

Meeting at 9:15 on 25 November 2016
Level 28, Majestic Centre, 100 Willis Street
Wellington

PRESENT

Dr Chris Teo-Sherrell	Living Streets Aotearoa Incorporated
Carina Duke	Blind Foundation
Kirsty Horridge,	Hamilton City Council
Bridget Burdett	Traffic Design Group Limited (from 10.45 to 2.30)
Amanda Banks	CCS Disability Action Waikato (to 2.30)
Gerry Dance	NZ Transport Agency, National Cycling Team
Kate Bevin	Greater Wellington Regional Council
Prof. Stuart Locke	Waikato University (from 10.45 to 2.30)
Sue McAuley	Nelson City Council (SASTA)
Simon Kennett	NZ Transport Agency, National Cycling Team (to 3.15)
Patrick Morgan	Cycling Action Network
Trish Rudolph	NZ Transport Agency
Phillipa Townsend	Office for Seniors, Ministry of Social Development
Travis Mills	NZ Police
Dr Lynley Hood	Trustee, Visual Impairment Charitable Trust Aotearoa
John Lieswyn	ViaStrada (from 1.20)
Wayne Newman	RCA Forum Research & Guidelines Steering Group

APOLOGIES

Jason Eady	NZ Police
Nathaniel Benefield	New Plymouth District
Michael Voss	Waitaki District Council
Michael Harrison	Dunedin City Council
Susan Hutchinson-Daniel	Greater Wellington Regional Council
Margaret Parfitt	Nelson City Council
Catherine Hall	Alzheimers New Zealand
Lee Orchard	Office for Seniors, Ministry of Social Development
Gerri Pomeroy	CCS Disability Action Waikato
Martin Dutton	Ministry of Health
Charlotte Flaherty	Dunedin City Council

AGENDA

- 9.15 1. Welcome, introductions, apologies and emergency briefing
- 9.25 2. Minutes of 18 August 2016 and actions arising
- 9.45 3. Presentation of participation impact research
- 11.00 4. Footpath cycling – Transport Agency research
- 11.30 5. Give Way and other Rule research
- 12.30 6. E-bike and low-powered vehicles research
- 3.00 7. Terms of reference and role of Group
- 4.00 8. Wrap-up and Next meeting
- 4.15 Close

ACTIONS

1. Dr C. Teo-Sherrell, C. Duke, G. Pomeroy and S. Mellsopp to complete review of publicly available guidance and other documents from the United Kingdom, Canada, divers European countries, Australia and New Zealand and further develop the gaps analysis.
2. All members to use individual contacts to advance policy engagement between health and transport on the determinants of health, expand connections, especially with potential research investors, and increase awareness of the working group and issues being addressed.
3. B. Burdett and Prof. S. Locke to complete and present Stage 2 and Stage 3 research reports.
4. W. Newman to revise the terms of reference in accordance with the instructions of the meeting, and circulate.
5. W. Newman to establish a suitable meeting date in April 2017 for the next meeting and arrange a venue.

NOTES

ITEM 1: INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES and EMERGENCY BRIEFING

G. Dance welcomed the meeting and provided the emergency and safety briefing. Each attendee gave a brief introduction of themselves and the organisation they represented. New attendees were welcomed and the apologies were noted. The minutes of the meeting on 18 August 2016 were approved as a true and proper record.

ITEM 2: ACTIONS FROM MEETING OF 18 AUGUST

1. Dr C. Teo-Sherrell (Living Streets), C. Duke (Blind Foundation), G. Pomeroy and S. Mellsopp (CCS Disability Action) to complete review of publicly available guidance and other documents from the United Kingdom, Canada, divers European countries, Australia and New Zealand and further develop the gaps analysis.
Open. Due to be completed soon.
2. W. Newman to circulate recommendation that road controlling authorities considering conditions for approval of footpath operation of electric delivery vehicles by NZ Post should seek a specified maximum speed less than 20km/h, specified hours of exemption, routine access to recorded vehicle data to allow proper monitoring of routes, behaviour and interaction, and a prior count of footpath users to enable monitoring of the effect on participation rates by the elderly or mobility aid users.
Completed.
3. W. Newman to propose to road controlling authorities through AMIG that consistent national conditions for the acceptable minimum footpath width and volume of use, exclusions and agreed safe speeds for NZ Post delivery vehicles be agreed.
For discussion with Footpath cycling research outcomes.
4. All members to use individual contacts to advance policy engagement between health and transport on the determinants of health, expand connections, especially with potential research investors, and increase awareness of the working group and issues being addressed.
Open.
5. W. Newman to provide copies of two reviews of international literature regarding personal mobility devices, and mobility scooters in particular, done for the Research and Guidelines Steering Group to the E-bike and low-powered vehicles research project.
Completed.

