

Summary of Submissions

Proposed Direction for the
Government Policy Statement
on Land Transport Funding
2012/13 – 2021/22

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	4
Engagement process	4
SUBMISSION PROCESS	4
Stakeholder submissions	4
Other submissions	4
STAKEHOLDER SUBMISIONS	5
Direction planned for GPS 2012	5
General comment	5
Strong and continuing focus on economic growth and productivity	5
Value-for-money	6
Road safety	7
Including a statement of strategic direction	7
Removing the focus short- to medium-term focus on economic stimulus	8
Roads of National Significance (RoNS)	8
Making explicit the full extent of infrastructure investment in road safety	8
Canterbury earthquake recovery	8
Impacts	9
Funding	9
Proposed funding allocations	9
Other land transport funding policies (regionally distributed funds)	11
Revenue	11
Additional revenue tools	12
OTHER SUBMISSIONS	12
APPENDIX: LIST OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BY KEY STAKEHOLDERS	13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document summarises the submissions received on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding 2012/13 – 2021/22 (GPS 2012) engagement document. It mainly focuses on comments received by key stakeholders, but also briefly summarises feedback received from unsolicited submitters.

Of the 44 key stakeholders invited to make a submission 29 responded. In addition, 25 district and city councils made a submission. Beside submissions received from key stakeholders, 474 unsolicited submissions were received, of which 421 were identical responses, based on information on the Green Party website.

There was significant variation in the views of stakeholders, nevertheless the following key themes emerged:

- There is general support for the three priorities proposed for GPS 2012 — economic growth and productivity, value-for-money and road safety. However, some submitters' support is contingent on these being short term priorities and some have different opinions on how economic growth and productivity should be achieved.
- Some submitters state their concern that longer term issues such as peak oil/the volatility of oil prices, climate change and an aging population also need to be addressed.
- There is wide support for the inclusion of a statement of strategic direction in GPS 2012 and the development of a Forward Plan for Transport. Some submitters state that there is an urgent need for the government to express its long-term vision to give some planning certainty to the sector. In some submitters' view, the GPS seems to be driving the strategic direction although it is not a long-term planning document but an implementation plan. However, there seem to be different expectations about what the statement of strategic direction and the Forward Plan should be.
- Some stakeholders submit that more consideration needs to be given to a more balanced investment across the activity classes. The proposed direction is described by some as being too focused on State highways, particularly Roads of National Significance (RoNS) at the expense of local roads and (mentioned less frequently) public transport. Some submitters argue that prioritising the investment on State highways fails to recognise the feeder function of local roads into the State highway system. There are also a number of stakeholders who think that more emphasis should be given to integrated transport solutions. Others are stressing that primary industries are important for economic growth and productivity. There is a view among some stakeholders that the provinces and rural New Zealand are somewhat overlooked.
- There is concern about the proposed levels of funding for maintenance and renewals, particularly for local roads, and to a lesser extent for State highways. There is a view expressed by some, that maintaining the existing network should have higher priority than building new roads. Many stakeholders are also concerned that reduced funding for these activity classes will lead to reduced levels of service.
- There are calls from some quarters to increase the funding ranges for the two public transport activity classes. The view is that the proposed funding ranges for public transport services fail to recognise the likelihood of patronage increases, not only in the main urban areas. Funding for public transport infrastructure is cited by some as vital to ensuring value-for-money from investment in public transport services is obtained.

- There is wide support for road safety as a key priority in GPS 2012. However, some submitters expressed the view that *Safer Journeys* is about the safe system approach and the engagement document under-represents safe speeds, safe vehicles and safe road users in terms of focus and funding.
- There are calls from some submitters to increase the funding ranges for the other activity classes, particularly walking and cycling facilities and road user safety.

INTRODUCTION

This document summarises the submissions received on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding 2012/13 – 2021/22 (GPS 2012) engagement document.

