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Minutes of a workshop of the Finance and Performance Committee held remotely on Wednesday, 26 August 2020 at 10.00am.

PRESENT

Cr Desley Simpson, JP, Chairperson
Cr Shane Henderson, Deputy Chairperson
Cr Josephine Bartley
IMSB Member Renata Blair
Cr Cathy Casey
Cr Bill Cashmore
Cr Fa’anana Efeso Collins
Cr Pippa Coom
Cr Linda Cooper, JP
Cr Angela Dalton
Cr Chris Darby
Cr Alf Filipaina
Cr C Fletcher
Hon Phil Goff, CNZM, JP
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Tracy Mulholland
Cr Daniel Newman, JP
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Sharon Stewart
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr John Watson
Cr Paul Young

ABSENT

IMSB Chair David Taipari
Purpose: To workshop matters related to the 10-year Budget 2021-2031.

Note: The information contained in the presentations attached to these minutes are for internal discussion purposes only, and should not be construed as council policy unless and until adopted.

Note: No decisions or resolutions may be made by a Workshop or Working Party, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Apologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No apologies were received from the Finance and Performance Committee.

The following apologies in relation to local board chairs were noted:

- Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Chair Aidan Bennett - absence. Deputy Chair George Wood in attendance.
- Papakura Local Board Chair Brent Catchpole – early absence
- Puketapapa Local Board Chair Julie Fairey – early departure. Deputy Chair Harry Doig was also in attendance.
- Waitakere Local Board Chair Richard Nortey – early departure. Member Alexandra Bonham was also in attendance.

Subsequent apologies were received from Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Chair Lemauga Lydia Sosene and Waitākere Local Board Chair Cath Handley for absence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 | Declarations of Interest  
Members were reminded of the need to declare any conflict that may arise between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.  
No declarations of interest were received. |
| 3 | Introduction to the 10-year Budget 2021-2031  
Cr Simpson welcomed Team Auckland to the first workshop for the 10-year budget.  
Mayor Phil Goff introduced the process and the proposed direction. |
|  | Process overview and financial context  
Kylie Thompson, Programme Manager, Ross Tucker, General Manager Financial Strategy and Planning; and Michael Burns, Manager Financial Strategy gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. |
|  | Scene setting and strategic lenses  
Denise O’Shaughnesy, Manager Strategic Advice gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. |
|  | The workshop adjourned at 12.00pm and reconvened at 12.45pm. |
|  | Performance information overview  
David Gurney, Manager Corporate and Local Board Performance gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. |
|  | Asset management 101  
Michael Boyle, Manager Infrastructure Strategy; Sri Rangamuawa, Asset Planning and Policy Manager (Auckland Transport); Justine Hayes, General Manager Service Strategy and Integration; and Rob Cairns, Head of Investment, Programme and Advice gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. |
|  | *Cr Fletcher left the meeting at 1.10pm.*  
*Cr Fletcher returned to the meeting at 1.45pm.* |
<p>|  | The workshop adjourned at 2.49pm and reconvened at 3.00pm. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Rates overview and land-based valuation**  
Andrew Duncan, Manager Financial Policy; David Norman, Chief Economist; Aaron Matich, Principal Advisor – Financial Policy; and Peter McKay, Principal Valuer gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes.  
Cr T Mulholland left the workshop at 3.09pm.  
Cr T Mulholland returned to the workshop at 3.25pm.  
Cr S Henderson retired from the workshop at 3.55pm.  
IMSB Member R Blair retired from the meeting at 4.21pm.  
Cr C Darby retired from the meeting at 4.30pm. |

The workshop closed at 4.32pm.
10-year Budget 2021-2031
Process overview and financial context

Finance and Performance workshop
26 August 2020

The 10-year Budget

- A statutory planning document
  - must be reviewed every three years
- A whole of group process
- Informed by financial context and strategic landscape
- An audited process
  - standards for performance measures and asset management planning
Today’s agenda

- Process overview and financial context:
  - Process overview
  - Financial context
- Scene setting and strategic lenses
- Performance information overview
- Asset management 101
- Rates overview and land-based valuation

Process overview
Overall process

2020
- Today: Inaugural F&P workshop

2021
- Audit Process
- 10 Feb: G3 meeting - Adopts CB & BI
- 25 Feb - 15 Mar: Public consultation
- 29 Mar: Final Audit process

2021
- 8x F&P workshops

10-year Budget architecture

Lenses – Review & alignment
How will we make sure that what we are planning aligns to our key strategies?

Activity Areas – External focus
What are services and investments to be delivered over the next 5-10 years?

Workstreams - Content & process
What are all the things we need to do to develop this 10-year Budget?

Lanes – Key decisions
What are the 5-6 key issues to be resolved for this 10-year budget?
### Key decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lanes – Key decisions</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>What key actions will we take to respond to climate change and how will this be paid for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and growth infrastructure</td>
<td>How will we respond to the need for significant infrastructure upgrades to support new housing and development across Auckland?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community investment</td>
<td>What are the priorities for community investment and what will we do with our aging facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water strategy and reform?</td>
<td>What is the medium to long-term strategy for securing Auckland’s drinking water supply? What are the implications of the government’s water reform programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku funding model?</td>
<td>Should we move Panuku to a more sustainable funding model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment levels and funding levers</td>
<td>What are the right levels of capital and operating spending and what are the options to pay for this?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity areas – external focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity area</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>What does the refreshed ATAP mean for RLTP and RFT?</td>
<td>AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do we respond to changing PT demand?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three waters</td>
<td>Are updates required to the water quality programme?</td>
<td>Watercare / AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Community</td>
<td>What changes are required to support communities?</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre &amp; local development</td>
<td>What changes are needed to our city centre and town centre upgrade programmes</td>
<td>Panuku / AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and cultural development</td>
<td>What at the opportunities post-merger?</td>
<td>RFA / ATEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management and regulation</td>
<td>Are updates required to the natural environment programme?</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council support</td>
<td>Opportunities for the corporate property strategy.</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involvement in the process “Team Auckland”

