

Draft Regional Land Transport Programme for Tasman 2012/13 to 2014/15



Table of Contents

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Purpose
- 1.2 Government Policy Statements
- 1.3 Background and Scope
- 1.4 Consultation on the RLTP
- 1.5 Area covered by the RLTP
- 1.6 Period of the RLTP

2. Context

- 2.1 Regional Land Transport Strategy
- 2.2 Regional Land Transport Programme Partners
- 2.3 Significance Policy

3. Tasman's Transport Issues and Challenges

4. Statement of Regional Priorities

5. The 2012/13 to 2014/15 Programme

- 5.1 Projects requiring prioritisation
- 5.2 Assessment and prioritisation process
- 5.3 Activities of Inter Regional Significance
- 5.4 Activities to be Recommended in the Three Years Following the Programme
- 5.5 Approved activities not yet complete

6. Monitoring, Reviews and Variations

- 8.1 Monitoring Reporting and Review
- 8.2 Variations to the Programme

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Detailed Regional Land Transport Programme with Priorities

Appendix 2 – Prioritised Capital Projects for Regional Land Transport Programme 2012 - 2015

Introduction

The Regional Land Transport Programme is prepared in accordance with the Land Transport Management Act by the Regional Transport Committee (RTC). The purpose of the Regional Land Transport Programme (RLTP) is to:

- Identify key transport issues in the Tasman region and how transport activities proposed in the RLTP will address these issues.
- List significant transport activities for national funding that will be undertaken between 2012/13 and 2014/15.
- Provide a ten year forecast of anticipated revenue and expenditure on transport activities.

Purpose

The RLTP allows the Tasman District Council and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to recommend funding for land transport activities or combinations of activities from the National Land Transport Fund (NLTF).

Scope

The RLTP has been prepared by the Tasman Regional Transport Committee (RTC). The committee is satisfied that the Tasman RLTP contributes to:

- The aim of achieving an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system.
- And each of the key government objectives as set out in the Government Policy Statement.

The Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding (GPS) sets out the government's priorities for expenditure from the National Land Transport Fund over the next 10 years. It sets out how funding is allocated between activities such as road safety, policing, state highways, local roads and public transport.

The following three priorities are to be included in GPS 2012.

- **A strong and continuing focus on economic growth and productivity** - The government's investment in land transport should support increased economic growth and productivity in New Zealand. This includes providing any ongoing support necessary to repair the land transport system in Canterbury over the next 3 to 4 years alongside continuing to improve the State Highway network, particularly through the RoNS programme.

- **Value-for-money** - As for other areas of public spending, it is expected that land transport services should be delivered better and smarter. Asset management will be improved to boost the performance of roading infrastructure. Although value-for-money is stressed in GPS 2009 its focus is on the initial selection of projects and activities. GPS 2012 will make it clear that getting more out of what is spent is an expectation.
- **Road safety** - Road safety is a transport priority for the government; this will be reflected in the GPS so that the direction outlined in Safer Journeys, the government's road safety strategy, will be supported through the next National Land Transport Programme.

The GPS sets out a number of specific targets known as impacts. In GPS 2012, the Minister of Transport intends to continue the impacts set out in GPS 2009. These are:

- Improvements in the provision of infrastructure and services that enhance transport efficiency and lower the cost of transportation through:
 1. Improvements in journey time reliability
 2. Easing of severe congestion
 3. More efficient freight supply chains
 4. Better use of existing transport capacity
- Better access to markets, employment and areas that contribute to economic growth
- A secure and resilient transport network
- Reductions in road deaths and serious injuries
- More transport choices, particularly for those with limited access to a car
- Reductions in adverse environmental effects from land transport
- Contributions to positive health outcomes

Background

The RLTP is essentially a programme of works through which the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and Tasman District Council bid for funding assistance from the New Zealand Transport Agency. The NZTA administers the National Land Transport Fund and can only allocate funds to activities included in a RLTP or to national activities.

There are principally two types of NZTA (government subsidy) funding currently available to the region. Those with the highest priority receive 'R' (Regionally distributed) funding. 'R' funding comes from a portion of fuel excise duty and light road user charges. It is allocated to regions based on population. In Tasman, this funding had been committed and use for the construction of the Ruby Bay Bypass. New projects for local roads and state highways will now be funded from nationally distributed funds (N).

Strategic Context

The development of a Regional Land Transport Programme must consider the national strategic documents along with the regional strategy documents. These documents guide the focus of the RLTP and ensure that they achieve both national goals and meet the demands of the region they are developed for.

The documents that have been used in developing this RLTP include the following:

- New Zealand Transport Strategy
- Safer Journeys
- "Connecting Tasman" (Regional Land Transport Strategy)
- Passenger Transport Plan
- Government Policy Statement

The main issues for Tasman include:

- Rising demand for personal mobility and freight movement is placing the transportation network under increasing strain
- The unacceptably high number of crashes occurring on the road network
- The lack of alternative transport modes, which results in people without access to a private motor vehicle being limited in their ability to participate in social and economic activities in the district.
- High number of single occupancy cars having an effect on both the efficiency and sustainability of the transport network.

Connecting Tasman also provides a set of opportunities for which the Regional Land Transport Programme can enable implementation. These opportunities include:

- Improve road safety by increasing education

- Encourage and promote land developments that reduce adverse impacts on transport and the environment
- Develop a road network that supports and responds to economic development in the region
- Provide safe and efficient and effective freight corridors
- Provide clear identifiable walking routes
- Provide clear identifiable cycling routes
- Undertake school and work travel plans
- Develop central business district parking strategies
- Work with Nelson City Council to develop an implementation plan for improved passenger transport services.

These elements amongst other initiatives will provide a robust and accessible road network for the residents of the District and visitors to the region. The Regional Land Transport Programme has been developed to make the most of these opportunities where local and central funding will allow.

Statement of National Land Transport Priorities

The 2012–2015 National Land Transport Programme and corresponding regional land transport programmes are expected to prioritise activities that advance this strategic direction including the 2012 GPS's priorities of economic growth and productivity, value for money and road safety. In doing so, the following impacts should be achieved through the allocation of funding from the National Land Transport Fund:

Short to medium term impacts

- Improvements in the provision of infrastructure and services that enhance transport efficiency and lower the cost of transportation through:
 - improvements in journey time reliability
 - easing of severe congestion
 - more efficient freight supply chains
 - better use of existing transport capacity.
- Better access to markets, employment and areas that contribute to economic growth.

- Reductions in deaths and serious injuries as a result of road crashes.
- More transport choices, particularly for those with limited access to a car.
- A secure and resilient transport network.
- Reductions in adverse environmental effects from land transport.
- Contributions to positive health outcomes.

It is expected that the 2012–2015 National Land Transport Programme and Regional Land Transport Programmes will be developed to contribute to the strategic direction, priorities and impacts outlined above. The government's expectations for how these are progressed are outlined below.

- Economic growth and productivity
 - Investing in the State highway network
 - Continuing to progress the Roads of National Significance (RoNS)
 - Rebuilding the land transport system in Canterbury
 - Getting Auckland's transport working well
 - Making quality investments in public transport
 - Improving the local road network
 - Investing in walking and cycling
 - Considering networks from a national perspective
 - Integrated planning continues to be important
- A sharper and broader focus on value for money
- Improving road safety

Funding Plan

This section sets out the financial forecast from 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2015.

Proposed Funding Sources

The following funding sources are identified in the 10-year forecast of anticipated revenue for Tasman District Council.

- National Land Transport Fund (NLTF)

This is the funding which Tasman District applies for through the RLTP.

There are two different types:

1. National (N) Funds

These are contestable funds distributed across the country by central government.

2. Regional (R) Funds

These funds are based on a proportion of fuel excise duty and road user charges collected over a 10-year period (2005-2015), and are distributed to the regions by the NZTA on a population basis.

For Tasman District the whole of these available funds have been committed to the State Highway 60 Ruby Bay Bypass project due for completion in 2011.

- Local (L) Share

This is funding sourced by the Tasman District Council e.g. rates or non-project specific development contributions. Council is required to part fund all of its activities, with the proportion of 'L' funding required for each activity class based on a Financial Assistance Rate (FAR) subsidy received from central government.

For Tasman District, most local road activities are currently funded by a government FAR of 49% and improvement projects by a government FAR of 59%. This is expected to remain unchanged for the three year period 2012 – 2015.

For all state highway activities, NZTA receives a government FAR of 100%.

Total funding

Table 1 shows the expenditure target (the expected level of expenditure) along with the maximum and minimum range for National Land Transport Programme expenditure for the first 3 years of this 2012 GPS. The total level of funding represents a balance between achieving the government's expected impacts and the level of revenue that can be raised.

