

HEARINGS PANEL REPORT

Penlink Tolling Strategy

Hearings Panel Report

Terry Brown - Chairman

Barry Mein - Member

Ralph Hall - Member

Date: December 2006

Status: Version 2

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Submissions and Hearings.....	2
2.1	Hearing Details.....	2
2.2	Consultation Hearings Panel.....	2
2.3	Attendance at Hearings.....	2
2.4	Submitters’ Details and Matters Raised	2
2.5	Written Submissions.....	2
3	General Commentary by the Hearings Panel.....	3
3.1	General.....	3
3.2	General Comments on the Tolling Strategy	5
4	Deliberations on specific questions	6
4.1	Question 1	6
4.2	Questions 2, 3, and 5	8
4.3	Question 4	9
4.4	Question 6	10
4.5	Questions 7 and 8	11
4.6	Question 9	11
5	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	12

Appendix 1 - Hearing Commissioners and Support Staff.

Appendix 2 - Official Minutes of the Hearings.

Appendix 3 - Schedule of the Submitters Heard.

Appendix 4 - Matters Raised by Each Submitter and Responses to Questions by the Panel.

1 Introduction

Rodney District Council (RDC) is proposing to construct the planned 7 km route known as Penlink, between the Whangaparaoa Peninsula and the State Highway 1, Northern Motorway at Redvale. The Land Transport Amendment Act 2003 (LTMA) makes provision for the tolling of new roads. In light of this legislation, an application for an Order in Council is being made by RDC to construct Penlink as a toll road. The RDC has made provision for a toll road under the 2006-2016 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP).

Section 49(1) of the LTMA states that where a public road controlling authority seeks funding by way of a road tolling scheme, consultation in accordance with sections 15-18 of the Act must be undertaken. In addition Section 48(1)(c)(v) states that the Minister must not recommend the making of an Order in Council unless he or she has taken into account *“the outcome on consultation undertaken by the public road controlling authority”*. In making an Order in Council; the Minister must also be satisfied that there is a high degree of support from affected communities. The term *“affected community”* is defined in section 5 of the LTMA and means *“a group of people who are affected by the proposed activity because of living, studying, or working on close geographical proximity to the proposed activity”*. To satisfy these obligations under the LTMA, RDC is undertaking consultation on the Penlink tolling strategy and in parallel completing a survey of the affected community. The survey of the affected community is separate and not dealt with in this report.

In accordance with the special consultative procedure set out in the LTMA, the Penlink Tolling Strategy component of the consultation involved a mail out of a consultation brochure to residents/businesses within the whole of the Rodney District, key stakeholders and interest groups, and the placement of public notices in all national daily and local newspapers. The brochure outlined proposals for the Penlink tolling strategy and invited residents, and others, to complete and return the questionnaire which was included.

The role of the Hearings Panel was to consider the feedback from the Penlink Tolling Strategy Brochure; to consider the presentations of the submitters at the hearings; to deliberate on the collective submissions and presentations; and to report back to Council. This report considers the submissions heard at the November hearing and consideration of the written submissions which are summarised in the separate appended report titled *“Penlink Tolling Strategy - Consultation Report”*, dated November 2006.

The scope of this report is to consider matters that were raised through the submission process. The Panel was not tasked to provide a definitive view on all of the issues raised, as in some cases further information will be required.

2 Submissions and Hearings

2.1 Hearing Details

The Hearings on the Penlink Proposed Tolling Strategy were held in open forum at Rodney District Council's Orewa Office. The Hearings were held:

- Tuesday 21st November 2006 8.30am to 2.30pm
- Thursday 23rd November 2006 8.30am to 10.30am

2.2 Consultation Hearings Panel

The members of the Hearings Panel (Commissioners) were:

- Terry Brown (Chairman)
- Ralph Hall (Member)
- Barry Mein (Member).

Biographies of the Panel members and details of support staff are included in [Appendix 1](#).

2.3 Attendance at Hearings

Official minutes of the Hearings and Proceedings are attached as [Appendix 2](#).

2.4 Submitters' Details and Matters Raised

The Council received 1403 written submissions. They were reviewed and considered by the Hearings Panel prior to the hearing and are summarised in the Penlink Summary Consultation Report.

Twenty two submitters chose to be heard in support of their written feedback. A schedule of those submitters heard by the Panel is attached as [Appendix 3](#).

Details of the matters from each submitter at the Hearings and the responses to questions raised by the Panel are attached as [Appendix 4](#).

