	Only transitory attention is paid in <i>Road to Zero</i> to the safety features of heavy vehicles; yet when these vehicles are involved in a crash the outcomes are generally more severe.	The Committee recommends that safety features for heavy vehicles receives more consideration in <i>Road to Zero</i> .
27	The Committee supports the intention to review warrant of fitness and certificate of fitness systems to ensure existing cars	The Committee recommends that the

	in the fleet are as safe as they can be. The Committee questions whether changes to improve fleet safety need as long a lead in time as contemplated by Road to Zero.	Government consider bringing the implementation dates for both new and imported secondhand vehicles forward.
--	---	--

3. *Work-related road safety*

Every day, thousands of people travel on our roads while at work. All of them have the right to come home from work healthy and safe.

To what extent do you support this focus area?

Strongly
oppose

☐

Mildly
oppose

☐

Mildly
support

☐

Strongly
support

☒

I don't
know

☐

Do you have further comments on this focus area?

	Comment	Recommendation
28	The Committee supports the focus on work-related road safety. The Committee supports strengthening commercial transport regulation as an immediate action. A clear definition as to what best practice is, in the New Zealand context, is needed within the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.	The Committee recommends addressing best practice for work-related road safety. Driver hours and fatigue is also a significant concern and the Committee recommends that this particular issue is given immediate attention.

4. *Road user choices*

Although most road users try to follow the rules, many of us sometimes make bad choices or mistakes.

We need to help people follow the rules and make good choices, and take care of each other.

To what extent do you support this focus area?

Strongly
oppose



Mildly
oppose



Mildly
support



Strongly
support



I don't
know



Do you have further comments on this focus area?

	Comment	Recommendation
29	<p>The Committee supports the focus on encouraging road users to make better choices and the emphasis on road safety education. Shifting public mindsets and behaviours, and obtaining buy in to Vision Zero is essential.</p> <p>However, as noted briefly under the principles section, <i>Road to Zero</i> does not provide any indication of how a change in community attitudes could be achieved or consider the leadership that is needed to bring about such a change.</p> <p>Road safety education requires a strong partnership among central and local government as well as many other partners and stakeholders. However, <i>Road to Zero</i> does not address the role of local government road safety co-ordinators – there has been a large decline in the number of co-ordinators around the country, compromising the ability of local government to deliver education.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends <i>Road to Zero</i> explicitly address the action and leadership that is needed to shift community mindsets and the role of local government road safety co-ordinators in doing so.</p>

5. System management

We need to work together so we can make a difference.

To what extent do you support this focus area?

Strongly
oppose



Mildly
oppose



Mildly
support



Strongly
support



I don't
know



Do you have further comments on this focus area?

	Comment	Recommendation
30	<p>The Committee supports the increased focus on effective leadership, co-ordination and partnering, including the recognition of the role of local government and Regional Transport Committees.</p> <p>Currently, Regional Land Transport Plans (RLTPs) are not given sufficient mandate and recognition as part of the land transport planning and funding framework. Transport Special Interest Group (TSIG) is working on developing a more consistent format and content for RLTPs across the country. As part of this, TSIG is also working with NZTA to identify the parts of RLTPs where improved consistency and best practice could add the most value in supporting NZTA to make decisions under the Investment Decision Making Framework (IDMF).</p> <p>TSIG would like to see NZTA take account of the strategic direction and outcomes contained within an RLTP as part of the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) development and funding approval processes, and have greater regard to regional priorities when making investment decisions under the IDFM.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends that NZTA give greater weight to prioritisation within Regional Land Transport Plans when making decisions under the IDMF to ensure that critical regional infrastructure and service projects are supported, including critical safety projects.</p>
31	<p>It is noted that NZTA, the Ministry of Transport and NZ Police have formed a road safety partnership to support joined-up delivery of the 2018-21 Road Safety Partnership Programme. To support a more integrated and co-ordinated approach, local government should also be included in this partnership.</p>	<p>The Committee also recommends that local government be represented on the Road Safety Partnership.</p>

Do you have any other comments about these focus areas?

No.

Actions

Here is a list of our proposed initial actions for the first action plan.

