

OC220617

30 August 2022

s 9(2)(a)

Tēnā koe ^{s 9(2)(a)}

I refer to your email dated 19 July 2022, requesting the following under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act):

"May I request:

- Details of the "Portfolio Investment Appraisal" (PIA) process and a copy of the PIA template used by the ATAP Working Group at the MoT led workshops in 2020.
- Details of the seven 'packages' following the PIA workshops.
- Any official advice or correspondence as to why ATAP investments were not assessed per clause 89 of GPS 2021."

On 27 July 2022, the Ministry of Transport (the Ministry) advised you that, pursuant to section 15A of the Act, I extended the deadline for the response to 30 August 2022. On the same day, Auckland Transport made partial transfer of your request below to the Ministry Transport as the information to which your request relates is held by us:

"Details of AT's "Portfolio Investment Appraisal" (PIA) process and a copy of the PIA template"

This response addresses both requests.

The seven documents that fall within the scope of your request are enclosed in the document schedule attached as **Annex one.**

Documents one to six fall within scope of part one of the request "Details of the "*Portfolio Investment Appraisal*" (*PIA*) process..." and documents seven and eight relate to part two of the request "*Details of the seven 'packages'*...".

Part three of the request, "Any official advice or correspondence as to why ATAP investments were not assessed per clause 89 of GPS 2021" will be refused under section 18(e) as the information does not exist.

With regard to part three, the ATAP investments were assessed against objectives agreed by the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Finance and the Mayor of Auckland, the sponsors of the work. These objectives reflected the intent of the GPS. Alternatives were considered through a series of workshops in 2020. This approach means that there is no official advice or correspondence as to why ATAP investments were not assessed per clause 89 of Government Policy Statement for Land Transport 2021 (GPS-LT).

For more information, you may wish to visit the Cabinet paper linked below, which outlines the ATAP investment package.

https://www.transport.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/ATAP-2021-31-Cabinet-Paper.pdf



You have the right to seek an investigation and review of this response by the Ombudsman, in accordance with section 28(3) of the Act. The relevant details can be found on the Ombudsman's website <u>www.ombudsman.parliament.nz</u>

The Ministry publishes our Official Information Act responses and the information contained in our reply to you may be published on the Ministry website. Before publishing we will remove any personal or identifiable information.

Nāku noa, nā

cos

Karen Lyons Director, Auckland



Annex one - Document schedule

	Document	Description of information withheld	Previously released?
1.	ATAP workshop 2	Release in full.	No
2.	Briefing - Decision Conferencing for assessing Portfolios	Release in full.	No
3.	ATAP Criteria Workshop Slides	Release in full.	No
4.	Evaluation Criteria	Release in full.	No
5.	ATAP Process	Release in full.	No
6.	ATAP Process v4	Release in full.	No
7.	Excerpts ATAP RLTP Slides for Design and Delivery Committee Meeting 23 October Final	Release in full.	No
8.	Appendix 1 ATAP Packages	Release in full.	No

ATAP 2020 Update: Partner Workshop 13 July 2020





















- Provide an outline of the MoT's Portfolio Investment Approach (PIA)
- Assist Partners to understand how the RA process works

office of the office

Agenda

- Purpose
- Introductions
- PIA Context
- Overview
- Ideation
- Preparation
- Prioritisation
- Results Review
- ASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT Portfolio Generation Delivery Planning

Portfolio Investment Approach (PIA) Context

- The MoT is developing a new approach to how it delivers strategic investment advice which will support a 10 to 50 year perspective on investment across the whole transport system – that is the PIA
- The PIA lifts the Ministry's capability to shape investment advice across the land, maritime and air transport systems over short, medium and long-term horizons
- Development of the PIA has involved MoT, KiwiRail, NZTA, Maritime NZ and MHUD. Governance includes key agencies along with MoD and an independent advisor with air and maritime experience

Why this approach?

- The PIA enables the comparison and prioritisation of projects across a portfolio (e.g. transport and urban development) on a value for money basis
- PIA allows for the comparison of projects at different stages of their development (concept to detailed business case stage)
- PIA is designed to involve a wide range of agencies, stakeholders and perspectives in the development of investment advice, as well as enabling integrated planning of transport and land use

Portfolio Investment Approach (PIA)

Ministry of Transport



Ideation

Ideation Process informed by future thinking



. FASH

- Investment candidate options come from a wide range of sources
- Caters for different levels of maturity between candidate options
- Candidates are organised into an MCDA 'model' to group more 'alike' options with each other eg Urban Mobility, Domestic Freight, ... (making initial comparisons easier for evaluators)

Preparation

Preparation Criteria Safetv Environment Economy **Options Detail**

- Criteria need to be developed suitable for the prioritisation process.
 In the PIA these have been developed with other agencies (MoT, NZTA, KiwiRail) and signed off by Governance
- Options detail is collected for candidates for prioritisation. Detail required is informed by the criteria and the MCDA prioritisation process. It is a requisite set and provision is less onerous than many might believe.
- The key is sufficient information to compare the value one project delivers relative to another. Can include quantifiable, non quantifiable or not yet quantified information.

Decision Conferencing

Prioritisation **Decision Conferencing** Evaluation all Options against all Criteria Scoring Normalisation Criteria Weiahtina

• Technical Process – MCDA, professionally facilitated

- Score options relative to each other, criterion by criterion
- Normalise the scores within a criterion to bring all the scores onto a common scale for each criterion
- Weight the criteria to take account of preference for a given amount of value against each criterion
- Social Process
 - Establish a shared understanding of project issues
 - Develop a sense of common purpose
 - Understand different perspectives and objectives
 - Gain agreement & commitment to the way forward from those implementing the decisions

Review Results



- Look at the results through two lenses:
 - 'Value-only' reflecting of the evaluation of value
 - 'Value-for-money' to determine where investments provide the best return on tax-payers dollars



Why use 'Value for Money'?

