

In confidence

## NLTP indicative allocations for continuous programmes and interim funding from 1 July 2024

ELT owner: Sara Lindsay, Group General Manager Commercial and Corporate  
Issue owner: Gareth Hughes, NLTP Development Manager

# Out of Scope

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

# Out of Scope

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

# Out of Scope

## Kia mōhio mai koe | What you need to know

### Recommended Investment targets

Decisions on indicative allocations are predicated on having a largely settled view of investment targets across all activity classes. Reflecting previous Board feedback, recommended targets have been derived by:

- prioritising discretionary spend to the SHI activity class to ensure that ca. \$2bn is available to progress the Roads of National Significance (RONS) programme which is highly aligned to GPS strategic priorities;
- as far as possible, prioritising funding to maintenance activity classes to give effect to the GPS regarding improved maintenance;
- ensuring sufficient funding to maintain existing PT services plus critical new services including City Rail Link (CRL);
- funding at or close to the bottom of the GPS funding range for all remaining activity classes.

Accordingly, funding emphasises the GPS “top” strategic priority for economic growth and productivity.

A summary of the proposed investment targets is below. A final Board decision on investment targets will be made following finalisation of the GPS.

Activity class	GPS range (\$m)	Investment Target (\$m)	% of mid-point	% NLTF ex. debt	2021-24 spend*	% change
SH Pothole Prevention	1,370 – 2,280	2,072	114%	11%	994	108%
SH Operations	1,890 – 2,570	2,303	124%	12%	2,114	9%
LR Pothole Prevention	1,820 – 2,530	1,840	85%	10%	1,268	45%
LR Operations	780 – 1,520	1,330	116%	7%	1,104	20%
PT Services	1,260-2,310	1,930	108%	10%	1,485	30%

Activity class	GPS range (\$m)	Investment Target (\$m)	% of mid-point	% NLTF ex. debt	2021-24 spend*	% change
Investment Management	205 – 265	265	113%	1%	215	23%
Safety	1,530 – 1,830	1,600	95%	9%	1,520	5%
Rail Network	740 -1670	740	61%	4%	1,145	-35%
PT Infrastructure	870 – 2,190	1,550	101%	8%	1,355	14%
SH Improvements	3,750 – 6,250	4,100	82%	22%	2,994	37%
LR Improvements	460 – 1210	460	55%	2%	646	- 29%
Walking and Cycling	275 – 510	310	79%	2%	624	-50%
<b>Total Activity Classes</b>		<b>18,500</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>15,464</b>	<b>20%</b>

### Indicative allocations for continuous programme

The process for arriving at the recommended allocations is summarised in Attachment 2. Detailed allocations for each continuous programme are included in Attachments 3-8. Key issues arising from the allocations are outlined below:

#### State Highway Pothole Repair and Operation Activity Classes

- NZTA is working to implement the new Integrated Delivery Model (IDM) for maintenance in 2025. In seeking to implement the new model, NZTA has seen evidence of further cost growth, which further adds to risks of cost escalation across the 2024-27 NLTP.
- Recognising the above but also other funding constraints and the process applied for council bids, the recommendation for the state highway maintenance activity classes is to fully fund NZTA's maintenance bid but to exclude provision for additional cost escalation identified after final bids were received.
- Noting the above risks, NLTF constraints (including the more constrained funding for local road maintenance) and GPS expectations regarding "*finding efficiency in road maintenance spend to deliver more for road users and taxpayers' investment*"; any further increase in allocation to state highway maintenance would need to be carefully tested.

#### Local Road Pothole Repair and Operation Activity Classes

- Funding demand for local road maintenance has grown significantly (i.e. 37% above 21-24 allocations). Notably, Auckland Transport's funding bid increased 86% (\$377m).
- To ensure adequate funding provision for other activity classes, the investment targets for the local road maintenance activity classes have been set materially below the level of council funding bids (refer Attachment 4 for more details).
- The constrained funding will mean lower rates of rehabilitation, deferral of reseal and an increased risk of significant future costs to restore network condition.
- While total indicative allocations represent a 17% increase on final allocations for the 2021-24 NLTP period, we expect the lack of parity with state highway maintenance, with a recommended 41% growth, may give rise to reputational risks and complaints from councils.

## Public Transport Services

- The recommended investment level is \$85m lower than the combined final bids from AOs. The reduction reflects standardising cost escalation rates (to 3% per annum) and removing funding for levels of service considered ineligible as part of (existing) continuous programme funding recommendations.
- The allocation makes provision for network growth, agreed level of service variations from 2021-24, and operational expenditure for major PT projects such as City Rail Link and Papakura to Pukekohe in Auckland.
- Allowance has not been made for funding new services, notably: service changes to accommodate new infrastructure including Eastern Busway and planned service improvements in Christchurch, Palmerston North and the Hawkes Bay.
- It is noted that funding allocations for Nelson and Tasman cover 2024/25 only. s 9(2)(f)(iv)

## Public Transport Infrastructure

- The scale of commitments is already significant with pre-approved funding accounting for \$1,508m of the (affordable) \$1,550m investment target.
- Noting that the complexity of PT Infrastructure projects has historically led to project delays, the provision for PT infrastructure maintenance, operation and renewals (MOR) relies on a 10% underspend across the committed programme in the 2024-27 period. Consistent with the intervention hierarchy, MOR should take priority over any new improvements.
- Based on the recommended target, there will be no funding for significant and named GPS projects, being; North-western Rapid Transit and Airport to Botany. A small amount of funding for low cost PT improvements may be possible, subject to progress/cash flow timing of committed projects. As opportunities allow (e.g. alternate revenue generation, programme re-prioritisation), increased funding for PT infrastructure should be a priority.

## Safety

- Recommended spend includes provision for the road policing programme of \$1,315m. Once provision is also made for Safety Cameras (\$202m) and key nationally delivered activities, including Alcohol Interlock and Drug Driving, there is limited funding available for road safety promotions.
- We are recommending the available funding be prioritised to the “do minimum” national Road Safety promotion programme (\$75m), with no funding for council programmes<sup>3</sup>. This represents a significant change from previous NLTPs and we expect it will generate opposition from some councils (refer Attachment 6). Measures to adequately address public education and engagement, as well as enforcement, are relevant to NZTA’s role as system regulator and well as road controlling authority.

