

**INTERIM Summary of
Submissions
on the
Draft Regional Public
Transport Plan 2014**

Draft PT Plan 2014
INTERIM Summary of Submissions

This is an interim summary of submissions.

An update will be issued with further officer comments, refined classification of submissions, and editorial improvements.

The summary is to provide assistance to Councillors in the decision making process, and is not intended to substitute for the full text of the submissions which has been provided to Councillors separately.

Contents:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Topic: Current Bus Routes (9 submissions) | 5 |
| Topic: Current Bus Stop Facilities (35 submissions) | 7 |
| Subtopic: Bus stops and shelters (19 submissions) | 7 |
| Subtopic: Information Provision (5 submissions) | 8 |
| Subtopic: Real Time Information (14 submissions) | 9 |
| Topic: Current Rail Services (24 submissions) | 11 |
| Subtopic: Hutt Valley (9 submissions) | 12 |
| Subtopic: Johnsonville (1 submissions) | 12 |
| Subtopic: Kapiti (5 submissions)..... | 12 |
| Subtopic: Wairarapa (5 submissions) | 13 |
| Topic: Customer Experience (40 submissions)..... | 15 |
| Subtopic: Accessibility (7 submissions) | 15 |
| Subtopic: Comfort (3 submissions) | 16 |
| Subtopic: Provision for bikes (18 submissions) | 16 |
| Subtopic: Staff (5 submissions) | 18 |
| Subtopic: Timetables (2 submissions) | 18 |
| Subtopic: Toilet facilities on trains (3 submissions) | 18 |
| Subtopic: WiFi (4 submissions)..... | 19 |
| Topic: Exempt Services (33 submissions)..... | 20 |
| Subtopic: Airport Flyer (4 submissions) | 20 |
| Subtopic: Cable Car (2 submissions)..... | 21 |
| Subtopic: Capital Connection (23 submissions) | 21 |
| Topic: Fare Structure (548 submissions) | 25 |
| Subtopic: 25% off peak discount (511 submissions) | 25 |
| Subtopic: Affordability (35 submissions) | 27 |
| Subtopic: Discounts for young people 5-18 yrs (493 submissions) | 29 |
| Subtopic: Existing 14 zone system (435 submissions) | 30 |
| Subtopic: Fare Capping (15 submissions) | 32 |
| Subtopic: Farebox Recovery Policy (7 submissions)..... | 33 |
| Subtopic: SuperGold Card (18 submissions)..... | 35 |
| Subtopic: Integrated fares and ticketing (76 submissions) | 36 |
| Subtopic: Other comments (32 submissions) | 42 |
| Subtopic: Tertiary Student fares (18 submissions) | 44 |
| Topic: General (37 submissions) | 46 |
| Subtopic: Corrections (3 submissions) | 47 |
| Subtopic: Maintenance (5 submissions) | 48 |
| Subtopic: Maps (4 submissions)..... | 48 |
| Subtopic: Walking and cycling routes (7 submissions) | 48 |
| Topic: General Transport Issues (20 submissions) | 50 |
| Topic: Policies and Actions (31 submissions) | 53 |
| Subtopic: 1 - An integrated public transport network (5 submissions) | 53 |
| Subtopic: 2 - Services and infrastructure standards (19 submissions) | 53 |
| Subtopic: 3 - Fares and ticketing system (5 submissions) | 56 |
| Subtopic: 4 - An effective connection with customers..... | 57 |
| Subtopic: 5 - Providing for the transport disadvantaged (9 submissions)..... | 58 |
| Subtopic: 6 - Monitoring and review (1 submissions) | 59 |
| Subtopic: 8 - Sustainable funding (2 submissions) | 59 |
| Subtopic: General (2 submissions)..... | 60 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Topic: Process and Submission Form (26 submissions) | 61 |
| Topic: Procurement Policies (16 submissions) | 64 |
| Subtopic: Contract requirements (8 submissions) | 65 |
| Subtopic: Procurement approach and unit design (9 submissions) | 65 |
| Subtopic: Transition and timing (3 submissions) | 66 |
| Topic: Regional Rail Plan (489 submissions) | 68 |
| Subtopic: Park and Ride facilities (465 submissions) | 68 |
| Subtopic: Raumati Station (4 submissions) | 72 |
| Subtopic: Service redesign (416 submissions) | 73 |
| Topic: Wellington Bus Network (330 submissions) | 81 |
| Subtopic: Khandallah (120 submissions) | 83 |
| Subtopic: Network design (170 submissions) | 94 |
| Subtopic: Victoria University access (32 submissions) | 113 |
| Subtopic: Wellington Public Transport Spine or BRT (33 submissions) | 117 |
| Topic: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options (561 submissions) | 121 |
| Subtopic: Carbon and other emissions (514 submissions) | 121 |
| Subtopic: Cost to ratepayers and travellers (508 submissions) | 123 |
| Subtopic: Funding for trolley buses (203 submissions) | 123 |
| Subtopic: Noise (506 submissions)..... | 136 |
| Subtopic: Where, how, and when people want to travel (512 submissions) | 137 |
| Subtopic: Willing to pay for lower emission option (500 submissions)..... | 137 |
| Subtopic: Fleet preference (286 submissions)..... | 138 |

TOPIC: Current Bus Routes

Topic: Current Bus Routes (9 submissions)

Officer Comments:

Proposals for modifications of current bus routes have been referred to the network design team for inclusion in service reviews. The draft PT Plan proposed an integrated approach to the public transport network with a simple layered network of services, and does not support duplication of rail and bus services, however some bus services that may appear to duplicate rail services will remain if they are existing fully commercial services, or if they serve a different catchment.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #241: Suggests: bus routes 111/112/114/115 run every 30 minutes to connect with train service at Upper Hutt that run every 15 minutes, buses at Upper Hutt timed to connect with the Wairarapa rail service, no bus departure from a train station until 2 minutes after the train has stopped (or bus to wait if the train is expected in less than 10 minutes taking account of small delays using RTI system), transfer window for catching a second bus or train should be up to 6 hours, encouraging people to take return trips on the bus where currently they may be taking a car.
- Sub #257: Opposed to current network design - e.g., four buses bunched (3, 11, 18, 43/44) to go to Eastern Suburbs, then almost a 25 min wait for another bus.
- Sub #342: Better Wairarapa bus to rail connections.
- Sub #342: Modify a non-commercial route to service both Wellington and Paraparaumu airports.
- Sub #403: Questions why empty buses are travelling around Porirua / Paremata. Where is the demand and how is this translated into an appropriate timetable?
- Sub #443: Notes little integration between bus and train services late in the evening.
- Sub #473: Suspect the very poor timekeeping has not helped patronage and feels dubious about not getting on a 14 bus if unsure where the following 22/23 is supposed to be.
- Sub #520: Does not support early evening/weekend services in Wainuiomata operating hourly (currently half hourly). Does not support current bus connections between Wellington and Wainuiomata. Suggests realistic time allotted for train/bus connections. Notes current capacity issues on services. Does not support new routes with increased transfers as there are often delays/breakdowns. Suggests weatherproof bus shelters. Does not support changes to bus routes 1, 2, 4, 22, 23, 81, 83, 84 and 85 as they appear to pre-empt the review. Removal of route 81 at weekends will reduce options for part of Petone.
- Sub #586: Suggests the four current routes in Masterton, which are operated in a single loop alternating in different directions, should be combined into a single route, perhaps numbered #207. The #200 route should terminate at Featherston, instead of some trips running to Martinborough, leaving the Featherston – Martinborough section to the #205 route.

TOPIC: Current Bus Routes

- Sub #586: Believes that duplication between rail and bus services is wasteful and unnecessary, and that such duplication should be resolved in favour of rail services. That means bus services that duplicate the rail network would be disallowed, both within and outside Wellington City.
In Porirua and the Kapiti Coast, this would apply to the #210 route, which would be terminated at Porirua Station instead of Johnsonville, and the #289 Kapiti Commuter, which would be eliminated.
Similarly, any services in the Hutt Valley that duplicate the rail network (especially between Petone and Wellington stations) would be terminated at the Hutt Valley end. This includes services from Eastbourne, which would terminate at Petone station, and the commuter services numbered #90, #92 and #93.
The #110 service would be broken into three sections: #113 Emerald Hill to Upper Hutt; #110 Upper Hutt to Taita; and #128 Taita to Queensgate.
The #145 Belmont and #154 Korokoro services would be combined as the #150.
- Sub #629: Requests 170 bus Wainuiomata South bus route connect with trains departing Wellington at 3:31pm (buses currently leave earlier than timetable) and earlier services on Sundays/public holiday (currently 7:55am).

TOPIC: Current Bus Stop Facilities

Topic: Current Bus Stop Facilities (35 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The draft PT Plan includes a policy to ensure that all public transport infrastructure and facilities meet quality and safety standards including improvements in the design and capacity of stops, but implementation of the policy is limited by the availability of funding. GWRC uses a prioritisation tool that provides a rational and consistent approach to deciding where to place new bus shelters. However, with nearly 3000 bus stops the current level of funding enables approximately 15 new shelters or shelter replacements to be installed each year. Officers acknowledge that the current programme of new shelter roll out is extremely slow, and as a consequence the Council is considering a significant boost to funding as part of the preparation of the next Long Term Plan that will commence in 2015/16. The increased funding would enable the number of new and replacement shelters to increase to approximately 40 per annum. The concerns with the bus stop shelter at Coastlands are being addressed, and subject to the ongoing positive collaboration between GWRC, Kapiti Coast District Council and Coastlands Mall, improvements should be in place by end of September 2014.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #295: Supports the destination sign of route 110 display "via Gillespies Road". Alternatively, Gillespies Road services should have a different route number displayed.
- Sub #345: Suggests recessed bus stops would help with traffic flow.
- Sub #437: Suggests improving the quality and convenience of the existing Wellington station and Kilbirnie interchanges, both significant impediments to increased patronage.
- Sub #624: Request that current work to increase the limited size of the bus shelter at Coastlands opposite Westpac is resolved before the end of June.

Subtopic: Bus stops and shelters (19 submissions)

- Sub #99: Recommends adding a bus shelter on route 150.
- Sub #116: Wants more shelters where routes are.
- Sub #123: States there is only very poor shelter options currently available due to shelter size (not big enough)
- Sub #211: No bus shelter at Manners Street Burger King stops (eastbound toward Courtenay Place). Other side of the road (westbound towards Willis Street) has three bus shelters.
- Sub #212: Support dry interchanges.
- Sub #245: Clearer signage needed at interchanges to avoid confusion as the draft plan encourages more transfers. RTI info should say where a service travels via.
- Sub #257: Supportive of fewer bus stops - more stops increases travel time.

TOPIC: Current Bus Stop Facilities

- Sub #376: Requests a bus shelter on one side of the road, where the two bus stops are almost opposite each other in Porirua.
- Sub #429: Requests bus shelters for Otaki bus stops. Notes the promise to build a certain amount of shelters per year over the last 10yrs has not happened and Otaki residents are paying same rates as Wellington residents. Includes a slide show of photos of Otaki bus stops.
- Sub #432: Requests to make a verbal submission on the current Transport Plan and the lack of shelters in Otaki.
- Sub #441: Requests bus shelters on 13 locations listed in the submission to enhance access to areas. Also requests relocation of bus stops from Aotaki Street to clear Countdown supermarket and from Rangiru Road to improve visibility for traffic using Rangiruru Road and the avenue Intersection.
- Sub #453: Recommends significantly greater numbers of quality shelters. Requests that, when terminus points and interchanges are being developed, bus layup areas and suitable driver facilities (e.g. toilets) are incorporated into the planning, particularly at route terminus with careful considerations given to Lambton Quay area.
- Sub #577: Concerned that the design of the 'modern' shelters at Epuni Station and Naenae Station are not sufficient to provide good shelter from inclement weather. Wind and rain get through the gaps in the designs and leave all the seats in the shelters wet and make it difficult to shelter from bad weather. More solid structures would ensure passengers would not be reluctant to catch services from these stations.
- Sub #592: Supports review of bus stops - location, spacing, design, etc. - to reduce dwell times.
- Sub #595: Under the proposed plan I will have to transfer more. At a bare minimum this will mean providing adequate shelter from wind, rain and sun and adequate seating.
- Sub #598: Supports improvements in bus stops and shelters
- Sub #622: Request GWRC include Masterton District in the region's bus stop shelter programme. Increase bus shelters and shelters with seats, with priority given to locations where there are higher proportions of people reliant on public transport e.g. near rest homes, schools and around Masterton East where car ownership rates are lowest. Propose GWRC add one new bus shelter each year in Masterton District.
- Sub #637: Recommend GWRC and WCC install shelters with three full sides and one partial side at all new locations required by implementation of BRT. Recommend timetables be located inside the shelters and shelters are free of advertising. Recommend GWRC and WCC replace Adshel structures with similar structures to those just described.
- Sub #643: Supports provision of shelters at all stops. Supports shelter design which reduces the exposure to weather. Suggests shelters should be located as close as possible to where the bus stops and the RTI should be visible from the shelter.

Subtopic: Information Provision (5 submissions)

- Sub #315: Suggests better timetable displays to reduce bus direction confusion.

TOPIC: Current Bus Stop Facilities

- Sub #394: Suggests more work is needed to give good information to people on PT services and how to navigate between PT and destinations. Maps of surrounding areas at stations and major stops are needed.
- Sub #437: Requests provision of on board information (both visual and audible) and well-signed and well-lit stops for buses, considering that trains are well provided for in this respect.
- Sub #564: Considers there should be better information at the bus stop - such as route maps - rather than only the timetable and bus arrival times.
- Sub #643: Requests the route name and number on buses are made larger font, illuminated, more legible and provided on all sides of the bus.

Subtopic: Real Time Information (14 submissions)

Position: Strongly Supports (1 submissions)

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #7: Suggests adding real-time information in Johnsonville/Upper Hutt/Waikanae.
- Sub #34: Requests that 'P' or 'O-P' are added to the electronic displays at bus or train stops to indicate if the journey falls within peak or off-peak times to improve eligibility assessment by Gold Card users.
- Sub #73: The electronic signboards are not much use as they have too many non-existent buses. At Kirks bus stop in Lambton Quay, I notice that very few people look at the signboard. More buses, less frills.
- Sub #116: Advises the current electronic timetables do not work as they give fictional times instead of real time information.
- Sub #315: Suggests upgrade to electronic bus arrival displays as they do not appear in real time.
- Sub #358: Supports real time information and notes that cell phone updates are working very well.
- Sub #415: Real Time displays should either always say how many minutes away a bus is or devote one line to displaying the time on which the public transport system actually operates. This would greatly improve reliability from the point of view of those whose watches differ from the actual time.
- Sub #447: Hopes RTI investment includes making it more accurate for rail.
- Sub #486: Provision of better real-time information to intending passengers will offset the inconvenience of delays caused by safe driving.
- Sub #564: Requests bus arrival boards "Railway Station", as the bus itself does rather than "Wellington St"
- Sub #619: Suggests real time boards on Courtenay Place S/E Bond.
- Sub #622: Request roll-out of real time timetable information at bus stops to Masterton District to reduce uncertainties associated with public transport, particularly in Masterton where services are less frequent than the cities.

TOPIC: Current Bus Stop Facilities

- Sub #643: Considers existing RTI display font is too small and requests next bus due is shown in larger font. Requests unobscured visibility of RTI boards from the waiting area.

TOPIC: Current Rail Services

Topic: Current Rail Services (24 submissions)

Officer Comments:

To be added.

- Sub #15: Requests better spacing of peak time morning services on Johnsonville line - there is a 25 minute gap between two trains between 7am and 8am. Not very convenient.
- Sub #39: Requests better alignment of the number of train carriages with the number of travellers. Trains arriving at, or leaving wellington shouldn't regularly have people standing.
- Sub #39: Requests that trains are measured as on time when it arrives within 3 minutes and that this is reported - a train running 4 minutes 59 seconds late is VERY late in a 17-odd minute journey (Melling -> Wellington), and that would be counted as "on-time" under the measures proposed. Saying that '5 minutes is the standard around the world' is neither true, nor relevant, as Wellington has a relatively small network, with services running relatively infrequently, and 5 minutes is a big deal when compared with car traveling times.
- Sub #61: I think that the improvements made over the last couple of years have greatly benefited the commuter however I think some further changes need to be made to the timetable. I travel from Mana daily catching an express train however it is always stuck behind the stop all stations train? Are they not express for a reason?
- Sub #177: I applaud the decision to upgrade all the unit fleet to the same Matangi units, but it just makes good practical sense in the end.
- Sub #437: Suggests increasing off-peak frequency on all electric routes to every 15 minutes, at least within the core Porirua/Johnsonville/Melling/Waterloo area.
- Sub #437: Requests a rail/bus interchange at Ngauranga, facilitating transfers between northern suburbs and Hutt Valley services without the time-consuming and expensive detour via Wellington.
- Sub #441: Requests rail passenger station stops for the Kapiti-Horowhenua Coast. Also requests creation of covered station stops at McKays Crossing, Paekakariki -Tourism; Raumati South-Dormitory; Lindale-Dormitory, Tourism; Southwards, Otaihanga-Dormitory, Tourism; Peka Peka-Dormitory; Te Horo-Dormitory, Tourism and Manakau-Dormitory to enhance level of access to these areas. Suggests that using prefabricated standardised facilities and methods would bring the costs down compared to concrete construction at the locations indicated above. Requests to open up the Kapiti Coast to the day visitor market to encourage tourism that is presently missing because lack of access.
- Sub #447: Surprised that a trial of wheel / tyre re-profiling has not been carried out on the Matangi trains to try to reduce their squeal.
- Sub #588: Considers that where buses are replacing trains, it will do a lot for the reputation of train travel to pull the proverbial socks up on the bus service (which is a big step down in punctuality and service and sours one's whole perception of train travel).

TOPIC: Current Rail Services

Subtopic: Hutt Valley (9 submissions)

- Sub #51: Do not support a goal of having more people on trains unless there no rolling stock. If I'm on the 6.42/48 from Waterloo on a work day it's fine but the 7.10 can be like a sardine tin. For someone who does not start work until 8am and only has a 5 min walk from the station that means an early rise to get to work in comfort. I do not mind standing but hate being squashed. It is not good enough if staff decide not to come to work because they cannot be bothered - so trains are cut.
- Sub #120: Concerned that the recent designs of stations on the Hutt line have not provided adequate shelter from the weather.
- Sub #304: Suggests improvement on the current seating shelters, they're unenclosed and cold.
- Sub #342: Proposes a possible redesign of the off peak timetable from Wellington as follows: a) on the hour, Upper Hutt Service stopping all stations to Silverstream then express to Upper Hutt (approx. 40 minutes running time), b) on the 1/4 hour, Featherston Service stopping at principal stations (Petone, Waterloo, Taita) then all stations from Silverstream to Featherston (approx. 55 minutes running time), c) on the 3/4 hour, all stations to Upper Hutt, d) on the hour, all stations to Melling
- Sub #393: Suggests there needs to be at least six carriages from Waterloo or Taita because four carriages aren't enough.
- Sub #443: Queries why the last train arrives at Melling at just 6.25pm as the line is well patronised
- Sub #471: Train services to the Hutt must continue - just look at the chaos on the roads after the storm last year or the earthquakes - and they must be electric.
- Sub #587: Is concerned about the design of the modern shelters at Epuni and Naenae stations suggesting that the stations need more solid structures to provide an acceptable level of storm protection.
- Sub #621: Current timetable from Wellington to Hutt Valley means last train Gold Card can be used for HV trains is 235 p.m. Either change train departure to 3:00 p.m. or extend Gold Card availability.

Subtopic: Johnsonville (1 submissions)

- Sub #447: Notes the main issue with the Johnsonville Line is that it is a single track railway with 3 intermediate crossing loops – this constrains the service pattern and makes recovery difficult once services are delayed. The optimal service pattern is 13 minutes allowing up to 4 trains to run. Flexibility in the timetable is a simple solution.

Subtopic: Kapiti (5 submissions)

- Sub #58: The cost of train travel is too high & the frequency / capacity is too low. Combine that with reliability. As a commuter from Porirua these are of utmost importance alongside your park and ride facilities.
- Sub #86: Support express trains from the Kapiti Coast arriving up to 9.30 am. The morning express trains do not finish late enough. People who drop off children at school before going to work currently have to catch an all stops train to town.

TOPIC: Current Rail Services

- Off-Peak Trains - Trains that are not off peak when they leave the Kapiti Coast become off peak as they near town. This inconsistency does not appear fair to all travellers.
- Sub #220: Fit a further train from Waikanae in between the 6.30 and 7am trains as it is a long gap. Matangi trains are not as comfortable as the Ganz Mavag trains and prefers more Ganz Mavag on Kapiti line.
- Sub #621: Concern that since Kaiwharawhara station closed Kapiti Line trains leave as Hutt Valley trains arrive, leaving passengers with a 30 minute wait at Wellington Station.
- Sub #624: Acknowledges the improvement in rail services reliability improving the travelling experience for Kapiti commuters and other rail users.

Subtopic: Wairarapa (5 submissions)

Officer Comments:

There is an existing work programme in place to improve reliability on the Wairarapa Line.

The cost of additional locomotives to provide additional services has been assessed as uneconomic, however GWRC is currently investigating the cost of installing a turntable at Upper Hutt and the cost of acquiring SD driving carriages from Auckland. Once the costs are known a business case could be considered to introduce additional Wairarapa off peak and weekend services by shuttling between Upper Hutt and Masterton.

This type of service extension fits into the Regional Rail Plan Rail Scenario B category therefore no change in the draft PT plan is recommended at this stage, as Rail Scenario 1 is the priority above Rail Scenario B.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #321: Suggests the service on the Wairarapa train line is very poor regarding punctuality and reliability.
- Sub #437: Suggests increasing off-peak and weekend Wairarapa services by running shuttles between Upper Hutt and Masterton and converting Wairarapa trains to push-pull operation, with extra cycle space that would reduce congestion at Wellington by eliminating the multiple shunting movements, many at peak times that are required by the current method of operation.
- Sub #441: Suggests the 3.40pm services to Wellington from Masterton needs to leave 10 to 15 minutes earlier to allow Wairarapa Train arrives at Wellington prior to Capital Connection departing the station that allows passengers who have their destinations north of Waikanae - where the electric train terminates - to travel to Wairarapa and return on the same day.
- Sub #622: Support more frequent and convenient travel to Wellington on week days and during weekends including additional off peak services to enable easier access to Wellington which would further enhance Wairarapa's appeal as a lifestyle option.

TOPIC: Current Rail Services

- Sub #622: Request provision of a train turn around facility in Upper Hutt, further investigation of electrification of the Upper Hutt to Featherston line, and investigating a communication system upgrade for the Rimutaka Rail Tunnel. These will improve scheduling options, enable the provision of a shuttle service, and provide more convenient access to major social, cultural and sporting events in Wellington.
- Sub #623: Suggests reinstatement of a turnaround facility at Upper Hutt will enable better connections between Wairarapa and Hutt Valley services. Supports initiatives that provide for more reliable services.
- Sub #623: Suggests standardizing performance measurement system e.g. a consistent measure of delays per 100 trips for all service across the network.

TOPIC: Customer Experience

Topic: Customer Experience (40 submissions)

Officer Comments:

To be added.

- Sub #73: The snapper website should make it easier to re-claim "penalty applied" fares. The system sometimes breaks down in buses, and buses break down.
- Sub #301: Suggests GWRC should get more involved in the running times the bus companies allow each trip to be completed. At present may peak-time services run back-to-back, so that the arrival time at a destination is the same as the departure time from the same point. This means that the driver has no chance of keeping to time, with a consequent loss of customer goodwill. Surveys have shown repeatedly that reliable bus services are key to a successful operation, yet many peak-time services run so late that the one behind overtakes it, and often the one behind that. The present situation seems to owe more to the bus company's accountants' requirement to get the maximum out of every dollar paid and every bus kilometre travelled, rather than keep faith with its customers.
- Sub #396: Suggests when there is an issue with the trains, there needs to be improved communication and alternative transport provided immediately.
- Sub #473: Dubious as to how satisfactory or pleasant changing buses will be in quieter times, whether at Thorndon Interchange or the Karori Tunnel Mouth, especially in the evenings.

Subtopic: Accessibility (7 submissions)

- Sub #46: Improve accessibility on buses for families including ease of access for strollers and change bus drivers prohibitive attitudes to families with strollers.
- Sub #438: Places where PT and pedestrians interact must be designed in full conformance with the Transport Agency Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide. Pedestrian access to and from bus stops, railway stations and ferry wharves be explicitly identified as an important factor in PT use, including disabled access. Increasing the accessibility of the core network by improving pedestrian links should be a priority action, including signposting/waymarking links between stops/stations and the places of interest that they serve. Priority given to increasing accessibility of the core network by improving pedestrian links including signposting/waymarking between stops and stations. All stations and main stops should have maps of the area, including details of other public transport. Where nearby stops serve the same destination(s), RTI screens at every one of these stops should show departure information for all of them. All interchanges must be safe and convenient, and existing interchanges modified as necessary.
- Sub #462: RPH notes that public transport networks are particularly important for vulnerable groups in our society, including older persons, disabled people, children and young people, and those on low incomes. They have immediate and direct influences on health as well as long term intergenerational health influence through climate change and air pollution.

TOPIC: Customer Experience

- Sub #486: Suggests significant attention and monitoring should be given to the provision of safe services. Harsh braking, extreme acceleration/turning often cause discomfort, stress and injury to passengers.
- Sub #499: Supports the continuation of transport information being accessed via phone including the toll free number.
- Sub #577: Supports pram accessible buses to remove a barrier for parents travelling with children having to collapse prams.
- Sub #595: Hubs need to be more accessible for passengers to transfer.

Subtopic: Comfort (3 submissions)

- Sub #107: Opposes new seats on new metro trains as too small with no gaps in between seats.
- Sub #437: Suggests to minimise inconvenience to baggage-carrying passengers on Wairarapa line by moving the baggage/generator car of Wairarapa trains to the Wellington end of the train given that with the current arrangement Wellington passengers need to walk the length of the train.
- Sub #643: Requests seat design in buses take account of tall people.

Subtopic: Provision for bikes (18 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The draft PT Plan includes a policy of integrating public transport with walking and cycling. The timing of the installation of bike racks on buses will be reviewed as part of the preparation of the new GWRC Long Term Plan over the next 12 months.

Currently GWRC is not able to make bus/bike workshops compulsory for bus drivers, but this matter will be considered further as we develop new bus operating contracts over the next couple of years.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #23: Supports changes to the bikes on trains policy to allow bicycles of any size to be taken on any Kapiti line service, and for Matangi bike storage areas to be modified so bikes stand up vertically. This would save space and be safer.
- Sub #34: Supports making it easy for cyclists to use a train or bus
- Sub #92: More consideration should be given to integrating the bus network with the cycling network. The two modes of transport do not mix easily.
- Sub #135: Supports the provision of bicycle park and ride facilities at public transport hubs such as the Wellington Central Rail Station, Johnsonville, Kilbirnie, Tawa, Miramar, and other hubs.
- Sub #166: Supports bike users on trains. Suggests more provisions for peak times.
- Sub #183: Suggests the train system allow bikes on peak commuter travel times.

TOPIC: Customer Experience

- Sub #220: Bikes should be allowed on all trains during peak times. More Ganz Mavags on the Waikanae line would allow more bikes to be carried during peak.
- Sub #313: Suggests working with The Transport Agency to construct bike lanes and an earlier introduction for bike racks in buses.
- Sub #318: Supports a trial and full implementation of bike racks on buses, as soon as possible.
- Sub #348: Recommends placement of cycle racks to be put on buses. These could also be used for baby buggies.
- Sub #437: Suggests provision of secure cycle parking and make it free given that car parks are free but cycle lockers have to be paid for.
- Sub #486: Suggests the provision of cycles on trains, the Cable Car and some bus routes be increased.
- Sub #507: Suggests incorporating cycling as a transport system in the plan as it is door-to-door, provides reliable journey times, is fast within the CBD, does not contribute to congestion, requires only minimal parking facilities, creates no carbon emissions, has significant health benefits, and is relatively safe. Suggests the integration of cycle paths parallel to bus lanes (i.e. remove parking on Golden Mile, shared space on city centre streets), adding bike racks on buses/rail (sooner than the proposed 2017/18 timeline), creating bike facilities at public transport stops/park and ride, develop a public bike rental scheme, continue bus/bike workshops and make them mandatory for new bus drivers.
- Sub #527: Suggests the trial of bikes on buses should be brought forward to 2014-15 to encourage more active, healthy transport that reduces congestion and is economically sensible.
- Sub #530: Requests full implementation of bike racks on buses brought forward as early as possible. Connecting bikes and public transport makes good sense and extends the network for those who don't live near a bus stop currently. It also enables those who aren't fit or brave enough to ride up hills or in wet and windy conditions to still commute one way and reduce congestion by using public transport for the other part of their journey. Support Cycle Aware Wellington's submission.
- Sub #587: Supports improvements in walking and cycling facilities.
- Sub #588: Considers public transport needs to encourage (not just enable) mixed-mode journeys. Initiatives otherwise not considered should be investigated and if they look effective at seducing commuters should be pursued. GW should think laterally about overcoming the issues (e.g. maintenance obligations, jurisdictional issues with City Council) which may have hitherto deterred it from investing in these kinds of initiatives. Examples could include: "ride, park, ride" facilities enabling commuters to cycle to PT nodes in decent numbers, and store their bikes conveniently and under cover; cooperating with CBD bike hire so bikes are available in the CBD for train commuters; being more enabling of peak-hour bike transport on trains
- Sub #598: We also support the proposal to require operators to provide for the safe carriage of cycles on appropriate rail and ferry services

TOPIC: Customer Experience

Subtopic: Staff (5 submissions)

- Sub #211: Improve customer relations training for bus drivers.
- Sub #407: Recommends bus drivers need more training in using the kneeling capability of buses and consideration for passengers like waiting until older passengers are seated or stable before accelerating.
- Sub #564: Notes that while most drivers are polite, professional and competent, there are a few drivers out there who seem rather stressed and anything you can do to improve their relationship with passengers will help them and the passengers.
- Sub #595: The drivers should have their GPS off otherwise how will the real time information be irrelevant.
- Sub #642: Recommends drivers not release their air brakes at bus stops and do it only as a matter of necessity in areas away from congregations of passengers, as this produces an ear-damaging noise.

Subtopic: Timetables (2 submissions)

- Sub #256: Supports improvements made on the inconsistencies between available timetables - online/print/real-time.
- Sub #643: Requests onboard route sign be provided on buses and restoration of the timetable racks provided on buses.

Subtopic: Toilet facilities on trains (3 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The issue of toilets on trains was considered when the new Matangi trains were being designed. The trains are metropolitan commuter trains and the costs of including toilets could not be justified, both in a monetary sense and in terms of the loss of passenger capacity that would result. Similar trains in other parts of the world (e.g. Melbourne, Sydney, Hong Kong, London etc.) with run times of up to one hour plus (probably up to one and a half hours) do not have toilets. However toilets are available at Waikanae and Paraparaumu stations.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #61: Support consideration of a bathroom (as simple as an airplane bathroom) on each train, I understand the need to remove some seating to fit this in however I think that most commuters would agree that this is a good idea especially if you are travelling to Pram or Waikanae? Just a thought.
- Sub #394: On Sundays there are no toilets on the Kapiti line.
- Sub #624: Requests options for providing toilet facilities on trains is investigated.

TOPIC: Customer Experience

Subtopic: WiFi (4 submissions)

Officer Comments:

GWRC has recently secured access to a fibre optic network that runs along the rail lines and opens up the prospect of on board Wi-Fi for passenger trains and Wi-Fi at stations. GWRC will be investigating the possibility that such Wi-Fi services be provided by a third party with no cost to ratepayers.

Further officer comments to be added.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #124: Suggests facilities on Capital Connection and also the Kapiti line to include provision of tables and power points to allow customers to work on the train.
- Sub #437: Suggests provision of WiFi, preferably free at point of use.
- Sub #577: Recommends free wi-fi on services which would appeal to professionals.
- Sub #622: Supports the provision of Wi-Fi access on Wairarapa train services to significantly enhance the level of service offered to commuters. Along with more frequent and convenient services, would encourage more commuters to use public transport and encourage leisure travellers to use the train.

TOPIC: Exempt Services

Topic: Exempt Services (33 submissions)

- Sub #192: Suggests Mana and Airport Flyer services included in RPTP.
- Sub #268: Supports more long distance trains e.g. Levin, Palmerston North, Masterton and Auckland.
- Sub #419: Does not support the exclusion of Eastbourne buses/Airport Flyer/Cable car in plan.
- Sub #633: Identify in the RPTP each exempt service and identify which unit it is proposed to be replaced by, and an indicative date by which it is to be deregistered.

Subtopic: Airport Flyer (4 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The Airport Flyer services are run on a fully commercial basis by the operator, so the Council does not decide on the timetables or route. Under current legislation, the Airport Flyer is exempt from the need to operate under contract with the Council, and the PT Plan cannot include the Airport Flyer in the Metlink network without agreement from both the operator and the Government.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #48: Suggests the restoration of the airport bus service to Upper Hutt without having to change buses in Lower Hutt (which causes problems for elderly/infirm/those with suitcases and in inclement weather when services don't synchronise). Suggests making every fourth 110 bus a joint airport bus (travelling to the airport) and vice versa.
- Sub #152: Suggests Airport Flyer service be reinstated in Upper Hutt.
- Sub #265: Requests the reinstatement of the airport flyer as a direct service (without vehicle changes) to Upper Hutt and be rerouted along Hutt Road from the Ngauranga interchange to facilitate commuter access to Kaiwharawhara.
- Sub #443: Identifies need to maintain the current service levels of the Orange Airport Flyer Bus as it is a complete success and well supported by Lower Hutt and Wellington residents, tourists and visitors.

TOPIC: Exempt Services

Subtopic: Cable Car (2 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The Cable Car services are run on a fully commercial basis by the operator, and under current legislation, is exempt from the need to operate under contract with the Council. The PT Plan cannot include the Cable Car services in the Metlink network without agreement from both the operator and the Government.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan, and that officers be requested to investigate the proposal from Wellington Cable Car Limited that the Cable Car could be included in the Metlink network in future Regional Public Transport Plans.

- Sub #201: Requests consideration of including the Cable Car in the Metlink network in six to eight years' time. At this time significant investment will be required to replace the existing Cars as they will be over 40 years old and their design life predicated replacement at an estimated replacement cost of \$8 - 10 Million. If the Cable Car becomes part of the contracted network at this point it would provide the possibility of public funding to enable this iconic public transport facility that carries over 1,000,000 passengers per year to continue.
- Sub #643: Does not support the cable car being an exempt service, the provision being at the operating company's discretion. Considers the cable car to be a rapid, efficient and fossil fuel free service heavily used by tourists, students, residents.

Subtopic: Capital Connection (23 submissions)

Officer Comments:

Previously GWRC has supported the retention of the Capital Connection service and was pleased with the decision by KiwiRail to continue to operate the service. Should KiwiRail decide not to continue operating the service, it would need to be reassessed based on updated information on the performance of the service in terms of passenger growth and subsidy requirements. However, in 2013 changes to the Land Transport Management Act defined inter-regional services as automatically exempt from the requirement to operate under contract to a regional council. In practice, this means that they are not eligible for funding from the Transport Agency as public transport services.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #107: Supports the continuation of the Capital Connection return service from Palmerston North to Wellington. Requests timetable change for service to leave earlier in the morning and return later in the day. Waikanae's train station is nearing capacity (parking) and the last thing residents need is more commuters parking at this facility. GWRC should allow Capital Connection passes to be used on Metro services. Both services should be allowed to co-exist.
- Sub #107: The Capital Connection also provides a vital link between Wellington to Kapiti North for bike commuters and increases bike usage.

TOPIC: Exempt Services

- Sub #124: Opposes cessation of the Capital Connection service. Acknowledges the proposed Kapiti transport route includes a bus to Otaki that may be caught at both Waikanae and Paraparaumu, but states this is not at all equitable with the current service the Capital Connection provides. Considers the Capital Connection is a service with inter-regional significance and therefore must be considered under the LTMA and RLTP. It is important for the commuters North of Waikanae that the Capital Connection service continues and that joint funding be sought from the appropriate councils to enable this service to continue.
- Sub #129: Supports the subsidising of Capital Connection (in conjunction with the Horizons Regional Council), improving the service and allowing tickets to be used on electric services up to Waikanae. Concerned Waikanae's overloaded park and ride facilities will be worse if this service is cancelled. Does not agree this is a Transcenic service, but a commuter train.
- Sub #137: Suggests the Capital Connection is the only viable public transport system for the commuters living north of Waikanae and that this service continues. Subsidising this is vital to its continuance and joint funding should be sought from the appropriate councils to enable this service to continue.
- Sub #157: Opposes discontinuation of the Capital Connection service as it is a vital transport for working and studying commuters.
- Sub #162: Supports the continuation of the Capital Connection service as it frees up the roads and provides a fast, reliable service to Wellington. Notes that there is no other option travelling from the Kapiti Coast to Palmerston North. Suggests more route recognition and funding.
- Sub #177: The Capital Connection should be working more with responsible agencies in an attempt to modernise 'the community' of commuters further built. A trust or cooperative structure should be applied to gain public ownership in order to raise more finances for the Capital Connection.
- Sub #234: Supports retaining Capital Connection as commuters north of Waikanae would be deprived of working in Wellington, trains from Waikanae would be overcrowded and the ability to cater for extra commuters from Waikanae is limited by track capacity and carriage availability. Park and ride at Waikanae would be untenable with no Capital Connection leading to extra associated costs for expansion. Can also provide back-up when electric services can't operate. Notes it is the only commuter rail service not subsidised.
- Sub #277: Information on the Capital Connection's services and timetables should be included in regular channels. Some people think the CC needs to be pre-booked and is exclusive in some way. This would ensure that many potential passengers were aware of the CCs services and it's availability to all. This may reduce load on Tranz-Metro services at peak times if some passengers chose the CC option.
- Sub #277: Supportive of the Capital Connection. It should qualify as an activity of inter-regional significance and be included in the plan. Capital Connection passes should be accepted on the Kapiti line. This would allow passengers to receive a subsidized ticket, and provide flexibility for people needing to get in to town early or stay late. This would also increase demand. The timetable of the Capital Connection also needs to be in between existing Tranz-metro services to allow a consistent frequency.
- Sub #288: Supports the Capital Connection as a commuter service.

TOPIC: Exempt Services

- Sub #355: Recommends TranzMetro Kapiti line accepts Capital Connection passes to provide flexibility for commuters, and Capital Connection work with KiwiRail to schedule trains at staggered times.
- Sub #356: Requests Capital Connection be considered for inter-regional significance and funded as Regional transit by GWRC, and be part of the region's fare structure.
- Sub #364: Requests Capital Connection is included in the RPTP as it is the primary source of transport (and best option) for many Otaki residents, because the drive to Waikanae and lack of parking near the station make the TransMetro option less feasible. Requests GWRC state it intends to continue collaborating with Horizons Regional Council in pursuit of a subsidised service between Palmerston North and Wellington.
- Sub #392: Supports including the Capital Connection rail service because if this service was unavailable the options for travel would mean more cars going into Wellington, not to mention carbon emissions going up. Suggest the Council support keeping the Capital Connection service operating by providing a subsidy along the lines of the subsidy already provided to the Wairarapa rail services offered because it would encourage more younger people out to the smaller towns to keep these towns alive and less congestion in Wellington.
- Sub #401: Recommends adding the Capital Connection into the system because it's for Wellington workers.
- Sub #413: Supports adding the Capital Connection service to the rail network and see improved timetabling so that the Capital Connection complements the other Waikanae services instead of competing.
- Sub #434: Concerned that the extension of rail services to Waikanae has threatened the viability of the unsubsidised Capital Connection service, and that there is a risk the service may be ended by KiwiRail next year. Suggests continuation of the existing Capital Connection services as part of the Wellington rail network and recommends that the priority is given to the enhancement of the rail services between Wellington and Palmerston North with financial support from GWRC, Horizon Regional Council and The Transport Agency as the service offers greater potential for easier movement of people for employment and for tourism and could offer a connection to international air services operating from Wellington airport and better connections to and from Palmerston North when Wellington airport is closed.
- Sub #445: Strongly supports the continuation of Capital Connection. This service acts as a valuable Otaki to Wellington commute, keeps extra cars off the road and services the widest area of all commuter train services into Wellington. Notes the two fare increases in the past year and the limited park and ride facilities at Waikanae. Suggests subsidies from The Transport Agency and an inclusion in the RPTP as Otaki residents pay Wellington Regional rates and get no subsidy on this service.
- Sub #483: Supports the continuation of the Capital Connection service. Notes it is not mentioned in the plan.
- Sub #491: Recommends that the Capital Connection is included in the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2014 and the Greater Wellington Regional Council actively supports the continuation and enhancement of this train service. A number of initiatives could be implemented that would help fund this service - accepting Capital Connection passes on the Tranz Metro Kapiti line, improve timetabling so the CC is not within 5

TOPIC: Exempt Services

minutes of another service at Waikanae and it arrives in Wellington slightly earlier and leaves slightly later than currently, adding information on the CC's services and timetables to its newsletters.

- Sub #508: Concerned that the Capital Connection is an exempt service. Feels Greater Wellington Regional Council appears to be ignoring it. Considers that it should be treated the same as the Wairarapa Train and should accept Trans Metro passes or be part of the Trans metro service. Parking at Waikanae has poor access from north and surely cost would be high to extend parking to accommodate commuters from Palmerston North to Otaki.
- Sub #591: Supports Capital Connection service. Worried increased prices will force people into cars. Supports joint GWRC and Horizons subsidisation of service.
- Sub #624: Request that GWRC recognise the Capital Connection as an inter-regional service and restate their commitment to continuing this service, including their financial commitment should other partners come on board.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

Topic: Fare Structure (548 submissions)

Officer Comments:

To be added

- Sub #34: Supports (and is willing to pay for) any incentive that encourages people on to public transport such as free fares for kids, reduced fares for families, free or reduced fares for elderly

Subtopic: 25% off peak discount (511 submissions)

Position: Oppose (64 submissions)

- Sub #244: Suggests keeping the price as is and using the extra funds to cover operational costs so ticket fares will not have to increase.
- Sub #479: An overall 25% off-peak discount would put a further burden on those who pay rates, either directly or indirectly (those who rent).
- Sub #598: The Centre considers that rather than off-peak discounted fares, the GWRC should implement a model of peak-discounting, as it is during peak time, when congestion is greatest, that shifting car users onto public transport would have the greatest community benefit. This can only make economic sense if the community costs of private car use are also factored into the financial model used to establish fares and rate of return.

Position: Support (423 submissions)

- Sub #7: Suggests off-peak discount at 20% rather than 25%.
- Sub #150: Suggests a discount for travel before 9am as opposed to after.
- Sub #358: Requests monthly pass is still available for passengers who must travel during peak hours.
- Sub #360: Suggests this would be beneficial for young parents with children.
- Sub #437: Supports the 25% off-peak discount, replacing the current mixed situation.
- Sub #540: Suggests allowing the Go Wellington Beneficiaries Permit at the same time.

Position: Will change my behaviour (193 submissions)

- Sub #182: Suggests this applies to train travel as well as buses.
- Sub #617: Notes a Gold Card is currently being used, but would change behaviour otherwise.