- Prioritisation of 59 projects
- These can be prioritised in two ways
- If budget is 8000, all options can be pursued
- If budget is 4000, then 80% more benefit is realised by funding options on the basis of benefit/cost

.ON ACT



Portfolio Generation – creating Portfolio Options



- Iterative process where science and art meet
- Start with the order which maximises the value for money delivered (order of priority)
- Check dependencies
- Consider synergies
- Apply constraints
- Does it work as a system

Throughout the aim is to maximise value for money while delivering a system that works • Output a high-level plan



Decision Conferencing for assessing Portfolios

Client Challenge

You are faced with evaluating a portfolio of options to provide advice and recommendations on an optimal portfolio to decision makers. You want to maximise the value delivered by the selected options for a given level of investment; in other words, optimise the portfolio based on value for money (VfM).

You want to be confident and clear on the options, how they perform relative to each other and the decision to be taken on the final portfolio. You also want the outcome to be transparent and to align stakeholders through the process – and the final decision to 'stick'.

What is an Evaluation Conference?

An Evaluation Conference is a tried and tested event using a process academically known as 'Decision Conferencing'. The process uses best practice analytical techniques and social processes to align a group of stakeholders on the decision to be taken. It is designed to draw out the varied perspectives and experience of stakeholders, increasing the level of shared understanding of the options.

In practice an Evaluation Conference is a group of stakeholders meeting in a highly structured workshop, facilitated by an independent expert in decision making. Subject matter experts brief the stakeholders and provide an opportunity for questions. Stakeholders then apply their judgement to determine the value options will deliver relative to each other from the perspective of the (stakeholder) group(s) they represent.

Evaluation Conferences are normally conducted in person. However, through the COVID-19 lockdown in New Zealand they have continued to be used successfully as online workshops using widely available video-conferencing tools.

History

As a process, 'Decision Conferencing' has evolved since its early practice by one of the founders of Catalyze, Professor Larry Phillips of the London School of Economics and Political Sciences. Larry first started 'Decision Conferencing' in 1981. Larry alone has facilitated over 300 Decision Conferences. An Evaluation Conference is one form of Decision Conference.

Evaluation Conferences have been used widely in the New Zealand public sector in the last 15 years with more recent examples covering decisions relating to the future of the Defence Force, future investment in Education Payroll (after Novopay), investments for the Police, Capital investment portfolios for a number of the District Health Boards, and investment choices in the Transport Sector in New Zealand to name a few.

The Decision Conferencing approach is recognised by the Treasury and this work has underpinned business cases that have received very favourable reviews through the Gateway process.

How does an Evaluation Conference work?

For participants, the conference can be a part-, full-, or sometimes multi-day workshop. The idea is to break the evaluation of the options into small conversations considering each evaluation criterion in turn. By looking at the options one criterion at a time, it is easier for the group of stakeholders to reach agreement on how each option performs.

The process requires no previous experience of Decision Conferencing; in fact, frequently it is a new experience for most people in the conference. Briefing packs in advance advise not just the Options being considered and the Evaluation Criteria but also how participants can best prepare themselves for the workshop.

The Criteria will have been developed by Decision Conferencing experts with active participation from stakeholders and cover a range of benefits, risks, and costs.

A Model on a Page represents all the available Options. In the model, Like' Options are grouped in Areas to assist in the evaluation process by having the evaluators assess similar Options first. An example of a Model on a Page is shown in Figure 1 below.



Figure 1: Model on a Page

Evaluating one criterion at a time, a process known as Scoring, the picture of how options perform builds until there is an overall view of how options perform relative to each other. Scoring conversations are a simple process that is explained in detail in the Conference. The work starts slowly to allow participants to gain familiarity with the process and then speeds up as understanding of the options and process grows.

What the results look like

Decision Conferencing is underpinned by an analytical technique called Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA). The results from an Evaluation Conference can be presented in many ways, usually live at the end of the conference.

A key view is a 'Tornado diagram' (see example in Figure 2) that shows how options perform relative to each other in terms of Value for Money - the total value against all Criteria (as evaluated by the group) divided by the cost of the Option. Each coloured segment on the right-hand side of the tornado provides a visual indication of how the option performed against a given criterion. This way the group gets to see how the options perform relative to each other, and how much each criterion contributes to their performance.

The Evaluation Conference scores options relative to each other, so the conversations build on one another during the conference. These rich conversations take up most of the time in the conferences. Continuous presence by the stakeholders conducting the evaluation throughout the conference is therefore essential to getting the best outcome.



Figure 2: Value for Money tornado diagram

The tornado diagram shows the best VfM Order of Priority (OOP), which is the key input to the next stage, namely Package/Portfolio Generation. With the OOP as a starting point, the organisation can build an optimal portfolio by considering delivery dependencies (pre-requisites etc.) and other practical considerations. Reviewing the package of options to see that it will also work as a whole helps determine the final portfolio composition. Typically, the available investment is the key constraint limiting the number of options that can be included in the portfolio.

More information

For further information on Decision Conferencing please contact your nearest Catalyze consultant or contact info@catalyzeapac.com.