Table 1 – Total Expected Expenditure Levels for NLTP

	12/13 \$m	13/14 \$m	14/15 \$m	15/16 \$m	16/17 \$m	17/18 \$m	18/19 \$m	19/20 \$m	20/21 \$m	21/22 \$m
Expenditure target	2,950	3,100	3,250	3,400	3,500	3,650	3,800	3,900	4,050	4,150
Maximum expenditure	3,200	3,300	3,400							
Minimum expenditure	2,500	2,500	2,500							

The table above also provides indicative expenditure targets for 2015/16–2021/22. The expenditure target figure for each year is deemed to be the maximum level of National Land Transport Programme expenditure.

Funding ranges for activity classes

Funding in the National Land Transport Programme is allocated to activity classes established in the GPS. The allocation of funding to these activity classes reflects the strategic direction the government has set. For each activity class, a funding range is given which sets out how much can be spent.

The NZTA is required to allocate funding to activity classes within the funding ranges set out in **Table 2**. The expenditure targets do not envisage funding being allocated at the top end of every activity class range. By specifying the funding allocations as a range, the NZTA has some flexibility in responding to requests for funding set out in regional land transport programmes and actual funding applications received, and in managing overall expenditure under the National Land Transport Programme.

Table 2 – Funding for Activity Areas for NLTP

Activity class	11/12 Allocation ³ \$m	Funding ranges						Forecast funding ranges			
		12/13 \$m	13/14 \$m	14/15 \$m	15/16 \$m	16/17 \$m	17/18 \$m	18/19 \$m	19/20 \$m	20/21 \$m	21/22 \$m
New and improved infrastructure for State highways	1036	875 1150	900 1200	950 1300	1000 1400	1050 1450	1100 1500	1150 1550	1200 1600	1250 1700	1300 1750
Renewal of State highways	202	180 220	180 220	180 220	190 230	190 230	190 230	200 240	200 240	200 240	200 240
Maintenance and operation of State highways	300	255 325	255 325	255 350	255 350	255 350	255 360	255 360	255 360	255 380	255 380
New and improved infrastructure for local roads	132	130 180	130 185	130 190	140 210	140 210	140 210	150 230	150 230	150 230	160 250
Renewal of local roads	236	190 250	190 250	190 250	200 250	200 250	200 270	210 270	210 290	210 290	210 310
Maintenance and operation of local roads	251	205 300	205 300	205 300	205 310	205 310	205 310	205 310	205 310	205 310	205 320
Road policing	302	280 310	280 310	280 310	280 315	280 315	280 315	280 320	280 320	280 320	280 320
Public transport services	220	220 290	230 300	240 330	255 340	270 360	280 370	295 390	295 410	295 420	295 440
Public transport infrastructure	57	20 60	20 60	20 60	20 50	20 40	20 40	20 30	20 30	20 30	20 30
Road safety promotion	38	29 36	29 36	29 36	29 36	29 36	29 36	31 38	31 38	31 38	33 38
Walking and cycling	15	12 30	12 30	12 30	14 32	14 32	14 32	15 34	15 34	15 34	16 36
Sector research	6	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5
Transport planning	32	14 23	14 23	14 23	15 23	15 23	15 23	15 23	15 23	15 23	15 23
Management of the funding allocation system	32	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30

Investment in Road Safety

Safety is a key priority of this GPS. To reflect this priority, this GPS makes explicit the amount of roading expenditure that is safety related. In previous GPS in 2009 the safety related roading expenditure was included as roading improvements or maintenance with the safety gains tending to be understated. However, roading improvements have contributed significantly to the gains that New Zealand has made over time in reducing deaths and serious injuries from road crashes. Further investment is a key part of the Safer Journeys road safety strategy. This expenditure will target safety priorities and will focus on:

- safety improvements such as installing safety barriers, improving line markings, providing

- better passing opportunities, intersection improvements, rural road realignments, and
- demonstration projects
- safety improvements that target high-risk rural roads and high-risk urban intersections
- maintenance and renewal activity for safety for example providing the appropriate level of
- skid resistance.

Table 3 below indicates how much of the State highway and local road expenditure is expected to be safety related.

Table 3 – Expenditure on Road Safety

Activity class	2012/13 \$ million	2013/14 \$ million	2014/15 \$ million
State highways	150–240	150–240	150–240
Local roads	80–120	80–120	80–120

There is no increase in road safety spending planned in the three years covered by this RLTP.

Assessment of Roles to the Regional Land Transport Programme

New Zealand Transport Agency

The NZTA was established on 1 August 2008, taking over the functions of Land Transport New Zealand and Transit New Zealand. The Agency’s objective is to carry out its functions in ways that will contribute to producing an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system.

The NZTA plays a pivotal role in New Zealand’s land transport planning and funding system. Its planning role is expressed through the three-year National Land Transport Programme, which contains all the activities that the Agency has agreed to fund, or anticipates funding, over the duration of the programme. Further, the evaluation policy that the Agency adopts has a strong influence on the kinds of projects and services that are funded.

The NZTA also provides guidance to Regional Transport Committees on the development of RLTPs. With regards to the development of this RLTP, the NZTA has two distinct roles to play. These are:

1. The state highways section of the NZTA submits their state highway programme of activities to the RTC for inclusion in the RLTP. The RTC is required to decide which activities to include in the RLTP and then prioritise them.
2. The Tasman District Council submits the RLTP to the NZTA for consideration in the development of the National Land Transport Programme. The NZTA must take into account the regional priorities when deciding on national priorities, but may end up with a different order of priority for activities. The NZTA cannot include anything in the National Land Transport Programme that has not been included in a RLTP.

Tasman District Council

The role of the Tasman District Council with regard to the RLTP is as follows:

1. Ensure that the RTC prepares a RLTP.
2. Consider and approve a RLTP by 30 April 2012. If not approved the Council must forward the unapproved programme by the same date, along with reasons for not approving it.
3. Ensure that details of the RLTP are correct in Transport Investment Online (TIO) and confirms this to the NZTA.
4. Forwards copies of the RLTP to the NZTA and other parties listed in section 18 of the Land Transport Management Act and make it publicly available.
5. Varies the RLTP in accordance with statutory requirements.

Tasman Regional Transport Committee

The Tasman Regional Transport Committee includes representation from the Tasman District Council, the NZTA, as well as one cultural representative, and one representative of each of the five objectives listed in the New Zealand Transport Strategy 2010 (economic development, safety and personal security, public health, access and mobility, and environmental sustainability).

The purpose of the RTC is to:

- Prepare, review or vary a RLTP.
- Prepare, monitor and review a regional land transport strategy.
- Provide advice on transport matters, as and when requested, by the Tasman District Council.

Statement of Regional Transport Priorities

Local Road Programmes for maintenance, renewals and minor capital projects are included in this programme and, as for all activities, have been assessed against the objectives to be achieved. However, they are not included in the priority rating process.

Taking into account the NZTS, the 2012 GPS, Connecting Tasman 2010 and the Passenger Transport Plan 2011, a list of priorities has been developed for types of activities within the Tasman District. The list below is in priority order.

Due to funding constraints, not all projects and measures proposed in the district will be able to be undertaken. Accordingly, these priorities will be used to guide decisions on funding for proposed activities and are set out in **Table 4**.

DRAFT

Table 4 – Issues that will guide funding priorities.

Policy	Activities that contribute to issue
<p>Roads and Traffic Policy 1</p> <p>Reduce the number and severity of road crashes in the Tasman region</p>	<p>The highest level of funding priority is for activities that will reduce fatalities and casualties arising from road crashes. It aims to increase the use of walking and cycling, addressing road safety concerns. The safety of motorcyclists is also crucial due to the increase in popularity of this mode and the vulnerability of the rider in a crash.</p>
<p>Roads and Traffic Policy 2</p> <p>Support activities that will improve public health and ensure monitoring of environmental impacts of land transport and compliance with national and regional standards</p>	<p>This strategy aims to protect and promote public health by supporting transport related public health initiatives in the region. Activities such as encouraging the use of a wider range of modes, demand management tools and supportive land use policies all work to enhance positive and reduce negative health impacts. For example, encouraging walking and cycling can increase individual levels of physical activity.</p>
<p>Roads and Traffic Policy 3</p> <p>Ensure the integrated, efficient, timely and safe maintenance and enhancement of the region’s road network to meet the needs of the regional community and economic growth and development in line with this overall strategy.</p>	<p>It is important that the road network is safe, reliable and efficient at transporting people and goods throughout the region for the needs of the local communities as well as the economic vitality, growth and development of the region.</p>