2.5 Written Submissions.

Written responses to the specific feedback questions are summarised as:

- [Question 1](#).
On toll collection points, over 50% of respondents prefer Option 4 (three collection points and a capped toll) because it is considered to be fair, manages congestion and gives back to those who use the whole route. Option 1 (Weiti River Bridge only) is the second most popular option because it is considered the simplest.
- [Question 2](#).

53% of respondents are not prepared to pay a higher toll to reduce the tolling period.

- Question 3.

A small majority of respondents support lower tolls in off-peak periods.

51% of respondents opposed a higher toll during peak periods, but 45% indicated that they would be prepared to pay a higher toll during peak times.

- Question 4.

55% of respondents support partial tolls to use part of the Penlink route.

- Question 5.

A clear majority of respondents support higher tolls for heavy commercial vehicles.

- Question 6.

A high number of respondents failed to understand what was being asked by Question 6 (concession arrangement). Many respondents interpreted the term 'concession arrangement' as meaning a discount. Of the approximately 300 respondents whose responses related to the question, the majority agreed with Council's concession approach. However, many respondents were concerned with managing the associated potential financial risk to the Council, and in particular, ensuring that the risk and liability is not with the Council or ratepayers.

- Question 7.

90% of respondents understand that Land Transport New Zealand funding approval is required.

- Question 8.

Over 90% of respondents understand that external funding and tolls are necessary.

- Question 9.

This question asked "Is there anything else relating to the Penlink Tolling Strategy that you want the Council to consider?" The Council received a number of responses to this question, with many responses that did not relate to the proposed tolling strategy or approach to the concession agreement.

3 General Commentary by the Hearings Panel.

3.1 General

3.1.1 The Panel notes that a small percentage of the respondents (22 of 1403 or 1.57%) requested to speak at the hearings.

- 3.1.2 The Panel is concerned that inadequate information was available to submitters, particularly in relation to the concession approach. The consultation brochure contained limited information to assist people to understand the Council's proposed concession approach. While information was provided in the more detailed consultation briefing document available on the Council's website, the brochure did not direct people to where the information was available on the website. Furthermore, the Panel noted that the consultation brochure did not direct people on previous decisions made by the Council as part of the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP).
- 3.1.3 The Panel shares the concerns of some respondents on the amount of information that was available on the 'risk' such arrangements could have on the Council and ratepayers. For example, the panel heard from Brian Smith that the Council is leaving itself open to challenge because due consultation process has not been followed. Mr. Smith believes the Council should undertake further consultation with full and clear information about the risks. Jeannie Wilson, while supporting Penlink, also raised similar concerns about the financial risks to ratepayers.
- 3.1.4 The Panel noted that Hans Grueber believes that the information made available to the public was hazy around issues of costs and risks and his assertion that people were misinformed.
- 3.1.5 Other submitters raised concerns about the extent and timing of the consultation process. Peter Rigg questioned the delivery of the consultation brochure, noting that several households in his area had not received it. The Automobile Association (AA) was concerned at the limited time available to respond, considering that the Penlink consultation period clashed with the Western Ring Route tolling consultation period. Furthermore, the AA in its role as an advocate for motorists nationwide would have appreciated an individual technical briefing prior to the submission deadline.
- 3.1.6 The Panel is of the opinion that the specific details of the operating strategy and risk allocation need to be clarified. In particular, the Panel notes that the allocation of risks between the Council and other parties through the concession arrangement is unclear from the available information, and is of the opinion that a more thorough level of information should be provided on this issue.
- 3.1.7 The issue of whether or not a decision has been made to build Penlink as a toll road was raised by some submitters. The Panel notes that support for the proposal to build Penlink as a toll road has recently been confirmed after consultation on the Council's draft 2006-2016 LTCCP. That consultation attracted 662 submissions relating to the Council's proposal to proceed with Penlink as a toll road. Of those submissions, 92 percent were in favour of the Penlink project proceeding. There was no specific reference to this issue in the consultation brochure, however.
- 3.1.8 'Penlink Now' undertook an advertising campaign that suggested how individuals should respond to questions in the feedback form. The advertising campaign was criticised by some submitters, but the Panel notes that consultation is not a 'numbers game,' and that all responses and comments will be taken into consideration.

3.1.9 The Panel acknowledges the submission of John Brown, who was concerned that the Council should not have identified a preference in its consultation document. While the Panel accepts his assertion that the information provided could have been better, it believes it is not unreasonable for the Council to present the options and identify the one preferred by the Council's advisors (this does not mean the Council itself has a preferred option).

