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Memorandum

To: Wally Thomas, Executive GM Stakeholder, Communities & Comms; Colin Homan, Group Manager Transport Services Development
From: David Stephenson, Commercial Manager Transport Services Development
Date: 5 December 2018
Subject: A big idea for Auckland Transport to consider – Fare Free Public Transport (FFPT)

Background

An opinion paper was tabled at a recent demographic panel meeting by Janet Clews and passed on to Colin Homan – Transport Services Development for investigation and comment.

The paper was authored by Roger Fowler, an advocate for free public transport, and promotes the concept of free public transport for Auckland. The paper contains a few examples of other towns/cities that have implemented FFPT, most notably in the capital city of Tallinn, Estonia which has the largest population amongst cities that have implemented FFPT.

While free-fare public transport services exist in numerous countries, they remain the exception.

The term Free-Fare Public Transport (FFPT) is used rather than the common ‘free public transport’, since this policy is not free-of-charge. While passengers have no out-of-pocket costs, the public transport system does not run for free. Transport Authorities have to cover for the lost fare revenues in order to fully subsidize the service.

This memo summarises my findings, based on a desktop review of the examples quoted in Mr. Fowler’s paper, and of the concept of FFPT. The evidence below has been gathered from a large source of studies and articles on the subject.

Findings from an initial investigation:

2013 Tallinn - 420,000 inhabitants

Tallinn, with approximately 420,000 residents, is the first European capital and the largest city in the world so far that offers FFPT services to all of its inhabitants. The City of Tallinn introduced this policy as part of its overarching agenda to promote sustainable transport solutions. The FFPT policy was introduced on January 1, 2013.

The public transport system in Tallinn consists of 5 tram lines, 8 trolley bus lines and 57 normal bus lines. Public transport in Tallinn had in 2012 a substantial market share, with 40% of all trips in the city performed by the urban public transport system. Moreover, 50% of the trips were performed by foot. However, this favourable modal split followed a negative trend. The share of public transport trips decreased dramatically during the last two decades, since Estonia regained its independence in 1991. The motorization rate—the number of private cars per 1000 inhabitants—has more than doubled during the same period, up to the current level of 456 cars per 1000 residents.

Even though public transport retained a substantial market share in Tallinn, ticket sales covered in 2012 only one-third of the system operational cost at approximately NZ$20m fare box revenue. This was a very low fare-box recovery rate in comparison to other European cities.

FFPT for Auckland = “There’s no such thing as a free ride”
Memorandum

This would have placed the PT operating costs of Tallinn at approximately NZ$60m per annum, at the time of implementation.

Almost a year after the introduction of FFPT, public transport usage increased by 14%. The patronage increased by 24% due to an increase in the average public transport length. The effect of FFPT on ridership is substantially lower than those reported in previous studies due to the good level of service provision, high public transport usage and low public transport fees that existed already prior to the FFPT.

It is noteworthy that while the share of car users decreased by 5%, the average distance travelled by car increased resulting with a 31% increase in total vehicle-km. This is explained by the increase in daily travel distance, i.e., from 7.98 to 9.07 km per person, a 13% increase, driven by changes in shopping and leisure destination choices. In summary, the modal shift from car to public transport was accompanied by an undesired shift from walking to public transport and an increase in car traffic.


2009 Aubagne - 100,000 inhabitants
Cost NZ$1.15 million of lost income from tickets, and NZ$1.42 million for costs related to increased demand for public transport.

In 2008, the bus network transported 1.9 million passengers. This figure went up to 4.48 million passengers in 2011, which equates to 135.8% increase in ridership. Having maintained this level in 2012 and 2013, the ridership increased once more, when the Aubagne tram line was opened in 2014. The figure increased from 4.8 million in 2014 to 5.5 million passengers in 2015. As a result, in just 7 years, the number of passengers in CAPAE’s public transport network increased by almost three times (189.5%).

2001 Chateauroux - 75,000 inhabitants
- 15 bus lines
- 1 Sunday bus line
- 8 of the 15 bus lines are also on demand
- 1 flexible bus line. Goes where people need to go.
- 43 school bus lines
- Free for all, including non-residents

2018 Dunkirk - 200,000 inhabitants
Before the buses were free, fares (NZ$8.3 million) raised around 10% of the network’s NZ$78 million annual running costs. Dunkirk recently invested another NZ$98 million in the network with five new bus lines and 45 new buses that will be put into service, expanding the fleet from 100 to 140 buses.

60% is funded by the versement transport, a French public transport levy on companies and public bodies with more than 11 employees, and 30% came from the local authority. The rise in
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the company transport tax has made up the fare shortfall – meaning no rise in taxes for local households.

To date, 15 towns in France have scrapped fees on their public transport networks completely. The small town of Compiègne near Paris led the way in 1975, and gradually, other, larger towns followed suit. Niort in western France was the latest to sign up to the scheme this summer.

Other French towns with completely free public transport

- Castres (since 2008) - 41,382 inhabitants
- Chantilly (since 1992) - 11,000 inhabitants
- Châteaudun (since 2009) - 13,226 inhabitants
- Crépy-en-Valois (since 2011) - 14,968 inhabitants
- Figeac (since 2003) - 9,820 inhabitants
- Gallejac (since 2014) - 15,077 inhabitants
- Issoudun (since 2002) - 12,270 inhabitants
- Mayenne (since 2002) - 13,555 inhabitants
- Niort (since 2017) - 120,000 inhabitants
- Nyon (since 2008) - 13,808 inhabitants
- Nyon (since 2011) - 6,641 inhabitants
- Pont-Sainte-Maxence (since 2006) - 12,669 inhabitants
- Saint-Brevin-les-Pins (since 2008) 13,210 inhabitants
- Senlis (since 2000) - 15,232 inhabitants

2002 Chapel Hill - 59,246 Inhabitants

Chapel Hill Transit (CHT) is the second largest transit system in North Carolina, providing over seven million rides per year. CHT serves the communities of Chapel Hill, Carrboro, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC). The two towns and the university share annual operating and capital costs associated with CHT on a contractual basis.