Position: Will not change my behaviour (283 submissions)

- Sub #570: Have to travel due peak times to get to work

TOPIC: Fare Structure

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #35: Supports a 25% off peak discount to provide a cheaper option for those not earning, or unable to work, or on low income.
- Sub #86: Support making weekends off peak may encourage people to make single trips using public traffic.
- Sub #99: Supports travelling off peak but over all seven days a week.
- Sub #181: Supports 25% off peak discount but not if applied to monthly passes or multi-tip tickets which are already heavily discounted.
- Sub #245: Supports off-peak discounts to attract people off peak services and people using private transport.
- Sub #270: Opposed to a 25% discount on cash fares, if only available with a snapper card.
- Sub #292: Supports peak/congested pricing of public transport.
- Sub #299: Opposed to off peak discount, as this will not influence movement from peak to off peak
- Sub #336: Support off peak fares being extended to evenings and weekends as fares need to create a desire to use the services.
- Sub #342: Supports
- Sub #412: Suggests off peak discounts can translate into "very expensive peak fares" further down the track.
- Sub #419: Suggests frequent services.
- Sub #435: Supports 25% off peak fare as it encourages people to change travel times.
- Sub #436: Strongly supports the option of removing targeted concessions and replacing them with an off-peak discount for all would be strongly supported commenting that removing the need for bus drivers to check eligibility for various concessions would make for a simple easier journey for all.
- Sub #549: Support 50% off-peak fares. Currently buy a monthly pass but rarely use it at the weekend due to the price of additional single tickets needed for other family members to travel.
- Sub #570: Support an off-peak discount - not sure of the %
- Sub #577: Supports the off peak discount regime. Adding travel before 7am to the off peak period would encourage some peak hour travellers to depart earlier.
- Sub #589: Supports other off-peak fares
- Sub #591: Does not support 25% discount for off-peak travel as many commuters have no genuine choice about when they have to travel. Prefers to lower fares across the board.
- Sub #592: Supports 25% off peak discount.
- Sub #639: Supports the proposed off-peak discount but at the rate of 50% not 25%. Otherwise, suggests due consideration of concessionary fares for tertiary students.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

Subtopic: Affordability (35 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The key initiatives that will assist in continuing or improving the affordability of public transport fares include:

- Introducing free transfers, so there will be no additional cost if you transfer from one vehicle to another during your journey
- Introducing fare capping – so that there are pay as you go discounts for frequent travellers
- Discounted products e.g. a 25% off-peak discounts and weekend family pass
- Reducing the share of operating costs covered by fares from 55% to approximately 50%
- Improving the efficiency of the public transport network. The Transport Agency requires that public transport fares cover at least 50% of the direct operating cost of public transport services – current and proposed efficiency improvements will reduce requirements for fare increases while still achieving at least 50% fare box recovery.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #10: Supports reduced fares for commuters.
- Sub #24: Requests that public transport be affordable to all- \$2 for one section in the city is absurd, and \$15 return from Eastbourne to Wellington makes it cheaper to drive than catch the bus. At the end of the day, to get more people using public transport, you need to lower the fares. Please make public transport accessible and attractive to your citizens.
- Sub #65: Suggests the train fare is too expensive, as carpooling is more cost effective.
- Sub #101: Supports ratepayers subsidising buses, as it is too expensive to access CBD.
- Sub #115: Supports a reduction to monthly passes. Proposes a reduced fare for public servants. Supports discount incentives for using smart cards.
- Sub #119: Does not agree with increase as it will lose the public goodwill. Would also like the "missed tag off" penalty fare fully removed and alternatively just charge the most common stop the person uses if on the same route.
- Sub #119: Does not wish to pay more if route changes for transfers.
- Sub #123: Service is now getting worse but costs more to use the transport.
- Sub #124: Advises he currently pays \$30-35 per day which is too much.
- Sub #138: Supports the introduction of a low income travel rate available to beneficiaries, students and pensioners.
- Sub #152: Suggests an introduction of a Family Monthly pass as costs are high to travel from Upper Hutt.
- Sub #154: Suggests public transport be heavily subsidised (as much as roads are) to increase use.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #178: Requests fares do not increase.
- Sub #182: Suggests an increase in funding from central government so that fares will not change for many years.
- Sub #184: Opposes current fares as these are not reasonable compared to other cities. Also suggests should be no further charges for transfers where a service routes are going to be ceased.
- Sub #213: Suggests further subsidies to reduce ticket costs. Notes the cost of two people driving and parking one car often the same or slightly less than using public transport. Reduced rates would encourage patronage.
- Sub #237: Suggests government subsidy on public transport to encourage use.
- Sub #263: Supports holding public transport fares at current prices, in real terms, as part of the strategy to encourage people from their cars, particularly at peak times.
- Sub #269: Opposed to current fares - need to be reduced.
- Sub #321: Recommends keeping fares at a competitive level and not increasing them at a rate greater than inflation.
- Sub #396: Suggests the cost of public transport needs to be significantly reduced in order to attract new customers and attract people away from cars.
- Sub #398: Suggests economically taking the bus or train is marginal over the car nowadays.
- Sub #401: Suggests not to put the fares up because it will drive passengers towards their cars and alienates the very people who generate the most revenue - the peak commuters.
- Sub #415: Opposes raising fares to pay for the added cost of the trolleys as it would discourage public transport use, especially by the poor. The money saved by abolishing the trolleys could be used to reduce fares.
- Sub #424: Concerned about the cost of bus fares, as proposed bus routes would require three bus journeys to travel from Houghton Bay / Southgate to the university during the off-peak.
- Sub #435: Supports an emphasis on limiting any increases to bus fares as the cost of catching the bus to work from Northland for a couple is only marginally cheaper than the cost of driving. Council subsidies disproportionately benefit train users over inner city bus users.
- Sub #447: Notes that Wellington fares are incredibly high. Suggests congestion charging, petrol tax, or some other method to generate additional income for public transport.
- Sub #481: Notes the fare rises that have occurred since 2008 have been largely attributed to the cost of fuel. Suggests electrically powered transit would be less affected by the price of oil. Suggests the Regional Council should campaign for more funding from central government for public transport and bus fares should be frozen.
- Sub #487: We pay ridiculous amounts for bus travel given the service is what it is. Supports any steps to reduce the cost per ride. If that means reducing overhead lines, so be it.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #518: Suggests a low income pass that would support tertiary students/minimum wage earners/those on benefits and a free fortnight's travel voucher to raise patronage.
- Sub #573: Concerned services planned to connect at Karori Tunnel will affect fares when a transfer is required to complete a journey.
- Sub #620: Suggests a Hutt Valley monthly bus pass reintroduced as fares have gone up with the introduction of Snapper in 2009.
- Sub #622: Request ongoing consideration of affordability issues when making public transport decisions to take account that parts of the Wairarapa, and Masterton in particular, have lower than average income levels and an ageing population with more people on fixed incomes.
- Sub #631: Suggest fare reduction as it is currently cheaper for two people to travel and park with a car.
- Sub #638: Suggests a higher public funding for bus fares to reduce fare-box recovery.
- Sub #639: Requests that affordability be given a high priority, given that it is a key factor for commuters when choosing which mode of transport they use. Does not support the proposed fare increase scheduled to take effect from 1 October 2014.

Subtopic: Discounts for young people 5-18 yrs (493 submissions)

Position: Oppose (53 submissions)

Position: Support (435 submissions)

- Sub #128: Supports current policy for young people 5-18 yrs but no further discount.
- Sub #141: All students should get a discount on bus fares not just high school students.
- Sub #360: Suggests free travel for children under 11 (as in the Netherlands) to increase patronage overtime.
- Sub #419: Suggests this replaces discounts for children/students.
- Sub #540: Suggests all Community Service Card Holders should be able to get the same discount.

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #123: Discounts for under 19s.
- Sub #181: Opposes discounts for under 19's and he states it should be extended to 20 and under.
- Sub #245: Supports discounts for 5 - 18 year olds.
- Sub #248: Supports discounts for young people but it has to be simple (i.e. cheap) and reliable to administer (ensuring that people cannot use their discount beyond 18).
- Sub #342: Supports for those aged under 20
- Sub #403: Supports free train rides for children under 5
- Sub #479: Suggests a differentiation between those on a wage and students. Would support discounts for students.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #481: Free to all children (17 years and under).
- Sub #577: Supports raising the child fare regime to 18 years.
- Sub #589: Supports a 50% discount fare for children and young adults aged five to 18 years (or still at school)
- Sub #591: Supports discounts for young people under 19
- Sub #592: Supports under 19 discount

Subtopic: Existing 14 zone system (435 submissions)

Officer Comments:

During the Fare Structure Review the Council reviewed a range of options for the zonal fare structure, including a seven zone system. For a seven zone system, the modelling undertaken showed that a relatively high one zone fare would be required to maintain revenue at approximately current levels (\$4.50 cash or \$3.40 smart card), and that this would have a significant impact on customers undertaking short trips, and accordingly this option was not supported.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

Position: Oppose (105 submissions)

- Sub #368: Recommends alternate zone/fare system such as Vienna's option of an honesty system with small number of zones and unlimited travel.
- Sub #394: Suggests dividing the region into "cities" and having one zone in each, boundaries might overlap i.e. Tawa located in both Wellington and Porirua, having some free travel areas within the CBD to encourage patronage.
- Sub #453: Disagrees with the proposal to retain the 14 zones radiating from the CBD as this will retain much of the complexity of the current system. Suggesting that 7 zones would be more appropriate.

Position: Support (325 submissions)

- Sub #358: Supports existing system. Recommends flexibility between lines - would like to use a 4-zone ticket on both Hutt and Kapiti lines.
- Sub #401: Recommends all monthly passes should be cost beneficial for each zone of commuters as a current monthly pass is only cost effective beyond Zone 2.
- Sub #532: Suggests free transfers.

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #81: Do not support the 14 fare zones, recommend making it one fare zone, allow swapping from train to bus etc. in other words a transferable ticket for up to 2 hours for \$5-00 adult (60% of adult fare for child 12 years of age or under).
- Sub #136: Supports a reduction of existing 14 zones to 3-5. Would like to be able to use monthly ticket for whole zone.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #181: Agrees to keep 14 zone system until integrated ticketing available.
- Sub #184: Recommends that the zone system changes due to Ngaio Gorge Road represents the start of Zone 3 which is only 4.5 Km from the Willis St / Lambton Quay intersection. But Kilbirnie shopping centre is still in Zone 2.
- Sub #245: Supports reduction in number of fare zones through consolidation of existing zones.
- Sub #267: Supports smaller fare zones, making fares more affordable. Supports a single fare system that is valid for 90 minutes on buses, train, metro and cross-harbour ferries.
- Sub #288: Supports a simpler fare structure that is equated fairly within the region.
- Sub #299: Supports less fare zones so that there is greater freedom to travel within fare zones.
- Sub #316: Recommends less zones, suggests 5.
- Sub #336: Tawa CB believes there should be fewer zones, but that it does not take into account the real cost of each line or the distance travelled. The fare structure should include some allowance for the real cost of each service. Maintenance costs of the Hutt and Kapiti lines should be shared with freight and long-haul services.
- Sub #447: Notes the zonal system is too granular with high fares per zone, discouraging public transport use by families particularly on weekends when parking is free.
- Sub #452: Keolis Downer advocates a simplified fare zone system with a significant reduction in zonal boundaries. Melbourne is a prime example to strive towards.
- Sub #548: Does not support the retention of the current 14 fare zones as they are Wellington CBD-centric, and not passenger destination centred for non-Wellington destinations. Feel aggrieved at cost of 2-zone trip from Naenae to Lower Hutt. Taking the car there and back in the weekends costs about \$5.00 in fuel, taking the bus, even with Snapper, twice cost - about \$10.00. Cost unreasonable for a trip that is already slightly more inconvenienced by not having a car. Moving the boundary from Epuni to Lower Hutt would remove this disincentive, and provide a logical stage boundary for Lower-Hutt centred passenger trips. Submit that GW investigate having zones that reflect an inter-related set of hub destinations, rather than a single, Wellington-centric zonal pattern.
- Sub #549: Supports a smaller number of zones
- Sub #577: Does not support the current fare boundaries as they penalise residents who live near a boundary.
- Sub #586: Believes that the current zonal fare structure is arbitrary, unfair and overpriced, and that excessive fares are a disincentive to public transport patronage in the region. Believes that a zonal structure based on existing geographical boundaries in the region would better reflect how people travel, how they would use public transport, and the patterns inherent in the network itself. Proposes that fare zones be based on territorial local authorities, with fares set at a base level of \$3.00 for travel between local authorities, and with cheaper fares (perhaps a base of \$2.00) for travel within wards. An important part of fare zones proposal is the use of transitional zones on the edges of local authorities, where travel from one local authority area to a neighbouring one can

TOPIC: Fare Structure

be done without incurring the cost of crossing a fare zone boundary. This would apply to Tawa Community Board area, Judgeford and the Belmont Hills, Paekakariki Hill, Stokes Valley, and wards in South Wairarapa and Masterton Districts that border Carterton District.

- Sub #590: Believes that section 4.5 states firmly that the decision on fare zones has already been made.
- Sub #592: Supports basing fares on the number of zones travelled through, not the number of zone boundaries crossed. Believes zone boundaries should be at a stop or station where the spacing is reasonably close (less than 2km rail, 1km bus) so that a short trip to the next stop/station isn't more than a one zone fare. Improve zone alignment.

Subtopic: Fare Capping (15 submissions)

Position: Support (4 submissions)

- Sub #545: Suggests this as a replacement to other passes if it was cheaper than what is currently available.

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #2: Supports fare capping to make Smartcard travel more attractive and not penalising multiple trips.
- Sub #101: Supports daily capped fares for the CBD (similar to Melbourne).
- Sub #130: Suggests fares should be capped dependant on how many services you get and how frequently.
- Sub #181: Opposes fare increase to keep trolley buses running.
- Sub #241: Reasonable fare cap would be seven most expensive trips per week. Currently the monthly pass is a fare cap at 30 trips (at 10 trip prices) per month. If the smart card / 10 trip discount is to be removed the cap should be 5 trips per week or 24 per month.
- Sub #292: Supports fare capping, as this will increase bus use - as long as there is a reduction from current pricing.
- Sub #342: Supports
- Sub #430: Suggests to work with GWRC to determine the impact and the options for a regional fare policy based on capping.
- Sub #488: Support fare capping. Offer annual passes for unlimited travel within set zones.
- Sub #549: Requests a weekly fare capped at the value of the 8 longest trips taken and integrated ticketing and fares.
- Sub #590: Supports reducing fare packages available as it is currently confusing. Unsure on monthly passes versus fare capping as fare capping leaves the passenger unsure until he trip has passed whether they have benefited.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

Subtopic: Farebox Recovery Policy (7 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The proposed change in the farebox recovery target is intended to assist in addressing community concerns about affordability, declining customer satisfaction with the affordability of public transport, and to grow patronage. The Transport Agency has commented that the fact that GWRC has the highest farebox recovery rate for public transport of the three major urban centres does not mean that Wellington subsidises the rest of the country, as the Transport Agency's investment decisions are not based on a region's farebox recovery ratio, but on its investment priorities. However, Wellington's relatively high farebox recovery ratio means that central government funds a lower proportion of the operating cost of public transport services in Wellington than it does in other major cities.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #453: Encourages the Council to reduce the reliance on farebox in conjunction with its restructuring of fares and ticketing.
- Sub #488: The fare box recovery should be lowered to 30 percent with the short fall made up with an increase from GWRC rates. This would see a huge increase in patronage and justify an increase in contributions from central government.
- Sub #545: Notes that GWRC currently receives the highest proportion from patrons nationally as calculated by the fare-box recovery policy (currently 55% for the network - well above the 44% in the case of Auckland in 2013). Furthermore, this amount is above the Transport Agency mandated target of 50%. Hence we do not think that the on-going fare rises are justified and that setting a farebox recovery target of 55-60% is grossly unfair to Wellington patrons when compared to other region
- Sub #587: The council refers to the government policy that includes reducing government subsidies for fares and infrastructure and argues that a farebox recovery rate at 50% in the future means that GWRC needs to increase its investment; and contends that the proposed improvements in ticketing and integration of public transport will not lead to reduced rate payer subsidy over time.
- Sub #598: A more sophisticated financial model is needed than farebox recovery (p. 80), and we realise that achieving this might be as much a political issue as a common sense one. By isolating public transport off from the costs and benefit structures of other transport modes - through the farebox recovery model - public transport is disadvantaged. Such isolation also prevents using financial mechanisms to influence shifts in mode share.
- Sub #633: Concerned that GWRC expects the farebox recovery target to drop to 50% arguing this is contrary to the government's objective of increasing the commerciality of public transport services and improving patronage with reduced reliance on public subsidy. Needs to be satisfied with the proposed strategy in the PT Plan to ensure support for its investment in the services. Notes that the fact that GWRC has the highest farebox recovery rate for public transport of the three major urban centres does not mean that Wellington subsidises the rest of the country, as the Transport Agency's

TOPIC: Fare Structure

investment decisions are not based on a region's farebox recovery ratio, but on investment priorities.

- Sub #639: Supports the alignment with the farebox recovery target of 50% and requests that affordability be given a high priority. Also supports the drive for efficiency in the network and comments that efficiency gains, and the application of the subsequent cost savings as fare subsidies, are an effective tool to reduce fares. Suggests that the effect of recent fare increases to be considered as one of the reasons listed in the PT Plan for the low patronage growth.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

Subtopic: SuperGold Card (18 submissions)

Officer Comments:

During the Fare Structure Review the Council reviewed the possibility of extending the SuperGold card hours, but concluded that current arrangements should be retained. The SuperGold concession is a government funded scheme that provides a high level of access to public transport services for those who are eligible. Extending the SuperGold concession would require increases in rates or fares for other users, and officers do not consider that benefits of extending the period of free travel for SuperGold card holders would justify decreasing the affordability of public transport for other users, or increasing the rates.

It is important to note that the SuperGold travel scheme is fully funded by the Government, who sets the rules around eligibility. The Government does not support any extension of the scheme.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

Position: Oppose (1 submissions)

Position: Support (4 submissions)

- Sub #128: Supports current policy for Gold Card but no further discount.
- Sub #394: Suggests the card can be used in the evening peak as with the Auckland service.
- Sub #550: Suggests transfers can still be used if first vehicle was boarded before 3pm.
- Sub #585: Suggest being available to use after 3pm.

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #76: Very strongly support extending the Gold Card eligibility times to allow travel into Wellington CBD. Extension from current 3.00pm cut-off to 3.30pm or even 4.00pm on weekdays is justified.
- Sub #166: Does not support free travel for Gold Card users on Harbour Ferries and Masterton Trips.
- Sub #266: Supports Gold card use inpm peak, as in Auckland.
- Sub #342: Supports Gold Cards from 9am-3.30pm then after 6pm
- Sub #455: Gold card users who start their journey in the CBD before the 3.00pm expiry time should not have to pay again when they reach their transfer point after 3.00pm.
- Sub #460: Availability should be tied to specific services rather than boarding times.
- Sub #481: Gold card should apply all day.
- Sub #589: Supports continued free off-peak travel for SuperGold card holders
- Sub #591: 50c or \$1.00 fare for SuperGold card holders

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #594: Supports SuperGold Card” free travel into the afternoon like Auckland with no restriction from 3pm to 6.30 pm.
- Sub #624: Support extending gold card hours on public transport to 3.30pm.
- Sub #640: Recommends extending the hours for use of the gold care to at least 4.00pm
- Sub #642: Supports off-peak hours for Gold Card and proposed discounts are extended.

Subtopic: Integrated fares and ticketing (76 submissions)

Officer Comments:

Improving the fares and ticketing system is the next significant element in the modernisation of Wellington’s public transport system. It is a complex multi-year programme which will involve significant and complex new business systems.

The current investigation process will identify everything that will be required to develop and implement integrated fares and ticketing successfully throughout the region and how much it will cost. There are currently different ticketing systems on buses, trains and harbour ferries, and hundreds of fare products. Simplifying the existing complex system will not be easy. As part of the investigation, GWRC will seek input from the public transport operators in the region and from operators of other integrated fares and ticketing systems, both in New Zealand and overseas. It is anticipated that free transfers between Go Wellington services can be introduced in advance of the introduction of a fully integrated ticket, as part of the fares transition plan.

The next stage after the approval of the business case will be design and procurement, including the calling of tenders for the development and provision of an integrated ticketing system. The tender process will be open and subject to rigorous ethical and probity standards. Like other tenderers, current providers of electronic ticketing systems in the region such as Snapper will be welcome to tender. All tenderers will need to meet the tender requirements, which will include being suitable for all modes and meeting the national standards set by the Transport Agency.

Officers believe that the proposed timing of the project is appropriate to mitigate the risks and ensure the best outcome for the people of the region.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

Position: Strongly Supports (1 submissions)

Position: Support (12 submissions)

- Sub #113: Supports integrated ticketing and free transfers.
- Sub #160: Suggests a sooner start date.
- Sub #182: Suggests integrated ticketing and free transfers are a priority.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #394: Suggests a full blown system could wait for the Auckland trial to be finished, but in the meantime: extend transfers from Valley Flyer to Go Wellington, provide an affordable after 9am day pass that can be used on any bus in Wellington City and provide more Kapiti Plus arrangements.
- Sub #419: Supports free transfers but notes that some of the proposed routes now have double transfers and may be a disincentive for patrons.
- Sub #501: In favour of integrated ticketing.
- Sub #550: Supports a transition before new bus routes implemented.
- Sub #585: Suggests timetable/travel information available in large print/braille/online/telephone for blind travellers to access, booking systems online/telephone, automated ticketing and check-in facilities that are accessible to blind people, card readers that speak all data shown on screen.

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #7: Cautions electronic ticketing will encourage fare evasion.
- Sub #21: Requests an integrated (electronic) ticketing system to encourage easy multi-modal public transport journeys.
- Sub #27: Wishes to use snapper on any public transport which will encourage patronage.
- Sub #38: Supports integrated ticketing. Notes that with a move to train journeys using smart cards stations would need to be changed to being gated at least in many instances, and requests confirmation that this is budgeted for. Not having gated stations leads to problems like they are having in Auckland with high levels of fare evasion.
- Sub #39: Requests the introduction of smartcards and readers. Trains should never run late, get cancelled, or run with reduced seating because there isn't enough ticket clipping staff. Routine audits of trains to check that everyone tagged on would also increase revenue as free riders would be eliminated. It would also get rid of the monthly queues, people could renew their monthly pass online, (or auto renew from credit card).
- Sub #51: Do not support a combined bus and train ticket as I seldom use buses - but prefer to walk if I'm needing to get through or/and around the city.
- Sub #58: Supports integrated ticketing as a priority as traveling by bus to the train and bus in Wellington involves 3 different fare structures, costs & methods (snapper, paper ticket & cash).
- Sub #81: Support one fare zone; allow swapping from train to bus etc. in other words a transferable ticket for up to 2 hours for \$5.00 adult (60% of adult fare for child 12 years of age or under). A day ticket for \$10.00 and base your other tickets accordingly allowing a 25% discount for weekly (e.g. 10 trip) or more tickets. For the 2 hour ticket, the last boarding of a bus or train to be within the 2 hours and 15 minutes from first validation for a 2 hour ticket. It would increase patronage make policing and ticket printing a lot easier and allow an easy transition to electronic ticketing.
- Sub #99: Supports using one ticket for public transport travel.
- Sub #107: Suggests that passes for the Capital Connection should be able to be used on all modes of public transport.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #122: Supports the simplified ticket system allowing transfers between vehicles as part of a single journey. Proposes a discounted rate for remainder of journey if there is a short stop between vehicles.
- Sub #136: Supports integrated ticketing for multiple vehicle travel. The cost benefit would be an incentive for train users to use a connecting bus and decrease the need for park and ride facilities.
- Sub #142: Supports the integrated ticketing system to allow for proposed network changes (some travel services will now require a transfer). Suggests being able to use your smart card several times within a 2-3 hour period with the zone fare charged only once (as with Christchurch and their Metro card system).
- Sub #166: Suggests train tickets become multi directional if going the same amount of stops.
- Sub #172: Implementing a network that makes far greater use of transfers and connected journeys is absolutely imperative. It's better to sort out the fares first so that only the future suite of products will go to the GWRC card.
- Sub #175: Supports an integrated ticketing system. This would open up the option of having one "shuttle" system running through the golden mile with hubs at either end to hop on / hop off. This will free up current congestion in the golden mile.
- Sub #184: Is concerned that not all transport has been moved to snapper.
- Sub #184: States the appropriate time for integrated ticketing is straight away.
- Sub #184: Suggests if Snapper cannot fully support integrated ticketing to use an alternative way.
- Sub #201: Supports the use of Snapper to provide public transport ticketing in Wellington on the basis that considerable capital has been invested in installing Snapper at the Cable Car so there would be a considerable sunk cost if the whole Metlink transport network was to change to a different provider.
- Sub #204: Supports removing the need to pay an additional fare to transfer between bus services.
- Sub #211: Supports free transfers being included in current cost of bus fares. Cost of taking the bus in Wellington too high (without free transfers).
- Sub #212: Support paying by electronic card only.
- Sub #213: Supports integrated ticketing via Snapper card to reduce ticket prices.
- Sub #215: Very supportive of integrated ticketing and free transfers. Suggests the Cable Car line be included in this.
- Sub #227: Supports an integrated ticketing system and standard fares to reduce travel times.
- Sub #245: Supports but should be brought forward to eliminate transfer penalties as this provides a disincentive for people to use public transport.
- Sub #262: Supportive of integrated fares and ticketing between rail and buses and for the single journey concept. Supports free fare transfers between trips.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #263: Supports integrated fare systems. Suggests the cost of providing such a system in Wellington remains expensive with the rail network operating without barriers, thus requiring on board ticket provision and inspection. Recommends swift implementation, noting that bus services already have an electronic integrated system in use and available for use across the region. Suggests the national ticketing approach favoured by the NZ Transport Agency appears to be over specified, costly and not necessary for a regional scheme.
- Sub #265: Supports the simplified fare structure and integrated ticketing system but notes the financial impact of the new Public Transport Operating Model on Upper Hutt residents has not been identified. Suggests fare structures could be equitably distributed regionally according to network capacity, while simultaneously increasing passengers with parking availability.
- Sub #275: Supports investment in a single ticketing system that can be transferred between services.
- Sub #278: Supportive of free transfers between modes.
- Sub #298: Supports free transfers.
- Sub #331: Suggests an effective implementation of the transport plan based on an early roll out of integrated ticketing.
- Sub #336: Tawa CB supports electronic and integrated ticketing but are concerned this will increase train fares. Ideally electronic ticketing should reduce fares given that many unpaid rides would no longer occur.
- Sub #342: Supports electronic integrated ticketing and free transfers between modes and legs of travel.
- Sub #380: Supports free transfers between service. Suggests using one form of payment (snapper, etc.) on any bus, train, or ferry now.
- Sub #396: Supports easy transfers, a cap in a daily charge (similar to the Oyster card in London) and integrated ticketing for all services.
- Sub #401: Suggests effective integrated ticketing should be introduced by simple daily cap on snapper.
- Sub #411: Supports end to end journey ticketing to improve patronage and should be introduced as soon as possible regardless of the delay to introducing the revised routes.
- Sub #413: Supports integrated ticketing between services because it will provide more flexibility.
- Sub #422: Supports introducing integrated ticketing, where one smart card solution is used across all modes of public transport and all operators, and encourages GWRC to make this a priority. Supports the removal of the transfer fare penalty as it would benefit Victoria staff, students and visitors who currently transfer between services to reach the University.
- Sub #424: Suggests extending 30min transfer time to 2hrs to account for missed buses/traffic/delays.
- Sub #425: Supports GWRC advocacy for appropriate fare evasion measures as part of a comprehensive service improvement programme and the equitable distribution of

TOPIC: Fare Structure

costs. Recommends a high degree of involvement from the operator, particularly with regards to rail operations i.e. planning for gate arrays, implementation, operations and reporting etc. Suggests that GWRC provides a small revenue growth incentive bonus for the operator/maintainer rather than a material sharing of revenue/reset patronage benchmark following the introduction of major changes, as this alternative approach is simpler and easier to administer and also more closely aligns with the areas that are under the operator's control.

- Sub #430: Supports GWRC's vision for a fares and ticketing system and the proposed new fare policies and initiatives. Supports GWRC's plans to own the ticketing system and suggests that GWRC to take a formal policy and audit role at the strategic level in an existing scheme and to consider extension of the Snapper scheme and a range of ownership options as part of the PT Plan. Suggests to extending the scope of the existing Snapper scheme to Wellington Rail with a cost at the range of \$15-\$20m as an alternative option that would improve value for money, reduce the risk for GWRC and ratepayers, and allow GWRC to achieve the benefits of the RPTP earlier. Suggests to trial aspects of the fare policy to better understand the costs and benefits for customers and to allow release of the fare policy on an incremental basis, i.e. reduce the risk of transition and habituate public transport users to the proposed changes.
- Sub #447: Disappointed there has been zero movement from GWRC to make operators use a consistent payment system. Opportunities for early, easy integrated ticketing were lost.
- Sub #453: Strongly supports investing in Snapper as the technology is fully capable of meeting the needs of an integrated ticketing solution for the region and there is likely to be significant synergies through expansion of this Snapper system. Has offered to fund half the cost of free transfers in Wellington and between Wellington and Hutt Valley customers should the Council wish to introduce this in advance of integrated fares and ticketing across the region, recognizing that the Snapper system is configured and capable for immediate implementation which would give intra and inter operator transfers (Go Wellington, Airport Flyer and Valley Flyer) for approximately 70 per cent of bus users in the region and that this is a sensible and low cost enhancement. Also recommends that GWRC to thoroughly examine the proposed connection points and the capacity of connecting services to ensure that the integration will deliver the expected benefits.
- Sub #470: If the replacement of the 43 and 44 is to go ahead, an issue with the ticketing of this route needs to be addressed. Currently the route ends at one of the stops on Homebush Road, meaning that any passenger tagging on with a Snapper before this point will then get a penalty fare for not tagging off. If they happen to tag off at the front of the bus when they reach town, they will be charged the first penalty, as well as a second trip and penalty as they unintentionally tag on again. Customers wanting to avoid this have to walk either beyond the point where the route officially ends, or back to the start of Mandalay Terrace, which defeats the purpose of having the bus loop around Homebush Road.
- Sub #473: Opposes starting the M route at the Railway Station before an integrated ticketing system is introduced that incorporates transfers at no extra cost (including for Gold Card trips started before 3pm) and a real-time information system that really works.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #482: Supports free transfers to significantly increase patronage especially in off-peak periods.
- Sub #493: Supports integrated ticketing investment and exploration of discounted fares as both will increase patronage growth and provide seamless transition between modes for an integrated transport network.
- Sub #545: Suggests integrated ticketing and free transfer schemes be implemented before the proposed route changes take effect.
- Sub #562: Supports integrated ticketing system and standard fares which would reduce travel times significantly. Time spent loading passengers is an issue. Standard fares [discounted for electronic payment] would also result in increased patronage, while any change to the fare box recovery ratio will result in a decrease in passengers which traditionally takes time to recover, often never to previous levels.
- Sub #577: Supports integrated ticketing system, prefers 'smart' system that automatically calculates the cheapest fare option for the user for the journey and has a capped daily, weekly and monthly charge equivalent to the existing monthly fare arrangement. Supports internet top up via credit card without penalty and internet banking or ATM top ups.
- Sub #586: Recommends a system of integrated ticketing that would be compatible with both ISO 14344 Mifare/DESfire, and with Visa Paywave / Mastercard Paypass, would allow fares to be paid regardless of whether a user had a stored value card issued by the system, and regardless of whether that stored-value card held current value. This may allow the entire system to go completely cashless over the long term, which would be a significant advantage from an operational point of view, as well as speeding up boarding for passengers.
- Sub #587: In general supports the system but believes that full integration could be achieved for less than \$160m with the understanding that Snapper have already integrated many transport activities in the region at no cost.
- Sub #588: Requests "getting an integrated ticketing system already (Snapper please)"
- Sub #589: Supports integrated and consistent fares and ticketing
- Sub #590: Supports integrated ticketing as soon as possible.
- Sub #592: Supports integrated ticketing and fares and bringing forward timeframe. Also supports bringing integrated ticketing and fares in advance of an electronic system.
- Sub #595: I fully approve of the proposal to implement an integrated fares and ticketing system that enables the use of a single smartcard for all public transport rail, bus and ferry services. I don't support getting rid of day trip tickets.
- Sub #598: The Architectural Centre strongly supports integrated public transport ticketing across all transport modes (This should include the Airport Flyer). We also encourage the GWRC to consider the potential for PT smartcard compatibility with other NZ cities national PT card this would facilitate tourist use of public transport throughout the country.
- Sub #633: Supports the intent of the changes to the fare structure to simplify and integrate the fares available to public transport users across all modes and from all public transport operators. Willing to invest in additional services in the off-peak, provided that evidence is provided that this is the best way to optimise the network

TOPIC: Fare Structure

overall. Also fully supportive of work on integrated fares and ticketing being done in the Wellington region as an important step in increasing public transport patronage in the longer term. Intends to work closely with GWRC on the optimal timing for the suite of changes to the fare structure (i.e., the 'fare transition plan') and the longer term benefits accruing from such changes, as part of developing the business case for integrated ticketing.

- Sub #639: Supports the mechanism but concerned about implementation delays and recommends the work to be prioritised. Also suggests GWRC to work with The Transport Agency to investigate feasibility of building the system on the existing smartcard infrastructure to reduce the capital costs and to ensure that the price tag will not come at the cost of significant fare increases. Recognises that Wellington's current smart card system 'Snapper' has been an effective system for ratepayers and encourages GWRC to work with The Transport Agency to determine how it might be possible to build on the smart card infrastructure currently available in Wellington in a way that meets The Transport Agency's standards requirements.
- Sub #643: Requests that cable car is included in integrated ticketing as a one-zone fare and included in the fare transfer system between modes.

Subtopic: Other comments (32 submissions)

- Sub #2: Introduce Pre-Pay Only CBD/busy stops & ticket machines to increase speed of bus service.
- Sub #11: Requests a fare review / consultation is undertaken
- Sub #12: Reduce (only) monthly fares by 40-50% & increase the fares for short runs by 25%. Monthly fares encourage commitment to public transport & with reduction would be more economical for users travelling together to use public transport and not take their car.
- Sub #16: Supports introducing free transfers, so that when you are on a train and transfer to a bus, you shouldn't have to pay twice for travel in same zone. Especially since zone one is increasing to \$2.50 for a cash fare.
- Sub #37: Reduce the price of public transport to make it cheaper than using the car and increase patronage. Patronage has not increased since 2006 despite improvements to the quality of the public transport product.
- Sub #40: Equitable subsidies should provide for the population demographic which are poorest - instead of peak travel subsidies, offer subsidies to leisure card holders, community service card holders, residents of council housing, Pacific Islanders, members of local iwi, people who live in Cannon's Creek, or any other group identified as in need. Does not consider urban Wellington school children or elderly necessarily make up the largest cohorts of impoverished people of our community.
- Sub #41: Prefer distance-based fare structure for reasons of equity. Don't think an off-peak discount is a good use of funds as it would not alter behaviour. Prefer lower fares for peak travellers rather than a subsidy for off-peak.
- Sub #97: Suggests a reduction of fares and an increase in service frequency to raise overall patronage.
- Sub #185: Concerned that introducing a new shuttle bus in Miramar will add to fares and zone charges.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #188: Improvements for ticketing on the Mana services to be similar to the tag and go on Go Wellington.
- Sub #268: Supports the ability to pay Cash if they so choose, and not feel obliged to have snapper or a Universal one travel ticket.
- Sub #316: Suggests introducing a "fine" for those travelling without the correct ticket.
- Sub #324: Recommends unlimited travel passes on the whole transport network (such as in London).
- Sub #324: Suggests there is no need for zoning when using Snapper, the charge should be for the distance travelled.
- Sub #336: Tawa CB believes that a monthly pass in some form should also be available on the bus network.
- Sub #342: Free travel for under 5 year olds. Supports group travel discount.
- Sub #358: Suggests swipe or turnstile system as sometimes is difficult for staff to remember whose tickets they've clipped.
- Sub #360: To increase patronage, suggests providing a free 10-day travel card for bus and train travel. A Dutch company have called a similar project the "Low Car Diet".
- Sub #368: Consider alternate fare systems. E.g. honesty systems with a small number of zones and unlimited travel (like Vienna).
- Sub #394: Supports the ability for adults to take kids with them for free on weekend services. Supports free venue travel for community facilities like the zoo, international conferences, events etc.
- Sub #436: Concerned with the idea of a weekend and public holiday family pass as the experience shows validating eligibility of child travel on the weekend where students are out of uniform has been a big challenge for drivers and that this would be magnified when the driver needs to validate a whole family. Encourages GW to consider this issue very carefully before going forward.
- Sub #436: Strongly supports and commends the intention to rationalise the various fare products across the region.
- Sub #443: Supports free travel for children under 5 on trains, the 50% discount for ages 5 to 18 and school children, free travel for SuperGold card holders outside peak travel and a possible 25% discount for off-peak travel.
- Sub #488: Off peak fares should be 50 percent of peak fares. This would increase patronage without an increase in services.
- Sub #499: Does not support the top up facility available for Snapper cards. Until 2011, a downloadable application for PC and Mac computers and a Snapper Feeder USB device was available and it was possible for screen reader users to top up independently using this facility. This is now not available for screen readers and Snapper has refused to comment.
- Sub #540: Does not support public servants receiving a discount on fares.
- Sub #545: That the free transfer scheme be implemented before the proposed route changes take effect

TOPIC: Fare Structure

- Sub #545: Suggests discounted bulk purchasing be investigated by GWRC, VUW and VUWSA
- Sub #584: Support proposed fare structure and encouraging promoters of large events to include travel by public transport in the ticket price.
- Sub #586: Suggests in the absence of integrated ticketing, multimodal combo tickets and passes for single journeys, full days, full months and full school terms would help to encourage Metlink users to make use of the system as intended, transferring longer trips from buses to the rail network.
- Sub #589: Supports riders being able to use one smart card. Must ensure quick boarding and exit of buses and trains, free travel for children under five years old, continued discounts for people with disabilities, weekend family passes and encouraging promoters of large events to include travel by public transport in the ticket price.
- Sub #591: Cash fares good for visitors.
- Sub #636: Supports a fare increase in order to deliver a 2% revenue.
- Sub #638: Suggests family fares.

Subtopic: Tertiary Student fares (18 submissions)

Officer Comments:

During the Fare Structure review the Council chose not to propose a tertiary student fare on the basis that the fare structure should reward target behaviours rather than advantage particular groups within the community. However, the proposed off peak discount will benefit the many tertiary students who are able to travel outside the peak hours (information from Victoria University suggests two thirds of student trips occur off peak). The off peak discount has the following benefits over a tertiary student discount:

- it is available to everyone, and is therefore seen as fairer,
- it is expected to be more effective in increasing public transport use (for example, a 25% off peak discount is expected to cost approximately \$4.5 million annually and result in a 4% increase in patronage, while a 50% tertiary student discount would cost approximately \$4 million annually but result in only a 1% increase in patronage),
- it has lower administration costs.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

Position: Support (5 submissions)

- Sub #78: Supports University student discounts similar to school student discounts.
- Sub #155: Suggests same discount as the 5-18 yrs.

TOPIC: Fare Structure

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #33: Supports a 25% discount for fulltime students - Upper Hutt students living on student allowance of \$240 per week or less (depending on accommodation allowance) are spending over \$70 pw on train fares 10 trip to Wellington and back. While workers who earn over \$300 - \$500 per week can afford the fares, we can't. Mature students also support other family members still living at home on our meagre \$20K per year, so \$70 per week 10 trip to Wellington is onerous as you can imagine.
- Sub #42: Introduce university student (higher education) discounts for bus and train travel
- Sub #123: Discounts for students which include university ID students.
- Sub #152: Suggests an introduction of a senior student monthly pass as costs are high to travel from Upper Hutt.
- Sub #200: Supports tertiary student discounts
- Sub #289: Supports reductions in student tickets.
- Sub #316: Suggests negotiating with Universities (all tertiary students) to include a very low-cost "annual student public transport pass" in their tertiary fees (so that it is purchased automatically and can be added to the student loan)
- Sub #422: Acknowledges proposed fare structure would provide some financial relief through discounts and the removal of fare penalties. Suggests some tertiary students could miss out on discounted bus fares due to the timing of their classes. Encourages GWRC to proactively engage with the university to explore the introduction of a bulk purchase scheme where discounted tickets could be available to tertiary students.
- Sub #510: University student's income is usually low, so a 20-25% discount would be helpful for them.
- Sub #539: Questions why discounts only for children under 19? Consider bus becoming unaffordable for University students. In most other places and countries bus fares are discounted for full time University students or have youth passes available for people under 26 years. Suggests Wellington should too.
- Sub #545: That the 25% off-peak concession be extended to an on-peak concession for tertiary students and those eligible for community services cards, and that this concession be at the same level as secondary school students. NOTE: submitter provided numerous supporting submissions from students.
- Sub #587: Identified the cost of using PT as a major barrier for young people and suggested an action to include youth in decisions on the cost and access to PT for young people.
- Sub #643: Suggests more help be given to students and supports fare capping for students.

TOPIC: General

Topic: General (37 submissions)

Officer Comments:

To be added.

- Sub #34: Overall I'm really impressed with Wellington's public transport - I shifted up from Christchurch 2 years ago, and Wellington is just light years ahead - hurrah!
- Sub #123: It is long overdue that the buses were looked at; extremely tired of seeing and hearing about the work on the train system.
- Sub #186: Suggests staggered start/finish times for schools and universities to minimise transport congestion.
- Sub #219: Supports the overall proposals in the RPTP.
- Sub #239: Suggests too much time wasted at GWRC on PT matters, recommends experts be employed.
- Sub #263: Supports increased use of public transport where it helps overall road congestion.
- Sub #325: Supports the overall ideas in the RPTP and recognises them as a major step forward into the future.
- Sub #331: The draft plan is a very good document and the authors deserve credit for it.
- Sub #335: Requests more action to improve sustainability, including setting ambitious targets for public transport patronage growth, trip speed and transport quality generally, encouraging City Councils to maintain transport-orientated land-use planning and provide public transport priority, and making further studies of trolley bus options, including modernising and combined options.
- Sub #335: Requests changes in the PT Plan to rapid or even revolutionary change is required to reducing carbon emissions from transport
- Sub #335: Requests improvement in the PT Plan to create clear progression from goals to problem identification, solutions, quantified targets, programme and measured outcomes. As an example, reliability and journey time are policy objectives but submits that there is little emphasis and no measurable outcomes, in spite of the fact that the implications are very large. Reliability and journey time contribute to patronage growth, mode share, bus productivity, managing costs, lower fares and controlling congestion.
- Sub #340: Clarification needed on future bus storage facilities in Wellington.
- Sub #415: Suggests saving money by cutting back consultation with Maori over and above and separate from consultation with the general public, to the statutory minimum level. Participatory budgeting could (and should) help decide whence to get the money.
- Sub #439: Suggests the final version of this Plan to be effective it must include measurable objectives and defined service levels because without these, the council staff has no parameters for guidance and the travelling public has no means of calling the council to account.
- Sub #450: Support the aims of the Public Transport Plan.

TOPIC: General

- Sub #453: Argues that the share of the bus and ferry enhancements from the projected public transport infrastructure expenditure over the next six years (2.6%) is insufficient to significantly improve the service levels for the 67% of public transport users who take bus trips or to attract new customers.
- Sub #516: Suggests NZ weight based driver's license system creates scheduling problems as drivers are not qualified to drive all/correct buses.
- Sub #551: Congratulates the Greater Wellington Regional Council on creating a public transport plan which is balanced, thorough and will take Wellington in the right direction in reducing emissions from this sector.
- Sub #579: Consider Wellington's population should be strongly encouraged to use the public transport system, especially for the daily commute. The focus for proposals to "improve" services should focus on the customer experience, and address those negative impressions and experiences like punctuality and the need to change services, especially to central city destinations. One of the main put-downs for public transport is the experience of the long wait on a cold wet winter's day. While punctuality can be a by-product of road congestion, adequate time allowances to navigate peak time city traffic should be re-addressed.
- Sub #596: The GWRC favours rail users over improve bus users. The biggest problem with the PT Plan is it continues the GWRC ongoing focus to only invest and support improved passenger rail at the expense of supporting the bus service that actually carries the majority of PT users.

Subtopic: Corrections (3 submissions)

- Sub #45: The information is provided on the GWRC website is inconsistent, e.g.: Moa Point information that no change proposed to route 30 (C2) bus hours or days of operation, but the proposed bus route descriptions indicates C2 & C1 will route though "Broadway, Hobart St, Caledonia St". The BusSchematic2014.pdf map indicates these routes will pass through Miramar Shops, but BusMap2014.pdf shows them travelling down Caledonia Street. Clarification requested.
- Sub #45: Average Boardings: The average 72 boardings per year is a rubbish stat. Exclude all the non-bus users and you may find this is in the high 200s. A typical bus-loving, suburban living, inner-city working civil servant likely makes 10 boardings per week so in a 52 week period (less 4 weeks leave & stat days) that's more likely to be closer to 460 boardings.
- Sub #521: Concerned about the accuracy of the draft plan. Examined the plan for information about the main bus route between work and home, route 29. On page 96 the table indicates that currently the interval between services on the 29 route is three minutes in the morning peak, 10 minutes in the daytime and 2 minutes in the evening peak. This bears no relationship to reality. Wonder where else there may be errors in the draft plan and whether in fact this whole consultation is a sham.
- Sub #624: Change 'Aerodrome' to 'Kapiti Coast Airport' on the Kapiti proposed Metlink public transport network map (Figure 8 pg. 41).

TOPIC: General

Subtopic: Maintenance (5 submissions)

- Sub #127: Suggests that more maintenance should be done to stop faults from occurring on both bus and train services.
- Sub #127: The problems with mechanical faults might well be reduced if the track and the Ganz units were maintained to a better standard. Preventive maintenance, - fixing things before they break - is preferable to fixing them later. The incident where part of the undercarriage came through the floor of a unit illustrates how close we were to a government department suing the Regional Council for negligence. I was once in a unit where the electrics went on fire. Here again disaster was narrowly averted. Interested to see how NZ Bus can be sued under the Health and Safety in Employment Act over the condition of buses and rear doors. If the prosecution can demonstrate that the passengers on our buses are employees of NZ Bus then it is a short step to similar action against the Regional Council should there be another incident with our aging fleet of rail units.
- Sub #317: Recommends providing more/better shelter for commuters in key areas e.g. along Wallace St
- Sub #317: Requests fixing the clocks on the GO Wellington buses.
- Sub #317: Suggests that better maintenance of the bus fleet, especially over winter when Wellington's buses put more energy into heating which results in the buses end up clammy, claustrophobic and smelly. Good ventilation is key here, along with efficient heating systems.
- Sub #328: Recommends more effective maintenance of the overhead wires and introducing SLA measures and penalties for failure to meet required levels.
- Sub #328: Suggests better maintenance of the trolley wires
- Sub #342: Supports upgrade of the phone and radio communication systems along with other safety systems within the Rimutaka Tunnel.
- Sub #637: Recommend the fleet number of each bus be placed on the interior panel above the windscreen so passengers can easily report problems.

Subtopic: Maps (4 submissions)

- Sub #177: The Metlink Wellington city map is visually confusing. If it was redesigned in reference to Paris's le Metro map, ways to improve it could be seen.
- Sub #242: Maps in draft plan are unreadable as important detail such as which roads are to be travelled is not included.
- Sub #390: The maps and diagrams aren't clear where the Seatoun bus is going (via Miramar shops or not) and which way the Strathmore bus is going.
- Sub #590: Notes draft does not include a coverage map of the proposed network.

Subtopic: Walking and cycling routes (7 submissions)

- Sub #298: Supports cycleways in the CBD. Supports improved pedestrian crossing of Whitmore St, such as a bridge or subway from the railway station to the waterfront, as Waterloo Quay is far too wide and fast to cross.

TOPIC: General

- Sub #312: Suggests having bike lanes inside the car parking, safety issues of cyclists due to the buses having to drive through the cycle way to reach bus stops.
- Sub #394: Supports more emphasis on improving pedestrian routes and cycling routes to rail stations. The WCC walking plan approach of looking at walking times and identifying barriers/safety should be a key element in the PT plan.
- Sub #437: Suggests provision of signpost/wayfinding signs on all pedestrian access routes and particularly to and from nearby places of interest, starting between Porirua, Lower Hutt and Upper Hutt city centres and the stations serving them. Suggests all existing pedestrian access should be audited for conformance with the The Transport Agency Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide, and make it a requirement that all new and upgraded facilities conform fully.
- Sub #442: Recognises the Council's efforts to encourage active transport, but suggest that more strenuous efforts are needed to foster active transport by separate cycleways, bike carriage on buses, and wide footpaths. Concerned with the road safety for cyclists and requests for careful consideration of safety issues when planning for roads and public transport.
- Sub #453: Strongly supports integrated networks and the need for all transport modes to work seamlessly together. However seeks clarity on the definition of 'mode share' in the PT Plan to ensure that both walking and cycling - as vital components of successful Public Transport – are planned for, and included to work seamlessly together with bus, ferry and train services.
- Sub #584: Suggests plan include strategies to improve and facilitate cycling and walking as transport modes.