- Role of councillors
- Role of local boards
- Council-Controlled Organisations
- Audit and Risk Committee
- Audit New Zealand
Finance and Performance workshops - 2020

26 August
10am – 5pm
Introduction

9 September
10am – 1pm
Strategic discussion with CEOs

16 September
10am – 1pm
Investment levels and funding levers

23 September
10am – 5pm
Climate change

23 September
10am – 5pm
Environmental management & regulation

14 October
10am – 5pm
Housing and growth infrastructure

Performance information overview

Rates overview & fund base valuation

Asset management 101

21 October
50 minutes
Rates policy

20 October
10am – 5pm
Community investment

8 November
10am – 5pm
Water Strategy & Reform

11 November
10am – 5pm
Local Board input

25 November
10am – 1pm
Reform (including local elections)

Parks & Community

Economic and cultural development

Council support

City Centre & Local Development

Air quality

Transport

Panuku funding model

City Strategy

DC Policy

Mayoral Proposal for consultation
Communications and engagement

- Lessons learned from the Emergency Budget and ongoing monitoring
- Using councillors to promote the campaign worked – let’s do more
- New online forums worked well
- Tagging stakeholders will be improved and how we present the public feedback
- Opportunities for EM input into communications and engagement approach
- Building greater trust and confidence in how we are managing our finances

10-year Budget 2021-2031
Initial financial position
Our 10-year Budget 2018-2028

- Looked to respond to the three key challenges identified in the revision of the Auckland Plan:
  - Population growth and its implications
  - Sharing prosperity with all Aucklanders
  - Reducing environmental degradation

- Ambitious capital investment programme of over $26 billion

- Supported by new revenue sources – a regional fuel tax and two new targeted rates

Key considerations - trends

Population growth
- Consistently growth over the last decade
- Grown more than the population of Hamilton

Public Transport
- Before COVID-19, grown more than 4x the rate of population growth over the last decade
**Key considerations - trends**

**Capital delivery**
- The council group has ramped delivery rates over recent years, from 1.5 billion per annum to over 2 billion per annum.

**Climate change**
- For example, reduced rainfall will affect water supply and increased storm events will affect asset renewal requirements.

---

**Key considerations - COVID-19**

- **Emergency Budget 2020/2021**
  - Key challenge – revenue hit
  - Debt and capital expenditure levers have enduring impacts

- **Revenue over medium term**
  - Length of hit to commercial operations at airport and port
  - Pace of return to public transport use
  - What will happen to development? – impact on consenting and DC revenue

- **Identifying challenges for next decade**
  - What does the “new normal” look like?
  - Will population growth return? Will it look the same?
  - Will the public look for different services from the council?
Key considerations - Government policy

- Election
- Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP)
- Shovel ready projects
- Changes to RMA legislation
- Water reform
- Urban Development Agency

Planning in an uncertain environment

- Sources of uncertainty
  - COVID disruption – Alert levels, border restrictions
  - Growth projections
  - Rates of climate change
  - Central government policies

- Forecasting assumptions
  - Disclosure in planning documents
  - Set following advice from experts (economists, scientists etc)
  - Role of Audit and Risk Committee
  - Look to bring forward first draft set in October/November

- Scenario modelling
  - Where appropriate different scenarios will be presented to allow assessment of a range of outcomes
Indicative investment capacity

Total investment may be similar but:
- Higher CRL requirement
- Lower group capex

Debt-to-revenue pressure

Auckland Council Group debt to revenue ratio
**Investment demand – scale of challenges**

- **Climate**
  - Council has declared a climate emergency and set expectations of action
  - Both mitigation and adaptation actions required

- **Housing**
  - Demand to enable new areas in both greenfields and brownfields
  - Higher standards of infrastructure now expected for developments

- **Renewals**
  - Last LTP identified $759m funding gap for Community Facilities alone
  - Prioritisation in recent years to address funding gaps
  - Delays to investment increase both maintenance and eventual renewal costs

---

**Funding gap**

- Limited capacity to invest – especially in first three years
- Lever approach required to increase funding and achieve prioritisation

---

**Affordable Capacity**

- Increased Funding
- Prioritisation

**Investment requirement**

10 year LTP capex programme
### Available levers

**Levers used in Emergency Budget 2020/2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital investment</th>
<th>Operating spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Levels</td>
<td>• Service levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing</td>
<td>• Efficiencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt parameters</th>
<th>Asset opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Debt-to-revenue setting</td>
<td>• Recycling &amp; optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Depreciation funding</td>
<td>• Ports and airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shareholdings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional levers available in long-term plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue settings</th>
<th>Central government partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• General and targeted rates</td>
<td>• Kāinga Ora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fees and charges</td>
<td>• Waka Kotahi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative funding and financing**

| • IFF                        |
| • Congestion charging        |

### Financial next steps

- Workshop on investment levels and funding levers – 16 September
- Significant forecasting assumptions – October / November
- Deciding on any changes to financial settings for consultation – December
- Developing draft budgets / policies and audit review – December / January
Scene setting and strategic lenses
Finance and Performance Committee
26 August 2020

Our long-term strategy
Auckland Plan 2020
Delivering long-term sustainable outcomes for Auckland and its people

Key Strategies, Policies and Plans
Activities that are a long-term focus and outline priorities for implementation over the medium term

City Centre
Happiness
Resilience
Innovation
Development

Economic
Cultural
Social
Environmental

attachment B
**Our intermediate strategies**

Strategies and plans (typically 5 to 10 years horizon) provide the strategic directions to our Activity Areas.