CHT is a fare-free system with fixed-route bus service on 31 weekday and weekend routes and EZ Rider demand response (ADA) service. CHT has a fleet of 121 vehicles (98 fixed-route and 22 demand response) - covering 2.5 million miles per year in a service area of 62 square miles.

The agency considered shifting to a fare-free system back in 2001 after recognizing that its fare box recovery rate was quite low — in the neighborhood of 10 percent. Most of its revenue was already coming from the University of North Carolina, in Chapel Hill, in the form of pre-paid passes and fares for employees and students. To go fare-free, the agency needed a commitment from a few partners to make up that fare box difference. The university agreed to contribute a bit more, as did the taxpayers of Chapel Hill and Carrboro.

Clemson - 13,905 Inhabitants (plus approximately 17,000 university students)

Clemson Area Transit provides free bus transportation connecting to the surrounding cities of Anderson, Central, Pendleton and Seneca.

FFPT for Auckland – "There’s no such thing as a free ride"
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CATbus is a fare-free public transportation system operating in partnership with Clemson University, the cities of Clemson and Seneca and the towns of Central and Pendleton. Its eight routes, centered around the university, stretch from Seneca to Tri-County Tech outside Pendleton. CATbus currently maintains a fleet of about 34 buses for its eight routes.

1997 to 2013 Hasselt - 70,000 Inhabitants

Because of the free public transport, Hasselt got worldwide media attention and has become a success story. Both the number of travelers and the number of routes and buses has increased with time. In June 1997, there were approximately 1,000 Hasselt bus passengers per day. Ten years later there was an average of 12,600. The 46 buses on nine lines, with promenade and centre shuttles generate an annual 2.2 million kilometers. By 2006, they had transported 4.6 million travelers annually. Travelers transferred from cars, but cyclists also started using the free bus.

Meanwhile the cost of the free bus experiment also almost quadrupled in ten years. There was criticism that thorough investigation was never conducted into the effects of the intervention on the transport behaviour of the residents and visitors of the city. The cost of free public transport in Hasselt for the public transport company De Lijn had risen from NZ$1.6 million in 1997 to NZ$5.7 million in 2007.

Depending on your viewpoint, Hasselt is a success story or a failure. The town of 70,000 inhabitants succeeded by increasing the number of passengers tenfold in the 15 years after 1997. The program was partly cross-financed with revenue from parking spaces for cars. As people stopped driving cars and parking spaces were drawn down, this revenue decreased — at a time when more cash was needed for the expanding buses and the network.

So in 2012, a newly elected local government resolved to cover the gap with ticket prices (in Dutch) of 80 cents per trip. But even at its peak, only 5% of work-home trips were taken by bus for free — compared to 78% in cars.

2014 Zory – 60,000 Inhabitants

Before May 1st 2014 there were 6 bus lines within the city that didn’t cross the boundaries of the city and 6 regional bus lines that connected Zory with other cities with a NZ$ 1 million PT budget. Now there are 7 bus lines, with the bus numbers from 01 to 07 being free within the city limits.

2012 Avesta - 22,000 Inhabitants

Avesta had a PT budget of NZ$3.8 million before FFPT was introduced. Since FFPT, ridership is up 80%, the buses have gained 13% new commuters and 39% of new journeys were replacing a car drive.
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Large Cities claimed to be considering FFPT

Germany

In February this year, Germany announced it was planning to trial free public transport in five cities—including the former capital Bonn and industrial cities Essen and Mannheim. In June this was downgraded to a slashing of public transport fares to persuade people to ditch cars.

Paris

Anne Hidalgo, mayor of Paris, has publicly announced in March she’s thinking about the possibility to have free public transport in the French capital. But here we’re talking about 4.2 million people using public transport. That’s why she has ordered a feasibility study.

Conclusion

1. All cited cases of FFPT being implemented have been in towns or cities with a lower population and small scale, heavily subsidised PT services. Meaning that the local transport authorities were not sacrificing a proportionately large amount of fare box revenue to implement the policy.

2. The geography of fare abolition thus embraces small or mid-sized towns with less than one hundred thousand inhabitants. For small cities and towns, it can be rationalised and be a sensible solution. However, even with new ways of funding transport, it’s not something we are going to be seeing in major cities anytime soon. The amount of money gained through fares is simply too big to be removed. While it might revitalise a struggling small-town transit network, big cities don’t need to incentivize mass transit the same way.

3. In contrast, the Auckland PT network records 92 million trips per year, consists of 1316 buses serving 506 bus routes, a large fleet of ferries sailing to 15 ferry destinations and 4 train lines.

4. A FFPT policy for Auckland would cost approximately $176 million in revenue (@ 46% fare box recovery rate), and a minimum of $60 million in increased service costs to meet the additional demand. Estimating the cost of implementing a FFPT policy in Auckland at $236 million, without assessing any potential cost savings from ticketing systems, as some form of passenger tracking would still be necessary through the existing ticketing system.