TOPIC: General Transport Issues

Topic: General Transport Issues (20 submissions)

Officer Comments:

Submitters have commented on a number of transport issues that are outside the scope of the PT Plan. Where relevant they will be passed on to the relevant team or agency.

Officers recommend not change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #50: Supports encouraging motorcycles as a way of reducing congestion. Although a private rather than public transport option they could considerably reduce congestion and travel times, and it would be cost effective to convert more on-street car parks to motorcycle parks to assist this relatively efficient and effective form of commuter transport.
- Sub #55: Support following the example of Enrique Penalosa, Mayor of Bogota - Colombia, where the focus was shifted from cars to where the number 1 priority is now people, cyclists and public transport. This is what Wellington could become.
- Sub #113: Supports car share schemes using a common ticketing/smart card structure.
- Sub #123: Perhaps NZ Police should be doing more spot checks to ensure the Wellington public safety.
- Sub #213: Supports a new bus system that will improve service and capacity issues and encourage people to use it. Reducing cars will reduce carbon emissions.
- Sub #253: Supports council enforcing current bus lanes. Particularly the one on Petone Foreshore.
- Sub #328: Recommends bringing in a toll on private cars entering the CBD in peak periods.
- Sub #332: Opposes Central Government spending 9 billion on roads and reducing subsidies for public transport as short-sighted investment which commits future generations to environmental and economic liability.
- Sub #441: Requests GWRC to work with The Transport Agency to improve road safety on the locations listed in the submission.
- Sub #453: Recommends that GWRC develop a coordinated strategy with WCC to target the cost and attractiveness of alternative modes of transport including i.e. Inner city parking strategies and park and ride for bus services.
- Sub #471: Increasing parking costs in town (unless they're for EVs) will discourage car use.
- Sub #481: Opposes the flyover next to the Basin Reserve.
- Sub #484: The relationship between public and private transport is intertwined and so neither can be fully considered individually. A long term plan for reducing the use of private vehicles in the city is more viable than creating infrastructure to accommodate more private vehicles. The way to reduce private vehicles is to have a public transport service that is so efficient and cost effective that it is simply not viable to use only

TOPIC: General Transport Issues

private transport. Some public roads could be diverted solely for use by cyclists, electric rail, electric trolley buses and other environmentally sound transport projects.

- Sub #518: Requests figures about public transport - for ex. % of km travelled within urban areas of the Wellington region that is by public transport, active travel, single occupant private vehicle and multiple occupant private vehicle. The figures could accompany analysis of the GHG emissions implications of travel choices, and PT % km usage targets set that reflect the transport emissions reductions calculated as necessary every year. Requests surveys of Wellington region residents to explore why they make their travel choices and what would encourage them to change to public and active transport.
- Sub #519: Considers public and private transport are intertwined can't be considered individually. Asserts that a long term plan for reducing the use of private vehicles in the city is more viable than creating infrastructure to accommodate more private vehicles. This is in line with current environmental concerns, makes better use of public funding and would provide other positive financial and health benefits to individuals living in the city. The way to reduce private vehicles is to have a public transport service that is so efficient and cost effective that it is simply not viable to use only private transport in the city long term. By reducing the number of private vehicle in use in the city, some public roads could be diverted solely for use by cyclists, electric rail, electric trolley buses and other environmentally sound transport projects. There could be an additional cost attached to car use which could contribute to funding for comprehensive public transport making it cheaper and more viable to the wider community. Retaining the existing electric bus system is in line with this strategy.
- Sub #524: Suggests removing private vehicles on the roads by having an efficient/cost effective public transit: some public roads could be diverted solely for cyclists/electric rail/trolleys, additional costs applied to private vehicles in city centre (i.e. mass parking at the edge of the city that is free and offers a low cost day pass for public transport), suburban transport ring-routes attached to transfer stations (smaller buses/decreased waiting time and number of buses in central city).
- Sub #533: Considers that the relationship between public and private transport is intertwined and so neither can be fully considered individually, and that a long term plan for reducing the use of private vehicles in the city is more viable than creating infrastructure to accommodate more private vehicles as the city continues to expand. The way to reduce private vehicle use is to have a public transport service that is so efficient and cost effective that it is simply not viable to use only private transport in the city long term. By reducing the number of private vehicle in use in the city, some public roads could be diverted solely for use by cyclists, electric rail, electric trolley buses and other environmentally sound transport projects. There could be an additional cost attached to car use which could contribute to funding for comprehensive public transport making it cheaper and more viable to the wider community. This proposal should be seen long term in conjunction with incentives to use public transport, for example: Mass parking at the edge of the city for commuters using private vehicles where a low cost day pass for public transport in the city is included with the parking fee. Suburban transport ring-routes attached to public transport transfer stations to allow for smaller buses, decrease waiting time and to cut down on the number of buses converging in the central city.
- Sub #584: Wish GWRC take a firm stand for central government transport funding being directed firstly to walking and cycling, then towards public vehicle transport, rather

TOPIC: General Transport Issues

than more roads. Consider it shameful that GWRC has supported the basin flyover as contrary to strategic vision for region's transport network.

- Sub #589: Supports a broader concept of 'public transport' be considered in the Draft Plan - including improvements to facilitate and encourage people to use healthier transport modes such as walking, cycling, scootering etc. as a priority over public and private vehicles. Favour increasing funding from government to avoid the need for road based solutions to Wellington transport issues. Does not view GWRC support for Basin reserve flyover in a good light. Funding for flyover would be better served directed to public transport.
- Sub #639: Suggests Traffic Demand Management (TDM) as a means to improve PT network efficiency and to enable better utilization of resources.
- Sub #639: Suggests GWRC to explore other measures in consultation with the central government including congestion charging and parking levies on privately owned public parking facilities.

TOPIC: Policies and Actions

Topic: Policies and Actions (31 submissions)

Officer Comments:

To be added.

Subtopic: 1 - An integrated public transport network (5 submissions)

Officer Comments:

To be added.

- Sub #265: Oppose policy 1.c Would be supportive of an alignment of communications branding, but not the costly repainting of public transport vehicles.
- Sub #394: Suggests a consistent branding across all services, as the aim should be to have passengers essentially unaware of what company is running a service. The labelling should be the same, the ticketing the same, the fares the same.
- Sub #425: Suggest consideration of the changes to one mode, for example the introduction of BRT, may make that mode a more attractive option and eventually the result would be that customers may simply shift from one mode to another rather than increasing public transport usage overall. This will impact on the outcomes of GWRC's risk based patronage models.
- Sub #427: Agree in principle with the concept in the action under Policy 1.c to provide consistent network branding across information, infrastructure, services and operators, but disagree to see Metlink branding dominating buses, where buses are owned by operators.
- Sub #590: Request change to policy 1.c to see action note for consistency of route legibility. For example, Eastbourne 81/84 and Eastbourne 83, which could easily be fixed with "via Molesworth St" and "via Queensgate" respectively.

Subtopic: 2 - Services and infrastructure standards (19 submissions)

Officer Comments:

When procuring public transport services access to suitable depot space is a potential barrier to entry for operators. As GWRC develops its strategy for the procurement of bus services it will look to see what activities it can undertake to minimise this barrier in order to encourage and sustain long term contestability. Through recent consultation with NZ and overseas public transport operators, suggestions of various approaches GWRC could take to reduce the barriers to entry have been provided, however the compulsory acquisition of bus operators privately owned land was not a mechanism that was suggested.

TOPIC: Policies and Actions

The draft PT Plan includes a proposal to ensure that vehicle windows provide good visibility.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #32: Bus windows should be advertising/graphics free, not used to increase revenue. Clear windows would improve customer and tourist experience to enjoy Wellington views, for example the number 20 bus (Mt Victoria). I applaud your desire to continue improving our public transport system.
- Sub #121: Does not support dark window glass.
- Sub #265: Supports policy and actions identified under 5.2 – services and infrastructure standards, particularly the actions focused on improving reliability, punctuality and the provision of park and ride facilities. In addition, UHCC wishes to advocate that GWRC be proactive about the identification and acquisition of additional land for park and ride facilities.
- Sub #292: Supports using telematic information to enforce good bus driving practises.
- Sub #335: Request additional actions to improve reliability by clearing vehicle breakdowns as quickly as possible. Suggests a possible mitigation measure is driver training, so drivers have good knowledge of each bus type and can respond to instructions such as ‘try resetting circuit-breaker 7’, and training to take charge of one-way operations past their bus, until it can be moved. Control room operators will also need access to computerized diagnostic information, by bus model and even individual bus.
- Sub #427: Agree that passengers should have a choice as to how they travel to and from train stations, but does not support the policy of providing car park and ride facilities free of charge to motorists as this will discourage passengers to use connecting bus services, and cuts another revenue stream that could otherwise be used by GWRC to offset against rates.
- Sub #427: Agree with the action under the Policy 2.d e that all contracted bus services should comply with the RUB, however does not support introduction of other relevant standards if they vary from or contradict with the RUB.
- Sub #427: Agree with the concept of seamless transition under the last action under Policy 2.c , but strongly opposed to any attempts by GW to seize control (either directly or indirectly) of the private property rights held by existing operators. Considers such an attempt to be a serious breach of the spirit of PTOM and completely in breach of the current government’s stated policies to encourage continuing private sector participation and investment in New Zealand, including from international investors.
- Sub #431: Support the proposal to require all contracted bus services to comply with the Transport Agency’s Requirement for Urban Buses (RUB).Requested further clarity on what “all other relevant standards” may entail in order to eliminate ambiguity for the industry, and in order that the industry may future-proof their fleet. Suggested that standards should align with Ministry of Education contractual requirements for school services, which may differ from RUB standards.
- Sub #431: Acknowledged that a seamless transition during change is important (policy 2.c); however have concerns that GWRC does not stipulate operators forfeit property

TOPIC: Policies and Actions

rights to either GWRC, or to a third party. Suggested that due consideration should be given to the existing owners of the property, where infrastructure is required by GWRC to implement new services. Strongly against the inclusion of compulsory acquisition in GWRC's implementation of PTOM as this will not be in the spirit of partnership, and suggested that any imposition on property rights would have been more appropriately dealt through primary legislation than through the implementation of an RPTP.

- Sub #437: Suggests eliminating passenger-unfriendly features such as advertising and logos covering windows.
- Sub #462: RPH supports initiatives aimed to reduce carbon emissions but recommends that Policy 2.h is amended to include: Reduce the production of carbon and particulate matter emissions from the public transport network
- Sub #499: Requests, as a key stakeholder, being able to provide expert advice to ensure all services and infrastructure are accessible for those who are blind or have low vision. Suggests designs include even lighting levels throughout, prioritised accessible car parking and taxi drop off parks adjacent to station entry point, a raised pedestrian platform for park and ride facilities, bus shelters cannot block the Continuous Accessible Path of Travel (complex road crossings for those who have an impairment should not be included as part of the accessible route), installing tactile ground surface indicators to assist with locating the bus boarding position, all information on the platform should be accessible and audio announcements should focus on place names (as opposed to street addresses and numbers). Suggests training must be developed and provided by those who have the expertise and knowledge to do so for specific impairment groups. Driver training be provided by The Blind Foundation in reference to people who are blind or have low vision and that other disability groups are enlisted specifically to train in their respective areas of expertise.
- Sub #532: Suggests adopting The Transport Agency standards for car glazing/excluding rear windows.
- Sub #532: Suggests a customer charter needed to provide compensation for customers who suffer delays (as in the UK rail industry) as taxpayers and ratepayers have invested millions in rail. Suggests setting up/sponsoring a passenger advocacy group (as in the UK).
- Sub #564: Notes tinted bus windows are difficult to see out of, especially at night or on rainy cloudy days.
- Sub #590: Policy 2.h should provide an action note of seeking to replace diesel services with fully electric services over time.
- Sub #595: I fully support any proposal to ensure good visibility through vehicle windows.
- Sub #631: Does not support tinted windows and advertising on the bus exterior.
- Sub #634: Suggests accessibility awareness among bus drivers/ train operators/taxi drivers as some are unwilling/unaware of how to accommodate impaired customers (wheelchair users need help using the chair- belt etc.).
- Sub #637: Recommend against advertising, including company logos, on the side windows of buses
- Sub #637: Oppose use of tinted glass in the side windows of buses

TOPIC: Policies and Actions

- Sub #638: Suggests some control on window advertising on buses so passengers can see out.
- Sub #643: Supports removing all advertising from bus windows and more consideration given to tinting. Requests a window be provided behind the driver's seat in future buses and restore the back window for all round transparency.

Subtopic: 3 - Fares and ticketing system (5 submissions)

Officer Comments:

To be added.

- Sub #265: Supports the simplified fare structure and integrated ticketing system and specifically, the proposed policy and actions identified under 5.3. Public transport needs to remain affordable for 'all' of Upper Hutt's residents. Fare structures could be more equitably distributed regionally according to network capacity, while simultaneously increasing passengers through synchronising their structure with parking availability. This option is likely both practical and achievable through the proposed electronic ticketing system and in the absence of additional park and ride facilities would help to reallocate the distribution of parking and patronage along the Upper Hutt section of the Hutt Valley line.
- Sub #427: Suggested that the best way to incentivise operators to collect fares is for GWRC to share farebox revenue 50:50 with operators.
- Sub #427: Suggested that where two or more operators are involved in a trip, GWRC needs to reimburse the operators for the loss in revenue caused by the removal of transfer penalties.
- Sub #431: Supports the proposal that operators are incentivised to collect fares. Supports the preference for farebox revenue to be shared 50:50 with operators, where contract prices can be reduced according to agreed fare revenue estimates to incentivise operators to provide better customer service, as they will have a stake in the growth of fare revenue.
- Sub #462: RPH strongly supports Policy 3.c but recommends the following action is included: Concessions for community services card holders
- Sub #590: Supports boarding at all doors, especially considering the change to high-capacity vehicles in the future. Change would require fare enforcement instead of using the front door as a toll gate.

TOPIC: Policies and Actions

Subtopic: 4 - An effective connection with customers (9 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The PT Plan provides for a consistent brand for the Wellington public transport network on the basis that it makes it easier for customers to understand and use. The proposal includes co-branding of vehicles, so both the Metlink network and the operator brand are visible. The relative priority and positioning of the different brands is still to be established, but will be determined after consultation with operators, noting that many buses are used for both Metlink and charter services.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #427: Opposed the Metlink branding to dominate buses, where buses are owned by operators.
- Sub #431: Recognises the need for a uniform and consistently branded fleet, and emphasises that appropriate consideration should be given to the historically established operator branding and that branding needs to be carefully managed, arguing that the public perceive a uniformly branded network as a single entity and will rate performance of the whole network against its poorest performing operator; ultimately undermining strength of other better performing operators and attractiveness of the whole network. Offers to assist in facilitating discussions on the issue of co-branding.
- Sub #443: Queries what measures are being proposed to encourage the use of buses and trains. Notes that advertising on the side of buses, television adverts, and a voucher system to entice people to trial a bus or train for free would work
- Sub #462: RPH recommends that under Policy 4.a the following action is amended to read: Provide a range of opportunities for solicited and unsolicited customer feedback, including surveys and focus groups, and ensure that methods are appropriate to the transport disadvantaged (such as the young and those on low incomes)
- Sub #486: Suggests promotion of public transport options/benefits as well as improved forms of real-time information necessary to increase patronage.
- Sub #499: Suggests contacting the Blind Foundation for advice and technical expertise that would assist in ensuring systems and facilities used are fully accessible for those who are blind or have low vision.
- Sub #532: Suggests building a brand by setting time/quality standards for resolving complaints, a strong focus on customer service in contracts, supplier relationships linked to customer charters with meaningful remedies for customers.
- Sub #590: Suggest an action note for consistency of route legibility on policy 4.e. For example, Eastbourne 81/84 and Eastbourne 83, which could easily be fixed with “via Molesworth St” and “via Queensgate” respectively. Each railway station, ferry terminal and major bus stop should include way-finding materials, including nearby attractions and pedestrian links. Supports action note regarding providing technical information to third-parties.

TOPIC: Policies and Actions

- Sub #590: Supports publicly reporting on feedback statistics and issue resolution times (policy 4.h).
- Sub #612: Encourage more people to use public transport (policy 4D) by making it easier to get on and off buses (e.g.: Snapper); providing bus route maps at all stops and on buses; RTI about all connections displayed on the bus; standardise bus arrivals boards and front of bus panels; remove tinted windows; improve relationship of drivers with passengers.

Subtopic: 5 - Providing for the transport disadvantaged (9 submissions)

Officer Comments:

GWRC has a policy of providing information, facilities, and services that are increasingly available to all members of the public, including continually improving the accessibility of public transport services for the blind and low vision users. Examples include providing tactile indicators along railway station platforms when they are upgraded, the publication of an accessible version of the draft Regional Public Transport Plan, and the audio real time information displays currently being trialled. In addition, new Metlink signage has been designed to take into account the needs of the visually impaired and the upcoming review of the Metlink website will further improve the accessibility of information.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #34: Supports (and is willing to pay for) improved services for children, disabled and elderly as currently seems somewhat irksome and humiliating for an infirm person or a wheelchair user to catch a train or bus. Suggests using 'kneel' buses (as with Christchurch) to make bus travel easier for oldies and people on crutches or with pushchairs etc. Notes the demographic for elderly is increasing.
- Sub #313: Supports the consideration of the transport-disadvantaged in the RPTP.
- Sub #340: P74 Policy 5.5 Transport for disadvantaged Subparagraph 5a and 5b should apply to all transport users. Size and number of strollers and wheelchairs on buses should be limited for the safety of other passengers.
- Sub #427: Suggested that the target date for provision of 100% wheelchair accessible bus fleet should be delayed until after the commencement of new PTOM contracts in 2017. Commented that existing operators are not going to invest in new fleet to comply with this requirement by 2016, if they are unsuccessful in winning new contracts.
- Sub #462: RPH recommends that under Policy 5.b the following action is included: Understand and provide for the future demand, and access, of the older population
- Sub #585: Requests the Transport Agency extend their interpretation of “improving access and mobility” to include the provision of blind-friendly features (as per the Land Transport Management Act 2003), and regional authorities acknowledge the blind as part of the public transport-using community. Notes the current issues by blind users are: locating/verifying the correct boarding bus stop, identifying the right bus to catch, knowing when destination stops are being approached/reached, negotiating obstacles such as poles/rubbish bins/seating/bus shelters that obstruct passage on/off bus, inconsistent placements of bus shelters/stops, timetable/real-time scheduling poles and

TOPIC: Policies and Actions

not knowing where to wait, unreliable audible announcements, access-ways that intruding into bus stops, inability to access key information available to the sighted public at bus stops. Suggests drivers: identify their bus number or destination when they see a blind person waiting, display vigilance when the bus is unable to pull up at the front of a multi-route zone, announce all major stops or specific stop requests, verbally indicate seating/accommodate for guide dogs, remain stationary until the blind person is seated, pull close/parallel with curb at bus stop. Suggests visibility enhancements that provide: large print colour-contrasted timetables also available in braille, eye-level signage, adequate lighting. Notes gaps between trains and platform edges are clearly identified for the sighted public and are a hazard for the blind. Suggests braille/large print and real-time timetables including identification of station name and contact information at stations/booking outlets, ticket vending machine that include braille and audio operating instructions and large tickets, real-time scheduling announcements of train movements at all stations/correct side of the train to depart/any abnormality when disembarking, early and regularly repeated announcements of changes to timetables and platform to enable sufficient time to make accommodations, consistently located areas for passengers who require assistance, platform edges and train steps that are clearly marked in contrasting colour/tactile markings. Suggest all transport operators who come in contact with the public to be required to undergo compulsory blindness awareness and competency training as part of their contracted responsibilities.

- Sub #590: Terms of carriage doesn't allow parents to properly support children when waiting for bus as prams must be folded prior to bus arrival.
- Sub #634: Suggests funding to increase the number of wheelchair vans available and extend their hours of operation. Notes the Taxi Mobility Scheme has a \$40 limit which is difficult for people travelling longer distances.
- Sub #643: Supports provision of level pavement access wherever possible, starting with the hubs. Suggests kerb heights/design need to also take account of the future fleet types.
- Sub #643: Requests future bus design take account of disabled and elderly passengers including wider seats, optional seat belts. Suggests driver training about customer needs and comfort could also be undertaken.
- Sub #643: Suggests a group be formed to trial design prototypes of buses including tall people and the transport disadvantaged.

Subtopic: 6 - Monitoring and review (1 submissions)

- Sub #499: Supports implementing monitoring systems to ensure goals are achieved; opportunities for improvements are identified and then implemented.

Subtopic: 8 - Sustainable funding (2 submissions)

- Sub #462: RPH recommends that Policy 8 is informed by scenario analysis exploring the relationship between fare reductions and patronage numbers. Alongside scenario analysis, RPH recommends further exploration into price barriers and disincentives experienced by patrons outside of the commuting population to Wellington. The question should be asked whether a decrease in fares could increase patronage of the transport disadvantaged, as well as increase farebox recovery.

TOPIC: Policies and Actions

- Sub #471: If all else fails – sell advertising space (but please ask first if consumers want this). Partnerships are free publicity. There are firms out there now looking for sustainable investments or credible ratings of social responsibility.

Subtopic: General (2 submissions)

- Sub #453: Considers Plan does not explain how the Council's vision aligns with that of Wellington City Council (WCC) or how the Council will engage with WCC to align goals for Wellington City. Recommended that the Council illustrate how it intends to address the environmental and other major risks facing the region including storm events, earthquakes and economic and demographic risk factors in the Plan.
- Sub #587: Hutt City is willing to develop a closer collaborative relationship with GWRC to ensure decisions will contribute to the community outcomes in the GWRC's Long Term Plan 2012-22.

TOPIC: Process and Submission Form

Topic: Process and Submission Form (26 submissions)

Officer Comments:

To be added.

- Sub #7: Suggests the decision to remove trolley buses has been made (and reported in the Dominion). Requests to know why this decision did not involve public consultation. Requests to know if Tom Pettit's article Dominion Newspaper 28/8/13 page 10 arguing that someone in Wellington is inflating costs is correct.
- Sub #13: The submissions form is skewed to emphasise financial costs of the future bus fleet but ignores the important issue of the health implications of emissions from diesel-powered buses.
- Sub #41: Does not consider Yes/No tick boxes engage fully with the community. Appears decisions have already been made and that consultation is just for appearances.
- Sub #45: Public meetings were not advertised. At the 10 April WCL meeting attendees were told that all buses had notices placed advised of the upcoming "Information meetings". All public attendees, including myself, agreed that no such notices were to be seen on any buses they used. Co-patrons I've spoken to also have not seen any of these notices. Double-checking the 2 services I used to get home, I saw a reminder of the Newtown Festival and a blank notice holder.
- Sub #84: I asked a number of questions via your website feedback but the site does not work as nothing could be uploaded and everything I typed was lost. You need to design your sites so they are robust enough to be used.
- Sub #91: Suggests adding an extra box ('don't care') to the submission form to allow submitters the option to only comment on those matters which they wish to comment on.
- Sub #207: Suggests thorough public consultation take place to ensure residents are informed and can have their say.
- Sub #223: Insufficient time and notification provided for consultation on new route K. Proposal runs against efforts to get people using public transport as presented in the draft Plan.
- Sub #248: Questions does not allow submitter to indicate how much they would pay for lower emissions options.
- Sub #262: Concern with the lack of consultation on the routes shown in the Draft RPTP, as these differ from those publicly consulted on in 2012. Concerned that past consultation addressed safety concerns that may not have been addressed in the current Draft RPTP.
- Sub #292: Believes the plan is biased against trolley buses.
- Sub #306: Suggests the specific phrasing of the trolley funding question is designed as a challenge and shows a potential bias against keeping them.

TOPIC: Process and Submission Form

- Sub #344: Concerned people lack the computer skills to check out the proposals in any depth given the complex scope, and depth of the GWC web site. Considers the period for consultation too brief.
- Sub #394: Not sure why the emails to info@gw.govt.nz do not work.
- Sub #424: Requests Snapper data indicating bus usage shared with public.
- Sub #437: Concerned about the integrity of the consultation process particularly with respect to the information presented i.e. improvements such as improved frequency are emphasised in bold, while any worsening in service is either not emphasised or just not mentioned and the detail in the plan shows all peak-only services finishing at 6pm, whereas currently many continue up to 6.30pm-7.30pm, a significant reduction in hours at a busy time; the map on p51 shows different picture of the coverage as stated on p48 etc. The submission is attached with the details on the examples of discrepancies.
- Sub #447: Notes a potential mistake in the table showing proposed rail services. The Johnsonville Line shows it as simply 1 while other lines retain the 2/1 frequency. Strongly opposes any reduction to services on the Johnsonville Line.
- Sub #447: Notes costs for Option 1 are obviously slanted as they appear to include complete replacement of the trolleybus fleet. The fleet will only be 8 years old in 2017 and should have around 20 years life before needing to be replaced. Other operational costs associated with trolley buses appear to have been improperly calculated.
- Sub #463: Asking about cost (of trolleys) is disingenuous.
- Sub #481: Does not agree that a thorough public consultation has been conducted. Suggests local government should work through a system of participatory democracy whereby all people can participate in decision making through neighbourhood councils. Public transport operations should be under direct control of Regional Council.
- Sub #504: Suggests some of the questions on form are too "all or nothing". They do not allow any nuances or qualifications. For instance "Would a 25% off peak discount encourage you to change when you travel?" - the answer to this depends on prior commitments that give a choice or not.
- Sub #518: Suggests draft plan and online questionnaire have flaws without: a quantified transport emissions reduction target based on the latest IPCC global emissions budget for the investment lifetime of the buses, data on the health costs of diesel buses, evidence to frame keeping the trolley buses as a cost.
- Sub #520: Requests information on why Fran Wilde was defending cuts to the Kelburn services before this review is closed, and would remain neutral if decisions are to be made on the basis of submissions. Suggests decisions have already been made invalidating fair process.
- Sub #523: Suggests professional bias on behalf of GWRC staff as there is a predetermined outcome. Suggests disinformation has been put out (the deliberate conflation of Euro emissions standards with CO2 emissions). Strongly suggests that the PwC report is discarded and a full assessment of the lifecycle costs and benefits of the trolley bus fleet is conducted. Suggests staff that have allowed inaccurate/misleading information to be promulgated into the media, be reminded of their obligation to provide unbiased/factual information in their roles as public servants (in accordance with the SSC code of conduct).

TOPIC: Process and Submission Form

- Sub #566: Only by chance have I seen these new proposals no consultation has taken place and demand no decision made until consultation has taken place.
- Sub #602: No Khandallah public meeting and no submission forms available on 6/5/14. Online submissions are unrealistic for some elderly.
- Sub #636: Notes under the Land Transport Management Act 2003, GW's public transport plan is not required until 30 June 2015 (with current contracts expiring in 2017). Suggests further planning and consultation.

Topic: Procurement Policies (16 submissions)

Officer Comments:

GWRC's Public Transport Operating Model (PTOM) procurement strategy for bus is not detailed in the draft PT Plan. As noted in the draft PT Plan GWRC is working with the Transport Agency on the procurement approach, and transition plan. The procurement strategy will include aspects of the contracting approach, including the financial incentive mechanism. GWRC will engage further with operators as that work develops. Once the procurement strategy is finalised GWRC may amend the PT Plan to provide further detail and will consult appropriately at that time.

Units have been designed taking into account the guidance from the Transport Agency. As noted in the draft PT Plan, PTOM 'seeks to grow patronage while reducing reliance on public subsidies by meeting the dual objective of growing the commerciality of public transport services and growing a confidence that services are priced efficiently and the market is competitive', and these principles underpin the unit design approach and the procurement strategy.

Officers recommend that the PT Plan is amended to provide further detail in the policy on the process for establishing units (including how incumbent operators will be involved in identifying and agreeing like for like units), and to provide more detail on the timing of the procurement processes once that information is available.

- Sub #263: Submitter requests access to work that has been undertaken by consultants on the funding options going forward, as they are interested in any discussion of future funding options for expenditure not covered by fares, rates or NZ Transport Agency support.
- Sub #401: Suggests performance based contracts should reward good performance rather than penalising bad performance.
- Sub #403: Questions if there is actually going to be a public tender from someone else to operate the passenger rail services.
- Sub #403: Questions whether GWRC's strategic intent is then transferred to KiwiRail, then to their respective employees who then engage with the passengers. GWRC needs to have robust penalty clauses for not meeting standards for the delivery of public services. Ratepayers and passengers should know what the service level agreements are. Submission outlines several examples of poor service from KiwiRail staff.
- Sub #427: Agreed that GWRC is entitled to investigate any barriers to entry to the Wellington market for new operators, but strongly disagreed with any requirement for operators to hand over any property rights to GWRC or anyone else, on the basis that such an attempt to be a serious breach of the spirit of PTOM and completely in breach of the current government's stated policies to encourage continuing private sector participation and investment in New Zealand, including from international investors.
- Sub #532: Suggests partnering with suppliers cannot be at the expense of looking after ratepayers and customers as the most important stakeholders.

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

Subtopic: Contract requirements (8 submissions)

- Sub #336: Recommends penalisation of operators for delays to services
- Sub #410: Recommends fines should be imposed for de-wiring incidents for trolley buses and for not completing routes on time.
- Sub #425: Suggests that an annual planning regime may be too onerous to succeed. Comments that the ability to achieve punctuality and reliability KPIs is dependent on the KPIs and service standards contained in the Track Access Agreement with KiwiRail and the contract that GWRC has with its power provider for rail.
- Sub #427: Suggested that the best way to incentivise operators to perform is for GWRC to share farebox revenue 50:50 with operators, i.e. reduce contract prices paid by GWRC according to agreed fare revenue estimates, and let operators focus on providing excellent customer service and collecting all fares, in order to grow fare revenue.
- Sub #431: Requests participation in discussions surrounding the conception of GWRC's FIM as well as the other elements involved in this policy.
- Sub #439: Recommends bus depots are needed on opposite sides of the city either need to be planned for and provision made in the operating contracts to reduce service disruptions cause the traffic accidents.
- Sub #493: Requests GWRC to consider inviting potential rail and bus operators to explain how they can contribute positively to an Integrated Network in their responses to the respective Requests for Tenders for transport units.
- Sub #532: Suggests KPIs to incentivise good performance (based on passenger numbers not per train i.e. an 8am weekday service with 400 passengers has a much higher rating than an 8am Sunday service with 40 passengers). Customer compensation needs to be part of any KPIs.

Subtopic: Procurement approach and unit design (9 submissions)

- Sub #263: Submitter notes that only time will tell if this new procurement approach that the government has introduced will provide a better outcome in terms of service cost and operator performance.
- Sub #415: Suggests bringing public transport in-house to save transaction costs and obviate the need for private operators to make a profit.
- Sub #425: Concerned that the cost of buses is a major barrier to entry for new operators, as is the cost of land required for depots. suggests that GWRC allocates some of its land or other government land for operators to use for depots and possibly to include in the condition of entering into a new contract a requirement for those operators with existing depots to make such depots available for a period of at least two years at rates to be nominated at the time of entering into the contract. Believes that this should be payable by all bidders (including incumbents) to enable a new operator to commence operations.
- Sub #431: Support compliance with the Transport Agency's procurement requirements, particularly through the 'partnering' delivery model. Concerned that the GWRC has adopted a piecemeal approach to unit design because the unit design seems not to encourage negotiated units, is geared towards tendered units and is isolated from the

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

way units will be procured; the number of bus units (15) will limit GWRC's ability to offer an even mixture of negotiated, like-for-like and tendered contracts; and that through routes are long. Suggested that the GWRC to consider the optimal length of the through-routes and divide the proposed East Wellington, South/West Wellington and Lower Hutt units into smaller units; consider the value of existing services compared to the perceived value of services which may be procured through tendering; and consider a long-term view of the total value for money attributable to an activity, not simply the initial capital cost.

- Sub #452: Keolis Downer strongly supports the objectives and policies of the PTOM contract - specifically policies of integration, competition and partnering, which we believe will bring more choice to customers; improvements in value for money in service delivery and asset management; and more investment, resulting in greater passenger amenity and higher network performance.
- Sub #453: Argues that the procurement strategy in the PT Plan does not comply with the guidelines or the spirit of the PTOM and that it is inappropriate to select certain elements of the framework to support one of the PTOM principles above the others.
- Strongly opposes the approach in the procurement strategy that proposes only 25 per cent of services be negotiated while the commerciality ratio is 55 per cent and identifies this as being contrary to the PTOM principles that the number of negotiated services should be consistent with the commerciality ratio.
- Sub #493: Considers the relationship envisaged through the PTOM contracting model will ensure the benefits gained through a service provider's passenger rail delivery experience are captured in a way that supports the passenger growth targets set by GWRC. Considers that the partnering model outlined helps establish the appropriate cultures and behaviours to drive a long-term relationship that encourages innovation, fresh ideas and the development of exciting new intellectual property to constantly improve the levels of service delivered.
- Sub #493: Supports the approach taken to procure the future Rail Unit under the PTOM contracting model with benefits including: the ability to offer enhanced value through a competitive tendering process; an incentivised contracting model with transparent performance requirements; a strong 'partnering' culture embedded in the new relationship to collectively drive improved performance that meets the Wellington region's needs; and an orderly, structured process that provides for risk free transition from the old to the new contracting model with no service disruption.
- Sub #597: Considers 4 to 5 PTOM contracts for Wellington city is more suitable and that a maximum of 11 or 12 contracts for the whole area is sufficient to administer and monitor.
- Sub #633: Requests GWRC vary the RPTP prior to 1 July 2015 to include more information on the procurement approach for each unit and transition plan.
- Sub #633: Requests the RPTP include a policy on the process for establishing units, with reference to the principles (explaining how these apply to each unit) and how incumbent operators will be involved in identifying and agreeing like for like units.

Subtopic: Transition and timing (3 submissions)

- Sub #431: Concerned that the proposed transition period of at least 12 months will result in the existing fleet becoming run down during the transition, due to low

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

investments in maintenance while awaiting non-incumbent successful bidders to establish their service. Suggested that transition periods should ideally be between 6 to 9 months.

- Sub #453: Recommends that the contract transition period be limited to nine months as recommended in the PTOM guidelines as the risks and costs associated with managing the exiting business (such as staff retention) are high and could significantly impact service delivery. Suggests that to achieve a smooth transition it is necessary to respect the existing property rights and manage handover of land, assets or people to reduce the risks for incoming as well as outgoing operators
- Sub #633: Request GWRC provide additional detail of how procurement of units will be phased over time after first discussing and agreeing with the Transport Agency a transition plan covering when procurement of units will occur and how they will transition over time.
- Sub #633: Requests GWRC communicate the intended process for further developing the approach to bus procurement with operators.
- Sub #633: Requests GWRC further develop the transition plan and process for bus procurement with the Transport Agency and public transport operators as appropriate as a high priority.

TOPIC: Regional Rail Plan

Topic: Regional Rail Plan (489 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The service patterns described in Rail Scenario 1 (RS1) are high level timetable concepts. Significant timetable design and modelling is still required before working timetables are established. The feedback is noted and will be taken into consideration when the more detailed modelling is undertaken prior to the service changes signalled for 2019/20.

GWRC have allocated funding within its dedicated station budgets for Upper Hutt next year (14/15). The planning within the RS1 implementation timetable was set out before the Upper Hutt City Council money was allocated, and the full awareness of the issues with the station building came to light.

The extension to Timberlea is covered by Rail Scenario B (network extension). The strategy behind the extension is that the service should be extended (either by shuttle bus then perhaps existing diesel train etc.) and proven as viable before any significant capital is spent on extending the infrastructure (electrification, sub stations, signalling, platforms, station buildings etc.). It is recommended that RS1 remains the first priority.

Officers recommend that the PT Plan is amended to emphasise that the proposed service design will be further developed taking into account community feedback and that expenditure on Upper Hutt Station is expected to occur in 2014/15.

- Sub #447: Recommends a second track through Waikanae station itself with a second platform to reduce delays and turnaround times.
- Sub #493: Supports the investment in new rail assets and considers these will allow a future rail service provider to deliver a high quality service and tangible savings in both operations and maintenance.

Subtopic: Park and Ride facilities (465 submissions)

Officer Comments:

GWRC has an on-going programme of expanding park and ride facilities at rail stations, and has identified priorities. Further additional improvements to park and ride capacity will be made in line with land availability and available funding.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

Position: Oppose improving (41 submissions)

- Sub #638: Suggests walk/cycle/bus.

Position: Support improving (407 submissions)

- Sub #162: Positive about the Levin and Otaki parking stops but Waikanae is very limited.

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

- Sub #335: Supports small scale park and ride as long as it does not interfere with pedestrian, cyclist and bus access to the station, or station amenity.
- Sub #394: Also supports of a stronger emphasis on high quality bus feeder services, rather than endlessly increasing park and ride facilities
- Sub #419: Suggests equal emphasis on providing good feeder bus/walking/cycling access. Notes the provision of parking is expensive and encourages driving for the feeder leg.
- Sub #453: Supports and encourages the development of Park and Ride facilities in conjunction with the network where population density is not sufficient to support connector or local bus services. Recommends that options be reviewed for park and ride facilities for major bus services as well.
- Sub #460: Provision for additional park and ride facilities should be included for both Johnsonville and Takapu Road.
- Sub #507: Suggests improvements should include secure bicycle storage and basic repair facilities (e.g., air pumps, basic tools).
- Sub #532: Supports park and ride emphasising on the stations that suffer most from parking shortages. Suggests data is collected on this.
- Sub #636: Supports an increase in park-and-ride facilities in the outer regions to increase patronage.

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #18: Requests increased park-and -ride facilities at Crofton Downs and Ngaio stations
- Sub #20: Supports upgrading park and ride facilities, and requests an increase in the number of car parks at Tawa stations. There are currently not enough car parks at Tawa stations, resulting in people parking illegally and probably inconveniencing local residents. At most Tawa stations, there appear to be options for increased car parking. If it was easier to get a car park, more people would catch the train, and this would have the benefit of reducing traffic on SH1.
- Sub #38: Supports upgrading the park and ride facilities at Waterloo, as the new service patterns will encourage more people to park and ride at Waterloo and the car park fills up early even with current demand.
- Sub #50: Support increasing park and ride, including at intermediate stations. For the many years I worked every day in Wellington the inconvenience of getting to and from the suburban station to home was the most common reason I chose to drive or motorcycle for periods of time. The parking facilities at the main stations are overcrowded already and consideration should be given to extending the facilities at the intermediate stations to help relieve the concentration. For example, parking at Silverstream station already overflows to side streets on some days.
- Sub #65: Supports more car parking spaces around train stations.
- Sub #95: Requests improved park and ride facilities serving the Silverstream Station, and supports improvements to park and ride at Upper Hutt, Taita, Waterloo, and Petone stations. The demand for parking spaces at Silverstream has risen considerably over the past five years and this is obviously set to increase further, and as a result the

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

surrounding residential streets are very heavily used for parking, particularly during the school term times. There are two areas where an immediate increase in parking could be put into effect: 1] creating angle-parking facilities outside St Patricks' College, just before the bus stop; and 2] extending the angle parking along Kiln Street all the way down to the junction with Terminus Street.

- Sub #107: Suggests if the capital connection ceased, that the park and ride facilities at Waikanae would not have enough space to accommodate all passengers that usually board the service in Palmerston North.
- Sub #124: If the Capital Connection train was ceased there would be insufficient parking at Waikanae park and ride.
- Sub #181: Supports improving park and ride facilities but also states new facilities need to be added on bus routes around Wellington City including Johnsonville and Newlands.
- Sub #241: Consider adding a Park & Ride facility to Manor Park to reduce the number of people driving to Melling and Petone stations, timed with grade separation of Haywood Hill intersection.
- Sub #245: Park and ride at all stations should be encouraged. Expand park and ride at Johnsonville.
- Sub #248: Supports improving park and ride without unnecessarily jazzing things up.
- Sub #265: Suggests GWRC be proactive about the identification and acquisition of additional land for park and ride facilities. Notes Upper Hutt and Silverstream parking is inadequate and overflowing into areas that would otherwise be utilised by local businesses and retail customers.
- Sub #288: Opposes park and ride facilities at Waikanae and possibly Paraparaumu. Supports improved bus services.
- Sub #342: Supports upgrade of Wairarapa park and ride
- Sub #350: Suggests using land at Old Block Road adjacent to SH 2 to expand Melling Station park & ride facility. This would require safe pedestrian access at Tirohanga intersection.
- Sub #354: Suggests City Rail charge for parking near railway stations to generate funds.
- Sub #355: Suggests additional parking at Waikanae consistent with needs of Capital Connection and TranzMetro commuters.
- Sub #366: Supports the improvement of the park and ride facilities at the Waikanae Railway station. Notes the insufficient budget in 2009 and the original requirement of 450 car parks was not built. Waikanae village suffers from commuter parking clogging retail parks and pedestrian safety is compromised due to poor bus circulation. Would oppose any moves by GWRC to use any surplus land, from the revocation of the State Highway, for commuter parking. Suggests an extension of the core rail service to Otaki, considering a new station/park and ride at Otaihanga, providing a transparent evaluation of the provision of parking buildings at any of the possible park and ride sites, and becoming actively involved in the TCC project as part of its investigative work.

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

- Sub #437: Requests explicit provisions for free parking recognising that free parking is essentially a subsidy for those who park paid for by those who don't.
- Sub #437: Supports park and ride, but not at the expense of improving access to rail services from other modes arguing that park and ride is expensive to provide, and the nature and extent of this is effective subsidy needs to be made as clear as fare subsidies are.
- Sub #448: Suggests Paremata Station is included in expanding the park and ride facility to meet demand and encourage people to use the train rather than drive to their destination.
- Sub #471: Favour electric vehicle parking for 1 or 2 parking spaces at train stations - maybe under cover, or have free recharge stations for. This may cost more in electricity (which is 75% renewable) but could count towards GWRC's emissions reduction targets. Offset electricity use by installing solar panels as a roof over the car parks as well. Electricity retailers may do a deal by reducing daytime tariffs as it also helps them to control the demand for electricity during peak hours. Encouraging electric private vehicles reduces emissions from private vehicles, one of your goals – so count it.
- Sub #484: Mass parking at the edge of the city for commuters using private vehicles where a low cost day-pass for public transport in the city is included with the parking fee.
- Sub #491: Currently there are limited to zero car parks at Waikanae and they are in the wrong place for those wanting to travel north. Extra parking would be needed at Waikanae to cope with the demand. This should cost at least as much as accepting Capital Connection commuters on current services. The Capital Connection provides a reciprocal arrangement to Tranz-Metro when they are overloaded or have service issues.
- Sub #549: Oppose expanding park and ride facilities at inner network stations, such as Petone, unless there is a fee for using the car park. The money should instead be spent on improving the frequency, and operating hours of the feeder bus routes and cycling links to the stations. Park and ride car park fees would need to be easy and quick to pay for - perhaps with a travel smart card or weekly/monthly pass.
- Sub #555: Suggests: closing the northern eastern car park at Waterloo Interchange during the Christmas/New Year period and installing a one or two level secure car park with a nominal charge operated by a pre-loaded card, acquiring one or two of the abandoned state houses on the north eastern side of Epuni Station for new park and ride facilities, acquiring the land on the western side of Petone Station on the other side of State Highway and add a ramp to the station (cars are currently parking on this undeveloped land).
- Sub #577: Recommends that extending park and ride facilities at Waterloo would encourage additional residents to travel. The Hutt City Council has in the past offered land for parking in the triangle between Cambridge Terrace and Waterloo Road for this purpose.
- Sub #584: Support continued investment in upgrading train fleet and infrastructure, including to park and ride facilities. This investment important as provides safer ride, reduces vehicles coming into city, and valuable city space used for roads and parking.

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

- Sub #587: Suggests extending park and riding facilities in Waterloo station to encourage the use of rail services.
- Sub #589: Supports continued investment in upgrading the train fleet and infrastructure, including improvements to park and ride facilities at stations across the rail network as it provides commuters a safer ride into the city, and reduces the number of private vehicles and the associated unpleasant and unproductive roads and parking buildings.
- Sub #590: Supports shuttle buses connecting to rail stations over park and ride increases as they may have better total outcomes.
- Sub #591: Canvass users of park and ride for their opinion. Supports visible and weather proof bike racks.
- Sub #592: No expansion until integrated ticketing & fares, decent quality bus/train interchanges with addressing poor shelter, excessive walking distance, security, etc., and park and ride charged for.
- Sub #622: Request Masterton is included in the ongoing development and expansion of the region's Park and Ride facilities.
- Sub #624: Requests the GWRC 2015 comprehensive review of Metlink services in Kapiti is closely aligned with the Waikanae and Paraparaumu Town Centre planning process and the revocation of the existing State Highway. In the meantime requests fliers be distributed to better inform the public about parking options at train stations.
- Sub #633: Supports GWRC continuing to develop a prioritised programme of park and ride facilities that optimises existing infrastructure investment.
- Sub #639: Suggests more investment in park and ride facilities.
- Sub #643: Suggests park and ride is also relevant for those in the inner suburbs such as Kelburn and suggests parking charges and hours for pay parking at the top of the cable car should be explored.
- Sub #643: Supports any improvements to Park and Ride carparks.

