

*Local Government New Zealand***Next Steps Review Update**16<sup>th</sup> August 2007

This update follows a meeting on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> August 2007 between the Minister of Transport, and President Basil Morrison, Graeme Weld and Ian Buchanan representing *Local Government New Zealand*.

The table identifies 8 key items which were discussed and indicates the confirmed responses which have now gone to Cabinet and will likely form the basis of proposed legislation.

Item	<i>Local Government New Zealand Position</i>	Response
1	In recognition of the partnership relationship between government and local government in the joint ownership, management and funding of transport and roads there needs to be <b>statutory requirement</b> for the crown to consult with local government in the development of the Government Policy Statement. Many of the outcomes that the GPS is likely to seek can't be delivered without local government support.	The Government Policy Statement is a document owned by the government of the day. However consultation will occur in the development of the "Trends, Issues and Options Briefing Paper which is the basis for the Policy Statement.
2	Only capital items of " <b>regional significance</b> " should be subject to a regional prioritisation process. This would include the state highway network, significant arterial routes and connections and significant capital improvements to public passenger transport. It would exclude operational, maintenance, renewals and minor capital works from any regional prioritisation process.	Agreed
3	The delivery of outcomes based upon regional strategies will be enhanced if the <b>same committee or entity</b> is involved in both the preparation of both regional land transport strategies and regional land transport programme. (In a sense the regional prioritisation process could be seen as a method to give effect to the regional land transport strategy and in that context the programme could be viewed as an appendix to the strategy.)	Agreed
4	The core voting <b>membership</b> of this committee or entity needs to be constrained to the funders (one from each territorial local authority, the region and the land transport entity). There will remain a need to consult with those representing other New Zealand Transport Strategy interests and flexibility around how this is achieved is recommended.	Agreed in principle. Committee will be 1 from each TLA, 2 from the region and 1 from the land transport entity. Non voting members representing the 5 New Zealand Transport interests and 1 representing cultural interests will be co-opted. The chair will be one of the regional council representatives.

5	On the proviso that prioritisation is restricted to capital expenditure on activities of "regional significance" as defined in 2 above and the membership as defined in 4 above, the preferred committee model is to retain it as a <b>committee</b> of the regional council.	Agreed The committee will replace the regional land transport committees and be a committee of the region.
6	The <b>role of the regional council</b> is to service the committee, provide the resources the committee needs to undertake its functions and approve the regional land transport strategy and the regional land transport programme as recommended. In other words should the regional council disagree on any item of "regional significance" then it can refer that matter back to the committee for further consideration.	Agreed
7	<b>Consultation</b> should be integrated (in as far as is practicable) with the existing processes of local government and no new consultative requirements imposed.	Agreed There will be alignment between the planning cycles such that consultation will be integrated into existing consultation cycles in as far as is practicable. /
8	<i>Local Government New Zealand</i> would also take this opportunity to reinforce the strong view that <b>existing</b> planning, funding and operational <b>agreements</b> with the crown and crown agencies in relation to transport must be honoured and that the Next Steps Review implementation process is not seen as an opportunity to renegotiate those arrangements.	Agreed

As illustrated in the table above agreement was obtained on nearly all aspects of the *Local Government New Zealand* proposal.

The requirement that the same committee develops both the RLTS and RLTP is seen as strengthening the alignment between the strategy and the programme.

It is believed the changes to the committee membership from that initially recommended will not adversely affect functionality and in some respects may allow for better representative advocacy. The key aspect is that voting membership has been constrained to those who have a funding interest in the Regional Land Transport Strategies and Programmes.

The restriction of activity subject to regional prioritisation is also seen as a major win with "business as usual" activity, apart from having to be included in a Regional Land Transport Programme, not changing.

The three year programme certainty is welcomed along with the opportunities to prioritise state highway functions within the region.

In essence the above table will form the basis of a legislative framework in which the detail will be developed. It is the *Local Government New Zealand* view that this a table is a pragmatic response from which workable process will emerge.

Geoff Swainson  
**Manager Development & Infrastructure**