**What are the strategic lenses?**

Provide a framework to inform decisions by:
- Checking strategic alignment
- Thinking about recovery
- Focusing on critical response areas
Recovery lens

Recent challenges that affect all outcomes

- Employment and Income
- Business resilience
- Community resilience
- Hard-hit industries e.g. hospitality, tourism and export education
- Auckland as a destination

Recovery objectives

Restored economic activity with greater equity and longer-term resilience

Sustainable employment

Social cohesion and inclusive, resilient communities

We focus our efforts and investments on recovery guided by the Auckland Plan.
Recovery applied to Auckland Plan outcomes

**Belonging and Participation**
- Focus on community resilience and some communities of greatest need through inclusive access to services and social infrastructure

**Opportunity and Prosperity**
- Immediate needs of businesses
- Local business growth and innovative business practices
- Māori and Pacific youth transition into workforce

**Healthy City and Vibrant Towns**
- Focus on tamariki and whānau needs, strong mahi tamariki leadership, and employment outcomes

**Transport and Access**
- Affordable and equitable travel choices and improved transport safety

**Homes and Places**
- Infrastructure to enable housing (including social and affordable) development
- Investment in anticipated growth areas with significant development prospects by council or partners
- Variety of housing cost and tenure options

**Environment and Cultural Heritage**
- Ensure development continues Auckland’s natural environment with a focus on green infrastructure

- Services that build community resilience
- Adaptable services that meet community needs
- Community-led solutions, including Māori Wānanga and Māori communities

Communities of greatest need will be different depending on the type of service we are delivering.
Māori outcomes lens

- Kia ora Tāmaki Makaurau outlines the Council group’s strategic priorities for delivery and how they will contribute to the Mana Outcomes.
- Delivering on these priorities is particularly important in the light of COVID-19 which may disproportionately impact Māori.

Climate lens

Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan

- Climate mitigation
  - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by **50 per cent by 2030** and achieve net zero emissions by 2050

- Climate adaptation
  - Adapt to impacts of climate change by **planning for changes**, we face under a dynamic pathway approach.

We consider climate impacts in everything we do.
Development lens

- Auckland is expected to continue to grow over time, but may slow over next 3-4 years
- Infrastructure delivery takes time, we need to plan now to ensure we make the best use of our resources
- Investment in the short to medium term should follow the Development Strategy’s strategic approach, through investing in key spatial priority areas
- Prioritise places where:
  - significant short to medium term growth anticipated
  - council or partners delivering significant development projects and infrastructure

What’s next?

September
Options development

Working with business to apply the lenses across Lanes, workstreams and Activity Areas where appropriate

October/November
Political workshops and decision-making

Assess how lenses have been applied to assist decision making
Performance Measures review
10-year Budget 2021-2031

David Gurney
Manager Corporate & Local Board Performance

Background

- LTP allows the review of Levels of Service statements, associated performance measures (KPIs) and targets
- Alignment to Auckland Plan Outcomes and Council strategies is important
- Last LTP we did a comprehensive review of all measures and improved alignment to Auckland Plan outcomes
- We propose an incremental review for this LTP – reflecting new Council strategies and practical issues with some KPIs
- We want to offer Local Boards some choice about which measures they will use.
Working with CCOs

- When reviewing KPIs with CCOs, we consider:
  - Legislatively required measures (i.e. Watercare with DIA measures),
  - Statement of Intent 2020-2023, and
  - Current set of LTP performance measures
Local Board performance measures

- LB feedback
- Menu of measures

Local Board members indicated that they would like some ability to tailor their performance measures to reflect the individual outcomes and priorities of their local board area.

Currently, there are 15 measures which are reported consistently at the LB level and aggregated up to a regional measure.

Target setting > Investment logic

- Targets are based on historical performance, adjusted for any change in investment or mix of activities
- Audit requirements: Credibility and Measurability
  - Measures with robust meta data (measure intent, methodology, data source, accountability)
  - Evidence/baseline approach to target setting
  - Practicality
Example

The percentage of threatened plants and animals under active management

- 2017: 35%
- 2018: 34%
- 2019: 42%
- 2020: 35%

We have estimated 400+ threatened species in Auckland and know enough about 127 of them so we can enhance their populations.

This also includes island biosecurity which has been enhanced by the Natural Environment Targeted Rate
Asset Management 101
Finance and Performance Committee workshop
26 August 2020

Today’s workshop

Part 1: Asset management fundamentals (20 mins)

Part 2: Auckland Transport (30 mins)

Part 3: Community (30 mins)

Part 4: 30-Year Infrastructure Strategy (10 mins)
Asset management fundamentals

The purpose of asset management is to provide a desired level of service through the management of assets in the most cost-effective manner for present and future customers.

Over $50b in assets across 7 asset management plans

- Stormwater: $4.6b
- Waste: $48m
- Community services: $12b
- Transport: $19b
- Water & wastewater: $10b
- Urban regeneration: $0.8b
- Regional facilities: $1.5b
Drivers of asset management

- **Demand** – changing demand for services
- **Levels of service** – asset performance and community outcomes
- **Renewals** – replacing existing assets
- **Resilience** – for example, natural hazards and climate change
- **Operational expenditure** – ongoing running costs

*balanced with*

Available funding – acceptable cost to the community

---

**2021 LTP population growth**

- 2018 LTP
- 2021 LTP
- Uncertainty
Growth staging and sequencing

Attachments

Asset management to meet levels of service

Levels of service enable council to report reliably/meaningfully on the effects of its activities on the four well beings and on its performance in delivering planned levels of services.

Less deaths on road

Level of service set

What does this mean for our assets?