Subtopic: Raumati Station (4 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The information provided by the Raumati Station Action Group is the same information provided and assessed by the Rail Operations and Transport Modelling departments, and was considered by Council when it made the decision to note that Rail Scenario 1 (which does not include a new station at Raumati) is the preferred next stage in the development of the Wellington Metropolitan rail system. The submission mentions the preparation of another more targeted survey. It is recommended that the results of any new survey are assessed when the information is made available.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #96: Request the inclusion of the Raumati South station in the Regional Public Transport Plan. Over the last 8 years members of our community have put in a lot of work and commitment to a Station at Raumati South, through surveys, petitions and

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

attending meetings with Community Board and KCDC. Raumati is the only community on the western line route without a Station. It has been on the plan for 20+ years and would meet all future proofing demand for public transport on the Kapiti line. Raumati has over 8000 people (Census 2013) and 6000 of those live south of Raumati Road. In Raumati rail patronage is only 8% - a lot of room for passenger potential growth; and a local station is the quickest way to get it. The Raumati Station Action Group has the numbers/data for you. Parking has been accommodated by The Transport Agency's expressway design with potential for 100 carparks on the side of the local road (currently SH1). Please continue to consult with the community on this as you promised and ensure that Raumati Station and its funding is included in the Annual Plan, the Long Term Plan and the Regional Public Transport Plans as appropriate.

- Sub #105: Supports the addition of a railway station in Raumati South. Notes the funding provided by the government in 2007 has since been used for Waikanae. This would complete the Kapiti line and ensure Raumati South residents would be no more than 600-800 meters from a public transport line (as outlined in the plan's aims). Suggests working with The Transport Agency who are able to support the project and build provisions.
- Sub #441: Suggest that a rail stop at Raumati South would possibly require more facilities other than a "bus shelter" type of building on a regulation platform.
- Sub #583: The Raumati Station Action Group seeks a reply in response to Ms Wilde's assurance that "new evidence" can change the interim decision to remove the station from the draft plan. We are confident that the replies to this new survey will favour our predictions rather than the mysterious Greater Wellington Regional Council figure.
- Sub #583: Express surprise and disappointment that Raumati Station has been removed from the draft Regional Transport Plan. Request that Raumati Station be restored to the draft plan and maintained in the long-term Regional Transport Plan. Submission considers removal of the station from the draft plan as a departure from good faith consultation and planners are developing a rail system without giving genuine attention to the communities which that rail system is meant to serve. Primary concern is that the single station policy for the Paraparaumu and Raumati communities does not work for Raumati. Argue that a station for the Raumati community will deliver a reasonably assured annual income flow which will enable the GWRC to budget for a positive loan repayment schedule and to predict an acceptable repayment period. Expressed view that the GWRC should widen consideration of Raumati station expenditure beyond what is related only to its own financial commitments. Account should be taken of what the lack of a station has cost and will continue to cost Raumati constituents simply because there is no easy access to the Western Corridor rail system.

Subtopic: Service redesign (416 submissions)

Position: Oppose (106 submissions)

- Sub #368: Opposes current schedule as offers less service than current schedule and recommends small, single unit trains operating very frequently (e.g. every 5 minutes during peak times).

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

Position: Support (284 submissions)

- Sub #131: Considers Council has done a great job over many years with the passenger rail services with new units, the extension to Waikanae, and much better timetables than we had in the run-down years when so many services were cut.
- Sub #335: The service design will probably make the journey to work slower on the Johnsonville Line
- Sub #479: Supports a further development of rail in the future, with infrastructure put in place so that heavy vehicles can be taken off the roads.
- Sub #501: Consider the upgrade to the rail system is very good news. Heartened to find that GWRC values the rail network and is prepared to invest a substantial sum to provide a low-emission system with many ecological advantages.
- Sub #601: The proposal to stagger bus and train timetables at the Johnsonville Hub is a good one and should help improve the service operating between the Hub and the CBD.

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #7: Suggests a pedestrian link from Kaiwharawhara station to the ferry terminal and to rename it "Ferry Terminal".
- Sub #18: Does not support direct Johnsonville to Wellington trains, which would be at the expense of the quality of service to the Ngaio and Crofton Downs residents. This would force these residents to drive to work, instead of using public transport. These stations should have regular, quick peak-hour services with cheaper fares and better station parking in order to encourage city-end users to take the train to work. This reduces the congestion, carbon-emissions and parking battles in town.
- Sub #20: Does not support the service design if it means that Redwood and Takapu Road are being bypassed by express services. More train services should be implemented in Tawa for capacity, which is currently overcrowded. The current situation of trains from Porirua not stopping at all at any Tawa stations is not efficient, and causes load on the other services, especially when there are delays (which is frequent). Frequently, trains coming through Tawa are full, and passengers are unable to get on, whereas express trains sail past, with empty seats. Suggests express trains make one stop in Tawa - at Tawa station. This is the station with the most car parking available, and is the most central station in Tawa, and additional car parking could be added. In summary: (a) the proposed 8 trains per peak hour on the Kapiti line should all stop at least one Tawa station; (b) services to Tawa stations must not be reduced in any way; and more car parking is needed at Tawa stations.
- Sub #38: Supports retaining a timetabled service (rather than a number of trains per hour) so that customers can see that trains are running on time. The service resign proposal is not clear as to whether the morning peak would be un-timetabled with a number of trains per hour, or whether the current timetable would be updated to include an increased number of services. While un-timetabled approach can be efficient, people have strong memories of a time when there were many delays, and an un-timetabled approach will lead to criticism that trains are running late or unreliably. The adherence to timetable measure is an important accountability measure for a service that has previously had delays and not being able to measure this would be a problem.

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

- Sub #43: Supports the new service patterns in principle, but requests that they be revised so that some of the express services stop at Waterloo, to ensure that Waterloo receives sufficient services and there is access to express services from Waterloo, as otherwise journey time will increase for many commuters, which is a disincentive for public transport users. An extra 10-15 minutes may not seem much, but it is a long time on a wet and windy station platform in the middle of winter, or if you have to get up earlier to take an earlier train because of the extra time a train that stops all stations takes.
- Sub #50: Strongly support increasing the frequency of express services at peak
- Sub #51: Support more services from 2020 - Request that more services are started earlier on the Hutt line to Taita or at least Waterloo - as no upgrades required. However understand we would then need a turn around and may lose park ride land.
- Sub #63: Support the new service patterns. The idea of express trains from Kapiti is very attractive. Cutting out Porirua and having faster travel time at a competitive cost are important for my daily commute.
- Sub #65: Recommends a service from Paraparaumu into Wellington departing between 6.30am and 7.00am, as current timetable does not suit an 8am start.
- Sub #86: Support the reduction in travel time from the proposed express train timetable for the Kapiti Coast However the timetable will need to ensure that people travelling to intermediate stations do not have to wait long for their connecting trains to minimise their travel time.
- Sub #94: Support focus on better services rather than continued expansion of the services. No need for rail extensions or new stations. Focus on better park and ride.
- Sub #118: Supports double tracking between Trentham and Upper Hutt. Concerned about an increase in HVL trains as the WRL are currently being held up by this line. Proposes passing/additional tracks between Taita and Petone/Wellington. Supports a plan to reduce travel times on the WRL.
- Sub #120: Supports upgrading objectives. Concerned at the cost estimates. Suggests upgrades do not have to be expensive as long as they contribute to the comfort of travellers.
- Sub #132: Supports the install of double tracks between Trentham and Upper Hutt.
- Sub #220: 3 trains north of Plimmerton with 6 cars is not an improvement. Current services have people standing from Pukerua Bay. Supports 4 trains of 6 cars in the peak hour or 3 trains of 8 cars with park and ride improvements. Amend the peak hour arriving into Wellington from 8 to 9am to 7:45 to 8:45am.
- Sub #241: Electrification to Maymorn, timed to match district plan changes allowing more intensive housing in the area, should be added to year 10 (2024/25) of the plan.
- Sub #245: Supports increasing frequencies during peak. Increased peak-time frequency on Johnsonville line should be introduced immediately or when the additional new Matangi's arrive, as there is no track work required to implement this. Expand and upgrade seating, and long-term introduce a second platform at Johnsonville to cater for increased frequency.
- Sub #263: Supports the Regional Rail Plan and thus the next phase of it.

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

- Sub #265: Strongly supports double tracking from Trentham to Upper Hutt to improve service and reliability. Strongly supports the upgrade of the Upper Hutt station and requests further information about what this is to entail e.g. the provision of toilets, timing etc. Strongly supports more reliable/higher frequency services between Upper Hutt and Wellington via faster express trains. Also suggests a dedicated express from Silverstream Station (the second busiest station) and free Wi-Fi on services to make commuting attractive to more residents and ensure commuting is productive (adding to regional GDP). Suggests extension of the Hutt Valley electrification to Timberlea station, based on recent population growth.
- Sub #275: Supportive of improved capacity on the rail network during peak times.
- Sub #285: Suggests rail spine equal in the same extent as the state highway spine i.e. from the northern boundaries of the region to Wellington International Airport. This could be addressed by converting the inner part of the present rail network to tram-trains.
- Sub #295: Supports better coordination between rail and bus transfers, using technology or infrastructure to facilitate this.
- Sub #298: Supports improved off peak frequency to Melling (half hourly), Upper Hutt and Porirua (one every twenty min), and Johnsonville (every fifteen min).
- Sub #299: Supports improving platform facilities with indoor waiting areas which allow for natural light.
- Sub #299: Concerned at a lack of proposals to improve reliability and punctuality of rail services. Supports double tracking the Trentham to Upper Hutt line. Supports a turnaround for Wairarapa trains at Upper Hutt.
- Sub #299: Supports increased service on the Wairarapa line, to arrive earlier in the morning.
- Sub #304: Suggests retaining Waterloo as the main hub and not Taita.
- Sub #304: Suggests more express trains, more carriages.
- Sub #304: Requests signage at top of ramps leading into the train station on which services are departing what platforms. Suggests current signage isn't adequate.
- Sub #336: Tawa CB requests better scheduling of train services since Tawa has three road crossings over the rail line which experience huge traffic jams when the north and south bound trains are in the same area. Tawa CB observes no benefit to Tawa from the proposal to have different services running between different sets of stations as the benefits appear to benefit those from Porirua north.
- Sub #342: Supports arrival times on the Masterton Railway Station RTI boards
- Sub #342: Does not support Wairarapa Councils proposal for transfers at Upper Hutt as it involves two separate rail journeys and increased travel time to Wellington.
- Sub #342: Proposes a possible redesign of the off peak timetable from Wellington as follows: a) on the hour, Upper Hutt Service stopping all stations to Silverstream then express to Upper Hutt (approx. 40 minutes running time), b) on the 1/4 hour, Featherston Service stopping at principal stations (Petone, Waterloo, Taita) then all stations from Silverstream to Featherston (approx. 55 minutes running time), c) on the 3/4 hour, all stations to Upper Hutt, d) on the hour, all stations to Melling. During the

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

peak, with the addition of a return crossover (points) at Naenae, the same pattern could be used half hourly with the addition of services stopping all stations to Naenae and return from there, allowing the Upper Hutt services to run express from Wellington stopping at Waterloo and all stations from Naenae.

- Sub #342: Suggests Council to look into the possible extension of rail services into Wainuiomata as this would also reduce pressure on Waterloo Railway Station park and ride along with providing a more direct and frequent service into the Wellington City for Wainuiomata residents.
- Sub #342: Supports an hourly service between Wellington and Featherston in addition to current Wairarapa services to increase off-peak patronage through use of surplus trains from Auckland.
- Sub #342: Supports double tracking Upper Hutt - Trentham as soon as possible, as leaving until 2018/19 will lead to more delays on the Hutt Valley and Wairarapa lines. Double tracking should come before Upper Hutt station upgrade
- Sub #342: Supports reviewing electrification to Featherston as it would reduce demand on existing Wairarapa services for people further north and allow a redesign of Upper Hutt services.
- Sub #368: The proposed train schedule offers less service than the current one. We should look at other cities globally, e.g. Vienna, Hong Kong, London. Get rid of the idea of "express" trains and infrequent long trains. Instead, have single units operate more frequently, e.g. Kapiti line, a train from Wellington to Plimmerton every 5 minutes peak (10 minutes off-peak), and have half of those services continue to Waikanae.
- Sub #376: Suggests surveying potential passengers that would catch proposed additional train services.
- Sub #378: Opposes reducing the number of services from Waterloo, and making them stopping all stations because it will inconvenience people who live near the station, and a large number of people from around Lower Hutt currently use the park and ride and bus connections to catch the train from Waterloo.
- Sub #394: Suggests better service provided to the Hutt CBD by: providing a better pedestrian bridge from Melling link to further in the CBD / extending Melling line through CBD via a new rail bridge near Western Hutt and creating a new light rail loop through CBD (including Hutt Hospital)/Melling/Petone/Waterloo), short stations to improve accessibility and only have short trains stop at them (Muri can re-open now as a short station with specified off peak services stopping), double tracking Paekakariki to Muri, having "light construction" stations as in Australia, having two trains operating on the same line stop at alternating stations to provide a faster transit time and more trips per vehicle (also stops the risk of all station stopping trains slowing down the express services).
- Sub #417: Suggests the new stopping patterns haven't considered both the ageing population and the performance/ability to perform of the train service because the proposed train services have passengers moving trains much more often. Suggest the proposed train service will decrease performance because the services will need to connect more seamlessly.

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

- Sub #419: Suggests off-peak high frequency concept for city connections (every 15min instead of 30min). Notes the current interchange issues at Wellington station have not been addressed.
- Sub #422: In general, support the proposals in relation to the rail service. Requests the regional rail plan initiatives would shorten travel times for Victoria staff, students and visitors during peak times.
- Sub #425: Strongly supports the proposed partnership approach in the PT Plan as it is crucial to running Wellington passenger rail services, especially with several factors outside the operator's control that can impact punctuality and reliability and that are essential for providing service standards and satisfaction to increase patronage. Also concerned about and requests clarity about access to data, factors taken into account in the design of new network hubs at Waterloo and Porirua, management of rail incidents and infrastructure works to deliver Rail Scenario 1 to reduce operational impacts, improvements in level crossing, safety upgrades e.g. electronic train protection (ETP) etc. Requests the reason for exclusion of locomotive hauled Wairarapa line trains in the count of trains per hour on the Hutt Valley line in the Appendix 1, Unit 16 table.
- Sub #437: Support the new peak train stopping patterns, and improving off-peak headways to every 15 minutes.
- Sub #443: Recommends a new train trip to the Hutt after the last 11.05pm service.
- Sub #447: Supports the clock-face timetable for rail services but notes concern that heavy peak demand may fall on only one or two services since 30% of passengers arrive in a 15 minute window. Suggests being a bit flexible about the exact timings to spread the peak demand. Also notes congestion or closeness of services starting at different points will very quickly lead to minor delays affecting following services. Full effects on platform usage in Wellington would need to be considered for all options.
- Sub #447: Recommends consideration for an extra evening service on each rail line at midnight.
- Sub #448: Supports the addition of loop lines at certain stations to enable the increasing number of freight trains being able to pass commuter trains without delaying commuters which is the current experience.
- Sub #460: Suggests a new rail station at Rowels Road to provide for the Grenada Village/Glenside/Churton Park areas. Notes there are several areas for park and ride facilities.
- Sub #491: Proposed changes to timetabling may impact on the Capital Connection and this needs to be considered before finalising new schedules.
- Sub #493: Supports the RS1 strategy to improve peak capacity into Wellington city. Supports providing increased service frequency to provide more effective use of the current infrastructure. Considers the Plan signals a desire to move from an asset focus to a customer focus which will result in increased rail patronage. Considers the analysis undertaken for RS1 will provide useful information for future rail improvements.
- Sub #494: Requests that train timetabling extend the high frequency services times to enable drop off and pickups that fit with school hours.

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

- Sub #516: Suggests extending the Hutt Valley Rail operations to Featherston and eventually Masterton, a Glenside Railway Stn park and ride/bus station with local bus network, underground rail extension to Courtenay Place.
- Sub #549: Support improving train frequencies for the evening peak and extending the hours of operation for the feeder bus services.
- Sub #577: Opposes removal of express services from Waterloo as it reduces services at the busiest suburban station in the region from 6 services per hour to 5 services per hour and removes all express services except the Wairarapa trains. Proposes that the plan is updated to include a thrice hourly Waterloo to Wellington express service.
- Sub #577: Generally agrees with most of the rail plan proposals. Supports increasing the frequency of all stop peak services from Taita station from three per hour to five per hour.
- Sub #587: Opposes the proposal to remove express services from Waterloo station. Agrees with the Eastern Community Committee proposal to update the PT Plan with a trice hourly Waterloo-Wellington express service and proposes an arrangement for the express services to operate without conflicting with other Hutt Valley services.
- Sub #590: Supports proposed changes to train services over the metro network as it could offset projected patronage drop when Transmission Gully opens. Access between Melling and Hutt CBD is a weak link. Supports GW working with Hutt City Council to improve the pedestrian link.
- Sub #591: Supports rail peak stopping patterns.
- Sub #592: Stopping patterns should be simplified and frequency increased over current levels. Peak services every 10min stopping all stations from Plimmerton to Wellington and Upper Hutt to Wellington with extra stopping services from Plimmerton/Porirua & Taita, if they can fit, between lower frequency expresses from Kapiti and Wairarapa to reduce bus transfer dwell time. Tighten timetable to take into account station closures and improved performance of the Matangi units. Restore evening frequency and span to be similar to that prior to 2004. Main lines (Hutt, Kapiti, J'ville) should be half hourly to midnight all week. Melling should a targeted service due to lack of evening and weekend services.
- Sub #621: Supports Rail Scenario 1.
- Sub #624: Requests that Otaki is included in the ongoing planning provision of commuter rail services and that significant work is undertaken in the next two years on the options for improving rail services to Otaki including electrification.
- Sub #633: Supports changes to the rail service configuration to reduce peak congestion. Encourage GWRC to continue to look at opportunities to deliver greater efficiency and better patronage from investment.
- Sub #635: Suggests a new railway station on Middleton Rd.
- Sub #636: Supports the initiatives to double track some rail lines.
- Sub #638: Suggests train stations conform to the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide and supply network maps/timetables/maps of the local area/directions to train and bus stops.

TOPIC: Procurement Policies

- Sub #639: Agrees with the scenario 1 but is concerned with the cross-subsidisation between trains and buses and suggests bus fares should be comparable with trains given that buses outweigh trains in mode share, fare per km travelled and farebox recovery rates.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

Topic: Wellington Bus Network (330 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The proposed routes are based on a network approach which moves away from providing many individual low frequency overlapping bus routes with specific trip purposes to providing a connected network of frequent services providing more abundant and affordable travel opportunities.

By providing a more efficient network with less duplication of services we can provide more frequent services and more weekend and evening services across Wellington within current resources. A more efficient network supports our proposals for more affordable fares such as a 25% discount at off-peak times and reduces pressure for future fare and rate rises.

Following public feedback received in 2012 on initial bus proposals, GWRC have been very mindful of minimising the need to transfer between buses. At peak times direct commuter services to and from the CBD will be retained from across Wellington where numbers are sufficient to fully utilise buses. Where transfers are required these are balanced against the ability to offer better overall levels of bus frequency and access compared with existing services.

Ensuring buses connect reliably and provision of adequate facilities such as shelter and information at connection points is acknowledged to be critical to support the move to this network approach. An approach successfully used in a wide variety of cities overseas and also being implemented closer to home in Auckland and Christchurch.

Proposals to maximise cross-town routing have been developed to reduce bus duplication on the Golden Mile with the dual outcome of reducing bus congestion and increasing the efficiency of the bus network. Resources from not having bus routes overlapping on the Golden Mile support the provision of more frequent and extensive services across Wellington.

Following feedback from bus operators in late 2013 on initial more extensive proposals for cross-town routing, concerns around reliability were noted and incorporated into the current bus network proposal. As a result of this initial operator feedback a decision was made to limit cross-town routing to the most reliable bus corridors, which generally already have bus priority measures in place and are proposed to have further significant improvements in provision of dedicated rights of way such as the Public Transport Spine corridors to allow a more reliable and efficient operation of buses.

Initial options for cross-town routing buses from Brooklyn and Taranaki Street through to the northern suburbs were abandoned in the light of data on bus unreliability on these corridors and the lack of immediate plans to implement priority measures to address these issues.

It is acknowledged that operating long cross-town bus routes will require a more proactive approach to monitoring bus travel times and delay points and ensuring

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

timetables are written to fit real world conditions. Likewise as with existing successful cross-town bus routes use of control points and built in recovery along the route will be essential tools to minimise buses bunching and minimise late running.

At peak times the proposed cross-town routes would be supplemented by additional short running peak buses which would (as now) start and end at Wellington CBD ensuring reliable peak services from Wellington are still able to be provided. . The proposals are for a more efficient bus network built around new north-south and east-west public transport spine routes with greater access to frequent services, evening services and weekend services for Wellington residents, without any increase in resources required.

The proposed spine routes are a key structural change proposed to the Wellington bus network which if adopted will form the basis of the future bus network contracts to be introduced from 2017.

Within local suburbs the proposals should be seen as a starting point with the expectation that details of local streets served and times that buses run would be open to refinement with local communities as we move towards implementation. Likewise after introduction we would expect services not to be set in stone but rather to be responsive to address issues that arise or to changing demands over the period of the contract. Where communities have issues or concerns we have undertaken to engage with community representatives to review local proposals and consider alternative options.

It is also must be acknowledged that there will be some existing users that benefit from the current inefficient bus route structure who may feel disadvantaged as we move to a network approach that aims to reduce service duplication and increase access to more frequent services, evening services and weekend services for the greatest number of residents within Wellington city.

Officers recommend that the Hearing Committee notes changes to local routes identified in the PT Plan can be made following targeted consultation with the local community and the operator, and that the PT Plan is amended to clarify that further consultation will occur where local communities have identified concerns, including for Khandallah and Churton Park routes.

- Sub #45: Do not support the 10pm cut-off time for bus services: kills the enjoyment of a night of the town for our cultural residents. Go to any 8pm theatre/stage show and many don't get out until after 10pm & you'll miss the last departure. If you live on new routes B, D, Q, L, M, K, some O, J, H, & G you might as well stay home. Many of the existing routes have last departures of around 11pm.
- Sub #92: Support prioritising punctuality above frequency outside of the immediate peak (e.g. After 6pm), There is no point having e.g. buses every 20 minutes if passengers regularly have to wait 40 minutes at the bus stop. There does not appear to be any method of improving punctuality. This could involve reducing the frequency and holding buses at certain stops as they do in other locations.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

Subtopic: Khandallah (120 submissions)

- Sub #84: Support retaining the 47 bus will continue to call to Khandallah. I would like to protest at the loss of this service, and the overall drop in the service to Khandallah - my normal route to work and back.
- Sub #130: Believes the redesigned routes for those of north of Khandallah are worse than the previous services. Due to only getting peak hour services but paying the same rates.
- Sub #143: Does not support proposed changes to Broadmeadows services. Suggests an hourly service that runs from the city, up Ngaio gorge, through Khandallah Village and Broadmeadows then finishes in Johnsonville. Also suggests more evening services to ensure a safe commute for students/city workers and a weekend service to deter taking cars to city centre and perhaps drink driving. Notes the proposal does not keep the promise of living close to easily accessed public transport for all Wellington residents.
- Sub #163: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43, 44 and 46. Suggests the direct stops north of Khandallah village remain. Notes that this is a busy well used service and an effective transport option.
- Sub #164: Does not support removing route 47. Does not support needing to transfer and increased cost of transfers. Requests route 47 run between 2-5pm and over holidays and weekends.
- Sub #170: Does not support the changes to the Khandallah services. Notes that the 46 bus is regularly full and not able to service the Broadmeadows residents (suggests this is because of Homebush Ave residents). Cautions the evening bus would result in a congested Broadmeadows service at the start of Lambton Quay and empty by Cashmere Ave.
- Sub #171: The proposition regarding routes 43 and 44 will actively discourage people from taking public transport. No changes to the Khandallah bus service should be made until the local community has been adequately consulted.
- Sub #175: The 43 / 44 bus route are always late. This will easily be addressed through the golden mile shuttle option-as the route will be split in half.
- Sub #176: Requests frequency to proposed K1 route to allow afternoon school pick-ups on weekdays. Notes there will be no efficient public transport options to arrive in Ngaio by 3pm.
- Sub #179: Does not support the removal of bus route 46. Suggests this is kept to frequently service Northern Khandallah residents in addition to new structure. Notes that bus routes 43, 44, and 46 are very busy services and will not have their needs met with the new proposal.
- Sub #189: Does not support the removal of bus route 43. Suggests the proposed K route would add an extra 20+ minutes of travel time to/from Homebush Road to the city. Notes the current bus runs 20-40min late on Sundays and the 46 bus is always at capacity. Cautions the new service will be overwhelmed and will bring disadvantages to Homebush Rd/Mandalay Terrace/Onslow Rd areas.
- Sub #190: Does not support the removal of bus route 43.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #191: Opposes the changes to service 43 and 44 as this will make service 46 too full also recommends that if service 43 and 44 cease that on Onslow Road and Homebush Road have no footpaths or safe access on the four-lane Hutt Road highway with no pedestrian crossing to the new service.
- Sub #193: Does not support a removal of bus routes 43/44. Suggests continued morning and afternoon service for Strathmore.
- Sub #194: Does not support proposed Route K for Cashmere/Khandallah. Notes the current 43 bus route provides extra stops in a hilly area for people who can't walk far.
- Sub #195: Does not support the removal of bus route 43. Notes the current high capacity on the 43 and suggests further delays would occur with the proposed route K.
- Sub #196: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44. Notes these are critical services for Khandallah/Ngaio and the 46 is already at capacity at peak times. Also notes delays for travelling via Khandallah village/Ngaio to the city outside peak times.
- Sub #198: Opposes the removal of bus route 43 and the extension of 46 (route K). Notes the lengthy time, current capacity issues and the zone 3 costs of the 46 route.
- Sub #199: Does not support the proposal of route K. Suggests significant delays to a service that is currently a round trip of less than 30min.
- Sub #205: Does not support the proposed route K. Notes the existing service via Hutt Rd and Onslow Rd is essential. Suggests the final decision not be influenced by the bus companies alone.
- Sub #206: Proposed changes to routes 43 and 44 is too long for people taking buses on Onslow Road, Mandalay Terrace and Homebush Road. K1 route does not take shortest route. Supports alternate K1 buses continuing down Onslow Road like present route 46 during peak times. K1 route via Ngaio too inefficient and would take too long for off peak travellers.
- Sub #207: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44. Notes current route via Hutt Rd and Onslow Rd essential for Khandallah residents. Proposed route K via Ngaio will fill up quickly, result in delays and will not be sufficient during peak hours.
- Sub #217: Does not support proposed route K. Suggests the continuing services of bus routes 43/44 and extending route K to include off-peak hours. Notes the longer travelling time on route K and the pending congestion issues on 43/44/46.
- Sub #218: Does not support proposed route K.
- Sub #219: Supports proposed route K.
- Sub #223: Opposes route K through Khandallah until further community consultation takes place. Proposal runs against efforts to get people using public transport as presented in the draft Plan. Change will mean quick route down Onslow and Homebush Roads will be replaced by a long and winding route through the hills. There is no footpath on the road to get to the new bus route on Hutt Road and roads in Khandallah are steep. Existing routes 43 and 44 should be retained up and down Onslow Road. Supports smaller buses being used to cut costs and shuttle people to the railway station.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #224: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44. Notes the longer travel time on proposed route K. Suggests keeping 43/44 during peak hours to assist with congestion issues.
- Sub #225: Does not support the proposed route K. Notes the extra travel time and the exclusion of Onslow Rd (which has no pedestrian crossings and will be dangerous to walk down). Suggests a full public consultation.
- Sub #226: Does not support the removal of bus route 44. Suggests a pedestrian access on lower Onslow Rd should the routes change. Notes the costs of this and an adverse impact on the Khandallah community.
- Sub #228: Does not support the proposed route K and the removal of bus routes 43/44. Notes the current congestion issues and all the students who regularly use this service. Suggests a further discussion with the public.
- Sub #229: Does not support proposed route K and the removal of bus routes 43/44. Notes the longer travel time on route K and the extra time spent on public transport per week.
- Sub #230: Does not support proposed route K as it will result in longer travel times. Notes the current capacity issues on lower Onslow Rd.
- Sub #233: Does not support the removal of bus routes 44/46. Notes the current capacity issues on both services and the longer travel time on proposed route K.
- Sub #240: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44. Notes the longer travel times via Ngaio.
- Sub #242: Opposed to ceasing routes 43 and 44 and restricting route 46 to peak times only as people downhill of Homebush/Onslow Road corner will have no daytime bus service. Students, mums and elderly predominantly live in the area and need daytime services. Walking to nearest stops at Homebush/Onslow corner and Hutt Road is dangerous as there are no footpaths, long walking distances and steep terrain. In wet weather, this road is subject to rock falls and other pedestrian and traffic hazards. Retaining only the peak route 46 service is inadequate. 43, 44 and 46 are very full at peak often unable to pick up passengers from Homebush Road onwards. Under the draft plan capacity will more than halve leading to more delays. Route K will more than double trip to work due to extra length of route and buses will be overflowing. Opposed to route K until further substantial consultation with better information.
- Sub #243: Does not support proposed route K. Notes the longer travel times, the exclusion of Onslow Rd, the current capacity issues/weekend delays. Suggests two different routes for going in/out of the city to cover all 43/44 stops.
- Sub #245: No benefit in changing from routes 43 and 44 at the Khandallah end as this means an increased journey time and no daytime service for residents below Homebush/Onslow Road intersection. This proposal was not widely publicised. Walking to Homebush Road or Old Hutt Road is hazardous. Existing delays on 43 and 44 are in the east – through Khandallah and Ngaio is seldom delayed. The change to final destination of Highbury via Willis Street will mean that the two-way services to and from town down and up Onslow Road would anyway be more reliable, therefore not needing a change to a one-way loop in Khandallah. The need for all buses to take the route from Khandallah to Wellington via Ngaio and the Ngaio Gorge Road negates the argument that the direct onward route from Homebush down Onslow Road should be redundant.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

The current bus stops in Khandallah Village provide good checkpoints for both routes 43 and 44 where buses can wait until their scheduled departure times if necessary – any checkpoint further north of this for route K would mean that anyone already on the bus would be further delayed. Another argument for the change is to have all Wellington-bound buses depart from the same side of the street. Khandallah/Ngaio patrons can work out on which side of the road to wait. Replacing route 47 with route M a bad move. No indication of a weekday frequency to/from Johnsonville or how frequent Crofton Downs will be served.

- Sub #246: Supports shortening of routes 43 and 44 (route k) due to off peak unreliability but does not support stopping double route operation as travel times would increase for people in Khandallah and Onslow. Made worse by the lack of a footpath on lower Onslow Road. Does not support reducing evening service level. Suspects the low patronage currently is a result of the unreliability of the service and suggest no change be made until the results of having a much more reliable service are known.
- Sub #250: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44. Notes the extra travel time with proposed route K. Suggests route K alternates clockwise/anti-clockwise to provide a similar service to 43/44.
- Sub #251: Does not support proposed route K. Suggests travel times will be longer and capacity issues will be worse. Cannot afford to take more time off work to accommodate new commute. Notes the removal of Onslow Rd and the risks this will create for pedestrians and motorists as there are no footpaths to walk on. Suggests further consultation with affected neighbourhoods.
- Sub #254: Opposed to changing all the Khandallah buses to one route, as there is not enough capacity currently. Travel times to Homebush will also be adversely effected. Opposed to the route not travelling all the way to Strathmore, due to people having to change buses which means the travel time will be increased as they wait for the connection.
- Sub #261: Opposed to route 44/43 bus transfers at Wellington Hospital - prefers transfers at Kilbirnie due to shorter travel times to the CBD and reduced traffic congestion. Also supportive of a ½ hour frequency to be equivalent to the present service levels for this route.
- Sub #264: Opposed the changes to bus numbers 43 and 44, as there is no pedestrian access to Hutt Rd from the bottom of Onslow Road meaning this area will have no PT coverage.
- Sub #273: Opposed to proposed route K, as it denies services to the lower end of Onslow Road. Suggests residents in this area are at risk walking uphill to PT services as there are no footpaths. Suggests travel times to the CBD will be longer, and travel across Khandallah will be more difficult. Recommends continuation of the present routes 43 and 44, but eliminate the Strathmore destination, instead terminating at Newtown (Park Zoo). Recommends City bound buses travel at least to Courtenay Place.
- Sub #274: Opposed to the Route K, as Onslow Road between Homebush Road and the Hutt Road would no longer be serviced. Suggests safety concerns for residents walking to proposed route K, as there are no footpaths in this area. Suggests increased travel times from Khandallah to the CBD, and fewer route choices. Recommends eliminating Strathmore destination from route to improve service.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #276: Opposed to proposed route K. Changes would add inconvenience, time and cost. Full consultation with the affected community should be held.
- Sub #281: Opposed to scrapping of bus routes 44 and 43 in off-peak hours and replacing them with planned route K. This change will affect travellers to and from the city from the Cashmere Avenue, Onslow Road and Homebush Road areas. Currently the route has standing loads. The planned route K will abolish this service and leave no option but to take a car.
- Sub #282: Opposed to the removal of Routes 43 and 44. These have good travel times and are well patronised. Demands no decisions be made until proper consultation has taken place.
- Sub #286: Supports retaining and increasing interpeak network coverage from Wellington City to Broadmeadows, as currently there are capacity problems during the peak. Supports improving reliability - wait times can be in excess of 20mins.
- Sub #287: Considers current proposal for the new K bus service is inefficient and doesn't take into account the view of residents in the area. While proposed route service might cover a bigger area, quality will be reduced as the commute duration will increase significantly.
- Sub #296: Opposes proposed changes to the Khandallah bus route, particularly for users east of Khandallah village. Opposed to reduction of direct services to Cashmere, due to increased journey time to and from Wellington city. Opposed to reduction of services to Lower Onslow road. Opposed to relying on the existing 46 to provide peak services, as capacity will not be enough.
- Sub #309: Opposes Bus Routes K
- Sub #310: Supports the proposed K2 route, but requests more frequent evening services that run later.
- Sub #310: Requests Bus Route 46 (Broadmeadows) has more frequent evening services that run later.
- Sub #311: Opposed to the proposed route K bus, due to changes in trip time, delays and safety.
- Sub #315: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44 as they are especially needed in peak hours. Suggests separate route for Highbury/Aro valley operating from Wellington station.
- Sub #319: Suggests if route 43 & 44 disappear for a route K this may encourage people to take cars. Also mentions, longer journey times, potential no serves at lower Onslow Rd and capacity on buses, standing room only.
- Sub #320: Opposes proposed route K due to longer travel times, increased crowding of the peak time buses, loss of any daytime public transport for those living below the Homebush Road/Onslow Road corner and safety issues - no lower footpath and road crossing on Hutt Road. Requests further consultation to the community of Khandallah
- Sub #326: Does not support proposed route K as it will not meet the need of northern residents and adds extra travel time. Does not support the removal of off-peak service to residents below Homebush Rd. Also notes the lack of pedestrian access up to Homebush Rd/Onslow Rd.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #327: Opposes proposed bus route K due to lack of buses outside of peak times, and safety issues of road crossing, lack of footpaths and bus route.
- Sub #329: Opposes route K because people who live at the bottom of Onslow Road won't have a service and they can't safely get to another bus stop neither at Homebush Road or the Old Hutt Road. Concerned that route 47 connection with Khandallah and Johnsonville won't be effective.
- Sub #330: Does not think that route K will have enough capacity as the current 44 is virtually almost full now. Reducing the evening service to hourly will not be good. It will also be a shame to have to catch two buses to Courtenay Place.
- Sub #337: Keep current 43 & 44 routes as they are efficient. Replacement with Route K would be inconvenient and not provide a fast direct link. Also does not provide good peak or off peak services for the bottom half of Onslow Rd.
- Sub #339: Changes to route 43-44. looping from Homebush Rd via Onslow Rd not a good idea due to lack of footpaths below 61 Onslow Rd. My journey to town would increase by 30-35 minutes. Homebush/Onslow Rd intersection dangerous.
- Sub #343: Objects to changes to route 44 as it will no longer go up Onslow and then Homebush Rds. The route K proposed turn from Homebush into Onslow Rd is unsafe as there is nowhere to go for cyclists if bus is blocking the road.
- Sub #344: Wants bus routes retained as they are with more frequent 43, 44 and 46 services due to safety reasons (need to cross Hutt Expressway) and increase in journey length. Also concerned that the changes will mean people park cars at the service station or along footpaths to catch the express buses along Old Hutt Rd. Concerned about effect on people on Onslow and Homebush Rd. Reallocate resources from other scarcely used routes. Believes the assertions claimed in the Draft Wellington Public Transport Plan summary of the benefits are clearly unproven, given the above.
- Sub #351: Opposes removal of Route 43/44 and creation of new Route K. Urges no decisions without consultation.
- Sub #352: Does not support the proposed route K as it will result in longer travel times. Over 100 students of Wellington Girls' College currently use bus routes 43/44.
- Sub #360: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44 and the proposed route K. The new route will exclude Onslow Rd and Homebush Rd. There are no footpaths on Onslow Rd which is a hazard. Suggests a further consultation with Khandallah residents. Also notes current capacity issues on 46, the early timetable (43/44 runs later) and the direct links with Wellington Hospital. Suggests the proposed Courtney Place hub will not be spacious enough to facilitate the rapid transfer of passengers to connecting buses.
- Sub #361: Opposes cutting service in Khandallah (Routes 43 and 44) especially bottom of Onslow Road, because footpaths are difficult to navigate and roads are unsafe for pedestrians; dependence on personal vehicle will increase; teenaged children who rely on bus service would lose independence.
- Sub #363: Does not support changes to routes 43 and 44 due to increases in the length of journey via Ngaio. Concern over eliminated bus stops in Onslow Rd due to longer walk to catch bus and lack of footpath and narrow road and the need to cross a 4 lane highway to catch a bus on Old Hutt Rd.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #369: Opposes change to Routes 43 and 44 in Khandallah due to crowding on the 46 and accessibility needs of senior citizens.
- Sub #369: Suggests cutting off-peak services through Khandallah rather than altering or eliminating existing Routes 43/44.
- Sub #374: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44. Does not support proposed route K.
- Sub #377: Opposes the proposed changes to the services from the northern end of Khandallah to the city due to a major reduction in services, considerably longer to travel between home and the city. Recommends reinstating the services for Khandallah residents, either by retaining the current 43 and 44 routes, or by having the 46 route operate during the day and in the evenings, as well as at peak times.
- Sub #383: Opposes removal of Khandallah loop bus service because it will effect residents beyond the Khandallah shops by doubling the daily commute time (excluding use of severely overcrowded Broadmeadows buses), and cut off daytime access for anyone below Homebush Road where there are also no footpaths.
- Sub #384: Does not support proposed route K as it will add travel time and increase capacity/congestion issues. Also suggests improvements to the current Sunday timetable.
- Sub #386: Opposes removal of the route 43 and 44 bus services because the proposed changes are reducing off peak services, residents in the northern end will take a longer time to get to town, apart from peak we will have to travel to Ngaio instead of straight down Onslow Road to town which is a far longer journey.
- Sub #391: Strongly opposes the proposed changes to Routes 43 and 44 because removing the option to travel up and down Onslow Rd adds a significant amount of time to those who live north of Khandallah Village, and if there are no off peak bus options people will use cars or walk up/down a non-footpathed hill, in the dark, and try to get over to Hutt Road to catch a bus.
- Sub #395: Suggests under the proposed plan there doesn't appear to be any improvement in the current Route 46 bus service. Recommends increase frequency of services at peak times and even on Friday nights to cater for people working later or staying in town for functions. Opposes the change in the service to start/end in Johnsonville hub as that is likely to result in more people using the service on what can already be an overcrowded trip either to or from the city.
- Sub #398: Opposes the proposed change to the Khandallah route due to the shortened the hours of operation, finishing the service at 10pm, removing the Onslow Road onto Hutt Road option of the route will increase the journey time by 15 minutes, and by rerouting the bus away from Courtenay Place will no longer become a convenient way to travel to work. Suggests changing buses only works if connections are well-timed and buses frequent, and half-hour to hourly gaps will make this difficult for you to fulfil.
- Sub #399: Opposes introducing route K because it doesn't meet the needs of the Khandallah community. Supports keeping the current routes.
- Sub #416: Strongly opposed to removing route 43 and 44 bus services and introducing Route K due loss of daytime direct access/to/from the city.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #419: Does not support proposed Karori or Khandallah routes as they will make current congestion problems worse. Notes there are no plans indicated on how the proposed larger buses will fit in Wellington's urban and suburban environments. Does not support a reduction in services (some current beyond 7pm services are proposed to finish at 6pm).
- Sub #426: Does not support Route K due to less services to lower Onslow Rd. Dangerous road conditions for pedestrians and parking cars means services should be enhanced.
- Sub #447: Generally the route changes will work, but suggests the Broadmeadows service be routed through Khandallah Village and then out to the Khandallah Road / Box Hill intersection and beyond to Broadmeadows – even if it is along Agra Crescent.
- Sub #450: Disagree with Route K as it does not meet needs. Proposal does not provide direct, fast access to the city during off-peak, does not provide safe pedestrian access up to Homebush Rd and buses turning uphill from Homebush Road back into Onslow Rd would face busy weekday downhill traffic. Proposed Route K will encourage people to use cars and fewer on the bus. Agree that the current service is unreliable and agree with merits of shortening the current route. However, request consultation with Khandallah residents before decisions are made on Route K.
- Sub #451: Opposes proposed changes to bus routes 43, 44 and 46 as they will dramatically curtail services to those living below the junction of Onslow and Homebush. Opposes reducing K route services to hourly after 6pm. Views service changes as merely a cost cutting exercise. Recommends retaining current 43, 44 and 46 routes during peak periods, remove proposed K route's connection with Johnsonville, connect K2/46 to Courtney Place, frequency should be 10 minutes in the peak.
- Sub #454: Opposes proposed changes to the Khandallah bus route. Uses the 44 bus regularly.
- Sub #464: Opposes change to the Khandallah 44, 46 and 43 route. Simply not fair to cut back on these routes as many people depend on it.
- Sub #470: Opposes the replacement of the 43 and 44 routes with a single K route - very inefficient for anyone living in the Cashmere end of Khandallah. The bottom section of Onslow Road where it meets Hutt Road is particularly dangerous for pedestrians, especially at night, and these changes would encourage more foot traffic in that area.
- Sub #470: Supports the increase in frequency of the 46/K2 route. However, it is unclear whether there is any increased capacity (offset by the removal of the 43 route). The same comment applies to the changes to the 44 and 46 in the opposite direction. An alternative might be to make the new K2 route both on and off peak, and terminate the K route at the Khandallah Shops. The K2 could also be made to travel via the Khandallah Shops as part of that change.
- Sub #503: Opposed to the proposed deletion of the 44 and 43 route to and from Khandallah, via Onslow Road. No consultation has taken place. No decisions regarding the deletion of this route should be made until full consultation with residents of the area. Concerned proposal will result in longer travel times. Buses already full by Homebush Rd and without 43 will not be enough buses. For those living below the Homebush Road/Onslow Road intersection, there will be no day time service. This will

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

create a safety issue of people walking on the road, as their only way to get to public transport. Significant increase in housing development on lower Onslow Road and proposal is removing the transport infrastructure to support this. Opposed to route no longer going through Newtown as have a part time job in Newtown. Patrons who work in the city passed Lambton Quay will have to catch two buses. This change to the route will result in more residents using private cars, more cars on the road, creating more congestion, more pollution and less bus patronage. This will create further problems as parking in wellington city is already at a premium as at least two parking buildings are still out of use since last years earthquake.

- Sub #514: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44 which will reduce the service to the Ngaio/Khandallah area. Suggests the current capacity issues in southern Ngaio areas will get worse. Eastern areas of Ngaio are too far away from the rail system and rely on buses. Also suggest weekend timetable updates to provide a more frequent/early service.
- Sub #517: Request keeping the current routes 43 & 44 for reasons; provides the most direct route into town; proposed route K would at peak time add at least another 15 possibly 20 minutes travel time into the city; alternative route 46 means walking to opposite Cashmere school where there is no shelter and would get wet in rain.
- Sub #536: Concerned about proposed changes to the Khandallah bus routes, particularly to off-peak services. As a part time worker I need easy access to off-peak buses to get me into town (I work in Courtenay Place). I also need to be able to get home if called by school for illness/emergency. A lack of off-peak services will likely force me to consider other transport options such as using my car and parking rather than making the most of public transport. I am also concerned over what buses will be available for my children once they reach Year 9, as they will most likely be attending college in town. The increased level of in-fill housing from Cashmere Ave down through Onslow Road will also be affected by the proposed cuts. I would like to see a good deal more (and well publicised!) consultation undertaken before any decisions are made on changes to these routes.
- Sub #539: Extremely unhappy and disappointed with proposed deletion of the 44 and 43 route to and from Khandallah via Onslow Road. This is a major change to the bus service and no consultation has taken place. No decisions regarding the deletion of this route should be made until full consultation with residents of the area has been made, and feedback from affected parties considered. These changes will significantly affect the way I travel to and from employment, shopping and social outings. As I work and study, the hours I catch a bus to these places are not around peak times. With the proposed changes to my bus route, it will be extremely difficult for me to catch the bus. What would usually be a one 15minute bus ride, would change to me catching 2 to 3 different buses and taking me over an hour to get to my destinations. If it goes ahead will stop using the bus.
- Sub #542: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44. Suggests the current capacity issues will get worse and will discourage people from using buses and that 43/44 should be kept during peak times.
- Sub #556: Opposes removing route 43 bus service because for residents north of Khandallah Village the Homebush/Onslow this route is the quickest way to the city. Opposes introducing route K due to longer journey times, no daytime service for those below the Onslow/Homebush corner to/from the city, and no safe access for those

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

below Onslow/Homebush corner to Route K via footpath. Suggests the proposed bus routes will be inconvenient for northbound trips for customers north and east of Khandallah village (Cashmere, Homebush).