Please select **three** you think are the most important:

1. Invest in safety treatments and infrastructure improvements
2. Introduce a new approach to tackling unsafe speeds
3. Review infrastructure standards and guidelines
4. Enhance safety and accessibility of footpaths, bike lanes and cycleways
5. Raise safety standards for vehicles entering the fleet
6. Promote the availability of vehicle safety information
7. Implement mandatory anti-lock braking systems (ABS) for motorcycles
8. Support best practice for work-related travel
9. Strengthen the regulation of commercial transport services
10. Prioritise road policing
11. Enhance drug driver testing
12. Support motorcycle safety
13. Review financial penalties and remedies
14. Strengthen system leadership, support and co-ordination

The Canterbury Regional Transport Committee supports the priorities identified by Transport Special Interest Group, which are:

1. Invest in safety treatments and infrastructure improvements
2. Introduce a new approach to tackling unsafe speeds
3. Raise safety standards for vehicles entering the fleet.

In addition, the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee supports the proposal by Transport Special Interest Group to view the strengthening of system leadership, support and co-ordination as a pre-condition to achieve all other actions outlined above.

Do you have any comments about these priority actions?

	Comment	Recommendation
32	<p>The Regional Transport Committee does not possess a body of information and modelling to be able to make a fully informed decision based on evidence as to which of the action areas are required in Canterbury/across New Zealand and in what combination to achieve the target outlined in <i>Road to Zero</i> as well as, ultimately, Vision Zero itself.</p> <p>The Committee supports the same priorities proposed by Transport Special Interest Group because it is clear that speed and unsafe vehicles contribute significantly to deaths and serious injuries in Canterbury and across New Zealand, and that investing in safety treatments, and infrastructure and service improvements will be vital to improving outcomes. Improving leadership, and addressing issues relating to capability, capacity and funding is clearly a pre-condition to successful implementation of any actions.</p> <p>The top priority actions, however, should ultimately be based on evidence relating to the greatest potential to reduce deaths and serious, and whether those actions are a pre-condition for the success of other interventions.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends that the <i>Road to Zero</i> provide more information about the actions which would result in the greatest reduction in deaths and serious injuries, and which are a necessary pre-condition to other actions to improve road safety.</p> <p>The Committee also recommends that Vision Zero implementation be aligned with long term planning and funding cycles.</p>
33	<p>The Committee are interested in the new approach to tackling unsafe speeds. The Committee wish to take this opportunity to highlight the need for national consistency. Some issues transcend district and regional boundaries - for example, the question about whether there should be a default rural speed limit of 80km/hour and urban residential speed limit of 40km/hour, and the approach to consulting on and implementing speed changes. Ultimately, the speed environment should align with the One Network Road Classification (ONRC) and the approach needs to be consistent across geographical boundaries. Central government needs to address the requirements of consultation processes where the changes in question are supported by evidence and required to give effect to <i>Road to Zero</i>.</p>	<p>The Committee recommends that a nationally consistent approach, led by central government be taken to tackling unsafe speeds and determining the requirements of public consultation.</p>
34	<p>The Committee would also like to take this opportunity to reiterate that there is a need to avoid a default to lowering speed limits to improve road safety. There should be a greater emphasis on taking a comprehensive Safe System Approach where engineering solutions should also be seriously considered, alongside funding implications, as well as other speed reduction tools. These include speed cameras and police enforcement</p> <p>The Committee wishes to highlight that while MegaMaps is seen by many as a good starting point for identifying speed changes, there is a widely-held view that further technical and</p>	<p>The Committee recommends a greater emphasis on a Safe System Approach when considering speed management interventions, and that technical and expert analysis support the use of the MegaMaps tool in identifying speed changes.</p>