## Footpath and cyclepath renewals and maintenance

- Due to the funding constraint in the Walking & Cycling activity class, we do not recommend making indicative allocations to Councils for footpath renewals and maintenance at this time. There remains uncertainty as to the scale of funding demand from committed activities including the potential for price level increases. Current forecasts suggest \$292m of funding is required to support the committed programme against an investment target of \$315m.

<sup>3</sup> The draft GPS identifies “reducing expenditure on general advertising and identifying the most cost effective and beneficial method for necessary advertising, such as road safety promotion.”

- Noting advice in this paper in respect of potential changes to funding assistance rates (FAR), we consider funding will be well short of demand; with Council and NZTA bids of \$198m. Consideration will need to be given to informing Councils that no NLTF funding is available to support footpath renewals, with remaining walking & cycling funds directed to footpath and cyclepath maintenance potentially at reduced FAR.

### *State Highway and Local Road bridge replacements*

- Allocations for end-of-life bridge replacements are proposed from the State Highway Improvements (\$109m) and Local Road Improvements (\$86m) activity classes.

### **Implications of investment targets for improvement activity classes**

Key implications for improvement activities, given the recommended investment targets, include:

- For State Highway Improvements the investment target will fund forecast funding variations, existing commitments, the bulk of the 'end of life' bridge and structures renewals, with circa \$2B available for progressing activities highly aligned to GPS strategic priorities like the RoNS programme. There will be limited discretionary funding (approx. \$0.5B) compared to the remaining improvement bid in the state highway investment proposal of \$2.7B, which includes the Waitemata Harbour Connections business case, SH6 Frankton Flats network improvements, Otago State Highway bridge upgrades, resilience activities and the low-cost low-risk (LCLR) programme.
- Local Road Improvements will need to be funded near or at the bottom of the GPS range. Existing commitments, plus recommended funding for end-of-life bridge and structures renewals will need approx. \$335m, leaving \$125m available for new low cost, low risk and improvements project. The Ashburton Bridge, which is the only Road of Regional Significance specifically noted in the GPS would be funded from this activity class<sup>4</sup> (\$57m NLTF share).
- Walking and Cycling will need to be funded at the bottom of the GPS range with funding significantly constrained. After existing commitments are funded, there is only approx. \$50m available for funding variations to currently approved projects and footpath and cycleway maintenance and renewals. Accordingly, no new activities are likely to be affordable.

### **Existing commitments**

All existing commitments have been re-evaluated. A commitment is an activity approved for NLTF funding in an earlier NLTP period with forecast cashflow during the 2024-27 NLTP. Further information on the level of commitments is included in Attachment 1.

The value of "dormant" and potentially un-contracted council committed activities that have yet to have any spend incurred is \$182m, representing approximately 4% of all committed spend. We are currently re-evaluating NZTA activities and expect to provide further advice in June.

Work is ongoing to understand the feasibility and implications of withdrawing funding approvals thereby cancelling projects and/or rescoping projects. We also intend to discuss with councils whether some walking and cycling business cases that are incomplete should be stopped given the likelihood that there is no NLTF funding for implementation.

When presenting the final NLTP to the Board including prioritisation of improvement activities, we will include details of committed activities that are included and prioritised in the funding for 2024-27.

---

<sup>4</sup> Noting that depending on the final GPS the walking and cycling elements may be required to be funded from walking and cycling.

# Out of Scope

## Update on enhanced funding assistance rates for 2024-27

The Board signalled in April that it intends to minimise the use of enhanced FAR for activities in 2024-27. This approach was advised to the Minister in response to an information request. We will be providing this signal to AOs and in the prioritisation of activities in the 2024-27 NLTP. Notable exceptions are: five special purpose roads; committed activities with agreed enhanced FARs (e.g. emergency works, transitional rail activities); mobility services<sup>5</sup>.

Decisions on whether to apply an enhanced FAR for 2024-27 include inter-regional public transport services: Capital Connection services and Te Huia services (refer separate May paper).

The draft GPS 2024 requests the Board to consider amending the FAR for walking/cycling maintenance. Depending on the size of councils' walking/cycling maintenance programmes for 2024-27, a 5% reduction from normal FAR could save \$9-13m of NLTF. The pros and cons of reducing the FAR for walking/cycle maintenance and renewals are set out below:

---

<sup>5</sup> NZTA has informed AOs that these enhanced FARs are interim and are subject to change arising from the Ministry of Transport's review of the Total Mobility scheme.

Pros	Cons
Frees up \$9-13m of NLTF for other activities	AOs either reduce maintenance programmes or accept a lower level of service <sup>6</sup>
Acknowledges that some users of walking/cycle ways do not contribute to the NLTF	Inconsistent with normal FAR for walking/cycling improvements

We propose that the Board make a final decision as part of NLTP adoption after the GPS is confirmed and after we have moderated the Walking and Cycling activity class.

### Ngā tūraru matua | Key risks and how we will manage them

Key risk	Management
There is insufficient funding available for strategic priorities in the revised draft GPS because the NLTF is expected to fund recovery activities relating to the North Island Weather Events (NIWE).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeking early advice on whether NIWE funding will be sufficient and considering whether NLTF funds are diverted.</li> <li>If NIWE funding is insufficient, investment targets may need to be amended and funding approvals may need to be deferred.</li> </ul>
Increased funding in the draft GPS results in heightened expectations when much of this funding is already committed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communications will continue to indicate where funding is substantially committed.</li> </ul>
There is a lack of certainty around forecast spend within activity classes caused by delayed work due to local government funding constraints, greater than forecast inflation or other external factors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk adjustments and where appropriate "over-programming will occur within activity classes to account for these, where possible.</li> </ul>
GPS direction, NLTF constraint and activity class ranges may result in some projects/programmes being stopped or slowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communications with the Minister and Ministry of Transport including feedback on the draft GPS highlight funding constraint implications. Explore alternative revenue and other funding options.</li> </ul>
Overall revenue may mean that some Activity Class Investment Targets are set below a level required to meet all of the Government's ambitions and/or ensure levels of service are maintained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigate opportunities for additional funding and financing so that investment targets can be increased during the NLTP.</li> <li>Keep MOT and Treasury appraised of funding pressures.</li> </ul>
Construction industry capacity may not grow fast enough to deliver on the ambition of GPS 2024 and/or result in cost increases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where possible ensure the scale and scope of maintenance programmes and projects account for capacity of the market to deliver.</li> <li>Changes to the new maintenance delivery model (Integrated Delivery Model) seek to grow capacity of the market to deliver.</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> Residents' satisfaction with maintenance of footpaths is commonly less than 50% across NZ councils.