- Sub #556: Supports the existing Khandallah timetables because there is a half hour service either way and the further from the village this becomes about 20 minutes with a 40 minute gap. Suggests current bus services are reliable unless due to traffic accidents or roadworks in Ngaio Gorge, or Onslow Road.
- Sub #566: Oppose the changes to Route 43 and 44 as parking is difficult in the CBD and the buses drop off in convenient stops. Concerned if reduced to using cars, city will be clogged up with slow moving traffic looking for spaces - and more pollution.
- Sub #567: Opposes change to the 43 & 44 as much utilized
- Sub #575: Oppose Khandallah bus changes as has serious impact for the young and old of community as below Homebush there are no footpaths so with no bus service during the day cutting off a part of the community and impacting on the village economic vibrancy. There was no consultation with the local community.
- Sub #576: Request bus services to Onslow Road (the lower part) should be improved as there is no access for lower Onslow Road for pedestrians to trains or to other bus services easily. The proposed route K should not be advanced as there is a lot of new housing in lower Onslow Road area and these need to be serviced by buses esp. in off peak periods and the weekend
- Sub #579: Consider proposed changes to 43/44 service will result in inferior rather than improved service. Khandallah/Ngaio residents have a double change to contend with, one being the ending of the 43/44 loop service via lower Onslow Road which for some will add an extra 10 minutes to each journey, and of more significance is the new K route termination in the Aro Valley rather than Strathmore via Courtney Place and the Hospital.
- Sub #582: Oppose Route K. Think service to lower Onslow Rd should be improved. - due to high density house and lack of pedestrian access & walkways to other public transport services.
- Sub #594: Does not support cutting routes 43 & 44 for being long and unreliable as that is where people live and unreliability is responsibility of the operator.
- Sub #599: Does not support proposed Khandallah/Highbury route changes as it will not improve travel time as promised. Notes the current services often run late (sometimes up to 40min) or early and has kept records over the past few years. Notes the congestion issues on Raroa Rd and Strathmore. Notes there will be no service after 8pm when Fran Wilde promised there would be more added in the evenings.
- Sub #602: Strongly object to Route K proposal to cut the bus service to lower Onslow Road and highlight the safety issue of no footpath for lower Onslow Road.
- Sub #603: Supports the network overall, but opposed to Route K proposal. The lower Onslow road now has greater housing & very poor access for pedestrians. Bus services should be improved to this area not unimproved!! The pad for walking is dangerous especially for children.
- Sub #604: The proposed changes to the bus service to Khandallah are not welcome. What is wrong with a continuous circular routes that we have now?

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #606: The proposal for the new bus service to Khandallah which cuts out Lower Onslow Road makes no sense. The Lower Onslow area has no foot paths and the proposal simply encourages greater car usage. What provisions is the Council making for those with no car?
- Sub #607: Opposes the proposed route K and advises there are no footpaths or walking spaces on Onslow Road.
- Sub #608: Opposes the changing of route 43/44 as this will increase travel time and will reduce the amount of people who will use public transport.
- Sub #609: Opposes ceasing services 43,44 and 46 as this is her only mode of transport as she is elderly.
- Sub #611: Strongly opposed to removing routes 43 & 44 and introducing Route K due to loss of daytime direct access to/from the city, longer journey times, more uncomfortable longer route, no daytime service for those below the Onslow/Homebush corner to/from the city or uphill to the village, would affect the accessibility to the Royal Danish Consulate in Homebush Rd, and includes a dangerous right turn for the bus out of Homebush Rd onto Onslow Rd. Do not support losing access to Courtenay Place and to the hospital on one route. Proposed route does not retain access to a reasonable and reliable bus route for the whole suburb. Proposed route changes conflicts with draft RPTP aims to encourage use of public transport, ease of use, greater access and more coverage. Route K also fails to meet the needs of an exposed hilly suburb with variable car access, difficult pedestrian access, and a varied rapid increasing population. Concerned about lack of meaningful stakeholder consultation and request no decisions are made without meaningful consultation, and consideration of options to meet streamlining of bus network while retaining daytime direct links to/from the city.
- Sub #613: Opposes changes to route "K" and the ceasing of service 43/44 due to accessibility to Wellington and surrounding areas.
- Sub #616: Does not support proposed changes to the Khandallah bus routes.
- Sub #618: Strongly oppose the removal of bus routes 43/44 and the proposed route K. Suggests this route K will discourage commuters to use public transit and will result in more cars on the road creating traffic/pollution. Notes current capacity issues on 43/44, the extended travel time on route K, the exclusion of Onslow Rd/Wellington College/St. Patrick's College.
- Sub #626: Does not support the removal of bus routes 43/44. Notes the exclusion of Onslow Rd on route K will also affect Rangiora Ave residents as there are no footpaths to reach another stop, travel time will be much longer, peak time service does not provide direct service to Khandallah Village/Rangiora Ave/Onslow/Homebush/Mandalay/Cashmere. Suggests route 44 remain and alternate services for Onslow Rd and Homebush/Mandalay. Suggests further consultation on proposed route changes.
- Sub #630: Strongly opposed to removing routes 43 & 44 and introducing Route K due to loss of daytime direct access to/from the city, longer journey times, more uncomfortable longer route with associated higher fuel costs and emissions, no daytime service for those below the Onslow/Homebush corner to/from the city or uphill to the village, inadequate pedestrian facilities to Route K and a dangerous right turn for the bus out of Homebush Rd onto Onslow Rd. Proposed route changes conflicts with draft

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

RPTP aims to encourage use of public transport, ease of use, greater access and more coverage. Proposed route does not retain access to a reasonable and reliable bus route for the whole suburb. Route K also fails to meet the needs of an exposed hilly suburb with variable car access, difficult pedestrian access, and a varied rapid increasing population. Concerned about lack of meaningful stakeholder consultation and urge no decisions are made without meaningful consultation, a social impact study and consideration of options to meet streamlining of bus network while retaining daytime direct links to/from the city. Group covers the Cashmere/Khandallah area.

- Sub #632: Strongly opposed to Route K due to loss of daytime direct access to/from the city, longer journey times, no daytime service for those below the Onslow/Homebush corner to/from the city, and no safe access for those below Onslow/Homebush corner to Route K via footpath. Does not meet the needs of a hilly suburb with an ageing population. Wish to be consulted about options to meet streamlining of bus network while retaining daytime direct links to/from the city. Proposed route changes conflicts with draft RPTP aims to encourage use of public transport, ease of use, greater access and more coverage. This submission is supported by a 20 page petition of signatures. Group covers the north Khandallah/Cashmere area.
- Sub #640: Requests an increase in off-peak frequency on the 43 and 44 bus services to half hourly.
- Sub #640: The current route from Strathmore is often running late and the loop route (Khandallah/Ngaio) does not serve most local communities well.
- Sub #641: Opposes removal of Routes 43/44 and proposed new Route K for off-peak services because this will add 60 minutes to travel time into town and removes bus access from the residents of lower Onslow Road area. Suggest Routes 43/44 be retained as-is for benefit of elderly residents and to continue to encourage public transport.

Subtopic: Network design (170 submissions)

- Sub #27: Requests Maungaraki bus services are coordinated better with the Wellington-Petone train service and the Eastbourne bus service.
- Sub #28: Proposed route does not meet the submitter's family needs for commuting with school children. Submitter will still need to drive on rainy days to pick up school children. Suggests a timetable change so the bus travels through Kelburn and onwards to Highbury after primary school ends.
- Sub #36: Does not support Churton Park being classed as a targeted service. Believes current buses are full, with people being left behind at stops, and as Churton Park is one of the fastest growing suburbs in Wellington this will only get worse. Does not object to having to change buses in the city to get to Newtown, but does not support Churton Park residents being required to change buses at Johnsonville, on the basis that a) it treats Churton Park residents like second class citizens, b) transfers are unsafe for a woman travelling alone, particularly in the dark, and will surely lead to an increase in crime with attacks on women becoming more prevalent.
- Sub #36: If the Churton Park bus routes are implemented as planned submitter believes that people will no longer take the bus and it will result in more people taking cars, which will add to congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #49: Supports the extension of the core bus corridor to Karori. Suggests exploring peak hour bus priority corridors in Karori - in particular in and around Marsden Village in the morning and an extension of the Glenmore Street priority lane to assist with evening peak hour.
- Sub #71: Requests additional capacity and service improvements on the Karori route. The proposal seems to reduce the number of buses to and from Karori during the peak periods by reducing the number of direct buses (no 3) but also the other buses that carry the overflow (no 21 and 17). The peak buses are already too full and often go past the stop at Standen street without picking up the passengers. The plan does not seem to include any infrastructure improvements to improve the bus route. Given that the Karori route is one the busiest bus routes in the city there doesn't seem to be any proposal to improve the service.
- Sub #75: Does not support proposed changes in relation to Churton Park Route 54 and request that it is kept as is, or have additional services added.
- Sub #76: Maintain the current bus network in Kapiti as it is efficient and links well with the rail service.
- Sub #79: Reliability is the priority for bus services - transfers are alright if the buses are on time. The new network may not address the problems of late buses and passengers will have to wait at unsafe dirty hubs. It currently takes a long time to get anywhere because I always have to allow 10 minutes for the assumed lateness of any bus. The proposal states there will be an 11-minute morning peak time saving from the CBD to Kilbirnie but this seems to be a distraction - in the morning most traffic is travelling TO the CBD not AWAY from it. What is the proposed time saving from Kilbirnie TO the CBD? The proposed new network shows the Seatoun bus travelling through Hataitai. Given that there are plans for all Hataitai traffic to exit Hataitai at Goa St (not Taurima St), Moxham Ave is expected to have much more traffic than it does currently. If you add more buses to Moxham Ave then we will have complete gridlock.
- Sub #80: Does not support the removal of bus route 54 as it is an efficient and direct service from Churton Park to the city centre. The removal of the 54 loop will result in more bus stops (primarily in undeveloped areas) and will discontinue the all-day service. The proposed route extension to Island Bay via the Basin Reserve will result in delays. Suggests separate bus route for Churton Park via motorway or Johnsonville Station.
- Sub #82: Support the proposals in the plan as they relate to Johnsonville
- Sub #90: Supports the changes overall, even though will lose the no 17 bus.
- Sub #90: Requests review of capacity on Karori routes, and whether the slight drop in frequency for peak buses to Karori will be adequate. There is already an issue with the Lambton Quay bus stop often being by-passed by totally full buses. End up waiting for a very long time as 2, 3 or 4 full buses go past. Knows a number of people (particularly women who have to get home to cook tea) who take their car because they cannot guarantee that they will get a Karori bus at rush hour at that stop.
- Sub #93: Considers hubs have little public support and due to buses running late in practice will result in long waits at hubs. However if hubs are proposed, then they should only be located at suburban shopping centres with better cover from the weather than standard bus shelters and include excellent night time lighting and security.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #99: Does not support changes to bus route 150 and the 83/91 services between Wellington and Queensgate (which are useful for returning home after evening functions in Wellington).
- Sub #100: Supports the proposed "I" route, with more frequent connections between the suburbs of Brooklyn, Morningside and Kingston to suburbs to the east and south such as Newtown, Island Bay and Kilbirnie.
- Sub #104: Requests improved frequency of evening services in the weekend and during the week. Suggests a wait of up to 15 minutes is more convenient. Would be tempted to drive instead of wait up to 30 mins for a bus to Island Bay on a Saturday evening.
- Sub #104: Requests more information about the proposed hubs including where exactly these will be, what facilities will be there, how connections will be timed?
- Sub #108: Any Wellington transport plan must be designed primarily around the needs of pedestrians.
- Sub #109: Suggestion for current bus route 21 Wrights Hill going through Kelburn and then onto Vivian Street: at present it leaves Karori, goes down Glenmore Street and into Bowen Street/Lambton Quay. Recommends a feeder route for morning commuters going down to the Parliament end of the city (ex. By going down the Terrace towards Bowen Street and in the evening returning from the Bowen Street end and going up the Terrace and onto Karori).
- Sub #110: Does not understand the proposed network naming convention. A,B,C,D should be for important/busy routes.
- Sub #114: Would like information regarding the proposed 53 and 54 bus routes.
- Sub #115: Supports a more reliable connection from Wellington city to the Hutt, including short waiting times for city transfers.
- Sub #116: Strongly objects to getting rid of the 5 as he thinks it's preferable to the 14. Advises stopping the 5 service and increasing 14 frequency will make travel worse.
- Sub #119: Supports route realignment also proposes local service from Kowhai Park to Brooklyn library doesn't seem to be frequent enough. The use of small buses (20 seaters) should mean a 15 min shuttle service on a loop could be utilised.
- Sub #120: Supports the objectives of the plan.
- Sub #123: Not keen on changing buses mid-route.
- Sub #125: Supports decisions based on user needs and not on profits. Supports a safe, comfortable, reliable, cost effective, and clean bus service with shorter wait times between connections.
- Sub #131: Suggests alternative routing of buses through Wellington.
- Sub #134: Does not support the introduction of dedicated bus lanes along Karori Road. Marsden Village businesses are highly dependent on carparking being available to shoppers and trade is directly proportional to there being easy access to the village.
- Sub #138: Supports the introduction of a levy to city centre businesses for a free central city loop route.
- Sub #140: Supports an introduction to weekend and evening service on Aro Street.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #141: Members of Broadmeadows, specifically students, require better bus options and off peak/weekend/night buses from Broadmeadows to Wellington and vice versa. Requests a bus that goes from Johnsonville through Broadmeadows down to Khandallah and through to town.
- Sub #144: Supports the rerouting of the Seatoun and Airport buses through the bus tunnel to reduce traffic on Taranaki St and Newtown and make for a faster journey.
- Sub #147: The new system should be similar system to the current one because the proposed may cause more delays and also alienates students. A good idea would be to run the buses along ring routes outside the CBD with stops allowing people from the CBD to filter out onto stops on the ring routes (and vice versa).
- Sub #152: Suggests an introduction of a Greater Wellington Circular Bus route that includes Wellington, Upper Hutt, Whitby, Porirua and Johnsonville as travel from Porirua/Johnsonville to Upper Hutt is only available via Wellington.
- Sub #166: Suggests strong services provided for large city events (stadium events etc.).
- Sub #172: The cessation of the #5 service will cause inefficiencies in the #14 route that can result in turning people off of this service.
- Sub #181: Suggests the better option is to align the Houghton Bay Service with the Wrights Hill Service and bring the Hataitai Service close to the Mt Victoria Summit (but not actually to it). He states at looking to combine the "L" and "O" services so they form a loop. States service "L" and "M" could not cope with taking over 6 bus services routes currently. Advises Service "L" and "M" has reduced catchment area which will affect students. He suggests this is not the most optimal link. States Route "A" will increase delays during the peak periods.
- Sub #181: Opposes new bus routes as they miss key areas such as Hospital Workers, High Schools, Students and Home's.
- Sub #183: Suggests an improvement on bus/train timelines to ensure a seamless connection/short waiting time when using both services in a single journey.
- Sub #185: Opposes the combining of three routes into one in Miramar. Is also concerned to get to Newtown Hospital will need to change service twice. Requests that service 18 re-instated due to not been able to reach amenities like the hospital, schools and universities without changing service at additional costs.
- Sub #185: Opposes the changes due to fewer seats, fewer direct services, higher fares, no direct services linking schools, universities and hospitals, More exposure to the elements, Longer journey times, Less security for passengers, and will effectively cost more money.
- Sub #187: Does not support a bus service operating from Johnsonville railway. Suggests all passengers use the rail system that has been invested in. Also suggests services from the Hutt Valley/Johnsonville/Newlands/Porirua terminate at the rail station to avoid congestion.
- Sub #188: Suggests improvement in bus timetables to avoid overcrowding/empty buses and bus lane congestion. Also running selected routes only during peak hours. Suggests 3W service discontinue after 6pm and extend the shuttle service until 8pm. Also smaller buses for 3W/S.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #192: Suggests densely populated and high traffic areas like the Golden Mile be emissions free (only trolleys and hybrid vehicles).
- Sub #200: Increase frequency of bus services in general. Increase bus services connecting to university campuses. Route from Houghton Bay/Southgate area to Kilbirnie/Lyall Bay area. Drivers miss out Houghton Bay and divert to Southgate – both suburbs should each have unique services.
- Sub #202: Suggests regular service on John St to support the proposed route I for a timely commute in/out of the city from Vogeltown. Very supportive of a later running and weekend service in this area.
- Sub #208: Proposed changes to routes 43 and 44 is too long for people taking buses on Onslow Road, Mandalay Terrace and Homebush Road. K1 route does not take shortest route. Supports alternate K1 buses continuing down Onslow Road like present route 46 during peak times. K1 route via Ngaio too inefficient and would take too long for off peak travellers.
- Sub #212: Buses too slow as the car takes half the time and allows more family time. Buses often full between lower Lambton Quay and the Railway Station during peak time and do not stop adding to a perception of poor value for money. Increased rapid travel from suburban hubs and CBD to avoid people being stranded in town.
- Sub #214: Does not support the removal of bus route 20. Suggests the exclusion of Highbury St stops would result in a walk to Kelburn bus station causing commute delays and hazards for school children.
- Sub #216: Suggests a look at traffic congestion, motor accidents, road works/bad roads and weather conditions and the effects these will have on the overall plan to save time on public transport.
- Sub #221: Suggests timetable adjustments for Newlands services as the transfers are often missed. Drivers on this service are also rude.
- Sub #227: Notes Wellington's recent large investment in rail and suggests similar investment to the trolley bus network to compliment the rail network rather than compete with it. Therefore, does not support proposed Johnsonville to Island Bay via Ngauranga Gorge bus route. Suggests use of Wakefield and Featherston Streets to relieve congestion on the "golden mile". Does not support proposed Wilton service ending at Hataitai rather than continue it to Kilbirnie. Does not support proposed hub and spoke model approach resulting in transfers rather than a single journey. Notes the costs to improve Kilbirnie hub with no concrete plans to do so.
- Sub #244: Requests more information regarding the new evening/weekend services to 10 new suburbs. Notes the current need for taxis based on no PT options.
- Sub #247: Does not support a bus service from Wellington to Johnsonville. Suggests these passengers use the train to save the city on PT.
- Sub #253: Suggests daytime services to Homebush road in Khandallah. Service required for elderly citizens to have access to hospital services.
- Sub #253: Suggests peak time wellington-Petone bus services are increased as Eastbourne peak services buses have capacity issues. Suggests reducing the 81 Eastbourne buses to every 20 minutes instead of every 15 minutes at peak times.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #255: Opposed to Southgate route proposal, as transferring buses to travel to the CBD will be unpleasant in winter.
- Sub #256: Supportive of busses that run later than 11pm to places outside of the CBD, particularly on the weekend when people stay out late. This would be good for individuals to save money and to lower carbon emissions.
- Sub #260: Supportive of route 11 plans. Particularly the East-West spine. Opposed to less direct travel to Ira St.
- Sub #262: Supports network review and rationalisation. Believes public safety should not be compromised as a result of any such review. A detailed safety assessment should be undertaken where changes are proposed to routes before these are agreed and publicly committed to. If further changes are required to be made, through what forum would public engagement occur? I support this and wish to remain involved in the options around any potential "minor route changes" to Route 19 before that is finalised.
- Sub #263: Suggests the distinction of public transport routes into core, local and targeted is an unnecessarily complication as the differences between groups is of no interest to users. Suggests it is important to consider the network as one entity and be careful not to remove links on the basis of just the patronage using that link as many low use services act as feeders to other services and to remove one link has a downward effect on others.
- Sub #265: Does not support the omission of key possible future connections for Upper Hutt i.e. no mention of the Riverstone bus service (which is regularly used by school children and rail commuters).
- Sub #269: Opposed to transfers at Kilbirnie.
- Sub #269: Supports the current route 3 frequency and an increased evening and weekend service.
- Sub #270: Proposes a new peak only service from Wrights Hill via Glenmore Street to Lambton Quay, as proposed route L will not adequately cater for current PT demands.
- Sub #271: Recommends transfer hubs are convenient through ensuring arrival/departure times for transferring trips match, facilities are provided for disabilities, pushchairs, parcels, i.e. within footpaths reach, without high steps, and that transferring passengers stay dry, even in rain.
- Sub #272: Recommends improved traffic control measures for traffic turning right out of Homebush Road on the proposed route 43/44, as the proposed route would be crossing the main traffic flow.
- Sub #278: Opposed to Karori Tunnel for a bus hub. Supports Victoria University as a hub, as there are more passengers bound for many more destinations.
- Sub #280: Opposed to reduction of direct services Wellington Public Hospital.
- Sub #284: Buses and trains should not be competing on the Johnsonville sector this represents a poor return on investment for the rail upgrade in this area
- Sub #289: Supports more crosstown routes - less route through the CBD.
- Sub #302: Suggests removing bus service from Johnsonville and making passengers use the train.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #305: Requests that any bus lane proposed for Karori be withdrawn due to minimal space of current parking facilities.
- Sub #314: Opposes changes to R44, due to longer travel times.
- Sub #315: Does not support the proposed hub concept for buses which would involve transfers. Notes the difficulty for the elderly to reach the hospital.
- Sub #321: Supports the extension of services to the route 8 that serves Brooklyn West. Opposes any extension route 29 services. Suggests cancelling the route 29 and run a shuttle bus from Brooklyn Library to Happy Valley in peak hours Monday to Friday.
- Sub #323: Opposes changes to R5 as bus capacity at peak times is limited to standing room only.
- Sub #323: Oppose changes to the R14 due to lack of capacity at peak times and longer travel duration.
- Sub #327: Requests further face-to-face consultation meetings and that consideration is given to an ageing population in a very steep, windy suburb.
- Sub #329: Supports continuing the after midnight bus service.
- Sub #331: Supports the submission from the Wilton Residents' Association re. Wilton and Mairangi bus routes.
- Sub #335: Requests a review of the evening intervals between services on route A in order to make it consistent with other core routes, as otherwise the pattern of interchanges will not work effectively.
- Sub #335: Supports the layout of the four core bus routes, except that of the northern and southern sections of the north-south spine have very different operating characteristics, and might be better kept separate.
- Sub #353: Does not support the removal of bus route 5 and the replacement of route O. Currently nine route 5 buses running between 7.30-8.30am and will reduce to two. Notes the capacity issues this will cause. Also extra transfers needed for students and elderly. Suggests Grafton Rd not suitable for more buses and cautions the roll on affects this will have.
- Sub #358: Recommends work be done to prevent bottlenecks at bus stops near footpaths during peak times.
- Sub #365: Suggests the Wellington bus hub be kept where it is outside the train station as it is the logical place for integrating the public transport systems. Suggests smaller buses for suiting narrow winding streets. More frequency during peak, less in off-peak.
- Sub #370: Opposes removal of bus route from Caledonia Road because many residents would have to go to Hobart Street for service, and walk long distances in the dark during off-peak hours. Current express 30 from Wellington Station runs late and will add to peak time customer frustrations.
- Sub #372: Recommends the Council looking at scheduling so buses don't come in clumps especially at peak times.
- Sub #376: Supports fewer buses on the Golden Mile as they compete with pedestrians who are always in a hurry even at 30kph, they are still dangerous.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #389: Opposes no direct route from Karori Park terminus via Kelburn and The Terrace because the existing route 17 takes pressure of Lambton Quay and is very useful transport option for those working on the Terrace, Boulcott Street and the upper end of Willis Street. Suggests putting larger buses on Karori Road will not make any impact as they will still end up in the traffic jam that is Karori Road in the morning. Recommends the only way to improve it is to extend bus lanes from Chafer Street to Karori Mall.
- Sub #390: Suggests Seatoun bus run via Miramar and Roxy Cinema.
- Sub #394: Suggests overall network improvement by: having higher capacity vehicles (bending/double decker), reducing vehicle movements to 60/hr, removing current competition between bus and rail by staggering timetables and increasing service, turning the Golden Mile into a bus/pedestrian space with no cars, fixing the bus hubs so they are attractive and well-functioning, having a more legible numbering system, providing a full Highbury service via Aro Valley.
- Sub #396: Suggests priority traffic lights for buses to reduce significant delays.
- Sub #397: Opposes proposed new bus routes as planned because this will mean catching 3 buses to Newtown that is Miramar (Darlington Road) to Miramar Ave, Miramar Ave to Kilbirnie, Kilbirnie to Newtown which isn't an efficient use of time and having to wait for interconnecting buses. Suggests having tourists coming to Miramar to Weta Cave and catching 2 buses to get to the end point does not seem efficient or attractive for tourist.
- Sub #400: Suggests route "I" (Mills Road, Cleveland Street, Washington Avenue, Brooklyn Road) should not have reduced frequency of services as current peak buses are often at capacity and more patronage should be expected if the route is extended through Vogeltown. Suggests the average peak frequency should be 7 or 8 minutes rather than the proposed 10 (currently 9 minutes average).
- Sub #401: Suggests decisions need to be made whether public transport is a service or a commercial venture because it is extremely difficult/impossible to satisfy both approaches. Recommends that regardless of how frequent the services, passengers will not change buses multiple times for a journey from the suburbs to the city. Suggests altering the roading layouts to ensure that public transport has not just priority, but an unimpeded path to be able to maintain the schedules.
- Sub #404: Opposes the proposed Route L service using Campbell Street to service the Victoria University Karori Campus because it will appear more inconvenient to bus users where the main entrance to this campus is on Donald Street and current services to the campus use Donald Street.
- Sub #404: Suggests the proposed bus routes rely heavily on getting a large number of passengers to disembark and then board at least one other bus to complete their journey. Suggests it will take more time for passengers to complete their journey and in some cases it will make the private car again seem a more viable and timely option.
- Sub #404: Recommends bus travel times could be sped up by removing all other vehicles from the bus route and providing bus priority at traffic lights through the CBD.
- Sub #404: Recommends rather than heavily relying on a flyover, a better option would have been to enlarge the current bus tunnel to create a dual lane tunnel, rather than the

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

current single lane. This would keep buses away from other traffic allowing them to travel more efficiently.

- Sub #404: Suggests hub facilities would still need to be developed for Miramar and there are problems when there is wet weather, low light or at night time at existing facilities. Suggests hubs requiring passengers to change buses need to reflect places to change where passengers would require fewer bus changes. For example somebody travelling from the eastern suburbs (Miramar, Strathmore etc.) who is wanting to travel to the hospital would need to use 3 buses to get to the hospital. Suggests the hub for transfers to be at Kilbirnie rather than at Miramar.
- Sub #404: Suggests Miramar is also becoming more of a tourist destination with a higher number of visitors (including international tourists) coming to the suburb to visit Weta Cave and Weta Workshop and the proposed local route will be more inconvenient for tourists and may in fact discourage them from visiting this and other attractions.
- Sub #404: Suggests Miramar is one the areas identified by the Wellington City Council for more intensive housing as there is currently a very good public transport system and therefore not everybody in the household would require their own vehicle. The proposed change of routes does not appear to follow the same philosophy.
- Sub #404: Requests keeping some of the current Route 11 service particularly along part of Hobart Street Miramar as residents will have a longer walk to catch a bus as the proposed bus routes doesn't go down Hobart Street. Suggests with the route changes passengers from Taranaki St, Wallace St and Newtown will not have a direct service that takes them close to the airport using the current Route 11 service instead of the current 91 route service.
- Sub #404: Suggests the proposed Route I appears to include a left turn from Priscilla Crescent onto Balfour Street (when travelling towards Newtown) requires the bus to be driven on the wrong side of the road to enable the turn to be made. Suggests bus routes should be ensuring that all services can use the road spaces legally without having to drive on the wrong side of the road or requiring U-turn or reversing to complete the route.
- Sub #406: Opposes decreasing the number of buses on routes or in making it harder with multiple change overs between buses for people to travel in buses because patronage will decrease and people will use alternative methods of transportation.
- Sub #409: Does not support the development of dedicated bus lanes on Karori Rd. Suggests adverse impact on Marsden Village businesses with the removal of kerbside parking. Requests to meet with officers of GW, WCC, and the traffic management/flow specialist consultants retained by the respective Councils to present data showing the likely impact on the businesses with the removal of kerbside parking - even for limited periods. Notes very limited options for the provision of other than kerbside parking in an attempt to mitigate.
- Sub #411: Supports the timetable review which will lead to far less buses in the city.
- Sub #411: Supports improved off peak coverage for suburban dwellers.
- Sub #411: Suggests Hataitai tunnel peak services are a jewel in the crown for Eastern suburbs and this route needs to be carefully managed to give service improvements at times when existing buses are overloaded because the travel experience will determine patronage.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #412: Supports the new Wellington bus network.
- Sub #412: Opposes routing buses away from the Golden Mile to deal with the congestion. Supports the proposal for split bus stops, reducing private cars on the Golden Mile. Recommends introducing electronic bus information kiosks to reduce delays when people ask drivers for bus information.
- Sub #419: Suggests Ngauranga would make a good bus/rail interchange for the northern suburbs (to avoid a costly/time-consuming detour via Wellington). Suggests upgrades to proposed interchanges before new routes begin (Wellington railway/Kilbirnie etc.) as they will become more heavily used.
- Sub #420: Supports retaining the current bus route 5 as this is an essential service during busy morning commute times. Suggests if this service is dropped, the alternative will be a 14 bus running far less frequently and adding time to the transfer to city.
- Sub #424: Requests the following in regards to Houghton Valley/Melrose/Southgate services: more than 3 direct services to the CBD to meet the weekday peak, transport for school children (i.e. from the Basin Reserve in the afternoon), late night services all week, the continuation of the Lyall Bay service to Hungerford Rd, connections between southern suburbs and eastern suburbs, a direct link to the University, timely/consistent connections removing travel time/capacity issues, weather proof shelters at the Newtown hub including toilet facilities and safety measures explored, fair public transport expenditure per ward resident. Opposes the changes to current bus routes 3/6/22/23/32 as it will reduce frequency of service for Lyall Bay especially at peak times. Notes the topography and distance from Wellington provides no other commuting option (walking/cycling). Requests meeting with council officers to work through these issues.
- Sub #427: Support the proposed bus network acknowledging that it is more efficient than the existing network, and appears to be more adaptable to future changes and the introduction of new vehicle technologies.
- Sub #428: Support a centralised bus terminal at Queensgate. Current set-up makes it difficult for new passengers to find their bus, and spreads security problems over a large area. Support the relocation of the entire terminal into Bunny Street i.e. removing the existing bus stop from the frontage of Queens Drive. Provide toilets for bus patrons due to people relieving themselves in doorways.
- Sub #435: Proposed route M terminate at Norwich St rather than continuing to Johnsonville as it would be too full by the time it reaches Northland. Peak M buses should have increased frequency than proposed regardless. M1 route should go down Glenmore St, Tinakori Rd and Bowen St as the current 13 service does as it contains a bus lane and is quicker and the Terrace is congested on rainy days.
- Sub #437: Suggests route C to continue the combined evening 10-minute headway currently offered by routes 2, 11, 43, 44, rather than reducing this to 30 minutes; and enable retention of trolleys by wiring Miramar cutting, but if trolleys are withdrawn make the route more direct by diverting along Ira St instead of Hobart St, and route Q via Hobart St instead of Ira St. Also suggests all non-trolleybus routes terminating at Wellington station to be diverted from the south to run via Molesworth St and Murphy St. and ensure that both routes to VUW Kelburn match the 10-minute headway of the connecting core routes.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #438: While current network coverage is mapped in terms of distance from core routes and stops, there is Analyse distance network coverage (in time or walking distance) in terms of distance from core routes for the proposed network.
- Sub #439: Suggests when bus lanes are fully in place Council needs to allow free movement of buses regardless of general traffic conditions before through services are introduced. Recommends to provide flexibility of response to frequently occurring traffic disruption, spine services should be a mix of through buses and buses terminating in the city centre, the latter allowing service to continue independently in an unaffected area.
- Sub #439: Suggests Council needs to increase budget necessary to provide, as a minimum, the current levels of service to a growing population living both over a greater area (Churton Park) and in a greater density of housing (Johnsonville). Suggests Wellington City Council has in place the Northern Growth Framework and Greater Wellington Regional Council planning must be consistent with that, allowing for increased growth costs in these areas.
- Sub #443: Supports new weekend services, more frequent off peak services and services running later in the evening.
- Sub #443: Recommends a new link between the Hutt and Porirua over the Haywards Hill to facilitate the Whitireia Polytechnic attendance by Hutt students. Could be a Polytechnic and GWRC joint project for funding.
- Sub #443: Supports the ferry links connecting Day's Bay and Petone to Wellington.
- Sub #447: Queries if there will be enough buses and capacity for passengers at the busiest time of the peak hour along the Golden Mile.
- Sub #447: Agrees buses contribute to congestion along the Golden Mile and proposes several solutions including moving / extending bus stops, introducing bus clearways, narrowing sections of the footpath and restricting private vehicle access during peak times.
- Sub #448: Suggests expanding the bus service from Whitby and Papakowhai and the Paremata Station during the peak hours to meet the local population growth and encourage public transport use.
- Sub #453: Strongly supports integrated networks and the need for all transport modes to work seamlessly together. However seeks clarity on the definition of 'mode share' in the PT Plan to ensure that both walking and cycling - as vital components of successful Public Transport – are planned for, and included to work seamlessly together with bus, ferry and train services.
- Sub #453: Suggests that bus priority measures, including bus lanes and other infrastructure must be fit for purpose and deliver significant reductions in travel times relative to the private motor vehicle.
- Sub #453: Support the overall intent and principles behind the network design, which will attract customers through its interconnectivity and all day high frequency rate.
- Sub #455: Transfer hubs need to be comfortable and provide proper shelter for commuters. Bus connections at transfer points need to be reliable and commuters need to be able to step from one bus straight onto a connecting bus without a 20 minute wait.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #460: Suggests two all-day bus routes for Churton Park (east and west). These should be dedicated services departing from Courtenay Place and Brandon Street during evening peak times (alternating with buses departing from Island Bay) and bypass the Johnsonville hub. Notes the growing residents/housing in Churton Park and the current capacity/time issues with buses through Johnsonville.
- Sub #462: RPH recommends that public transport stations are designed in a way which allows them to become natural focal points for communities; places that people use and interact with as part of their everyday life.
- Sub #462: RPH supports an integrated public transport network that encourages higher land use densities and development in nodes and corridors with close access to public transport
- Sub #468: Recommends new bus routes that make a loop of the outer roads of the inner city, so from the Railway station toward Courtenay Place, around the Basin and through to Karo drive and Willis Street. That loop would capture people who want to get across town. There is no way to get from the inner-city Western side to the inner-city Eastern side without changing buses.
- Sub #471: Does not want a repeat of the issues with the introduction of the Matangi trains when the new bus fleet is purchased. Suggests using a reputable company, ensure new buses fit on all routes on the network, ensure the mechanics can fix them and spare parts are available (or create a local industry around manufacturing spare parts. Get financial partners onboard to reduce risk of future privatisation. Bulk buy with other NZ councils.
- Sub #471: Agrees with more frequent & widespread bus stops (within 500m of a connection).
- Sub #471: Location of bus hub. So long as I don't get wet, and it's safe, I don't mind walking a bit.
- Sub #473: For various reasons there has been little effort until now to link northern suburb bus routes to southern suburb bus routes, to reduce bus congestion and equalise loadings. The proposal to link routes is basically sensible, but has consequences for what kind of buses can run linked routes.
- Sub #473: Notes the current weekend timetables allows 15 minutes from the Mairangi Terminus to the Railway Station. I doubt whether in fact this would allow one bus and driver to maintain a 30 minute service, so why not use 2 buses and run the service as far as Courtenay Place (22 minutes)?
- Sub #473: If those catching the M1 before Wilton will largely be going to Kelburn for the University, shouldn't those buses go that way, and the other M ones at that time run down Glenmore Street? Suggests trials should be done before the final contracts are signed. Another option, if the Johnsonville train line is working well, is to revert to the option of starting a bus at Crofton Downs that was previously proposed.
- Sub #473: Opposes the proposal to reduce the Sunday services on the M and O routes to the Mairangi area. Suggests timings on the two routes are offset by 30 minutes. Concerned the M1 will bring unpunctuality to the morning peak if every second bus has to wind round a circuitous route in Khandallah, resulting in massive overcrowding of the alternate M buses.
- Sub #473: Suggests some more shelters on The Terrace would be needed.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #475: Concerned about proposed changes to bus routes on Hataitai, particularly the discontinuance of the No. 5 route and the fact that the proposed O route will terminate in Hataitai. The changes will result in a longer commute, increased bus traffic along the unsuitably narrow Grafton Road, no direct buses to Rongotai College or Wellington East Girls College, difficulty for the elderly in travelling to Kilbirnie which is the location of many services used by Hataitai residents. The two latter issues seem to indicate that the review has not properly taken into account community of interest or how facilities are used.
- Sub #479: Suggests uninterrupted bus journeys from Seatoun/Strathmore/Island Bay via Newtown to city centre, a direct Strathmore bus route to the Pacific Island Church on Daniel St in Newtown and a rename of these services to "Strathmore Park" (the legal name of the suburb). Supports a Seatoun bus running via Miramar but suggests three bus routes would be an overkill for the area.
- Sub #481: Does not support the removal of bus route 11. Suggests a new trolley route that services Miramar Peninsula/Wellington Hospital/Toi Whakaari/Massey University/Wellington High school and the Railway Station.
- Sub #482: New route designs need to include customer demand (ex. Aro Valley has a strong preference for travel to Lambton Quay during the day and Te Aro in the evening) and topography (taking into account vertical separation from bus routes as well as horizontal distance). Supports the core geometric concepts from Jarred Walker but suggests customising for individual cities.
- Sub #484: Suburban transport ring-routes attached to public transport transfer stations to allow for smaller buses, decrease waiting time and to cut down on the number of buses converging in the central city.
- Sub #486: Suggests the operational plan, routes, frequencies, etc. require regular review for effectiveness and schedules and service modes should be reviewed for best service/value fit. Supports the plan to reduce bus volume through the Golden Mile. Suggests an introduction of dynamic routing and load management in the next few years.
- Sub #495: Opposes the discontinuation of the No 5 route as it often has standing passengers, will extend walk from 3 minutes to 13 minutes and will reduce patronage / increase private car use.
- Sub #500: People do not like transfer and do not like to wait. Requiring people to transfer off peak will be a deterrent for those with other transport options; particularly if the transfer process is not as seamless as the plan envisages.
- Sub #500: Appreciate the objective to decrease congestion and thereby decrease travel times in the Golden Mile. However, will the standard core services provide enough capacity and frequency in off peak times?
- Sub #500: Off Peak frequencies a disincentive; faced with a 30 minute or 60 minute frequency, using a car is far a more attractive proposition than a bus.
- Sub #500: Considers the spine is logical in theory, but concerned with peak time reliability.
- Sub #502: Would like to see Churton Park buses servicing both east-west and north-south options, not just the north-south spine. Notes concern at proposal to have the 54 bus go from the roundabout at Westchester and Middleton Rd, up to the shopping area.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

Suggests alternative route along Middleton Rd to Halswater Drive and following 54 bus route along Burbank Crescent to the Village area. Consider only concerned about the future potential property owners in Churton Park and ignoring the needs of those of us who have lived in CP for more than 35 and who are happy with current bus system, although more peak time buses from Wellington in the evening would be appreciated.

- Sub #509: Oppose increased passenger transfers as would unnecessarily add time to the commute and cause stress to already time-poor students. Students with disabilities will be further marginalised as transferring buses creates an additional barrier to getting to class. The idea that all services must travel through the centre-city is outmoded 1950s hub-and-spoke thinking. More innovation is needed so that more passengers can travel more flexibly. The plan is over-ambitious as Wellington faces particular challenges; crowded roads, unpredictable weather, poor road design, low-skilled bus operators with poor customer service skills, poor quality or non-existent bus shelters which mean the system is not robust enough to deliver on-time buses capable of connecting seamlessly and would result in chaos and ultimate fall-offs in patronage.
- Sub #513: Concerned about the much earlier end to evening service "On your description the service is currently listed as ending at (approximately) midnight. Under the new plan the last bus (for my route) is listed as ending at (approximately) 10pm, at the more distant Johnsonville terminus."
- Sub #513: Requests reconsideration of the last bus time and considers people will not use a system that will not take them home.
- Sub #515: Considers change to route 21 via Kelburn is good as it allows University Students to reside in this area of Karori. Concerned only 2 morning & evening trips down Lambton Quay would not suffice. Suggest that the No.21 travel through Kelburn, down the terrace, and along Lambton quay, and then continue with its proposed destination or if not possible -have at least 4 morning & 4 evening trips for commuters.
- Sub #516: Requests time to sit down with Regional Transport Planners to regarding bus route ideas: Miramar to Wilton/Mairangi/Wadestown loop (via extended Trolleybus network), Wilton via Tce, Randwick Rd, Curtis St to new terminus, Miramar to Karori extended to South Karori, Houghton Bay/Southgate rerouted to Karori West via Wrights Hill (Hourly), Highbury through routed to Mt Vic and Vogeltown, Rongotai extended to Moa point during peaks (finishing buses), Miramar Heights from Rail via Evans Bay (hourly), Happy Valley via Brooklyn and on to new terminus at Island Bay, Houghton Bay and Southgate additional services from Hospital, routed with Hospital to Vogeltown or Kowhai Park, Eastern suburbs local routes from Kilbirnie, Lyall Bay operates from Rail via Mt Vic Bus Tunnel, Karori Park to Island Bay, Seatoun via Taranaki St, Ngaio/Khandallah services to Strathmore via Taranaki St (linking Massey Uni/Wgtn High) with northern suburbs, Kowhai Park additional services.
- Sub #516: Suggests routes too long and offers ideas for infrastructure including: separate stops with passing loops for different routes, improved parking enforcement (possible towing policy), better signage identifying no parking areas, removing some on street parking in Lambton Quay, widen bus lane from Stout St to Bowen St, increased layover/storage parking near rail and Courtenay Place, Stout St for rail terminating buses, increase the use of Brandon St for commencing addition peak hour services bound for Northern/Western Suburbs, work with The Transport Agency and Wellington City Council to improve roading to enable motor vehicles to flow out/around the city

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

quickly, re-route railway terminating buses via Stout St, underground bus station in Courtenay Place.

- Sub #518: Suggests route changes should have included scenarios with trolleys and the use of battery charging with overhead wires resulting in greater flexibility.
- Sub #521: For people wishing to access the hospital by bus (workers, patients, family members etc.) it is important that services go to and leave from the very front of the hospital - John Street is too far away.
- Sub #525: Route 45 - the proposal to have this route run between Khandallah and Courtenay Place would greatly increase patronage. Now passengers on the 45 route which terminates in Brandon Street pay the highest fares in the city. There is no stop between the Railway Station and Brandon Street for all but 2 of the timetabled buses. The site of the stop at the Railway Station means a long walk to the Lambton Quay terminus especially when NIS buses are parked on the stop and in bad weather this can be very unpleasant.
- Sub #529: Does not support the removal of bus route 5 as there are a large number of users catching this bus along Hataitai Road or Waipapa Road. Suggests services from Hataitai to go straight through the Hataitai bus tunnel (rather than going Roseneath /Oriental Bay) as it will reduce time and capacity issues. Suggests keeping bus route 14 to service these areas separately.
- Sub #538: Very satisfied with current Mairangi service. Made a submission last time re: bus changes and very pleased that seemed Regional Council representatives were really listening to comments as changes made to original plan. Extremely surprised to find that now all the changes that had been agreed to were mostly completely reversed! Concerned many people in the Mairangi bus route area do not realise that many of the changes after the last consultation now reversed. Seems they have to fight again to be heard.
- Sub #538: Consider the Mairangi buses should continue through the central city for reasons detailed in earlier submissions, the Sunday service should not be reduced in any way, the extension of the bus route should only go to Crofton Downs.
- Sub #544: The interchange at Karori will need a lot of design, the spaces are really small, the sites are really exposed and will need really good shelters.
- Sub #546: Consider the net effect of Mairangi changes could well be that more people actually travel by car to the city thus clogging up the roads. If these changes go ahead in their present form more likely to either walk or take car as both will be quicker.
- Sub #546: Work at the hospital and currently catch a 22 or 23 all the way to Wgtn Hospital. When other family members travel to the city to work , they can catch the bus that takes them anywhere in the city from Lambton Quay to Courtney Place and beyond. The new planned service will take us 3 minutes in the WRONG direction to Wgtn Rail Station where we then have to change buses to travel to say Willis St. Absurd! No longer can we get off anywhere in the city on a single bus ride.
- Sub #546: Concerned that a lot of students and young working people live in the Wilton , Kelburn, Northland areas and they would all have to change buses just to get to their workplaces in the city which is less than 5kms away. A person working in Willis St on his way home would have to travel to the Station and then change buses just to get up to Northland thus adding a possible 15 to 30 minutes to the homeward journey. I hear

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

that you want less buses going through the city, but why don't they run up Victoria St or Wakefield/Taranaki St. Feel concerns raised in previous submissions do not appear to have been listened to.

- Sub #546: It is proposed to have some of 22 and 23 buses travel onto Crofton Downs and Johnsonville which have train services. A double up of services albeit different modes.
- Sub #546: Saturday afternoon buses to Mairangi get standing room only. Sunday buses are proposed to be cut back to once an hour. Why? Sundays can be almost as busy as Saturdays.
- Sub #550: Does not support proposed routes M/M1 terminating at Wellington bus station as this will increase travel time for commuters who wish to go to the city centre/Wellington hospital. Suggest M routes also extend to Johnsonville but notes possible congestion issues for this. Suggests higher frequency on Sundays. Notes a decision to return to Wilton via Wellington bus station based on which M or O service comes first. Does not support the removal of extra Wadestown buses as these are needed in bad weather/winter. Requests further consultation.
- Sub #553: Considers scrapping of the 47 is the most stupid thing ever heard and would affect (and annoy) hundreds of university students who you are planning to leave out of the reduced pricing anyway. Central spine idea makes it difficult, time-consuming and expensive to travel from one point "off the spine" to another. Leave the spine to the trains but make sure to keep buses that go between the suburbs.
- Sub #554: Notes that as a person with a physical mobility difficulty who does not drive a car, having to change buses at a hub "fills me with horror" due to additional difficulty and stress of having to board and alight twice per journey, time and discomfort waiting for a connection in Wellington winter, in the dark, and, the risk of a longer total journey time. Also concerned about a longer distance between stops.
- Sub #557: Concerned that if the current 23 and 10 buses are replaced by route B, then off peak travel will require a transfer and second ticket purchase at Newtown to get to the CBD, increasing commuting costs by 100%. This will discourage bus use as cars will be less expensive than buses.
- Sub #559: Opposes bus lane in Marsden Village, would dramatically effect business and happiness in Marsden Village, Karori.
- Sub #560: Opposes extra-large buses over Melrose, Roseneath, Brooklyn roads as too dangerous both for the drivers and their passengers.
- Sub #561: Coverage is important to include those that are not able to walk. Peak time transport definitely needs a rethink as often some buses are full and others empty. Any move to improve timeliness, efficiency, without degradation of coverage is a positive move. Over 30 years in the same residence, the walk to local bus stop has changed from just 150m to 500 to a possible 1km.
- Sub #562: Opposed to the hub and spoke model approach. Adopting a transfer system with intending passengers having to transfer buses to reach a given destination is doomed to failure and will result in a massive reduction in patronage in the short term which will be difficult to recover. It has been tried before without success, especially with no concrete plans to improve the infrastructure, which at Kilbirnie alone will mean large and costly alterations to the existing facility. The fact that only just over 2% of the

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

\$494M to be spent on public transport infrastructure is earmarked for buses, means that the changes proposed for the successful implementation of the plan will not be able to be accommodated.

