

Response Requirements Document – City Centre to Māngere Project

The Response Requirements Document (RRD) sets out the minimum response requirements for NZTA and NZ Infra as they develop their proposals for the City Centre to Māngere Project.

Auckland Transport was provided with a copy of the draft RRD for comment on 16 July 2019.

The table below sets out Auckland Transport's feedback and the Ministry of Transport's response.

The document has now been finalised and provided to NZTA and NZ Infra.

Auckland Transport Comments			Ministry of Transport Response
Risk associated with too many detailed requirements AP	This is a very thorough document – well done considering the time available to put it together! The response requirements may be too onerous on the respondents because of the level of information required.	Red – Suggestion to consider removing from response requirements some of the lower level requirements that would not normally be expected during this stage of proposal.	The RRD was amended to ensure it only requests information that is required to make a decision on a Preferred Delivery Partner and provide Ministers with the information they need regarding the deliverability and cost of the Project.
Being 'held' to the response AP	If some items have been left off as they are not differentiators, how will the respondents be 'held' to them if they are not included in their response? Not sure what has been left off but worth considering this.	Orange – update	Respondents are required to submit a key commercial terms sheet which will indicate the key terms under which the response will go ahead. Further, the selection of a Preferred Delivery Partner will enable detailed project agreement discussions, rather than finalise any contractual obligations.
Being 'held' to the response NP	Similarly, how will respondents be held to statements made re design and visual response, alignment, property requirements, stakeholder consultation etc	Orange – update	As above.
Other modes NP	Haven't seen anything re active modes and how respondents will be providing quality and safe walking and cycling facilities. If these are separate, how do we integrate them with the ALRT	Orange – update	Included in Key Outcomes (e.g para 6.2.3)
ATAP LE	I notice there is nothing in here regarding	Red – update	Noted.

	<p>expectations of when services should begin operating. ATAP highlights a need for the corridor by 2028. Previous work has shown a potential need for it earlier than that date. We wouldn't want to select a preferred respondent if they're not going to begin operating services until after they'll be needed.</p>	<p>Suggest some form of expectation, potentially even a requirement, needs to be set regarding this.</p>	<p>To be discussed with Respondents in initial briefing. Respondents will be aware of the timing requirements for this Project, and will submit a timeline as part of their response (para 31.10)</p>
LE	<p>Does anything in here preclude the financing of the NZTA proposal by CDPQ in the end if that was somehow determined as the best solution following this process? Is that something that should not be precluded?</p>	<p>Orange – update</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Withheld to maintain effective conduct through free and frank expression of opinion</p>
PM	<p>The option of delivering the project in distinct phases is limited in the report. Some reference should be made for the potential for phasing, in order to deliver benefits along the corridor as early as possible</p>	<p>Orange – update</p>	<p>See above regarding start date and we expect phasing to be part of the delivery plan.</p>
PM	<p>Whilst the document references some key policy guidance such as ATCOP and RPTP, there is a lack of clear parameters in here to help guide the tender submission. We discussed last week the need to be more explicit where possible without being overly prescriptive, for instance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State that Dominion Road is preferred over Sandringham, (or other N-S corridors) • State the preferred terminal location in the CBD could be Wynyard or Queen St • State the station locations that 	<p>Orange – update</p>	<p>The Ministry has had to make some careful judgements about the amount of specificity in the RRD given the timeframe and the principle of maximising flexibility and minimising constraints for the Respondents. The technical requirements have therefore been kept to a level of detail sufficient to enable the key differences in the proposals to be discerned during the evaluation process.</p> <p>With regard to the examples in your feedback, at 31.2.2 key journeys and interchanges have been referenced.</p>