Will our current approach achieve this goal (LoS)?

Role of asset management
To meet Auckland Plan 2050 outcomes...

...and give effect to Council strategies

## Asset renewals

- Renewals are prioritised based on asset condition, criticality and risk
- But often linked to a growth or level of service project
- How can we be confident we are sufficiently investing in renewals?

Healthy Waters 2018
The role of demand management

The growth of demand for our services and assets will impact significantly future cost profiles.
Demand management can be an effective mitigation and can include:
- Managing community / development expectations
- Effective council policies to improve asset efficiency in the use of transportation and water assets – e.g. water conservations efforts
- Thinking about using price mechanisms to help manage demand – e.g. lower priced off-peak public transport fares to manage peak demand after the first Covid-19 lockdown
AT Asset Management Functions

- Maintain Assets Inventory
- Monitor investment completion rates and creation of new invested assets
- Assess asset performance (existing and future needs)
- Develop investment plans to meet agreed community outcomes
- Review community needs, service levels, and risk exposure

AT Asset Portfolio Overview
16 million items with a current value of $19 billion, growing at a rate of 1.5%

- Transport network
  - $336 million per year
- Roads
  - $18.2 billion
- Park and open spaces
  - $9.2 billion
- Public transport assets
  - $1.5 billion
- Traffic problems, pipes and sewers
  - $7.2 billion
- Street lighting and other services
  - $6.2 billion
- Bridges, walls and embankments
  - $5.3 billion

Road network growing @ 50km - 100km in length per year
Detailed Breakdown by Asset Class

Attachment B

AT Asset Management Framework
(NAMS NZ IIMM Guidelines)
### Asset Performance Monitoring

Regular (every 1 – 3 years) Asset Performance Monitoring includes:

- Demand predictions and traffic count surveys
- Asset Condition surveys including strength assessments
- Risks, criticality and vulnerability assessments
- Seismic assessments
- Asset fatigue and changes in use assessments (i.e. double decked buses, heavy construction traffic)
- Skid resistance surveys
## Operating Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Type</th>
<th>Present Day Land Transport Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased usage of</td>
<td>• The population of Auckland and the transport network continue to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the network</td>
<td>• Will need increasing consequential opex to manage the expanding network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More people</td>
<td>• The number of cars being registered has increased considerably over the last ten years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally require</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aest Detrioration</td>
<td>• The number of heavy trucks using the network increasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy loads and</td>
<td>• The number of buses registered have increased considerably over the last 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher temperatures</td>
<td>• Auckland Council projections show an increase in average temperatures from 15.5 degrees by between 1.5 and 3 degrees by 2080.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will speed up rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of road wearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Context Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Type</th>
<th>Present Day Land Transport Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>• 667 people were killed or seriously injured on Auckland’s roads in 2019. While this is unacceptable, it is a 27% improvement relative to 2017, when 812 people were killed or seriously injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland safety</td>
<td>• Deaths and serious injuries of pedestrians and cyclists decreased significantly in 2019 (pedestrians down 34%, cyclists down 19%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs improvement</td>
<td>• Road death deaths and serious injuries dropped 24%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BUT we still have 300+ high risk intersections and more than 1,000 km of high risk corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>• Changes in our climate will affect the continued operation of our transport services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sea level rise is resulting in more flooding and erosion of the network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased rainfall (weather bombs) means our road drainage systems needs more capacity to overcome flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additionally, there is an increasing evidence that our investment dollar is buying less.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Management and Criticality

Key Asset Risks
- Safety
- Asset Integrity
- Exposure to Natural Hazards

Risk Mitigation Plans
- Inspections and surveys to assess safety deficiencies, asset condition and defects
- Natural hazards exposure assessment of critical assets to establish vulnerability
- Develop and implement resilience improvement programmes
- Develop and implement safety improvement programmes
- Develop and implement asset replacement programmes (future sustainability of the network)

Network Criticality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Network</th>
<th>PT/Metro Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Classification (km)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Criticality Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No. of Sites</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Level 1 - Vital | Level 2 - Major | Level 3 - Significant | Level 4 - Local | Level 5 - Minor

17 September 2020
Asset Management Plan – Key Tasks

- AT updates the 10 year Asset Management Plan guided by the Mayor's vision for Auckland and NZTA requirements

- Asset Renewals Forward Works Programmes (RFWP) are developed on a priority basis annually

- RFWP are checked and optimised against the other planned works within the road corridor

Asset Management Improvements

- Asset Management Investment Portfolio Governance Group (ELT led)

- Utilise Treasury's Investor Confidence Rating (ICR) System for self assessment to benchmark and measure improvements

- Significant improvements currently underway include:
  - Enterprise Asset Management System (INFOR)
  - Streamlining asset vesting processes
  - Use of technology for performance monitoring
  - Benchmarking with peers
Community Portfolio
Finance and Performance Committee workshop
26 August 2020

What do we deliver?
Demand
Who we are providing services for
(Now/future)

We manage demand by understanding the needs
of our communities

Focusing on building our customer insights on
these groups

Our current customers that use our services as their
preferred choice

Groups that use our services infrequently

Groups that use our services frequently

Groups that are missing out (Communities that
need our help)

Lease

Levels of Service
Our current investments

Facilities we run
(>70% of income and non-service)

Programmes we run
(>30% of income and service)

Implications of majority of our services being
asset-based

Our customers need to physically access our
facilities

Assessing our physical library collections

Assessing our e-book collections

Retrofitting assets to current needs is often very costly

25/08/2020
Renewals

More money
- Increased proportion of available budget in LTP
- Alternative income sources to apply to assets

Delivering differently
- Change our portfolio
- Deliver services in different ways
- Deliver our assets in different ways

We undertake renewals to ensure our assets are fit for purpose to deliver services to our communities

Our infrastructure portfolio

We deliver our services using 7 asset types

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS BY SERVICE

LAND
STRUCTURE
PARK
WATER
In the past 3 years
Continuous improvement - dealing with ageing infrastructure

- 2000+ Council Assets surveyed
- 200+ Heritage Building surveyed
- 56000+ Equipment surveyed
- 2000+ Equipment surveyed within the last 12 months
- 140 Keyboard Inspection Reports
- 3800+ Asbestos Management Plans
- 1000+ Full Asset Condition Assessment undertaken

We have more confidence in the accuracy of our renewal forecast.