5. If this was to be subsidised through increased rates and taxes, it would represent a 15% increase to Auckland ratepayers.

Auckland already offers free travel to its senior citizens through the SuperGold and Senior CFS schemes, along with significant Child, Secondary and Tertiary discounts.

Whilst there may be merit in further investigating FFPT in a limited scale, such as for the city centre, the scale of the Auckland PT network, operating costs and fare box recovery is too large relative to the towns/cities that have implemented this policy to make FFPT a viable and sustainable option.

Free public transport as a political goal in its own right is of course legitimate. But when free fare schemes are advocated and justified as a means to meet environmental, social or efficiency goals, the evidence presented here suggests that the arguments are largely misguided.

FFPT for Auckland – “There’s no such thing as a free ride”
Thank you Mr Chair for the opportunity to address the meeting.

We wish to make some observations regarding item 15 on the agenda, Adoption of the Devonport-Takapuna Open Space Network Plan.

Last Tuesday, March 12th, The Guardian published an article headlined "Almost certain extinction: 1,200 species under severe threat across world"\(^1\) quoting research\(^2\) from Australia’s University of Queensland and the Wildlife Conservation Society. This world-wide problem is not just happening elsewhere, it is on our doorstep, in Ngataringa and Shoal Bays.

![Hotspots of human impact on threatened vertebrates](image)

From The Guardian 12 March, 2019 - Photograph: PLOS Biology

Endangered and vulnerable shorebird’s including the New Zealand Dotterel and Variable Oystercatcher and seabirds, including our largest tern, the Caspian Tern, continue to reside in the bays, feeding and attempting to nest when tides and conditions permit.

Migratory visitors, including the unique, endemic and ‘At Risk’ Wrybill, the South Island Pied Oystercatcher and Banded Dotterels continue to visit annually, arriving

\(^1\) https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/mar/13/almost-certain-extinction-1200-species-under-severe-threat-across-world

\(^2\) https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.3000158&sec=016
around late February, early March from the South Island. Our champion of long distance travel, the Bar-tailed Godwit makes the area its southern summer home.

The endemic, only found in NZ, Wrybill is on the international IUCN Red List of threatened species as Vulnerable and also meets the international RAMSAR (NZ is a signatory) wetland convention criteria, over 1% of its population regularly visiting the estuary for winter feeding.

As the proposed Devonport-Takapuna Open Space Network Plan notes, Shoal and Ngatarina Bays are designated by the Department of Conservation a Site of Significant Wildlife Interest (SSWI) and are designated in the Unitary Plan as Special Ecological Areas (SEA) Marine 1 and 2. They also have SEA areas of terrestrial coastal strips of remnant bush around its edge.

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), under s6(c), clearly asserts that the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a matter of national importance. Further protective statements are clearly stated in the Department of Conservation Guidelines for Assessing Ecological Values, Part 4 Statutory Responsibilities. There is also RMA relevant case law where there is now a stated clear obligation to maintain our overall indigenous biodiversity.

An Open Space Network Plan must put the highest priority on the protection of recognised and significant natural environment areas and biota as a matter of statute. Such ‘protection’ is not a nice to have, we submit it should be central to the Board’s plan.

On the 5th of March, The Planning Committee of Auckland Council adopted the resolution to “agree that Auckland Council is a creature of statute, which adheres to the intent of empowering acts even where those acts are inconsistent with any precinct plans at individual marina’s”. Likewise, we submit it follows that this Board should require that its Open Space Policy adhere to statute.

We ask that this board recognises the potential of harm to significant natural environment areas and biota by improperly calibrated measures to optimise the utilisation of our outdoor spaces. We ask that the Board require open space planning to be informed by best practice resources to understand the ecosystems of Ngatarina and Shoal Bays and avoid harm from development and the urban environment.

We recognise the significant and difficult work to bring together a comprehensive plan for our public open spaces. It surprises us that this might happen without open public consultation and observe it covers issues which rightly concern a great many
of our community across a broad spectrum. These open spaces, on all three coasts and throughout our peninsula, are a special reason for many to call this area home.

With this statement we append BEAC’s prior submission on Auckland Council’s Annual Budget 2019/2020 which further elaborates on points we have made here.

Bayswater Environment Action Coalition (BEAC)
Tuesday, 19 March 2019
Authors: Trish Deans, Philip Moll, Iain Rea
Addendum

Submission on the Auckland Council Auckland Budget 2019/2020

by

Bayswater Environment Action Coalition (BEAC), 17 March 2019

Baywater Environment Action Coalition (BEAC) is an informal group of Devonport Peninsula locals working together with like minded partners to protect and enhance the area’s natural environment. It has made previous submissions to Auckland Council, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board, and held public events such as an inaugural Devonport Peninsula’s Welcome to the Godwits 2018.

1. Auckland Council Goals

Introduction - Protecting our Natural Environment

Auckland has many precious natural environments - some more heavily modified than others.

Shoal and Ngataringa Bays are designated by the Department of Conservation (DoC) a Site of Significant Wildlife Interest (SSWI) and are designated in the Unitary Plan (AUP) as Special Ecological Areas (SEA) Marine 1 and 2. They also have SEA areas of terrestrial coastal strips of remnant bush around its edge.

Many endangered and vulnerable species of shorebirds including the New Zealand Dotterel and Variable Oystercatcher and seabirds, including our largest tern, the Caspian Tern, continue to reside in the bays, feeding and attempting to nest when tides and conditions permit.