Policy	Activities that contribute to issue
<p>Roads and Traffic Policy 4</p> <p>Ensure the integrated, efficient and safe provision for freight activity in support of regional economic growth and development while minimising adverse impacts on the regional community.</p>	<p>The strategic road network, both in Tasman and neighbouring regions, is a key element of the freight system, although some local roads can take on temporary or long term roles in supporting freight movements, such as during logging operations in a particular forest block over a set period. Freight activity can have negative impacts on communities and the environment, such as safety issues, increased road maintenance and noise nuisance, especially at night.</p>
<p>Walking Policy</p> <p>Promote and support the convenience and safety of walking to increase usage and mode share</p>	<p>The strategy aims to recognise the importance of walking and promotes a pedestrian friendly built environment. Walking routes should be well signposted, connected, convenient, comfortable and convivial. Walking does include those using walking aids such as wheelchairs and mobility scooters. It also includes those with specific requirements such as people with pushchairs. A walking environment designed with the needs of mobility impaired pedestrians in mind will often create excellent levels of service for all pedestrians.</p>
<p>Cycling Policy</p> <p>Promote and support the convenience and safety of cycling to increase usage and mode share</p>	<p>It is key to improving cycle usage to recognise that different types of cycling environments will suit different cyclists (learners, commuters, social and serious recreational) have different infrastructural needs. Cycling forms an important element of a sustainable land transport system and this policy aims to change the current trends and situation in the Tasman region by enhancing the volume of cycling trips.</p>

Over the 10 years of the RLTP the available funding will not support the implementation of all desired activities in the region. Therefore the RTC adopted a prioritisation process to select those activities that represent the best value for money. This process was guided by the priorities outlined below in the RLTP.

Assessment of the Tasman Regional Land Transport Programme

The Tasman RTC has assessed this RLTP and is satisfied that it contributes to the aim of achieving an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable land transport system, and contributes to each of the following:

- a) Assisting economic development
 - Growth and development are increasingly integrated with transport.
 - Transport users increasingly understand and meet the costs they create.
 - New Zealand's transport system is improving its international and domestic linkages including inter-modal transfers.
 - The effectiveness of the transport system is being maintained or continuing to improve.
 - The efficiency of the transport system is continuing to improve.
 - The negative impacts of land-use developments on the transport system are reducing.
- b) Assisting safety and personal security
 - New Zealand's transport system is increasingly safe and secure.
 - The transport system is improving its ability to recover quickly and effectively from adverse events.
- c) Improving access and mobility
 - The transport system is increasingly providing affordable and reliable community access.
- d) Protecting and promoting public health
 - Negative impacts of transport are reducing in terms of fatalities, injuries and harm to health.
- e) Ensuring environmental sustainability

- The transport system is actively moving towards reducing the use of non-renewable resources and their replacement with renewable resources.
- Negative impacts of transport are reducing in terms of human and natural environments.

It is consistent with:

- The Government Policy Statement (GPS); and
- “Connecting Tasman” 2010,

It has taken into account any:

- National Strategy and Policy Statements.
- National energy efficiency and conservation strategy, relevant national policy statement and any relevant regional policy statement or plans that are for the time being in force under the Resource Management Act 1991.
- Likely funding from any source.

The priorities for the region consist of the following:

- Reducing fatalities and casualties associated with Tasman’s roads.
- Promoting affordable alternative transport options to the private motor vehicle.
- Promoting network efficiency.
- Promoting the integrated, efficient and timely and safe provision for freight activity.

The land transport issues and challenges facing the Tasman region, as identified in the 2010 RLTS ‘Connecting Tasman’ and provides the countermeasures to address the identified issue. Population growth and associated demands for accessibility, personal mobility and freight movement could place sections of the transport network under increasing strain unless strategies are developed to address these issues. In urban areas, congestion leads to increased travel times, reduced trip reliability and increased costs for users.

The Regional Land Transport Programme details the transport issues, problems and opportunities for Tasman which address the five objective areas in the National Land Transport Strategy; economic development, safety and personal security, access and mobility, protecting and promoting public health and environmental sustainability. **Table 5** below shows the issues and activities that contribute to the five objective areas.

Table 5 - Regional transport issues and countermeasures

Issues	Countermeasure
<p>Economic Development</p> <p>The transport demand within a region is derived from a need to move freight and people. An efficient transport network that permits the efficient and sustainable flow of freight and people is therefore crucial to the economic vitality of a region.</p>	
<p>Issue 1: Decreasing level of service on critical routes</p>	<p>Road renewals Road operations and maintenance</p>
<p>Issue 2: Limitations of local road network to cater for heavy vehicles</p>	<p>New and improved infrastructure for local roads</p>
<p>Issue 3: Low commuter vehicle occupancy rates</p>	<p>Travel Demand Management Road Safety and Travel Planning activities</p>
<p>Issue 4: Route security on major arterial</p>	<p>Minor safety improvements</p>
<p>Safety and personal security</p> <p>The increased traffic over the past decade has resulted in an increase in the number of injuries and deaths from motor vehicle crashes; the social cost of crashes in the Tasman region now averages over \$30 million a year. It is considered to be unacceptably high. The Tasman region represents 1% of the nation's population, but accounts for 3% of the number of crashes.</p>	
<p>Issue 5: Loss of control on bends</p>	<p>Realignment of bends Road Safety activities</p>

Issues	Countermeasure
Issue 6: Vulnerable road user casualties	Road Safety activities Minor safety improvements
Issue 7: Increasing trend of crossing/turning injury crashes	Intersection upgrades:
Issue 8: High risk drivers	Road Safety activities
Issue 9: Personal safety and security	Road Safety and Travel Planning activities
<p>Access and mobility</p> <p>Accessibility relates to the ability of people to access jobs, education, services and recreational facilities via the transport network and is critical to promoting community well-being and the economic development of the region. It is critical to promoting community wellbeing and the economic growth and development of the region. Mobility relates to the quality and ease of that movement. Access to the land transport network provides for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of regional communities and it is important that residents can potentially employ all transport modes.</p>	
Issue 10: Accessibility for non-car owning households, mobility impaired and the elderly	Minor safety improvements Continued contributions and support of the Total Mobility scheme Passenger Transport
Issue 11: Reduced community cohesion due to transport network barriers, especially for walking and cycling	Cycling and walking activities Community focused activities

Issues	Countermeasure
<p>Protection and promotion of public health</p> <p>Changing the way people travel can have significant benefits in terms of public health. The increased physical activity associated with walking, cycling or using other active modes significantly reduces the risk of health problems. Further, by reducing the amount of private vehicle travel, fewer pollutants such as exhaust emissions, contaminants, dust and noise are produced, reducing their adverse effects on the community.</p>	
<p>Public health – Issue 12: High use of private motor vehicles for short distance trips</p>	<p>Cycling and walking activities Travel Demand Management</p>
<p>Public health - Issue 13: Poor air quality in sensitive environments</p>	<p>Cycling and walking activities Travel Demand Management</p>
<p>Public health – Issue 14: Health effects of dust from unsealed roads</p>	<p>Sealed and unsealed road renewal and maintenance</p>
<p>Environmental sustainability</p> <p>The environmental consequences associated with the land transport network in the Tasman region are similar to those being experienced in other regions of New Zealand.</p>	
<p>Environmental sustainability – Issue 15: Greenhouse gas emissions</p>	<p>Walking and cycling activities Travel Demand Management</p>
<p>Environmental sustainability – Issue 16: Land use planning impacts on transportation network</p>	<p>Activities outside the direction of the RLTP</p>

Issues	Countermeasure
<p>Affordability</p> <p>All projects and measures that are progressed in the region need to provide justification of their benefits, whether they are based on economic, safety, accessibility, health or environmental factors. Projects that make better use of existing infrastructure can defer, or reduce the need altogether, for new infrastructure, resulting in savings.</p>	
<p>Issue 17: Value for money community perception</p>	<p>Applicable to all activities</p>

The issues described in this section have been categorised by the five objective areas representing Government transport policy, as set out in the NZTS. Most issues relate to more than one objective area.

Assessment of Police Activities to the Regional Land Transport Programme

The Tasman RTC has assessed the relationship of policy activities to the RLTP, as required under Section 16(2) (b) of the LTMA.

Through the Road Policing Programme funded from the National Land Transport Fund, the New Zealand Police focus on the delivery of enforcement activities. The NZ Police also support and work with the Tasman District Council to deliver community and educational programmes such as safety of vulnerable road users, driver fatigue, restraints, drive licensing and younger drivers.

These projects in the RLTP aim to increase road safety and security within Tasman District by reducing the number of crashes and/or fatalities. The projects will also aim to increase the number of cyclists and pedestrians commuting to work and school and for recreation.