Literature:

Transparent prioritisation, budgeting and resource allocation with multi-criteria decision analysis and decision conferencing, Lawrence D Phillips and Carlos. A Bana eCosta: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10479-007-0183-3 (paid content, 34 EUR)

http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10479-007-0183-3 (paid content, 34 EUR) Structuring Multi-Criteria Portfolio Analysis Models, Gilberto Montibeller, L. Alberto Franco, Awan Lord, Aline Iglesias: http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/22693/1/08102.pdf

© Catalyze APAC | 2020

ATAP 2020 Update: Developing Criteria and Process for Document 3 Assessment

















Agenda

- Introductions
- Purpose
- Criteria Work
 - What do we mean by value and why are we interested in it? THEOFFICIAL

RMATIONACT

- What are Criteria
- What do stakeholders value?
- Identification of headline criteria
- Capture of content for descriptions
- Process
 - Structured Decision Making
 - Portfolio Investment Approach
 - Portfolio Generation
 - What might work for ATAP Partners?
- Next Steps

Purpose

- To develop and agree assessment criteria for the ATAP 2020 Update
 - Assessment criteria built around the ATAP Objectives
 - Provide decision makers with confidence that we have used a robust and consistent approach to any assessment
- Consider Process for next steps

What do we mean by 'value'?

- Value lies in the domain of outcomes the 'ends' we get as a result of doing or having something
- Value covers both tangible and intangible outcomes
 - Value is not just about financial outcomes, it is much wider than that. It can relate to anything that matters to ATAP Partners
- Value refers to the contribution that an option makes to achieving an outcome that you care about
- Value relates to 'why' why we want something is because of the value it provides

What are Criteria?

- Headlines used to represent the value that options deliver to stakeholders
 - Explanatory paragraphs, inclusions/exclusions
- Developed in this workshop with ATAP Partners
- Signed off prior to use
- Provides a clear framework within which to compare potential alternatives
- Articulates basis for judgements of value delivered'
- Specific for an intended purpose

Attributes of Helpful Criteria HEOFFICIAL MEORMATION ACT

- Strategic
- Complete
- Non-redundant differentiate the options
- Mutually preference-independent
- Concise requisite in number
- Specific
- Understandable to the 'person in the street'
- Accommodate preference over time

Relationship between Criteria and Objectives

- Criteria are about things which matter, not necessarily which can be measured
- Ends vs means
 - Means Objective:
 - an objective whose importance stems from its contributions to achieving another objective
 - Ends Objective:
 - objective that defines a basic reason for caring about a decision
 - Examples
 - "arrive home from work early" ...
 - To "make my partner happy
 - "upgrade workplace infrastructure and accommodation"...
 - To "retain staff" or "improve productivity"

Criteria Questions

- What is the Value that ATAP investments deliver to stakeholders?
- Why might you prefer one investment option over another?

office office

The Recipe for Structured Decision Making





What is **PIA** - Overview



The investment prioritisation approach is a really helpful way to choose the best projects when there are lots of alternatives, conflicting trade-offs and uncertainty and it is carried in four steps.





Portfolio Generation





Decision Conferencing

- A technical process (MCDA) to:
 - Support the social process
 - Provide real-time modeling
 - Conform to the axioms of decision theory
 - Perform sensitivity and robustness analysis
 - Act as knowledge repository or 'corporate memory'



- A social (group) process to:
 - Establish a shared understanding of project issues
 - Develop a sense of common purpose
 - Understand different perspectives and objectives
 - Gain agreement & commitment to the way forward from those implementing the decisions





- Quickly play back to participants for feedback Obtain sign-off

PELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL



RMATIONACT







The ATAP prioritisation framework:

Assessment criteria for discussion

- This section provides draft assessment criteria for each objective area
- Criteria has been developed based on the Future Connect ILM, NZTA's draft prioritisation methodology and the 2018 ITP Calculator

Draft assessment criteria: Enabling and supporting growth



		NA						
Strategic Fit	Effectiveness	Cost Effectiveness / VFM	Sequencing					
Assessment should be evidence based, and preferably								
Give effect to approved strategy or plan (e.g. Supporting Growth Alliance Indicative Supporting Network or Integrated Transport Assessment)								
Be based on sound empirical analysis, which may include a business case or modelling								
High: Seeks to support housing growth in the Council's priority areas by supporting	Assessed based on the scale of:	BCR based on NZTA's banding	The project/programme:					
increased intensification of dwellings around Rapid and Frequent Transit Network	 level of priority of the growth area served; 		Provides a critical building block to enabling the					
(FTN) stations and interchanges, or removing significant infrastructure constraints	• expected scale of residential and employment	Opportunities for savings	proposed housing growth to occur or future likely					
preventing housing growth or by improving the accessibility of greenfield areas and	growth in the area served by the project (in		high value/impact network development; and/or					
or sustainable travel from greenfield areas.	numbers of houses);		Unlocks significant additional benefits from					
Madium: Socks to support housing growth by accessibility removing constraints or	scale of increase in access (or travel time saving		related investment in the transport network.					
Medium: Seeks to support housing growth by accessibility, removing constraints, or in non-priority greenfield areas or in urban intensification areas that are not near RTN or FTN stations.	on a key ink from growth area to urban or							
	employment area) or impact in removing		A rating of High / Medium / Low impact across either					
	infrastructure constraints; and/or impact in encouraging a shift to more sustainable travel;		criticality or interdependency with other activities is applied.					
Low: Does not support material increases in housing.	• ability to optimise the benefits of other		A High or Medium rating is often associated with					
	infrastructure investment.		being an integral part of a programme or package.					
			Where neither criticality or interdependencies are					
	Growth areas must be likely to begin development		an issue, the activity/activities should be given a					
	within the first decade.		rating of Low.					
			[From NZTA]					