ITEM 3: PARTICIPATION IMPACT RESEARCH

The previous meeting noted that there is a need to understand why some facilities are used or not used by the elderly and those with mobility aids. It recognised that the challenge is to “see who is not there” and to understand why, and that more data are needed to make any inferences about variation by time of day or week.

The meeting also agreed that there is a need to establish the principle of use and the priority of pedestrians, which requires a reassessment of the reallocation of space that is occurring, with the default becoming the shared path.

The Stage 1 report on participation impacts demonstrated that paths probably have different values for different people, depending on their mode (cyclist, pedestrian and mobility-aided pedestrian), trip purpose and time (peak vs off-peak).

The purpose of Stages 2 and 3 was to use the Stage 1 data and existing published research to develop Willingness to Pay indicators for shared and exclusive footpaths and cycleways, as there is little understanding in the international transport planning community about how to account for the relative value of different trips to different people.

The research has used focus groups to establish willingness to pay for different groups (namely people who ride bicycles, people who walk with no mobility aid; and people who use a mobility aid). The two main research questions addressed are:

1. What is the value of a path (shared or exclusive; footpath or cycle path) for their users in New Zealand?
2. Are there differential values for a trip for people with and without access to a car, people who ride a bicycle, pedestrians, or mobility-aided pedestrians; and does the “first trip” have a different value to subsequent trips within any particular day?

The preliminary results of the research were presented to the TRAFINZ Conference. B. Burdett and Prof. S. Locke presented their findings to the meeting.

The study has received 500 responses: 28% reported a disability, but 38% self-identified a mobility difficulty; 11% had no access to a motor vehicle. The study response profile has a slight bias to older footpath users and those with an interest in footpath safety.

The responses have identified a significant non-transport function for footpaths, not just in the value of walking, but in the value of social inclusion. They have shown that footpaths are essential for Work & Income clients, and for those with Traumatic Brain Injury (often from motor vehicle collisions), and suggest that providing a safe footpath would see a 99.2% increase in use by disabled pedestrians.

The study indicates sensitivities for footpath use relate to security, safety, availability and timing of use.

In considering the implications of an aging population and the cost of social and economic participation – whether by having access to the internet or to motorised transport – the study has noted the calculation of the economic cost of ‘loneliness’: \$2,500 per capita per annum.

The study is expected to provide a solid basis for establishing a benefit-cost for providing safe and secure pedestrian infrastructure. The meeting noted the research report is expected before the end of the year.

ITEM 4: FOOTPATH CYCLING RESEARCH

J. Ward and H. Mackie facilitated a workshop at the previous meeting on the issues for footpath cycling, as part of the Transport Agency research on the effects of allowing cycling on footpaths.

The Executive Summary of the research findings was tabled at the meeting. This considered footpath cycling primarily in terms of the improved safety benefits to cyclists, but recognised pedestrian disbenefits from increased footpath cycling. It notes that a rule change limiting footpath cycling to children would generate fewer disbenefits and concludes that a rule change permitting those aged 12 and under (and accompanying adults) to cycle on footpaths has merit.

S. Kennett explained to the meeting that this research fits within a wider review of the Rule to identify impediments to increasing the uptake of cycling, which is a NZ Transport Agency strategic priority. Research on requiring a mandatory minimum overtaking gap for cyclists has identified that discomfort with a passing gap of less than 1.5 m is strongest among inexperienced cyclists. The perception of relative safety causes cyclists to use footpaths in preference to roads.

The meeting noted that, just as actual collisions involving overtaking cyclists are relatively rare and it is the perception that is central to the argument, so it is the perception of safety, rather than actual cyclist-pedestrian collisions, that is key to understanding the effects on pedestrians, who lack a choice to take in preference to footpaths. While the Executive Summary does not refer to pedestrians with specific impairments, the meeting assumed that the report would properly reference the studies that are unequivocal that cyclists riding on footpaths frighten those with visual, cognitive or sensory impairment.

While the meeting recognised that a Rule change was necessary for trainers legally to offer safe footpath cycling training to children, it agreed that the consequences and costs of the proposed change need to include the effect on vulnerable pedestrians and the wider social costs from reduced social inclusion. The meeting queried whether this proposed change reflects a transport hierarchy that privileges motor vehicles at the expense of cyclists, and cyclists at the expense of pedestrians, and noted that issues related to speeds, courtesy, surfaces and width will need to be properly addressed.

ITEM 5: GIVE WAY AND OTHER RULE RESEARCH

Dr G. Koorey (ViaStrada) and Dr S. Turner (MWH) have undertaken research on possible changes to give-way rules. Their report was tabled for the meeting and included recommendations relating to:

- I. giving cyclists priority over turning traffic where separated cycling facilities cross side roads;
- II. giving pedestrians priority over turning traffic when crossing side roads;
- III. allowing cyclists to use a left turning lane while riding straight ahead;
- IV. allowing cyclists to undertake slow moving traffic;
- V. allowing cyclists to lane split when filtering to the front of a queue of traffic;
- VI. allowing cyclists to turn left and/or ride across the top of a T-junction despite being faced with a red light.