Migratory visitors, including the unique, endemic and ‘At Risk’ Wrybill, the South Island Pied Oystercatcher and Banded Dotterels continue to visit annually, arriving around late February, early March from the South Island. Our champion of long distance travel, the Bar-tailed Godwit, was welcomed in October 2018 at Ngataringa Bay and, as this submission is made in mid-March, will soon be leaving to return to Alaska and Siberia via China to breed.

The hard work of a growing number of local people continues to protect these areas with pest control and restoration work by Restoring Takarunga Hauraki (RTH) and informative signage (Forest & Bird and Auckland Council).
The North West Wild-Link pest control continues; a coastal bait line project, supported by the Local Board in 2016 with continued support from Auckland Council Ranger, Anna Baine.

However, BEAC submits that the demands of Auckland’s urban intensification is bringing considerable pressures on this natural environment and management of these many taonga requires particular resourcing as we outline below.

1.1 Co-ordinated Planning

BEAC asks that additional resources be allocated for the creation of an environmental management plan for Ngatararinga and Shoal Bays. The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), under s6(c), clearly asserts that the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a matter of national importance. Further protective statements are clearly stated in the Department of Conservation Guidelines for Assessing Ecological Values, Part 4 Statutory Responsibilities. There is also RMA relevant case law where there is now a stated clear obligation to maintain our overall indigenous biodiversity.

1.2 Research

BEAC asks that additional resources be allocated to understanding the ecosystems of Ngatararinga and Shoal Bays and the effects of development and the urban environment on this area.

In particular we ask that Auckland Harbour current flows, sediment loads and their effects on the the SEA’s, including those in Ngatararinga and Shoal Bays needing to be studied. Such research should guide planning decisions to avoid detrimental effects in this area.

We raise the specific issue that Council is currently proposing that the largest ships visiting Auckland Harbour may be moored at Queens Wharf, the narrowest point of the main harbour, perpendicular to tidal flow. The resulting effects of sediment load and tidal flow on Ngatararinga and Shoal Bays should be urgently studied.
1.3 Monitoring of Natural Environment

BEAC asks that additional resources be allocated to the testing and monitoring of the Ngataringa and Shoal Bays natural environments including the health of the indigenous and migratory species inhabiting it.

This should include accounting for contamination from legacy landfill sites, a reclamation, current and historic industries, and New Zealand Defence Force historic and current activities.

1.4 Monitoring of development

BEAC asks that additional resource be allocated to the monitoring of urban development and the support and training of Council staff employed in this area. We particularly ask that additional resource be allocated for the measurement of sediment load entering Shoal and Ngataringa Bays from existing stormwater and development stormwater systems.

1.6 Review of development controls

BEAC asks that resources be made available to ensure the review of development rules, recognising the increasing adverse effects of significant weather events, is conducted urgently. The risk to vulnerable areas, particularly harbour and waterways from such events, when the fitness-for-purpose of Guide Document 2016/005 (Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region) is widely being questioned, prompts BEAC to ask this resourcing be given urgent priority.

1.7 Marina Study

With the following proviso, BEAC supports the allocation of resources to a comprehensive regional marina strategy agreeing that increasing public access to and around the regions marinas for walking, cycling and social gatherings is desirable, generally provided in the form of esplanades vested in Council and that enhancement of these recreational open space provisions is a significant opportunity. However, such a comprehensive strategy must include ways in which increased use of marine facilities and access to harbour areas can be achieved without negatively impacting areas of high ecological value - including the SEA’s of Ngataringa and Shoal Bays.

BEAC Presentation to DTLB on proposed Devonport-Takapuna Open Space Network Plan, 19 March 2019
### 2. Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Goals

#### 2.1 Environment

With the following provisos, BEAC supports the Board’s recognition of the area’s outstanding beaches, Lake Pupuke and the Wairau Estuary and its focus on the protection and enhancement of these assets and that it will look for ways to support and educate our community and volunteers, who do so much to enhance this local board area. Additionally, BEAC asks that the Board formally recognises its role in promoting the protection and enhancement of Shoal and Ngataringa Bays and that “protection”, when it relates to natural environments, may exclude “enhancement”.

#### 2.2 Education

A positive outcome is being demonstrated in the Charles St reserve where signage control outlining dog control and interpretive signage (now around the estuary) illustrates the importance of the rare Chenier shell banks, and the DOC designation of a Site of Special Wildlife Interest (SSW1). The designation emphasises the importance of the area for the feeding of five specific species – the NZ Dotterel, Wrybill, Reef Heron, Banded Dotterel and Caspian Tern. The public message is gaining traction. The nesting signage to protect the Variable Oystercatcher, NZ Dotterel and Pied Stilts nests is also raising public awareness and building improved public rapport. The endemic, only found in NZ, Wrybill is on the international IUCN Red List of threatened species as Vulnerable and also meets the international RAMSAR (NZ is a signatory) wetland convention criteria, over 1% of its population regularly visiting the estuary for winter feeding. The low tide mud flats adjoining and around the Landsdown shoal bank is critical for feeding Wrybills, Bar-Tailed Godwit (from Alaska), NZ Dotterels and many other shore birds. BEAC asks that the Board allocate additional resources to further public education about appreciating and protecting these areas.

#### 2.3 Research

BEAC asks that the Board support additional resources being allocated to understanding the ecosystems of Ngataringa and Shoal Bays and the effects of development and the urban environment on this area.
Authors: Graham Pitts, Iain Rea, Trish Deans

Date: 17 March 2019

Bayswater Environment Action Coalition
Email: beacnz@gmail.com
Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna
Devonport Group submission to the Tupuna Maunga Authority’s 2019/20 Operational Plan.