Draft assessment criteria: Accelerate better travel choices – public transport



Strategic Fit	Effectiveness	Cost Effectiveness / VFM	Sequencing			
Assessment should be evidence based, and preferably Give effect to approved strategy or plan (e.g. RPTP, Better Travel Choices, Accessibility Action Plan) Be based on sound empirical analysis, which may include a business case or modelling 						
 Very High strategic fit projects will: either, expand the catchment of the RTN network outlined in ATAP or address major current or future capacity or performance constraints on the existing RTN network; and, will provide an effective alternative to congested strategic roading corridors or access to key town/employment centres High Strategic Fit projects will: either provide other improvements to the RTN network outlined in ATAP; or, seek to provide significant improvements to the operation of the Strategic PT Network eg, through improving competitiveness of travel time, facilitating interchange, reducing capacity constraints, or improving reliability and legibility Medium Strategic fit projects provide other improvements to the Strategic PT Network, or provide significant improvement to key elements of the connector networks Low Strategic Fit: Other projects supporting PT 	 Assessed based on the scale of: expected mode change away from SOV (preferable if available); or; expected increase in PT patronage; or, other key indicators of likely patronage uptake, such as size of capacity constraint / pinch point removed, relative improvement in PT travel speedete (not ideal and not acceptable for high cost projects) Projects that can demonstrate improvements in the performance of surrounding primary road network (particularly strategic freight network) through decongestion or materially improved access to town / employment centres should receive a higher rating – with weight given to scale/importance of the surrounding network / employment centre 	Either: BCR based on NZTA's banding Or Assessment of expected effectiveness in achieving mode change / PT patronage increase compared to cost	 The project/programme: Provides a critical building block to enabling future likely high value/impact network development; and/or Unlocks significant additional benefits from related investment in the transport network. A rating of High / Medium / Low impact across either criticality or interdependency with other activities is applied. A High or Medium rating is often associated with being an integral part of a programme or package. Where neither criticality or interdependencies are an issue, the activity/activities should be given a rating of Low. [From NZTA] 			

Draft assessment criteria: Accelerate better travel choices – active transport



GUIDANCE FOR ASSESSMENT OF PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES FOR ACTIVE MODE		and the second s		
Strategic Alignment	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Urgency	
Assessment should be evidence based, and preferably		/		
 Give effect to approved strategy or plan (e.g. Cycling PBC, RPTP, Better Trav 	el Choices)			
 Be based on sound empirical analysis, which may include a business case or 	modelling			
Very High strategic fit projects will: result in a significant increase in active mode	Assessed based on the scale of :	Either:	The project/programme:	
trips through the improvement of safety, connectivity and attractiveness of the	, CN	BCR based on NZTA's banding	Addresses an immediate and/or significant safet	
transport network. This will be achieved by either: utilising planned or existing	1. expected increase in active prodes; or,	Or	risk; and/or	
strategic infrastructure; or, creating new strategic connections which link people to	2. Addressing known safety (actual or perceived)	Assessment of expected	Links into additional investment of infrastructure	
employment, services or education.	issue on network by perception of safety associated	effectiveness in achieving mode	in the nearby area i.e. seeks to leverage ona networ	
	with active travel, number of crashes per 1000 trips;	change / active modes increase	effect and/or;	
High Strategic Fit projects will result in a modest increase in active mode uptake by	or,	compared to cost	 Unlocks significant additional benefits from 	
either creating connections between employment, services or education; or,	3 other key indicators of likely increase in active		related investment in the transport network.	
support the uptake of active modes through essential ancillary infrastructure.	modes, decrease in relative journey times compared			
	to other modes.		A rating of High / Medium / Low impact across either	
Low Strategic fit projects which seek to address deficiencies within the existing	4 Increased use of public transport network		criticality or interdependency with other activities is	
network or provide non-strategic network connections; or, other, non-strategic ancillary infrastructure or Other projects supporting active modes.			applied.	
ancinary intrastructure of other projects supporting active modes.	Very High/High/Medium/Low/Very Low		A High or Medium rating is often associated with	
	Very High/High/Wedium/Low/Very Low		being an integral part of a programme or package.	
			being an integral part of a programme of package.	
S.			Where neither criticality or interdependencies are	
EASE			an issue, the activity/activities should be given a	
			rating of Low	
			[From NZTA].	
Draft assessment criteria:

Better connecting people and goods 🧳



Strategic Fit	Effectiveness	Cost Effectiveness / VFM	Sequencing
 Assessment should be evidence based, and preferably Give effect to approved strategy or plan (e.g. Network Optimisation PBC) Be based on sound empirical analysis, which may include a business case or 	-	OMATIC	
 High strategic fit is a project on the Strategic or Primary Arterials or the Strategic Freight Network (Level 1A and 1B) that seeks to: address severe congestion that occurs or is expected to occur within the first decade: where AM and/or PM peak Volume/ Capacity (V/C) ratio >1 (Strategic or Primary Arterials), <u>AND/OR</u> where Interpeak V/C ratio > 0.8 (Strategic Freight Network (Level 1A and 1B)), <u>OR</u> address severe unreliability; <u>OR</u> address high vulnerability to unplanned closures; OR is a project that seeks to materially reduce high travel times to employment and social opportunities from high deprivation areas Medium Strategic Fit projects seek to Address severe congestion (forecast to have AM and/or PM peak V/C ratio > 0.8), improves reliability or increases resilience, on the Strategic or Primary Arterials and/or the Strategic Freight Network (Levels 1A, 1B and 2) within the first decade. Makes moderate reductions to high travel times to employment and social opportunities from high deprivation areas 	 The extent of congestion on the corridor, The expected increase in throughput, improved travel times, reliability or resilience along the corridor The use of low cost interventions and/or technology to efficiently address the problems Projects that can demonstrate improved access to employment and social opportunities from high deprivation areas assessed according to: The extent of deprivation in the area The disparity in travel times compared to other areas, The extent that the intervention reduces those travel times. 	Either: BCR based on NZTA's banding Or Assessment of expected effectiveness in increasing throughput, travel time reduction, or travel time reliability, taking account of the number of people/freight vehicles that benefit, compared to cost	 The project/programme: Provides a critical building block to enabling future likely high value/impact network development; and/or Unlocks significant additional benefits from related investment in the transport network. A rating of High / Medium / Low impact across either criticality or interdependency with other activities is applied. A High or Medium rating is often associated with being an integral part of a programme or package. Where neither criticality or interdependencies are an issue, the activity/activities should be given a rating of Low. [From NZTA]

