

From: Alex Campbell
 To: 9(2)
 Cc: 9(2)
 Subject: RE: GM Do minimum - future bus provision
 Date: Friday, 2 October 2020 2:44:07 PM
 Attachments: mjae001.png
 mjae004.png

Hi Rowan

Yes regarding Golden Mile this is why it is an issue we keep raising. As of October 25 2020 we will have peak flows of 88 buses per hour northbound (8-9am) and 81 buses per hour southbound (5-6pm). So well into the "Unstable flow Queuing – 81-100 buses per hour" area as defined by the TRB Transit Capacity of Service Manual.

Hence the desire to see a second corridor as an early outcome of City Streets.

Funding wise we are still finalising the LTP for the next ten years. Appears we will go with a growth assumption on the basis it can be lowered after the first triennium. However still a political process to go through in coming weeks. At this stage it is a reasonable expectation that it would be funded beyond current fleet orders.

My view on the following

- Do we include provision for the projection of additional PVR in the Do Minimum (noting these are unfunded by likely to be funded)

yes

- Do we assume all additional peak trips continue to be provided on the GM?

Harder question. Given no confirmed plan to introduce the second bus corridor then they would have to be accommodated on the Golden Mile. Noting that this is part of the case for why a second corridor is required.

MRT is intended to reduce the volume of buses required on the Golden Mile however the number of buses reduced has not yet been confirmed as is subject to what final MRT proposal is adopted (1 spine dual spine airport verses peninsula etc)

I have included Natasha in this replay in case she has any thoughts regarding how we should deal with the second corridor.

Alex

From: 9(2)(a)
 Sent: Friday, 2 October 2020 1:46 PM
 To: Alex Campbell <xxxx.xxxxxxx@xx.xxxx.xx>
 Subject: RE: GM Do minimum - future bus provision

Thanks for this, very useful.

One question (I suspect the elephant in the room with respect to the Golden Mile) – if I'm reading the PVR projections correct – it looks like something in the order of an increase of 130 in PVR by 31-32. This is volume is likely to significantly impact all options for GM improvements, given the constraints around Manners/Willis.

Beyond the 25 vehicles procured up to July 2022, the additional PVR is unfunded, but I would assume there is a reasonable expectation that additional funding will be made available to deal with growth as time progresses.

With regard to the MCA on the GM, we are considering a design year of 2036 (or thereabouts) as the design year for comparison purposes – this points to the following questions

- Do we include provision for the projection of additional PVR in the Do Minimum (noting these are unfunded by likely to be funded)
- Do we assume all additional peak trips continue to be provided on the GM?

Which ever assumptions we apply, it is important that we are transparent and consistent in the application. If we assume all additional services must be accommodated on the GM, it may impact the MCA in that under the volume increases all options are likely to exhibit some form over capacity issue. If we assume an alternate route is proposed, we need to be clear about this assumption and also ensure this assumption is incorporated in related projects (such as MRT).

What are your views?

Regards

9(2)

From: Alex Campbell <xxxx.xxxxxxx@xx.xxxx.xx>
 Sent: Friday, October 2, 2020 11:59 AM
 To: 9(2)(a)
 Subject: RE: GM Do minimum - future bus provision

Hi Rowan

We have contracts in place to deliver 25 growth busses with delivery between April 2021 and July 2022.

As a very basic assumption each bus would operate one peak of peak trip in the am peak adding to Golden Mile volumes.

As part of our LTP we are working on different assumptions for growth over the next decade. This is still a work in progress given uncertainties about Covid recovery and structural changes to peak demand.

We essentially have two projections that we are considering shown below. First has us getting back to 2018/19 patronage levels by 2022 vs 2025 for a more conservative projection. Given long lead times to procure new EV fleet the view at this stage is that we work on the higher projection for the next three years and review for the following triennium subject to how demand actually recovers. The risk of over providing capacity being less than the risk of underproviding.

PT GROUP MEMO TO FINANCE (11 MAY 2020)										
Estimated annual patronage (million trips)										
Year ending 30 June	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Bus	24.75	25.24	25.75	26.52	27.31	28.13	28.96	29.85	30.74	31.67
Rail	14.32	14.61	14.90	15.35	15.81	16.28	16.77	17.28	17.79	18.33
Ferry	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.22	0.23	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.26
Network	39.27	40.06	40.86	42.09	43.35	44.65	45.99	47.37	48.79	50.25
Assumed patronage growth										
Bus	100%*	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Rail	100%*	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Ferry	100%*	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Network	100%*	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%

* The 100% growth rates shown for 2021/22 represent a doubling of patronage from estimated levels of the previous year, and a return to 2018-19 patronage levels.

For the first year of the 2021-31 LTP we are now assuming that patronage levels will be around 10% lower than pre-COVID-19 expectations (i.e. 2018/19 levels assumed in the May 2020).