We represent the 1,370 petitioners who, in a petition presented to the Tupuna Maunga Authority at a public meeting on May 24, 2018, asked:

1) that easy and unobstructed access to the tihi / summit of Takurunga / Mt Victoria should be enhanced rather than restricted, as occurred on March 1, 2018 when the Tupuna Maunga Authority’s imposed a restrictive barrier arm on the maua road.

2) that no further works impacting on the maua’s roading and parking infrastructure should proceed without the demonstrable support of local mana whenua, Devonport residents, and other Aucklanders directly affected by such decisions.

3) that in all future interactions the Devonport community expects the Authority to consult widely, and not simply impose its will, in an authoritarian manner.

Acting under the aegis of this petition, we request that the Tupuna Maunga Authority (TMA) should not yet seek, nor should the Auckland Council yet allocate the $500,000 specified in the 2019/20 Operational Plan to “Repurpose or remove redundant parking” at or near the summit of Takurunga / Mt Victoria. This capital work should be put on hold pending completion of the TMA’s three-level consultation process, as outlined below.

The delay implicit in this request will ensure the Devonport community, and the Auckland population itself, can finally exercise their democratic right to make submissions on the major management changes proposed by the TMA for Takurunga / Mt Victoria. These include the management ban, by way of a barrier arm, on all but accredited vehicles from using the summit road, and the apparent pending removal of the upper carpark.

The three levels of consultation between the public and the TMA -

1) The Integrated Management Plan (2016) is in place. It covers the 14 maua which the TMA was given legal authority to administer under the Nga Mana Whenua o Tamaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014. It establishes Values and Pathways, and is a terrific introduction to Maori spirituality on the maua, but we contend it does not signal, except in strictly circumscribed references, any TMA plan to scrub public vehicle access off Takurunga / Mt Victoria.

2) The Strategies are still a work in progress. They apply on a pan-maua basis to all cones administered by the TMA, namely a Recreation Strategy, a Pest Management and Biodiversity Strategy, a Communication, Signage and
Education strategy etc, totalling seven. The Strategies are presently the main focus of the TMA’s management strategy and should be in place some time this year. During the Devonport meeting of May 24, 2018, the TMA chairman Paul Majurey assured Devonport people that these strategies would have a consultation phase, and the TMA’s Co-Governance Manager, Dominic Wilson, reiterated this in his letter to us of 14 March 2019. We applaud this consultation, though it’s not yet clear to us how that consultation will take place.

3) The Individual Tupuna Maunga Management Plans (ITMMP) are the third and last level of management and still some time off. They are the final delivery mechanism at an individual maunga level of the policies, frameworks, and decisions generated by the Values and Pathways of the IMP, and the Strategies. When these plans appear, we expect them to present the entire management plan for each maunga, tailored to the special character of each separate maunga. The ITMMPs seem to us to be the reserve management plan as envisaged by the Reserves Act, with public feedback mechanisms guaranteed by the Act. We can expect intelligent, thoughtful submissions, cognizant and respectful of the Maori perspective, but stating other needs also and we’d expect the submissions on Takarunga to be numerous, for Devonport people hold the mountain dear. Hopefully, if this submission succeeds, then major management decisions on vehicle-free tihi can be postponed until they’re dealt with at this level, with proper consultation procedures in place, as outlaid by the Reserves Act.

Statutory guarantees for consultation on Reserve Management plans

The TMA administers Takarunga / Mt Victoria as a Recreation Reserve and the Reserves Act 1977 specifies procedures as to how a management plan for such a reserve should proceed. The reserve administrator produces a draft management plan and the act then specifies an extensive consultation process, as outlaid in (Section 41, (5) a, b, c, and d). The ‘legacy’ management plan previously in place for ‘Mt Victoria – Takarunga’ is a good summary of why draft management plans exist, and why the consultation process is valuable (the italics are our own):

‘Every administering body of a reserve, including Local Authorities, is required, pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977, to prepare a reserve management plan for each reserve under its control. The aim of the legislation is to ensure that the development and management of reserves and the subsequent use and enjoyment of them by the public is based on sound resource management and that, through involvement, the needs of the public are identified and accommodated as appropriate.”

We acknowledge, as you state in your letter to us of March 14 2018, that the TMA’s 2016 Integrated Management Plan (IMP) replaced whatever management plans then

---

1 IMP, p 7
2 IMP, p 90
existed for all 14 of the maunga that came under the TMA’s cloak, including Takarunga / Mt Victoria. We respectfully disagree, though, with your further statement in that letter implying that therefore “the Authority has met its requirements under the Reserves Act 1977.” Not at all. The IMP put in place the values and pathways that would guide TMA management planning of the maunga. The IMP though, except in a few instances which we review below, did not give any policy details. In particular it did not address the policy that’s at issue in this submission – namely vehicle bans and the removal of legacy car parks.