Key risk	Management
Cost inflation/ escalation remains high (or gets worse) driving up the cost of projects even further with an accentuated risk to ongoing operational programmes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure ongoing scrutiny and challenge of cost forecasting including in line with NZTA's update cost estimation manual.</li> </ul>

# Out of Scope

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

---

<sup>7</sup> We propose “out of cycle” engagement on the draft NLTP ahead of final approval in August.

# Attachment 1

## Advice on committed activities

Committed' spend includes projects:

- under construction
- contracted (e.g., at the investigation, design or construction stages) but not under construction
- approved to commence – but not contractually committed (e.g., funding approved for business casing, construction etc).

A review of approved local government projects with nil spends (i.e., are unlikely to be contractually committed) showed these had a combined value of approximately \$182 million, which represents approximately 4% of all committed forecast spend at the start of the 2024-27 NLTP.

As a public decision-maker NZTA has very limited power to revoke council approvals falling within the “approved to commence” bullet above:

- unless the approval includes a condition permitting it to do so. To provide funding certainty only a very small number of approvals have included a condition of this type
- where the council has not followed certain procedural requirements or “gold plating” of a project
- we are looking into the ability to revoke funding where this hasn't been used within a reasonable period but the spend in this category is very small.

NZTA could agree with a council/authorised organisation (AO) that the approval be withdrawn (e.g., Let's Get Wellington Moving).

NZTA has more latitude in respect of its own projects;

- It could cancel a project. This would need to be managed to varying degrees depending on the stage of the project (e.g., exiting a contract, through to no implications). There are also potential stakeholder implications.
- It could rescope a project. This may have consenting implications – these may be manageable or require reconsenting the project. Project by project assessment required. There are also potential stakeholder implications.

We are still working to identify NZTA projects that are not contractually committed and will provide further advice to the Board on this, prior to NLTP adoption.

**Attachment 2**

# Out of Scope

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

# Out of Scope

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

## Attachment 3

### Summary of recommendations – state highway maintenance

Activity class component Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
SH pothole prevention	\$994	\$2,072	\$2,072	\$2,072	100%
SH operations - MOR	\$1,630	\$1,950	\$1,843	\$1,843	95%
SH operations - EW	*\$473	\$427	\$420	\$420	98%
SH operations - NDA allowance	\$11	N/A	\$40	\$40	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,108</b>	<b>\$4,449</b>	<b>\$4,375</b>	<b>\$4,375</b>	<b>98%</b>

\* Forecast for NLTP emergency works expenditure, exclusive of North Island Weather Events (NIWE).

### Summary of the impact of the recommended programme on state highway maintenance

The programme proposed in the 2024-34 SHAMP will increase activity levels gradually over 2024-27 and then maintain at the increased level until 2034/35. This will restore asset condition to the point where activity may be reduced to a sustainable level which has the least long-term cost. Specifically, the proposal will:

- facilitate meeting the longer-term GPS target for increased pavement rehabilitation (2%) and surfacing (9%) by funding a programme which, over 2024-27, delivers pavement rehabilitation length totalling 1.4% of the network length and resurfacing length totalling 6.3%.
- provide an increase in drainage maintenance and renewal works that will reduce the incidents of surface flooding and prevent water damage to pavements, thereby extending their service life.
- provide increased preventive maintenance and component renewal of structures to preserve condition and extend service life (including ring fencing funding for three major deck renewals).
- restore and maintain skid resistance and minimise rough and rutted roads.
- deliver increased capacity to address increasing emergency works required to restore access as a result of increasingly frequent and intense storms.
- provide increased activity to offset the expected impacts of continued increase in freight.
- deliver improvements to asset management, procurement and productivity that will improve the effectiveness and efficiency of activities, and thus the return on investment.

- ensure compliance with recent changes to environmental requirements and standards.
- provide for a new maintenance contract model (including governance and decision making, processes, performance and quality management) to replace the NOC contracts, building on their strengths and addressing opportunities.

The gradual increase in the scale of programme activities is designed to enable the sector to respond with sufficient resource. Delivery to programme has improved markedly (allowing for the impacts of recent storm events) giving confidence that capacity can match expectation.

However, the speed of sector growth and their ability to source materials to deliver these significant lifts in output remain key risks to be managed.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Error! No text of specified style in document.

## Attachment 4

### Summary of recommendations - local road maintenance

Activity class component Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
<b>LR Pothole Prevention Activity Class (LRPP)</b>					
LRPP - Council Allocation	\$1,268	\$2,148	\$1,947	\$1,822	85%
LRPP Contingency	N/A	N/A	\$18	\$18	N/A
<b>Total (LRPP)</b>	<b>\$1,268</b>	<b>\$2,148</b>	<b>\$1,965</b>	<b>\$1,840</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>LR Operations Activity Class (LRO)</b>					
LRO - Council Allocation	\$741	\$1,104	\$990	\$964	87%
Provision for NDA's	\$13	\$47	\$47	\$47	100%
Provision for Emergency Works	*\$351	N/A	\$310	\$310	N/A
LRO Contingency	N/A	N/A	\$9	\$9	N/A
<b>Total (LRO)</b>	<b>\$1,104</b>	<b>\$1,151</b>	<b>\$1,356</b>	<b>\$1,330</b>	<b>N/A</b>

\* Forecast for emergency works expenditure, exclusive of North Island Weather Events (NIWE).