- Sub #562: Concerned over proposal to terminate the Wilton service at Hataitai rather than continue it to Kilbirnie when the potential catchment through to Kilbirnie is realised.
- Sub #562: No merit in road and rail competing against each other, rather they should be complimentary, which is why are opposed to the introduction of the proposed north/south spine which would be better served utilizing the current Johnsonville rail link to Wellington station and the current Island Bay to Wellington Railway service with the proposed new integrated ticketing system.
- Sub #562: Suggests to relieve pressure on the "Golden Mile" that former "city outer route" streets, primarily [Wakefield & Featherston Streets] could be utilized.
- Sub #563: Opposes placing a bus lane along the Karori Road as will remove the very little parking that is available for shoppers and will kill businesses on the road front who are struggling for parking
- Sub #564: Considers proposed changes from the current Wellington City bus network include frequent core buses every 10-15 minutes that are no more frequent than the current situation from Kilbirnie. If there is going to be an increase in buses along the spine to service hubs then significant work is needed to encourage existing passengers who travel out to the noncore areas to keep using the buses. This needs to include; comfortable, sheltered, safe places to wait for the connecting bus; extended afternoon peak timetables during winter when it is harder to walk the half kilometre or more home in the cold and dark; frequent bus and minibus services between the hub and the non-core areas.
- Sub #570: The peak number 5 service should be retained - otherwise we going to have full buses from other locations leaving Hataitai passengers at the bus stop. The 14 bus service should start/finish at Kilbirnie. Kilbirnie is a destination point for many who use the 14 bus. The plan doesn't appear to take account of the Bus Rapid Transit system that is planned when the second Mt Victoria tunnel is built. Moxham Avenue will become severely congested when the The Transport Agency intentions take effect. This needs to be factored into the plans.
- Sub #573: Concerned the Plan makes no provision for direct service Karori to Wellington Hospital or Newtown. As the largest suburb with a large population of older people this is critical. The existing route 18 should be retained to allow direct service to Hospital and Newtown, to continue to cater for passengers between Karori Campus, Kelburn and Massey and avoids inner city travel - via Ghuznee St.
- Sub #574: Concerned at proposed loss of direct bus services between city and Cashmere outside peak hours in direct conflict with the stated aim of the Regional Public Transport Plan of more bus coverage.
- Sub #584: Support proposed network changes such as reducing duplications, improved daily services to poorly-served areas (including Mt Victoria), and frequent service for areas of high demand. All regional and Wellington City services should enable timely and accessible transitions between network modes and services.
- Sub #589: Supports network approach. Notes over-emphasis on north-south and east-west corridors spines' with limited definition of their location, a clash where they cross,

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

and an assumption that people would wish to move in and around the region in such a manner. Support reducing duplications, improved daily services to poorly-served areas (including Mt Victoria), and frequent service for areas of high demand.

- Sub #590: Supports concept of connections to increase frequency. Disappointed at infrequency of weekend services. Core routes should be 15 minute frequency or less 7 days. Concerned on choice of spine following SH1 between Basin Reserve and Kilbirnie and about Ruahine Street spine duplicating/replacing Hataitai service with poorer placement for passengers and that it was done to tie bus network to RoNS programme to justify road duplication. Concerned about pedestrian safety issues in having to cross SH1 to get to bus stops. Buses should not be routed down Ruahine Street if there are no bus stops, excepting expresses. Welcomes continued implementation of bus lanes preceding development of spine.
- Sub #592: Johnsonville core route should be on main route to Churton Park with connecting services rather than branching. Supports 15 minute frequency. Supports Integrating Cable Car with the network by diverting buses to the Kelburn Terminus for easy interchange & congestion free trip to/from Lambton Quay. Supports making the Karori South and Karori West peak services into expresses with coordinated timetable on the common section. Review Hutt Valley buses. Core route to Wainuiomata needed with one or more feeder routes. Reduce length of the 110 due to lateness issues.
- Sub #593: Questions if new routes were designed to make trolley buses unusable. Considers spine was defined as the CBD to Newtown and that buses running to outer areas should be programmed to have more frequent buses (from a variety of starting points (may hourly/ half hourly staggered to give 15min/ 10min or even 5min (at times) along the spine routes. Simply extending routes and having buses run longer routes means that a delay anywhere will cause the whole route to run late. Supports network transfer stations to feed the outer spokes which are in "interesting" places so that customers are happy to shop/window shop etc.
- Sub #594: Favours extending the suburban routes.
- Sub #597: Service level proposed for Route A from Johnsonville is too high after 2017. Delete proposal for Route O and split the Route C 10 minute service to Seatoun at Miramar where half the trips should go to the Miramar terminus and half to Seatoun. Proposals to introduce feeder routes and circuits are a retrograde step which will lead to a reduction in fare revenue. Proposals for Mairangi Route M turn it into a second rate service which will reduce fare income by stopping all trips at the Railway Station and also require more subsidy due to the proposal to extend all trips to Johnsonville. Submitter provides to summary tables of the current vs proposed trips and considers a lot of timetable work, effective bus priority measures and maybe larger bus sizes are still needed to achieve a reduction in congestion below current levels.
- Sub #598: Supports. The Centre considers that bus frequency is a more important characteristic of successful public transport, and hopes that the proposed combination of larger vehicles and faster journey times is not at the expense of bus frequencies.
- Sub #600: The proposal increases that distance to the #54 which is very far at present already. I would suggest that the Council secures land presently un-built upon at 34 Winsley Terrace for the purpose of a walkway from Winsley to Ohariu Road. It has been used as such for years and formalisation could ameliorate concerns about the changes to route 54.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #601: Requests confirmation that a greater frequency will apply for short periods during the morning and early evening peak times for CBD commuters.
- Sub #601: Requests reassurance that the 15 trips/week is still an intention on Route #210. The 210/211 has 15 minute intervals but the proposed states 30 minute intervals.
- Sub #601: The GPA fully supports what is proposed for Route A even though our residents will only use this service occasionally. We strongly suggest this route be extended to include an off-peak service at hourly intervals. This could then also provide a way residents at the southern end of Glenside (Monterey) could get to the Churton Park Shopping Centre.
- Sub #605: Reconsider cutting the off peak trips on Route C4 Karori West. Rearrange service to provide a round trip to Karori West and on the Karori South route.
- Sub #605: Does not support Unit 5 Central Route O terminating at Hataitai and suggests it should terminate at Kilbirnie. Opposes Oriental Bay/Roseneath/Hataitai catchment users having to change buses at Hataitai. Hataitai transfers would require users crossing two pedestrian crossings/roads and the outward bus stop offers little weather protection. Opposes bus being required to make a right hand turn from Waitoa into Hataitai Road. Suggests GWRC needs to observe traffic volumes and reassess this proposal for peak times.
- Sub #612: Considers proposed changes do not increase bus frequencies or improve the bus experience. If spine services will be increased to service the hubs then need to provide comfortable, warm, safe places to wait for the connecting buses (not a bus shelter); extended afternoon peak timetables to the branches during winter; and frequent bus and minibus services between the hub and the non-core areas to retain bus users.
- Sub #619: Suggests smaller buses on some routes in off peak periods.
- Sub #619: Does not support changes to bus routes 22/50.
- Sub #625: Does not support the proposed design as routes are too simplistic. Suggests staggering timetables for bus routes 14/24. Notes the current 14 bus is very unreliable with many delays. Supports the proposed route for 24 for frequent full week service. Requests real time indicator outside 260 Oriental Parade as it is the busiest stop on the bay.
- Sub #627: Does not support proposed bus lanes taking away kerbside parking as retail will become non-existent.
- Sub #628: Does not support plans to place a bus green lane along Karori Road as it will require the removal of car parking in Marsden Village and inevitably lead to closure of businesses in the area.
- Sub #631: Suggests increasing services on weekends. For safety reasons, suggests buses: use Jervois Quay in CBD, reduce in size in order to turn properly (not extending into lawns etc.), focus on passenger comfort and not journey time, train/pay drivers accordingly and offer better working conditions. Notes the current bus service take twice as long as walking in the CBD. Suggests more funding as most goes to rail.
- Sub #635: Does not support changes to the Churton Park bus routes. Suggests Churton Park West/East services, regular local/city services on weekdays, double

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

decker buses will take too long to load/unload. Notes the current capacity/reliability issues on these services and the need to change to new (further) bus stops.

- Sub #637: Opposes changes to 22/23 services because buses are already often late and extending the service to Crofton Downs would further reduce reliability. Recommend instead that Route 47 Johnsonville – John Street service be more frequent and run every day.
- Sub #638: Suggests Golden Mile bus issues be a priority, increase weekend services, better signage of network maps/timetables/maps of the local area/directions to train and bus stops, frequent services on 5/10/15min intervals, interchanges being safe/convenient, proposed network mapped in terms of distance from core routes/stops.
- Sub #639: Generally supports the proposed changes which could result in cost efficiencies to be applied as fare subsidies to grow patronage. However is concerned about specific routes including proposals for bus routes on Homebush Road in Khandallah and the lack of a bus service down Onslow Road, and the number 18 bus route to Victoria University, and that the need to take two buses to travel to the hospital in some eastern suburbs is not suitable for elderly, families with young children and people with disabilities. Suggests more consultation is required with affected communities to ensure that their needs are being addressed.
- Sub #640: Believes every new route from Ngaio should continue right through town instead of stopping at the rail station
- Sub #642: Opposed to terminating the no. 14 at Hataitai as this will mean passengers wanting to go to Rongotai have to transfer to another bus.
- Sub #642: Opposed to removing the Number 5 route, as capacity on alternative routes will not cater for the number of passengers that will use them.
- Sub #642: Opposed to proposed change to the route 14, as using Hataitai Road to re-enter the route at Hataitai School will eliminate present pick-up spots along Waipapa Road, and will not meet the objective of making public transport convenient.
- Sub #642: Opposed to GW's stated objective of having bus stops "within 1 km of every home", as this takes no account of Wellington's topography. Suggests struggling uphill for 1 km is a daunting prospect for all but the very fit. Suggests this is the scenario for many Hataitai residents if the number 5 is eliminated, and the number 14 loops around via Hataitai Road.

Subtopic: Victoria University access (32 submissions)

Officer Comments:

The proposed bus network is a move away from having specific dedicated university bus routes that benefit some suburbs and leave others unserved. The new network aims to provide frequent connections to and from Victoria University at key hubs so that people from more areas of Wellington can access the University easily.

While many would need to change buses to reach Victoria University overall travel times may be reduced by offering the option to use more frequent and direct routes, including express services, and minimising the average wait time for a bus.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

For example from Newtown instead of waiting for a specific route 18 bus departing every 30 minutes during the day (average wait 15 minutes) any bus can be used departing every 5 to 10 minutes from Newtown with a free connection at Courtenay Place to Kelburn departing every 10 to 15 minutes (average wait 8 to 13 minutes).

By providing a more efficient network with less overlap and duplication of services we can provide more frequent services and more weekend and evening services across Wellington including Victoria University.

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #15: Look at alternative routes for crossing the city or make more frequent such as the 47 Johnsonville - Newtown or Campus Connection - much faster route to Te Aro from Northland than always going along the Golden Mile.
- Sub #139: Does not support the proposed changes to the number 23 bus route as it is an important link to Northland via Victoria University.
- Sub #142: Does not support the removal of bus routes 18, 22 and 23.
- Sub #144: Does not support the removal of bus route 18. Suggests 18 route should go through Mt Cook and Newtown as opposed to Mt Victoria.
- Sub #145: Does not support the removal of the number 18 bus service. The proposed changes will significantly increase travel and costs for students living in the Eastern Suburbs and Newtown. Suggests increase of this service during peak hours to accommodate the full buses.
- Sub #149: Supports the continuing of Victoria University bus routes 18, 20 and 47. There is a safety concern for single females walking longer distances to their home with the new proposed structure.
- Sub #151: Does not support the removal of bus route 18 as it is regularly used by many.
- Sub #153: The route number 18 is the quickest route in the Golden mile and it should not be removed.
- Sub #155: Suggests University lines run more frequently in peak times and later in the evening.
- Sub #156: Does not support the removal of bus route 18 as it is a vital connection between Newtown and Miramar. Supports the continuation of a direct route to Seatoun.
- Sub #158: Does not support the removal of bus route 18. Suggest the direct route be made more frequent and not be redirected through Courtney Place and Lambton Quay.
- Sub #159: Does not support the removal of bus route 18 as it is a very popular route. Suggests any new routes still run via Newtown.
- Sub #161: Supports a design that includes a direct connection between Highbury and Kelburn University Campus via Aro St and the current number 20 route.
- Sub #174: Keep the #18 and #47 bus routes Because it allows connectivity between Victoria University and Massey University Campuses, and the suburbs in between. By

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

taking away #18 and #47 service you are leaving out these customers and causing more inconvenience for them to get from point A to point B.

- Sub #204: Does not support cutting route 18 access to the University and Wellington High School as it will lead to a longer and more expensive trip to Victoria University requiring a transfer or long walk.
- Sub #209: Suggests the Victoria University services via Newtown remain as is.
- Sub #210: Does not support the removal of bus routes 17, 18, 20, 22, 23 and 47. Suggests route 47 remain as it is the only direct route from Johnsonville to Victoria University.
- Sub #222: Retain existing route 18 as it provides a direct service to the university campuses and Wellington High School from Miramar and Kilbirnie, and is well patronised. Changing buses will add time delays. Changing to a local service at Courtenay Place will take longer (still a longer route), local bus service will be less frequent, and will mean standing/waiting in the rain when transferring.
- Sub #231: Does not support the removal of bus route 18. Notes the high percentage of students living in Newtown and the current capacity issues. Suggests frequent evening buses in Kelburn for safety reasons.
- Sub #236: Does not support the removal of bus route 18. Notes the high percentage of students and employees of Victoria University using the regular, efficient service. Suggests a higher patronage on the continued route will keep costs manageable and reduce pollution.
- Sub #257: Opposed to removal of route 18 direct service to the University.
- Sub #278: Suggests redesigning the 47 from Johnsonville through to Newtown, integrating it into the Victoria University hub. This would provide greater links to Khandallah, Ngaio and Crofton Downs and reduce traffic congestion throughout the Golden Mile throughout the day, with students being able to bypass the central city and help to prevent capacity issues in the CBD.
- Sub #381: Does not support the removal of bus route 18. This provides an excellent link across the city to all three tertiary institutes and the hospital. Notes the disadvantages for those in Eastern Suburbs and past the airport.
- Sub #404: Opposes the removal of the route 18 service and changes to the route 43 and route 44 services there is no longer a direct route from the eastern suburbs to the Wellington Hospital and universities because it will be inconvenient and people will feel it would be more time effective to take their own car (or taxi).
- Sub #422: Concerned that the proposed bus network would require many Victoria staff, students and visitors particularly those living in the suburbs of Newtown and Karori to transfer between services as part of their journey to and from University; reduce the frequency of the weekday off-peak service between Kelburn and Pipitea campuses from current levels; and alter the direct service between Kelburn and Karori campuses resulting in longer journey times. Suggests improvements in transfer points including planning timetables to minimise waiting times, ensuring fare penalties are avoided for transfers between operators and improving the infrastructure at major transfer points as possible solutions.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #422: Expects the proposed Wellington City bus network would deliver more frequent evening and weekend services to all Victoria University campuses; a simpler connection between Victoria's Kelburn and Pipitea campuses with all buses travelling via the Railway Station; more frequent connections between Kelburn campus and the CBD; and faster journey times for many Victoria staff, students and visitors commuting to and from the University.
- Sub #455: Opposes removal of 18 bus route because commuters living near the Miramar terminus will have to catch 3 buses to get to the hospital or go to university. The present arrangement provides excellent service to many users.
- Sub #466: Does not support the removal of bus route 18 as it avoids congestion and is very useful for students. If this service is removed, suggests keeping bus route 47 as it also avoids congestion and is a direct link to Kelburn campuses. Also suggests extending this service through Newtown to avoid a private operator seizing the opportunity. Notes the inefficiency of terminating bus routes at Te Whaea as opposed to Massey University (might cause capacity issues on connecting buses). Notes the exclusion of a service for Highbury residents to get to Kelburn shops or University. Suggests a service from the train station runs to Kelburn campus and then to Highbury a few times a day or a loop route including Highbury/Kelburn/Railway station/Aro Valley or the proposed route alternate via Aro Valley or Kelburn.
- Sub #504: Does not support the removal of bus route 18 as it provides important connections for students and staff needing to get between tertiary campuses. Suggests route 18 also adds earlier and later services. Does not support the removal of bus route 21 as it is a direct route to the city. Notes the disincentives to use buses if you face steep topography/too far away and carrying heavy items to reach bus stops, inclement weather with poor bus shelters and long waiting times, uncertainty and risk of loss of connections and unsafe routes (especially at night).
- Sub #509: Oppose the proposal to axe the popular and convenient Campus Connection number 18. This route is almost always full and replacement services would be slower and less convenient. WRC should be looking to decrease traffic through the overloaded Golden Mile with more cross-city services, skirting central city traffic blockages. The current direct route is the fastest way for students living in Newtown to get to Kelburn Campus or between Massey, Te Aro, Kelburn and Karori campuses.
- Sub #526: Requests not cancelling the Campus Connection route. Sister and I use it every day to get to and from school. Why would you want to cancel it when it is really popular and always full? Don't want to go to the Railway Station or Courtenay Place as they are a long way out of our way and wouldn't be bothered getting off one bus and waiting for another. Would just have to walk further like we have to when we miss the number 18.
- Sub #545: That the 1 and 47 bus routes be retained, along with regular routes from the railway station to Kelburn and that regular routes from Courtenay Place to Kelburn be implemented. Note: submitter provided numerous supporting submissions from students.
- Sub #545: Does not support the removal of bus route 18 as it is widely accessed by students and staff who live in the Eastern suburbs. This current service provides a direct service to/between all Wellington campuses and a connection to the hospital. The proposed route will result in longer travel times with transfers or walking (stops at a different place than the 18) and will have negative effects for people with disabilities.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

Does not support the removal of bus route 47 as this provides a direct service from Johnsonville/Wilton to the Kelburn campuses. Suggests regular bus routes from the railway station to Kelburn with a frequency increase on weekdays. Suggests all University services run frequently in the evenings to ensure safe travel options. Requests regular routes from Courtenay Place to Kelburn be implemented.

- Sub #545: That night-time bus services are provided to and from the university.
- Sub #643: Considers GWRC should consult with Massey and Victoria Universities and their students before removing the route 18.

Subtopic: Wellington Public Transport Spine or BRT (33 submissions)

Officer Comments:

GWRC is working in partnership with Wellington City Council and the Transport Agency to plan and design multi-modal corridors suitable for the planned Bus Rapid Transit system. Submissions raised issues that were addressed in the report of the Wellington Public Transport Spine Options Hearing Subcommittee (Report 14.93).

Officers recommend no change to the PT Plan.

- Sub #7: Suggests green strips on the road is not enough to implement BRT (Brisbane has a good system). Does not support bending buses on winding roads (Karori). Suggests removing cars from Courtenay Place and Lambton Quay.
- Sub #12: Light rail is the best option.
- Sub #73: BRT might cost more than it is worth, as bus priority lanes are good and sufficient.
- Sub #100: Broadly supports the new bus network, with the range of "spines" that will bring more people within reach of a bus, and allow easier movement across different suburbs of the city.
- Sub #108: Light rail should be a priority for Wellington City.
- Sub #177: While I'm in favour of modernising the buses I would like to see light rail kept on the agenda.
- Sub #263: Opposed to the Wellington spine, as it is expensive and unproven in Cities of this size. Suggests a system of bus priorities, extending the current Willis Street to Courtenay Place improvements, would be more cost effective. Concerned that the BRT proposal increases the need for bus to bus transfers and this is seen as undesirable world-wide. The submitter also attached a copy of their previous submission on the Wellington Public Transport Spine dated 6/9/2013, to Wellington City's Future Public Transport Spine Options.
- Sub #298: Supports a separate public transport spine through the CBD.
- Sub #313: Strongly objects to the BRT option from the Spine Study as it 'relies' on grade separation at the Basin Reserve, and on integration with the Mt Victoria tunnel duplication project. Does not support major new road building as it is imperative for Wellington to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #316: Opposes BRT as believes it is ill thought out and will hold the city back.
- Sub #328: Recommends a much stronger enforcement of the dedicated bus lanes
- Sub #335: Request route C / BRT is routed using the Bus Tunnel - Moxham Avenue - Kilbirnie Crescent route, instead of the duplicated Mount Victoria Tunnel / Ruahine Street route.
- Sub #335: Requests routes F and I be run as part of a four route BRT system on the Golden Mile, while most or all other routes take an all-day alternative (such as Featherston, Victoria, Wakefield, and Taranaki Streets)
- Sub #335: Requests early trials of ways to minimise dwell times, including improvements to door opening times, approach to berthing, changes to stop design to minimise re-entry time and to allow buses to draw up close to the kerb, allowing all door boarding, and to identify the effect on dwell times of changes such as door width, dual snapping points at entrances, and other card systems.
- Sub #335: Support the use of overflow routes to relieve bus congestion on the Golden Mile, but supports it being all day, not only for peak over flow
- Sub #335: Requests checking of the following points for BRT vehicles: geometrical fit, ability to handle camber changes, review of standing passenger densities, and power supply.
- Sub #347: Would rather have electrified light rail linking the Wellington Railway Station, Interislander Terminal and Airport.
- Sub #394: Strongly supports the proposed hierarchical network and having a priority spine from the Golden Mile to Newtown (and then another connecting to Kilbirnie).
- Sub #394: Opposes: a dual spine through CBD, having a network spine through the Mount Victoria tunnel (suggests going around the Bays would be better), long bus routes as they will affect reliability.
- Sub #418: Supports public transport spine study. The northern spine terminus should be at Churton Park Village. Melksham can provide a turning/waiting point. From Churton Park, the route should be to Johnsonville Rail and then on to City and Island Bay. Route 54 should be a figure of eight with two loops, both loops taking-in Churton Park Village and Johnsonville Rail Hub. Would need to be two-ways.
- Sub #424: Notes the BRT proposal relies on completion of basin flyover/duplication of Mt Victoria tunnel/road widening and the uncertainty of these projects.
- Sub #425: Supports the choice of BRT as the next significant public transport network improvement and the first step towards light rail. Suggests grade separation will make the transition to light rail simpler and far more cost effective once population and patronage reach levels to justify the expansion. Also comments that the timing of infrastructure development projects such as the Basin Reserve flyover and the second Mt Victoria tunnel and the manufacture and ownership of the bus fleet need to be well co-ordinated to minimise the costs of implementation and secure the success of BRT as an option and the eventual expansion to light rail.
- Sub #431: Supports the proposal to implement Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on the PT Spine. Suggested that the GWRC to consider the optimal length of the through-routes and divide the proposed East Wellington, South/West Wellington and Lower Hutt units into smaller units.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #442: Prefers light rail for the main routes as the success in the uptake of the other electric trains bodes well for the acceptability and efficiency of a light rail network.
- Sub #453: Supports the Transport Spine as a core part of the long term transport Plan. However concerned that the length of the proposed east-west and north-south spines will create significant barriers to reliability. Strongly recommends that these services be split into separate services to mitigate the risk.
- Sub #482: Suggests initial minor improvement such as a second core route through city centre.
- Sub #527: Strongly supports LRT over BRT as they are: popular, safer (being predictable on rails), clean, quiet, and will provide enough capacity to allow major increases in PT usage in future (unlike buses on the Golden Mile).
- Sub #555: Concerned that the decision to exclude light rail option for the transport path between Wellington Station and Kilbirnie has been based on invalid information e.g. that a bus system is faster or can travel the route in the same time as a rail based vehicle which is not true. Notes that spending money on a slow system, even if it costs less to install is not a good plan and more money will be needed if the bus plan proceeds in the future as it will need fixing correctly. Suggests that a light rail system should go via the airport into the Miramar area with a park and ride facility. Requests for the reasons why a bus system was selected. Requests GWRC to place on hold any bus plan until a full review is undertaken.
- Sub #564: Opposes large 100 seater buses and in particular articulated buses. Prefer buses to be frequent rather than large. Large buses in Wellington's hilly and often narrow streets are impractical, especially on tight corners. People like to walk to work, bike to work, and sit outside cafes. Having very large diesel buses to contend with makes all these practices less pleasant and sometimes less safe. Instead of increasing the size of buses, please consider having buses travelling down Jervois Quay as well as the Golden Mile.
- Sub #584: Consider chosen preference of bus rapid transit (BRT) instead of light rail is short-term and ill-considered: It is unlikely that faster journey times are achievable between Courtenay Place and the north end of Lambton Quay because the speed limit is 30kmh and there are many pedestrian crossings. From personal experience, the main contributor to unreliability is bus congestion caused by many people getting on and off some buses at peak hours in the Lambton Quay to Courtenay Place corridor. Much larger BRT buses and fewer stops will mean even longer stopping times. I have also noticed that currently the longer diesel buses have difficulty turning at sharp corners. The study does not explain how the BRT buses, which will be twice as long, will negotiate these corners. The analysis was flawed in including another tunnel through Mt Victoria in the BRT and light rail (LRT) options and in including the tunnel cost in its LRT option cost estimates (\$380m) but not in BRT cost estimates. More questionable is why the two options even need another tunnel when there is already a functioning bus tunnel at the top of Pirie St and bus routes through Hataitai. The validity of the 'peer review' of the study is questionable when Ian Wallis Associates was also involved in the whole process including developing the process and criteria for selecting the short-list options. The study claims as a major benefit of BRT the current services enabling people to travel from the CBD all the way home to Island Bay, Miramar or Karori on the same vehicle.

TOPIC: Wellington Bus Network

- Sub #586: Supports light rail on the Public Transport Spine and Core Routes with extensive submission provided under the headings: Spatial Efficiency, Energy Efficiency, Labour Efficiency, Safety, Reliability and Speed, Journey Times, Light Rail Extensions to Schools, Investment Certainty and Property Value Uplift on Light Rail Corridors, Alternative Route for Light Rail, Capital and Infrastructural Costs of Light Rail, Network Hubs. Comments that lack of consultation between teams within GWRC working on the PTSS and the Wellington City Bus Review (WCBR) was a serious mistake that has compromised the outcomes of both studies.
- Sub #589: Concerned about process of Spine Study and independence of peer review. Faster bus times not achievable between Courtenay Place and the north end of Lambton Quay because the speed limit is 30kmh and there are many pedestrian crossings. Amount of people getting on and off buses leads to unreliability. Larger buses and fewer stops will mean longer stopping times with resulting unreliability. Larger buses will also have issues negotiating corners. Pirie Street tunnel could be used for light rail/bus rapid transit, removing reliance on Basin flyover and second tunnel. People can travel from CBD to Island Bay, Miramar or Karori on the same vehicle currently, so it is not a major benefit with bus rapid transit to do so.
- Sub #598: We strongly support the PT spine, especially its extension to the airport. The issues currently being debated at the Basin Board of Inquiry will, we believe, be equally relevant to other parts of the city, especially the CBD
- Sub #598: The Architectural Centre strongly supports the GWRC and WCC planning for LRT.
- Sub #601: We trust that the various measures proposed by the Spine Study etc. such as more dedicated bus lanes, fewer buses travelling through the CBD at peak and use of larger capacity buses will alleviate congestion.
- Sub #621: Spine proposal will increase number of passengers needing to change buses discouraging public transport use and cross-city services will encounter more delays.
- Sub #633: Supports the proposed Wellington future bus network and particularly the public transport spine routes as they provide the foundation for the bus network design and are likely to result in tangible benefits for Wellington public transport users.
- Sub #637: Oppose taking any Town Belt land beside SH1 (e.g. along Ruahine Street). Support phasing out trolley buses one route at a time effective 2021 to match demand for change to BRT service.
- Sub #637: Support planning for two initial BRT routes (via Wellington Hospital and via Mt Victoria Tunnel to Kilbirnie with extension to Airport) and a further route between Karori and Island Bay. Support proposals to remove on-street parking, and to redirect traffic from the Golden Mile.
- Sub #637: Support BRT if it can navigate narrow streets in CBD and if traffic-light pre-emption by buses throughout the spine is enabled. Support consideration of double-decker or articulated 100-person buses.
- Sub #639: Recommends that implementation of the PT Spine is coordinated with all other planned public transport improvements particularly with consideration of high capacity buses.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

Topic: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options (561 submissions)

- Sub #56: Requests deferring any decision about the future of Wellington's trolley buses until it has conducted a trial to upgrade several existing trolley buses with modern high efficiency motors and batteries that can be charged either from overhead wires or by being plugged in at a depot, and that Wellington keeps its overhead wire network, to ensure that Wellington remains resilient, and retains the option of electric powered public transport.
- Sub #335: Reliability is very important

Subtopic: Carbon and other emissions (514 submissions)

Position: Least important (49 submissions)

Position: Less important (85 submissions)

Position: Important (209 submissions)

- Sub #358: Supports green fleet but acknowledges diesel may be the best fit for hilly streets not designed for buses.

Position: Most important (167 submissions)

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #92: Although the overall environmental impact is important, emissions are more important with respect to the immediate effect on central Wellington (i.e. benzene and particulate emissions).
- Sub #108: Decreased carbon emissions as part of a larger climate change prevention and effects mediation program (decrease or eliminate fossil fuel use in public transport).
- Sub #357: Supports extending the trolley network to present Wellington as a green city.
- Sub #359: Opposes focus on short-term cost; suggests diesel is not an affordable / ecological long-term solution as extraction of fossil fuels becomes more risky and more costly over time. Recommends electric-powered rail vehicles due to environmental benefits and longer lifespan.
- Sub #446: Recommends allowing more input on alternatives for existing transport options that take seriously the real problems of carbon emissions for future generations.
- Sub #461: It's time for the council to take a stand and start spreading the right messages about who we are as a city: not just carbon-loving cheapskates but as thoughtful innovators and good global citizens.
- Sub #463: It is imperative to try and eliminate the choking diesel fumes encountered within the CBD golden mile.
- Sub #471: Electric vehicles will reduce emissions significantly.
- Sub #501: Consider replacement by diesel buses would mean more pollution no matter how technologically advanced the new diesel buses are.
- Sub #537: Don't make Wellington look bad to save a little bit of money right now. The transport system is already bad enough don't make it more pollutant too.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #548: The trolley fleet provides the City with a near-zero emission, relatively very quiet public transport option for the inner city. I think that it is an option that may in the long run be better suited to running strictly inner city and core services in an effort to reduce noise and particulate pollution on these routes and in the centre of town.
- Sub #551: Requests recognise that maximum reduction in emissions is necessary if we are to achieve climate-safe levels. Environmental considerations should be in the forefront of decisions regarding the new fleet.
- Sub #562: New Zealand electricity is around 75% renewable with large untapped resources of wind and solar energy as demand grows. Additionally international research is increasingly highlighting the health risks of operating diesel buses in areas like the Wellington Golden Mile no matter to what Euro standard they are built.
- Sub #562: Diesel is a dirty fossil fuel emitting CO₂, other dangerous gasses, soot and other particles. The smallest particles are particularly dangerous for health as they are able to cross through the lungs, enter the bloodstream, and are associated with heart attacks, strokes, lung and brain diseases. Concerned that even with tighter regulations on diesel emissions they cannot be removed from exhausts.
- Sub #564: Considers carbon and other harmful emissions are very important, both for the environment and public health. I consider that public transport is a long term investment. With the inevitable increasing cost of petrol/diesel and peak oil looming, investments in fossil fuel solutions can only be short term. Wellington is very close to sources of wind energy, meaning public transport could be partly fuelled from locally available renewable energy sources. Diesel buses rely on imported fossil fuel whose use contributes to climate change and particulate matter. Within the next ten to twenty years we may be obliged to change those diesel fuelled buses to buses fuelled by renewable energy.
- Sub #570: Trolley buses should be retained - we must make a positive contribution to reducing use of fossil fuels and lowering carbon emissions. In the long term our trolley bus fleet may be the most cost effective!
- Sub #584: Consider carbon and other harmful emissions is the most important factor and should be weighted to reflect that. With growing numbers of people living, walking and cycling in the city emissions are health hazards. Should GWRC continue with diesel buses would like to see the Draft Plan providing for strict performance measures with rigorous emission standards for the maintenance and monitoring of diesel emissions and financial penalties for non-compliance.
- Sub #593: Questions if Auckland's problem with air emissions from diesel buses has been considered.
- Sub #612: Very important. Public transport is a long term investment. Investments in fossil fuel solutions are short term. Wellington is close to sources of wind energy, meaning public transport could be fuelled entirely from locally available renewable energy sources.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

Subtopic: Cost to ratepayers and travellers (508 submissions)

Position: Least important (26 submissions)

Position: Less important (101 submissions)

Position: Important (270 submissions)

Position: Most important (109 submissions)

- Sub #367: Support keeping fare prices low as incentive for people to use buses.

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #446: Suggests Wellingtonians have in recent years paid for an upgrade to the trolley wires to help retain this network. Suggests reconsidering the importance of the trolley buses in terms of climate change and noise otherwise Council will precede with an option like the Johnsonville trains that are noisy, more expensive than budgeted for, and make the Council look incapable of providing suitable transport options for Wellington.
- Sub #463: Wellington has survived for over 50 years with the cost burden of electric vehicles. There is no reason to imply that continuing into the future with electric buses is suddenly unaffordable. If the extra cost of electric buses means less buses or reduced services, then so be it.
- Sub #551: Considers the increased patronage of a lower cost, efficient bus service, also contributes to environmental savings through reduced private transport usage.
- Sub #564: Supports draft plan investment in public transport (\$334. 1 million) over the next six years. Notes almost all of this (more than \$300 million) is for rail and couldn't find an explanation of the \$20.7 million allocated to "trolley bus overhead network renewals and overhead removal". If trolley buses are to be replaced with diesel buses, this cost should have been included in the diesel bus option.
- Sub #584: Considers the question regarding paying for lower emissions is flawed in assuming lower-emissions are more costly. Proper economic pricing systems would truly price the negative environmental and social costs of emissions, and count the wider environmental and health effects as benefits. Factors should include sustainability and cost of fuel source and environmental impact.

Subtopic: Funding for trolley buses (203 submissions)

- Sub #1: Support the use of bonds funded through fuel and operating cost savings on the out years. This is due to trolley buses having a higher up front capital cost but a lower cost per passenger mile of operations cost.
- Sub #2: Suggests funding through rates and farebox recovery.
- Sub #3: Ratepayers once service convenience, safety and reliability to suburban areas is equitable. Also suggests funding is sought from central government as investment in Wellington's public transport infrastructure is significantly less than Auckland city receives.
- Sub #5: Funding for trolley buses a difficult and valid issue.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #7: Suggests funding from the same place as other transport modes.
- Sub #8: By reducing the remuneration of GWRC management and councillors and re-municipalizing the buses instead of subsidizing a private company.
- Sub #13: Increase the central Govt. contribution and regional business rates contribution.
- Sub #14: Trolley buses would not be more expensive than diesels if costs are properly taken into account - e.g. a diesel has a 5-10 year useful life while a trolley bus last 20 or more years, older diesels leaks oil, requires more servicing costs, and the cost of diesel is going up. If you look at replacing all 60 Trolleys which have 10 years left in them that is 30 Million right there that can be put into renewing the neglected power supply.
- Sub #16: Supports funding for retaining trolley buses, in the same way as funding was found to upgrade the Johnsonville line. The Johnsonville line received millions of dollars for the upgrade to allow for new Matangi trains. This only benefited people in part of Wellington. The trolley buses cover a large number of people, more than the Johnsonville line covers. If millions of dollars can be found to upgrade the Johnsonville line then money can be found for the trolley buses.
- Sub #24: Considers GWRC controls the finances and it is not for the submitter to comment.
- Sub #27: Submitter considers this is a Wellington CBD issue.
- Sub #37: Choose the most cost effective option.
- Sub #46: An overall fare increase if required.
- Sub #48: Pay for trolley buses from the savings in not paying ever-increasing fossil fuel prices.
- Sub #53: Would provide funding feedback if was given information about options for redirecting funding.
- Sub #54: Rates increases.
- Sub #56: States the actual cost of diesel (including noise, accidents, lowering quality of life, toxic fumes creating a measurable number of deaths and asthma attacks, carbon-load) would if accurately accounted for mean is isn't really the cheapest option.
- Sub #59: Would not pay more for trolley buses but would pay more for lower emission option (question 5 on form).
- Sub #62: Considers the cost should already be budgeted as the current electrical infrastructure is 50 years old. Suggests additional costs should be split 50:50 between passengers and ratepayers (WCC & WRC).
- Sub #64: Introduce a city tax for visitors as done overseas (e.g.: Italy) where a tax is added to the cost of hotel bills per night. Use the revenue collected into clean sustainable public transport.
- Sub #66: Mixture of user pays and government funding
- Sub #67: Questions how much the additional cost is especially as the report fails to consider the non-direct economic costs of continued fossil fuel use. Central government via the The Transport Agency should pay any direct economic costs. The amounts are

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

minimal in comparison to roading expenditure especially the discretionary budget which is the Roads of National Significance.

- Sub #68: Not prepared to pay extra for trolley buses.
- Sub #71: It should be spread over the current funders as the current costs are spread.
- Sub #77: Suggests expenditure to upgrade the overhead lines and generating equipment would extend the life of the present fleet for some years [reconditioned only recently] and by the end of this fleets' economical life efficient and affordable electric buses may be available.
- Sub #80: Suggests funding through fares.
- Sub #84: They should be paid for with a carbon tax related bus/train/car 'fare' system. The answer is that petrol and diesel should have a carbon tax the revenue from which can be used to install the low emission transport modes, like wind electric trolley buses.
- Sub #85: Impose an electronic car tax to fund public transport, like Singapore and London. Like Australia, make inner city buses free, funded by parking fees.
- Sub #86: Supports additional costs from the bus users.
- Sub #89: Fare and rates increases along with better utilization of the buses. Currently you do not see them running at weekends or after 7pm on weeknights. This is crazy. Extend the wires to more routes and use these buses more. The savings in fuel will be worth it
- Sub #90: Strongly opposed to the ratepayers being asked to pay extra for trolley buses
- Sub #92: Additional capital or one-off maintenance costs should be split between GWRC and WCC rates. Annual operating costs to be funded as per current model.
- Sub #97: Suggests funding by a reduction in fares and therefore an increase in patronage in off-peak times. Notes that electric buses are less costly than diesel.
- Sub #98: Suggests the additional, environmental and health costs do not appear to have been quantified clearly in the plan. Suggests the Council needs to look at long term environmental and health costs including contributions to global warming because if the impact of climate change was factored in to the costings.
- Sub #101: Suggests funding trolley buses through road taxes for domestic cars accessing CBD (such as Melbourne, London) or levy on car parking. Alternatively suggests a rates increase.
- Sub #108: Does not believe it will be more expensive when all factors are taken into consideration. Suggests increased bus and train services with a corresponding increase in investment in public transport (more person-km capacity) with funds transferred from the governments' highway fund.
- Sub #119: Feels strongly that the trolley buses should not be funded due to not been efficient climbing hills, the wires are visual pollution and the buses are slow and prone to breaking down / coming off the wires and look outdated. Would like this to be replaced with modern dynamic transport like a Hybrid as his preferred fleet replacement, followed by diesel.
- Sub #119: I feel strongly that the trolley buses should be mothballed. - I disagree with the 'pros' point that they are efficient in climbing hills. The #7 on Brooklyn Hill can only

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

go at 20Kmph, holding up all other traffic. - The wires are visual pollution - The buses are slow and prone to breaking down / coming off the wires - They are old and smelly!