Our portfolio profile

Asset condition
27% of our assets are in poor to very poor condition

Cost of maintaining current portfolio
Our modeled renewal costs are less than our available budget

Cost: $100,000,000

2018 LIP renewal budget
Modelled cost to undertake required renewal at end of useful asset life
30-year Infrastructure Strategy
Bringing together Council's Asset Management Plans in the 2021 LTP
What is the role of the infrastructure strategy?

- **30-year infrastructure strategy** required under the LGA
- Identify significant **challenges** that council faces
- Present how council plans to **manage its current and future infrastructure** over the next 30 years
- Provide a transparent understanding of **asset condition, performance and lives**
- Look at **tradeoffs, risks, certainties and uncertainties**
- Options to respond to **long term issues** (11-30+)

---

LTP asset management questions to consider...

- 🧑‍💼 Are we sufficiently reinvesting in our assets?
- 📈 Are we preparing ourselves for the future?
- 🔍 Will our investment enable us to meet the levels of service we set?
- 💲 Do our LTP asset decisions represent value for money?
- 🛠️ Have we considered the most effective way we could be delivering our services?
Rating issues: Overview for LTP

Andrew Duncan, Manager Financial Policy

Rating issues: LTP 2021-2031

Primary issues
- Land value rating
- Urban rating
  - set policy basis for adjustment of boundary as city expands

Targeted rates
- Local boards TIBs
- Growth related TIBs
- Tree hazard management
- Cost recovery reviews
- Technical adjustments

Future issues
- Waste standatisation 2022/2023
- APTR technical issues – 2022/2023
Land value rating

Finance and Performance workshop
26 August 2020

David Norman, Chief Economist
Andrew Duncan, Manager Financial Policy
Aaron Malch, Principal Advisor
Peter McKay, Principal Valuer

Overview

- Land value economics
- Policy considerations
- Impacts on ratepayers
- Administrative challenges
- Alternatives to incentivise development
Land value economics

David Norman, Chief Economist

Attachments

Item 12

Land value-based ratings theory

- Land value tax recognised for hundreds of years as the most efficient of all taxes
- There are established, straightforward ways to determine land value for all property types
- Land value tax
  - taxes only land and not what you build
  - does not punish those who use their land efficiently unlike capital value tax
  - encourages more compact development
  - could give us more certainty on when and where land would be developed
  - BUT we need to know what land is worth...
What has been found in places where LV-based taxes are used?

- Evidence from around the USA suggests that LV-based taxes result in:
  - more dwellings consented
  - As property taxes skew more to LV, more development occurs
  - more compact development
  - less sprawl
  - less land-banking on rural land

- Pennsylvania is the most commonly studied locality as the data is available and there are a range of LV/CV taxation schemes

What if Auckland had LV-based rates?

- If development in Auckland responded to LV-based rates in the same way as development did in Pennsylvania
  - approximately 650 additional dwellings consented each year
  - studies suggest that this development would also be more compact

- If the 650 new, additional dwellings per year looked like the average 2010s-built house, they would add around $380 million in construction activity per year.

- We want more housing to:
  - Make housing more affordable
  - Improve social outcomes
    - Social stability and inclusion
    - Better health and education outcomes
    - Better access to services and jobs
But Auckland isn’t Pennsylvania

• There are factors that suggest Auckland’s response could be a bit smaller or a bit bigger than Pennsylvania’s

• Could make Auckland’s response bigger:
  • We have much higher population growth
  • We have much higher rates of new development
  • We have a housing shortage
  • We have stronger growth in land values
  • There is more incentive to develop because of lower property taxes

• Could make response smaller:
  • Our average rates bill is lower
  • Taxes make up a lower percentage of the land’s holding cost

• If Auckland’s response was 50% smaller or 50% bigger than Pennsylvania’s, the value of the additional house construction activity would be between $190 and $570 million per year.

Policy considerations

Andrew Duncan, Manager Financial Policy
 Legislative and LG context

- Decisions on funding must consider matters in:
  - Local Government Act 2002
  - our Revenue and Financing Policy
- Local Government Act key elements include
  - community outcomes
  - beneficiaries
  - drivers of cost
  - overall affordability
- Revenue and Financing Policy as above plus
  - minimise the effects of change
  - efficiency and effectiveness

 Council decision making LGA and R&F

- General rates fund activities that have wide social benefits
- LV supports strategic outcome to increase housing supply
- Benefits accrue to
  - Land — availability of and proximity to services
  - Residents through use of services
- Costs driven by residents use of services
- Affordability
  - more developed land better able to pay
  - sudden large changes to rates may cause affordability issues for some ratepayers
Council decision making - R&F Policy

- Council must weigh matters and consider community views before making funding decisions
- Previously determined
  - CV better reflects ability to pay
  - UAGC ensures everyone contributes minimum reflecting benefits to properties and demand from users irrespective of value
  - differentials reflect balance of demand on services and ability to pay
- Other urban councils
  - All 5 of the main urban areas use CV
  - 7 of 15 minor urban areas use CV

