

## Response Requirements Document – City Centre to Māngere Project

The Response Requirements Document (RRD) sets out the minimum response requirements for NZTA and NZ Infra as they develop their proposals for the City Centre to Māngere Project.

Auckland Council was provided with a copy of the draft RRD for comment on 16 July 2019.

The table below sets out Auckland Council's feedback and the Ministry of Transport's response.

The document has now been finalised and provided to NZTA and NZ Infra.

Auckland Council Comments	Auckland Council Response
We have assumed the detail around contracts/financials/technical requirements/probity etc. all meet Government requirements so we have no comments on these aspects.	Noted
The one objective which could be enhanced is the <b>environment</b> objective which at present provides fairly precise expectations re air quality and water quality but is vague regarding the impact of any proposal on Auckland iconic volcanic landscapes (both the cones but factors such as lava caves etc and the coastal marine area (Manukau Harbour). We would therefore like to see another criteria around landscapes that could address the impact of the proposals. The water quality aspect of the coast can fit within 2.3 but this is more around the visual and physical elements of these landscapes.	Agreed.  Para 6.3.3 has been expanded and now includes specific reference to volcanic landscapes ( <i>"Protected physical and visual integrity of natural features and landscapes, including volcanic landscapes."</i> )
Linked to above, <b>Section 28.9 [ 29.9]</b> should also reference the <b>environment</b> objective.	Each of the Key Outcomes will be considered in the evaluation of all Response Requirements as well as the specific Environment Key Outcome Narrative Response.  The Evaluation Plan will provide evaluators with further guidance.
<b>Section 11.1.4</b> indicates that AT and AC will provide respondents with community and stakeholder feedback and input during the proposal development phase. It is not clear whether this implies that AT/AC are expected to talk to local communities etc. about each of the proposals – which could be difficult as AT/AC would only be the messenger (ie not know the detail) or is that section referring to the provision of current information that AT/AC already have about the communities' views along the route? We presume (and would expect) the latter so it would be good to clarify this.	Noted and clarified.  Para 12.1.5 has been amended to confirm that AT and AC will provide feedback on behalf of stakeholders based on previous engagement.
<b>Section 28.10</b> should also include the CRL stations at Britomart, Karangahape Rd and Mt Eden	The purpose of 28.10 (now 31.4) is to identify two specific locations where there are key stakeholder interfaces and potential constraints / conflicts (Auckland Airport and KiwiRail).  Interchange requirements are included in relation to Karangahape Rd station.

<p><b>Section 28.11</b> should also include specific reference to minimisation/reduction of construction waste in both the design and construction phases. Construction and demolition waste is the biggest contributor to CO2/climate change in the waste stream and therefore could make a significant impact on emissions targets</p>	<p>Agreed and update made (now para 31.5.2) Included:  <i>The approach to minimising construction waste</i></p>
<p><b>Section 28.18.3</b> – while we recognise the Gantt chart requirements are just examples, we think specifically including “consenting strategy and process” is critical as this is often an area of uncertainty and is likely to be an area of interest (positively or negatively) of politicians.</p>	<p>Agreed and update made (now para 31.10.1) Included:  <i>Key dates for consenting and consultation</i></p>
<p><b>Section 29.3.2</b> – the bullet point “impact on parking” should be “impact on on-street parking particularly in town centres”. In our view, the issue is about on-street parking, not parking in general.</p>	<p>Agreed and update made (now para 33.4.2)  <i>Impact to on-street parking (particularly in town centres) and any additional provisions on the side streets</i></p>
<p><b>Section 31.2.2</b> – add an additional bullet point “Summarising the approach to avoiding impacts on Auckland’s significant geological features and the coastal marine area”</p>	<p>Agreed and update made (now para 32.2.2)  Included: <i>The approach to avoiding adverse impacts on Auckland’s significant geological features and landscapes and the coastal marine environment</i></p>
<p><b>Section 31.5</b> – This section is currently blank but we (Auckland Council) should provide input into this particularly if it is envisaged that the current options for consenting (Notice Of Requirement, Direct Referral, EPA process etc.) are the baseline approach.</p>	<p>Noted.  Proposals must include a Consenting Strategy that sets out the statutory framework and proposed approach to securing the necessary approvals.</p>
<p><b>Section 31.6</b> – An additional bullet point should be added that asks the Respondents to identify how it intends to engage with affected parties ( eg property owners) if the existing frameworks are not followed. It should be noted that when a different legislative approach to the LRT project was discussed last year even the Crown was saying there needed to be some sort of process to engage with affected parties.</p>	<p>Agreed and update made (now para 32.5.3) Included:  <i>How the Respondent proposes to ensure engagement with parties affected by the proposed change</i></p>
<p>Are <b>Sections 31.6 and 31.8</b> duplications or at least dealing with some of the same issues?</p>	<p>Yes – updated to remove duplication</p>
<p>In <b>Sections 33 and 34</b>, in the language of the document, Auckland Council will be both a ‘partner’ and ‘stakeholder’. Under <b>33.1.5</b>, we think it’s important to include Local Boards if we’re including advisory panels. Respondents may choose to use Local Boards as a conduit into communities as part of a wider engagement strategy, but also Respondents will need to engage with Local Boards as entities in and of themselves.</p>	<p>The RRD has been updated to remove specific reference to advisory panels.</p>