Draft assessment criteria: Safety



			e.g. Converti-and containability: Toccional option
	Safety	ATIONACT	e.g. Swert Ook ar adforbinens midder Stocaler sigten e.g. Gineste anderse Stocaler sigten e.g. Gineste anderse Stocaler sigten for ACM Plockage Tour ACM Plockage
Strategic Fit	Effectiveness	Cost Effectiveness / VFM	Sequencing
 Assessment should be evidence based, and preferably Give effect to approved strategy or plan (e.g. Vision Zero for Tamaki Makaun Be based on sound empirical analysis, which may include a business case or 	A 2010 Constant and a		
Assessed based on evidence that the project or programme is specifically addressing parts of the network that are subject to significant safety risks as assessed under the KiwiRAP system. A project has High Strategic Fit if it seeks to reduce the actual crash risk involving deaths & serious injuries at locations assessed, using the KiwiRAP system, as having: high or medium-high collective risk; High personal risk; or seeks to address portions of the strategic road network that is operating at higher than Safe and Appropriate Speeds. A project has Medium Strategic Fit if it seeks to reduce transport related deaths and serious injuries at locations assessed, using the KiwiRAP system, as having Medium collective risk or Medium-High personal risk. A project has Low Strategic Fit if it is not expected to have a material effect on reducing deaths and serious injuries.	We are interested in the expected reduction in risk level, using the KiwiRAP assessment methodology, and then the consequent expected reduction in deaths and serious injuries over a five-year period. Assessed based on the expected reduction in risk level using the KiwiRAP system, and the consequent expected reduction in deaths and serious injuries.	Either: BCR based on NZTA's banding Or Assessment of expected effectiveness in reducing deaths and serious injuries compared to cost	 The project/programme: Provides a critical building block to reducing future deaths and serious injuries; and/or Unlocks significant additional benefits from related investment in the transport network. A rating of High / Medium / Low impact across either criticality or interdependency with other activities is applied. A High or Medium rating is often associated with being an integral part of a programme or package. Where neither criticality or interdependencies are an issue, the activity/activities should be given a rating of Low. [From NZTA]

Draft assessment criteria: Resilience and sustainability



Transport emissions reduction potential

matrix

Climate assessment	Typology	High - Med	Med - Low	Low - Neutral	Negative		
Significant emissions		PT operational	System integration in priority corridors	Traffic	Roadway		
reduction potential	1, 2, 3	improvements		management	capacity expansion		
Moderate emissions	1,2,3	Light rail, metro	Low emission public transport	Roading	expansion		
reduction potential	and a second second	rail and commuter		maintenance			
	4, 5, 6	rail systems		2 2		. (2).	
Neutral emissions reduction potential		Bus rapid transit	New and improved sidewalks and pedestrian crossing	Roading resilience			
reduction potential	7		pedestrian crossing	improvements		/ Definition of Interdependent Conditions criteria	
Negative emissions			Improved bicycle infrastructure,	Roading safety		Land use An "Enhanced" rating is given to projects / programmes which predominantly serve higher density zoning, i.e.	
reduction potential	8		networks and support programmes	improvements	C >	business, centres, Mixed Use and THAB zones	
			Intelligent transportation systems	Park and Rides		A "Neutral" rating is given to projects / programmes which predominantly serve medium density zoning, i.e. Mixed Housing U	Urban
			Enhancement of intermodal freight			and Mixed Housing Suburban zones, OR where there is insufficient data	
			infrastructure Regional freight distribution centres,			A "Diminished" rating is given to projects / programmes which predominantly serve low density zoning, i.e. Single House, rura	al and
			inland ports, and logistics parks	(Future Urban zones	arana
			Parking management / enforcement			Intervention An "Enhanced" rating is given to projects / programmes which have a regional focus and a large geographic reach, i.e. cycling	5
Fits one or more		1	ranning management / emotionent			scale network, RTN	
criteria below		-		\sim		A "Neutral" rating is given to projects / programmes which have a sub-regional focus and a moderate geographic reach, i.e. tr	rain or
Land use: High density				\sim		bus interchange, OR where there is insufficient data A "Diminished" rating is given to projects / programmes which have a local focus and a small geographic reach, i.e. single stre	aat
zones (business, centres, mixed use,						upgrade	et
THAB)				_		System An "Enhanced" rating is given to projects / programmes where there is high integration with other low carbon interventions, i	i.e. first-
Intervention scale:	Enhanced	1		/	8	integration last mile infrastructure, multi-modal interchanges	
Regional focus						A "Neutral" rating is given to projects / programmes where there is moderate integration with other low carbon interventions	is, Or
System integration: High						where there is insufficient data A "Diminished" rating is given to projects / programmes which are not integrated with other low carbon interventions, i.e. are	
Land use: Medium				-		standalone interventions	e
density zones (MHU,							
MHS) OR Unknown							
Intervention scale: Sub- regional focus OR	Neutral	3	4	7	8		
Unknown			S				
System integration:							
Moderate OR Unknown			<u>C</u>	-			
Land use: Low density zones (SH, rural, FUZ)							
Intervention scale:					1.00		
Local focus	Diminished	5	6	7	8		

Type of Interventions

TONACT

Influencing Factors

System integration: Low (standalone)