The NZ Police is represented on the RTC and through groups such as Road Safe Nelson Bays, the Road Safety Action Plan Committee and the Nelson-Tasman Active Transport Forum.

The NZ Police will continue to be included in the studies, strategies and community programmes included in the RLTP.

During project development the NZ Police will continue to provide advice and information on safety related issues to assist in establishing the most sustainable and safety improved solutions.

Through the above the NZ Police are assessed by the RTC as having a high relationship to the RLTP and the achievement of the impact statements in the GPS and the RLTS.

Monitoring, Reviews and Variations of the RLTP

Monitoring Implementation of the Programme

The Tasman RTC shall, with the support of the Tasman District Council and the NZTA, monitor the implementation of the RLTP which will include:

- Gathering and reviewing information to determine the effectiveness of the RLTP.
- Annually updating progress towards completion of activities and projects listed in the RLTP, including expenditure.
- Maintaining an overview of regional trends and statistics that measure progress against the objectives, priorities and targets in the RLTP and the RLTS.
- Review the 'Annual Achievement Report' from the Tasman District Council and the NZTA that details how all funded activities are being delivered.

Further to the above, the Tasman RTC will report on the above via the Tasman District Council's significant activity report on transport matters. This report will be provided to the NZTA, neighbouring territorial authorities, the Commissioner of Police, and will be available to the public.

Review of the RLTP

A full review of the RLTP will be commenced by the Tasman RTC in the following circumstances:

- Prior to the completion of the RLTP's three-yearly cycle - 30 June 2015.
- Following a request by an approved organisation (Tasman District Council or NZTA) seeking 'significant' changes to the RLTP that vary, suspend or abandon activities in the RLTP.

In accordance with section 18A of the LTMA, a full review of the RLTP will use the special consultative procedure (as specified in the Local Government Act 2002).

Variations to the RLTP

The RLTP will remain in force until 30 June 2015 – or unless a variation is required under Section 18D of the LTMA.

Over the duration of the RLTP, activities or projects could change, be abandoned or added.

Variation requests are likely to occur due to variations in the time, scope or cost of proposed activities (especially given that a funding application can be made three years before an activity is to be undertaken). Tasman District Council, or the NZTA, can therefore request that the Tasman RTC prepare a variation to the RLTP, or the Committee can prepare variations on its own initiative.

The Tasman RTC will consider requests for variations promptly and forward the amended RLTP to the Tasman District Council for its consideration.

When variations are 'significant', in terms of the Tasman RTC's significance policy (set out in Section 9.3.4 below), the Committee must consult on the variation before adopting it and forwarding it to the Tasman District Council and ultimately the NZTA.

Public consultation is not required for any variation that is not significant in terms of the significance policy adopted in Section 9.3 of this RLTP or arises from the declaration or revocation of a state highway. It is probable that the majority of variations will not be significant.

Summary of Significance Policy for Tasman District

Policy Intent

The intent of this policy is to provide a clear understanding of what is considered significant in terms of variations to the proposed or adopted RLTP. It provides the thresholds and procedures that the RTC will use in assessing which variations are deemed significant and the subsequent consultation requirements.

Legislative Requirements

Section 106 of the LTMA requires each RTC to adopt a policy that determines significance in respect of variations made to the RLTP and regional land transport strategies.

General Approach

The Tasman RTC has the final decision on what is considered significant in terms of requested or recommended variations to the RLTP.

In determining the significance of a proposed variation, the RTC will be guided by the following:

- Whether the variation contributes to the objectives of the RLTS.
- Whether the variation is in the interest of public safety.
- Whether the activity or activities have previously been consulted on in accordance with section 17 and 18 of the LTMA.
- Whether there is a change in scope of the project.
- The variation requested relates specifically to a prioritised activity.

Thresholds

The thresholds that are established in this section are quantifiable and allow for a predetermination of the outcome. Therefore this threshold test can be applied to give a clear indication of whether a particular variation is deemed significant or not.

The following amendments or variations are considered significant and will be required to undergo public consultation prior to adoption:

- a) Change in scope of a project that substantially alters the original objectives of the project in a way that reduces the contribution of the project towards the New Zealand Transport Strategy objectives or the GPS targets or the RLTS objectives.
- b) Scope change resulting in cost increases of more than 15% of the NZTA approved allocation and more than \$10 million in value.
- c) Addition of the construction phase of any activity that has not previously been consulted upon in accordance with section 18 of the LTMA, and the total project cost is over \$10 million.
- d) Any activity or combination of activities that the RTC considers to be regionally significant.

Set out below, for purposes of clarity are examples of variations that do not meet the thresholds set out in this policy and are therefore considered not significant:

- e) Funding requirements for preventative maintenance and emergency reinstatement activities.
- f) Changes to activities relating to local road maintenance, local road renewals, local road minor capital works or existing public transport services. This refers to activities in the aforementioned areas that have been included in the RLTP.
- g) Variations to timing, cash flow or total cost (resulting from a change in inputs costs), for the following:
 - improvement projects,

- demand management,
 - community-focused activities.
- h) Transfer of funds between activities within a group.
- i) End of year carryover of allocations.
- j) Addition of the investigation or design phase of a new activity, one which has not been previously consulted upon in accordance with section 18 of the LTMA.
- k) Variations to timing of activities if sufficient reasoning is provided for the variation and such that the variation does not substantially alter the balance of funding or make the RLTP unaffordable.

Procedures

The decision to determine whether or not a requested variation is significant and requires a variation to the RLTP will be decided by the RTC. Once a variation has been determined to be significant, then the variation to the RLTP will be consulted upon in accordance with the consultation principles set out in Sections 17 and 18 of the LTMA.

Where possible any consultation required for the RLTP will be carried out in conjunction with any other consultation undertaken by the Tasman District Council, an example of which is the Annual Plan consultation, in order to optimise consultation costs.

Regional Land Transport Programme 2012 - 2015

Projects included in the RLTP

Appendix 1 details the activities that the approved organisations, Tasman District Council and the NZTA have submitted for funding approval from the National Land Transport Fund for the three years 2012 - 2015.

Assessment and Prioritisation of Activities/Projects Requiring Prioritisation

The RTC is required to prioritise activities or combinations of activities that Tasman District Council (for local road activities) and the NZTA (for all state highway activities), submit in their respective land transport programmes. Projects relating to local road maintenance, road renewals, minor capital works and existing passenger transport services are excluded from the prioritisation process.

The assessment and prioritisation process determines which projects are put forward for inclusion in the National Land Transport Programme.

The Tasman RTC used the following process:

- Identified activity classes that needed prioritisation.

- Determined whether the total number of projects in each activity class lies within the regionalised funding range for that activity class identified in the GPS.
- Ranked projects in line with the NZTA ranking process.
- Rankings were then adjusted within activities or groups of activities to better reflect how the project would best contribute to the objectives and targets of the Tasman RLTS and the GPS.
- The RTC accepted that adjustment to the ranking of projects would be required from time-to-time where delays in programmes occurred or activities were varied, suspended or deleted.
- Programming of projects may not follow exactly the prioritised order of projects due to the varying stages of development with which projects are situated. This may therefore result, for example, in a project ranked number 6 constructed ahead of a project ranked number 3.

The NZTA process for assessment and prioritisation is summarised as follows:

Assessment Process

Each activity or project requiring prioritisation has been assessed according to:

- the **strategic fit** of the transport issue, problem or opportunity addressed, taking account of relevant strategies and regional priorities
- the **effectiveness** of the proposed activity or combination of activities in dealing with the issue, problem or opportunity
- the **economic efficiency** of the proposed activity or combination of activities.

Three main functions are to plan and invest in land transport networks, manage the state highway network and provide access to and use of the land transport system. These are underpinned by four functional strategies, one of which is the Investment and Revenue Strategy (IRS). This document sets out the changes made to the IRS that are necessary to align it with the 2012 Government Policy Statement on land transport funding. Under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA), we must ensure that the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) 'gives effect to the 2012 GPS'. The IRS is the investment prioritisation tool that is used to ensure that investment targets in value for money activities that collectively achieve the impacts set out in the 2012 GPS.

Project Profiling

Each project is rated High (H); Medium (M) or Low (L) for each of the three assessment factors listed above resulting in a 'profile' for the project (e.g. HHM). The default ranking for all projects is Low, unless evidence is supplied to support a higher ranking.

Appendix 2 details the prioritised activities that the approved organisations, Tasman District Council and the NZTA have submitted for funding approval from the National Land Transport Fund for the three years 2012 - 2015.

