

APPENDIX 2 – SPECIALISTS’ BRIEF FOR REVIEW OF OPTIONS,
AND SUBSEQUENT NOTE

PP20 Assessment of Alternatives – Specialists' Brief

2.1 Introduction

NZTA have determined that further work is required to ensure consideration of alternative routes has been adequately considered.

This brief sets out the following:

- The background and purpose of the assessment of alternatives.
- An outline of what is required from the specialists.
- When inputs will be required.

2.2 Background

When considering a requirement for a designation, a territorial authority must have particular regard to whether adequate consideration has been given to alternative sites, routes, or methods of undertaking the work.

- Options around the current alignment were considered in the 2000 Review and Development Report and the 2002 Scheme Assessment Report.
- The 2003 Scheme Assessment Report Addendum also contained an assessment of an alternative western alignment; the 'Te Waka' route.
- In October 2009 community groups requested that an assessment also be made of alignments to the east of the board preferred alignment. At the request of NZTA, Opus have therefore completed a project feasibility assessment for two eastern alignments, looking at technical engineering, transportation, cost and economic elements for the two eastern options.

The planning and legal team have now identified that work needs to be done to bring together a single 'Assessment of Alternatives Report' summarising all work completed to assess alternatives including environmental considerations. This report will be provided to the NZTA Board along with the Scheme Assessment Report for the current board preferred alignment to allow the Board to give adequate consideration to alternatives when they make their decision on the scheme in July.

An initial screening process of all routes considered has been completed to identify gaps in consideration of some options and to clarify reasons why some options have not proceeded further. This has provided information on options which have justifiably been retained/rejected and those that are genuine options which have not been sufficiently investigated.

For options that have been retained and options that require further investigation we require our technical specialists to review the existing information on the route options and undertake a desk top investigation¹ to describe effects and coarsely evaluate the options using an effects rating scale with documentation of reasons for the rating conclusion. These ratings will be fed into a review workshop to determine the relative merits of each option on an equal footing.

¹ If necessary you may need to carry out a field trip to view the routes from public roads and places. No private access can be provided for this assessment.

2.3 Description of options

All options are illustrated in the PP20 Alternative Corridor Drawings drop box. If you have not used the dropbox before, follow the link below and enter your Opus username and password.

<https://www.opus.co.nz/dropbox/>.

2.3.1 Board preferred alignment

The Board preferred alignment is the current alignment and for purposes of clarity is the alignment put forward in the Scoping Report in 2010. This will need to be assessed as one of the four options.

2.3.2 Te Waka alignment

In 2002 NZTA (then Transit) prepared a Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) recommending the current board preferred alignment. In 2003, as a result of consultation NZTA commissioned an addendum to that SAR reviewing a new western alignment, the 'Te Waka' route; three possible Te Waka options were reviewed.

The SARA concluded that the current board preferred option was the preferred option. As part of that SARA, specialist input was received from archaeology, built heritage, noise, ecology, landscape, social effects and cultural impacts. We have the technical reports for cultural, ecology and landscape only. We only have the summary for built heritage, noise and social and cultural.

While the Te Waka alignment is described in the Scheme Assessment Report Addendum 2003 (on NZTA's website) for the purposes of this assessment Opus have prepared a 'best fit' alignment between the three Te Waka options. This is included in the drop box and is the route now requiring assessment.

2.3.3 Eastern alignments

Opus have identified two alternative eastern alignments.

- Option A is an eastern foothills alignment and extends from just south of Manukau (in the north) and connects in the south near Hadfield/Peka Peka Road to link with the proposed northern interchange of the SH 1 MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway, a total distance of approximately 19 km. The route is up to 2.7 km east of SH 1 at Otaki and follows the transmission line corridor up to the Waitohu Valley before swinging back west to join state highway near Manukau.
- Option B connects to SH1 approximately 3km south of Manukau and links to the Board Approved Option in the vicinity of School Road, Te Horo, and a total distance of approximately 12 km. This route is up to 2 km east of SH1 at Otaki.

If required, the Alternatives Technical Report in the drop box gives a more detailed description of the routes.

2.4 Tasks required

We would like specialists to review any previous assessment (where relevant) and either update or prepare an assessment of the likely effects of each alignment listed above, and to rate these effects, using the rating table provided below. The assessments will be based on a desk top assessment and whatever preliminary site visit you consider necessary and will be made at a high level only. Tasks to include:

- Review any relevant information from your specialist area from previous reports (where relevant).
- Carry out any additional desk top investigation required to complete the assessment below.
- Describe the positive and negative effects of the proposed alignment in a series of bullet points as they relate to your speciality area (this assessment to be made using the previous assessment and your own updates).
- Rate each route using the effects rating table provided Identify the key considerations that led to your conclusion.
- Briefly record all methods used
- Write up.

Note that experts may wish to reach an overall conclusion by first evaluating different sub-sections of options, or by considering different aspects of their area of expertise.

This is a coarse assessment method which is just to help us gain an overview of the individual experts' first-cut relative evaluation of the options (it is nothing like the MCAT that has been used to choose between detailed design options). Don't get too worried about this assessment – just apply your best judgement.

The attribute is to be defined in terms of your area of expertise, taking into account all the aspects that you would normally take into account when doing an assessment of effects on the environment. In your report, can you explain what you have taken into account, and the particular considerations that have led you to the score that you have given for each option.