Patronage will then increase on average by 3% per annum for the duration of the 2021-31 LTP. This means that patronage will not bounce back to pre-COVID-19 levels (2018/19 levels) until 2025.

The revised growth assumptions and forecast patronage is shown in the following table:

REVISED ASSUMPTIONS (September 2020)										
Estimated annual patronage (million trips)										
Year ending 30 June	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Bus	22.98	23.67	24.50	25.36	26.24	27.16	28.11	28.96	29.83	30.72
Rail	12.19	12.56	13.00	13.45	13.92	14.41	14.92	15.36	15.82	16.30
Ferry	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.21	0.21
Network	35.35	36.41	37.68	38.99	40.36	41.77	43.23	44.52	45.86	47.23
Assumed patronage growth										
Bus	7.5%*	3.0%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Rail	7.5%*	3.0%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Ferry	5.5%*	2.0%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Network	7.5%*	3.0%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%

* Actual patronage in 2019/20 was 16% lower than 2018/19. The growth rates shown for 2021/22 assume that patronage in 2020/21 will remain at 84% of the 2018/19 levels and reach 90% of 2018/19 levels in 2021/22. This is consistent with the forecast provided to NCTA and the NCTA's expectations under their funding policy for COVID-19 recovery. The growth rates assume that from 2021/22 onwards, patronage will permanently be about 10% lower than the 2018/19 levels due to structural changes to travel patterns. However, patronage is expected to grow at a higher rate after an effective and safe vaccine is widely available from mid-2023.

These estimates and assumptions have implications on both funding and planning for growth, as further discussed in the following section.

In terms of bus numbers below is a recent projection of additional PVR by bus company. Mana NZBus and Tranzurban expect almost all additional PVR to be in Wellington city so would result in an additional peak-of-the-peak service on the Golden Mile.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
							18-19	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29	29-30	30-31	31-32	Buses requir
2	Operator	Measure	Double decker	Large vehicle	Medium vehicle	Small vehicle	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
4	Mana	PVR	5	17	3		25	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	36	38	40	
5	Mana	Active Fleet	6	23	4		33	35	36	37	39	41	43	45	47	49	51	53	
6	Mana	Spares	1	6	1		8	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
8	NZ Bus	PVR	16	66	21		133	143	146	140	153	157	164	166	171	176	181	187	
9	NZ Bus	Active Fleet	17	102	48		167	180	184	188	194	200	206	213	220	227	234	242	
10	NZ Bus	Spares	1	6	27		34	37	38	39	41	43	45	47	49	51	53	55	0
12	Transurben	PVR	26	79	81	21	207	214	218	223	229	236	243	250	257	265	273	281	
13	Transurben	Active Fleet	28	95	100	18	241	249	254	260	268	277	286	295	304	314	324	334	
14	Transurben	Spares	2	16	19	-3	34	35	36	37	39	41	43	45	47	49	51	53	5
16	Uzabus	PVR		4	10		20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	
17	Uzabus	Active Fleet		7	15		22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	
18	Uzabus	Spares	0	3	-1		2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
21	Operator	Measure						21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29	29-30	30-31	31-32	Total
22	Mana	Additional Active						2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
23	Mana	Additional Spares						0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
24	Mana	Total Additional						2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
26	NZ Bus	Additional Active						0	4	4	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	8	
27	NZ Bus	Additional Spares						0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
28	NZ Bus	Total Additional						0	5	5	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	10	80
30	Transurben	Additional Active						0	5	6	8	9	9	9	9	10	10	10	
31	Transurben	Additional Spares						0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
32	Transurben	Total Additional						0	6	7	10	11	11	11	11	12	12	12	103
34	Uzabus	Additional Active						1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
35	Uzabus	Additional Spares						0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
36	Uzabus	Total Additional						1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	21
38																			Total
																			234

From: 9(2)(a)
 Sent: Friday, 2 October 2020 10:26 AM
 To: Alex Campbell <Alex.Campbell@gw.govt.nz>
 Subject: GM Do minimum - future bus provision

Hi Alex,

Thanks for your input in the TAG update earlier in the week, that was very useful.

I'm in the process of creating an uncertainty log and assumptions register and I want to capture the base assumptions around future bus service provision on the GM bus corridor.

Could you give me a couple of sentences summarizing the future program of bus improvements that we will need to include in our do-minimum assumptions?

Regards

9(2)(a)
 Principal Transport Planner
 Mobile: 9(2)(a)
 Stantec
 Level 13, 80 The Terrace
 Wellington 6011

Stantec



In content of this email to be confidential to you. Stantec and should not be copied, modified, or distributed or used in any way except with Stantec's written authority. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not copy or disseminate and notify us immediately.

ATTENTION This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not represent those of the organisation.
ATTENTION This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982