The meeting supported giving pedestrians priority over turning traffic in accord with the priority in many North American and European jurisdictions, but noted that it would reverse the current priority for motorists on the roadway here and would need to be a highly publicised national change to avoid increasing the risk for pedestrians.

ITEM 6: E-BIKE AND LOW-POWERED VEHICLES RULES

The NZ Transport Agency has commissioned ViaStrada to undertake a two-part review of rules relating to electric vehicles, including e-bikes and low-powered vehicles. Part one consisted of a literature review of:

- Studies into the uptake and crash rates of electric bicycles and other low-powered vehicles, comparison with any New Zealand data available, and estimating likely growth of low powered vehicle use in New Zealand;
- Regulation relating to the sale and use of electric bicycles and other low-powered vehicles in New Zealand and similar countries;
- Features of electric bicycles and other low-powered vehicles that affect their safety, trends in the development of these features and whether user age has a bearing on crash risk (or injury severity).

Part two of the project included workshops with electric bicycle and other low-powered vehicle users, other path and road user representatives, importers and retailers, and those responsible for regulation and enforcement of rules associated with such vehicles. These workshops, and interviews with subject matter experts, inform a discussion within the report that explores the options for future regulation and road user rule changes that may be applied to electric bicycles and other low-powered vehicles and their users in New Zealand.

John Lieswyn presented a report on the options for better regulation of devices that currently use or potentially will use footpaths, including mobility scooters, e-bikes, Segways, hoverboards, e-skate boards, e-unicycles and e-kick scooters.

The meeting agreed that there is a clear need to establish the regulations and ability to use devices before they are imported, and noted that current regulations do not address devices adequately.

The meeting agreed that the critical consideration for any powered mobility device used on a footpath is the speed differential between that device and any unpowered user. A speed limit of 25 km/h, which e-bike users regard as too slow for effective commuting, is not accepted as an appropriate speed for cyclists using a shared path in locations likely to have vulnerable pedestrians.

The meeting agreed that, by definition, a shared path is a footpath for any pedestrian using it and any device travelling on a footpath at 25 km/h would be travelling at a speed that posed a risk to other users.

Delivering facilities that can provide an acceptable level of service for faster devices remains a critical challenge. The meeting recognised the challenge in providing space for dual facilities, and the trade-off required in terms of green space or parking likely to be lost in order to provide separate facilities.

The meeting considered the potential effects of an increasing uptake of a mix of powered personal mobility devices, e-bikes and mobility scooters. If the trend is to larger and heavier devices (larger Segway devices and mobility scooters) a slight reduction in both car use and public transport use might result. If the trend is towards the smaller devices able to be carried onto public transport, which appears to be the increasing trend at present, a greater reduction in car use, but an increased use of public transport could be expected.

The meeting noted that reducing urban speed limits would improve safety for users of these devices and improve their attractiveness as a competitive alternative to cars. The meeting agreed that a staged re-allocation of road space needs to be included in the policy conversation, to ensure that the primary benefactors of any reduction in vehicle use are not the remaining motorists.

Mobility scooters were recognised to bring a distinct set of challenges. The mass and speed of these devices can make them a hazard to other users, but the meeting agreed that ensuring that the operator was competent and had the visual and cognitive abilities needed to use the device safely, before the device was acquired, appears to be the critical issue for mobility scooters.

The lack of prior occupational therapist assessment (and funding for this) of skills needed for operating a powered mobility scooter, when this is required to operate a wheelchair, was identified as a significant deficiency.

ITEM 7. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND ROLE OF GROUP

The draft terms of reference for this group had been previously circulated, reviewed and expanded, but not yet formally adopted.

The meeting discussed the role and objectives of the group, and the role of the RCA Forum. The treatment of footpaths in isolation from other policy initiatives affecting the use of roads and footpaths was rejected and the

meeting agreed that the terms of reference must enable the fullest discussion of appropriate responses to emerging challenges.

The meeting agreed that the terms of reference and scope of the group's activities should reflect a Safer System approach towards footpaths, so that no one aspect of the issue is considered out of its context.

The meeting specifically identified education as an area of interest, noting the need for kick scooter, mobility scooter and cycle user training, education in how to use footpaths, improved awareness of the vulnerabilities of other users and improving behaviour of users.

The meeting also identified a need for identified best practice to be able to be quickly taken up in planning and engineering standards, design guides and manuals

The revised terms of reference will be circulated.

ITEM 8. OTHER BUSINESS & NEXT MEETING

No item of other business was raised.

The meeting agreed that the group should meet again in April 2017. A date and venue to be set and communicated.

The meeting closed at 4.15.