- Sub #122: Supports funding through an increase in household rates. Agrees with the reduced noise, reduced diesel pollution, the use of renewable power and the longevity of service that the trolleys offer. Supports the use of trolleys on new 'core' bus routes.
- Sub #123: We should not keep trolley buses due to when electricity supply is suddenly lost, the trolley buses just sit.
- Sub #125: Suggests funding through Infratil's profits.
- Sub #126: Supports funding through Wellington taxes.
- Sub #127: The cost should come from rates and economies achieved by cutting catering at board meetings and cutting meeting fees.
- Sub #130: If we wish to keep the trolley buses and I think should we the public that use these services will need paid more to use them.
- Sub #130: States would like to keep trolley buses and for the public to pay to do so.
- Sub #135: Supports funding through a congestion charge on private motor vehicles being driven on public roads between the hours of 7-9.30am Monday-Saturday and 3-6PM Monday to Friday.
- Sub #138: Supports funding through an increase in private vehicle costs.
- Sub #143: Suggests Wellington City Council should set aside part of its budget to fix the power lines.
- Sub #147: The cost of the switch-over from diesel to electric buses is worth the cost in the long run. This future cost will be paid for by the savings made from not having to import the diesel or the expenses incurred for other environmental clean-up projects that will be required in the future.
- Sub #153: Agrees with rate increases
- Sub #154: Suggests a surcharge on current rates to invest in lower emission options.
- Sub #161: Supports funding through an increase in fares and also by rate payers/tax payers. Also suggests carbon credits be awarded for the maintaining/extending of trolley routes.
- Sub #172: If there is a compelling case, economically and in the service to passengers, to remove them (and presumably the ease of transition to modern light rail in the future) then I say do it. My only concern would be in the long run we find ourselves in a situation that having the infrastructure in place would have given us options that the removal of trolley buses now precludes.
- Sub #173: Does not support funding for trolley buses as it is too costly , slow and inefficient.
- Sub #178: Suggests an increase in gas prices or a postponement of the current Airport plans.
- Sub #181: Agrees trolley buses should not be stopped but does not want to pay for the service to continue with fare rises.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #184: Supports funding as long as this is done through fares then subsidised across the board.
- Sub #184: Yes. Additional costs (if indeed there are any) should be funded from fares and subsidies across the board.
- Sub #187: Suggests trolley buses be paid for by regional rates as it is a good investment (with an upgrade after another 8-15 yrs). Also supportive of a regional rates funded power supply upgrade over a 10 yr period (\$5m per year).
- Sub #192: Suggests funding by residents in Wellington Region through rates or some form of levy. Also increased parking charges and toll charge for bringing private vehicles into city centre.
- Sub #197: Suggests retaining their current funding system through fares and GWRC transport budget.
- Sub #199: Suggests the council re-institute public ownership and redirect the profits paid to Infratil into developing an efficient no-emissions public transport network.
- Sub #203: Several suggestions for funding including: renegotiating contracts with operators that include enforcement and penalty clauses, running trolleys on evenings and weekends to reduce cost per unit, applying subsidies on trolley services only, imposing penalties on operators of other services, tender for services competitively, upgrade lines to 750 volts and decrease the amount of substations, phase expenditure overtime, continued investment.
- Sub #210: Suggests funding through higher car parking rates in the Central City to discourage people from driving.
- Sub #212: Does not support retaining trolley buses as they are unreliable and expensive to maintain two types of fleet and cause visual pollution.
- Sub #216: Suggests funding through a rates increase over a ten year period.
- Sub #242: Yes, I support keeping the trolley buses as a low emissions option. They should be paid for through the costs saved from replacing the fleet and through fares.
- Sub #247: Suggests funding from regional rates.
- Sub #248: Trolley bus activists should raise the money themselves.
- Sub #249: Suggests a cost reduction based on a downsizing of the trolley routes. Only central city and depot trolley lines would need to be maintained.
- Sub #256: Supportive of rates/taxes funding or subsidising public transport.
- Sub #258: With Central Government Subsidy.
- Sub #259: Suggests an increase in fares primarily, possibly an increase in rates.
- Sub #260: The cost of maintaining trolley buses, and of developing other low carbon alternatives, could be met by a toll on private cars entering the CBD during peak hours (e.g. London).
- Sub #279: Supports local council funding.
- Sub #280: I am not convinced there are "additional" trolley bus costs that need to be paid for separately. If the Wellington City network is to continue using trolley buses then simply manage the business accordingly and ensure the public service is maximised.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #283: Supports taxes to pay for trolley bus and sustainable low carbon emission transport options.
- Sub #284: Supports increasing rates over ten year period.
- Sub #285: Suggests funding as has been done in the past - as part of the wider cost of Public Transport.
- Sub #288: Considers the proposed costs for retaining the trolleys is over estimated. Appears the current costings are just that, current. The trolleys have many years of life in them. By the time money needs to be spent on new buses and facilities, technology advances will mean less facilities will be required for the operation of electrically driven buses and the running costs will be comparable with those for diesel. Wellington will then have the advantage of running environmentally friendly, emission free buses. Ratepayers will pay as now. Meantime, the blended fuel option as has been developed at the Clean Tech facility in Otaki would no doubt save GW money and mean less emissions from current buses.
- Sub #292: Supports increased fares to fund fleet options, and/or sponsorship from electricity generator / suppliers.
- Sub #295: Supports a CBD fare surcharge zone for passengers boarding or alighting along the golden mile. Transfers at Lambton Quay and Courtenay Place would be at a zone boundary, reducing congestion.
- Sub #298: Supports increasing rates, car park charges, removal of off street parking.
- Sub #300: Supports paying more for long term benefit.
- Sub #302: Suggests paying for them from the rates.
- Sub #303: Suggests removing trains from J'ville and using the money to fund the trolley buses.
- Sub #303: Suggests using the rates money.
- Sub #308: Suggests Increasing the rates and fees paid by developers who want to build subdivisions miles away from existing services and expect councils to pay to get the services to them.
- Sub #313: Suggests The Transport Agency increase its contribution to funding from 24%, otherwise to be taken from other roading projects.
- Sub #315: Suggests funding by imposing some sort of tax on those who use their cars to commute into the city.
- Sub #316: Suggests that the payment for the trolley buses should be balanced across the whole public transport sector as it is at present and bring back public ownership of the buses. Believes that a refurbished trolley bus fleet will prove to be just as economic, and provide better environmental performance, than new diesel buses
- Sub #317: Suggests to tax petrol more heavily for users of vehicles that are fuel inefficient (e.g. can only carry max. 2-3 passengers, burn a lot of fuel, take up a lot of space) as determined by size, # seats, make/model.
- Sub #317: Suggests running more buses, thereby more passengers/fares
- Sub #320: Out of the general transport budget.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #325: Suggests increasing fares and even rates increase.
- Sub #332: Suggests reducing the amount spent on roading and other investments that induce more traffic and reliance on private motor vehicle use
- Sub #333: Suggests taking out long term loans. Central Govt Loans. Public/Private partnerships. Lobbying for increases in The Transport Agency subsidies including CAPEX. Lowering subsidies on routes that are commercially viable to do so. Understanding the difference between long term value and short-term costs.
- Sub #334: Tolls on cars driving into the city and using the new flyover
- Sub #335: The question is false because a modernised trolley bus system would be cheaper than new diesels.
- Sub #339: How much would the emissions rise by? Are electric (battery) powered buses an option?
- Sub #341: Retaining trolley buses is more important than saving money through using diesel buses.
- Sub #345: Suggests using part of parking fees to subsidise the public transport to encourage pp to leave their cars at home.
- Sub #347: Recommends additional costs be paid for by reducing the number of diesel buses being used where trolley buses are being run. Otherwise a flat fare scheme for the trolley buses that increases the average trip fare over short trips.
- Sub #349: Suggests Government needs to increase the percentage of subsidy provided for public transport development and start using tax payers money more equitably for the benefit of public use, believing the costs of maintaining the fleet, as presented, have been inflated and many of these costs can be addressed without the need for further expenditure.
- Sub #350: Suggests targeted rate increase
- Sub #354: Supports funding for trolleys through car travel: fees from road use charges, vehicle registration, fuel tax, etc. Supports funding through rates and higher usage charges.
- Sub #357: Suggests using funds from non-public-transport revenue streams (i.e. parking ticket revenue and parking fees) to finance trolley buses.
- Sub #359: Recommends costs be spread over several years' budgets and routine maintenance be scheduled to extend track/vehicle life.
- Sub #371: Notes it is not necessarily correct that there will be greater cost. With no life cycle assessment everyone is in the dark concerning longer term costs. Will further comment at the public hearing.
- Sub #372: Supports splitting the cost between ratepayers, public transport users and GWRC.
- Sub #374: Happy to pay for efficient, clean, frequent, safe and reliable public transport.
- Sub #379: Opposes funding for trolley buses.
- Sub #382: Suggest peak time tolls in the city like London does because it would get more people out of cars and onto public transport.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #385: Suggest increasing rates and making efficiencies.
- Sub #392: Supports funding from the Wellington City and Wellington Regional Councils and The Transport Agency.
- Sub #393: Supports funding through higher regional rates.
- Sub #396: Supports using the same funding used for the trolley network or introducing a cost to drive into the city during peak times.
- Sub #400: Supports an increase in GWRC rates as all Wellingtonians would benefit from continuing to minimise the use of diesel buses at their negative environmental and health effects.
- Sub #401: Suggests every option presented to date requires significant investment. Trolley buses are not the ultimate solution but they are at least a sustainable approach, rather than the utilising the ageing internal combustion engine. Suggests investment in the trolley network infrastructure has been asset stripped for decades and to reinvest in the network.
- Sub #402: Supports keeping the trolley buses because people's health will benefit as well as an upgrade was completed which should last a few more years and the cost of removing the cables could be reinvested instead to maintain our current system.
- Sub #406: Suggests Council should consider how the increased cost to people's health should be paid for with the increase in diesel polluting buses in the city.
- Sub #407: Recommends rates, regional petrol tax, sale of excess property, advertising and sponsorship and public transport subsidy from Government.
- Sub #410: Suggests costing information or ownership and maintenance arrangements for the electric infrastructure needs to be reviewed by an impartial body.
- Sub #412: Supports extra capital costs to set up any future diesel-electric hybrid or battery-electric bus network instead of a diesel-only fleet. Suggests additional maintenance costs of the trolley overhead infrastructure can be justified if the trolleys really go where people want to go.
- Sub #414: Suggests fare increases and rates increases.
- Sub #415: Pay for them with rates, perhaps a one-off levy. Central government and the other councils in the region should contribute.
- Sub #419: Suggests funding provided by the owners of the present trolley bus/overhead wiring network as compensation for the unexpired working life of those assets beyond 2017 and the same sources used a decade ago when a green Wellington decision was made to keep the trolleys.
- Sub #421: Fund public transport by way of a tax on every car park lease in Wellington (excluding permanent inner-city residents parking) equivalent in price to the cost users corresponding public transport alternative. This could be used to service a loan to upgrade the trolley bus network and develop other public transport infrastructure in future.
- Sub #426: Cut council salaries.
- Sub #442: Suggests more effective use of The Transport Agency's funding resources and to increase their contribution to fund excellent public and active transport, rather

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

than pouring finances and other resource into RoNS given that The Transport Agency contributes 24% of funding for public transport.

- Sub #444: Supports offering advertising space in and on the trolley buses, increase rates or a combination of both. Suggests spending less money on the 7s and more on the buses.
- Sub #447: Money already used on overhead wire upgrades can be used to incrementally pay for the substation upgrades. 8 years ago, Vector mooted the substations were obsolete and in need of replacement. Why then was this work not done?
- Sub #449: Supports funding trolley buses and other forms of non-polluting public transport through higher subsidies from central government, with funding freed up by scrapping unnecessary roading projects such as Basin flyover, Petone-Grenada link and Transmission Gully. Suggests the figures for the cost of retaining trolley buses are worse than they are.
- Sub #459: Taxes
- Sub #465: Offering day passes to tourists is a good incentive e.g. Japan rail. A decent marketing effort and some interesting destinations along the route and an innovative mind-set to see trolley buses as an asset that helps to make Wellington special (not a liability). Perhaps a joint ticket could be offered for trolleys and the cable car, those foursome bike/cars on the waterfront, rickshaw rides and harbour ferry. How about thinking of the interesting day/weekend excursions?
- Sub #467: Suggests ratepayers pay the additional cost rather than higher bus fares, as it is often low-income residents who use public transport.
- Sub #468: It should rest with ratepayers, a lot of low income people catch buses
- Sub #469: Should be paid for by the people who didn't upgrade the Substation
- Sub #472: Suggests an entry "tax" on private vehicles entering the centre of Wellington (as London)
- Sub #473: The run-down option to preserve future electric paths is not necessarily dearer than any other good long-term option. Current substations and wiring would provide the basis for charging points for some of these buses that would be very hard to arrange otherwise. Although the substations are old, new developments such as SiC semiconductors will enable cheaper package replacements. If multiple charging is needed for opportunity electric buses anyway, the extra costs for keeping trolleys would be minimal, otherwise they would be phased out and replaced by an improved bus.
- Sub #474: The same way local government has always paid for infrastructure. Believes this question is scaremongering.
- Sub #482: The extra cost of an infrastructure upgrade ought to be paid out of rates (although, the trolley buses do not need replacing until 2022). Notes the exclusion of a sensitivity analysis around diesel and carbon costs over the next 25 years, and the different lifespans of different types of vehicles.
- Sub #484: Diverting funding from proposed developments designed to accommodate more private cars, increased parking fees for private cars, additional levies for motorists driving private vehicles in the central city, income generated from offsetting carbon

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

emissions, increasing the profile of the service via the tourism industry, low cost day passes for cruise ship tourists to attract new patronage.

- Sub #486: Suggests additional costs are paid through fare increase along with a promotion of the unique infrastructure/benefits (no stinking diesel emission/black smoke/reduced noise) that Wellington enjoys with the trolley services.
- Sub #488: Additional costs should be paid for by either increasing rates or by central government, not through fare rises.
- Sub #492: Introduce a business commuter contribution tax where all CBD businesses contribute a small amount, based on the size of their business, to offset cost of public transport. Divert funding from other areas of council activity.
- Sub #495: Does not believe there is sufficient unbiased information to be able to decide.
- Sub #496: A mixture of user pays and rates.
- Sub #497: Suggests the additional cost be paid for by a levy on less sustainable travel modes, such as via a regional petrol levy or a levy on central city car parking used by commuters. Also Greater Wellington should be more proactive in lobbying The Transport Agency to fund public transport improvements instead of the Basin flyover, tunnel duplication and road widening projects, which will reduce the sustainability of Wellington's transport network and increase congestion by inducing traffic.
- Sub #501: Consider ticketing incentives would help. Instead of paying extra for clean emission trips the price of diesel rides could include a carbon emission component that subsidised the trolley rides.
- Sub #504: A regional fuel tax on private vehicles including taxis or a congestion charge at particular times of day.
- Sub #505: Suggests the additional costs identified may be overstated for the renewal of the electricity infrastructure.
- Sub #506: Rates, income from parking.
- Sub #509: Supports retaining trolley buses and does not believe there are additional costs if all factors are properly attributed.
- Sub #511: Seek central government funding in exchange for not building expensive poorly cost-effective RoNS motorways. GWC should seek revision of the Transport NZ Economic Evaluation Manual to account for the costs of climate change and apply carbon costs to regional CO₂ emissions from induced traffic, using a \$40-\$120/tonne range.
- Sub #512: The additional cost (if any, over a longer time cycle - such as 100 years, you might find that price of diesel goes up, and the value clean electrical renewable and sustainable methods pays for itself handsomely), should be worn by all ratepayers and the business services who use the roads and who benefit from a clean and quiet public transport system that takes cars off the road.
- Sub #513: Thinks overall the costs of buying new buses to replace the (newish) trolleys needs to be considered as part of the overall cost-benefit analysis. Thinks that there is a high likelihood of petrochemical resources costing MUCH more in the near-ish future, and the planning should look at projected fuel and infrastructure costs over the next 30-

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

50 years, not just the immediate future. Costs should be paid for by a split of central government, local government and users.

- Sub #514: A mixture of Regional, City and passenger funding should be used.
- Sub #519: Suggest diverting funding from proposed developments designed to accommodate more private cars, increased parking fees for private cars, additional levies for motorists driving private vehicles in the central city, income generated from offsetting carbon emissions, increasing the profile of the service via the tourism industry, low cost day passes for cruise ship tourists to attract new patronage.
- Sub #520: Suggests additional costs could partly be paid for by ensuring that all GoldCard passes are recorded by drivers so that the full subsidy is obtained. Suggests an open and transparent tender process.
- Sub #521: This is not a suitable question to put to submitters as individuals have varying priorities. Rather the source of funding is something for the Council to sort out, in response to community wishes.
- Sub #524: Additional costs could be paid for in a number of ways: diverting funding from proposed developments designed to accommodate private cars, increased parking fees for private cars, additional levies for motorists driving private vehicles in the central city, income generated from offsetting carbon emissions, increasing the profile of the service via the tourism industry, low cost day passes for cruise ship tourists to attract new patronage.
- Sub #527: Suggests GW work with The Transport Agency to divert funds from RONS plans for Wellington to provide a totally electric-driven public transport system. New motorways are an anachronism, climate & health hostile and hugely expensive.
- Sub #528: Out of John Keys pay check.
- Sub #531: Suggests costs for the trolleybus system electrical infrastructure are not correctly assessed. Notes the supply system is a remarkable present and future capable asset and can be kept reliably for many years. Suggests substations and underground cabling are not worn out/overloaded and an engineering review of Wellington Electricity Lines Ltd's direct current plant/substations to make them reliable would cost a fraction of the proposed \$52M. Suggests overhead system maintenance costs at \$6M/per annum will decline as work falls to routine maintenance and much of it has been done over the last 7 years.
- Sub #532: Suggests costs spread over a realistic period such as 20 years and paid out of Greater Wellington's general subsidy of public transport and farebox recovery levels.
- Sub #533: Funding should probably include multiple sources, possible examples include: Diverting funding from proposed developments designed to accommodate more private cars, increased parking fees for private cars, additional levies for motorists driving private vehicles in the central city, income generated from offsetting carbon emissions, increasing the profile of the service via the tourism industry, low cost day passes for cruise ship tourists to attract new patronage.
- Sub #534: Levy private vehicles entering the CBD during peak hours.
- Sub #537: It doesn't cost the earth. Trolley buses are more sustainable. There's no additional cost to trolley buses they are far better long term. Better to make the investment now. Don't make Wellington look bad.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #540: Suggests funding through users and ratepayers.
- Sub #544: Rates - the environmental benefits are of value for everyone. I currently live on a diesel route (#21) and run or walk for most of my commuting, and I am happy to contribute to the costs of trolley buses.
- Sub #548: Pay for them in the short term is through efficiencies and just biting the bullet on the basis of their economic costs vs their environmental and amenity benefits. In the longer term, fuel prices will begin to add a competitive advantage to the retention of this infrastructure.
- Sub #549: Support raising additional funds from a regional levy and the reallocation of funds from projects that are not directly related to improving public transport and cycling. Regional councils also need to lobby the central government to reinstate the ability to levy a regional fuel tax.
- Sub #552: tax or rates, not fares as everyone benefits
- Sub #557: Suggests an increase in ticket prices to pay for trolleys. Considers the process is not objective and is biased to non trolley options. Questions what the additional costs are for the other options such as increased diesel prices, health costs from increased emissions and ETS costs.
- Sub #559: Cut to politicians annual bonuses.
- Sub #562: Considers that over time savings in energy and maintenance costs will generate the funding to maintain and renew the fixed infrastructure and GW should defer making any decision about the future of trolley buses until it has conducted a trial to establish the feasibility of upgrading the existing fleet to be more efficient, flexible and reliable using the latest battery technology which is expected to improve dramatically in the next 3 to 5 years, meaning lower cost and higher performance.
- Sub #564: Willing to pay for lower emission options because this is the only long term option. The costs given in the discussion document are not set out clearly and do not properly reflect the actual costs because they ignore: the longer life-span of electric vehicles; the social benefits of liveable cities with quiet zero emission electric buses versus the general unpleasantness of large, noisy "low" emission diesel buses; the intergenerational costs to future generations for likely costs of carbon or climate change effects from diesel emissions; the existing trolley buses were only recently upgraded and have more than 10-15 years life left. The plan itself notes that oil price volatility is a constant pressure on operating budgets. This is only going to get worse, and losing the trolley buses will make public transport even more vulnerable to oil price volatility.
- Sub #569: am quite OK about paying for the "additional costs" to keep trolley buses. Suggest you gradually phase in the maintenance & upgrade costs/processes. Also, trolley buses are so benign to our environment, that I believe the funding to some of the roads of "national significance" be diverted to this.
- Sub #570: If the additional costs are the costs of bringing the trolley bus infrastructure up to date because of lack of care and attention in the past then that needs to be funded out of general rates. The on-going costs of maintaining the trolley bus infrastructure should be borne by users of the Wellington bus service (both trolley and diesel bus users)

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #571: Trolley buses should be funded by a local carbon tax on petrol and suggests if less money were spent on roads, more could be spent on electric public transport, or there could be a congestion charge as in London.
- Sub #572: Regional fuel tax Congestion charging for cars entering CBD Wgtn. Retain trolley buses & modernise over time. See Leeds BRT - Commissioners Report - UK
- Sub #578: Contract with Electricity Suppliers i.e. similar to the "smelter" in Southland. Funding through Bond issue may also be an option. Investing in our infrastructure.
- Sub #581: Payment would be made by most of us as usual through our taxes rates and fares. The majority contribute to them all.
- Sub #584: Considers the question about additional costs of trolley buses ignores that the other options will also cost more. Trolley costs are the result of past neglect, perhaps due to the conscious intent of running-down the service so it is no longer a viable option. The \$20 million required to remove the trolley wires could be better spent on gradually upgrading the trolley network.
- Sub #588: Comments "I don't think we should keep them"
- Sub #589: Spend the money removing trolley wires on upgrading the system instead.
- Sub #592: Supports trolley bus replacement but not with standard diesels. Supports extending use of trollies through to 2020-2022 to allow alternative options such as battery and opportunity bus technologies to mature.
- Sub #593: Does not consider that all the WE network(\$52M) needs to be replaced, especially immediately and all at once. It needs regular maintenance and setting from someone skilled and committed. NZBuses pays network maintenance fees each month and questions how much of this is being spent on maintaining the network and renewing items in the network?
- Sub #603: Yes.
- Sub #604: Meaningful recognition of the reduced emissions should be provided by central & local/regional government, with some contribution by patrons.
- Sub #605: Additional costs should, as is customary for other transport modes, be seen as part & parcel of the cost of providing public services. Questions if the per km cost of trollies is higher than other modes when the longer lifespan of the trollies is taken into account.
- Sub #606: Unaware of the Light Rail. Is it worth the cost to switch over?
- Sub #607: Agrees to keeping trolley buses but no explanation.
- Sub #609: Supports funding trollies until they become uneconomic.
- Sub #609: Retire trolley buses when they become uneconomic. Replace them with economic alternatives.
- Sub #610: Proposes rates funding. Proposes all transport is brought in-house and publicly owned and run. Considers a well-maintained electric trolley-bus fleet is different to existing poor maintenance of lines due to the fractured nature of ownership & lack of investment.
- Sub #612: Funding for trolley buses should be from rates (like train replacements) and central government should pay half. The discussion document did not show the relative

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

costs of the options in a meaningful and transparent way. GWRC should invest in buses as well as trains, which currently secure a lot of the funding.

- Sub #614: Suggests funding through rates and fares.
- Sub #616: Suggests funding through users or rates.
- Sub #617: Suggests funding shared between travellers and rate payers.
- Sub #621: Investment in trolleybus infrastructure will last for many years - current buses are good up to 2030. Given amount spent on new trains, 10% of this is good value to keep trolley buses.
- Sub #626: Suggests funding through rates.
- Sub #627: Suggests a reduction on CEO packages/salary.
- Sub #631: Suggests funding from taxes, not by rates or fare increases.
- Sub #638: Suggests funding from regional/central government (as with rail).
- Sub #642: Suggests anticipated additional costs are not correct. Submitter points out trolley buses are capable of running under battery power. Concerned that the costs of removing the overhead network and lost opportunity costs not been factored in to the evaluation of options. Submitter notes that NZ Bus have stated that the trolley buses could remain in service until 2022. Concerned there has been no mention of the overhead network being partially upgraded, and suggests trolley buses would be more reliable if Wellington Electricity was more efficient and collaborative.

Subtopic: Noise (506 submissions)

Position: Least important (90 submissions)

Position: Less important (160 submissions)

Position: Important (189 submissions)

- Sub #437: Comments that a particular irritant is the very loud noise that appears to come from trolleybus air brakes discharging by the back door, a poor piece of design.

Position: Most important (64 submissions)

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #488: The air brakes on the existing trolley buses are excessively loud.
- Sub #564: Notes noise control in built up areas is important, but less important than emissions or sustainability. Trolley buses or other electric buses are clearly the quietest option.
- Sub #584: Consider noise in built-up areas should be a factor. High-rise developments in the city have turned streets into echoing canyons that concentrate any noise. I urge GWRC to place limits on noise from both engine brakes and engines – the constant loud hiss from brake controls has become a new health hazard.
- Sub #612: Noise in built up areas is important, but less important than emissions or sustainability. Trolley buses or other electric buses are the quietest option.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

Subtopic: Where, how, and when people want to travel (512 submissions)

Position: Least important (6 submissions)

Position: Less important (16 submissions)

Position: Important (119 submissions)

- Sub #545: Suggests timetables for services travelling to and from the university takes lectures into consideration, as well as the fact that students are wanting to come to and leave university in off-peak time as well as on-peak.

Position: Most important (371 submissions)

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #3: Support increased off peak services - this is one of the biggest barriers to increased user occupancy. Being unable to rely on public transport in the evening, weekends, public holidays, etc. is not only an inconvenience but also makes public transport unsafe - it's unreasonable for people to be left waiting at bus shelters for 40 minutes for a bus with nowhere to go because other businesses are shut.
- Sub #116: He advises that Reliability/punctuality is most important, followed by cost and frequency.
- Sub #150: Supports an increase in overall services including evenings, weekends and off-peak times.
- Sub #376: Suggests will larger diesel buses put into service be able negotiate Wellington's narrow streets with the CBD. Recommends using smaller buses on weekend services rather than larger buses.
- Sub #407: Suggests smaller buses could also be provided for suburb to suburb connections.
- Sub #471: There is no convenient bus to Melling Station.

Subtopic: Willing to pay for lower emission option (500 submissions)

Position: No (156 submissions)

- Sub #581: This would already be included in the fares

Position: Yes (343 submissions)

- Sub #419: Suggests this cost should be borne by all beneficiaries, with the resultant health and other benefits taken into account.
- Sub #437: Willing to pay more for a lower emission option taking into account that the costs should be borne by those who contribute to emissions and those who benefit from their reduction, not by arbitrarily allocating them to passengers.
- Sub #532: Provided that the technology was proven.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

Submitter Comments:

- Sub #34: I'm VERY happy to pay more for improved environmental outcomes.
- Sub #415: Willing to pay more for a low emissions option, I do not think keeping the trolley buses is the best way to achieve this.
- Sub #458: Would pay a little more in fares to avoid the pollution of other options.
- Sub #488: Would rather pay more now than to be stuck with a fleet of buses reliant on fossil fuels.
- Sub #612: Is willing to pay for lower emission options because this is the only long term option. Costs given in the discussion document are not set out clearly and do not properly reflect the actual costs because they ignore the longer life-span of electric vehicles (trolleys and batteries) versus the shorter life of diesel buses; the social benefits of liveable cities with quiet zero emission electric buses versus the general unpleasantness of large, noisy "low" emission diesel buses; the intergenerational costs to future generations for likely costs of carbon or climate change effects from diesel emissions; the existing trolley buses were only recently upgraded and have more than 10-15 years life left.

Subtopic: Fleet preference (286 submissions)

- Sub #1: Support increasing the use of trolleys. All major routes should be trolleys. Trolleys are cheaper due to longer lifespan and economies of scale. Consider modern trolley bus designs with off wire capacity and articulated trolley buses.
- Sub #2: Suggests a heritage line be established if trolley buses are not used.
- Sub #3: Not enough consideration is given to the long term costs and benefits of the trolley bus fleet. While the cost of maintenance is thought to be higher, reduced availability of fuel resources mean that in time fuel prices will continue to increase and these are more costs passed on to the user. In some circumstances the cost of public transport is not sufficient to move light users of public transport away from cars because the cost is just not worth the hassle of public transport. This isn't feasible long term. How are you going to keep public transport cheap when fuel prices increase and the bus fleet is run on fuel and diesel vehicles?
- Sub #4: Cannot afford electric buses until affordability is increased with technological advances. Supports interim approach of lowering the cost of bus transport and removing visual pollution from trolley wires.
- Sub #6: Supports a standardised fleet of low emission diesel or LPG buses. Supports phasing out trolley buses. Considers trolley buses are archaic, slow and prone to break down. Maintenance of a trolley buses and infrastructure adds to the total cost of the bus service.
- Sub #7: Supports the continuation of trolley buses as it is a sustainable electric service with NZ electricity being about 75% renewable. Suggests improvements to Matangi should also mean improvements to trolleys as the current infrastructure is run down. Does not support diesel buses as they are pollutants. Suggest ferry service to Petone.
- Sub #11: Hybrid buses are the best option for the future of bus rapid transport in Wellington. Trolley buses should not be part of the future fleet.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #13: Supports zero-emission electric trolley buses, not polluting gas-guzzling diesel-powered buses. GWRC must consider fully the health costs and environmental costs of diesel powered buses.
- Sub #14: Support retaining trolley buses as they are low emission, their lack of flexibility can be managed for example by adding turning areas, they could largely run the spine routes anyway and cover all the main areas. Diesel buses have major impacts on people's health; diesel exhaust has been linked to asthma and cancer, and if you put more diesel buses along the golden mile you are only moving the costs from the bus infrastructure to the people's health and the health system. If the trolley buses are to be replaced it should be with something electric but current electric buses have expensive batteries that don't have the range required. If you think trolley buses are obsolete you need to take a look at Vancouver. It runs over 250 trolley buses on 13 routes and many are air conditioned as well as having large capacity bending trolleys. They are non-polluting and quiet. From a cyclist or pedestrians point of view diesel buses are the worst thing on the roads.
- Sub #24: Supports upgrading the fleet to an environmentally friendly one, thus lowering costs in the long term, and making public transport attractive and sensible to use now and in the future.
- Sub #25: Electric battery buses as they offer excellence overseas, are most beneficial in the PWC report and could be powered with NZ-made electricity.
- Sub #34: Does not support Local Govt trialling brand new environmental technology - supports choosing proven eco-positive buses and systems to be sure of the wins we will make.
- Sub #35: Supports hybrids, with maybe better electrical technology/batteries next time around. Seems like accelerating their implementation would make little difference to costs, and eventually we should do all electric with no emissions. Trolley bus wires are visual pollution. In an ideal world I'd get rid of Rio Tinto Bluff smelter or charge them full price and use the difference to power all NZ public transport by renewable electricity for free.
- Sub #45: Do not support trolley buses - With the evolution of more low-emission fossil-fuel (+ electric) trolley buses are a dying relic that will become too costly to maintain. If the movies are right, in 100 years our descendants will all be carried on high-capacity self-charging electric vehicles and we'd have wasted 10s of millions trying to maintain the infrastructure for a mode of transport that isn't that common worldwide now anyway.
- Sub #47: Move to hybrids and abandon trolley buses.
- Sub #48: Move to a non-fossil fuel fleet, start by experimenting with battery-powered trolley buses.
- Sub #49: Prefers hybrid. Hybrid is now a mature technology (as opposed to electric). Considers trolley network unreliable, expensive to upgrade and inflexible. Very concerned about the increasing evidence regarding the damaging effects of fine particulate emissions from diesel.
- Sub #51: Remove trolleys and the visually polluting trolley wires.
- Sub #53: Supports retaining and upgrading trolley buses, and converting them into a more efficient, reliable and flexible bus service, using the latest vehicle battery technology.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #54: Supports trolley buses. Considers diesel buses noisy, polluting and as a cyclist prefers sharing the road with electric buses.
- Sub #56: Requests trolley buses retained until a zero-emitting alternative option has been selected, and particularly not want our non-polluting trolley bus fleet replaced with oil-based, polluting trolley buses. Notes that: New Zealand electricity was 77% renewable (2013), with large untapped resources of wind and solar energy if demand grows; Electric vehicle technology is evolving very rapidly, with lower costs and higher performance; There are about 400 public transport systems operating trolleybuses worldwide, with over 600 new trolleybuses scheduled for delivery this year; Research is increasingly highlighting the health risks of operating diesel vehicles in busy pedestrian streets and some cities have already banned diesels in inner city areas; New electric buses cost around one million dollars each to purchase, and it may be more economical to upgrade our existing trolley bus fleet than scrap it and purchase new electric buses; and Hybrid buses could also use trolley poles in town. And a future light rail system could also tap into a well-established system
- Sub #58: You are assuming that costs for trolley buses are more expensive than diesel and the impact on the environment / social aspects of Wellington. This is short sighted.
- Sub #59: Totally against keeping the trolley buses
- Sub #62: Decisions about the future of trolley buses and infrastructure should be based on a qualitative and wider framework and not just quantitative factors. Trolley buses and infrastructure should not be removed until a suitable alternative is agreed. Trolley buses are a key part of the city's fabric, an environmentally friendly point of difference that helps make Wellington unique. They are quiet, great to ride on, pedestrian friendly without the fumes in Wellington's narrow streets.
- Sub #64: Supports maintaining trolley buses on existing trolley bus routes until replaced with another electrically powered option e.g.: light rail. Good environmental and economic outcomes from repair/renovation of substations and maintaining overhead wires to keep trolley service for their full life span. Supports the statement in the draft RPTP regarding the use of public transport reduces CO2 emissions. Does not support replacement with diesel.
- Sub #68: Does not support slow noisy expensive and unreliable trolley buses.
- Sub #72: Does not support trolley buses or overhead wiring. Getting rid of trolley buses will provide savings on maintenance which can be used for other things.
- Sub #73: Supports phasing out trolley buses. Suggest bigger and bendy buses will cost a lot and be in-efficient in off-peak. Better to spend the money on more buses and employ more drivers. More frequent buses are better than big ones as time spent at bus stops is the deadest time ever.
- Sub #74: Supports retaining as much of the trolley network as possible without incurring significant extra cost. Supports keeping central city route as trolley buses where emissions and noise are more important. Does not support a wholesale replacement strategy and suggests a route by route decision. If the trolley system is to be phased out then favours hybrid buses. If hybrid suggests design which uses battery power in the central city, diesel engine shutdowns at stops, charging outside the city area and future battery charging at terminals. Suggest GWRC use the expertise from Oxford City and Oxford University.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #76: Keep the trolleys until 2020 because this links with other improvement aspects proposed. Support gradual long term replacement of trolleys and diesels with low emission options from 2017 (i.e.: hybrid for hill suburbs and electric elsewhere).
- Sub #77: Supports retaining trolley buses until a better system is available. The expenditure to upgrade the overhead lines and generating equipment would extend the life of the present fleet for some years [reconditioned only recently] and by the end of this fleets' economical life efficient and affordable electric buses may be available. Considers diesel buses a retrograde step.
- Sub #79: Strongly supports the removal of slow, noisy, unreliable and congestion causing trolley buses and considers the wires cause visual pollution.
- Sub #82: Support replacing the trolley buses.
- Sub #83: Perhaps reduce the trolley support to trunk lines such as the Newtown/Strathmore-Seatoun and Island bay circuits that are so heavily resourced already, freeing up the diesels for some of the more thinly spaced suburbs (Roseneath/Southgate etc.). These themselves could be fed from the far-end of CBD locations (Say Lambton Q, not Courtenay - reducing the need for a 'hop' for most people)
- Sub #84: Keeping trolley buses is investing in the future since they run on renewable energy via the Makara wind farm. This should be celebrated as a tourist edge for Wellington - a renewable energy bus (trolley) fleet. Removing them is going backward. The impact of a renewable energy trolley bus travel is 0.8MJ/passenger-km compared with 3.5MJ/passenger-km for a diesel city bus. Moving to bio-diesel will not help since the land to grow/supply bio-diesel is a factor of 600 times that of wind energy.
- Sub #85: Supports trolley buses. Considers GWRC has failed to plan for the costs of replacement of generators and therefore the least cost option (diesel) seems attractive. Replacing trolleys with diesels is short sighted and ultimately a very costly option. Considers the increasing health and environmental costs of emissions from diesel buses will result in diesel buses not being used in the future and GWRC will be open to future health claims from emissions.
- Sub #87: Really pleased to see that the trolley buses will probably go due to reliability and speed issues.
- Sub #88: Supports removing the trolley buses.
- Sub #90: Opposes continuing to fund trolley buses when they are so much more expensive, and when they are so much slower. Trolleys are the main reason why submitter prefers the number 17 to Karori - guaranteed not to be a trolley bus!! Trolley buses are not just slower for the passengers, they also slow down the whole of the traffic flow so making commuting for everyone more time consuming. Most important factor is reliability, people want to get to work on time, and they want to get home reliably. If GWRC had asked about reliability of the service it would have been rated as highly as price and destination.
- Sub #91: Supports removal of slow, unreliable and more expensive trolley buses. Trolley buses discourage the submitter from using public transport.
- Sub #92: I believe the current trolley buses help to encourage the number of pedestrian and cycle commuters in the central city. As a cyclist and pedestrian I have a strong

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

preference to avoid using diesel powered vehicles in the central city as much as possible.

- Sub #93: Supports keeping trolley buses, at least until there are better options for replacement than are currently being proposed. Replacing/upgrading substations will be less costly than dismantling an effective transport system and buying new buses that are probably no more effective. The present trolley buses can travel some distance on batteries, so make this a requirement of any new trolley buses required.
- Sub #94: Trolley buses should be replaced. Trolley buses are old technology like the Ganz and English electric trains and have no part in the future of the city.
- Sub #97: Supports electric buses. Notes New Zealand's surplus of electricity and the resulting reduction of carbon monoxide. Supports an electric, low carbon emissions option that is based on public service and not private profit.
- Sub #98: Suggests having euro standards for diesel engines misses the point that they are still burning fossil fuel and contributing to global climate change. Recommends the cost for such a survey should be met by central government as part of New Zealand's contribution to combating climate change.
- Sub #98: Suggests the proposal regarding the trolley buses is based around managing the short term impact resulting from the end of the trolley wires contract.
- Sub #101: Recommends retaining the trolley bus overhead wires, as they may be used for light rail and it would be impossible under RMA to replace that network.
- Sub #101: Supports trolley buses and suggests electric buses should be an option.
- Sub #102: Supports replacing trolley buses with diesel buses as wishes to remove the overhead wires.
- Sub #104: Supports removal of trolley buses as they are slow, unreliable and cannot pass other buses.
- Sub #111: Supports removing the trolley buses as they are too expensive to buy and to run and they are too slow and unreliable. First preference for buses is hybrids as they are a proven mature technology that delivers significant emission reduction and fuel saving. Second preference is the new low emission diesels as they are proven mature technology with much reduced emissions compared to the old ones. Third preference is rechargeable electric as this is an unproven immature technology at the bleeding edge. It may be the best long term option but seems high risk at this time. It can be phased in as the technology matures.
- Sub #113: Supports Option 4 for Electric Vehicles. Proposes an investigation into whether the current trolley lines could be used for charging Electric Vehicles. Supports a minimum fare increase for funding based on an increased bus patronage.
- Sub #116: States that using bigger buses creates more hazards to the public for route 14.
- Sub #116: Get rid of them. I actually ride them most days. I'm over them. We can do better than this outdated technology.
- Sub #117: Supports the removal of trolleys if additional funding is required.
- Sub #120: Opposed to trolley buses as they are noisy, costly to operate and limited in their versatility. Suggests that if the trolley bus support system is too costly to maintain,

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

to not replace it. Concerned about the judgment of GWRC in recently purchasing new trolley buses. Suggests fleet should be influenced by cost, then by noise emitted in use and finally by emissions emitted in use. .

- Sub #120: Supports modern diesel buses, then diesel plus Hybrid and finally hybrid. Opposed to electric buses as they are insufficiently advanced to justify their purchase or higher cost of maintenance. Recommends the technology be kept under review though and possibly be considered in 5-10 years time.
- Sub #121: Supports the removal of trolleys. Proposes to retain one short route for tourist/historic reasons. Supports the addition of Hybrid and Electric buses assuming the electrics will not be effected in power cuts. Does not support larger buses on Wellington's narrow streets.
- Sub #123: Remove trolley buses from the option - when electricity supply is suddenly lost, the trolley buses just sit. At present on weekday evenings (after initial peak) and on weekends diesels are used already. It would be very interesting if stats were provided for how often GWRC Councillors use public transport especially the ones advocating trolleys.
- Sub #128: Supports the removal of trolley buses to a more cost effective option.
- Sub #131: Supports keeping trolley buses as the renewed trolleybus fleet is only 5 years old and has plenty of life left in it. Cannot afford expensive hybrids and electric buses that are not in commercial service. Does not support introducing 100 passenger bendy buses as they are unsuitable for Wellington. Considers the long term plan for Wellington should be a 'staged' light rail.
- Sub #132: Supports the removal of trolleys.
- Sub #133: Supports the retention and improvement of the trolley bus system. Agrees with the renewable energy resource and the emission of carbon dioxide.
- Sub #136: Supports an investment in modern technology Electric buses. These would preferably utilise the existing/adopted infrastructure to charge/plug-in. Would only discard the existing trolley option if there is a clean alternative available. Does not support the investment in traditional diesel buses.
- Sub #140: Supports the continuation and maintenance of the electric trolley service including regular upgrades to keep them viable. Agrees with the reduced emissions and noise that this service provides.
- Sub #143: Supports the continuation of the trolley buses as they are a zero emission method of transport.
- Sub #148: Suggests the overnight charge battery electric buses represent the most reliable, cost effective and sustainable option that are available now. The PT Plan states that diesel buses are the lowest cost and the most popular internationally but suggests that this is not necessarily the case for Euro V and Euro VI options. The Plan includes hybrid technology as a credible option for large scale rollout, suggests that this is not the case. The Plan summarises opportunity electric buses as expensive and immature technology requiring additional infrastructure but suggests the costs, performance and reliability of large battery electric vehicles and believes them to be the best solution for the urban transport.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #154: Suggests a trial of new trolley bus options before deciding to discontinue. Does not support oil dependent options.
- Sub #161: Supports the continuation of trolleys and acknowledges the infrastructure may need to be upgraded. Appreciates the lower carbon emissions and reduced noise.
- Sub #168: Supports a trolley or electric bus system as both are environmentally friendly options. Also notes the investment would be beneficial based on rising oil prices. Does not support a diesel bus option.
- Sub #169: The best option for the future bus fleet is option 4 in the presentation; replacing diesel and trolley buses with battery electric buses. Instead of new charging stations you should keep small sections of the existing trolley overhead wire network for charging while driving and install poles on the new electric buses as charging terminals.
- Sub #169: Supports a trolley or electric bus service as opposed to smelly, noisy diesel options. Suggests an investigation into people's willingness to use the proposed options before making a future investment.
- Sub #173: Supports modern diesel buses due to their cost-effectiveness and efficiency but notes the impact on the environment. Suggests a transition to hybrid/electric buses as they become more affordable.
- Sub #175: Requests reconsideration of a light rail option for the Golden Mile because the costs i.e. the tunnel could have been removed from the proposal. A light rail is hugely effective and cheap to run (after the comparatively high installation costs). These costs may be too high in the future.
- Sub #177: My preference is for hybrid buses as it reduces emissions and gives flexibility.
- Sub #180: Closing the trolleybus system now would limit our options for the future. By retaining the overhead wire network we are future proofing our Public transport system. The overhead wire network has been renewed why waste this investment now? Trolleybuses are a Wellington icon and must be retained so future generations can enjoy clean zero emissions buses.
- Sub #181: Keep the trolleys until cost effective alternative options have been found. Also, let's not get fixated on a technology that excludes other alternatives at a time when more low emission technology solutions are fast emerging.
- Sub #185: Supports the use of hybrid buses
- Sub #185: Supports the use of hybrid buses.
- Sub #186: Supports the removal of trolley buses and the 'aerial graffiti' for an overall visual improvement to the city. Suggests the proposed larger capacity buses be restricted to those routes that can accommodate the vehicle size.
- Sub #187: Supports the trolley bus system as zero emissions and very little noise.
- Sub #188: Suggests electric buses for smaller routes only as not suitable for hilly suburbs.
- Sub #192: Supports the retention and upgrading of the trolley buses including a free city loop. Trolleys should be used on weekends and in hilly suburbs. Notes a cost to upgrade but also a cost to remove current network. Does not support a diesel option

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

based on health risks and carbon emissions. Notes the absence of a Light Rail or CNG option.

- Sub #197: Supports an electric bus system. Suggests trials using current overhead lines to charge electric motors before a decision is made. Does not support a fossil fuel based alternative. Notes health and environmental interests are a priority for Wellington.
- Sub #201: Support trolley buses, but if it is decided that another type of electric bus requiring some form of reticulated electrical system for motive force is required, Wellington Cable Car Limited would expect to be given the opportunity to be involved in specifying the network user and system requirements, procurement and operation / maintenance, including the electrical power supply system instead of WELL.
- Sub #201: Supports the continuing use of Trolley Buses, in particular iconic status and their low environmental impact. Support the right for the public to select the transport option that best suits their needs. If Trolley Buses do continue beyond 2017, believe that it would be easy for WCCL to continue operating as it does now, and the cost of maintaining the WCCL network will decline significantly as its material state and operational performance improves (this trend has already commenced).
- Sub #203: Supports the continuation and investment in trolley buses citing international success/investment in recent months. Suggests the overall lifetime cost will be similar to other systems and ongoing costs may decrease over time.
- Sub #206: I don't think we should keep trolley buses. Please get the cheapest option available.
- Sub #211: Supports retaining trolley buses with a view toward sustainability and choosing the most environmentally conscious option for public transport, celebrating Wellington's unique character and for the long term future of the Wellington region.
- Sub #224: Does not support the continuation of trolley buses as costs to maintain are too high.
- Sub #227: Suggests deferring any decision until a trial is conducted to establish the feasibility of upgrading the existing trolley fleet to a more efficient/flexible/reliable service using the latest electric vehicle battery technology (which is expected to improve dramatically in the next 3 to 5 years). This will mean lower cost/higher performance and over time savings in energy and maintenance costs. New Zealand electricity is approx. 75% renewable with large untapped resources of wind and solar energy. Does not support diesel options for health and carbon emissions reasons.
- Sub #230: Does not support the continuation of the current bus fleet. Suggests an upgrade to modern buses for noise and emission levels.
- Sub #236: Supports the continuation of trolley buses.
- Sub #238: Does not support a decision on fleet preference based on carbon emissions.
- Sub #239: Suggests any decision made about the trolley buses be deferred until a detailed analysis of the options by credible persons/businesses is conducted. Does not support a diesel option for cost and health reasons.
- Sub #245: Given that the trolleys were refurbished relatively recently, the trolley bus fleet should be phased out over a period of time - it doesn't all have to go early! But long-term we should move away from fixed overhead lines (this inflexibility was also an argument against light rail).

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #245: Favours gradual phase-out and removal of routes as new buses arrive, as it's wasteful to replace trolley buses early. Prefers to not replace trolley buses due to inflexibility. Increasing public transport patronage will make a greater contribution to reducing emissions. Favours a mixed fleet of hybrid (some advantages of trolley buses on steep grades), electrics to be trialled on shorter routes and small diesel buses for local links.
- Sub #247: Supports the continuation of trolley buses including upgrades.
- Sub #248: Trolleys clearly aren't going to fit with the future given the investment required and flexibility.
- Sub #249: Supports a downsized trolley route and the introduction of hybrid diesels.
- Sub #251: Suggests trolley buses should be phased out.
- Sub #253: Opposes trolley buses as they cause traffic delays.
- Sub #258: Supports expansion of trolley bus network. The overhead wiring needs to be owned and controlled by the council. Trolley bus expansion will incur lower operating costs.
- Sub #259: Supports the electric trolley system for emissions reasons and the affordability vs an electric car.
- Sub #260: Supportive of Trolley Buses continuing due to lower carbon emissions, and lower fuel costs.
- Sub #261: Supportive of this decision being influenced more by individual submissions rather than those from interest groups with strongly held agendas.
- Sub #263: Submitter is unconcerned over the current make-up of the Wellington City bus fleet. Suggests it would be sensible to future proof the fleet if possible by looking towards low emission vehicles with sensible fuel options. Suggests that if fares are increased higher than their current level in real terms, the Council will not succeed in its overall objective. This is likely to put the purchase of electric buses and similar vehicles out of contention.
- Sub #265: Supports the retirement of the trolley buses in favour of low or zero emission alternatives, as it is considered that the maintenance cost of these vehicles outweigh the benefit of keeping them on any longer.
- Sub #267: Opposed to trolley buses, as they are unreliable and uncomfortable. If retained, supportive of a CBD ring route use only.
- Sub #268: Supports light rail.
- Sub #268: Supports trolley buses, as they are quiet, non-polluting, with a never ending supply of electricity.
- Sub #271: Supports hybrid or electric buses when they are reliable.
- Sub #275: I don't believe trolley buses are the best option.
- Sub #276: Opposed to trolley buses, would prefer the most efficient
- Sub #277: Opposed to trolley buses, there are better options.
- Sub #278: Opposed to trolley buses. Supports hybrid buses, then cleaner diesel buses.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #279: Supports GWRC trialling existing trolley buses with modern high efficiency motors and batteries that can be charged either from overhead wires or by being plugged in at a depot. GWRC should defer decision on fleet type until after trial.
- Sub #285: Supports the continuation of trolley buses as they: currently save 2.1 million litres of fuel each year, are cleanest/greenest option with renewable electricity, supports GWRC's target of a carbon neutral Wellington, and provides most economic option with zero emissions. Suggests renewing infrastructure over time. Does not support diesel options as they are oil dependent and pose health risks. Suggests long term plan include high capacity light rail option and electric buses.
- Sub #287: Opposed to trolley buses, supports diesel buses, due to costs.
- Sub #288: Supports option 4, as this will keep costs down.
- Sub #289: Opposes trolley buses due to reliability, supports diesel buses.
- Sub #291: Opposes trolley buses. Supports modern diesels or hybrids - will keep emissions sufficiently low. Supports reducing noise levels of most current diesels.
- Sub #292: Supports retaining trolley buses as they are part of Wellington's identity.
- Sub #292: Supports Trolley buses, due to reduced noise levels. Opposes hybrid buses due to higher maintenance costs. Disputes trolley bus inflexibility, citing they can operate on battery power.
- Sub #295: Supports trolley buses on high passenger demand routes and times. Supports diversity of fuel sources - considering economic outlook of electricity and diesel.
- Sub #300: Supports retention of the trolleys, suggests including a lithium battery option and charging from the existing wires.
- Sub #301: Suggests low-emission technology should take precedence over the perceived clean/green qualities of the present fleet.
- Sub #306: Does not support the removal of trolley buses. Suggests a trial be conducted with current fleet to see how they perform with rechargeable batteries/high efficiency motors and upgrade accordingly. Also notes the \$40 million investment in the last decade and the associated health benefits from an all-electric system. Trolleys also support a smoke-free golden mile as proposed by WCC. Does not support a diesel option for cost and climate change reasons.
- Sub #312: We should definitely keep trolley buses. They obviously need replacing with new vehicles and the substations need upgrading. Reading the report it sounds like for inadequate maintenance we have had a good service for 50 years. A fleet that is a mixture of trolley buses, hybrids and modern diesels would carry Wellington into the 21st century. I think a mixture of rates and transport users sharing the cost should be how the additional costs are paid. Also putting in overhead wires for high growth areas north of Wellington should be investigated; although I love living next to the Johnsonville train line and use it regularly.
- Sub #313: Does not support diesel options. The Golden Mile is already extremely unpleasant due to diesel fumes, noise, and bus-clutter.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #315: Trolley buses are the better of what are poor options. Suggests combined councils stick to the plan for a light rail system instead of capitulating to central government.
- Sub #316: Supports Electric buses and suggests overhead assets should be retained (in zones) to use as part of the charging system for new electric battery buses which will use a mix of direct and inductive charging systems.
- Sub #321: Opposes removing trolley buses when a cost effective alternative has not yet been identified. Suggests removing trolley buses on some routes like the #7 route due to the numerous bends and drivers going slowly to avoid losing their poles. Concerned that the trolley bus fleet was only upgraded about five years ago and these new trolley buses should be used for at least a further five years.
- Sub #322: Supports retaining trolley buses.
- Sub #323: Opposes trolley buses, recommends more non diesel/ petrol buses if that is possible.
- Sub #324: Suggests more trolley buses (and less prone to breaking down) so that the infrastructure is better utilised and can reduce use of diesel (which is going to get more expensive).
- Sub #325: Trolley Bus
- Sub #328: Suggests having another look at light rail from the railway station down to Courtney place. I think that the "financial analysis" of the options was designed to justify a pre-determined conclusion
- Sub #329: Supports removing trolley buses.
- Sub #330: Does not have a strong view on whether or not to keep trolley buses.
- Sub #331: Supports a hybrid bus option first and a low emissions diesel option second, based on costs. Does not support the continuation of trolleys as costs outweigh benefits. Suggests a light rail option for the core route from the Railway Station to the Hospital/Kilbirnie but notes the cost/disruption of the installation might render it impossible to be realised.
- Sub #333: Opposes Diesel bus fleet due to noise and emissions.
- Sub #334: Does not support new diesel buses as the small seats are uncomfortable.
- Sub #335: Supports deferring decisions on bus motive power until more is known about likely options and costs, preserving the option of upgrading the trolley buses while it has option value, and adopting a programme that balances the risks and costs of spending too much on research or upgrading on the one hand, and missing promising options on the other. Requests a different approach to the decision on the Wellington bus fleet options, with a cautious, one-step at a time path which would preserve a series of trolley based electric bus options until the benefits are properly understood, consider trolleys as an effective short-term option to at least 2030, charge battery buses from the overhead on the move with no need for charging time in the timetable, minimise the number of new heavy-current (and costly) battery bus charging points, extend the life of costly traction batteries, allow conventional hybrid buses to run through the central city with no emissions, avoid the proposed surge in GHG emissions from Wellington buses and reduce damaging PM10 emissions, and minimise the risk of legal action by the bus owners. Submits that the cost of modernising the trolley system is roughly 20% cheaper

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

than replacing with diesels. This submitter has provided a critique of the information provided by the GWRC and a detailed alternate approach which should be read in full in the original submission.