	<p>are critical to successful delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no reference to Roads and Streets Framework or TDM 		
PM	Fare integration and use of the AT Hop system (or whatever national system that may eventually replace it) should be a core specification	Orange – update	<p>Integration with AT HOP (or its successor) is a requirement (see para 33.4.2 and App C: Commercial Terms)</p> <p>Respondents to provide detail regarding integration.</p>
PM	<p>City Centre bus issues are not clearly encapsulated. The problems identified in the bus reference case can help to define these issues and use as a reference document for the bidders. AT will provide the bus reference case.</p>	Red – update	Ref para 6.2.4 regarding inclusion as a Key Outcome element. Additionally, para 33.4, regarding how the proposed design mitigates capacity constraints and reduces bus movements in the corridor.
PM	Need definition of LRT	Orange – update	LRT no longer referenced.
CM	<p>The design life of the system might extend beyond the term of the contract when assets and operations are handed back to Auckland Transport. There should be a clear requirement to provide elements to compare proposals on this matter.</p>	Red – update	Requirement that the design life extends 10 years beyond expiry of the term. There is no reference to the eventual asset operator.
CM	<p>Auckland Transport is the Nominated Operator. AT's role as the operator and integrator of the Auckland public transport network is critical to public confidence in both the performance of a multi-modal system and the integration of light rail into the broader transport network such as, for example, the roading network.</p>	Red – update to make this explicit	<p>Respondents are to provide detail on how the design integrates with the existing network.</p> <p>The role of Auckland Transport as “nominated operator” is the subject of discussion with Auckland Transport’s Chief Executive and a letter will be sent to clarify the position.</p>
CM	Auckland Transport has the authority to set the fares and will be the entity collecting revenues of the system.	Red – update	<p>The Ministry has chosen not to be specific regarding setting of fares (as this may be negotiated with the Preferred Delivery Partner). However assuming integration with AT HOP it would then follow that AT would collect and pass on fare revenue. This would however be dependent on the agreement reached with the Preferred Delivery Partner.</p>

Specific comment by section			
2.1.1 PM	Suggest rewording “the spine of a modern mass transit network...” – to “next generation of mass transit/ rapid transit projects that build out the core existing rapid transit network”	Orange – update	Noted. Have avoided the term “next generation” as this could be interpreted as precluding some technology forms.
2.1.3 LE	My understanding is CDPQ’s proposal is more of a ‘metro’ style solution, as opposed to ‘light rail’ as its described. I think it needs to be clear that there is a difference between the technologies, and the document should not preclude or be seen to require a specific technology.	Orange – update	The RRD has been specifically drafted to remain agnostic between forms of technology.
2.1.6 LE	suggest the wording “sufficiently concrete” should really be “sufficiently complete”	Green – Update	Reworded to “sufficiently developed”
3 PM ML	<p>Opportunity here to mention broader transport policy and need for the proposal to align:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land-use / transport integration as stipulated in the GPS 2018, • Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) • Regional Public Transport Plan (RTP), Auckland’s statutory PT plan which stipulates hierarchy of PT service (Rapid, Frequent, Connector, Local) along with the expected frequency and span of service • City Centre Masterplan Refresh and Access for Everyone, given that Access for 	Orange - update	Reference to the broader transport policy documents has been made where relevant.

	<p>Everyone is a strategy specifically designed to leverage the opportunity of light rail in Queen Street to move Auckland city centre in a more sustainable transport direction.</p> <p>Mention is needed regarding wider council policy</p> <p>Recommend that the key roles of MoT, AT and Auckland Council are summarised here including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoT: proposal and evaluation lead and coordinator on behalf of Government. • AT: Transport Authority for Auckland. Integrator and specifier of the transport system in Auckland. Road Controlling Authority. Public Transport Authority. As such will require to provide input and approvals on service specification, route, transport outcomes. Will set ticketing and fares and collect fare revenue. Will be the operational client specifier. Will provide access to roads (other than 		
--	---	--	--

