

30 March 2021

s9(2)(a) privacy

s9(2)(a) privacy

REF: OIA-7775

Dear s9(2)(a) privacy

### **Request made under the Official Information Act 1982**

Thank you for your email of 2 March 2021 requesting the following information under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act) and each question will be answered in turn:

*As I alluded to earlier I'm interested in the work that preceded the Board's attached Decision from their 20 May 2020 meeting regarding "Transmission Gully Revocation". Obviously I have from you Matt Hunt's 19 May 2020 position paper to your Investment and Delivery Committee, but I'm particularly interested in how Matt arrived at this position.*

As a background to your request, please see the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency State Highway revocation policy (<https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/planning-and-investment/docs/state-highway-revocation-policy.pdf>), which states:

*Where there are changes to the state highway network that create duplicate sections of State highway serving the same function (e.g. as result of realignments or construction of a bypass), and it is established that a state highway is no longer required, the NZTA should seek to have the state highway status of that road revoked.*

- 1. What other options if any were considered,**
- 2. what were the pros and cons of each, and what were the overriding factors that resulted in Matt's choice of option?**

Prior to the recommendations of the 19 May 2020 Investment & Delivery Committee paper being presented to the Board on 20 May 2020, Waka Kotahi conducted a strategic review of the two sections of state highway (State Highway 1 between Linden and Paekākāriki, and State Highway 58 between Paremata and Pāuatahanui) that would be affected by the opening of Transmission Gully.

The review only considered the future of these sections of the state highway network. It did not consider reconfiguration of the wider state highway or local road network.

This was an objective consideration of whether each section of road would continue to meet the definition of a state highway following the opening of Transmission Gully, and how the Waka Kotahi revocation policy may then apply.

The review took a "whole of network" approach, which included consideration of:

- Resilience benefits and challenges
- Current and future maintenance costs

- Emergency and disaster response
- Access to rail line and other infrastructure
- Future urban development and traffic volumes

The review recommended that the preliminary position of Waka Kotahi on the strategic importance of SH1 and SH58 should be:

- SH1 coastal route will still be considered of significant strategic importance
- SH58 is considered to be of lesser strategic importance.

SH1 coastal route - the reasons for the recommended preliminary position for SH1 coastal route include:

- resilience – SH1 will continue to provide an additional route into Wellington, particularly during times when closures are experienced on Transmission Gully. It is crucial that journey time predictability, economic confidence and the importance of the Kapiti railway line and its relationship to the SH1 coastal route are considered.
- careful future land use management is required so as not to undermine the transport benefits that are associated with Transmission Gully – impacting SH1 coastal route's ability to provide an alternative route to / from Wellington should Transmission Gully experience full or part closure.
- alignment with the State Highway Control Manual.
- alignment with the strategic goals and objectives of external stakeholders.

SH58 west of Transmission Gully - the reasons for the recommended preliminary position of SH58 include:

- analysis of the State Highway Control Manual suggests that SH58 will no longer be representative of a state highway once Transmission Gully opens. Rather, this road will function more as a local road.
- the strategic importance of SH58 is reduced significantly with the opening of Transmission Gully.
- access and growth from existing SH58 will be best realised by Porirua City Council.

**3. Also to what extend were the committee and later the board made aware of any alternative options (if at all) and their respective merits?**

**4. And finally how was this all presented to the board? a paper, a presentation or simply as an agenda item?**

A paper outlining the proposed position regarding these sections of SH1 and SH58 was provided to the Waka Kotahi Board ahead of its May 2020 meeting, and included as an agenda item, as per usual processes. As noted in the answer to questions 1 and 2, there were no alternative options provided, as that was not the purpose of the strategic review. The review only looked at the appropriate sections of SH1 and SH58 to determine whether they would still meet the criteria to remain a state highway, and whether the revocation policy should apply.

A Waka Kotahi Transport Services Group representative was available to provide further context and explanation of the proposed positions.

**5. *And while were here I note that the attached decision still seems to be redacted in the Board's minutes on your website – why is this so, and when can I expect this redaction to be removed please?***

The reason for the redactions in this instance was to give Waka Kotahi time to advise partners and stakeholders of the preliminary position. Waka Kotahi will look to get this updated on its website and we will inform you when this has happened.

If you would like to discuss this reply with Waka Kotahi, please contact Ministerial Services by email to [official.correspondence@nzta.govt.nz](mailto:official.correspondence@nzta.govt.nz).

In accordance with Waka Kotahi policy, this response will be published on its website shortly.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robyn Elston', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**Robyn Elston**

National Manager Systems Design