3.2 General Comments on the Tolling Strategy

3.2.1 Some submitters expressed opposition to the tolling of Penlink. For example, the Panel heard from Graham Jurkovich, Simon Newband, Stephen Pearce and Hans Grueber, all of whom expressed opposition to tolling. A number of submitters believe Penlink should be fully funded by central government.

3.2.2 Notwithstanding these submissions, and the concerns outlined in section 3.1.3 of this report, the Panel is of the view that the responses to this consultation process, as well as the consultation process associated with Council's LTCCP, demonstrate that there is strong community support for Penlink as a toll road.

3.2.3 A high level of support for construction of Penlink as a toll road was particularly evident in feedback from Whangaparaoa Peninsula residents, with a common sentiment being "just get on with it." The submission of Janet Fitzgerald from Penlink Now highlighted the concern about getting Penlink built as soon as possible, and the view that this overrode the specific details of where to locate tolling points. The level of support for Penlink declined outside of the Whangaparaoa Peninsula, with a number of respondents in Stillwater opposed to tolling as was evidenced in the submissions (52 received). Opposition to Penlink from Stillwater was not unanimous however.

3.2.4 The Panel recognises that Penlink would bring significant benefits to the economic development of the wider Rodney District. The Panel agrees with submissions from Richard Stillwell and Sue Simons that Penlink would relieve demand on the wider road network and would have positive impacts on business expansion and population growth on the Hibiscus Coast, particularly at Silverdale North. This would benefit future growth areas like Silverdale North, which would not contribute to the cost of Penlink (unless through development contributions).

3.2.5 The Panel also notes the submission of Brian Chamberlain that development should be concentrated on Whangaparaoa Peninsula to help to protect the proliferation of development of valuable farmland elsewhere in the District.

3.2.6 The Panel notes and generally supports the submission of Stephen Selwood from the New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development who believes that the Council should adopt a flexible form of Request for Proposal, based on the outputs the Council seeks rather than specific inputs to the tolling methods to be applied. This would encourage parties bidding for the "commission" to adopt innovative processes.

3.2.7 The administration costs of any tolling system will be established by the National Toll Systems Project (TSP) and the Panel considers it difficult to make any recommendations regarding toll rates while these are not known. For instance, if the TSP entrenched a tolling

strategy based around a transactional charge per reading, every vehicle may incur three transaction costs under Option 4 to travel the entire route. A multiple gantry point/transaction system may create difficulties in recouping administration and transaction costs, which must be weighed with other fairness and equity considerations.

4 Deliberations on specific questions

4.1 Question 1

Question 1 reads:

Question 1: “What are your views on the toll collection points?”

My preferred option is (tick one):

- 1. Weiti River bridge (site C) only.**
- 2. Weiti River bridge (Site C) and the Weiti toll road (Site B).**
- 3. Weiti River bridge (Site C), Weiti toll road (Site B), and the Redvale motorway ramps (Site A).**
- 4. All three collection points (as in 3 above), but with a toll capped for people using the full route.**

The reason for my choice is.....

4.1.1 Based upon an assessment of the issues raised in the submissions, the Panel believes the key issues that need to be considered when assessing the number and location of toll collection points are equity and fairness, efficiency (including transaction costs), operational considerations (particularly with respect to the motorway ramps), and revenue potential.

4.1.2 The Panel considers that all users who benefit from the new infrastructure should contribute to its cost. It considered the issue of benefit in the following geographical areas.

Whangaparaoa Peninsula: Whangaparaoa Peninsula residents should be paying most tolls as they are the primary beneficiaries. The residents will receive benefits that are demonstrable in time and vehicle operating cost savings, even in off-peak periods. The toll for Whangaparaoa Peninsula residents will be more than offset by savings on vehicle running costs.

Stillwater: The Panel notes that Stillwater residents will derive a benefit from Penlink, both from access to the motorway and access to Whangaparaoa Peninsula and therefore it seems equitable that these residents should be tolled.

The Panel also acknowledges the submission Mary Gallagher who felt that as Stillwater residents will “bear the brunt” of the adverse environmental effects resulting from Penlink, they should not have to pay a toll for access to East Coast Road. However the Panel notes that these effects were addressed as part of the RMA process and does not believe these considerations should be “re-litigated” as part of the tolling strategy.

Nevertheless, the Panel considers it is essential that Duck Creek Road continues to be well maintained to ensure that Stillwater people have safe untolled access. This should take into account the need to provide the safe crossing of Penlink between Stillwater and Duck Creek Road.