	expert analysis is vital to ensuring a robust, evidence-based set of complimentary recommendations for change. Some regard should be had to areas of great need and/or where public support is likely – such as lowering speed limits around schools and urban areas, and unsealed rural roads.	
35	The Committee notes that police speed tolerance and enforcement practices may influence driver behaviour. There is a need to ensure Police and central and local government actions are aligned – enforcement action should support the new approach. It is not clear whether the prioritisation of road policing refers to greater direction as to how police allocate resourcing, increases in resourcing, increasing enforcement or removing or reducing the speed tolerance.	The Committee recommends that police enforcement and partnership with central and local government be a key part of the drive to tackling unsafe speeds.
36	The Committee welcomes the proposed increase of safety cameras. International evidence supports national safety camera deployment and signing strategies, often delivered by close partnerships between central and local government and enforcement agencies. The Committee would welcome a stronger commitment to the significant expansion of speed enforcement and red-light running resources in the early years of strategy implementation as an action which would likely greatly improve the chances of the 40% target being achieved. Many Road Controlling Authorities see safety cameras as low cost solutions to road safety concerns and may be willing to invest in their installation. However, under the current model only the police can take enforcement action and there are limitations with their backend processing capacity. Changes to the current model could vastly improve the opportunity to deploy more of these valuable road safety resources.	The Committee recommends the proposed increase in safety cameras be an immediate action for tackling unsafe speeds.
37	The Committee supports the review of the penalties regime. There is a 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). Another concern is the ability to continue to drive on a limited licence after a restricted or full licence has been revoked.	The Committee considers cellphone use, poor restraint use, and the ability to drive on a limited licence after a restricted or full licence has been revoked, should be considered in the review of the penalties regime.
38	The list of actions includes both “support motorcycle safety” and “Implement mandatory anti-lock braking systems (ABS) for motorcycles”. The latter is very specific and should not be included as a separate action.	The Committee recommends all motorcycle-related actions be included in a single action “support motorcycle safety”.

Additional actions

What else do you think we should do to make the roads safer?

	Comment	Recommendation
39	New technological solutions have the potential to deliver significant improvements to road safety outcomes as well as creating additional hazards. <i>Road to Zero</i> needs to ensure both possible dimensions of technological advances will be addressed.	The Committee recommends a specific action covering the rollout of new technology to improve road safety and managing the disruptions posed by technology.
40	As outlined earlier in this submission, the Committee considers there are serious issues with access to quality information and ensuring support is in place to analyse information and use it to develop, implement and evaluate initiatives. The Committee considers an explicit action, or sub-action, is needed to address this issue.	The Committee recommends an action on improving access to quality information, and analysis of that information, for the purposes of investment planning and decision making.
41	Councils have concerns about safety at level crossings, as KiwiRail is not funded to improve the interface between the rail and roading systems and this poses serious risks to safety.	The Committee recommends the ongoing issue of safety at level crossings be addressed in <i>Road to Zero</i> .

Measuring success

The *Road to Zero* provides a list of key measures that can help us track progress and meet our targets. This framework will help us monitor how the road safety system is performing, drive action and hold agencies publicly accountable for delivering the strategy.

Do you have any comments about the way we intend to monitor our performance?

	Comment	Recommendation
42	The Committee strongly supports the proposed monitoring regime. <i>Safer Journeys</i> was not supported by a comprehensive monitoring framework to enable an effective way in which to adjust the strategy or actions when it became clear that the desired targets would not be met. The Committee suggests that there is a need to develop national data capture and reporting functionality to allow for reporting on a regional and sub regional basis.	The Committee recommends that consideration be given to the need to report on a regional and sub-regional basis.
43	<i>Road to Zero</i> includes a measure of 40km/hour for urban schools – best practice is 30km/hour.	The Committee recommends a measure of

		30km/hour for urban schools be considered.
44	The measures are heavily focused on reducing speed limits, and could be achieved if a national approach is taken to implementation. As speed reductions appear to be the focus of the measurements rather than proportion of the network when upgrades to the network have been put in place, the action plan needs to reflect this, with the Government driving the process and not individual Road Controlling Authorities as is currently the case.	The Committee notes the emphasis in the measures on reducing speed limits and recommends the Government lead the drive for nationally consistent implementation of speed limit reductions. The Committee also considers there is a need to separate out monitoring of speed and infrastructure improvements, and ensure infrastructure improvements are appropriately monitored.
45	The Committee considers a number of additional measures might also be useful.	The Committee recommends monitoring the number of deaths and serious injuries where the vulnerable road user is not at fault; qualitative assessment such as public perceptions on safety (in particular, on matters such as speed management); police enforcement; and the percentage implementation of speed limit interventions on the top 10% of high risk roads (state highways and local roads).

Additional supporting information

If you would like to provide any additional supporting material, you can attach it here. Please note, this is not required.

None.

Use of information

The Ministry of Transport will publish a summary of submissions, which may include quotes from individual submitters.

Do you want your submission to be anonymous and your name or organisation's name to be withheld from any information that the Ministry of Transport publishes?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Please check this box to acknowledge

☒ I understand that this submission will be classified as Official Information and may be subject to public release under the Official Information Act 1982 if requested.