### Summary of the impact of the recommended programme on local road maintenance

Local road maintenance activities have been split across Operations; Pothole Prevention; Walking and Cycling; and LR Improvements (Bridges and Structures Renewals) – see Attachment 8.

The combined allocation for LRO and LRPP is \$2,786m against a bid of \$3,252m (NLTF Share). This compares to a current allocation of \$2,372m for the 21-24 NLTP.

Heightened demand for funding within the local road maintenance activity classes stems from:

- Cost escalation for transportation operations, maintenance and renewals works.
- Increased traffic management costs.
- Good aggregate is becoming scarce due to environmental constraints and demand. This is leading to increases in the cost of supply and cartage costs.
- The number of significant storm events in the North and South Island have resulted in rapid deterioration of the overall network which will require 2024/27 period to repair and recover.
- Heavier electric buses are leading to premature road pavement failures resulting in earlier maintenance and renewal interventions, and therefore earlier investments.

- Growth in the size of the local roads network by 1% growth since 2018 and an increase in total vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) by 6% since 2018.
- Consequential operational costs due to the large investment in traffic calming devices through Road to Zero and the Climate Emergency Relief Fund (CERF). This has increased asset density (i.e. number of assets per network length). Also, the type of marking used is costly to maintain.

In order to meet the recommended investment target for the activity class, the indicative allocation for LR Pothole Prevention has been reduced 7% (\$124m) below the level recommended by NZTA investment advisors as necessary to maintain levels of service.

Potential impacts of this decision include:

- rehabilitation sites may need to be changed to heavy maintenance patching as a holding treatment.
- deferral of reseal sites, meaning an increase in faults requiring repair work and a risk of significant future costs to restore network condition.
- a risk of resilience reduction if the drainage maintenance and renewals are not fully funded.

A 3% reduction in the estimated funding required to maintain the levels of service across the LR Operations activity class is needed to meet the investment target. This is a \$26m reduction from the NZTA moderated funding level, which will lead to minimal funding being available for minor events (emergency works response less than \$100,000 per event), and reduced funding for network and asset management. Most of the expenditure in the other work categories within LR operations have long term contracts in place making it difficult to reduce costs until these are renewed.

Some councils' bids are constrained and not at the level needed to operate, maintain and renew their network due to their limited ability to fund the local share. This will lead to a more rapid deterioration of these networks, with the continued risk of significant future costs for the council and NZTA to / ensure appropriate levels of service. For these councils we have not reduced their funding allocation below their bid.

The NDAs proposed to be included in the LR Operations activity class are the Consistent Condition Data Collection, Asset Management Data Standards and Road Efficiency Group (REG). These are currently under review and a recommendation for these will be coming to the Board in June 2024.

The emergency works claims for 21-24 (excluding NIWE) are forecast to be \$350m. The provision for 24-27 has been set below this at \$310m, as proposed changes to the Emergency Works policy and related criteria for councils to claim emergency works should lead to a reduction in the demand for emergency works funding from the NLTF. This emergency works provision will not allow for larger events such as Cyclone Gabrielle.

Noting uncertainty surrounding the level of funding in the Walking & Cycling Activity Class, we do not recommend allocating funding for foot path maintenance and renewals at this time. This will be confirmed in the later paper to the Board along with other investment activities.



## Recommended allocations by organisation<sup>1</sup>

Organisation Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
Ashburton District	\$19.1	\$22.5	\$22.5	\$22.3	99%
Auckland Transport	\$440.4	\$817.4	\$761.5	\$692.0	85%
Buller District	\$13.3	\$16.1	\$15.1	\$15.1	94%
Carterton District	\$5.1	\$9.1	\$9.1	\$8.8	97%
Central Hawkes Bay District	\$20.6	\$28.2	\$25.3	\$24.9	88%
Central Otago District	\$13.6	\$22.0	\$20.2	\$19.8	90%
Chatham Islands	\$10.2	\$13.3	\$12.1	\$12.0	91%
Christchurch City	\$97.8	\$160.6	\$143.5	\$136.2	85%
Clutha District	\$27.8	\$35.6	\$34.6	\$33.9	95%
Dunedin City	\$50.1	\$71.5	\$66.4	\$66.4	93%
Environment Southland	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	96%
Far North District	\$64.4	\$111.5	\$103.9	\$100.6	90%
Gisborne District	\$54.7	\$70.9	\$70.9	\$70.9	100%
Gore District	\$8.9	\$11.7	\$11.1	\$11.0	95%
Grey District	\$9.3	\$20.6	\$14.4	\$14.0	68%
Hamilton City	\$42.3	\$100.6	\$61.9	\$59.2	59%
Hastings District	\$34.4	\$66.6	\$48.4	\$47.6	72%
Hauraki District	\$15.8	\$32.0	\$30.5	\$28.2	88%
Horowhenua District	\$11.3	\$14.4	\$13.4	\$13.4	93%
Hurunui District	\$12.2	\$30.0	\$15.6	\$15.3	51%
Hutt City	\$23.0	\$44.6	\$32.1	\$31.5	71%
Invercargill City	\$16.8	\$25.7	\$22.5	\$22.5	87%
Kaikoura District	\$3.0	\$4.2	\$3.5	\$3.5	82%
Kaipara District	\$30.8	\$52.7	\$46.5	\$45.2	86%
Kapiti Coast District	\$12.8	\$17.9	\$17.9	\$16.5	92%
Kawerau District	\$1.7	\$1.7	\$1.7	\$1.7	99%
Mackenzie District	\$5.4	\$7.3	\$6.4	\$6.4	89%
Manawatu District	\$16.3	\$21.4	\$19.7	\$19.7	92%
Marlborough District	\$25.2	\$35.7	\$32.9	\$32.4	91%
Masterton District	\$17.2	\$23.7	\$23.7	\$23.3	98%
Matamata-Piako District	\$17.1	\$21.5	\$21.5	\$21.5	100%
Napier City	\$11.5	\$19.8	\$15.7	\$15.2	77%
Nelson City	\$10.9	\$22.9	\$18.0	\$16.9	74%

