

LVR: Funding Heavy Vehicle Impacts Works Group-Teleconference summary

9:00 Friday April 10th 2015

Present; Henri Van Zyl -Kaipara DC, Jamie Cox -Wairoa DC, Warren Furner -Ruapehu DC, Rui Leitao - Wanganui DC, Wayne Furlong -Waikato DC, Wayne Newman -RCAF,

Apologies : Steve Murrin -Malborough Roads, Gary McGraw -Far North DC, Murray Gimblett -NZTA P&I, Joe Bourque -Southland DC ,

Teleconference summary

Members reviewed the draft outline for the guidelines that had been circulated. They agreed that the guidelines need to fit the business case model used by NZTA as co-investor. The title needs to clearly signal that they are designed to address funding unplanned pavement consumption by heavy commercial vehicles. Members are to provide their comments by Friday 1 May on the draft outline.

Discussion

The “impacts” of heavy vehicles is too imprecise; “funding” is the fundamental issue, and the need to achieve an equitable spread of the costs of providing infrastructure. The name of the guidelines should clearly signal this focus and purpose.

Action: JC/WN – title of guidelines to “funding pavement consumption”

The guidelines need to employ the language and style of the NZTA business case model in stating the problem, the costs, the proposal and the benefits.

Action: JC/WN – get examples and guidance on business case model

Consistency across regions requires a national approach and preparing national guidelines for dealing with the consumption of pavement by heavy commercial vehicles will require consultation with the organisations representing heavy commercial vehicle users and operators before the draft can be circulated for wider consultation. We need to identify and engage with directly or potentially interested parties at an early stage.

Action: JC/WN – review process for creating guidelines for local authorities

The FOA is already engaging with individual authorities and at a regional level, and has expressed a desire for national consistency.

In some areas the operators of HCV are being proactive, adapting schedules or routes to avoid or minimise the impact, so consideration also needs to be given to mitigation within the guidelines.

The guidelines will need to balance local conditions and national consistency. They will also need to cover the effects of mixing solutions or interventions. For forest owners maintaining a public road that serves only a forest under an MOU, adoption of a targeted rate for the district would expose them to double jeopardy. There are also significant public policy considerations to weigh up in relinquishing control of the maintenance of a public road to a third party.

The “enhanced targeted rate” refers to a higher co-investment rate. Regions are paying relatively more and receiving relatively less, but contributing the bulk of exports. The local share is being sought to maintain infrastructure generating national, but not local, benefits. A case might be made that there is a strategic fit under the GPS.

Action: RL/JC – each to circulate presentations on regional benefit cost analyses

Action: ALL – provide comments on Draft Structure v2 by Friday 1 May