Thank you for helping us

Once you have filled in your answers, please send this back to the Ministry of Transport by:

5pm Wednesday, 14 August 2019

You can **email** it to

roadsafetystrategy@transport.govt.nz

Or **post** it to

Helen Presland

Ministry of Transport

PO Box 3175

Wellington 6140

6.9 Advocacy for Low Emission Vehicles

Canterbury Regional Transport Committee

Date of meeting	8 August 2019
Author	Simon Fraser, Regional Forums secretariat, Environment Canterbury
Endorsed by	Sam Elder, Senior Strategy Manager, Environment Canterbury

Purpose

1. The Mayoral Forum intends to write to Ministers to seek increased action by central government on transitioning to low-emission vehicles.
2. Support for the attached draft letter is sought from the Regional Transport Committee (RTC).

Recommendations

That the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee:

- 1. agree to support the attached Canterbury Mayoral Forum letter advocating for increased central government action on transitioning to low-emission vehicles**
- 2. agree that the Chair of the Regional Transport Committee be a signatory to the attached letter.**

Key points

3. The Canterbury Climate Change Steering Group (CCSG) was established in February 2019 to provide political oversight and direction on climate change issues for the region, reporting to the Canterbury Mayoral Forum. The CCSG is chaired by Mayor Sam Broughton.
4. The CCSG are asking the Mayoral Forum to write to the Ministers for Transport and Climate Change advocating for increased action from central government in increasing the number of low-emission vehicles on our roads (draft letter attached). This includes 'in-principal' support for the Government's proposed subsidies on low-emission vehicles, but also for increased focus on electric vehicle infrastructure and further support to increase the use of low-emission vehicles to deliver public transport services.
5. As the subject of the letter covers both the Climate Change and Transport portfolios, the CCSG have asked if the:
 - RTC would support the proposed letter

- Chair of the RTC would be a signatory to the letter (letters from the Mayoral Forum are always signed by the Mayoral Forum chair and lead Mayor of Mayoral Forum workstreams).

Next steps

6. Following discussion by the RTC, the attached letter will be circulated to the Canterbury Mayoral Forum for feedback and endorsement. If the letter is supported by the Mayoral Forum, it will be sent to Ministers before the end of August.

Attachments

- CCS G-letter Transport Minister on low emissions

date

Hon Phil Twyford
Minister of Transport
Parliament Buildings
Wellington

p.twyford@ministers.govt.nz

Hon James Shaw
Minister for Climate Change
Parliament Buildings
Wellington

j.shaw@ministers.govt.nz

Dear Ministers

Transitioning to low-emission transport options

We are writing on behalf of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum to advocate for increased priority from central government to help New Zealand transition to low-emission transport options. Reducing our transport emissions is seen by many as an integral part of our response to climate change.

The Canterbury Mayoral Forum established a Climate Change Steering Group in February 2019 (consisting of Mayors and Chief Executives) to provide leadership, political oversight and direction for the region on climate change.

We note calls made recently by the Productivity Commission and the Interim Climate Change Committee to prioritise action to reduce transport emissions as a key step in mitigating the effects of climate change. These calls align with the strategy in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018. The Canterbury Mayoral Forum echoes these sentiments, as significant action is needed in the short to medium term to help reduce our country's emissions.

We welcome, and support in-principal, the announcement that the Government is considering subsidies for low-emissions vehicles. Light-vehicles contribute the majority of emissions across the transport network, but cost is seen by many as a barrier to purchasing low emission vehicles. Any subsidies to overcome this barrier will help improve the viability of low emission vehicles for both businesses and private consumers. Timeframes for implementing subsidies should be brought forward, where possible, to encourage early uptake of low-emission vehicles.

Further consideration is also needed of taxes for higher emissions vehicles. Exemptions should be considered, particularly for those where suitable low-emission vehicles aren't readily available (such as small businesses that require vans for example) or for members of our community where affordability is an issue.

To be ready for an increase in low emissions vehicles, and electric vehicles in particular, we need to ensure sufficient services and infrastructure are in place. This includes working with the fuel sector to increase the availability of hybrid fuels, ensuring the vehicle service industry has the

Mayors standing together for Canterbury.

Secretariat, E: secretariat@canterburymayors.org.nz W: www.canterburymayors.org.nz
C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

capability to maintain an increasing number of low-emissions vehicles, and establishing a network of electric vehicle charging stations across the country.

