

Meeting: 10 August 2017: Sub-committee Teleconference.

Meeting summary

- Actions from 6 July 2017 were reviewed.
- Limited and incomplete prioritisation data has been received.
- Cumulative graphs for this data yield a consistent curve.
- Only 2% of roads meet the high-risk category threshold.
- Individual weightings and the category thresholds appear to need to be revised against the data.
- An exemplar Business Case will be developed to facilitate councils be able to work through the process to get funding.

1. ATTENDING

Present:

Jamie Cox	Wairoa DC	Convenor
Tom Simonson	Local Government NZ	Convenor
Wayne Newman	RCAF R&G Steering Group	Secretary
Greg Haldane	NZTransport Agency	
Mark Seakins	Whangarei DC	
Jon Cunliffe	Marlborough DC	

2. REVIEW OF ACTIONS

Actions from 6 July 2017

1. **J. Cox** to re-circulate the individual work streams of the Action Plan and get feedback, and coordinate. Completed, but with a low return of feedback.
2. **G Haldane** to affirm that the a proposed “high level” mapping approach, presented through an Agency RfP, would be beneficial for the initial purposes of mapping most important areas of dust. Completed and proceeding.
3. **G Haldane** to circulate the HAPINZ study/model. Completed.
4. **T Simonson** to lead creating a subcommittee to work closely with the Transport Agency to develop improvements to the dust risk matrix. Further coordination will occur to draft a communications plan designed to go out to councils to explain how to include dust mitigation in LTP and how to make applications for mitigation funding. Completed stage one, with this group meeting; stage two to be progressed.
5. **K Parcell** to report activity of working group and need for broad cross-Government response to National Air Quality Working Group. Open.
6. **T Simonson** to set up meeting date and venue for mid-August. Completed; scheduled for 22 August.

Discussion

G. Haldane reported on progress to confirm processes and role of NZTA, which is to facilitate approved organisations being able to work through getting funding for dust mitigation. Prioritisation data has been received from four councils, but the results are not readily aggregated. One council has prioritised its whole network and included scores for sensitive ecological and horticultural areas, but the others have provided scores for partial networks and not included the sensitive ecological and horticultural areas. So the aggregated scores exclude sensitive ecological and horticultural areas.

It appears from this preliminary data set that the weighting given to schools, hospitals and marae is too low and also the weighting for duration might need further thought. At the moment, for 1,870 km of the unsealed network, only 2% would be rated as having a high dust risk, when it would be reasonable to expect it to be around 10%.

Nevertheless the cumulative graphs excluding sensitive ecological and horticultural areas do yield a consistent curve and we can see a robust distribution of risk scores to set prioritisation for mitigation. The bar for a high dust risk might need to be set at 15 to 16.

T. Simonson noted that we need empirical data to support getting funding and the data seem to support anecdotal reports that the bar has been set too high. The exclusion of sensitive ecological and horticultural areas might be an invalid approach, so we should continue to try to get complete data sets.

M. Seakins noted that the business case for the Wrights Rd-McCardle Rd proposal from WDC had cost \$60,000 to prepare, largely because the site did not meet the threshold set for funding mitigation and further monitoring and peer review was requested.

J. Cunliffe commented that the methodology was not intended to be used in this way. RR590 established criteria that would generate a number, but an intervention threshold was not set. We now have empirical evidence that the threshold has been set too high and we can set grades for high, medium or low risk based on wider research. A threshold that includes 10-20% of the unsealed network would be needed if we are looking at the impact on people's well-being and reflecting council priorities. Marlborough Roads used public complaints to identify priorities and then applied the matrix, and found 10-15% of the network required mitigation.

J. Cox noted that there has been a lack of data received from councils, but the question is: where on the graph does dust cease to be an issue?

3. NEXT STEPS

G. Haldane reported on the mapping exercise being commissioned to estimate the national health risk and costs, and support the benefits from mitigation work. The request for proposals sought mapping of bands at 40m, 60m and 80m from the roads in order to begin to understand the impacts. The work should be completed in about three months, but it might not work at all.

J. Cox noted that this approach seems sensible, as he had local examples that suggested that a very real difference in risk exists for sensitive receptors 20m from the road and 80m from the road, that the matrix does not appear to recognise.

T. Simonson noted that we now need to refine the weightings and set the risk levels on the matrix based on the evidence. This then needs to be promulgated as widely as possible.

M. Seakins suggested that any road scoring above 15 should automatically generate a business case for mitigation. G. Haldane agreed that, while there would still need to be a business case, with the lower bar the focus could shift to the appropriate option for mitigation based on the risk.

T. Simonson commented that we want to have sound investment logic and value for money decision-making in applying mitigation to the highest priority risks. Councils will need to know what resources they will need and we want to avoid requiring them to spend money in order to get money to the greatest extent possible. An exemplar Business Case would address this need, supported by the body of evidence and data-base now being created.

AGREED

- a. The weightings for individual components of the matrix and the threshold score for obtaining mitigation funding will be reviewed.
- b. An exemplar Business Case will be prepared to facilitate councils being able to work through the process to obtain funding.
- c. These will be promulgated within a clear communications plan to explain the connections of the remit, matrix, research, revision and refinement.

Meeting closed: 2.30