Weiti Station: The Panel notes that future residents of this area will get toll-free access to East Coast Road as stipulated in the conditions of the designation, because they have no untolled alternative. The Panel notes that this is a constraint on the design of the tolling strategy but there were no submissions on this issue.

Motorway Ramp: The Panel notes that the new motorway ramps will provide quicker access to the motorway for residents living near the proposed location of the motorway ramps.

4.1.3 The Panel concludes that from a fairness and equity perspective, there is no reason why any of the groups listed in section 4.1.2 of this report should be exempt from paying tolls. However, the Panel considers that the principal concern of the Council should be balancing these fairness and equity considerations with issues of administration and operational simplicity, transaction costs, and net revenue potential.

4.1.4 Taking these issues into account, the Panel evaluated the toll collection point options as follows:

Site C - Site C would capture the key benefits of the route, being time and vehicle operating cost savings when travelling from Whangaparaoa Peninsula to the Motorway, and it is reasonable for all users at this point to pay a full toll.

Site B - Site B may have marginal benefits given the potentially small number of additional users over and above those who will pass Site C.

Site A – The stated rationale for tolling on the motorway ramps is for demand management purposes but this may be affected by operational constraints. In particular, the Panel questioned the operational costs of collecting tolls from casual users. Transit indicated that there are options other than tolling to achieve demand management at this location. It is noted that Transit NZ will have specific operational considerations.

The Panel notes the concerns raised by the Automobile Association which supports tolling as a debt repayment strategy, but not as a demand management mechanism.

The Panel is also mindful of the submission from John Brown, who is opposed to tolling of the motorway ramps. Mr. Brown believes the tolling of motorway ramps will create a precedent that would effectively make SH1 a toll road for the local community. Ross Craig also questioned the costs associated with collecting tolls, and was opposed to tolling motorway ramps.

4.1.5 Of the respondents to question 1, 57% were in favour of Option 4, with 32% supporting Option 1. The Panel agrees with those submitters who argued that had people understood the financial and operational cost of multiple tolling points, their preference may have changed.

4.1.6 The Panel concludes that the number of transactions should be kept to a minimum. From an administration cost perspective the desirable option is to have one collection point and that is Site C. The Panel considers that this is consistent with comments made by submitters to keep the collection strategy simple.

4.2 Questions 2, 3, and 5

Questions 2, 3, and 5 relate to the tolling rate and whether the community would be willing to pay more during peak periods. The Council also asked whether heavy commercial vehicles should pay a higher toll. Specifically, the questions asked were:

Question 2 – “Given the need for a minimum \$1.50 (CPI Indexed) toll each way to pay for the road over 35 years, would you be prepared to pay a higher toll (but never more than \$2.50 (CPI Indexed) to reduce the tolling period?”

Question 3 – “Given the \$1.50 (CPI Indexed) minimum toll for travelling the whole route, would you support:

- A lower toll in off-peak periods?
- A higher toll (but never more than \$2.50 CPI Indexed) in peak traffic periods?”

Question 5 – “Do you support a higher toll for heavy commercial vehicles?”

Discussion.

4.2.1 From the analysis of written submissions, the Panel noted that:

- Most people would support a lower toll in off peak periods.
- The majority said they did not support a higher toll to reduce the tolling payback period.

- There were also people who said the proposed toll rates were inexpensive.
- Most people supported a higher toll for heavy commercial vehicles.

4.2.2 The Panel assumes from the documentation that a minimum toll of \$1.50 will apply at all times, however the wording of the first part of question 3 is ambiguous because it indicates a rate lower than this minimum as a possible discounted rate.

4.2.3 The Panel does not believe there is a compelling case for off-peak differentials. The administration costs of such a toll collection system are unknown but will not vary by time of day. The Panel accepts the view of submitters such as Stuart Shepherd that the proposed toll rates are inexpensive in relation to the benefits received from lower travelling time and vehicle running costs.

4.2.4 The Panel also cautions against discounts as there is a tendency to underestimate road maintenance costs. The Panel noted that a toll road should be maintained and operated to a high standard, including 24-hour surveillance, a very high level of service, breakdown recovery, etc.

4.2.5 The Panel concludes that the issue of peak and off-peak toll rates should be an issue amongst the bidding options that the parties seeking the concession must consider and that the costs and risks of the alternatives would be agreed upon between the two parties during the bid evaluation process.