We see the lack of a coordinated electric vehicle charging network to be a significant barrier to increasing the use of electric vehicles. The current approach is ad hoc and generally undertaken by private businesses (such as supermarkets) or local communities.

Local government is seeing increased pressure and demand for electric vehicle infrastructure, using council land and resources to establish charging stations. While local councils are willing to support electric vehicle infrastructure where we can, affordability will be a barrier. Central government planning and funding support is needed to ensure that there is a nationwide network of electric vehicle charging stations.

Just as vital to reducing emissions is the necessity of incentivising mode shift to public transport. Lifting public transport patronage offers the opportunity to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles on our roads and associated emissions, alongside numerous other co-benefits. Canterbury councils are working to grow public transport patronage, including developing business cases for greater investment in greater Christchurch, and piloting innovative approaches to public transport in smaller urban communities.

Environmentally-friendly vehicles offer a more attractive travel experiencing and would be likely to increase uptake of public transport. Operators across the country are already starting to make the move towards low-emission vehicles, such as the current trial of electric buses on selected bus routes in Christchurch. However, further funding is needed for local councils to drive change.

With climate change becoming an ever-increasing issue for our communities, it is vital that we start taking action now to reduce emissions and limit the impacts where we can. Transport lies at the heart of climate change mitigation and transitioning to low-emissions transport options is a first step on this journey.

The Canterbury Mayoral Forum reaffirms its willingness to work alongside central government on climate change and transport options.

Yours sincerely

Lianne Dalziel Chair, Canterbury Mayoral Forum	Sam Broughton Chair, Canterbury Mayoral Forum Climate Change Steering Group

6.10 Variation to Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan – Rolleston Town Centre Major Intersection Upgrades

Canterbury Regional Transport Committee

Date of Meeting	8 August 2019
Author	Andrew Mazey Asset Manager Transportation
Endorsed by	Lorraine Johns Principal Strategy Adviser, Environment Canterbury

Purpose

1. To amend the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) pursuant to section 18D of the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA) by adding “Rolleston Town Centre Major Intersection Upgrades” into the programme of activities for Selwyn District Council.

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. The RTC must consider any variation request promptly.
4. 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.
5. 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. **Notes that the following improvement specific activities are proposed as a variation to the Regional Land Transport Plan:**
 - a. Traffic Signals at Lowes Road/Tennyson Street Intersection
 - b. Traffic Signals at Rolleston Drive/Tennyson Street Intersection

2. **Determines that the requested variation is not significant.**
3. **Agrees to vary the Regional Land Transport Plan by adding the proposed activities to Appendix A 'Activities included in the Canterbury Land Transport Programme'.**
4. **Recommends this variation to Environment Canterbury.**

Key points

6. The new Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018 (GPS) identifies safety, access, environment and value for money as the four strategic priorities the Government is focused on investing in to drive improved performance in the land transport system.
7. These projects identified for inclusion in the RLTP strongly align to the theme of mode neutrality in the new GPS which requires all transport options to be considered from a “whole of system” perspective. These town centre projects also reflect the outcomes of integrated transport and land use planning.
8. These projects are identified in Selwyn Council’s Long Term Plan and reflect Selwyn’s response to the significant growth it is experiencing in Rolleston which is a Key Activity Centre within the Greater Christchurch area. The upgrade of the existing roundabout intersections with traffic signals provides for safer use by all modes, including pedestrians and cyclists, at these main transport network nodes in the town centre. It coordinates with a wider series of construction projects to enhance the town centre in Rolleston that will be commencing shortly.
9. The following specific Rolleston roading projects are proposed for the period 2019-21 for inclusion in the current RLTP:
 - a. Traffic Signals at Lowes Road/Tennyson Street Intersection \$2.7 million
 - b. Traffic Signals at Rolleston Drive/Tennyson Street Intersection \$2.3 million
10. The work will be completed under Work Category 324 “Road Improvements” with the standard 51% Funding Assistance Rate.
11. The projects are strongly aligned with the RLTP priority investment areas of “safety”, “accessibility” and environmental impact as these projects underpin a thriving town centre which will cater for a range of different transport modes.
12. Each of these projects has a total cost of less than \$5 million and no reasons exist to suggest they reach the significance threshold in the RLTP. Public consultation is not therefore required.

Attachments:

1. None