Engagement process

In preparing the GPS, the Minister of Transport must “have regard to the views of Local Government New Zealand and representative groups of land transport users and providers (including representative groups of coastal shipping users and providers)” (Land Transport Management Act Section 87 (1)(c)).

On 26 April 2011 the Ministry of Transport (the Ministry), on behalf of the Minister of Transport, sent an engagement document to 44 key stakeholders to seek their views on the proposed direction for GPS 2012. The engagement period closed on 27 May 2011.

A copy of the engagement document was also made available on the Ministry website.

SUBMISSION PROCESS

Stakeholder submissions

Submissions from the following stakeholders were received (see Appendix for detailed list):

- Local Government NZ (LGNZ), regional councils and regional transport committees, unitary councils, Auckland Council and Auckland Transport. In addition, 25 city and district councils submitted their views, often to add regional aspects to the LGNZ submission.
- Representative organisations, including the New Zealand Automobile Association (NZAA), Road Transport Forum, Roding New Zealand, members of the NZ Transport Agency’s (NZTA) freight forum, the Cycling Advocates Network, Kiwi Rail Group and the Institution of Professional Engineers NZ (IPENZ).

Other submissions

Beside submissions received from key stakeholders, 474 unsolicited submissions were received, of which 421 were identical responses, based on information on the Green Party website.

STAKEHOLDER SUBMISIONS

Direction planned for GPS 2012

General comment

Many stakeholders generally support the three priorities proposed for GPS 2012 — economic growth and productivity, value-for-money and road safety. However, some stakeholders note that their support is contingent on these being short term priorities. Significant issues like peak oil/the volatility of oil prices, climate change and an aging population are identified as not seeming to be addressed in GPS 2012.

Many submitters think that more consideration needs to be given to a more balanced investment across the activity classes. The view expressed most frequently in this regard is that following the proposed direction means that too much money will be spent on State highways, particularly the Roads of National Significance (RoNS) at the expense of local roads and (mentioned less frequently) public transport. Some stakeholders would like more emphasis to be given to integrated transport solutions and the interconnectedness of the transport system. The rural and provincial councils in particular comment on the provinces and the hinterland being somewhat overlooked.

The New Zealand Shipping Federation expresses its disappointment that the engagement document refers to the wider sector, eg. Within the vision for the transport sector, but in their view makes no attempt to put land transport spending in the wider context of the wider transport sector.

LGNZ comments that local government is a co-investor in transport outcomes and should not be viewed as simply being another interest group. LGNZ sees government as the steward, not owner, of the National Land Transport Fund (NLTF), and state the NLTF is generated from the use of central and local government assets. LGNZ requests that some form of distribution equity (based on where revenue was generated) must be reflected in funding allocations.

Some councils request that the GPS should take into account their regional plans and priorities. They refer to their regional land transport strategies, which councils are in the process of finalising. Some councils also request the opportunity to review the GPS before it is finalised, or more generally ask for more collaboration between central and local government.

IPENZ comments that the frequency and timing of the GPS makes it difficult for coordination with local government planning and funding processes.

Strong and continuing focus on economic growth and productivity

Many stakeholders generally support this priority. One reason given is that infrastructure investment is critical to economic performance.

Some submitters from rural and provincial areas stress the importance of primary industries for economic growth and productivity. This is used as an argument for the importance of local roads for economic prosperity and an urge for a transport focus on farm-gate to port or market. In line with this, some stakeholders submit that more recognition should be given to the fact that networks outside the main urban centres also contribute to economic growth and productivity.

LGNZ comments that economic growth and productivity can be achieved more comprehensively with a balanced (i.e. different) portfolio of investments. Suggestions are made that a greater number of smaller projects will contribute more towards achieving this priority than investment in a few big State highway projects. Concentrating

on a small number of locations is also noted as not supporting the contracting sector elsewhere in the country.

Investing in good public transport in urban areas is seen by some submitters as also being vital for economic growth and productivity. The Environment Canterbury submission refers to recent United States evidence that shows that whilst State highway construction does create employment, investing in public transport creates more jobs more effectively. It suggests that the Minister and the Ministry should look at other jurisdictions and take this information into account.