<sup>1</sup> Excluding emergency works and NIWE

Organisation Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommend ed allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
New Plymouth District	\$22.5	\$51.4	\$41.7	\$35.7	70%
Opotiki District	\$8.4	\$11.6	\$11.4	\$10.8	93%
Otorohanga District	\$13.4	\$21.0	\$19.2	\$18.7	89%
Palmerston North City	\$16.9	\$27.0	\$26.2	\$25.4	94%
Porirua City	\$11.9	\$29.4	\$22.9	\$22.2	75%
Queenstown-Lakes District	\$25.0	\$33.9	\$31.5	\$31.0	92%
Rangitikei District	\$20.7	\$33.4	\$30.1	\$29.2	88%
Rotorua Lakes	\$22.1	\$33.5	\$30.0	\$28.6	85%
Ruapehu District	\$34.6	\$41.5	\$41.6	\$41.0	99%
Selwyn District	\$29.0	\$38.6	\$35.1	\$34.1	88%
South Taranaki District	\$27.2	\$35.2	\$34.7	\$33.7	96%
South Waikato District	\$15.2	\$19.6	\$19.0	\$17.7	90%
South Wairarapa District	\$7.7	\$12.3	\$12.3	\$11.7	95%
Southland District	\$43.7	\$67.5	\$59.8	\$58.2	86%
Stratford District	\$11.3	\$15.0	\$15.0	\$15.0	100%
Taranua District	\$28.0	\$49.5	\$42.7	\$41.5	84%
Tasman District	\$28.6	\$38.1	\$38.1	\$37.1	97%
Taupo District	\$12.0	\$21.4	\$20.1	\$18.4	86%
Tauranga City	\$39.2	\$86.7	\$79.1	\$66.6	77%
Thames-Coromandel District	\$20.7	\$29.5	\$28.7	\$27.9	95%
Timaru District	\$22.4	\$33.6	\$27.9	\$27.5	82%
Upper Hutt City	\$9.6	\$13.9	\$13.1	\$12.9	93%
Waikato District	\$52.4	\$71.3	\$68.9	\$68.0	95%
Waikato Regional	\$0.3	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2	100%
Waimakariri District	\$18.6	\$28.1	\$24.3	\$23.6	84%
Waimate District	\$9.8	\$13.7	\$12.9	\$12.9	94%
Waipa District	\$22.9	\$26.1	\$27.9	\$26.2	100%
Wairoa District	\$23.7	\$34.0	\$32.4	\$31.8	93%
Waitaki District	\$19.2	\$27.9	\$24.5	\$23.8	85%
Waitangi Trust	\$0.5	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	100%
Waitomo District	\$25.9	\$32.3	\$36.5	\$32.2	100%
Wellington City	\$65.5	\$76.4	\$69.4	\$69.4	91%
Western BoP District	\$25.6	\$47.5	\$39.2	\$33.8	71%
Westland District	\$10.5	\$16.4	\$13.4	\$13.2	80%

Organisation Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommend ed allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
Whakatane District	\$27.9	\$30.8	\$33.8	\$30.8	100%
Whanganui District	\$21.5	\$30.0	\$29.9	\$29.4	98%
Whangarei District	\$45.5	\$78.0	\$72.0	\$69.5	89%
DOC National	\$6.3	\$10.3	\$10.3	\$10.0	97%
Buller District - SPR	\$4.3	\$10.4	\$5.5	\$5.5	53%
South Wairarapa District - SPR	\$1.7	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$2.0	100%
Wairoa District - SPR	\$2.0	\$2.5	\$1.8	\$1.8	72%
Whakatane District - SPR	\$8.2	\$7.2	\$5.0	\$5.0	70%
Westland District - SPR	\$3.0	\$8.9	\$4.5	\$4.5	51%
<b>LR MOR continuous programme total</b>	<b>\$2008.7</b>	<b>\$3251.4</b>	<b>\$2936.0</b>	<b>\$2786.7</b>	
Comprising:					
LR Pothole Prevention	\$1267.9	\$2147.8	\$1945.7	\$1822.5	85%
LR Operations	\$740.8	\$1103.5	\$990.3	\$964.2	87%

## Attachment 5

### Summary of recommendations – PT services and infrastructure

Activity class component Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
<b>Public Transport Services activity class</b>					
Bus services	\$758	\$1,117	\$1,107	\$1,061	95%
Rail services	\$323	\$444	\$426	\$423	95%
Ferry services	\$42	\$72	\$72	\$71	99%
Total mobility	\$51	\$87	\$87	\$85	97%
PT service opex	\$86	\$118	\$115	\$115	97%
Contingency continuous programme	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$42	N/A
Commitments <sup>1</sup> and est.funding variations <sup>2</sup>	\$225	N/A	N/A	\$133	N/A
<b>Total (PT Services)</b>	<b>\$1,485</b>	<b>\$1,838</b>	<b>\$1,806</b>	<b>\$1,930</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Public Transport Infrastructure activity class</b>					
PT infrastructure MOR	\$124	\$203	\$203	\$203	100%
Contingency continuous programme	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$	N/A

<sup>1</sup> Current allocations for 21-24 for the PT Services activity class include \$140m Crown to NLTF that contributed to continued delivery of PT across New Zealand by covering the funding shortfall experienced in 2022/23. The funding shortfall was associated with increased operating costs due to cost escalation, reduced fare revenue streams etc.

<sup>2</sup> The recommended funding allocation for 24-27 includes funding variations likely to occur prior to 30 June 2024.

Commitments and est. funding variations <sup>2</sup>		N/A	N/A	\$1,508 [\$1,347] <sup>3</sup>	N/A
<b>Total (PT Infrastructure)</b>	\$1,774	\$203	\$203	<b>\$1,550</b>	N/A

### Summary of the impact of the recommended programme on Public Transport

Across PT services and infrastructure, the PT continuous programme recommended allocation to council's is \$2,000m against a bid of \$2042 (NLTF share) and a current allocation of \$1,384 for the 21-24 NLTP.