Proactively released by the Ministry of Transport

	State Highways, which is NZTA). Auckland Council: Unitary Authority. Community and public realm representation. Co-funder(?) certainly of operating costs.		
5.2.4 LE ML	This section should be clearer in setting out expectations for integration with the rest of the transport network including public transport across RTN, FTN, local services, walking and cycling, micro and shared mobility, (as section 28.19 does. Perhaps refer to that section, or state something in 5.2.4 which 28.19 can refer back to). Should emphasise that the RTN is simply one part of a total integrated and connected mobility system.	Orange – Update	Key Outcome 1 refers to a need to integrate with the wider network, including active modes of transport and other public transport services.
5.2.4 PM	Add “public” after future.	Green – Update	Accepted and updated
5.2.4 PM	Add “trips and” before journeys. A journey could be composed of 1 trip or multi trips. Potential to be interpreted as only 1 trip journeys on the LRT is the only thing of interest.	Green – Update	This section has been deleted.
5.2.5 LE	Suggest more emphasis on bus congestion is required. If bus congestion is not alleviated, significant investment will be required just to maintain current levels of service. Needs to be clear to respondents that this is a key component of project.	Red – update	Key Outcome 1 now refers to the need to demonstrate alleviation of current and forecast bus capacity constraints in the City Centre. <i>Alleviating bus capacity constraints in the city centre is essential to the effective functioning of Auckland’s transport network and the CC2M Project plays a critical role in this.</i>
5.2.6 AP / ML	Yes, must use integrated ticketing. (AT HOP) and integrated fares or other as specified by AT. AT is the Transport Authority for Auckland and will set fares and ticketing.	Red – update	Respondents to provide detail of integration within existing AT systems. See above re: AT setting and collecting fares.
5.3 AP	Typo - missing "Optimises environmental outcomes and embeds sustainable practices"	Green – Update	Accepted and updated.
5.3 LE	How are they defining the environment? I	Green – Update	Updated to reflect “natural” environment.

	understand it's primarily around the natural environment, but this is different to/only one aspect of the RMA's definition. This should be clarified, especially as 'environment' is also used in the context of the Urban and Communities objective (under 5.4.1)		
5.3 LE	This section does not reference mana whenua/Māori outcomes (which are part of the assessment framework, and also section 32 of this document). Suggest they are included here to highlight importance of this work.	Green – Update	Accepted and updated.
5.3.1 NP	Narrow view of environment. Would prefer we use RMA definition so natural and physical	Green – Update	RMA incorporated throughout.
5.4.2 NP	Missing the acknowledgement of placemaking and town centre revitalisation that stations and stops can bring. Or conversely what bad design and location can do to areas from a severance and blight point of view	Green – Update	Key Outcome 3 adjusted to reference "Facilitating transformation of areas around stations while building on local identity".
5.4.3 AP	Consider deleting "(and potentially more)"	Green – Update	Updated.
5.4.3 ML	Mentions City Centre, Dominion Road, Mt Roskill, Onehunga and Māngere. As AT policy is also to connect CC2M to Wynyard Quarter, this should also be mentioned. As the Transport Authority for Auckland, AT seeks an integrated network across the public transport system. The proposal needs to confirm how AT approvals and input will be sought for route planning, service specifications and integration with the broader system.	Red – Update	The RRD has been kept broad to allow Respondents to determine the best solution. Wynyard Quarter has been incorporated as an area of focus for Respondents in relation to significant housing and business growth.

<p>5.4.3 AmT</p>	<p>5.4.3 does not align with the overall objective to enable additional capacity, and the intent of 5.4.2.</p> <p>5.4.2 states quite clearly that CC2M is expected to enable high density development. The main objective diagram notes under ‘Enables growth through intensification’ - “Additional enabled capacity – (over and above existing enabled capacity)”,</p> <p>However 5.4.3 implies that CC2M actually creates an uplift in value, making the already enabled growth (through the Unitary Plan) more attractive to private investment. In brackets it is highlights that there will be (potentially more) capacity due to CC2M. To me this paragraph reads as the AUP has enabled growth, and CC2M will make it more attractive to the market, rather than actually enabling an uplift.</p> <p>Clarity is needed – is CC2M expected to enable an uplift in growth beyond the Unitary Plan, or is it just potentially more?</p> <p>Query the implication here re uplift in value being more attractive to private investment – or lack thereof. Is CC2M unlocking these land holdings? Or would they come forward through the uplift enabled through the AUP?</p>	<p>Orange – Update</p>	<p>Wording updated to align Key Outcomes more clearly.</p>
<p>5.4.4 AmT</p>	<p>Query the use of the word ‘scale’. Is the writer referring to height? Or bulk/area/form.</p> <p>Suggest re-word to ‘...provide an opportunity</p>	<p>Green – Update</p>	<p>Section removed.</p>