KiwiRail submits that the document fails to acknowledge the contribution rail freight makes to New Zealand's economy.

The NZAA adds another facet to this discussion by strongly objecting that 'productive' is synonymous with 'heavy freight'. It suggests assessing the economic growth and productivity contribution of light vehicles before finalising GPS 2012.

Value-for-money

Value-for-money is supported by many stakeholders. However, there seem to be questions about what value-for-money actually means and what the explanation given in the engagement document means (ie. 'better and smarter' service delivery, 'getting more out of what is spent is an expectation'). Environment Southland's submission suggests providing a definition and a method of calculating value-for-money.

A wide range of comments are made with regard to value-for-money, a number of which are summarised below.

A freight forum member comments that value-for-money is a fashion statement and that further cost cutting will lead to reduction in quality and asset life.

Views differ on the question to what extent value-for-money is currently achieved in the land transport system, with some stakeholders providing information to prove that they have made and are making progress in this area, whereas others pointing to weaknesses in the current system.

In their combined submission, Roothing New Zealand and the New Zealand Contractors' Federation flag that innovative initiatives have become less accepted by clients (generally councils) when using traditional procurement methods, even if the product is of higher quality and is less expensive than the traditional alternative. They also think that significant value-for-money improvements can be made through procurement models. They suggest setting up a Sector Task Force, comprising of representatives from the NZTA, local government and industry, to identify and progress value-for-money and innovation initiatives.

Far North District Council refers to its development of a road maintenance hierarchy to help road users understand the levels of service they can expect. This hierarchy will be the foundation for establishing a new integrated management and maintenance system to achieve greater value-for-money.

One freight forum member submits that it is not convinced that the current model used by the NZTA for repair and upgrade of roading network gives best value-for-money as many repairs and upgrades require remedial work within a short time of work being completed. It states that this is a significant disruption for road users.

The NZAA considers there are areas where greater value-for-money can be achieved without compromising outcomes. It suspects that the single largest achievement of value-for-money lies in the area of the regulatory environment and consent processes and practices. The NZAA therefore encourages the Minister to include in GPS 2012 a direction to the Ministry and NZTA to investigate and report back on the cost burden of, and propose changes to, the regulatory environment for transport infrastructure (and

require the same from the Ministry for Economic Development to undertake a similar assessment for the other network infrastructure sectors). According to the NZAA, the second largest area for achieving value-for-money is in applying stronger protections for the asset from degradation of function that necessitate costly duplication. The NZAA recommends a holistic analysis of the roading hierarchy, including local roads, to identify gaps in investment in local arterial and feeder roads supporting the State highway network function.

Road safety

There is wide support for road safety as a key priority in GPS 2012. Many stakeholders that submit on this issue link this priority to the government's road safety strategy *Safer Journeys*.

The main comment in this area is that *Safer Journeys* is about the safe system approach and that the engagement document under represents safe speeds, safe vehicles and safe road users in terms of focus and funding. LGNZ acknowledges that investing in State highways is likely to provide significant safety benefits due to the concentrated traffic volumes, but comments that the safe system approach is more holistic. LGNZ concludes that resources are required in all areas to make progress.

Horizons Regional Council's Regional Transport Committee comments that local government is a key partner in *Safer Journeys*, but GPS 2012 allocates little funding to support local government.

The NZAA submits that it would have preferred a dedicated funding pool for safety. As it is unclear to the NZAA whether the safety related roading expenditure in the engagement document is additional funding. The NZAA will repeat its election call for an additional \$150 million road safety budget.

Living Streets Aotearoa (LSA) supports safety for pedestrians, but comments that the funding allocation does not show how this is going to be achieved.

Including a statement of strategic direction

There is wide support for the inclusion of a statement of strategic direction in GPS 2012 and the development of a Forward Plan for Transport.