Prioritisation Process

Projects are ranked according to their assessment Profile as set out in **Table 6**:

Table 6 – Assessment Profile Ranking

Assessment Profile (Strategic fit, effectiveness, economic efficiency)	Priority
HHH	1
HHM, HMH, MHH	2
HHL, HMM	3
HLH, MHM, MMH	4
LHH, HML	5
HLM, MHL, MMM	6
MLH, LHM, LMH	7
HLL, MML, MLM, LHL	8
LMM, LLH	9
MLL, LML, LLM	10
LLL	11

The primary focus of the NZTA's investment will be on those projects that make the greatest contribution to economic growth and productivity while safety, social and environmental impacts remain relevant. Some project profiles are likely to change and may affect the final priorities within the approved 2012 – 2015 NLTP as it relates to the

Tasman RLTP. Projects with the highest funding profile will be funded first and NZTA will be ensuring that the final draft of the RLTP will reflect this.

Consultation on the RLTP

The following steps are being undertaken in the development of the RLTP:

1. The Regional Transport Committee (RTC) carried out an assessment of those activities requiring prioritisation and submitted a draft RLTP to NZTA on 30 November 2011.
2. A consultation process is undertaken by the RTC using the special consultative procedures specified by the Local Government Act 2002. Following public hearings and deliberations on the submissions, a final RLTP will be developed by the RTC.
3. The RTC must submit the RLTP to the Tasman District Council for adoption. If amendments are sought, the RTC will need to revise the RLTP before resubmission to the Council. NZTA will also carry out a moderation process to rank projects nationally. This was expected to be completed by mid February 2012.
4. The Council is required to submit the final RLTP to the NZTA by 30 April 2012.
5. NZTA will consider the Tasman RLTP and issue the National LTP by 30 June 2012.

Relationship between the Regional Land Transport Plan and the Long Term Plan

In accordance with the Local Government Act, Tasman must prepare a Ten Year Plan (Long Term Plan) every three years.

The Ten Year Plan outlines how Tasman District Council contributes to community outcomes and what services and projects the Council will deliver. It also identifies how the Council will pay for what it does. The Ten Year Plan covers all the activities undertaken by the Council, including transportation activities.

The local roading programme, covering the maintenance, renewal and minor capital works for Tasman's local roads is outlined in the Council's Ten Year Plan. The public are consulted on the service levels and projects in the local roading programme through the Ten Year Plan process.

This RLTP incorporates the local roading expenditure programme outlined in the Council's 2012-2021 Ten Year Plan and the expenditure on all NZTA state highway activities within Tasman District.

The RLTP covers the Tasman District Council region only. It does not include any part of Nelson City or West Coast Regional Council.

Period of the RLTP

The RLTP is a three year document that will remain in force until 30 June 2015 unless there is any significant variation undertaken in terms of the RTC's significance policy.

Submissions

Many of the submissions addressed the local roading programme, covering the maintenance, renewal and minor capital works for Tasman's local roads which are outlined in the Council's Ten Year Plan. The public are consulted separately on the service levels and projects in the local roading programme through the Ten year Plan process.

DRAFT

Appendix 1 – Detailed Regional Land Transport Programme with Priorities

DRAFT

Project Name	Description	Phase	Profile	Work category	Indicative FAR	Total phase cost (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 1 - 3 (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 4 - 10 (\$000)	BCR	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	NZTA Profile			Funding priority	RCA priority	Draft RTC priority	
										(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Strategic fit	Effectiveness				Efficiency
State Highways																										
Renewal of state highways																										
Road renewals						80347.0	16403.7	63943.3	-	5485.5	5475.2	5443.0	8144.5	8307.7	8471.7	9281.8	9588.6	9849.3	10299.5							
Unsealed metalling road	Unsealed metalling road	State Highways	---	211		0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sealed resurfacing road	Sealed resurfacing road	State Highways	---	212		53790.7	10979.3	42811.4	-	3666.0	3602.6	3710.7	5339.9	5500.1	5665.1	6170.1	6478.9	6737.6	6919.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Drainage renewals	Drainage renewals	State Highways	---	213		5168.8	1236.3	3932.5	-	418.2	425.4	392.7	550.0	550.0	550.0	566.5	566.5	566.5	583.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Pavement rehabilitation	Pavement rehabilitation	State Highways	---	214		13217.8	2729.8	10488.0	-	726.8	928.2	1074.8	1380.0	1380.0	1380.0	1541.0	1541.0	1541.0	1725.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Structures component replacements	Structures component replacements	State Highways	---	215		3439.5	762.1	2677.4	-	285.2	266.5	210.4	369.6	369.6	369.6	387.2	387.2	387.2	407.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Environmental renewals	Environmental renewals	State Highways	---	221		3400.8	448.8	2952.0	-	265.2	183.6	0.0	360.0	360.0	360.0	456.0	456.0	456.0	504.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Traffic services renewals	Traffic services renewals	State Highways	---	222		1329.4	247.4	1082.0	-	124.1	68.9	54.4	145.0	148.0	147.0	161.0	159.0	161.0	161.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Associated improvements	Associated improvements	State Highways	---	231		0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Preventative maintenance		Construction	---	241		0	0.0	0.0	-											-	-	-	-	-	-	
Operations and maintenance of State Highways																										
Road operations and maintenance						99592.2	26224.5	73367.7	-	8744.8	8756.8	8722.9	9768.2	9919.1	10080.2	10590.2	10722.8	10920.2	11367.0							
Sealed pavement maintenance	Sealed pavement maintenance	State Highways	---	111		33144.1	7958.0	25186.1	-	2653.0	2652.6	2652.4	3380.0	3392.9	3406.2	3666.9	3681.0	3695.5	3963.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Unsealed pavement maintenance	Unsealed pavement maintenance	State Highways	---	112		0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Routine drainage maintenance	Routine drainage maintenance	State Highways	---	113		5637.0	1377.0	4260.0	-	463.2	454.8	459.0	570.0	585.0	580.0	625.0	620.0	625.0	655.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Structures maintenance	Structures maintenance	State Highways	---	114		5275.0	1545.0	3730.0	-	515.0	515.0	515.0	505.0	505.0	505.0	550.0	550.0	550.0	565.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Environmental maintenance	Environmental maintenance	State Highways	---	121		17475.6	3767.6	13708.0	-	1265.9	1255.7	1246.0	1802.0	1843.3	1885.9	1968.7	2013.8	2066.8	2127.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Traffic services maintenance	Traffic services maintenance	State Highways	---	122		15071.1	3682.9	11388.2	-	1239.4	1233.0	1210.5	1493.9	1536.0	1569.7	1636.0	1672.3	1710.1	1770.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Operational management	Operational traffic management	State Highways	---	123		2234.7	1302.5	932.2	-	450.1	457.5	394.9	125.0	127.1	129.3	131.5	133.8	139.0	146.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Cycle maintenance	Cycle path maintenance	State Highways	---	124		320.1	76.4	243.7	-	24.7	25.5	26.2	31.8	32.8	33.7	34.7	35.8	36.9	38.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Level crossing warning devices	Level crossing warning devices	State Highways	---	131		53.4	53.4	0.0	-	17.8	17.8	17.8								-	-	-	-	-	-	
Network and asset management	Network and asset management	State Highways	---	151		20381.3	6461.7	13919.6	-	2115.7	2144.9	2201.1	1860.6	1897.0	1970.5	1977.4	2016.1	2097.0	2101.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Emergency works		Construction	---	141		0.0	0.0	0.0	-											-	-	-	-	-	-	
New & improved infrastructure for State Highways																										
HPMV - TDC08 (Lansdowne Rd to Port Nelson)	HPMV route upgrades including Jenkins Bridge	Investigation	LMH			16.0	16.0	0.0	6.8	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	3	
HPMV - TDC08 (Lansdowne Rd to Port Nelson)		Design	LMH			33.0	33.0	0.0	6.8	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	3
HPMV - TDC08 (Lansdowne Rd to Port Nelson)		Construction	LMH			318.0	318.0	0.0	6.8	0.0	318.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	3
HPMV - TDC07 (88Valley to Port Nelson)	HPMV route upgrades including Jenkins Bridge	Investigation	HMH			41.0	41.0	0.0	5.3	41.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	H	4c	2	2	
HPMV - TDC07 (88Valley to Port Nelson)		Design	HMH			52.0	52.0	0.0	5.3	52.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	H	4c	2	2
HPMV - TDC07 (88Valley to Port Nelson)		Construction	HMH			690.0	690.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	690.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	H	4c	2	2
HPMV - TDC09 (Motueka to Port Nelson)	HPMV route upgrades including Jenkins Bridge	Investigation	LMH			16.0	16.0	0.0	4.6	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	4	
HPMV - TDC09		Design	LMH			33.0	33.0	0.0	4.6	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	4