	for (comprehensive redevelopment) (significant redevelopment)		
5.5.1 AP	Consider adding 'comfort' to the factors contributing to customer experience - unlikely to be a differentiator, but very important none the less.	Orange – Update	Section removed. Convenience and comfort will be factors taken into account in the measurement of the “Quality passenger experience” criterion.
5.5.1 ML	As the Transport Authority for Auckland, AT seeks an integrated customer experience across the public transport system. The proposal needs to confirm how AT approvals and input will be sought for this.	Orange – Update	No change in this section. Concept has been dealt with elsewhere in the RRD, including under 33.4.
11.1.4 AP ML	<i>Auckland Transport and Auckland Council will provide Respondents with community and stakeholder feedback and input during the Proposal development phase.</i> [AP] how is this going to happen? [ML] This is probably not appropriate at this stage. There will not (we assume) be any community engagement during the proposal development?	Red – update	As discussed with AT, this is to be based on historical engagement.
11.1.5 NP	There will be a period where we cannot engage with elected reps due to it being an election year. For AT it is three months before election day.	Green – update	Noted.
14.1.1 AP	It would be useful if the indicative alignment included indicative stops	Orange – Update	Noted.
15.1.1 AP	"Respondents may visit publicly accessible areas at any time" and are responsible for meeting all relevant H&S requirements during the site visit.	Green – Update	H&S is not expected to be required for publicly accessible areas.

16.2.1 AP	they should provide videos within their deliverables as well, e.g. fly-throughs I think this would be valuable and assist with the evaluation	Orange	Not required at this stage considering the time requirements and cost of the RRD response.
22 AP LE PM ML	Key Objectives should have a far higher weighting than 20%, at say 45% as this is the main reason we are doing the project. Propose reducing weighting of 'community and stakeholder management' to 5%, Construction Works and Delivery to 15%, Partnership to 5%. [ML] This needs fleshing out. E.g: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constructions Works and Delivery to include: disruption management, transport disruption, urban realm and heritage • Service Delivery to include: operational delivery model, reliability and punctuality, transport integration via AT for transport connections, integration on fares and customer experience, customer services 	Red We need to discuss further to confirm all weighting	The Key Outcomes are to be referenced within each component of the Evaluation Criteria. The 20% weighting is in reference only to the Narrative of the Key Outcomes which summarises each Key Outcome in a holistic manner.
25.1.1 ML	Should include a clear description of the end solution, including route and property, technical, customer, safety,	Red – Update	Technical requirements have been updated to reflect what the Ministry considers is required at this stage of the process.

Proactively released by the Ministry of Transport

	operational, service specifications, etc.		
26.3.1 AP	Suggest changing to: <i>Please provide details of three relevant reference projects that are in service and how they demonstrate the Respondents capability to deliver the Project.</i>	Red – Update	Noted. Neither party can meet this requirement specifically in relation to Light Rail projects so do not want to limit them to “in service” projects only.
26.3.1 NP	Need to specify which part of the project they delivered? i.e for ALRT, what were NZTA responsible for vs AT	Orange – Update	Noted.
26.8.3 NP	And outline what mechanism they propose to use for the development, i.e. PWA, UDA	Green – Update	This is covered in the corresponding land response requirement.
26.8.4 NP	Will they be held to that identification? I.e. they cant add more advertising later?	Green – Update	This requirement has been reduced.
26.8.4 LE / ML	[LE] Advertising and retail should conform to AT strategies. [ML] Need to consider alignment to rest of AT PT system and consistency. Comply with AT advertising and retail strategy. Recognise will need AT approvals for advertising in public spaces and potentially use AT existing suppliers.	Red – Update	Noted. The Ministry is not seeking to limit innovation as to how the Respondents may approach advertising opportunities. These will be discussed with AT further later in the process.
28 ML	Title should really be changed to “28. Project Solution and Outputs” A new section 29 should be the current 28.11 “Construction Methodology and Staging” from 28.11 to 28.19. This will clearly separate the what is to be delivered from the how it will be delivered. In the new 28, also need a sub-sections on “Customer Experience”, “Customer Services” and	Red – Update	Superseded, sections have been adjusted.

