

26th May 2022

Further comments on LGWM since my paper of 13th April.

My concern for LGWM.

LGWM, Wellington's once in a generation opportunity to improve transport, is not listening to key residential and business interests. They may talk about consultation but in my view, they are pushing ahead and ignoring the views of those that will end up paying the most for this project. I am making this statement because it reflects what I am seeing and my inability to get any action in my role as a Regional Councillor. I intend to keep escalating the issues because, removing carparks, closing roads onto Lambton Quay and temporary bike lanes should not happen until after a transport route and transport mode that has wide ratepayers support has been selected.

I see too many mistakes in the approach they are taking including a focus that will deliver little for those Wellingtonians who are not in the central city. More recently further detailed information I have been able to get has accelerated my belief that there is a need to pause and review the project immediately so that cost and value considerations for ratepayers in Wellington can be considered along with the decarbonization and mode shift targets that are in the objectives.

It is essential that we gain the overwhelming support of our Wellington residential and commercial ratepayers before construction starts. Transport makes up 66% of the Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) budget and 60.1% of the regional Transport budget is paid by Wellington ratepayers, (35.9% business contribution and 24.2% Residential and Rural). I believe this entitles you to effective consultation.

I am confident that the consultation documents have been based upon financial information that appears misleading to me and is so limited that it is impossible for those even with extensive financial ability to make informed judgments on this project. Recently it has come to my attention that requests under the Official Information Act have been treated in an inconsistent manner where my expectation of LGWM is that once information is released it should be available for all. I, as a Councillor will not support LGWM until there is a review of options and associated costs along with a look at central city transport routes.

I believe that integrity, honesty, along with my own reputation need to be above political expediency. I understand that standing up for what I believe in the face of political focus may mean I am standing alone against LGWM, but I am happy to do so if needed and will face the public support or censure at the GWRC elections later this year. I believe my integrity is not something that can be traded.

Here are updated issues that I am looking to have addressed:

1. Why I have no confidence in the LGWM program.

- a. I have asked for costs to ratepayers at an early stage but, no answer.
- b. I wanted a reduction of the 42% overhead costs over the longer term but the only answer I got was that they were "comfortable" at that level.
- c. 1st Feb engaged with GW people involved with LGWM and offered both soft and hard options but after 10 weeks I only had pushback.
- d. Since my letter of 13th April, lots more detail info has come to my attention.
- e. The project is based upon P95 Standard, (95% accurate) but I do not believe the figures are accurate.
- f. I have concerns about merging cost information details so that LRT and BRT appear to have similar costs. This appears as differing contingencies to balance gross costs.
- g. Options are between Bus or Light Rail, there should have been 2 bus options and 2 LRT options not 1 BRT and 3 LRT.
- h. Angled double tunnel cost.
 - i. Shown as \$583k p meter.
 - ii. Spine study for Mt Vic was about \$450kpm almost 10 years ago
 - iii. Arras "cut and Cap" was \$1m p meter
 - iv. Consider real cost of \$1.2m p meter, this creates a variance of \$1.5b for options 1+2 which translates into a WOLC variance of \$2b.
- i. BRT and LRT inground costs are assessed as the same however BRT is likely to be more than \$500m lower.
- j. Route Planning
 - i. A project like this should have started with transport route review.
 - ii. This would identify routes to Airport, Hospital and SH1 which should not be subject to congestion charging.
 - iii. Light Rail due to costs needs both tracks together so needs a different route planning than BRT which can have separate Southern and Northern routes.
 - iv. BRT route Planning can allow for access for emergency services, Taxi, service vehicles, and drop off pick up for private vehicles.
- k. Cost issues
 - i. If my comments on the tunnel costs are correct, they creates serious comparisons between the options.
 - ii. From consultation documents I have adjusted and recalculated the cost of LGWM options and created an Alternative BRT option based around the following cost sharing.
 - 1. 60% Waka Kotahi
 - 2. 20% WCC
 - 3. 20% GWRC
 - iii. I have estimated the impact on ratepayers that will result from each of the 5 options. These are based upon the adjusted LGWM costs and amortized over a 30-year period. The result is that our WCC rates are likely to increase by, i \$100mpa, ii \$89mpa, iii \$76mpa, iv \$66mpa, v \$45mpa, (25%-12%).

- I. LGWM has provided MRT service provision costings that do not appear realistic when compared to cost to operate GWRC's latest EV bus purchase. These add to GWRC LTP 172% increase over the next 10 years.

2. Car Parking and city access.

- a. When discussing parking we need to remember that 53% of passenger travel is during peak time which is about 3 hours per day.
- b. During the rest of the operating hours passenger numbers are substantially reduced.
- c. Why are we not considering Peak hour clearways which will allow for parking off peak?
- d. When we look ahead there is an expectation that by 2030 a substantial portion of vehicles in the city will be Electric so it is really about managing city access or congestion.

3. Other Issues.

- a. The focus appears to be on North South only with little benefit for Karori, Johnsonville Tawa Yet those suburbs end up paying.
- b. The population data differs from the WCC Spatial Plan, we should build a transport system that can grow and expand as the population builds rather than build for a potential population that may not eventuate for many years.
- c. The Cobham Drive crossing was not supported by the accident research which showed that other options may have greater benefit. If it is so important why not elevate it over the road at an early stage.

4. Climate, Environment and Coastal recession

- a. We can best meet the costs of these key issues with a strong economy
- b. If we destroy our city lifestyle, retail and social quality we will have a weaker economy for Wellington, Auckland already has empty Central City sites.

5. What can we do as a community?

- a. Our city our choice
- b. Email WCC and GW Councillors with views
- c. Point out it is an election year
- d. Your views but not being listened to

I believe we need to pause the program, review and reconnect to issues that are important to all those that make up and pay for our city.

Chris Kirk-Burnnand

chriskb@gw.govt.nz

021658237

Integrity Perseverance Family Dreams. Our Land. The Journey is the Reward