Project Name	Description	Phase	Profile	Work category	Indicative FAR	Total phase cost	Total phase cost	Total phase cost	BCR	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	NZTA Profile			Funding priority	RCA priority	Draft RTC priority	
						(\$000)	Year 1 - 3 (\$000)	Year 4 - 10 (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)				Strategic fit
(Motueka to Port Nelson)																										
HPMV - TDC09 (Motueka to Port Nelson)		Construction	LMH			446.0	446.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	446.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	4	
HPMV - TDC10 (MDF to Port)	HPMV route upgrades including Jenkins Bridge	Investigation	HMM			17.0	17.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	M	3b	1	1	
HPMV - TDC10 (MDF to Port)		Design	HMM			35.0	35.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	35.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	M	3b	1	1	
HPMV - TDC10 (MDF to Port)		Construction	HMM			326.0	0.0	326.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	326.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	M	3b	1	1
SH6 Doctors Creek Bridge	Rural narrow bridge replacement and highway realignment and removal of out of context curve	Construction	MMH			659.0	0.0	659.0	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	659.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	H	7a	5	5	
Newton Bridge Traffic Signals	Installation of signals on 1 lane bridge with high approach speeds and poor visibility, integrate with warning signs for over dimension vehicles	Investigation	LMH			32.0	0.0	32.0	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7a	6	16	
Newton Bridge Traffic Signals		Design	LMH			27.5	0.0	27.5	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7a	6	16	
Newton Bridge Traffic Signals		Construction	LMH			457.0	0.0	457.0	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	457.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7a	6	16	
SH6 Aniseed Valley Reconstruction	Upgrade cross road intersection with dedicated right turn bays and left turn deceleration lanes for both side roads	Investigation	MMM			116.0	0.0	116.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	116.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	7	6	
SH6 Aniseed Valley Reconstruction		Construction	MMM			1808.0	0.0	1808.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	892.0	916.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	7	6	
Crooked Creek Realignment	4 out of context high speed curves with pronounced crash history, poor clear zone and high maintenance costs	Investigation	MMM			111.0	0.0	111.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	111.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	8	13	
Crooked Creek Realignment		Design	MMM			132.0	0.0	132.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	132.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	8	13	
Crooked Creek Realignment		Construction	MMM			2247.8	0.0	2247.8	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2247.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	8	13	
SH6 Richmond Deviation 4 Laning	Construction of 2 new northbound lanes on Richmond Deviation between Craft Habitat RAB and McGlashen St	Investigation	MMM			179.0	0.0	179.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	179.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	9	14	
SH6 Richmond Deviation 4 Laning		Design	MMM			0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	9	14	
SH65 Hutchison Bridge - 2 Laning	Widen existing one land bridge on upstream side to two lanes and widen approaches	Design	LMH			89.0	0.0	89.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	89.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	8c	10	15	
SH65 Hutchison Bridge - 2 Laning		Construction	LMH			1018.0	0.0	1018.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1018.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	8c	10	15	
Tasman District Council																										
Renewal of local roads																										
Road renewals						67962.0	19656.1	48305.9	-	6466.2	6552.0	6637.9	6617.7	6795.5	6825.7	6859.9	6928.3	7016.4	7262.4							
Unsealed road metalling	Unsealed road metalling	Local Roads	---	211	49%	8000.0	2400.0	5600.0	-	800.0	800.0	800.0	800.0	800.0	800.0	800.0	800.0	800.0	800.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sealed road resurfacing	Sealed road resurfacing	Local Roads	---	212	49%	26054.2	8216.9	17837.4	-	2739.0	2739.0	2739.0	2632.2	2632.2	2489.2	2489.2	2531.5	2531.5	2531.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drainage renewals	Drainage renewals	Local Roads	---	213	49%	14913.0	4361.6	10551.4	-	1443.8	1453.8	1464.0	1474.4	1485.0	1495.9	1506.9	1518.2	1529.6	1541.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pavement rehabilitation	Pavement rehabilitation	Local Roads	---	214	49%	8410.0	1914.0	6496.0	-	580.0	638.0	696.0	754.0	812.0	870.0	928.0	986.0	1044.0	1102.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Structures component replacements	Structures component replacements	Local Roads	---	215	49%	3000.0	900.0	2100.0	-	300.0	300.0	300.0	300.0	300.0	300.0	300.0	300.0	300.0	300.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Environmental renewals	Environmental renewals	Local Roads	---	221	49%	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Traffic services renewals	Traffic services renewals	Local Roads	---	222	49%	4669.6	1209.8	3459.8	-	397.6	403.2	409.0	414.8	420.8	591.7	544.9	489.4	495.8	502.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Associated improvements	Associated improvements	Local Roads	---	231	49%	2915.2	653.8	2261.4	-	205.8	218.0	230.0	242.3	345.5	278.9	291.0	303.2	315.4	485.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Preventative maintenance		Construction	---	241	49%	1425.0	440.0	985.0	-	100.0	130.0	210.0	85.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operations and maintenance of local roads																										
Road operations and maintenance						67859.2	24104.5	43754.7	-	5871.0	6029.8	12203.7	6191.8	6191.9	6224.7	6243.1	6338.1	6189.7	6375.3							

Project Name	Description	Phase	Profile	Work category	Indicative FAR	Total phase cost	Total phase cost	Total phase cost	BCR	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	NZTA Profile			Funding priority	RCA priority	Draft RTC priority
						(\$000)	Year 1 - 3 (\$000)	Year 4 - 10 (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)			
Sealed pavement maintenance	Sealed pavement maintenance	Local Roads	---	111	49%	11329.9	2500.7	8829.2	-	1214.6	1214.6	71.5	1241.5	1241.5	1241.5	1269.1	1269.1	1269.1	1297.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unsealed pavement maintenance	Unsealed pavement maintenance	Local Roads	---	112	49%	3398.1	743.3	2654.8	-	357.2	360.8	25.4	368.0	371.7	375.4	379.2	383.0	386.8	390.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Routine drainage maintenance	Routine drainage maintenance	Local Roads	---	113	49%	5678.9	1431.6	4247.3	-	546.0	555.6	330.0	575.3	585.5	595.8	606.4	617.1	628.0	639.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Structures maintenance	Structures maintenance	Local Roads	---	114	49%	3563.7	1243.1	2320.7	-	331.5	331.5	580.0	331.5	331.5	331.5	331.5	331.5	331.5	331.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Environmental maintenance	Environmental maintenance	Local Roads	---	121	49%	11840.1	2606.7	9233.4	-	1300.0	1302.7	4.0	1308.7	1311.9	1315.2	1318.7	1322.4	1326.3	1330.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Traffic services maintenance	Traffic services maintenance	Local Roads	---	122	49%	5846.2	1507.8	4338.4	-	568.5	574.9	364.4	587.3	597.8	608.5	619.4	630.4	641.8	653.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operational traffic management	Operational traffic management	Local Roads	---	123	49%	612.4	570.4	42.0	-	4.0	4.0	562.4	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cycle path maintenance	Cycle path maintenance	Local Roads	---	124	49%	1724.3	1492.7	231.6	-	64.2	28.8	1399.7	28.8	28.8	28.8	28.8	28.8	58.8	28.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Level crossing warning devices	Level crossing warning devices	Local Roads	---	131	49%	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Network and asset management	Network and asset management	Local Roads	---	151	49%	23865.5	12008.1	11857.3	-	1485.0	1656.9	8866.3	1744.6	1717.2	1722.0	1684.1	1749.8	1541.5	1698.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Emergency works		Construction	---	141	49%	7000.0	2100.0	4900.0	-	700.0	700.0	700.0	700.0	700.0	700.0	700.0	700.0	700.0	700.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
New & improved infrastructure for local roads																									
Road Studies	Crash reduction studies	Study	---	311	59%	120.0	30.0	90.0	-	0.0	30.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bridge Renewals	Sites yet to be determined, selection will be based on priority matrix and NZTA funding criteria	Construction	M--	322	59%	5000.0	1500.0	3500.0	-	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	M	-	-	-	-	-
Minor Safety Improvements	10% of maintenance and renewal budget	Local Roads	---	341	59%	11154.1	3249.3	7904.8	-	1063.6	1082.7	1102.9	1097.3	1116.8	1121.8	1126.0	1139.1	1134.3	1169.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Richmond Construction - Queen/Salisbury Intersection	Construction of new intersection layout with traffic signals	Design	MMH	324	59%	99.0	99.0	0.0	5.1	0.0	0.0	99.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	H	4c	1	7
Richmond Construction - Queen/Salisbury Intersection	Construction of new intersection layout with traffic signals	Construction	MMH	324	59%	920.2	0.0	920.2	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	920.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	H	4c	1	7
Richmond Construction - Lower Queen/Lansdowne Intersection	Intersection layout improvements	Design	LMM	324	59%	188.6	188.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	65.9	122.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	5	12
Richmond Construction - Lower Queen/Lansdowne Intersection	Intersection layout improvements	Construction	LMM	324	59%	442.7	0.0	442.7	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	442.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	5	12
Richmond Construction - Moutere Highway/Waimea West Intersection	Intersection layout improvements	Design	MMM	324	59%	222.7	222.7	0.0	3.8	0.0	31.3	191.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	6c	2	8
Richmond Construction - Moutere Highway/Waimea West Intersection	Intersection layout improvements	Construction	MMM	324	59%	641.5	0.0	641.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	641.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	6c	2	8
Motueka Valley Construction - Motueka Valley Highway Widening	Corner widening between College Street and Mytton Heights	Design	LMH	324	59%	194.3	0.0	194.3	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	150.4	43.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	10
Motueka Valley Construction - Motueka Valley Highway Widening	Corner widening between College Street and Mytton Heights	Construction	LMH	324	59%	885.7	0.0	885.7	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	885.7	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	10
Moutere Construction - Moutere Highway	Widening of out of context curves between Kelling Road and George Harvey Road	Design	LMH	324	59%	58.6	0.0	58.6	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.3	37.3	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	11
Moutere Construction - Moutere Highway	Widening of out of context curves between Kelling Road and George Harvey Road	Construction	LMH	324	59%	436.4	0.0	436.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	436.4	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	11