	“Multi-modal Connected Mobility Integration” (to include connections with walking, cycling, micro-mobility, shared mobility, etc.).		
28.2.1 NP	Describe linkage between design methodology and project design principles with connection to Te Aranga principles	Green – Update	Accepted.
28.2.2 NP	<p>Approach to optioneering, approach to corridor and alignment and approach to stops and location and spacing – need to also capture proposed consenting strategy.</p> <p>Will it be a Notice of Requirement to designate in which case need to show assessment of alternatives.</p> <p>Also</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process for optioneering • Level of consultation to inform optioneering 	Orange – Update	This has been incorporated into the Technical Approach.
28.2.2 ML	<p>Not sure why approach to determining the corridor is mentioned. The corridor is a stated requirement: Wynyard Quarter, CBD, Dominion Rd, Mt Roskill, Mangere.</p> <p>[AP] could replace:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Approach to <u>determining the corridor and alignment</u></i>; • <i>Approach to <u>refining the alignment</u></i>; 	Red – Update	The previously identified route may not be the final route under this process. Respondents are encouraged to provide their view on the optimal route. This will be evaluated in conjunction with other response requirements.
28.3.2 ML	Main hub should include Wynyard Quarter.	Red – Update	The Ministry has decided to let Respondents determine the hub at this stage, provided it is within the City Centre.
28.3.2 NP	Different options will have different land impacts and impacts on road users. Need to show methodology for determining each section.	Orange – Update	This has been incorporated into other sections, such as Construction Methodology and Staging.

28.4 AP	Also key journey of Mangere to City centre could be considered for employment purposes	Orange – Update	Accepted and included in list of Key Journeys.
28.4.1 LE / ML	The route is currently a FTN with the project seeking to upgrade it to a RTN. This sentence should really say something like “The RTN as envisaged in ATAP provides...”	Green – Update	Superseded, no longer referenced.
28.4.4 (Table) LE / ML	<p>[ML] AT requires an option for a terminus at Wynyard Quarter with through running Downtown via Queen Street. Britomart explicitly has already been excluded. Include Wynyard Quarter as the first line of the table.</p> <p>[LE] In the interests of potential integration with the wider network, I disagree that Britomart should be specifically stated as the City Centre terminus of the proposal. Without wanting to debate the merits of Britomart vs another location, I can envisage a situation where this service might through-route with a service from the future North Shore RTN via the future-proofed east-west connection at Aotea Station, with passengers transferring to access Britomart/Downtown. Notwithstanding what ATAP currently says, I think that Civic/Aotea is the key point in the City Centre they should be required to serve (but not necessarily terminate at). Britomart could end up being the terminus, but it could also be elsewhere. The wording as current would also seem to preclude extending beyond Britomart to Wynyard, which we would also not want to preclude.</p>	Red – Update	<p>The RRD has been worded to allow respondents to determine where they believe the terminus should be, within the City Centre.</p> <p>The RRD makes specific mention of integration with future rail projects, such as the North Shore.</p>

