

The list of actions have been generated in response to the submissions received for SH5.

Focus Area	Issue	Action	Why	Responsible owner	Timeframe
Technical Assessment	Robustness of the Technical Assessment and appropriateness of the limit is being challenged	Confirm the Crash Statistics (numbers of crashes / time period)	Several submissions challenge the numbers being communicated	Urban Connection	2 weeks
		Validate the personal and collective risk ratings	The technical assessment is reliant in part on the personal and collective risk scores for the corridor. If there is an error in the crash stats, this could impact these ratings.	Urban Connection	2 weeks
		Validate the DSI benefits	If the PR and or CR ratings are vastly different to MegaMaps this will affect the estimated DSI savings	Urban Connection	2 weeks
		Revisit the time calculations for the proposal	Several submissions dispute the time impacts and claim this has been significantly downplayed	Urban Connection	2 weeks
		Further dissect the homogenous lengths and assess the SAAS	Several submissions claim that this is a blanket approach and that the changes in environment have not been accounted for. Some of the lengths are aprox 40km in length and would benefit from a refined assessment	Urban Connection	2 weeks
Broader Engagement	submitters claim that there has been significant under investment in the route which is directly responsible for the poor safety Performance. Specifically, that speed management is not the right response. Infrastructure investment is urgently needed.	Since initial engagement, there has been accelerated pavement resurfacing works. The amount (km/\$) should be provided	Overall, all of the mentioned activities demonstrate a holistic approach to the planned management of the corridor, demonstrating that Speed Management is not the only response being provided, however is perhaps the quickest action which can be provided in the short term.	Asset Manager	TBC
		Since initial engagement, there has been \$2.5M in safety improvements (guardrails, road marking, signage, intersection improvements at Tarawera Café)		Regional Safety Engineer	Complete
		There may also be other committed maintenance activities in the current NLTP programme. This should be provided		Asset Manager	TBC
		There is a committed \$160M SIP package for the corridor. The infrastructure outcomes should be provided.		SIP	TBC
		there is a committed Programme Business Case (PBC) scheduled within TIO for the current NLTP. The purpose of the PBC, and its integration with the SIP should be detailed.		Regional Transport Planner	TBC
	HDC/ NCC claim that the consultation process was inadequate.	Audit consultation process. The minimum consultation requirements as set out with the Setting of Speed Limits Rule must have been met (Audit).	Confirm the legitimacy of the consultation process	Standards	TBC
		Audit engagement process. Confirm whether appropriate engagement was undertaken with regional stakeholders in advance of the consultation period		Comms and Engagement	TBC
	Stakeholders are all very focused on individual crashes and the likelihood of speed management to affect the crash causation factors	A common approach to communication outlining the way Waka Kotahi are evaluating risk needs to be developed. I.e. the focus needs to shift from individual crash by crash analysis and emphasis on the inherent level of risk to an individual user as result of the available infrastructure being the most significant factor when determining the Safe and Appropriate Speed.	A consistent approach to key messaging about the merits and technical approach to speed management is required to underpin the credibility of the programme.	Comms and Engagement	TBC

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982