The recommended allocations incorporate for following costs:

- Network growth, agreed level of service variations that occurred during 2021-24, and operational expenditure for major PT projects such as City Rail Link and Papakura to Pukekohe in Auckland.
- Cost escalation at 3% compounding applied to the net operating cost per annum.
- Compliance with legislation changes during the 2021-24 NLTP.
- Meeting demand and consequently cost of Total Mobility services.

### Impact specific to PT Services activity class:

Based on the proposed investment target of \$1,930m, only contractually committed activities and the continuous programme would be affordable. It is very unlikely any further service improvements could be funded from the activity class during the 2024-27 NLTP. The inability to fund service improvements is likely to face significant push back from Public Transport Authorities.

The recommended investment level across the PT Services activity class is \$85m lower than the combined final bids from AOs. The cost reduction was focused on standardising the cost escalation rate to 3% per annum, and removing the cost associated with levels of service not considered eligible to the continuous programme funding recommendations.

The continuous programmes where the largest reductions have occurred include:

- Greater Wellington: reduction to funding requested by \$30.6m, primarily due to rail 'improvements' being removed from the continuous programme (approx. \$28m), the remainder (approx. \$2.6m) is to do with on-demand bus services.
- Horizons Manawatu: reduction to funding requested by \$10.3m. The AO has an NZTA endorsed PT service improvement business case, but the extent and associated cost increase with the level of service change is not considered eligible to be included in as part of the continuous programme recommended allocations.
- Nelson and Tasman funding recommendations cover 2024/25 only. s 9(2)(f)(iv)  
 The three-year investment level will be reevaluated following the outcome of a 12-month evaluation plan of their revised public transport network.

<sup>3</sup> Allowance after overprogramming of forecast funding commitments for 24-27.

## Discretionary funding available for 'improvements' in the Public Transport Services activity class:

The discretionary funding available to the recommended investment target is insufficient to include increased costs associated with new public transport service improvements, inclusive of low cost / low risk improvements. Based on current 2024-27 'improvement' bid information the following is a sample of activities that are unlikely to be funded and would face significant push back from the organisations identified.

- Auckland public transport service improvements. This includes services for the new Eastern Busway (a project called out in the GPS).
- Christchurch public transport service improvements. This covers frequency improvements as an outcome of the endorsed 'PT Futures' programme business case.
- Palmerston North and Hawkes Bay public transport service improvements.

## Impact specific to PT Infrastructure activity class

It is critical that the Public Transport (Infrastructure) continuous programme is funded as it covers the maintenance and operation costs necessary to operate assets (e.g. stations) including the likes of the CRL underground stations are expected to pose unique operational challenges.

Based on the proposed investment target of \$1,550m, once funding for the Public Transport (infrastructure) continuous programme is provided, the activity class will only be able to fund contractually committed activities. Furthermore, this requires over-programming of approx. 10% on the existing commitments. Given the level of existing funding approvals for some of the costliest transport projects in the NLTP, decision makers can have a level of confidence that 10% over-programming for delays is realistic. Noting the above, without a change in NLTF revenue it is very unlikely any new improvements could be funded from the activity class during the 2024-27 NLTP without further overprogramming.

## Recommended allocations by organisation

Organisation Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommend ed allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
Auckland Transport	\$775.0	\$1109.6	\$1109.6	\$1103.4	99%
Greater Wellington	\$333.0	\$465.1	\$437.3	\$434.5	93%
Environment Canterbury	\$115.1	\$185.9	\$185.9	\$178.8	96%
Bay of Plenty Regional	\$40.9	\$68.5	\$66.9	\$60.2	88%
Waikato Regional	\$42.4	\$58.7	\$58.7	\$56.7	97%
Otago Regional	\$32.7	\$52.3	\$51.9	\$50.1	96%
Horizons Manawatu	\$13.4	\$30.4	\$30.6	\$20.2	66%

Organisation Figures in \$m	Current Allocatio n for 21- 24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommend ed allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
Hawkes Bay Regional	\$8.1	\$21.6	\$20.9	\$17.5	81%
Taranaki Regional	\$7.7	\$11.1	\$11.1	\$11.0	99%
Northland Regional	\$4.7	\$8.4	\$8.0	\$8.0	95%
Nelson City	\$3.3	\$13.7	\$12.9	\$3.6	26%
Tasman District	\$0.6	\$3.5	\$3.3	\$ .9	25%
Invercargill City	\$4.0	\$6.8	\$6.7	\$6.7	99%
Gisborne District	\$2.0	\$4.0	\$3.7	\$3.7	92%
Marlborough District	\$0.7	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$1.2	97%
West Coast Regional	\$0.3	\$0.7	\$0.6	\$0.6	86%
Buller District	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	100%
Westland District	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	100%
Continuous programme contingency	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$43.0	
Total (includes PT infrastructure MOR)	\$1383.9	\$2041.6	\$2009.6	\$2000.0	98%
Comprising:					
<b>PT Services activity class</b>	\$1260.0	\$1838.4	\$1806.4	\$1797.4	98%
<b>PT Infrastructure MOR</b>	\$124.0	\$203.1	\$203.1	\$202.7	100%

## Attachment 6

### Summary of recommendations – road policing and road safety promotion

Activity class component Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
Road policing	1,244	1,315	1,315	1,315	100%
NZTA National RSP programme	93	75	75	75	100%
NZTA Regional RSP (Billboards) programme	3.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	100%
Council RSP programmes	42	53	50	Nil	0%
NZTA Alcohol interlock subsidy	3.3	7.5	4.2	4.2	56%
NZTA Vehicle impoundment	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	100%
<b>TOTAL indicative allocation</b>	<b>1,388</b>	<b>1,454</b>	<b>1,448</b>	<b>1,398</b>	<b>96%</b>
\$202m remaining funding available for Safety Camera programme and other Nationally Delivered Activities based on an investment target scenario of \$1,600m.					