Project Name	Description	Phase	Profile	Work category	Indicative FAR	Total phase cost	Total phase cost	Total phase cost	BCR	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	NZTA Profile			Funding priority	RCA priority	Draft RTC priority	
						(\$000)	Year 1 - 3 (\$000)	Year 4 - 10 (\$000)		(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Strategic fit				Effectiveness
Kaiteriteri Construction - New Road	Construction of a new road alignment between Cederman Drive and Martin Farm Road	Design	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	6	9
Kaiteriteri Construction - New Road	Construction of a new road alignment between Cederman Drive and Martin Farm Road	Construction	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	6	9
Kaiteriteri Construction - Martin Farm Road Upgrade	Upgrade of Martin Farm Road to match speed environment of new adjoining road section	Design	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	6	9
Kaiteriteri Construction - Martin Farm Road Upgrade	Upgrade of Martin Farm Road to match speed environment of new adjoining road section	Construction	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	6	9
Kaiteriteri Construction - Turners Bluff to Tapu Bay	Reconstruction of Riwaka-Kaiteriteri Road between Turners Bluff and Tapu Bay	Design	LMH	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	9a	7	17
Kaiteriteri Construction - Turners Bluff to Tapu Bay	Reconstruction of Riwaka-Kaiteriteri Road between Turners Bluff and Tapu Bay	Construction	LMH	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	9a	7	17
Kaiteriteri Construction - Tapu Bay to Cederman Drive	Reconstruction of Riwaka-Kaiteriteri Road between Tapu Bay and Cederman Drive	Design	MMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	9a	8	18
Kaiteriteri Construction - Tapu Bay to Cederman Drive	Reconstruction of Riwaka-Kaiteriteri Road between Tapu Bay and Cederman Drive	Construction	MMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	9a	8	18
Motueka Valley Construction - McLean's Corner Realignment	Realignment of poor road geometry	Design	LMM	324	59%	372.8	0.0	372.8	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.0	27.4	334.4	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	9	19
Motueka Valley Construction - McLean's Corner Realignment	Realignment of poor road geometry	Construction	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	9	19
Motueka Valley Construction - Narrow Bridge Realignment	Replacement of Narrow Bridge with two lane bridge and realignment of approaches	Design	L-L	324	59%	1255.7	0.0	1255.7	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.1	99.3	1141.3	0.0	0.0	L	-	L	-	10	20	
Motueka Valley Construction - Narrow Bridge Realignment	Replacement of Narrow Bridge with two lane bridge and realignment of approaches	Construction	L-L	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	-	L	-	10	20
Richmond Construction - Hill/Champion Intersection	Construction of a roundabout to service future traffic from growth areas	Design	L--	324	59%	88.0	0.0	88.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.0	0.0	L	-	-	-	11	21
Richmond Construction - Hill/Champion Intersection	Construction of a roundabout to service future traffic from growth areas	Construction	L--	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	-	-	-	11	21
Richmond Construction - Wensley Road	Ring route improvements from Oxford Street to Bateup Road	Design	L--	324	59%	1211.5	0.0	1211.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1211.5	0.0	L	-	-	-	12	22
Richmond Construction - Wensley Road	Ring route improvements from Oxford Street to Bateup Road	Construction	L--	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	-	-	-	12	22
Demand management & community programmes																										
Community Programmes	Community coordination,	Local Roads	---	432		2160.0	648.0	1512.0	-	216.0	216.0	216.0	216.0	216.0	216.0	216.0	216.0	216.0	216.0	216.0	-	-	-	-	-	-

Project Name	Description	Phase	Profile	Work category	Indicative FAR	Total phase cost (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 1 - 3 (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 4 - 10 (\$000)	BCR	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	NZTA Profile			Funding priority	RCA priority	Draft RTC priority	
										(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Strategic fit				Effectiveness
	programmes and advertising																									
Transport planning																										
Regional Land Transport Planning	RLTC administration / RLTP / RLTS	Implementation	---	001	50%	320.0	100.0	220.0	-	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Heavy Industry Impact Studies	Consultation and updates for two years and full review every three. Quarry, Dairy and Forestry	Study	---	002	59%	80.0	25.0	55.0	-	5.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Regional Transport Studies	Passenger transport studies	Study	---	002	59%	20.0	5.0	15.0	-	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
System Use Studies	Walking, cycling and system use studies	Study	---	002	59%	40.0	10.0	30.0	-	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
District Car Parking Strategy Review	Review of car parking facilities strategy	Study	---	002	59%	50.0	30.0	20.0	-	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LTP/AMP Review	Three year activity management plan update	Study	---	003	59%	276.0	92.0	184.0	-	0.0	46.0	46.0	0.0	46.0	46.0	0.0	46.0	46.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
dims Modelling	dims modelling excluding validation	Study	---	003	59%	71.3	23.8	47.5	-	0.0	23.8	0.0	0.0	23.8	0.0	0.0	23.8	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Road Asset Valuation	Asset revaluation	Study	---	003	59%	127.5	51.0	76.5	-	25.5	0.0	25.5	0.0	25.5	0.0	25.5	0.0	25.5	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tasman District Council Special Purpose Roads																										
Renewal of local roads																										
Road renewals		SPR	---		100%	431.0	154.5	276.5	-	75.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	39.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operations and maintenance of local roads																										
Road operations and maintenance		SPR	---		100%	717.9	213.0	504.9	-	71.0	71.0	71.0	71.0	71.0	71.0	71.0	71.0	71.0	78.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Appendix 2 – Prioritised Capital Projects for Regional Land Transport Programme 2012 - 2015