Impacts on ratepayers

Aaron Matich, Principal Advisor
Impacts on ratepayers

- Overall impacts:
  - increases rates for undeveloped/underdeveloped land
  - decreases rates higher developed land
  - decreases rates revenue from growth
- Base scenario
  - change general rates, WQTR, NETR to LV
  - keep differentials and UAGC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>-100% to -20%</th>
<th>-20% to -10%</th>
<th>-10% to 0%</th>
<th>0% to 10%</th>
<th>10% to 20%</th>
<th>20% to 50%</th>
<th>50% +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm/lifestyle</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impacts on ratepayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant business</td>
<td>+80 to 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private cemeteries</td>
<td>+70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>+39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depots/yards</td>
<td>+39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant residential/lifestyle</td>
<td>+33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms/Forestry</td>
<td>+20 to 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm/lifestyle</td>
<td>+4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air transport</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>-90 to 95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impacts on ratepayers - alternatives

- Keep business differential remove UAGC
- Scenario used in economic analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>-10% to -20%</th>
<th>-10% to -10%</th>
<th>0% to 0%</th>
<th>10% to 20%</th>
<th>20% to 50%</th>
<th>50% +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm/lifestyle</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Can mix and match changes to UAGC and differentials
- Larger changes result in increased incentive
- Changes can be managed through transition
Valuation challenges

Peter McKay, Principal Valuer

Overview to LV challenges

- LV rating possible but requires stronger focus on LVs to ensure they are fit for purpose
- New methods required either
  1. build on current approach – statistics and expertise
  2. consider alternatives - full statistical modelling
     (used overseas but not in NZ)
- Either option will be a considerable undertaking with associated delivery risk
  - requires Valuer General approval
  - additional investment required in information systems, data maintenance, and staff development
  - community understanding and acceptance will take time to develop
Public confidence

- Land owner perceptions of Land Value varies
  - “highest and best use” vs “in-use”
- More objections likely
  - costly and time consuming to resolve
  - difficult to support in LVT hearings
- Incentivises objections to lower land values and increase capital values
- Very little land sales evidence to support valuation levels
- LV movements are generally greater than CV movements at a revaluation

Technical issues

- Unit titles and cross lease properties
  - no defined land area on title
  - no standards for determining splits between titles
  - land values for these properties historically contentious
- Mixed and multi rating treatments harder to apportion
- Current approach challenges
  - structure plans and FUZ require full feasibility studies – additional resource needed
  - limited sales data
- Regression analysis challenges
  - data improvements required
  - additional data maintenance requirements
Alternatives to land value rating

Andrew Duncan, Manager Financial Policy

Alternatives to incentivise development

- Undeveloped/underdeveloped land
  - increase rates for undeveloped/underdeveloped land
- Unoccupied dwellings
  - increase rates for unoccupied dwellings
- Removing rural differentials
  - remove 90% differential for rural residential/business
  - remove 80% differential for farm/lifestyle
- Adjusting urban rating area descriptions
  - rate all live zoned land inside RUB as urban
  - no farm/lifestyle rates inside urban rating area
Minutes of a workshop of the Finance and Performance Committee held remotely on Wednesday, 2 September 2020 at 4.00pm.

PRESENT

Cr Desley Simpson, JP, Chairperson
Cr Shane Henderson, Deputy Chairperson
Cr Josephine Bartley
Cr Cathy Casey
Cr Bill Cashmore
Cr Fa’ananana Efeso Collins
Cr Pippa Coom
Cr Linda Cooper, JP
Cr Angela Dalton
Cr Chris Darby
Cr Alf Filipaina
Hon Phil Goff, CNZM, JP
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Tracy Mulholland
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Sharon Stewart
Cr Wayne Walker
Cr John Watson
Cr Paul Young

ABSENT

IMSB Member R Blair
Cr C Fletcher
Cr Daniel Newman, JP
IMSB Chair D Taipari
**Purpose:** To socialise the Panuku Development Auckland and Auckland Transport Park and Ride integrated development programme with committee and seek feedback.

**Note:** No decisions or resolutions may be made by a Workshop or Working Party, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Apologies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Apologies from Cr C Fletcher, Cr D Newman and IMSB Member R Blair for absence were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Declarations of Interest</strong>&lt;br&gt;Members were reminded of the need to declare any conflict that may arise between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.&lt;br&gt;No declarations of interest were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Panuku Development Auckland and Auckland Transport Park and Ride Integrated Development programme</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lettitia Edwards, Head of Strategic Asset Optimisation (Acting) – Panuku Development Auckland; Marian Webb, General Manager Assets and Delivery (Acting) – Panuku Development Auckland; and Kevin Jones, Manager Strategic Projects (North and West) – Auckland Transport provided a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes.&lt;br&gt;Cr S Henderson joined the workshop at 4.04pm.&lt;br&gt;Cr A Filipaine joined the workshop at 4.04pm.&lt;br&gt;Cr T Mulholland joined the workshop at 4.04pm.&lt;br&gt;Cr J Watson joined the workshop at 4.04pm.&lt;br&gt;Cr S Stewart joined the workshop at 4.07pm.&lt;br&gt;Cr W Walker joined the workshop at 4.20pm.&lt;br&gt;Cr G Sayers joined the workshop at 4.40pm.&lt;br&gt;Cr L Cooper retired from the workshop at 5.00pm.&lt;br&gt;Cr E Collins retired from the workshop at 5.05pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop closed at 5.12pm.
AT and Panuku Park and Ride Integrated Development Programme
Purpose

To seek feedback from the Finance and Performance Committee on the proposed Panuku and AT Park and Ride Integrated Development Programme

The proposed programme seeks to integrate transport service requirements at designated council owned park and ride sites with mixed use development

To provide an overview of:

- Programme context
- Park and Ride Objectives and Principles
- Identified sites
- Benefits
- Potential risks
- Local Board engagement and feedback
- Mana whenua engagement and feedback
- Next Steps
Programme Context