### Summary of the impact of the recommended continuous safety programmes

The above continuous programmes are eligible for funding through the new Safety activity class. The draft GPS currently reads “*This activity class is for the purpose of investment in road policing and nationally consistent and coordinated road safety promotion and will be focused on improving road safety through enforcement and behavioural change, not blanket speed limit reductions*”.

#### Road policing

The Road Policing Investment Programme (RPIP) involves the Ministry of Transport, NZ Police and the NZTA as key partners in the negotiation of the investment level for 2024-27. The RPIP is not yet finalised, but a provisional figure of \$1,315m has been included in the indicative allocations based on work completed to date. The draft GPS has a strong focus on road policing performance. The \$1,315m total currently includes circa \$24m per annum amount that will be available to Police dependent on performance against enforcement targets that are currently being developed. Ultimately the programme is approved by the Minister of Transport in



consultation with the Minister of Police. Further advice will be provided when a recommended investment level is finalised.

### **Road safety promotion**

Alongside road policing, investment in road safety promotion is identified in the draft GPS to support enforcement through promoting safer driving and behavioural change. To achieve this, and noting affordability constraints in the activity class, the proposal is to continue the delivery of the national road safety promotion programme, and to not co-invest in council road safety promotion programmes. The proposed investment will ensure continuity of national-led activities to support enforcement and target highest risk behaviours such as drink-driving, driving impaired by drugs, driver distraction and use of seatbelts; alongside activities for high-risk audiences.

#### *Impacts of a right sized investment in the NZTA national road safety promotion programme*

The proposed investment buys delivery of the education and marketing programmes at an appropriate level. The benefits of appropriately scaled investment include:

- appropriate reach of advertising spend, ensuring impact across target audiences.
- support police enforcement - evidence says that promotional activity in support of enforcement will increase the impact of both activities.
- continue to provide quality digital-based support for young learner drivers through the Drive programme (co-funded with ACC).
- contributes to the safety and harm reduction priorities set out in Tū ake, Tū māia.
- working in partnership with other organisations involved in road safety (NZ Police, ACC) to align messaging and activities across the sector and find efficiencies.

Priority will be given to highest risk behaviours. Road safety activities funded in the previous NLTP period relating to cycling and walking will cease. The programme will stop the public awareness campaign (which was funded at an additional \$14.7m in 2021-24). Other national RSP activities such as Visiting drivers, Fatigue behaviour change, Senior driver programme and promotional support for Rail Safety Week may not be funded. The national billboard programme will be delivered for a reduced amount, leveraging investment in the previous period to rationalise the programme.

#### *Impacts of not co-investing in council road safety promotion programmes*

The proposal to not co-invest in council programmes would have the following impacts:

- potential for local council share being re-directed and no longer available to respond to local road safety needs.
- reduce the capacity for councils to deliver direct engagement education activities. For example school-aged road user awareness and education, safe routes to school and walking school buses, driver licencing support programmes, child restraint education, education at local events and support.

To mitigate this, the national programme will produce packages of content that can be regionalised, identify councils who have road safety as a shared objective, and use tools such as the NZTA Communities at Risk Register to pin-point where national activity can have greatest impact.

### **Regulatory activities**

As an outcome of previous Cabinet decisions, the Vehicle Impoundment and Alcohol Interlock subsidy schemes have been included in the NLTP since 2001 and 2018 respectively and will continue as essential regulatory functions. Alcohol interlock funding demand is driven by the number of court-imposed sentences to low-income drink driving offenders. Vehicle impoundment rebates support police enforcement by providing continuity of services for tow and storage operators to remove and store abandoned/impounded vehicles when owners have failed to claim their vehicles to avoid payment of fees.

## Attachment 7

### Summary of recommendations – SH bridge and structures renewals (WC 216)

Activity class component Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
State highway bridge and structures renewals	113	109	140	109	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>100%</b>

Note – initial funding request was for \$120m, but this included \$11m for three structures where the treatment option selected was deck replacement. These have been transferred to WC 215: *structures component replacements* in SH Operations AC.

### Summary of the impact of the recommended programme on state highway maintenance

Historically like-for-like replacement of bridges and structures (such as retaining walls, sea walls and gantries) at the end of their serviceable life have been funded from the maintenance activity classes. As part of the draft 2024 GPS, these has been moved to the improvement activity classes.

There are 4,744 bridges and large culverts on the state highway network. These assets perform a critical function for the roadway and often carry a number of other infrastructure assets, e.g. water, electricity, phone and internet. While the age of a structure is not a proxy for renewal, state highway bridges are typically built for a 100-year design working life. Towards the end of the design life, the maintenance need will begin to increase leading to the end of the economic life. 39 bridges on the state highway network are now over 100 years old and this is set to increase to over 260 bridges by 2030. 500 bridges will be over 100 years old by 2039.

This programme for 'end of life' replacement of bridges identifies the 10 highest priority structures where signs of brittle failure are already apparent. All the bridges identified in the programme have a completed Present Value End of Life (PVEoL) analysis and have been assessed as being critical for the ongoing continuity of the network by NZTA's System Resilience team. The original programme of 13 bridges was estimated at \$151m but was tensioned to \$120m in the submitted funding request (2024-34 SHAMP). Subsequently, those three bridges where the treatment option selected was deck replacement were moved back to the maintenance operations activity class thereby reducing the request to \$109m. While the table below indicates a total cost of \$140m (based on the designers' estimates), it should be noted that the SH29 Omanawa River Bridge has been included due to its eligibility, but it is also potentially a component of a larger improvement project still in development. The programme also recognises the historical delays in bridge renewal, due to a lack of pre-implementation planning and funding, and allows for inclusion of the pre-implementation phases for the 2024-27 programme. Any reductions to the funding requested will result in having to post weight/speed restrictions on one or more of these structures.

The following table shows the bridges included in the programme together with the designers' estimates. As noted above, SH29 Omanawa River Bridge may be delivered under a State Highway Improvements project. If not, a further funding request may be required.