4.2.6 72% of respondents believed that a higher rate should be charged to heavy commercial users. The Panel believes a higher toll for heavy commercial vehicles is appropriate as transport operators will see the benefits of using Penlink compared to alternative routes. However, care must be taken to not set the rate to a level that discourages use.

4.2.7 The Panel acknowledges that some respondents requested that public transport operators be exempt from the higher rate charged for heavy commercial vehicles. The Panel also notes that some respondents (such as ARTA and Mr. Fussell) believed that buses and/ or shuttles should not be charged for using the route in order to encourage public transport use.

4.2.8 The Panel does not believe that there is any compelling reason why public transport vehicles should be exempt. However, we acknowledge that there may be public policy reasons for exempting scheduled bus services as well as emergency vehicles. If exemptions were to apply, transaction and administration costs would need to be considered.

4.3 Question 4

Question 4 read:

Question 4 – “Do you support paying a partial toll to use part of the route?”

The Panel believes that they have addressed the issues raised as part of the discussion on Question 1. Refer to sections 3 and 4.1 of this report.

4.4 Question 6

Question 6 asked for any comments on the proposed approach to a concession arrangement. Question 6 is as follows:

Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the Council’s proposed approach to a concession arrangement?

- 4.4.1 The Panel noted that the term “concession” was not well understood by the community. It is a commercial arrangement but many respondents interpreted it as meaning a discount. The Panel considers that the questionnaire did not clearly ask whether the Council should pass this responsibility to a private sector partner. The consultation brochure does briefly outline some of the issues identified in a concession arrangement that have not been carried into the questions asked. The Panel requests that more information is made available to the public to make an informed decision.
- 4.4.2 The Panel also recognises that there was inconsistency between the wording of questions 6 and 8 (which implied the Council would be borrowing directly), which caused considerable confusion. The terms ‘public private partner’ and ‘concession arrangement’ were used interchangeably in Questions 6 and 8.
- 4.4.3 Of the 300 respondents that appeared to understand the intent of Question 6, there was general support for the Council entering into a concession agreement with a private sector partner provided that the risks associated with construction, operation, and toll revenues are borne by the concessionaire.
- 4.4.4 However, some submitters raised concerns over the uncertainty of the Council’s risk exposure and noted that this is an issue for the ratepayers of the whole District and not just the area affected. For example, the Panel heard from Tom Parsons who raised concerns about the financial risk of the project, particularly with respect to Council borrowing money, as implied in question 8 of the consultation document. He also believes that the suggestion that Council will borrow the money is contrary to the Council’s previous position.
- 4.4.5 Allan Parker also raised the potential financial risks to Council that could result in an increase in rates. Mr. Parker is also concerned that the Council’s risk analysis of the project should also take account of global issues (such as oil depletion and climate change) which could reduce car trips and increase the financial risk of the project.
- 4.4.6 The Panel is of a view that the Council needs to clarify its intentions in relation to concession arrangements, with specific reference to risk allocation. This should be conveyed to the public in any further communication on the issue.

4.5 Questions 7 and 8

Questions 7 and 8 are outlined below:

Question 7: “Do you understand that the Council cannot build Penlink without funding approval from Land Transport New Zealand (yet to be received) for its standard Financial Assistance Rate funding share (estimated at 50% to 58% of the total cost) to Council?”

Question 8: “Do you understand that Council cannot build Penlink without borrowing funds from an external source, such as a public private partner, and repaying the debt from tolling revenues?”

Discussion.

- 4.5.1 The Panel notes that the overwhelming majority of respondents said ‘yes’ to Questions 7 and 8. This lends weight to the view that there is support within the community to build Penlink as a toll road.
- 4.5.2 As stated in section 4.4.2 of this report, there was some ambiguity between Questions 6 and 8. However, the strength of the response suggests that most residents are aware that a private sector partner and external funding source is required to enable the project to proceed.
- 4.5.3 The Panel notes that the Auckland Regional Transport Authority (ARTA) does not want any more funds going into the project than absolutely necessary in light of the scarce national funding available to the region.

4.6 Question 9

Question 9 invited the public to raise any matters for Council to consider relating to the tolling strategy. Question 9 read:

Question 9: Is there anything else relating to the Penlink tolling strategy that you want the Council to consider?

Discussion.