PIA Value Criteria

Γ		alue Criteria
No.	Criterion	Description
1.	Social Wellbeing	The extent to which the option provides and/or enhances social wellbeing in relation to access to essential services and social inclusion. ¹ This criterion includes consideration of liveability, community, amenity, choice, and emotional and physical connection. The Social Wellbeing criterion specifically excludes any financial benefits derived which are considered under the Economy criterion.
2.	Environment	The extent to which the option contributes to and/or enhances natural capital. This criterion includes consideration of ecosystem services, greenhouse gas emissions sustainable use and stewardship of natural resources and smarter use of the environment. The Environment criterion specifically excludes any resilience benefits from options which are considered under the Resilience and Security criterion.
3.	Safety and Health	 The extent to which the option contributes to and/or enhances safety and the extent to which the option contributes to and/or enhances long-term human health (including mental health). This criterion includes consideration of: the health effects of air and noise pollution the health benefits of physical activity including recreate the reduction of absolute and perceived harm, and reducing death and serious injury.
4.	Economy	The extent to which the option contributes to and/or enhances the economy. This criterion includes consideration of economic growth, stimulus and productivity, access to employment and economic opportunities including export and tourism opportunities.
5.	Resilience & Security	The extent to which the option contributes to and/or enhances resilience and security. This criterion includes consideration of natural, physical and man-made impacts over the short and long term. It includes the impacts of shocks and adaptive change. It also specifically includes resilience benefits that options provide in the face of climate change.
6.	Future	This extent to which the option enables the transport system to adapt and be ready for future challenges and opportunities over the long term (10-30 years plus). This criterion includes consideration of changing environments, adaptability and, the treatment of uncertainty.

Document 4

Evaluation Criteria (1 of 2)

No.	ATAP Objective	Description	LION .
1.	Connecting Better connecting people, goods, places and services	 The extent to which the option: Reduces congestion on key corridors Reduces disparately high travel times to employment and social opportunities Addresses this for journeys to and from areas of high deprivation or significant Māori population 	 extent of and reduction in congestion on the corridor expected increase in throughput, improved travel times, reliability or resilience along the corridor use of low-cost interventions and/or technology to efficiently address the problems extent of Maori population or deprivation level in the area disparity in travel times compared to other areas extent that the intervention reduces those travel times scale of change in access to employment, education, cultural spaces, health services improvements for freight movements improvements in recovery from unplanned closures/incidents
Ζ.	Choice Accelerating better travel choice for Auckland	 The extent to which the option reduces reliance on private vehicle travel, particularly SOVs: Improves or provides attractive PT or active mode travel alternatives Increases travel by PT and active mode 	 expected mode shift away from SOV expected increase in PT patronage or active travel scale of change in access to employment, education, cultural spaces, health services by PT and active modes improvements in PT and active mode access to areas of high deprivation, significant Māori population or high car dependency, or priority areas identified in Better Travel Choices degree of alignment with developing the RTN and strategic PT and walking/cycling networks
5.	Growth Enabling and supporting Auckland's growth	 The extent to which the option: Supports priority growth areas Provides for intensification around rapid and frequent networks 	 level of priority of the growth area served expected scale of residential and employment growth in the area served by the project (in numbers of houses (including affordable and social housing and papakāinga) and jobs,); scale of increase in access (or travel time saving on a key link from growth area to urban or employment area) impact in removing infrastructure constraints; and/or impact in encouraging a shift to more sustainable travel ability to optimise the benefits of other infrastructure investment

S.

Evaluation Criteria (2 of 2)

No.	ATAP Objective	Description	TION.
4.	Safety Making Auckland's transport system safe by eliminating harm to people	The extent to which the option contributes to and/or enhances safety through:the reduction of absolute and perceived harmreducing death and serious injury	 the expected reduction in risk level, using the KiwiRAP assessment methodology the expected reduction in deaths and serious injuries over a five-year period. extent of Māori population or deprivation level in the area reduction in air and noise pollution
э.	Environmental Improving environmental resilience and sustainability of the transport system and significantly reducing the greenhouse emissions it generates	 The extent to which the option reduces negative environmental impacts by considering: greenhouse gas emissions sustainable use and stewardship of natural resources reduction in risks associated with climate change impacts 	 reductions in or mitigation of fossil fuel usage and greenhouse gas emissions reduction in number and extent of transport infrastructure assets susceptible to climate change impacts increase in proportion of stormwater from transport system is treated

NC'

office of the second se

Document 5

Establish

assessment

criteria and

approach

Confirm in-scope projects for assessment

Group like projects together (7 ATAP categories?)

Project-level assessment

1 MF

Develop investment packages

Assess packages, provide advice

- 1. RLTP/NLTP prioritisation Alignment / Effectiveness / VFM / Sequencing ratings (H/M/betc)
 - Undertaken internally by the project owner agency (AT/NZTA/KR)
 - Use guidance from the detailed tables
 - Document rationale for use as an input to PIA
- 2. Collective PIA process to prioritise the projects
 - Project information sheet/briefing to be provided in advance
 - Use above ratings and supporting information to help inform discussion
 - Use criteria under each objective (still in progress) to collectively assess each project (by group)







rationale

Document 7

DDC Meeting

23 October 2020



AILAP Theme of Auckland Second Council Organisation



ATAP Themed Package introduction and early assessment

The next slides provide a preliminary run through of some of the key ATAP packages and a very early assessment of their performance

Note that ATAP has yet to undertake package evaluation and modelling, so this is a very preliminary view only which is intended to provide:

- background ahead of final evaluation reporting comes from ATAP (likely with a very short turnaround)
- an opportunity for your feedback on issues or areas for further advice

No specific decisions are needed now, but feedback is welcome!