Priority Order	Activity Name (WC 216)	Criticality	2024/25 (\$m)	2025/26 (\$m)	2026/27 (\$m)	NLTP Total (\$m)
1	SH82 Elephant Hill Bridge	Urgent	4.2	7.7	2.1	14.0
2	SH25 Pepe Stream Bridge	Urgent	7.0	10.5	3.5	21.0
3	SH6 Coal Creek Overbridge	Urgent	7.0	10.5	3.5	21.0
4	SH25 Ramarama Stream Bridge	Urgent	2.8	4.2	1.4	8.4
5	SH43 Kururau Stream Water Drive	Urgent	3.5	1.4	0.0	4.9
6	SH82 Waihao North Bridge	Urgent	7.0	10.5	3.5	21.0
8	SH3 Mangapepeki No. 2 Culvert	Urgent	1.4	2.8	0.0	4.2
9	SH36 Hauraki Stream Culvert	Urgent	0.7	2.8	0.0	3.5
11	SH27 Ohinekaua Stream Bridge	High	0.7	2.8	0.0	3.5
13	SH29 Omanawa River Bridge	Urgent	3.5	14.0	10.5	28.0
	General Pre-Implementation Funding for 2027/30 Bridge Replacements		3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
			40.8	71.2	27.5	139.5

## Attachment 8

### Summary of recommendations – local roads bridges and structures renewals (WC216)

Activity class component Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
LR Bridges and Structures Renewals	\$44	\$114	\$86	\$86	76%

#### Impact of the recommended programme on local roads bridges and structures renewals.

The draft GPS 2024 directs both End-of-Life bridge renewals and structures (e.g. retaining walls) renewals be funded from Local Road Improvements activity class.

In the 21-24 NLTP, all local road bridge and structure renewals were subject to submission of Present Value End of Life (PVEoL) assessment that was reviewed by NZTA before funding was approved.

Funding was ring-fenced and could not be shifted to other work categories without prior agreement from NZTA, with any surplus returned to NZTA. We recommend that this funding condition remain.

It is anticipated that bridges and structures renewals will prioritise highly for inclusion in the NLTP. The \$86m recommended for indicative allocations is affordable at that lower bound of the GPS range for LR Improvements but has implications for funding of other LR improvements.

This allocation will be closely monitored in 24/27 and any surplus will be re-allocated to other activities in the Local Road Improvements activity class.

Noting existing commitments in the Local Road Improvements Activity Class of ca. \$250m, should the Board agree to set the investment target being at the bottom of the range (\$460m) we expect the allocation will reduce the provision for low cost low risk funding, with no new funding for significant local road improvements including the Ashburton River Bridge – identified as a road of regional significance in the draft GPS 2024.

## Recommended allocations by organisation

Organisation Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
Ashburton District	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.4	100%
Auckland Transport	\$4.4	\$11.8	\$11.5	\$11.5	98%
Buller District	\$0.3	\$2.1	\$2.0	\$2.0	94%
Central Hawkes Bay District	\$0.0	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	100%
Central Otago District	\$0.1	\$1.6	\$0.8	\$0.8	50%
Christchurch City	\$1.3	\$9.6	\$4.1	\$4.1	43%
Clutha District	\$2.5	\$5.0	\$4.6	\$4.6	92%
Far North District	\$2.9	\$8.2	\$5.7	\$5.7	69%
Gore District	\$0.3	\$1.1	\$0.7	\$0.7	63%
Grey District	\$0.1	\$0.9	\$0.4	\$0.4	38%
Hamilton City	\$1.1	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.5	100%
Horowhenua District	\$0.1	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.3	90%
Hurunui District	\$0.0	\$2.1	\$0.3	\$0.3	15%
Hutt City	\$0.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	
Kaipara District	\$1.9	\$10.5	\$4.3	\$4.3	41%
Kapiti Coast District	\$0.6	\$2.4	\$2.4	\$2.4	100%
Mackenzie District	\$0.1	\$2.5	\$0.3	\$0.3	11%
Manawatu District	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	
Marlborough District	\$0.4	\$1.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	0%
Masterton District	\$3.0	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$0.6	100%
Napier City	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$0.6	100%

Organisation Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
New Plymouth District	\$1.1	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	100%
Opotiki District	\$0.0	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.3	100%
Palmerston North City	\$0.7	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$1.2	100%
Porirua City	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$0.6	100%
Rangitikei District	\$0.1	\$0.7	\$0.5	\$0.5	64%
Rotorua Lakes	\$0.2	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.7	100%
Ruapehu District	\$2.2	\$1.1	\$1.1	\$1.1	100%
Selwyn District	\$0.0	\$2.4	\$1.7	\$1.7	68%
South Taranaki District	\$0.0	\$2.9	\$2.9	\$2.9	100%
Southland District	\$4.4	\$9.3	\$8.3	\$8.3	89%
Stratford District	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$1.2	100%
Tasman District	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	0%
Tauranga City	\$0.1	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.4	100%
Thames-Coromandel District	\$0.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	
Timaru District	\$0.9	\$2.8	\$1.3	\$1.3	46%
Upper Hutt City	\$0.1	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2	100%
Waikato District	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	
Waimakariri District	\$0.0	\$0.7	\$0.4	\$0.4	54%
Wairoa District	\$0.0	\$0.8	\$0.8	\$0.8	100%
Waitaki District	\$0.4	\$5.3	\$4.3	\$4.3	80%
Wellington City	\$3.8	\$10.7	\$10.7	\$10.7	100%
Western BoP District	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	
Westland District	\$0.7	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.5	94%

Organisation Figures in \$m	Current Allocation for 21-24	Funding requested for 24-27	Estimated funding required to maintain levels of service	Recommended allocation for 24-27	Allocation as a percentage of the request
Whakatane District	\$3.8	\$1.3	\$1.3	\$1.3	100%
Whanganui District	\$0.3	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2	100%
Whangarei District	\$2.5	\$6.6	\$5.3	\$5.3	80%
DOC National	\$0.3	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	100%

Released under the Official Information Act 1982