- An Auckland Plan transformational shift is to ‘radically improve the quality of urban living’
  - A key aspect of improving the quality of urban living is delivering high-quality integrated development
  - AT and Panuku have complimentary roles to play in this area

- Many properties in the AT fixed asset register present opportunities to deliver high-quality integrated development as well as transport infrastructure

- Potentially significant opportunities have remained untapped

- A number of credible development companies have enquired about the prospect of partnering with AT and Panuku in order to pursue these opportunities.
Programme Context

Background

- Park and Ride (PnR) sites are single use on-ground facilities with untapped development potential
- If development potential can be realised (i.e. some part of the asset sold for redevelopment), optimisation can unlock value to provide funding for reinvestment back into the transport network
- Transport operations would be maintained while delivering a mixture of additional uses
- AT and Panuku have worked together to investigate integrated redevelopment opportunities at council-owned park and ride sites
- 10 potential PnR sites have been identified
Programme Context

• Service property optimisation is a policy tool that aims to deliver improved community outcomes with no impact on rates

• Service property optimisation previously only applied to council community assets

• On 20\textsuperscript{th} March 2018, the Finance and Performance Committee resolved that:

> “the extension of the Optimisation of Service Property approach to Auckland Transport noting that this will enable reinvestment of net proceeds by Auckland Transport in transport priorities arising from the commercial development of service property undertaken in partnership with Panuku as part of an urban development project where airspace is being sold above a transport service site”
Park and Ride; Objectives and Principles

- In 2018, Auckland Transport developed a Programme Business Case (PBC) for investment in Park and Ride across the region. In 2019, NZTA adopted endorsed the PBC.

Role of park and ride
- An integral part of the public transport (PT) network.

Purpose
- PnR is one component of facilities needed to provide customers easy access to public transport
- PnR facilities should intercept car commuters ‘upstream of congestion’ and direct them into the public transport system
Park and Ride; Objectives and Principles

Location Criteria

- PnR facilities are most effective in areas that are car dependent with minimal alternatives to access quality PT services
  - These areas tend to be on the urban periphery where a bigger positive investment impact is possible as land is cheaper
  - In more built up areas, feeder bus services tend to be a more cost efficient access mode

- As land surrounding PnR facilities is developed and land value increases over time, the opportunity to redevelop PnR land to multi-use should be investigated at strategic locations
## Identified sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ōrākei Train Station Park and Ride located 240 at Ōrākei Road, Ōrākei</td>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manurewa Station Park and Ride located at 33 Station Road, Manurewa</td>
<td>Manurewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Selwyn Road car park located at 8 Selwyn Road, Manurewa</td>
<td>Manurewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Homai Station Park and Ride located at 2R Dalgety Drive, Manukau</td>
<td>Manurewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sturges Train Station Park and Ride located at 76 Swanson Road, Henderson</td>
<td>Henderson, Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Papakura Train Station Park and Ride located at 18-22 Railway Street West, Papakura</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Constellation Park and Ride located at 62 Parkway Drive, Rosedale</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Albany Park and Ride located at 250 Oteha Valley Road, Albany</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Silverdale Park and Ride located at 1 Hibiscus Coast Highway, Silverdale</td>
<td>Hibiscus &amp; Bays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adjacent to 20-26 Symonds Street</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits

- Potential integrated development benefits include:
  - Increased residential density and intensification around transport nodes
  - Increased public transport patronage and safe access
  - Increased active mode share
  - Increasing housing supply and delivery of a range of housing typologies
  - Strong urban design and urban regeneration outcomes
  - Financial benefits, capital/latent value released from land holdings
Potential risks

• The main risk is the potential for the transport function of a site to be compromised

• To mitigate any potential risks, specific integrated development proposals for each site would need to:
  o Provide for safe and efficient transport operations and future infrastructure requirements specified by AT such as:
    - future requirements for park and ride capacity
    - additional rail tracks
    - extended station platforms for longer trains
    - increases in bus services/frequency
    - on-demand services and active mode arrival
Potential risks

- Ensure sufficient site footprint/airspace is retained for ease of constructability of future transport requirements

- Minimise/mitigate disruption to the transport system during construction, including coordination of construction timing with planned transport projects

- Include high quality urban design and density outcomes to maximise activities that could benefit from public transport access
Local Board engagement and feedback

- Informal engagement was undertaken with the Hibiscus and Bays, Henderson-Massey, Manurewa, Ōrākei, Papakura and Upper Harbour Local Boards in 2019 and 2020

- The Hibiscus and Bays, Henderson-Massey, Manurewa, Ōrākei, Papakura and Upper Harbour Local Boards endorsed the programme and provided site specific feedback at the respective June and July 2020 business meetings

- Subject to the Finance and Performance Committee approval, AT and Panuku will engage further with impacted local boards regarding:
  - site-specific feedback
  - potential development options for each site
Mana whenua engagement and feedback

- AT and Panuku attended three hui with mana whenua where we:
  - informed mana whenua of the proposed programme
  - sought feedback on the proposed framework for future mana whenua engagement on the Park and Ride Integrated Development Programme

Framework for future engagement

- Due diligence to understand if there are any historical issues or sites of cultural significance for mana whenua
- Contact with each mana whenua group on a site specific basis to understand any potential issues of cultural significance or preferred outcomes
- Invite mana whenua to express potential commercial interest in the subject properties
Finance and Performance Committee
17 September 2020

Attachments

Attachment C

Item 12

Mana whenua engagement

• Framework for engagement

  The feedback received from mana whenua was supportive of the proposal and the

  Seek input into, and collaboration on, any related public realm design

  continued
Next steps

- Subject to Finance and Performance Committee approval, a phased approach will be taken to progressing the selected sites
- Anticipated 20 year programme of work
- Proposed process to achieve programme objectives:

  - Elected members and key stakeholders will be appraised at various stages of the proposed process.
Minutes of a workshop of the Finance and Performance Committee held remotely on Wednesday, 9 September 2020 at 10.00am.