4.6.1 The Panel considers that the key messages to come from the responses to Question 9 were:

- Keep it simple
- Build it at no risk to ratepayers
- Just get on with it

4.6.2 The Panel notes that many respondents opposed tolling as a funding mechanism because they already pay for roads through road charges and petrol taxes. However, the Panel also acknowledges that 93% of respondents understood that the Council cannot build Penlink without borrowing funds from an external source and repaying the debt from tolling revenues.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

Having considered the submissions received and the information presented at the hearings, the Panel has drawn the following conclusions:

- 5.1 The key issues that need to be considered when assessing the number and location of toll collection points are equity and fairness, efficiency (including transaction costs), operational considerations (particularly with respect to the motorway ramps), and revenue potential.
- 5.2 The Panel sees no compelling reason why any group should be exempt from paying tolls.
- 5.3 The number of transactions should be kept to a minimum. From an administration cost perspective the desirable option is to have one collection point and that is Site C. The Panel believes that had people understood the financial and operational costs of multiple tolling points, the results of the survey may have been different. The Panel considers that having one collection point at Site C is consistent with comments made by submitters to keep the collection strategy simple.
- 5.4 There is not a compelling case to commit to lower off-peak tolls until greater information is available on maintenance and administration costs. The benefits of offering lower off-peak rates may not outweigh operating costs. The Panel accepts the view of submitters that the proposed toll rates are inexpensive in relation to the benefits received from lower travelling time and vehicle running costs.
- 5.5 A higher toll for heavy commercial vehicles is appropriate as transport operators will see the benefits of using Penlink compared to alternative routes. However, care must be taken to not set the rate at a level that discourages use.
- 5.6 There is no compelling reason why public transport vehicles should be exempt from tolls. However, the Panel acknowledges that there may be public policy reasons for exempting scheduled bus services as well as emergency vehicles.
- 5.7 The term “concession” was not well understood by the community, and the consultation document did not clearly outline the details of the proposed concession arrangement. In

particular, the 'risk' such arrangement could have on the Council and ratepayers is not clear. The Panel is of a view that the Council needs to clarify its intentions in relation to concession arrangements, with specific reference to risk allocation. This should be conveyed to the public in any further communication on the issue.

- 5.8 The Panel believes that the Council should adopt a flexible request for proposals from the private sector, rather than identifying specific inputs or tolling methods to be applied so that concessionaires are encouraged to adopt innovative processes.

Appendix 1 – Hearing Commissioners and Support Staff.

Terry Brown (Chairman)

Terry Brown is Director of the Resolve Group Consultancy. He retired from Transit in November 2005 after nearly 16 years association with transport issues throughout Auckland and Northland. As Regional Manager and Director Strategy and Traffic, he had a very close involvement with transport issues in Rodney, particularly through the planning, consent, design and initial construction phases of the ALPURT project. He was involved in

the Orewa Bridge replacement, some of the early planning of the Penlink connection to the motorway and closely associated with the strategic development of the Silverdale North Structure Plan. He had 17 years' experience in senior positions with local government before joining Transit.

Ralph Hall (Member)

Ralph is a land transport consultant specialising in project development, asset management and programming advice.

In 1989 he was involved in the establishment of Transit NZ and subsequently managed the delivery of Auckland/Northland regional land transport programmes for Transit NZ, Transfund NZ and Land Transport NZ through to his retirement in 2006.

Previous experience includes active army service in Malaysia, design positions with civil engineering consultants in Australia, extensive design office experience with the Ministry of Works and Development (MOWD) and finally as manager of the management services operation of the MOWD Hamilton District until disestablishment in 1988.

Barry Mein (Member)

Barry Mein is principal of Mein Consulting and a director of CityScope Consultants. He has over 25 years' experience in transport and strategic planning in public and private sector settings. He was Director, Transport at the Auckland Regional Council from 1994 to 2003, with responsibility for all of the Council's transport functions including preparation and review of the Auckland Regional Land Transport Strategy; and the planning and purchase of passenger transport services. As an independent consultant since 2003, he has undertaken a wide range of transport and urban development assignments, and has provided strategic policy analysis and advice to a range of public and private sector clients.

The Hearing Secretary was Melissa Thompson - Transportation Directorate Administration Officer (the Council).

The Commissioners were supported by:

- Helen Cook - Communications Consultant and Consultation Advisor (Helen Cook and Associates)
- Tania Darby - Consultation Advisor (Opus)
- Kim Gordon - Transportation Directorate Office Manager (the Council)
- Suzanne Crews - Penlink Administrator (the Council)

Appendix 2 – Official Minutes of the Hearings.

Appendix 3 – Schedule of Submitters Heard.

Appendix 4 – Details of the Matters Raised by Each Submitter at the Hearings and the Responses to Questions from the Panel