Many submitters comment that they are concerned about the lack of strategic thinking and that there is an urgent need for the government to express its long-term vision to give some future planning certainty to the sector. Comment is made by some stakeholders that the GPS seems to be driving the strategic direction, although it is an implementation plan rather than a long-term planning document.

IPENZ query the value of preparing the GPS in absence of an overarching strategy for land transport.

There also seem to be different expectations on what the statement of strategic direction and the Forward Plan will be. Some stakeholders assume or hope that the Forward Plan will give national guidance on issues like climate change, volatile oil prices and aging population. Others suggest that the Forward Plan could include targets, a vision and/or objectives.

Some stakeholders also comment on the vision provided in the engagement document. A number of submitters believe the environment and sustainability should be mentioned, whereas a couple think that the vision is too wordy and long. Greater Wellington Regional Council notes that the proposed vision does not reflect some important transport issues that the GPS is required to contribute to under the LTMA (being affordable, integrated, and sustainable).

LGNZ and some councils offer or request to be involved in setting of the long-term direction, with LGNZ giving the role of local government as co-investor as a reason.

Removing the focus short- to medium-term focus on economic stimulus

Many stakeholders did not comment on this aspect. Those who did comment had mixed views on removing the economic stimulus. A few, mainly representing the freight sector and/or rural and provincial New Zealand, think that the economic stimulus is still needed, particularly outside the main centres. One council thinks that the situation is likely to worsen as consequence of the Canterbury earthquake. Some other councils and LGNZ believe that the impact of the stimulus package is overstated.

Roads of National Significance (RoNS)

Comment on the existing and possible future RoNS is mixed. Support for RoNS comes mainly from regions that have RoNS in their own region or are benefitting from RoNS close by.

Some stakeholders agree with or are not opposed to RoNS in general. However, comment is made that future RoNS should not be identified in GPS 2012 but by the NZTA, following its decision-making process and based on evidence. Comments expressed by some stakeholders include that transparency is required around the selection process of current and future RoNS and that the State highway classification system should not be used for selecting future RoNS, as this is an operational tool and excludes local roads. Some submissions refer to the low benefit-cost-ratios of some RoNS.

In its submission the NZAA considers it is important to continue with the certainty provided by the RoNS framework, but urges a strong value-for-money approach. The NZAA suggests putting a cap on the RoNS budgets to generate efficiencies. The NZAA submits that RoNS should achieve 4-star safety standard, but not be over-engineered. The NZAA would appreciate having input into the selection of future RoNS.

The Road Transport Forum appreciates that RoNS demonstrate commitment to investment in infrastructure, but have growing concern that the RoNS programme will progressively politicise the decision making process, and that the emphasis on RoNS has the potential to distort the prioritisation of scarce resources.

Making explicit the full extent of infrastructure investment in road safety

Many stakeholders did not comment on this aspect. Those who did comment generally supported this idea. However, questions are raised in some submissions about the practicalities of making the safety investment explicit. Further explanation on how this would work or more research into the feasibility is requested. LGNZ comments that the appropriateness of the target will depend on how safety related expenditure is defined.

Canterbury earthquake recovery

Most stakeholders that commented on this priority support the need to rebuild Christchurch.

Some submitters, mainly councils, comment that this should not be done at the expense of local roads maintenance and renewals in other regions. Some submitters suggest deferring work on RoNS/State highway improvements if additional funding is needed for the Canterbury recovery. Environment Southland requests a definitive statement regarding where within the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) this funding will be found.

LGNZ suggests creating a temporary activity class for this purpose.

Impacts

Submitters note that the impacts listed in the engagement document are not measurable, and that the impacts could be better aligned with the government's vision for the transport sector. For example, accessibility is mentioned in the vision but not covered in the impacts, whereas environmental effects are part of the impacts but not covered in the vision.

LGNZ suggests making 'a secure and resilient transport network' a priority theme for GPS 2012.

Funding

Proposed funding allocations

The statement in the engagement document that "funding ranges [of some activity classes] have been lowered to encourage efficiencies" received some comments.

