

Report 14.68  
Date 18 February 2014  
File TP/03/28/07

Committee Regional Transport Committee  
Author Nicola Durling, Senior Data Analyst

## Regional Transport Targets Review

### 1. Purpose

This report details the approach taken to review the current set of Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS) targets. As a result of the review process a list of recommended outcomes and targets framework for inclusion in the new Regional Land Transport Plan is proposed.

### 2. Background

As detailed in a separate report (14.77), amendments to the Land Transport Management Act (LTMA) in 2013 require the RLTS and Regional Land Transport Programme to be consolidated into a new planning document from 1 July 2015 - the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).

The RLTP is required to set out the region's land transport objectives, policies, and measures/targets for at least 10 years. At the December 2012 Regional Transport Committee (RTC) meeting, an approach to transition from the current set of strategies and plans into the new integrated transport planning format was agreed (report 12.600). The approach proposed primarily to refresh the existing strategy content and did not anticipate any significant change in strategic direction. While this is still the case, the RLTP needs to reflect changes to the purpose and decision making criteria in the LTMA. The targets also need to be re-cast out to 2025 – which would be 10 years from the adoption of the RLTP.

Prior to officers re-casting the targets out to 2025 it was considered timely to review the region's current outcomes and targets to ensure they are relevant, measurable and where appropriate, align with national measures and definitions. The review has been undertaken and is detailed in **Attachment 1**.

### 3. Reviewing the outcomes and targets framework

The current RLTS identifies the outcomes that the region seeks to achieve. In total there are 21 outcomes and progress towards these are measured through 28 targets (set out to 2020).

The review process involved answering the following questions (based around SMART<sup>1</sup> criteria) in relation to each of the 28 targets:

- Is the target related to the outcome?
- Can the target be measured?
- Is the target achievable?
- Does our work influence the target?

Further to this, the review has also taken into account:

- Findings from an external review by Tim Kelly Transportation Planning Ltd that focused on the ‘value’ and ‘relevance’ of the targets to the RLTS outcomes.
- Feedback from officers involved in preparing the Annual Monitoring Report on the RLTS relating to data quality or measurability issues.
- Feedback from selected stakeholders (covering public transport, active travel and safety) in relation to changes/developments in terms of national measures and definitions, and their aspirations for the region.
- Feedback from a technical advisory group (TAG) comprised of representatives from all the territorial authorities in the region, Greater Wellington Regional Council and the New Zealand Transport Agency.

The findings from the review process are documented in Table 3 of **Attachment 1**.

The review process highlighted improvements that can be made to how a number of targets are expressed. Recommended changes are proposed. It has also been necessary to make some amendments to the outcomes to ensure consistency with the new LTMA, remove duplication between the outcomes and improve clarity across the RLTP strategic objectives, key outcomes and targets.

The recommendations aim to improve the region’s current transport targets by ensuring they are relevant and utilise the best available methodology and data source. They also focus on quantifiable factors that are clearly linked to outcomes and relate to aspects over which the organisations represented on the Committee have some influence.

The list of recommended RLTP outcomes and targets is shown in Table 1 below. Setting the magnitude of the targets will be the focus of further work (see section 4 of this report).

**Table 1. List of recommended outcomes and targets**

<b>Strategic objective:</b>	<b>A high quality, reliable public transport network</b>
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	<b>Increased public transport use</b>
Target 1.1:	Increase total public transport boardings per capita to ??

---

<sup>1</sup> For a target to be SMART it should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound

Target 1.2:	Increase public transport use to at least ??% of all trips in urban areas
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	<b>Improved public transport accessibility for all</b>
Target 2.1:	??% of public transport vehicles are accessible by wheelchair
<b>Outcome 3:</b>	<b>Improved public transport reliability and journey times</b>
Target 3.1:	??% of Real Time Information (RTI) tracked public transport services run to time
Target 3.2:	Reduced peak period public transport journey times on key routes
<b>Strategic objective:</b>	<b>A safe and attractive walking and cycling network</b>
<b>Outcome 4:</b>	<b>Increased mode share for pedestrians and cyclists</b>
Target 4.1:	Increase active mode use to at least ??% of all trips in urban areas
<b>Outcome 5:</b>	<b>Improved level of service for pedestrians and cyclists</b>
Target 5.1:	??% of people report a 'good' or 'neither good nor bad' level of service for the strategic cycle network
Target 5.2:	??% of people report a 'good' or 'neither good nor bad' level of service for the strategic pedestrian network
<b>Outcome 6:</b>	<b>Increased safety for pedestrians and cyclists</b>
Target 6.1:	The five-year moving average for fatal and serious injuries is no more than ?? for pedestrians and ?? cyclists
Target 6.2:	Reduce the pedestrian and cyclist casualty rates per 100 million km travelled by ??%
<b>Strategic objective:</b>	<b>A reliable and effective strategic road network</b>
<b>Outcome 7:</b>	<b>Reduced severe road congestion</b>
Target 7.1:	AM and PM peak congestion levels on selected routes will remain below ??
<b>Outcome 8:</b>	<b>Improved reliability of the strategic roading network</b>
Target 8.1:	AM and PM travel time variability for selected key routes will remain at or below ??
<b>Strategic objective:</b>	<b>An effective network for the movement of freight</b>
<b>Outcome 9:</b>	<b>Improved freight efficiency</b>
Target 9.1:	??% improvement in road journey times between key regional freight destinations
<b>Outcome 10:</b>	<b>A transport network that supports regional economic growth</b>
Target 10.1:	Increase the movement of freight by ??%
<b>Strategic objective:</b>	<b>A safer system for all users of our regional road network</b>
<b>Outcome 11:</b>	<b>Improved regional road safety</b>
Target 11.1:	Reducing trend in fatal and serious injuries on the region's roads
<b>Strategic objective:</b>	<b>An efficient and optimised transport system that minimises the impact on the environment</b>
<b>Outcome 12:</b>	<b>Reduced greenhouse gas emissions</b>
Target 12.1:	Transport generated CO <sub>2</sub> emissions will ??
<b>Outcome 13:</b>	<b>Increased private vehicle occupancy</b>
Target 13.1:	Vehicles entering the Wellington CBD during the 2 hour AM peak contain on average at least ?? people per vehicle
<b>Strategic objective:</b>	<b>An integrated and resilient transport network</b>
<b>Outcome 14:</b>	<b>Improved integration between transport modes</b>
Target 14.1:	The majority of public transport services are covered by integrated ticketing