To sum up, we believe you have not met your requirements under the Reserves Act 1977 because –

- The IMP went out for review to the Auckland public and attracted, according to TMA chair Paul Majurey, something like 130 submissions. However, those submissions cannot have been adequately informed about any pending vehicle-free tihi policy because there was no such explicit proposal in the IMP. The document mentioned it once as regards Maungawhau / Mt Eden, and we discuss that further in Appendix one. The IMP mentioned it a second time when describing the functions of the Individual Tupuna Maunga Management Plans. This is also discussed further in Appendix one, but briefly, the IIMMP can be seen as the third and most comprehensive level of management strategy. This is the plan, it seems to us, that most closely conforms with what the Reserves Act requires of an administrator, namely a clear draft policy relating to a specific reserve that then sits in the local library over weeks for comment from the public. Any IIMMP for Takarunga is still at least a year distant, yet without waiting, the TMA has taken major steps to secure a vehicle-free tihi on Takarunga anyway, piecemeal, with a barrier arm first and now – we think – though its somewhat obscured by the opaque language of the Operational Plan, the removal of most of the upper carpark

- To be clear, the IMP did not address vehicle-free tihi at a policy level, yet the TMA has moved swiftly to enforce that policy anyway. We consider that such actions – judged against the Reserves Act’s insistence on meaningful draft management policy, and meaningful public consultation – are quite possibly ultra vires.

**Provisions of the Collective Redress Act**

Section 8 of the Nga Mana Whenua o Tamaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 describes how the act is to be interpreted, and says . . . “It is the intention of Parliament that this Act is interpreted in a manner that best furthers the agreements expressed in the Collective Deed.”

The Collective Deed says (2.4.2a) that each maunga “is to be held for the common benefit of the iwi and hapu of Nga Mana Whenua o Tamaki Makaurau and the other people of Auckland.”

In respect of this clause in the Collective Deed, we submit that the TMA, by establishing vehicle-free tihi while effectively denying a sufficient submissions
process on that policy, has, in particular, trampled on the rights of “the other people of Auckland”.

The Collective Deed also says (2.30) under the heading ‘Further Provisions Relating to Administration of Maunga' that “existing public access to each maunga will be retained, except to the extent it is regulated otherwise by the Maunga Authority through the management plan for the maunga.”

The primary meaning of regulate as per the New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary is ‘Control, govern, or direct by rules or regulations.’ The Maunga Authority’s Integrated Management Plan, by our reading, did not “regulate otherwise” but the TMA by its actions after the IMP was in place, nonetheless changed existing public access.

We made clear during the public meeting of May 24, 2018, that the TMA’s own figures from its 2018 ‘Captivate’ survey on three of the TMA’s maunga – two of them, Maungawhau and Maungakiekie under vehicle prohibition, and one of them Takarunga, at that stage still open to vehicles – support the conclusion that usage of the reserves by 55-year-olds-and-older on the closed maunga has dropped around 30% compared to Takarunga which was still open to vehicles at the time of the survey. We also did a rigorous 54-day survey of Takarunga leisure populations—measuring attendance on consecutive days at sunset, and concluded that general use of Takarunga, at sunset, was down around 50% on weekdays and 66% on Friday nights and weekends. This survey is available if you want to see it, and includes notation and photographs of vehicles parking on and damaging the sward, a result of insufficient parking at peak times.

We thank the TMA for listening to our oral submissions on March 4 as regards the Operational Plan. The exchanges there have helped inform this submission. You should know that of the two maunga in our area, Takarunga in particular is sufficiently integrated into the community that it affects even the slope of the main street. It’s a pity there’s no council representative from this area sitting on the TMA to present arguments on our behalf, for feelings in Devonport are still raw and need care. As I understand it, local Devonport-Takapuna Local Board chair George Wood put his hand up for representation on the TMA in the current term and was not appointed, yet somehow, of the 6 council members who represent “the other people of Auckland”, two come from the Maungawhau area, where vehicle-free tihi is already a done deal, and the locals are satisfied. The point here is: there’s no representative where the need is greatest.

Geoff Chapple  
Cam Calder  
Ian Free  

17/03/2019
Appendix one

Mentions of vehicle-free tihi within the IMP

1) Maungawhau / Mt Eden - Aside from its Values and Pathways, the IMP did offer eight specific policies and frameworks and management decisions.\(^4\) Seven of them applied across all 14 of the maunga – an alcohol and smoke-free policy, a filming and events framework policy etc – but one of them was specifically single, namely “Vehicle-free tihi Maungawhau / Mt Eden Decision.” The process of clearing vehicles off Maungawhau / Mt Eden’s tihi had already begun, consonant with Maungawhau’s legacy management plan, its 2011 ban on buses, its supportive Albert-Eden local board, and its ‘Friends of Maungawhau’ community group. Mention of this policy was the time and place, had the TMA wished to be forthright, to announce any wider policy or framework for taking vehicles off the other five maunga that had public road access at or near their summits. Had it done so, the TMA’s IMP would likely have been deluged with nay-saying submissions, for, as one indication of public mood, the 2015 NZ Herald poll, the only poll ever taken on vehicle-free tihi, found that while 58% of Aucklanders supported the vehicle ban on Maungawhau / Mt Eden only 28% favoured that policy for the other Auckland maunga with road access.

2) The Individual Tupuna Maunga Management Plans - The second specific mention of vehicle-free tihi is relegated to the confines of the ITMMPs. These are the plans, the IMP states, that will “give effect to the Values, Pathways, guidelines and strategies.”\(^5\) These ITMMPs, says the IMP, will include “Management of vehicle access, traffic movement and car parking on the Tupuna Maunga, including vehicle-free tihi and traffic management plans.”\(^6\)

The Devonport meeting of May 24, 2018 expressed its belief that the TMA, by quoting the IMP as its justification for the barrier arm on Takarunga, and by failing to wait for Takarunga’s more detailed Individual Tupuna Maunga Management Plan was therefore massively jumping the gun. TMA chairman, Paul Majurey, replied to this charge.

