

ROAD RAIL WORKING GROUP

Meeting Minutes : 1 November 2021

Working Group Members

Name	Organisation	E-mail address	Attendance
Bruce Conaghan	Hastings District Council	brucec@hdc.govt.nz	Present
Eddie Cook	KiwiRail	Eddie.Cook@kiwirail.co.nz	Present
Jennifer Forret	KiwiRail	Jennifer.Forret@kiwirail.co.nz	Present
Tiffany Edwards	KiwiRail	Tiffany.Edwards@kiwirail.co.nz	Apology
Simon Prince	KiwiRail	Simon.Prince@kiwirail.co.nz	Present
Darrell Statham	Porirua City Council	Darrell.Statham@poriruacity.govt.nz	Apology
Mike Harrison	Waitaki District Council	mharrison@waitaki.govt.nz	Apology
Matt Williams	Manawatu District Council	Matt.williams@mdc.govt.nz	Present
Sebastian Jew	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Sebastian.jew@nzta.govt.nz	Present
Gareth Williams	Auckland Transport	GarethJ.Williams@at.govt.nz	Present
Megan Drayton	TrackSafe	megan.drayton@tracksafe.co.nz	Apology

1. Welcome and Introductions

BC welcomed those present and acknowledged their involvement on the Road Rail Working Group.

2. Background

BC provided an overview of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Road Rail Working Group outlining the purpose, objectives and issues for the Group, along with a brief overview of work done previously by the Road Controlling Authorities Forum (RCAF). Some of the issues included had been identified through the 2021 KiwiRail Railway level Crossing hui.

The general representation of the Group covers RCAs, Waka Kotahi, KiwiRail, and TrackSafe which is to ensure that there is good coverage of the Road Rail interface in the metro, provincial, and rural community context to cover both rail passenger and freight movements.

3. Draft Terms of Reference

A revised Terms of Reference had been provided to the Group prior to the meeting. There was general acceptance that they were suitable with one additional objective to include identifying and sharing opportunities for improvement and innovations among all parties.

BC to provide a final ToR to Group by end November 2021

<p>One other issue that had been raised separately was to provide clarity of the legislative requirements pertaining to the road rail interface and to identify any gaps, omissions, and conflicts between them.</p> <p>ToR to be updated to reflect additional comments and feedback.</p>	
<p>4. Discussion re gaps and opportunities</p>	
<p>There was feedback that the RCA representation may need to be looked at further given that there are 56 RCAs across the country that have public railway level crossings within their areas.</p> <p>It was commented that there was some lack of visibility and clarity around level crossing funding in regards to both existing maintenance programmes and upgrading programmes.</p> <p>SJ acknowledged that there is a need for a national level crossing funding policy discussion / workstream to take place and this is currently under discussion at Waka Kotahi. This approach was supported by the Group recognising that clarity around funding level crossings would support forward planning with the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) and the Local Authority Long Term Plan process.</p> <p>The Group would provide a suitable mechanism to provide awareness with both RCAs and KiwiRail of innovations being undertaken to enhance safety and operation at the road rail interface.</p>	<p>BC to invite further RCA representation via the RCAF Executive</p>
<p>5. KiwiRail concerns / issues</p>	
<p>SP identified that KiwiRail has a Strategic Working Group that covers a wide range of areas including the road rail interface. Of relevance to this Working Group are the property side in respect of deeds of grant, and the technical side in respect of maintenance and upgrading, and a prioritisation process for railway level crossing improvements.</p> <p>With the deeds of grant, JF noted that KiwiRail is looking to provide a single standardised deed of grant for each RCA with the deed covering all railway level crossings within that RCA. be they road over rail or rail over road. The key premise is that a shared approach is a good approach be they road over rail or rail over road railway level crossings. A single deed of grant for each RCA rather than individual deeds of grant for each railway level crossing was seen as beneficial from an administrative perspective for all parties. The nature of the deed of grant should have the flexibility to accommodate railway level crossing changes without the need to formally revisit the deed of grant.</p> <p>SP provided some examples of recent incidents at locations where railway level crossings were within the extent of the area of approved Temporary Traffic Management Plans. The nature of these incidents would indicate that lack of awareness in regard to the road rail interface.</p> <p>Need for RCAs to consider impacts of new developments where there will be increased traffic across railway level crossings including the need for Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessments (LCSIA). Some planning guidance from KiwiRail to RCAs would be of assistance.</p>	

6. RCA concerns / issues	
<p>Auckland Transport (AT) has a Level Crossing Working Group that encompasses all aspects principally associated with metro passenger operations and network safety in the context of the AT Vision Zero. This Group provides a cooperation mechanism to manage removal of level crossings, future timetabling especially to accommodate the Central Rail Link (CRL), data collection primarily around incidents at the road rail interface, and trialling of innovations such as the CCTV to minimise harm at railway level crossings.</p> <p>A key issue from RCAs includes the lack of forward visibility of costs associated with railway level crossing maintenance and forward upgrading programmes in order to better inform RCA Long Term Plans and Annual Plans, and consequently the NLTP. It is noted that this has been an ongoing concern for many years where there is a lack of detail around the maintenance costs in invoices to RCAs from KiwiRail.</p> <p>The road rail interface and TMPs continues to create areas of concern for all parties. Clear guidance in respect of works likely to impact on the road rail interface and the timing of any such works would be beneficial so as to minimise harm to all parties while ensuring that customers experience minimal loss of service.</p> <p>SJ noted that the Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management (CoPTTM) is currently being revised and this may provide the opportunity to provide clearer guidance around roles and responsibilities around the road rail interface.</p> <p>Management and maintenance responsibilities of “mothballed” railway lines.</p>	
7. Next steps	
<p>Work plan to address each of the issues to be developed. A draft Working Plan will be prepared for this Group to review by mid-December 2021.</p>	BC to develop draft Working Plan for the next meeting
8. Other business	
<p>General consensus was for meetings to be held quarterly and prior to the RCAF Executive Committee meetings. There may be issues that arise where there is the need to convene a meeting outside of this frequency.</p> <p>SJ agreed to be the second authority for approval of expenditure against the Group budget and the alternate Group Convenor.</p>	
9. Next meeting	
<p>Date to be confirmed.</p>	BC to confirm date.