PRESENT

Cr Desley Simpson, JP, Chairperson
Cr Shane Henderson, Deputy Chairperson
Cr Josephine Bartley
Cr Cathy Casey
Cr Bill Cashmore Presiding from 10.00am
Cr Fa'ananana Efeso Collins From 10.28am
Cr Pippa Coom
Cr Linda Cooper, JP
Cr Angela Dalton
Cr Chris Darby
Cr Alf Filipaina From 10.31am
Hon Phil Goff, CNZM, JP
Cr Richard Hills
Cr Tracy Mulholland
Cr Daniel Newman, JP
Cr Greg Sayers
Cr Sharon Stewart From 10.05am
IMSB Chair D Taipari Until 11.45am
Cr Wayne Walker From 10.05am
Cr John Watson
Cr Paul Young

ABSENT

IMSB Member R Blair
Cr C Fletcher
**Purpose:** To workshop matters related to the 10-year Budget 2021-2031.

**Note:** No decisions or resolutions may be made by a Workshop or Working Party, unless the Governing Body or Committee resolution establishing the working party, specifically instructs such action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | **Apologies**  
An apology from Cr C Fletcher for absence was noted. |
| 2 | **Declarations of Interest**  
Members were reminded of the need to declare any conflict that may arise between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.  
No declarations of interest were received. |
| 3 | **10-year Budget 2021-2031 - Strategic Planning Session with Council Controlled Organisations**  
Cr Simpson welcomed all in attendance, including the following representatives of the council-controlled organisations:  
Mark Franklin Chair – ATEED  
Adrienne Young-Cooper Chair – Auckland Transport/Chair – Panuku  
Andrew Barnes Chair – RFA  
Margaret Devlin Chair – Watercare  
Hinerangi Raumati Board member - Watercare  
Nick Hill CEO – ATEED  
Shane Ellison CEO – Auckland Transport  
David Rankin CEO (Acting) - Panuku  
Chris Brooks CEO – RFA  
Raveen Jaduram CEO – Watercare  
Martin Bridge Deputy CEO - Watercare  

Deputy Mayor, Cr Cashmore, welcomed those present and provided an outline for the session.  

*Crs S Stewart joined the workshop at 10.05am.*  
*Crs W Walker joined the workshop at 10.05am.*  

Mayor Goff addressed the workshop and made introductory comments.
**Item 12**

**Recovery - What is your short-term recovery focus and how will this impact on achieving longer term outcomes?**

Mark Franklin, Chair and Nick Hill, Chief Executive – ATEED; and Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and Shane Ellison, Chief Executive - Auckland Transport outlined their responses.

_Cr E Collins joined the workshop at 10.28am_  
_Cr A Filipaina joined the workshop at 10.31am._

Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and David Rankin, Acting Chief Executive – Panuku; Andrew Barnes, Chair and Chris Brooks, Chief Executive – RFA; and Margaret Devlin, Chair, Hinerangi Raumati, Board Member and Marlon Bridge, Deputy Chief Executive – Watercare outlined their responses.

**Māori - How will you fulfil your role in contributing to Māori Outcomes with consideration to the relevant CCO review recommendations?**

Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and David Rankin, Acting Chief Executive – Panuku; Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and Shane Ellison, Chief Executive – Auckland Transport; Margaret Devlin, Chair, Hinerangi Raumati, Board Member and Marlon Bridge, Deputy Chief Executive – Watercare; Andrew Barnes, Chair and Chris Brooks, Chief Executive – RFA; and Mark Franklin, Chair and Nick Hill, Chief Executive – ATEED outlined their responses.

**Climate - What do you think are the most important things for Auckland to do over the next 3 years to build resilience to climate change and reduce GHG emissions?**

Margaret Devlin, Chair, Hinerangi Raumati, Board Member and Marlon Bridge, Deputy Chief Executive – Watercare; Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and Shane Ellison, Chief Executive - Auckland Transport; Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and David Rankin, Acting Chief Executive – Panuku; Andrew Barnes, Chair and Chris Brooks, Chief Executive – RFA; and Mark Franklin, Chair and Nick Hill, Chief Executive – ATEED outlined their responses.

The workshop adjourned at 11.45am and reconvened at 11.50am.

**Development - How will you contribute to aligning investment in spatial priority areas?**

Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and David Rankin, Acting Chief Executive – Panuku; Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and Shane Ellison, Chief Executive - Auckland Transport; Margaret Devlin, Chair, Hinerangi Raumati, Board Member and Marlon Bridge, Deputy Chief Executive – Watercare; Mark Franklin, Chair and Nick Hill, Chief Executive – ATEED; and Andrew Barnes, Chair and Chris Brooks, Chief Executive – RFA outlined their responses.
Item 12

Working together - The independent CCO Review identified a number of ways that the council group could work together better. What changes are you considering that will give effect to these recommendations?

Hinerangi Raumati, Board Member and Marlon Bridge, Deputy Chief Executive – Watercare; Andrew Barnes, Chair and Chris Brooks, Chief Executive – RFA; Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and David Rankin, Acting Chief Executive – Panuku outlined their response to the question; Adrienne Young-Cooper, Chair and Shane Ellison, Chief Executive - Auckland Transport; and Mark Franklin, Chair and Nick Hill, Chief Executive – ATEED outlined their responses.

Feedback on LTP and next steps

Ross Tucker, General Manager Financial Strategy and Planning summarised the key points of the workshop and outlined the next steps.

The workshop closed at 1.00pm.