“It’s a misreading of the Integrated Management Plan to say that everything’s going to be held back for the Individual Management Plan. What we have set out is an architecture on how these things work together. Each layer provides more specificity and those Individual Management Plans are going to get right down to detail about what are the ideas around the furniture for people to sit on. What are the picnic areas?”

The TMA has apparently moved from the ITMMP being the chosen management tool for bringing in vehicle-free tihi, to it being merely the tool for deciding on minor matters of designated picnic areas, and reserve furniture. So the question remains: when the TMA makes major decisions such as vehicle-free tihi, and makes those decisions outside of the accepted procedures of the Reserves Act, isn’t it effectively silencing any informed public voice on these vital issues?

\(^4\) IMP p 84
\(^5\) IMP, p. 99
\(^6\) ibid p 91
18 March 2019

George Wood
Chair, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

By Email:

Dear George

Re: Notice of Motion – Issues relating to the Queensland Fruit fly response

I am advised that Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Member Mike Cohen has submitted a Notice of Motion for your business meeting of Tuesday, 19 March, seconded by Deputy Chair Grant Gillon.

This proposed motion refers to a meeting on Sunday, 17 February, in response to the identification of a Queensland fruit fly in Devonport. It asks me what the role of the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board and Chair is in a biosecurity issue of this nature.

There is an implied criticism that there was exclusion of the board from formal meetings that may have occurred. Let me assure you that this is not correct. I visited staff working on the fruit fly campaign because on both days of the weekend in question, I was in the area and wanted to understand and attend what was being done to contain the problem.

There were no pre-organised or formal meetings that the board ought to have been invited to. I was advised of the discovery of the fruit fly on Thursday, February 14, as I am sure your board was. I actively sought updates from staff of both the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) and Auckland Council.

On Saturday, 16 February, I attended a Korean community event at Takapuna Grammar School with North Shore Ward Councillor Chris Darby. We were advised that council staff were active in Devonport and made an on the spot decision to meet and talk with MPI and council staff involved in informing the community about the fruit fly threat.

On Sunday, 17 February, following another community event in North Auckland, I called back to Devonport to check progress on efforts to contain the spread of fruit flies. While I was there, I met up with the Minister for Biosecurity who hosted an impromptu press stand-up alongside biosecurity officials, at the Devonport Ferry Terminal. No planned meeting took place between myself, Councillor Darby and biosecurity officials, as Member Cohen’s Notice of Motion suggests.
I hope this clarifies the situation for you. Please feel free to ring me personally if you have any other concerns. Personal contact, rather than notices of motion, is generally a better way of dealing with issues of this nature.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Phil Goff
MAYOR OF AUCKLAND
Memo

27 February 2019

To: Councillor Linda Cooper – Chair, Regulatory Committee
   All Regulatory Committee members

cc: All Devonport-Takapuna Local Board members

From: George Wood – Chair, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board
      Grant Gillon – Deputy Chair, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Subject: Devonport-Takapuna Local Board feedback on draft Freedom Camping in Vehicles bylaw

1. The purpose of this memo is to outline the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board’s (the local board) feedback on the draft Freedom Camping in Vehicles bylaw (the bylaw).

2. This feedback is currently draft and will be formally endorsed by the local board at their March 2019 business meeting.

General comments

3. The local board thank and appreciate the Regulatory Committee’s (the Committee) support to date to prohibit freedom camping in the local board area.

4. The local board advocate that following the public consultation process, that the Committee continue to prohibit freedom camping from all 28 sites across the area.

5. In accordance with clause 7(1), the local board consider that all 28 sites across the local board area are unsuitable for freedom camping because:

   - parks and reserves across the local board area already are already experiencing high utilisation from both active and passive recreation users;
   - many parks and reserves in the local board area are for specialised activities (i.e. sports fields, or significant ecological areas) and therefore unsuitable as freedom camping sites;
   - there is extremely limited infrastructure (i.e. suitable carparks and toilets) to support freedom camping in parks and reserves;
   - other areas such as beaches and estuaries are environmentally sensitive areas which require a higher level of protection;
   - several parks, reserves and beaches across the local board area have popular assets such as boat ramps and boat trailer parking spaces. Allowing additional vehicles at both sites will restrict access for boat users and create further congestion and safety issues in the carpark areas, and surrounding streets; and
   - many parks and reserves across the local board areas are located in urbanised area and within close proximity to residential areas and permitting freedom camping in these areas may create noise and anti-social behaviour issues.)
Response to bylaw provisions

6. The local board support the following bylaw provisions:
   - clause 8(1)(a) freedom camping must be in a certified self-contained vehicle;
   - clause 8(1)(c) the vehicle may spend no more than two nights in the area during a four-week period;
   - clause 10(1)(a-d) the council may temporarily restrict freedom camping using a vehicle in all or part of any local authority for one or more of the following purposes:
     - to protect flora, fauna, land, structures, infrastructure from damage; and/or
     - to protect public health and safety; and/or
     - to allow for maintenance; and/or
     - to allow exclusive use for any person or specified activity.
   - clause 13(1) every person commits an offence who freedom camps or makes preparations to freedom camp in a local authority area in breach of any prohibition or restriction in this Bylaw that applies to the area is liable to a fine of $200, as outlined in the Freedom Camping Act 2011.

7. The local board do not support clause 9, as non-self-contained vehicles should be directed to camping grounds (both council-owned and privately operated).

Other comments

8. The local board notes significant concern that the bylaw contains no general rules that can apply to areas not specifically scheduled in the bylaw. In practice, the draft bylaw would permit freedom camping on local roads with no parking restrictions.