Notation	Interpretation
++	Route option is, on average, very good in terms of this attribute
+	Route option is, on average, good in terms of this attribute
0	Route option is neutral, or neither good or problematic, on average, in terms of this attribute
-	Route option includes, on average, minor or intermediate issues or concerns in terms of this attribute
--	Route option includes, on average, major or intermediate issues or concerns in terms of this attribute

The specialist assessments and the results of the review will all feed into an Assessment of Alternatives Report. We want each specialist to be comfortable that an appropriate assessment of alternatives in their specialist area has been completed; evidence to this effect may be required during the Board of Inquiry.

It is almost certain that we will have to proceed to a workshop where we will do a more comprehensive MCA assessment. If that is the case, your assistance will be needed in refining the attributes, scoring them and looking at possible weighting systems.

2.5 Clarification

- The "routes" to be investigated are nominally 200m wide, around the centreline of the routes on the latest maps provided by Opus in the drop box, except that the preferred option is to be considered with its current design. For the other three options, please assume you are looking at the area 100m on each side of the centreline, but also take into account the receiving

Peka Peka to North Otaki – Contract Number 442PN

environment beyond this to the extent that it would be affected by an expressway within the route. The extent of the receiving environment may differ depending on your particular specialisation (i.e., probably greater for social and cultural effects than for effects on ecological values).

- Please note that, to be comparable, the four routes will need to all be assessed as covering the same equivalent “length”. This means that each assessment will need to cover the complete route (including in some options, parts of the preferred option, and also making reasonable assumptions about improvements to SH1 at the northern end up to where Alignment A, the eastern blue route, meets SH1 beyond the current PP2O boundary).
- Opus has provided constraints maps. To the extent that this information is relevant to the evaluation of the options now being looked at, you will need to confirm that information and add any additional information that you consider relevant, for your assessment.
- When considering impediments or fatal flaws, it is important to note that the 200m width you are looking at allows for route options within it. A true fatal flaw would have to stretch right across the 200m width and be unavoidable.

2.6 Timeframes

When

Task	Deliverable	Indicative date for completion
Provide information	Opus to provide a description of the routes to be assessed, and the existing information available.	Done
First draft report	Short technical report as outlined above.	27 May 2011
Workshop	Possible workshop to complete a more comprehensive MCAT assessment	Indicative date early June 2011
Final report	As above incorporating any review comments.	5 working days after comments

If you have any general questions regarding the above, please contact **Vanessa (04-495 1482)** Vanessa.Browne@URScorp.com or for questions on the methodology please contact Sylvia Allan (021 665 155) sylvia.allan@ihug.co.nz.

Note to: PP2O Environmental/Social Consultants

From: Sylvia Allan

Subject: Notes on Review of Route Options

Date: 20th April 2011

The purpose of this note is to clarify a few points around the work you are doing in relation to the review of the additional route options for the PP2O Project.

1. The “routes” to be investigated are nominally 200m wide, around the centreline of the routes on the latest maps provided by Opus, except that the preferred option is to be considered with its current design. For the other three options, please assume you are looking at the area 100m on each side of the centreline, but also take into account the receiving environment beyond this to the extent that it would be affected by an expressway within the route. The extent of the receiving environment may differ depending on your particular specialisation (i.e. probably greater for social and cultural effects than for effects on ecological values).
2. Please note that, to be comparable, the four routes will need to all be assessed as covering the same equivalent “length”. This means that each assessment will need to cover the complete route (including in some options, parts of the preferred option, and also making reasonable assumptions about improvements to SH1 at the northern end up to where Alignment A, the eastern blue route, meets SH1 beyond the current PP2O boundary).
3. I note that Opus has provided constraints maps. To the extent that this information is relevant to the evaluation of the options now being looked at, you will need to confirm that information and add any additional information that you consider relevant, for your assessment.
4. When considering impediments or fatal flaws, it is important to note that the 200m width you are looking at allows for route options within it. A true fatal flaw would have to stretch right across the 200m width and be unavoidable.
5. I have asked that you:

“review the existing information on the route options and undertake whatever investigations are needed to bring the technical specialist up to a state of knowledge to be able to describe and coarsely evaluate the options (suggest a scale ++, +, 0, –, --) with descriptions as below, identifying the key considerations that led to their conclusion.

Notation	Interpretation
++	Route option is, on average, very good in terms of this attribute
+	Route option is, on average, good in terms of this attribute
0	Route option is neutral, or neither good or problematic, on average, in terms of this attribute
–	Route option includes, on average, minor or intermediate issues or concerns in terms of this attribute

--	Route option includes, on average, major or intermediate issues or concerns in terms of this attribute
----	--

Note that experts may wish to reach an overall conclusion by first evaluating different sub-sections of options, or by considering different aspects of their area of expertise. Their methods should be briefly recorded.”

This is a coarse assessment method which is just to help us gain an overview of the individual experts' first-cut relative evaluation of the options (it is nothing like the MCAT that has been used to choose between detailed design options). Don't get too worried about this assessment – just apply your best judgment.

6. The attribute is to be defined in terms of your area of expertise, taking into account all the aspects that you would normally take into account when doing an assessment of effects on the environment. In your report, can you explain what you have taken into account, and the particular considerations that have led you to the score that you have give for each option.
7. It is almost certain that we will have to proceed to a workshop where we will do a more comprehensive MCA assessment. If that is the case, your assistance will be needed in refining the attributes, scoring them and looking at possible weighting systems.

Please contact me if you have any questions about the general purpose of what we are doing (or questions that Vanessa can't answer!).

Sylvia Allan

sylvia.allan@ihug.co.nz

ph 021 665 155