- Sub #336: Tawa CB has no preference on what type of bus fleet should be used and strongly supports a bus fleet that has the least impact on the environment, taking account of whole of life considerations.
- Sub #338: No reason to withdraw the trolley bus fleet. If trolley bus routes are dieselised trolley bus wiring should be retained for possible future use (as with Aro Street in 1990's). Trolley buses suit Wellington and are used around the world. Trolley buses can move off the wires if they break down and Diesel and Hybrid buses can break down too. Hybrid buses are expensive and unreliable. Cost to disassemble the trolley bus system could be spent on upgrades instead. Light rail needs a higher population to work and is less earthquake resistant. Trolley buses are environmentally friendly and quiet and will last twice as long as diesels and can feed power back into the system. Advances in technology can make trolley buses more reliable. Why withdraw recently replaced and expensive sections of trolley wire if they will last another 30 years. Trolley buses can be planned as part of the Wellington City Bus Review. Wellington City Bus Review has flaws. Current operations are sufficient, only minor tweaks to the network are needed.
- Sub #341: Supports retaining trolley buses and replacing diesel buses with electric ones due to effects of climate change and health problems caused by diesel fumes and vibrations of buses sitting and idling near residence. Kilbirnie bus depot should be moved due to health concerns.
- Sub #342: Prefers hybrid diesel electric buses to provide an effective low/zero carbon solution and because electric buses would not be able to cope with steep grades. Supports removing diesel buses over time without replacement.
- Sub #347: Recommends the trolley buses should be retained until the fleet is all-electric
- Sub #349: Recommends and supports retention of Trolley buses and recommends GW look more at the health factors and environmental impact. Prohibitive costs of electric buses in the future. Recommends using local engineering expertise as well as technology that is readily available, in easy access.
- Sub #350: Supports retention of trolley bus network in the CBD, because it will help maintain air quality, reduce noise pollution, reduce capital costs of full network enhancement. Does not support diesel bus option.
- Sub #354: Supports transit that uses existing electrical infrastructure, because it is a reliable and clean energy source in good supply. Suggests future forms of transport may also utilise this infrastructure (e.g. hybrid buses, light rail). Recommends trolley buses be retained, saying 400 public transport systems worldwide use them. Opposes transition to diesel buses due to negative impact on Wellington's "clean and green" reputation.
- Sub #357: Opposes diesel buses as they are an overseas product and the cost of fuel is potentially unstable.
- Sub #359: Recommends increasing rail-based infrastructure (trolley and train) for cultural value and ease of consumer use. Recommends rail as fixed routes are more direct and easy to understand than changeable bus routes. Supports electric-powered

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

rail vehicles due to potential for urban regeneration along rail lines (as observed in Europe, North America)

- Sub #360: Strongly supports the continuation of trolley buses as opposed to diesel buses as the overhead network has been renewed and new buses provided. Trolley buses should also not be replaced with diesel buses at night. The addition of batteries to trolleys enables them to get past obstacles and is a major step forward. If trolleys are replaced, they should be with fully electrical buses, such as supplied by the Chinese company BYD Auto. If the NZ counterpart, Zero Emissions, builds an electric bus at a comparable price, the two could be evaluated against each other. All other forms of transport, involving combustion engines should be avoided.
- Sub #363: Does not support retention of trolley buses or purchase of battery buses as they cannot provide the same service levels of a diesel bus due to lack of advancement in technology, are slow, unreliable, expensive and cause visual pollution. Trolley buses are also fixed to where wires run. Supports diesel buses with E6 standard engines; existing buses below E6 standard not due for replacement until 2023 should have E6 standard engines retrofitted. Service offered to public should take primary concern over carbon emissions.
- Sub #365: Supports current trolley system as one of Wellington's assets and a clever, clean way of moving about the city. Suggests frequent trolleys to and from the airport. Notes the long term economic benefits vs diesel.
- Sub #367: Support hybrid option because it is environmentally and financially friendly.
- Sub #367: Oppose keeping the trolley buses due to maintenance costs.
- Sub #368: Supports keeping trolley buses
- Sub #370: Opposes further funding for trolley buses as they are slow and constantly losing power
- Sub #375: Supports keeping the trolley buses because they are functional, comparatively cheap to run and far greener than any present alternatives as well as long term benefits. Suggests replacing the trolley buses with diesel buses is more harmful to our environment because diesel engines burn fossil fuels there are harmful emissions into our atmosphere.
- Sub #376: Supports upgrading the system with new modern buses. Supports hybrid buses which would see reduction of emissions for a cleaner environment.
- Sub #379: Recommends a tram network linking Porirua, Johnsonville to Lower Hutt to Upper Hutt to Karori and past the Wellington Hospital to South Wellington.
- Sub #381: Does not support the continuation of trolleys as there is a rising costs of maintenance. Supports the modern diesel option for the improved efficiency and environmental friendliness they now offer.
- Sub #384: Suggests replacing trolley buses with an equally efficient option.
- Sub #387: Supports funding the upgrade of the trolley bus network until such time that battery technology is sufficiently advanced to be practical.
- Sub #387: Supports keeping trolley buses.
- Sub #388: Supports hybrid buses as there may be a better chance of converting them to an all-electric fleet when battery technologies improve.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #390: Does not support keeping the trolley buses as they are too slow going along Cobham drive, they hold up the traffic (especially when we have strong wind) and the poles fall off all time.
- Sub #394: Supports a light rail system and the continuation of trolley buses. The infrastructure could also be used for charging batteries. Willing to pay more for an electric option for health and environmental benefits. New service should provide reliable level boarding for people with children/bad knees/wheelie bags and be attractive/user friendly across all vehicles. Does not support noisy diesel options for cost and health reasons.
- Sub #396: Supports a combination of trolleys and hybrids would be ideal and provide a good basis for an effective long term strategy.
- Sub #397: Supports keeping the trolley buses.
- Sub #402: Supports keeping the trolley buses and removing the bus lane at Manners Street.
- Sub #404: Wellington should retain the trolley buses where possible. The proposed route changes will in fact make the current trolley wires redundant. The additional costs of the trolley bus system appear to be a case of 'swings & roundabouts'. While some parts of the network cost more other issues, such as bus life being longer, mean that some costs are in fact cheaper. Investment in the trolley bus network will be required to bring the system up to date with current technologies. This investment is the responsibility of the regional council to fund and find the funding for from central and local government. The regional council have already shown they take this responsibility with their investment into commuter passenger rail in the Wellington region. With relation to trolley bus costs it appears that the greatest cost for trolley buses is the need to add extra trolley wires to complete the new routes. While the infrastructure may need upgrading it should also be made clear that some of the costs will also be needed to changes to the routes. If hubs are to be used appropriate sized trolley buses could also be used from and to a Kilbirnie hub, for example the proposed Lyall Bay local service and the proposed Miramar local service.
- Sub #406: Supports keeping the trolley buses until there is a proper light rail system.
- Sub #407: Opposes switching to diesel powered buses because of the health risks, air pollution and climate change. Supports upgrades and modifications to the current fleet, or if not feasible, to a gradual replacement with other electrically powered vehicles over time.
- Sub #410: Opposes replacing trolley buses with fossil fuel powered vehicles because we're very likely to experience price increases, reduced availability of fossil fuels in the future and retain public transport that is independent of fossil fuels. Suggests the electric distribution network is outdated and needs substantial investment. Suggests the current trolley buses have many deficiencies and NZ Bus needs to have economic incentives to improve and gradually replace them with better ones.
- Sub #411: Opposes retaining the trolley buses. Supports continued replacement with latest diesel buses until mature technology is available and economically feasible. Suggests when diesel fuel becomes too expensive or in short supply then it will be prioritised to public transport use for the greater good. Opposes hybrid buses because of the high cost and likely frequent battery replacements over time to maintain performance on hilly Wellington runs.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #412: Suggests trolley buses might not be suitable for every possible route. Supports keeping the trolley buses but not necessarily the status quo and to try and get better use out of the network.
- Sub #415: The baseline in the PwC report should have been modern diesel and trolleybuses since the current fleet will need to be replaced over the medium term. Noise pollution (caused by diesel buses) and visual pollution (caused by trolleybuses) are not serious concerns and should have no place in the analysis. Nor is the 'iconic' nature of the trolleybuses of any import - passengers do not become excited upon seeing trolleybuses approach. The most important consideration is the efficiency of getting passengers where they want to go. Other important matters include environmental considerations and cost, in that order.
- Sub #415: Recommends abolishing the trolleys, but it is important not to increase net emissions. The trolleys should go because the wires could come down in a natural disaster, trolleybuses are slower (sometimes because too many are drawing power from the wires at the same time), cannot pass each other, not as reliable and if Wellington lost power sixty buses would be unusable. Abolishing the trolleys would best serve the most important consideration of where and when passengers want to travel. Diesel buses are not a sustainable option in the long-term, due to their contributions to climate change and limited oil supplies. Any savings should be used to offset the difference in emissions between a fleet of new diesels and a fleet of new diesels and trolleys, if that difference favours keeping trolleys. New diesels must actually meet the Euro standards in day-to-day practice, not just in tests. Diesels seem to be the better option than hybrids because hybrids carry fewer passengers and cost more to buy. Electrics would seem to be too expensive and immature at the moment, but perhaps they will be ready by the next time we have to replace our buses. The seating layout of the current trolleys should be replicated in the new diesels.
- Sub #416: Opposes keeping the trolley buses.
- Sub #417: Supports not to keep trolley buses.
- Sub #418: Does not support trolley buses due to fixed route.
- Sub #419: Does not support the removal of trolley buses. Suggests a balanced analysis on current system as proposed alternatives are all worse in terms of noise, emissions etc. Notes the current trolley fleet would be serviceable until 2022. Suggests Wellington Electricity costs analysed to provide a more accurate upgrade cost (\$52M seems too high). Suggests a revision on proposed routes to extend trolleys on A/C/F and notes this might cause congestion, but the advantages of trolleys still outweighs this issue. Notes the visual clutter caused but also that Europe and North America are investing and expanding their trolley systems.
- Sub #421: Supports retention of trolley buses as replacing them before they reach the end of their economic life with diesel buses would be a retrograde step. As a result, emissions produced from manufacture of replacement diesel buses, in addition to operational emissions, should be considered. Should aim for all electric fleet by the time Bus Rapid Transit is introduced in 2022.
- Sub #422: Supports investing in more reliable and modern bus fleet. Notes there are currently no trolley lines run past Victoria's main campus at Kelburn and the university so no vehicle preference. Supports vehicles that are modern, reliable, low emission,

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

cost effective and will most likely to maintain or increase patronage and benefit the community.

- Sub #425: Comments that implementing BRT will be a major investment for GWRC and the ownership of the vehicles, and whether they need to be custom built, will be important factors. Suggests that ordering 'off the line' vehicles for BRT or standard fleet operations reduces cost, and if GRWC owns the fleet as it does with the trains, it will provide significantly more options and greater competition for operations.
- Sub #431: Recognises that there is a need to modernise Wellington's bus fleet. Suggests that the bus fleet mix will be best left to be driven by GWRC's consideration of the right balance of market forces and public attachment to the status quo.
- Sub #433: Supports the use of renewable energy (electricity and/or biofuels) to power buses to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reliance on fossil fuels, and because the efficiency of electric motors is significantly higher than traditional diesel engines. If the trolleys are to be removed there are valid options that maintain one of the key benefits of the trolleys: minimising the use of fossil fuels (and maximising the use of renewable energy) in bus transport in Wellington. Some new technologies discounted (in PWC report) as they are regarded as still emerging and not commercially viable, yet there are examples overseas of electric battery buses in Shenzhen and Shanghai plus various trials underway overseas. These should be closely examined before ruling out a particular vehicle technology (Volvo, for example, appears to have a strategy with a heavy focus on electric and plug-in hybrid buses for inner-city operations in the medium term, with relevant vehicles available commercially within the next 2-4 years following proof of performance in current trials). It appears likely that viable options will be commercially available in New Zealand in time for the intended retirement of the trolley buses in 2017. Supports a mixed technology approach rather than choosing one over all others.
- Sub #435: Does not believe battery electric buses would be more cost effective than a trolley bus, thinks that as part of the BRT plan and wherever possible, bus services should be more frequent while maintaining current size rather than having larger, higher capacity buses.
- Sub #436: Concerned that there was no reference to CNG as an option. Strongly recommends that GW adds CNG into its list of bus fleet option considerations and that it be specifically allowed for in the procurement process arguing that CNG buses are readily available, are proven reliable technology; have highest well to wheel efficiency on CO2 reduction (vs. diesel); lowestpm and Nox emission (vs. diesel); low noise production; exceed Euro 6; don not need Battery Packs, disposal of, replacement; are biogas compatible and have no spillage risks. CNG also supports the proposed policy 2.h "Reduce the production of carbon emissions from the public transport network."
- Sub #437: Comments that the analysis of the different options is interesting but provides misleading and incomplete information. Suggests to consider other submissions about how to improve the current operations, and the fact that the current fleet will continue to be serviceable until 2022.
- Sub #439: Supports retaining the trolley buses.
- Sub #442: Support the introduction of electric buses rather than diesel, and strongly supports retention and upgrading of the trolley system that would enable us to move towards a climate compatible, healthy, zero-emission all-electric public transport system

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

in New Zealand's capital city. Concerned that economic, climate and health considerations appear to be ignored by plans to replace the relatively new electric trolley buses with diesel i.e. the plan and the online submission form both frame retention of electric trolley buses as a 'cost', yet there are no hard data on how much GWRC is attempting to reduce transport emissions over the lifetime of bus investment. Suggests that electric bus economic analysis must include health costs, rising oil costs and greenhouse gas emissions. Requests that GWRC carry out a new Health Impact Assessment (HIA) including the impacts of transport GHG on changing climate and health prior to making decisions on the region's long term transport as a necessary step in order to comply with the requirements of the Health Act (1956).

- Sub #443: Opposes discontinuation of the trolley buses as counter-productive. Notes that overseas, the trend is to bring them back. Has this been researched without bias for cost effectiveness?
- Sub #443: Notes that hybrid buses are the popular choice from consulting with users.
- Sub #446: Recommends looking at lithium batteries to power trolley buses on the proposed extension to the Aro Valley routes.
- Sub #447: Notes the aim to have fewer buses running down the Golden Mile by using larger capacity buses flies in the face of recent large purchases by the incumbent operator who has been purchasing small buses and using them on busy routes. Articulated buses would have issues with Wellington's short city blocks and short bus stops; tests for double deckers have gone very quiet.
- Sub #447: Notes that throughout the city are many diesels belching out unhealthy fumes right next to footpaths and the noise from the diesels is very loud.
- Sub #447: Strongly opposes proposal to eliminate trolley buses. The inability of trolley buses to pass one another is not a significant issue given the narrowness of the streets. Run properly trolleys should be cheaper to run than diesels and the more they are used the cheaper they should become. The current operator does not run them to the extent they are contracted to be – artificially inflating the costs per kilometre. New technology exists to make trolleys more flexible by allowing them to "rewire" to the overhead wires automatically - and wires themselves need only minor upgrades in order to dramatically improve trolley cornering speeds and performance.
- Sub #448: Supports replacing trolley buses with diesel buses.
- Sub #449: Supports retaining and upgrading the trolley bus fleet to make Wellington a city where people want to live.
- Sub #449: Suggests much of the trolley network has already been upgraded and the buses have twice the working life of diesel buses.
- Sub #452: Keolis Downer does not deem trolley buses to be a viable solution for the future of Wellington city on the basis it represents a lower cost benefit ratio compared to modern diesel bus alternatives. The opportunities for operational optimisation are also significantly constrained due to the inflexible nature of trolley bus infrastructure, which will undoubtedly hamper the potential for future patronage growth. While Keolis Downer recognises the iconic nature of the trolley buses, and the deep affection with which they are regarded by some citizens of Wellington, Keolis Downer's experience is that the creation of more open cityscapes increases the visual appeal of the city for residents and visitors. In addition, as indicated in the draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2014,

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

operational cost savings from removal of the overhead wires can be significant. It also increases the flexibility of vehicle design and selection, further reducing capital costs. These factors have been recognized in a number of cities where trams operate, and catenary-free sections have been introduced to all or part of the network. Examples include Dubai, Zhuhai, Nanjing, Rio de Janeiro, Bordeaux, Zaragoza, Seville, Angers and Reims. Keolis Downer is in agreement with the bus option evaluation presented in the draft Regional Public Transport Plan 2014 and fully supports the use of a modern diesel fleet across the entire network.

- Sub #453: Concerned that the fleet receives a very high level of focus in the RPTP, and this appears to be driven off the proposed termination of trolleys. Suggests that the fleet options should be considered long after the more substantive issues have been addressed. Suggests that any decision on the size of fleet must take into account the impacts of narrow and winding nature of Wellington roads on fleet and other vehicle, public transport reputation, and the safety of drivers, customers, pedestrians and cyclists. Requests for more clarity on the costs reported in the PT Plan for the upgrade and maintenance of trolley bus network. Requests urgent clarity on the transition plans for the fleet changes. Suggests that consideration should be given to retaining some elements of the trolley service through to at least 2022, when the transport spine is set to kick off to ensure gaining greater value from the trolley fleet before the end of its life. Suggests consideration of technology risk an important criterion for evaluation of new fleet options.
- Sub #455: I do not support the proposal to use diesel buses. Decision makers must start taking climate change seriously and prioritise elimination of emissions. Costs should not come into it. I want my grandchildren to inherit a liveable planet and not have to live with the short sighted and cheapest option for Wgtn's transport needs of an earlier generation.
- Sub #456: Keep the trolleys
- Sub #459: Keep trolley buses.
- Sub #461: Recommends keeping the trolley buses because they are iconic to Wellington, to avoid environmental pollution and to mitigate climate change.
- Sub #462: RPH recommends that any decision-making process regarding the future of the trolley buses should include a cost benefit analysis which explicitly considers environmental and social costs, as well as economic costs. Any analysis should also explore long term costs to the environment in context of climate change.
- Sub #463: Strongly disagree with the proposal to retire the trolley bus fleet in 2017. Trolley buses should be kept at least until the end of life of the current fleet, being 2022, and then replaced with next generation trolley buses or other fully electric vehicles.
- Sub #465: Supports keeping the trolley buses. All buses need replacing eventually. Trolley buses could be a tourist attraction. Fresh air would benefit the health of all, especially those who live and work in the inner city.
- Sub #466: Does not support the continuation of trolley buses as they are slow and unreliable. They're often overtaken by a diesel bus that should be 15 minutes behind, the pole comes off the lines frequently and the lines are unattractive.
- Sub #469: If the trolley buses disappear, then they should be replaced by electric buses

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #471: If you MUST choose diesel, use biodiesel or biogas. Lead by example. This could create a local biodiesel demand and encourage the creation of a local biodiesel or biogas plant. If opting for hybrid buses, then specify only biodiesel, made locally. How about using all those (organic fair trade) coffee grounds or the paper non-recyclable cups. This makes GWRC a sustainable, sociably responsible buyer who stimulates the economy and creates jobs.
- Sub #471: When calculating what new buses will cost, recommends adding in the offset cost of fuel savings and reduced GHG emissions from electric vehicles - consider the whole of lifecycle cost, not just the cheapest up front cost. Factor in future maintenance costs for 'normal' buses. Don't sell the region short just to meet a political timeframe. Purchasing decisions should serve across multiple elections and withstand scrutiny. The world price of copper will increase and make replacement parts (and fuel miles) more expensive. Making train and bus fleets more energy efficient is the most achievable means of reducing long term operating costs so that fare increases aren't as stark. . Electricity is carbon-tax proof.
- Sub #472: Supports keeping Trolley Buses as a non-polluting fleet and gradually replace Diesel buses wherever possible.
- Sub #473: Developments in vehicle technology, giving hope of electrical power without overhead wire installations, as well as hybrid solutions. Locking in a diesel bus fleet to meet a 2017 deadline would be a backward step. And I note that much of the discussion of improved diesel (Euro IV and so on) is of reducing the extra particulate pollution they cause, not the fundamental problem of their CO2 emission.
- Sub #473: A much better option is to plan for the PWC run-down option, which gives a net benefit close to that of the hybrid or electric, and in 2017 concentrate the trolleys running all services on the fully-wired routes, essentially C,D,F and I. (A very small amount of new wiring may be desirable to use the direct route from Miramar Shopping Centre to Cobham Drive.)
- Sub #474: Keep trolleys and add new hybrid buses. The cost of public health improvements need to be factored into economic decisions made by central and local government.
- Sub #477: Supports the hybrid bus option.
- Sub #479: Does not support the retention of trolley buses: they are costly as they are discontinued daily and do not run on evenings and weekends, they are slow (especially when poles come off), there is a restriction on coverage, they cause pollution with copper shredding off the lines, the aerial lines are unattractive and are a potential hazard to plans landing/departing from the airport.
- Sub #481: Supports the retention and extension of the trolley bus network including an increased frequency in services. They are quieter, have better acceleration and will minimise carbon emissions. Suggests the replacement of diesel buses with battery operated electric buses or light rail. Notes the recent \$500 million investment in rail and the reluctance to spend the forecasted \$27 million on trolleys.
- Sub #482: Suggests a loss of patronage from the removal of fixed infrastructure. Trolley bus wires signal commitment. Suggests a full cost analysis for considering a wider range of fleet options that includes air quality, noise, related health effects and long term environment considerations. A wholly electric fleet would complement the BRT proposal in representing a future-orientated option.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #486: Supports the continuation of trolley buses with the option to extend and evolve the fleet with electric power technologies (super-capacitor or advanced battery storage). The infrastructure has a visual impact but will provide long term cost-effective options for powering electric vehicles. Benefits include reduced noise, smell and emission. Does not support diesel options or larger buses in the inner city due to narrow streets and the impact on walkers/cyclists. Suggests increased frequency to better match capacity and demand.
- Sub #488: It is absolutely vital that the trolley buses should stay as part of the network
- Sub #488: The existing overhead trolley wires could be used to charge new eclectic vehicles whilst they are in operation, these new "battery trolleys" could then cover routes that are only partly covered by an overhead network. Overhead wires should be installed through the Miramar Cutting. This small investment would connect the existing overhead infrastructure on the Karori and Seatoun bus routes, and allow trolley buses to be used on the proposed new east west trunk route.
- Sub #489: Opposes the removal of trolley-buses from Wellington, and requests an increase in the proportion of electrically-powered buses to show that Wellington truly is a "smart, green eco-city". Suggests that the PwC report has been cherry-picked by GWRC officers to support a preconceived view that supports only the use of larger diesel buses. Does not support diesel buses on the basis of their noxious emissions, CO2 emissions, their lack of power compared with trolleys for climbing Wellington's hills, and the unsuitability of larger buses on Wellington's 19th century road system. Notes that diesel as well as trolley buses are unable to pass to each on sections of the Golden Mile. Submits that the reduction in trolley bus use internationally relates to the replacement of trolley bus systems with light rail or trams. Supports the use of electric vehicles in Wellington on environmental grounds. Believes that the decision on the bus fleet is similar to the choices before the region when the correct decision was made to upgrade the electric rail overhead and extend electrification to Waikanae, instead of replacing the old rolling stock with new diesel trains. Asserts that a different methodology has been used in comparing the bus fleet options than were used for the rail upgrade decision in order to ensure that the financial case against keeping trolley-buses appeared stronger, and requests that social and environmental costs are included in the overall analysis. Supports replacing older diesels with modern trolleys, increasing the low percentage of electric vehicles in the fleet.
- Sub #492: Super-efficient bio diesel fleet would be a better direction
- Sub #496: Prefers electric bus options if the trolley system is disbanded. Electric options have several benefits including reduced noise, carbon emissions and NOx and particulate emissions. A Diesel dominated bus fleet would be a backwards step for our environment and health.
- Sub #497: Strongly disagrees with the replacement of trolleys with more diesel buses. Suggests an investment to modernise the trolley infrastructure in the short term, and a plan to increase the proportion of electrically-powered buses in the next 5-10 years. Electric buses will deliver clean, quiet and comfortable journeys that will attract more people to use public transport. It will also protect the public transport network from the impact of rising oil prices.
- Sub #501: Is proud to live in a city which has trolley buses and wish them to be retained. Would like to see the trolley system augmented to provide an ecologically

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

sound system which would serve Wellington until even cleaner technology is available for buses in the future.

- Sub #505: Supports the continuation of trolley buses but suggests: the current overhead lines are in overall good repair and with appropriate asset management control/investment will last well into the future, no new major investment over and above current levels is required, Cost estimates for the electricity infrastructure renewals may be artificially high and alternative options need to be considered, GWRC should engage the services of specialist traction consultants to independently advise them.
- Sub #506: Asks to maintain trolley buses until viable electric buses are available to replace them. Trolley fleet was only upgraded in 2007 and are vastly more pleasant to ride in (smooth and quiet), efficient on hills, and are both practical and symbolic of our commitment to reducing our carbon emissions and preserving our air quality. Considers it absolutely horrible to sit at a bus top in town for twenty minutes while diesels belch out clouds of exhaust -- we need more trolley buses, not fewer!
- Sub #507: Supports an electric or hybrid option that uses sustainable fuel and minimises carbon emissions. Does not support diesel buses as the fumes are a strong disincentive to cycling.
- Sub #510: If trolley buses are phased out, perhaps Wellington could keep one on a short line for nostalgic reasons similar to the Cable Car.
- Sub #512: Supports the continuation of trolley buses. Suggests GW reconsider the timeframes for making a large decision on a much loved public transport network. Removing the trolleys is a decision you can only make once. They provide a clean, electrical, renewable and sustainable service. Supports the integration of the electric rail into one strong reliable transport mode. Notes the large investment already made and the personality the trolleys give to Wellington's landscape. Does not support a diesel based option as the costs of oil will go up and will also cause health concerns.
- Sub #513: Considers electric buses are a good idea overall, but is largely indifferent as to whether they're powered through wires or batteries.
- Sub #514: Supports keeping the ecologically sound service of the trolley buses. Suggests ownership of the system should be reclaimed by the WCC. Requests service be provided 7 days a week.
- Sub #515: No particular opinion whether trolley buses are kept - Most interested in public transport system that works for people and reduces vehicle congestion
- Sub #516: Supports the continuation of trolley buses as an environmentally sound public transport network based around renewable energy. Suggests upgrade to a lighter hybrid battery/capacitor to give longer life when off wire and allow more passengers. Suggests large amount of funding needed for trolley/house electricity upgrade and should be done over a longer period of time to reduce disruption to locals. Suggests the figures of trolleys being banded is excessive given new ones are available from China for approx. \$200,000 NZD.
- Sub #518: Supports the retention and integration of existing trolley bus system with battery technology to transition to a zero emissions economy. This will also offer considerable savings in contrast with the climate, fuel and health costs of diesel. Suggests a robust economic analysis so that we don't end up with stranded assets in the form of unhealthy last century diesel buses.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #523: Suggests the document builds an argument for change on the unstated assumption that trolleys are unfit for purpose. Suggests objectively assessing the merits of different transportation options. Notes no rationale is provided for why the trolley buses are unsustainable, or why the level of capital expenditure proposed for their maintenance is unwarranted. Notes the term "best practice" is not defined. Suggests the use of the EEM as the basis of the assessment framework is faulty. Notes the PwC report fails to explore societal issues such as public health, carbon emission increases and the long-run risks to ratepayers of a single-sourced bus fleet. Suggests the assessment of the current and future state of trolley bus technology is factually inaccurate and deliberately ignores international experience. Suggests the inclusion of future transport technologies (HFC and battery) proposes this is a sales document for a pre-determined option rather than an objective assessment of viable alternatives.
- Sub #524: Strongly supports keeping/investing/expanding the existing zero emission trolleys. Suggests hybridising trollies using efficient batteries/electric lines so they are capable of leaving the line and charging when back on.
- Sub #527: Supports keeping/modernising/expanding trolley system and combining with electric batteries. Does not support diesel vehicles as emissions are dangerous to the climate and create pollution.
- Sub #530: Frocks on Bikes would like to support low emission bus options.
- Sub #531: Supports the continuation of trolley buses as they have not been economically superseded by electric or hybrid options. Notes the issues with battery electric buses in Wellington's hilly routes and the current trolleys that have batteries to move off poles and clear obstructions for a few kilometres. Notes trolleys have more power than diesel and use electricity sourced from hydro/wind/geothermal sources. Does not support a diesel option as exhaust emissions are a worldwide hazard. Does not support light rail as it is track-bound.
- Sub #532: Supports retaining trolley buses. Suggests PwC report not detailed enough to make a cost benefit decision on future energy costs. Notes the study used a 10yr expected life for buses when trolleys have a much longer service life over diesel. Notes Dunedin and Auckland both removed their trolley networks before an oil increase and it is much easier to predict the costs of the trolley infrastructure.
- Sub #533: Strongly supports not removing the existing zero emission trolley arrangement, but to investing in and expand future-thinking infrastructures. Council should consider hybridising trollies using both new technologies efficient batteries and the existing electric lines, where buses could travel beyond the existing lines via battery, and recharge them when back on the lines.
- Sub #534: Consider electric buses would be better than the trolleys.
- Sub #545: Supports retaining trolley buses. Their life span is projected to last until 2022/2025 and should not be removed until a viable alternative option which takes environmental concern as well as cost efficiency into account is proposed. Supports a LRT option.
- Sub #548: Considers that retention of trolleys would add to the cool-ness of Wellington. Notes example of San Francisco with mixture of older and modern transport modes as example for Wellington.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #549: Support rebuilding the trolley bus network to make up for the decades of neglect. This is a proven and mature technology and is the most efficient way of powering electric vehicles. Trolley buses are quiet, clean and do not require large batteries that have a limited service life. Need to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels.
- Sub #551: Asks that in considering replacement options for the current trolley and diesel bus fleet environmental factors and overall emission reduction is made a priority. Encourage full consideration of the possibility of accelerated electric bus options. If battery electric is not chosen it is imperative that any savings be devoted to fare reductions for bus users and biodiesel be used to power those buses.
- Sub #552: Requests keep the trolleybuses, keep our city clean and green, Keep our cities character. History suggests that scrapping trolleybuses will discourage patronage. The current system has worked well, let's keep it that way
- Sub #553: Not fussed about trolley buses
- Sub #558: Considers it timely to replace trolley buses as they are costly, unreliable with antiquated infrastructure required to support them. Supports moving to flexible diesel buses and away from the non-flexible trolley buses. Supports de-cluttering the skyline.
- Sub #558: Support smaller, more efficient/flexible alternatives to trolley buses. Consider the value of trolley buses is far outweighed by the modern diesel.
- Sub #560: Opposes keeping trolley buses and wants to invest in electrical buses.
- Sub #561: Hybrid buses seen and option to explore.
- Sub #562: A major feature of the Wellington region public transport network is the recent large investment in rail and believe similar investment is required so that the trolley bus network can be maintained, even expanded beyond 2022, to compliment the rail network rather than compete with it.
- Sub #564: Supports retaining trolley buses. Considers all costs should be accurately and transparently calculated, in particular upfront substation costs should be costed according to the life of the substation in the same way that all large capital infrastructure costs are calculated, not presented as \$50 million for 60 buses. If the trolley lines inhibit flexibility, the trolley buses could be retained on a reduced number of stable routes, for example Karori, Kilbirnie and Seatoun to Wellington Railway station and Wilton routes. There is no option to retain the trolley buses and replace the 68 old high emission diesels with hybrids, more trolleys or electric buses. Would like you to choose the option that takes into account the whole cost of fleet replacement (including health effects, greenhouse gas emissions, and life span of the vehicle) as well as the effects of the vehicle choice on bus users, pedestrians, cyclists and other vehicle users.
- Sub #564: Considers the fleet reliability question is redundant as any new vehicle would presumably be reliable, including new trolley buses with upgraded electricity reticulation.
- Sub #571: Opposes transport based on fossil fuels and increasing oil dependence would be unwise for resilience. Considers fossil fuels would be a move towards the past, not towards the future, with limited future availability and much higher carbon emissions.
- Sub #572: Hybrids are unproven technology - both NZ hybrid experiments to date have failed - as have overseas examples. Batteries unproven technology. Trolley buses are

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

time proven technology if you buy tested examples ex Europe or China. Why has council failed to maintain power supply in timely & prudent manner

- Sub #578: Support Hybrid buses and Battery charged buses and consider need to move away from diesel and the noise and emissions associated with them. Other large overseas cities are moving in this direction. Consider home grown electricity may prove to be more cost effective long term than imported fuels. Security of supply important e.g.. Ukraine - threat to European gas supply.
- Sub #579: If \$ reported for yearly maintenance and upgrade of electrical power systems are at all accurate than trolley buses have no future. Work knowledge suggests the figure for the upgrade is excessive for what is a basic power network.
- Sub #580: Don't keep trolley buses
- Sub #581: Support keeping the trolleys. Money has already been invested and still have up to 15 years life in them. Solutions to keep them should be explored first and the useful life still available should be utilised. Society regrets the loss of the trams. Once the trolleys are gone they will be too expensive to replace and their network will not be available to be used by other means of transport.
- Sub #582: Happy for trolley buses to be replaced.
- Sub #584: Considers it is a great pity that long-term investment in a light rail system in Wellington City has not been seriously considered. In the long term it is the only real option that meets the vision stated in the regional strategy and the aims of reduced emissions and reliance on fossil fuels.
- Sub #584: The Draft Plan requests feedback on the relative importance of the different factors to be taken into account in the evaluation. Prefer consideration of a mix of weighted factors: Net benefit/cost – is important, but should not be the sole factor, particularly as recent experience with the Basin Reserve flyover and the spine study suggests cost/benefit analyses are flawed and biased in favour of a preconceived preference.
- Sub #584: Consider diesel and hybrid bus options fail to meet the strategic vision for the transport network which trolley buses mostly meet, and are a viable longer-term option in the absence commitment to light rail as have zero emission and operate on electricity that is generated from renewable resources. Globally, cities are switching to electric-powered public transport systems that are quiet and provide a smooth, comfortable ride and can be fitted with traction battery technology to provide off-wire capability.
- Sub #584: Favour trolley buses as a longer-term fleet option that meets the strategic vision for the public transport network and aims of reducing carbon emissions and dependence on fossil fuels. Consider options presented in the Draft Plan are flawed as the trolley bus option is combined with current diesel only, when it should also be combined with the other three bus options (modern diesel, hybrid, and electric). There is also a bias against any trolley bus option because the bus network has been designed on the basis that the trolley bus network will no longer operate after 2017 and the choice of BRT for the 'spine' has also limited the choice of bus fleet vehicle. The options need to be amended to include trolley buses in each of them prior to undertaking an evaluation.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #589: Support amending options so that trolley bus option can be combined with all other options. Believe bias shown because proposed network designed on basis of no trolley buses after 2017. Believe choice of BRT for the spine has limited the choice of bus fleet. Prefers consideration of a mix of weighted factors including; Net benefit/cost - important but not sole factor. Reliability – important. Carbon and other harmful emissions (most important). Reliability – should be a factor. Noise - should be a factor, especially around high-rise apartment buildings in city. Noise from both brakes and engines should be a factor. Support including sustainability and cost of fuel source and environmental impact. Does not believe lower emissions options are more costly due to absence of pricing of environmental and social costs. Supports retaining trolley buses as they already meet most of the criteria for assessing options, are a viable, longer-term option and the best in the absence of any commitment to light rail, have zero emissions, electricity generated from about 70% of renewable resources, are quiet and smooth, can be fitted with traction battery technology to provide off-wire capability. Diesel and hybrid buses fail to meet the strategic vision for the transport network. Concerned about diesel exhaust near bus stops at peak hours. Wish to see provision in draft plan for contracts with the bus companies to include strict performance measures requiring all diesel buses to be constantly maintained and monitored with financial penalties applying if standards are not met, each bus stop within the inner city to have an air quality monitor, GWRC to establish a separate contract compliance unit which could sub-contract an independent air quality and vehicle emission monitoring company to measure once every month the emissions from every diesel bus in each company's fleet and contracts with bus companies to contain a clause that all diesel bus drivers be trained in the techniques of slow acceleration and slow stopping.
- Sub #590: Supports recovering as much useful life of trolley buses as feasible to allow NZ Bus to recover investment in the old network. In extending use for 5 years fully electric vehicles will have become a more feasible option. Prefers fully electric vehicles over diesel, but understands operating cost implications. Evaluation of vehicles should internalise health and social costs of pollution and a net-benefits evaluation will come to the appropriate decision. Would pay more for a zero-emission service
- Sub #591: It makes sense to go for the least polluting option. Trolley buses OK for now. Concerned that removing trolley overhead and ordering new buses could increase fares.
- Sub #592: Review bus design and seating layout to further cut dwell times. Buses for frequent stop services should be two door with wide rear door having double tag off readers and 2 plus 1 seating between the doors allow more standing/circulating space.
- Sub #593: Electric buses have reduced passenger capacity reduced to accommodate bulk/weight of batteries and lower energy available resulting in more buses required to move the same number of passengers.
- Sub #594: Supports extending trolley buses past 2017. Battery buses problematic and less suitable for Wellington with steep hills. Supports hybrid (diesel/battery) buses.
- Sub #596: Does not support keeping trolley buses.
- Sub #597: Questions the rationale behind the proposal to stop the use of trolleybuses in 2017. Should be kept in use until 2022. Hybrids and electric power sources need 5 years to evolve enough to be competitive to diesel. If trolleybuses continue after 2017, a review for a new fleet of trolleys would need to be made around 2020 or so.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #598: The Architectural Centre supports the retention of the trolley buses (pp. 33-34), because they run on electricity. We do not support the conversion of the bus fleet to diesel, and do not believe that a solid case for replacing trolley buses has been made.
- Sub #608: Opposes keeping the trolley buses.
- Sub #609: Supports changing fleet to more economic transport.
- Sub #610: Supports Light Rail over Bus Rapid Transit. However if bus option is chosen then must be electric non-polluting buses. Retain trolley buses until battery/hybrid technology is able to provide solution.
- Sub #611: Support hybrids or fully electric buses. Do not support retaining trolley buses as less flexible, hold up traffic when fail and require more infrastructure. Oppose larger buses, propose a two size fleet, with smaller buses on the secondary routes and larger buses on the main spine routes.
- Sub #612: Supports retaining trolley buses. Options on bus type have not been fairly presented. No option to retain the trolley buses and replace the 68 old high emission diesels with hybrids, more trolleys or electric buses. Choose option which takes into account the whole cost of fleet replacement (including health effects, greenhouse gas emissions, and life span of the vehicle) as well as the effects of the vehicle choice on bus users, pedestrians and other vehicle users. Does not want large 100 seat buses. Buses should be more frequent not large. Requests route alterations to reduce congestion instead of increasing bus size. Considers fleet reliability redundant as any new vehicle will be reliable. Losing trolley buses will make public transport even more vulnerable to oil price volatility. Could retain trolleys on some routes for example Kilbirnie and Seatoun to Wellington Railway Station and Karori.
- Sub #614: Supports the continuation of trolley buses until other low carbon options become economically viable. Suggests trialling double decker buses.
- Sub #617: Supports the continuation of trolley buses as they cause less emissions and offer a smoother ride. Suggests decisions on bus replacements should not be based on short term financial issues.
- Sub #618: Does not support the continuation of trolleys.
- Sub #619: Does not support the continuation of trolley buses as they are always coming off wires and are slow.
- Sub #621: Draft RPTP lacks objectivity and the advantages of trolley buses are downplayed. Sustainability, pollution, health issues are important. Current diesel technology pollutes with fine particulates that cause serious health problems. Hybrid diesels have yet to prove cost-effective. Future technology is electric and by 2030 it should be clear which electric alternatives are viable for the entire bus fleet. No funding or incentives evident in draft RPTP to stimulate the trial, introduction or introduce of electric road vehicles. Wellington should be seen to lead in clean energy propulsion.
- Sub #624: Requests the RLTP includes exploration of innovative/alternative technologies and commit to a pilot programme using locally developed ZEV (Zero Emissions Vehicles) battery electric vehicle technology and Blended Fuels Solutions emulsion fuels.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

- Sub #626: Supports the continuation of the trolley buses. Suggests replacing diesel buses as emission problems affect all residents, not just passengers.
- Sub #628: Does not support the continuation of trolley buses.
- Sub #631: Supports the continuation of trolley buses as they are quiet, very fast and make use of renewable energy. Does not support the introduction of 100 seat buses. Does not support diesel options as increased emissions will have negative effect on the health of cyclists/pedestrians, noise will affect everyone and the associated price of oil. Suggests extending/reinstating routes (i.e. Wadestown to Roseneath). Notes the recent purchase of upgraded trolleys and the long life they offer.
- Sub #633: Suggests that the ongoing bus fleet analysis also identify operating and capital efficiencies and that GWRC continues to work with the Transport Agency to understand if there is merit in any efficiencies being redirected back into the Wellington public transport services programme.
- Sub #636: Supports the continuation of trolley buses if that proves to be the most cost effective option. Suggests further evaluation into costs such as: one-off cost to disestablish trolley lines, ongoing costs to defer the disestablishment (maintenance), current state/life time of overhead network, cost to continue until the investment is fully utilised, what are the costs to continue trolleys until their full lifetime (2022), increased costs as a result of declining overhead network. Suggests providing a raw breakdown of all costs.
- Sub #637: Support retaining the trolley buses to the end of their design lives in 2022 because ratepayers, taxpayers, and NZ Bus have already invested in them and the upgrades are well advanced; because the power supply has performed well; and because they do not produce greenhouse gas emissions. Suggest battery and hybrid technology by 2022 may be sufficient to offer zero-emission, 100-person buses at a cost similar to later version buses.
- Sub #638: Supports the retention and upgrade of trolley buses as a sustainable low emissions option. Notes size/noise, wheelchair/pushchairs/suitcase accessibility, comfort are important criteria.
- Sub #639: Supports the GWRC's approach that gives 'a low emission vehicle' a highest score when deciding on a fleet option; and suggests that highest priority should be with the long term sustainability of Wellington's PT system. Concerned that the proposed timeframe to finalise decisions on fleet options is ambitious and requests that GWRC delay decisions pending for a more in-depth analysis of options and related costs.
- Sub #642: Supports trolley buses.
- Sub #642: Opposed to larger, bendy or double decker buses, as double-deckers would be restricted to north-south routes to avoid tunnels, and bendy buses would not comfortably or safely fit on routes such as the Golden Mile with its tight intersections. Submitter suggests Auckland eliminated bendy buses because of safety concerns, particularly to pedestrians and disembarking passengers. Suggests two bendy buses at a stop is the equivalent of four buses, with the latter incorporating 4 different destinations, which is preferable.
- Sub #643: Supports gradually adopting a sustainable, electric and forward looking fleet model. Does not support discarding the trolley bus system especially when it is refurbished and still in good condition. Opposes moving to an all diesel fleet by 2017.

TOPIC: Wellington City Bus Fleet Options

Considers costings provided to be incomplete. Suggests a slower process for trialling electric buses would minimise the risk of the fleet technology being immature.