Project Name	Description	Phase	Profile	Work category	Indicative FAR	Total phase cost (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 1 - 3 (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 4 - 10 (\$000)	BCR	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	NZTA Profile			Funding priority	RCA priority	Draft RTC priority	
										(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Strategic fit	Effectiveness	Efficiency				
HPMV - TDC10 (MDF to Port)	HPMV route upgrades including Jenkins Bridge	Investigation	HMM			17.0	17.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	M	3b	1	1
HPMV - TDC10 (MDF to Port)		Design	HMM			35.0	35.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	35.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	M	3b	1	1
HPMV - TDC10 (MDF to Port)		Construction	HMM			326.0	0.0	326.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	326.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	M	3b	1	1
HPMV - TDC07 (88Valley to Port Nelson)	HPMV route upgrades including Jenkins Bridge	Investigation	HMH			41.0	41.0	0.0	5.3	41.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	H	4c	2	2
HPMV - TDC07 (88Valley to Port Nelson)		Design	HMH			52.0	52.0	0.0	5.3	52.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	H	4c	2	2
HPMV - TDC07 (88Valley to Port Nelson)		Construction	HMH			690.0	690.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	690.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	H	M	H	4c	2	2
HPMV - TDC08 (Lansdowne Rd to Port Nelson)	HPMV route upgrades including Jenkins Bridge	Investigation	LMH			16.0	16.0	0.0	6.8	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	3
HPMV - TDC08 (Lansdowne Rd to Port Nelson)		Design	LMH			33.0	33.0	0.0	6.8	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	3
HPMV - TDC08 (Lansdowne Rd to Port Nelson)		Construction	LMH			318.0	318.0	0.0	6.8	0.0	318.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	3
HPMV - TDC09 (Motueka to Port Nelson)	HPMV route upgrades including Jenkins Bridge	Investigation	LMH			16.0	16.0	0.0	4.6	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	4
HPMV - TDC09 (Motueka to Port Nelson)		Design	LMH			33.0	33.0	0.0	4.6	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	4
HPMV - TDC09 (Motueka to Port Nelson)		Construction	LMH			446.0	446.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	446.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	4
SH6 Doctors Creek Bridge	Rural narrow bridge replacement and highway realignment and removal of out of context curve	Construction	MMH			659.0	0.0	659.0	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	659.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	H	7a	5	5
SH6 Aniseed Valley Reconstruction	Upgrade cross road intersection with dedicated right turn bays and left turn deceleration lanes for both side roads	Investigation	MMM			116.0	0.0	116.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	116.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	7	6
SH6 Aniseed Valley Reconstruction	Upgrade cross road intersection with dedicated right turn bays and left turn deceleration lanes for both side roads	Construction	MMM			1808.0	0.0	1808.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	892.0	916.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	7	6
Richmond Construction - Queen/Salisbury Intersection	Construction of new intersection layout with traffic signals	Design	MMH	324	59%	99.0	99.0	0.0	5.11	0.0	0.0	99.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	H	4c	1	7
Richmond Construction - Queen/Salisbury Intersection	Construction of new intersection layout with traffic signals	Construction	MMH	324	59%	920.2	0.0	920.2	5.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	920.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	H	4c	1	7
Richmond Construction - Moutere Highway/Waimea West Intersection	Intersection layout improvements	Design	MMM	324	59%	222.7	222.7	0.0	3.8	0.0	31.3	191.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	6c	2	8
Richmond Construction - Moutere Highway/Waimea West Intersection	Intersection layout improvements	Construction	MMM	324	59%	641.5	0.0	641.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	641.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	6c	2	8
Kaiteriti Construction - New Road	Construction of a new road alignment between Cederman Drive and Martin Farm Road	Design	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	6	9
Kaiteriti Construction - New Road	Construction of a new road alignment between Cederman Drive and Martin Farm Road	Construction	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	6	9
Kaiteriti Construction - Martin Farm Road Upgrade	Upgrade of Martin Farm Road to match speed environment of new adjoining road section	Design	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	6	9

Project Name	Description	Phase	Profile	Work category	Indicative FAR	Total phase cost (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 1 - 3 (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 4 - 10 (\$000)	BCR	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	NZTA Profile			Funding priority	RCA priority	Draft RTC priority
										(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Strategic fit			
Kaiteriteri Construction - Martin Farm Road Upgrade	Upgrade of Martin Farm Road to match speed environment of new adjoining road section	Construction	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	6	9
Motueka Valley Construction - Motueka Valley Highway Widening	Corner widening between College Street and Mytton Heights	Design	LMH	324	59%	194.3	0.0	194.3	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	150.4	43.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	10
Motueka Valley Construction - Motueka Valley Highway Widening	Corner widening between College Street and Mytton Heights	Construction	LMH	324	59%	885.7	0.0	885.7	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	885.7	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	3	10
Moutere Construction - Moutere Highway	Widening of out of context curves between Kelling Road and George Harvey Road	Design	LMH	324	59%	58.6	0.0	58.6	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.3	37.3	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	11	
Moutere Construction - Moutere Highway	Widening of out of context curves between Kelling Road and George Harvey Road	Construction	LMH	324	59%	436.4	0.0	436.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	436.4	0.0	L	M	H	7c	4	11	
Richmond Construction - Lower Queen/Lansdowne Intersection	Intersection layout improvements	Design	LMM	324	59%	188.6	188.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	65.9	122.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	5	12
Richmond Construction - Lower Queen/Lansdowne Intersection	Intersection layout improvements	Construction	LMM	324	59%	442.7	0.0	442.7	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	442.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	5	12
Crooked Creek Realignment	4 out of context high speed curves with pronounced crash history, poor clear zone and high maintenance costs	Investigation	MMM			111.0	0.0	111.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	111.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	8	13
Crooked Creek Realignment	5 out of context high speed curves with pronounced crash history, poor clearzone and high maintenance costs	Design	MMM			132.0	0.0	132.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	132.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	8	13
Crooked Creek Realignment	6 out of context high speed curves with pronounced crash history, poor clearzone and high maintenance costs	Construction	MMM			2247.8	0.0	2247.8	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2247.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	8	13
SH6 Richmond Deviation 4 Laning	Construction of 2 new northbound lanes on Richmond Deviation between Craft Habitat RAB and McGlashen St	Investigation	MMM			179.0	0.0	179.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	179.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	9	14
SH6 Richmond Deviation 4 Laning	Construction of 2 new northbound lanes on Richmond Deviation between Craft Habitat RAB and McGlashen St	Design	MMM			0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	8c	9	14
SH65 Hutchison Bridge - 2 Laning	Widen existing one land bridge on upstream side to two lanes and widen approaches	Design	LMH			89.0	0.0	89.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	89.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	8c	10	15
SH65 Hutchison Bridge - 2 Laning	Widen existing one land bridge on upstream side to two lanes and widen approaches	Construction	LMH			1018.0	0.0	1018.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1018.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	8c	10	15
Newton Bridge Traffic Signals	Installation of signals on 1 lane bridge with high approach speeds and poor visibility, integrate with warning signs for over dimension vehicles	Investigation	LMH			32.0	0.0	32.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7a	6	16
Newton Bridge Traffic Signals	Installation of signals on 1 lane bridge with high approach speeds and poor visibility, integrate with warning signs for over dimension vehicles	Design	LMH			27.5	0.0	27.5	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7a	6	16

Project Name	Description	Phase	Profile	Work category	Indicative FAR	Total phase cost (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 1 - 3 (\$000)	Total phase cost Year 4 - 10 (\$000)	BCR	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	NZTA Profile			Funding priority	RCA priority	Draft RTC priority	
										(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(\$000)	Strategic fit	Effectiveness				Efficiency
Newton Bridge Traffic Signals	Installation of signals on 1 lane bridge with high approach speeds and poor visibility, integrate with warning signs for over dimension vehicles	Construction	LMH			457.0	0.0	457.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	457.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	7a	6	16
Kaiteriteri Construction - Turners Bluff to Tapu Bay	Reconstruction of Riwaka-Kaiteriteri Road between Turners Bluff and Tapu Bay	Design	LMH	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	9a	7	17
Kaiteriteri Construction - Turners Bluff to Tapu Bay	Reconstruction of Riwaka-Kaiteriteri Road between Turners Bluff and Tapu Bay	Construction	LMH	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	H	9a	7	17
Kaiteriteri Construction - Tapu Bay to Cederman Drive	Reconstruction of Riwaka-Kaiteriteri Road between Tapu Bay and Cederman Drive	Design	MMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	9a	8	18
Kaiteriteri Construction - Tapu Bay to Cederman Drive	Reconstruction of Riwaka-Kaiteriteri Road between Tapu Bay and Cederman Drive	Construction	MMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	M	M	M	9a	8	18
Motueka Valley Construction - McLean's Corner Realignment	Realignment of poor road geometry	Design	LMM	324	59%	372.8	0.0	372.8	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.0	27.4	334.4	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	9	19
Motueka Valley Construction - McLean's Corner Realignment	Realignment of poor road geometry	Construction	LMM	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	M	M	9a	9	19
Motueka Valley Construction - Narrow Bridge Realignment	Replacement of Narrow Bridge with two lane bridge and realignment of approaches	Design	L-L	324	59%	1255.7	0.0	1255.7	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.1	99.3	1141.3	0.0	0.0	L	-	L	-	10	20	
Motueka Valley Construction - Narrow Bridge Realignment	Replacement of Narrow Bridge with two lane bridge and realignment of approaches	Construction	L-L	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	-	L	-	10	20
Richmond Construction - Hill/Champion Intersection	Construction of a roundabout to service future traffic from growth areas	Design	L--	324	59%	88.0	0.0	88.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.0	0.0	L	-	-	-	11	21
Richmond Construction - Hill/Champion Intersection	Construction of a roundabout to service future traffic from growth areas	Construction	L--	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	-	-	-	11	21
Richmond Construction - Wensley Road	Ring route improvements from Oxford Street to Bateup Road	Design	L--	324	59%	1211.5	0.0	1211.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1211.5	0.0	L	-	-	-	12	22
Richmond Construction - Wensley Road	Ring route improvements from Oxford Street to Bateup Road	Construction	L--	324	59%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	L	-	-	-	12	22