9. The local board consider this a risk to both the draft bylaw and roading network because:
   - local roads in the area are already increased significant pressure from people using them to park and walk to bus stops under the new public transport network;
   - they will contribute towards increased congestion issues in both town centres and residential areas;
   - there is no infrastructure to support freedom camping along road corridors; and
   - allowing freedom camping outside residential areas and outside individual properties is an encroachment on people’s privacy and may create anti-social behaviour issues.

10. The local board strongly recommend that the Committee include general rules that will apply to areas not specifically scheduled in the bylaw. In addition, these areas should be restricted to certified self-vehicles and be limited to a two-night maximum stay.

Implementation and operational comments
11. The local board notes concern that council’s compliance teams are already responsible for a range of regulatory matters (e.g. bylaws breaches, resource consent monitoring, unconsented building work and noise control) and this bylaw will further stretch their limited resources.

12. The local board recommend that a budget be considered so that additional resourcing can support the implementation and regulation of the bylaw.

13. The local board recommend that implementation of the bylaw be supported by an ongoing marketing and education campaign to inform where freedom campers are permitted to stay. This campaign should also encourage self-contained vehicles to use their on-board facilities rather than park infrastructure.

14. The local board suggest that an online booking / permitting system be developed to manage and control freedom camping at permitted areas.

15. The local board suggest that a user-pays system for infrastructure and facilities should be developed at permitted freedom camping areas.
Report Name: Board Chairman George Wood

Report Period: From 20/Feb/2019 – To 19/Mar/2019

1. **Additional Waitemata Harbour Connection:** The New Zealand Transport Agency recently publicly released a document on the modelling work they have done for an additional Waitemata Harbour connection. 
   It is interesting to read the timeline for this additional crossing. The NZTA talk about the impact of heavy trucks on the clip-on lanes. I have written to the NZTA requesting information on their current policies for heavy trucks on the clip-on lanes. Letter attached.

2. **SkyPath Project:** I have written to the NZTA requesting information on the proposed SkyPath structure on the Auckland Harbour Bridge. I have requested that the D-T LB be party to any consultation on this project. Letter attached.

3. **Road Safety issues:** The issue of DSi on our roads was a topic at the Local Board chairs forum in March and I also attended a Panel Discussion on Safe Speeds at Auckland hospital on Friday 15 March. I am working with chair of the Waitemata Local Board Pippa Coom on a remit for the Local Government Conference in Wellington in July on the subject of traffic infringements policy. Programme for the Auckland Hospital meeting herewith.

   **Is the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board submitting on this changes in urban speeds proposed by Auckland Transport?**

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>George Wood – Chairman, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Panel Discussion on Safe Speeds

Join Auckland Regional Public Health Service and Auckland Transport for a panel discussion on safe speeds and how they affect you and the health of our city.

The panel will discuss why and how safe speeds are important to save lives, reduce injuries, improve wellbeing and encourage activity like walking and cycling.

Date: Friday 15 March 2019
Time: 8:00am - 9:30am
Location: Marion Davis Library, Ernest Davis Lecture Hall
Auckland City Hospital

THE PANEL:
Mike Shepherd - Director of Starship Child Health, Medical, Community and Paediatric Emergency Specialist
Melody Smith - Associate Professor, Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, Auckland University
Michael Hale - Public Health Medicine Specialist, Auckland DHB
Pippa Coom - Waitemata Local Board Chair
Shane Ellison - Auckland Transport Chief Executive
Bryan Sherritt - Auckland Transport Executive General Manager Safety

Get there with public transport
www.at.govt.nz/bus-train-ferry
08 March 2019

Mr Steven Mutton

NZTA Director of Regional Relationships for the Upper North Island

Email: steven.mutton@nzta.govt.nz

Dear Steven,

SkyPath Project:

Last month you contacted me to advise that the New Zealand Transport Agency was about to issue a media statement regarding the SkyPath project. Since then there has been a considerable amount of news media comment. Could the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board be sent a copy of the news media statement along with details of the critical path that NZTA will follow to deliver this project. If the NZTA intends to carry out consultation during this planning and delivery of the project could our board be included in this process please.

With Kind Regards,

George Wood CNZM,
chairman
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board,
email: George.Wood@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz,
mob 02108220923
08 March 2019
Mr Steven Mutton
NZTA Director of Regional Relationships for the Upper North Island
Email: steven.mutton@nzta.govt.nz

Dear Steven,

**Trucks on the Auckland Harbour Bridge:**

Following the strengthening of the Auckland Harbour Bridge clip-on lanes, back in 2009, it was initially decided that trucks over 13 tonnes would be kept off the northbound clip-ons. Then the NZTA relented and changed the policy to allow trucks up to a maximum weight of 44 tonnes onto the northbound clip-ons.

These days I see trucks displaying H signs traveling north on the clip-on lanes. Can I be advised as to the latest NZTA policy for managing heavy trucks with or without H permits on the Auckland Harbour Bridge? What is the maximum tonnage permitted on the clip-ons?

Also in the recent report “Additional Waitemata Harbour Crossing (AWHC) – Transport Modelling” there is mention at paragraph 13 of restricting trucks to a maximum of 35 tonnes on the AHB. Can I be advised as to how this figure was arrived at and what NZTA sees as the implications for more trucks on the AHB if this restriction is implemented?

With Kind Regards,

George Wood CNZM,
chairman
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board,
email: George.Wood@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz,
mob 02108220925