Western Bay of Plenty District Council supports this direction. The council submits that since it introduced a performance based contracting model in 2002, savings of 22 percent in comparison with the previous contract model have been realised (\$30 million over a ten year period).

Other stakeholders' comments are that encouraging efficiencies by lowering funding ranges is unrealistic and they question whether lowering funding ranges can drive efficiencies. One freight forum member comments that funding ranges should only be lowered if waste is identified and targeted.

Roading

KiwiRail submits that funding decisions for roads are sub-optimal if they fail to take account of all relevant infrastructure including rail, road and ports and their interfaces. KiwiRail argues that it may not be sensible to fund roading projects at the proposed levels when there is a suitable rail alternative that has or could be upgraded.

Maintenance and renewals

Most comments regarding the proposed funding ranges per activity class relate to concern about the proposed levels of funding for maintenance and renewals, particularly for local roads, and to a lesser extent for State highways. There is a view from some submitters that maintaining the existing networks should have higher priority than building new roads. Many stakeholders are also concerned that reduced funding for these activity classes will lead to reduced levels of service.

Roading New Zealand and the New Zealand Contractors' Federation submit that New Zealand has a low capital cost high maintenance cost roading network and that insufficient maintenance and renewals funding levels may lead to increasing the whole of life costs of the roading network. Some submitters refer to this as false efficiencies. Roothing New Zealand and the New Zealand Contractors' Federation also question whether the indicators currently in use to measure the condition of roads are appropriate, and suggest that instead international asset management techniques should be used to determine funding levels.

IPENZ submits that analysis is required to investigate whether reduced funding will have a long-term effect on the roading network.

Another issue raised is that much of the local roading infrastructure will come up for renewal at the same time, which will require additional funding. Some roading authorities are concerned that the proposed funding ranges will put more pressure on them to

maintain levels of service. They submitted that additional pressure on the maintenance and renewal budgets is also expected by the high productivity motor vehicles (HPMV) policy (both on local roads and State highways). The Road Transport Forum submits that as the road freight sector will pay more road user charges (RUC) under the HPMV policy, this should be reflected in increased expenditure towards maintenance and renewals.

Some councils submit that prioritising the investment on State highways fails to recognise the feeder function of local roads onto the State highway system. Some comment that the funding ranges seem to have little relationship with the forecasts in asset management plans and do not acknowledge the fact that councils are in multi-year contracts, which makes achieving efficiency gains in the short-term more difficult.

State highways

Most comment around State highway funding is related to either the proposed maintenance and renewals funding ranges, or the RoNS. Both aspects are discussed elsewhere in this summary.

One submitter suggests that a small reduction in the new and improved infrastructure for State highways activity class would provide an opportunity for existing networks to be maintained at a level that will allow productive growth to take place.

Public transport

There is wide concern among key stakeholders about the proposed funding ranges for the two public transport activity classes.

Whereas additional funding for metro rail is supported by the submitters commenting on this issue, some critical feedback is given regarding the proposed funding ranges for public transport services and infrastructure.

According to some submitters, the proposed funding ranges for public transport services fail to recognise the likelihood of patronage increases (not only in the main urban areas), the rate of inflation and the importance of public transport for addressing congestion and providing affordable transport alternatives. Horizons Regional Council submits that significant gains can be made in provincial areas for very little national subsidy, for example increased bus frequency in Palmerston North has led to a 16 percent patronage increase. However, another submitter comments that public transport subsidies must be targeted to congestion relief in main urban areas.

An argument given to support increased funding for public transport infrastructure is that this is vital to ensure value-for-money is obtained from investment in public transport services.

IPENZ recommends that the government explains the reasons for the proposed reductions in public transport infrastructure funding and the implications this will have for levels of service.

Road user safety

There is concern from some submitters about the funding range of the road user safety activity class. IPENZ considers the reductions planned in this area are unreasonable. Consequently, some stakeholders recommend reconsidering the funding ranges, as they do not think that the *Safer Journeys* outcomes can be achieved without additional funding, particularly for local government.