Overview of Packages

- ATAP has developed packages of projects to fill the remaining headroom above and beyond the baseline.
- Packages have been designed to operate within identified available funding of \$31bn, from all agencies, with a small allowance for over-programming.
- \$31bn includes: \$8bn for opex and \$20bn for baseline capex, leaving \$3bn unallocated for new projects
- The baseline programme delivers the vast majority of regional outcomes. At around 10% of the value of total investment, the additional impacts of the packages themselves will necessary be modest with most impacts being local to the specific projects.





Overview of Packages

 A total of seven themed packages have been developed which follow three broad categories:

Mode Shift	Growth Blended packages
 Public transport focus 	• Intensive Drury option(s) ^{hese combine various elements to achieve small}
 Active modes focus 	Balanced regional growth to medium scale investment across all outcomes
Climate change focus	Blended 1 Blended 2

- Packages have been developed based on the project prioritisation scoring undertaken by ATAP
- The following slides provide a first look at the two main mode shift packages, the balanced growth package and one blended package
- Note: These packages are developed assuming fungible Local/NLTF share, and <u>do not</u> fit within the constrained AT funding envelope
- Note: All Packages exclude City to Mangere or NW Light Rail
- See Annex A for full detail





Overview Assessment of ATAP Packages (excl baseline impact)[®]

	Connected	Travel Choices	Growth	Sustainable	Safe
Mode Shift: PT				ANA	
Mode Shift: Active			ALAL		
Climate Change					
Growth: Drury		R-HE			
Growth: Balanced					
Blended 1					
Blended 2					

Mode Shift: PT

Includes:	Connected Communities Complete*	Northern Busway enhancements	Northwest Busway Stations and Access*	Downtown Bus	Phase 2 Downtown Ferry*
includes.	Accessibility Improvement Project	Lincoln Road	Ferry Procurement	Park and Ride	PT Minor Capex enhancements*
Excludes:	Additional Growth Investment	Minor Safety Improvements	Cycling Business Case funding	Minor Cycling and popup cycleways	Full CC2M

- Covers almost all of the priority PT transport improvements including full funding of the Connected Communities programme. Also:
 - addresses capacity constraints on the Northern busway and allows for further interim development of the Northwestern busway
 - provides for CBD network upgrades, along with ferry network improvements and other smaller stations/interchanges
 - However, excludes the full Manukau to Botany (but provides for route protection and 'Horizon Two' improvements) and provision for new rolling stock to address forecast constraints on the southern line from around 2031
- Excludes all additional growth investment, further cycling or safety improvements outside of Connected Communities.
- In summary, provides for continued strong growth across all elements of the PT network, while supporting marginal increases in sustainability and safety through increased public transport mode share.





*Investment expands on baseline elements



Mode Shift: Active



- Delivers all 2017 Cycling PBC priority areas within the decade at increased costs, along with North Shore cycling network, minor improvements (includes 'pop up protection' programme) and additional Connected Communities corridors.
- Also includes some brownfields growth, corridor projects and Local Board priorities.
- Does not include Greenfields growth investment (e.g. Drury), and limited large scale PT projects.
- In summary, expected to deliver substantial mode change to cycling, and marginal increases in sustainability by encouraging mode shift and to safety through improvements to active mode infrastructure.





*Investment expands on baseline elements













*Investment expands on baseline elements

12





- Provides for highest priority PT projects to address network issues or capacity issues, delivers some cycling enhancements, provides for minimal to modest investment across priority growth areas and includes higher priority corridor projects
- Summary supports continued modest progress across all key areas





*Investment expands on baseline elements

Blended 2 Blended 2 Packa Elements:



Issues to Highlight 6

- Certain projects endorsed by the Board are not included in the baseline and risk losing out (e.g. Waiheke Transport Plan, Ferry Procurement, and Accessibility Improvement Project) as packages are further refined
- Large scale projects that may occur outside of this decade may not be allocated appropriate pipeline funding (e.g. Airport to Botany Horizon 3, Rail Programme Step 2)
- Certain smaller projects are not included in any package (e.g. Additional Unsealed Road Improvements, Chapel Road Realignment, Warkworth Western Link Road)

Next Steps:

- Package modelling and revision into a final ATAP package
- What are the Board's priorities for the final package?