<b>Outcome 15:</b>	<b>Improved land use and transport integration</b>
Target 15.1:	??% of people in the region live within 500 metres of a public transport stop on the core or local PT route
<b>Outcome 16:</b>	<b>Improved transport network resilience</b>
Target 16.1:	Identify, investigate and implement resilience improvements along the region's 'lifelines' transport corridor

#### 4. Setting new targets

As part of the transition process from the current set of transport strategies and plans into the new RLTP it is necessary to develop targets out to 2025. This will maintain the 10 year time horizon for strategic targets as currently found in the 2010 RLTS.

Progress towards the current RLTS 2020 targets is shown in Table 2 of **Attachment 1**, and shows that the region has made progress in the direction set by 12 of the 28 targets. However, in half of these instances, progress is not of the magnitude required if the target is to be achieved by 2020. No clear progress has been made toward five of the targets, performance has declined on seven of the targets and for four of the targets there is insufficient data for a trend to be determined.

There are a number of possible influencing factors that are likely to have affected the region's progress towards its transport targets. These are described in Table 2 of **Attachment 1**.

When considering what the appropriate target level for the region should be out to 2025, it is important to understand the wider influences and take into account recent trends.

There is a balance to be struck when considering the level of progress sought through setting strategic targets. These should provide a level of challenge and should not be set at a level that is easily achieved. However, they should not be so ambitious as to be completely unrealistic in a given policy setting.

It is therefore proposed that for each RLTP target two options ('challenging' and 'stretch') for target levels out to 2025 are developed by officers for the RTC's consideration. Both options will be a challenge for the region, with the 'stretch' option being much more ambitious, given projected trends. Table 5 in **Attachment 1** shows some examples of what the 'challenging' and 'stretch' projections could look like.

The proposed approach to developing the two sets of targets will take into account recent trends, estimated impacts from known projects and policies, and incorporate stakeholder feedback/aspirations for the region.

A paper on the options for the magnitude of all the RLTP targets will be brought back to the RTC at its next meeting.

#### 5. The decision-making process and significance

Officers recognise that the matters referenced in this report may have a high degree of importance to affected or interested parties.

The matters requiring decision in this report have been considered by officers against the requirements of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act). Part 6 sets out the obligations of local authorities in relation to the making of decisions.

### 5.1 Significance of the decision

Part 6 requires Greater Wellington Regional Council to consider the significance of the decision. The term ‘significance’ has a statutory definition set out in the Act.

Officers have considered the significance of the matter, taking the Council's significance policy and decision-making guidelines into account. Officers recommend that the matter be considered to have low significance.

This decision is to approve changes to the current RLTS outcomes and targets and to outline the approach for determining the appropriate magnitude of the new 2025 targets that will be incorporated into the Regional Land Transport Plan. The magnitude for each target will be adopted by the RTC at a later date.

Officers do not consider that a formal record outlining consideration of the decision-making process is required in this instance.

## 6. Recommendations

*That the Committee:*

1. **Receives** the report.
2. **Notes** the content of the report.
3. **Agrees** to adopt the following, as part of the Regional Land Transport Plan development process:
  - a. *the targets framework, as set out in Table 1; and*
  - b. *the outcomes, as set out in Table 1.*
4. **Agrees** to the approach set out in section 4 for setting the magnitude of the new 2025 RLTP targets.
5. **Notes** that a paper on the options for the magnitude of the targets will be presented at the next meeting of the Regional Transport Committee.

Report prepared by:

**Nicola Durling**  
Senior Data Analyst

Report approved by:

**Luke Troy**  
Manager, Corporate Planning

Report approved by:

**Jane Davis**  
General Manager, Strategy &  
Community Engagement

Attachment 1: Wellington's Regional Land Transport Plan: Targets Paper