Some submitters refer to the benefits of road safety education programmes and state that behaviour change is a long-term process. Reduced funding in this area is seen as

counter productive to the road safety related infrastructure investment proposed in the GPS.

Walking and cycling

There are calls from some submitters to increase the funding ranges of the walking and cycling facilities activity class. IPENZ recommends that the actual spend should be near the middle of the funding range, rather than at the bottom, where it sat historically. Reasons given for requesting more funding for walking and cycling include the multiple benefits, including health, and the fact that projects in this activity class are often very cost effective.

A few submitters support aligning the New Zealand Cycle Trail Expansion Project with GPS 2012, only one submitter explicitly opposes this idea.

A few stakeholders state their support for the model communities. However, one submitter raises equity issues around the model communities concept.

Sector training and research

Some stakeholders recommend increasing, or reviewing, the funding ranges for this activity class. They argue that sector training and research is important for the long-term direction and reduced funding is counter productive to identifying opportunities for value-for-money.

Transport planning

There is concern from some submitters about reducing the funding ranges for this activity class. A reason given is that reduced funding may affect the medium- to long-term outcomes, as it can lead to projects with ill-defined objectives and scope.

Some submitters also argued that some activities in this activity class are driven by several statutory planning processes required as a result of the latest Land Transport Management Act amendments and by the need to support NZTA funding applications.

Otago Regional Council supports a funding cut in this activity class, but the council states that legislative and NZTA requirements for planning will need to be reduced before local government can lower planning costs. It urges the government to expedite those changes.

Other land transport funding policies (regionally distributed funds)

LGNZ, a few councils and the NZAA comment on the regionally distributed funds (R-funds) proposal in the engagement document. LGNZ submits that clarification on the future of R-funds beyond 2015 is needed. Greater Wellington Regional Council encourages the Ministry of Transport to involve relevant regional councils in further work on this issue.

The NZAA submits that R-funds provide a valuable outlet for local preferences and ensure some ongoing development and improvement at local level. The NZAA supports developing some alternative to R-funds, particularly if this is linked to *Safer Journeys* and a strong value-for-money ethic is applied. The NZAA would appreciate being consulted on alternatives to R-funding.

Revenue

LGNZ questions whether the projected increase in revenue of 45 percent by 2021/22 is realistic, as it “seems to contradict current trends highlighted by declining car ownership

rates, static traffic volumes and decreasing travel both per capita and per vehicle". Based on this statement, LGNZ recommends that consideration should be given to the ongoing sustainability of the NLTF, particularly in out-years.

The NZAA thinks that the proposed funding ranges will present some strong challenges and will require progressive operational efficiencies. As the proposed funding ranges are wide, the NZTA will have "considerable scope" to allocate funds. The NZAA expects that a funding shortfall will emerge over time and anticipates that this will lead to fuel excise duty (FED), road user charges (RUC) and toll increases. As the NZAA thinks that there is currently a substantial inequity between FED and RUC payers, it submits that FED should be held constant until RUC contribution reaches that of petrol under the cost allocation model. To meet the expected funding shortfall, the NZAA suggests that GST on petrol tax and RUC could be redirected to the NLTF.

IPENZ submits that it is unclear whether the projections of the total level of investment available through the NLTF take into account the reduced revenue as a result of the recent decision not to implement the proposed 1.5 cents per litre increase in FED. IPENZ also compares the funding ranges for GPS 2008, the current GPS and GPS 2012 and recommends the government explains why 10 year funding projections are well below 2008 and 2009 projections.

Additional revenue tools

Although not discussed in the engagement document, a few stakeholders comment on or make recommendations about possible additional revenue tools.

Ports of Auckland acknowledge in its submission the need to return government finances back to surpluses. It urges that GPS 2012 provide clarity around the need to identify new revenue sources.

The New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development submits the need for new and innovative funding methods to enable the step change needed in transport infrastructure.