Document 8

				Package -			Package -		
Category	Package - Climate			Mode Shift - PT			Mode Shift - Active		
	Bus Depot Strategy Phase 1 (Strategic Bus depot assets)	AT	64		AT	110	Accessibility Improvement Project	AT	110
	Accessibility Improvement Project	AT	55		wiRail	20	Progressive fencing and security	KiwiRail	20
Operational	Progressive fencing and security	KiwiRail	20		AT	10	Core Operational Capital Programme	AT	10
	Core Operational Capital Programme	AT	10	Lonely Track Road North slip N	IZTA	0.6	Lonely Track Road North slip	NZTA	0.6
	Lonely Track Road North slip	NZTA	0.6		I				
	TOTAL Operational		150	TOTAL Operational		141	TOTAL Operational		141
	Nathan Dunum Faharanat	AT	005	Connected Communities Complete Proposal	AT	600	Connected Communities (Base Plus)	AT	
	Northern Busway Enhancement Connected Communities (Base Plus)	AT	335 317		AT	608 335		AT AT	17 220
	Downtown bus improvements	AT	220	······	AT	317	Downtown bus improvements Tranche 1 Level Crossing Grade Separation	KiwiRail	199
	Rail Programme Step 2	KiwiRail	220		AT	307	A2B Route Protection	AT	47
	Tranche 1 Level Crossing Grade Separation	KiwiRail	199		IZTA	230	Middlemore Station	AT	24
	Northwest Busway - Stations and Access	AT	155		AT	230	Rosedale Road corridor	AT	6.5
	Northern Busway Enhancements	NZTA	115		wiRail	199			0.5
	Ferry new purchase (phase 1) and associated Infra	AT	92		AT	161			
	A2B Route Protection	AT	47		AT	92			
Public Transport	A2B Horizon 2 Bus	AT	29		AT	51			
Projects	Middlemore Station	AT	24		AT	47			
Trojecto	Sylvia Park Bus Improvements	AT	19		AT	32			
	Whangaparaoa Bus facility	AT	9		AT	29			
	Albert and Vincent Street Bus Priority Improvements	AT	6.8		AT	24			
	Rosedale Road corridor	AT	6.5		AT	19			
	Neighbourhood Interchanges	AT	5		AT	18			
					AT	6.8			
			I I		AT	6.5			
			I I		AT	5			
	TOTAL Public Transport		1778	TOTAL Public Transport		2707	TOTAL Public Transport		813
	Cycling Programme Revised Cost Estimate	AT	287		I		Accelerated complet on of the 2017 Cycling Programme	AT	541
	Northern Pathway (Akoranga to Constellation)	NZTA	250		I		Cycling Programme Revised Cost Estimate	AT	287
	Minor Cycling Capex (including pop up cycleways)	AT	100		I		Northern athway (Akoranga to Constellation)	NZTA	250
Active	Cycling and Walking Connections to Waka Kotahi Infra	AT	58		I		Cy ling nd Walking Connections to Waka Kotahi, NZTA Inf		115
	City Centre Masterplan A4E Supporting Works - Intro	AT	30		I		Min r Cycling and Micromobility Capex (including pop up o	ycleway AT	100
	Walking PBC initiatives	AT	14		I		Cty Centre Masterplan A4E Supporting Works - Intro	AT	100
							Walking PBC initiatives	AT	14
	TOTAL Active		739	TOTAL Active		0	TOTAL Active		1407
				Lincoln Road Corridor Improvements	AT		Lincoln Road Corridor Improvements	AT	101
			I I	Lincolli Rodu Corridor Improvements		101	Glenvar Road/East Coast Road intersection	AT	101 63
			I I						
Connections									
connections									
connections				(
connections	TOTAL Connections		0	TOTAL Connections		101	TOTAL Connections		164
Connections	TOTAL Connections		0	TOTAL Connections		101	TOTAL Connections		164
	TOTAL Connections Safe & Healthy Schools Programme	AT	0	TOTAL Connections		101	Minor Safety Improvements	AT	164 139
		AT		TOTAL Connections		101	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme	AT	139 72.5
Safety	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme	AT	72.5				Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund		139 72.5 20
		AT		TOTAL Connections TOTAL Safety		101	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme	AT	139 72.5
Safety	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme	AT	72.5				Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety	AT	139 72.5 20
Safety Local Board	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety		72.5				Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund	AT	139 72.5 20
Safety	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme	AT AT	72.5				Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232
Safety Local Board	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles		72.5 73 34	TOTAL Safety		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84
Safety Local Board	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority		72.5 73 34 173				Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173
Safety Local Board	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles		72.5 73 34	TOTAL Safety		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84
Safety Local Board	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority		72.5 73 34 173	TOTAL Safety		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173
Safety Local Board	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority		72.5 73 34 173	TOTAL Safety		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority		72.5 73 34 173	TOTAL Safety		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority		72.5 73 34 173	TOTAL Safety		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority		72.5 73 34 173	TOTAL Safety		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7
Safety Local Board Climate	Safe & Healthy Schools Programme TOTAL Safety Supporting Electric Vehicles Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection		72.5 73 34 173 7	TOTAL Safety Warkworth Route Protection		0	Minor Safety Improvements Safe & Healthy Schools Programme Community Safety Fund TOTAL Safety Waiheke 10 Year Transport Plan Brownfields High Priority Warkworth Route Protection	AT AT	139 72.5 20 232 84 173 7

ATAP PACKAGES DRAFT AS AT 28/09/20 (Excludes Baseline)



ATAP PACKAGES DRAFT AS AT 28/09/20 (Excludes Baseline)



Package -		
Blended 2		
A cessibility Improvement Project	AT	55
Incressed Freight Allocation in Network Performance	AT	30
Progressive fencing and security	KiwiRail	20
Co e Operational Capital Programme	AT	10
Jonely Track Road North slip	NZTA	0.6
TOTAL Operational		116
Connected Communities (Base Plus)	AT	317
Downtown bus improvements	AT	220
Tranche 1 Level Crossing Grade Separation	KiwiRail	199
Northwest Busway - Stations and Access	AT	154
Park and ride programme	AT	51
A2B Route Protection	AT	47
Airport to Botany RTN via Manukau and Airport Access Improveme	AT	29
Sylvia Park Bus Improvements	AT	19
Albert and Vincent Street Bus Priority Improvements	AT	6.8
Rosedale Road corridor	AT	6.5
Neighbourhood Interchanges	AT	5

Northern Pathway (Akoranga to Constellation)	NZTA	250
Cycling Programme Revised Cost Estimate	AT	80
City Centre Masterplan A4E Supporting Works - Intro	AT	30
Minor Cycling Capex (including pop up cycleways)	AT	30
TOTAL Active		390

1054

TOTAL Public Transport

Lincoln Road Corridor Improvements AT	101
SH18 Squadron Drive interchange upgrade NZTA	68
Glenvar Road/East Coast Road intersection AT	63
Hill Street Intersection Improvements (Warkworth) AT	19
Smales Allens Widening and Intersection Upgrade AT	13.6
TOTAL Connections	265

TOTAL Safety	0
Supporting Electric Vehicles AT	34
Drury Essentials Limited Package	526
Brownfields High and Medium Priority Projects	285
Northwest Medium Growth Package	283
Warkworth Route Protection	7
TOTAL Growth	1102