LGZ recommends that consideration be given to the potential need to provide local government with additional funding tools to advance projects of local and regional importance. One potential non-rates based funding tool mentioned in LGZ's submission is regional fuel tax.

Auckland Council submits that it is exploring alternative funding sources for its transport programme and wishes to work closely with central government on these options. This is seen as urgent, as Auckland Council will need to be certain about its funding policy by July 2012, when adopting its Long Term Council Community Plan.

OTHER SUBMISSIONS

The main view expressed in unsolicited submissions from individuals and organisations with an interest in transport is that too much funding is being allocated to new and improved State highways. Some submitters think that the current RoNS have very poor economic justification.

A comment made by many individuals and organisations is that more funding should be allocated to public transport and to walking and cycling. Some also submit that new rail projects should be eligible for funding from the NLTF.

Another comment made by some submitters is the lack of consideration in the engagement document of future trends that impact on transport, particularly New Zealand's dependence on oil and problems around oil price volatility.

APPENDIX: LIST OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BY KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Key Stakeholder	Submission received
Accessible Transport Action Committee	
Bike NZ	
Bus and Coach Association	
Cycling Advocates Network	✓
Fonterra Co-operative Group Ltd	
Halls Refrigerated Transport Ltd	
Hooker Pacific	✓
HW Richardson Group	✓
Institution of Professional Engineers NZ	✓
KiwiRail Group	✓
Living Streets Aotearoa	✓
Mainfreight Ltd	
Motorcycle Safety Levy Advisory Council	
New Zealand Automobile Association	✓
New Zealand Contractors Federation	✓
New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development	✓
NZ Shippers Council	
NZL Group Ltd	✓
NZ Shipping Federation	✓
NZ Transport Agency	
Ports of Auckland	✓
Port of Tauranga Ltd	
Roading New Zealand	✓
Road Transport Forum	✓
Toll New Zealand	
TR Group Ltd	
Local Government New Zealand	✓
Auckland Council	✓
Auckland Transport	✓
Bay of Plenty Regional Council	✓
Environment Canterbury	✓
Environment Southland	✓
Gisborne District Council	✓
Greater Wellington Regional Council	✓
Hawke's Bay Regional Council	✓
Horizons Regional Council	✓
Marlborough District Council	
Nelson City Council	✓
Northland Regional Council	✓
Otago Regional Council	✓
Taranaki Regional Council	✓
Tasman District Council	
Waikato Regional Council	✓
West Coast Regional Council	

LIST OF OTHER SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

District or City Council	
Ashburton District Council	Queenstown Lakes District Council
Christchurch City Council	Ruapehu District Council
Dunedin City Council	Rotorua District Council
Far North District Council	Selwyn District Council
Grey District Council	South Waikato District Council
Hamilton City Council	Southland District Council
Hauraki District Council	Tararua District Council
Hurunui District Council	Taupo District Council
Invercargill City Council	Thames-Coromandel District Council
Kapiti Coast District Council	Timaru District Council
Manawatu District Council	Waikato District Council
Matamata Piako District Council	Western Bay of Plenty District Council
Palmerston North City Council	

Other organisations
Association of Consulting Engineers New Zealand Inc (ACENZ)
Bike Lanes In Paradise
The Campaign for Better Transport Inc
CCS Disability Action
Centre for Urban and Transport Studies (CUTS)
Cycle Action Auckland
Cycle Action Waikato
Cycle Aware Wellington
Engineers for Social Responsibility Incorporated
Gisborne Cycling Advisory Group
INGENIUM - The Association of Local Government Engineering New Zealand Inc
Island Bay World Service
Living Streets Canterbury
Living Streets Hamilton
SASTA - Safe and Sustainable Transport Association
Skycabs
Spokes Dunedin cycling
Sport Tasman
The Clean Green Machine Co Ltd
TRAFINZ - The Traffic Institute of New Zealand
Wellington Civic Trust
WWF New Zealand