28.6 LE	this section could benefit from outlining how AFC will charge for their services.	Orange – Update	Superseded. Section has been removed.
28.6 PM	the modelling scope is very high level – from experience, this can lead to very wide ranges in RFP costs from suppliers. A stronger specification of the type of modelling needed would be beneficial.	Orange – Update	As above.
28.8.2 IA/AP	Suggest say Overhead Line/On Board Energy/Third Rail Solution	Orange – Update	Superseded.
28.8.3 AP	would have expected 1:50 scale for X-sections?	Green – Update	Noted.
28.8.3 AP	Include - extent of land take both permanent and temporary and add including building demolition, any other significant structures, e.g. retaining walls over 1m high	Orange – Update	Accepted. The RRD references these requirements where appropriate.
28.8.3 AP	Include Stormwater, to the extent the operations are at risk due to major events?	Orange – Update	Noted.
28.9.1 NP	And link to project design principles with connection to Te Aranga principles	Green – Update	Accepted and incorporated.
28.10.1 LE	Need to provide more clarity for the respondents – for the purposes of this comparison, suggest alignment goes directly under second runway and connects to the forecourt/terminal at the northern end of the terminal	Orange – for Update	Noted.
28.10.1 AP	[REDACTED]	Orange – Update	Noted. For consideration during the Proposal Process.
28.11 PM	Need to coordinate LRT with other major projects in the city centre - this is something AT can help with during the tender phase and subsequently	Orange – Update	Reference to integration with other current and future transport network is referenced throughout.

Withheld as the information is commercially confidential and to protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers or officials

	once preferred bidder is awarded contract		
28.11.1 AP	Should be explicit that the Respondents will need to follow standard procedures when applying for Corridor Access Requests for site investigations and construction – suggest adding second paragraph to this effect.	Orange – Update	Included within the key Commercial Terms.
28.11.2 LE	the impacts of construction on public transport should not be limited to the FTN; there will be impacts on all layers of the wider public transport network. This should say “... managing the impact on the existing RTN and the rest of Auckland’s transport network during...”	Orange – Update	Noted. Consideration given and rephrased where appropriate, without unreasonably constraining Respondents.
28.14.3 AP	e.g.'s for the Utilities Management Strategy could include managing stray current and intended approach to utilities interfaces post construction.	Green – Update	Noted. Incorporated where appropriate.
28.15 AP	this seems too detailed for this level of proposal	Orange – remove section	Noted.
28.18.3 NP	Add consultation, consenting, property acquisition	Red – Update These are very time critical activities	Accepted & updated.
28.19.4 LE	Reword to ‘...to provide details HOW future extensions will be implemented’	Orange – Update	Noted. Superseded
29 LE / ML	[LE] more broadly, this section seems to assume the respondent will operate the services. In some cases, this responsibility may fall on AT. I suggest the wording of 29.6.2 (for example) should read “Respondents are to describe how the service will be operated” (not “how it will operate the service”). [ML] Need to recognise AT’s roles as the transport and public transport specifier and integrator for Auckland	Red – Update	Noted. This section has been rephrased to reflect the comment made by AT.

	<p>as the Auckland Transport Authority and AT will ultimately hold responsibility for the operational delivery, in contract with the ultimate operator.</p> <p>AT is the only mandate holder with operational delivery responsibility. Noting it does not need to actually do the operational delivery, but would likely be the client authority and operational contract holder.</p> <p>Proposals therefore need to define how AT approval will be sought as the ultimate operational client and likely operational contractor holder.</p>		
29.2.2 AP	This should include how the control room will be integrated with ATOC for network monitoring and management.	Orange – Update	Accepted and included.
29.3.2 AP / ML	<p>[AP] ‘park and ride’ is not appropriate for this corridor.</p> <p>[ML] Need to mention integration to connected mobility: walking, cycling, micro-mobility, shared mobility, etc.</p>	Red – update	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Reference to ‘park and ride’ has been removed.</p> <p>Reference to active transport in outcomes narrative.</p>
29.3.2 bullet 3 LE	this again should read “with the RTN and the rest of Auckland’s public transport network”. For clarity it should state the specific appendix of the RTP that deals with LRT integration; “(refer appendix 4)”	Orange – Update	Accepted and included.
29.5.1 IA / ML	It is AT’s statutory responsibility to set fares for a public transport network within Auckland as the Transport Authority. Proposals will need to be integrated with AT HOP integrated ticketing and Auckland integrated fares.	Red – Update	Noted. Integration with AT HOP ticketing referenced as identified above.
29.6 AP / ML	We should make it clear that the respondent needs to address customer experience for travel to stops, within	Orange – Update	Noted. Incorporated where appropriate.

	stop environment and within vehicles in accordance with AT's customer experience requirements.		
29.7.2 AP	Replace detailed requirements with 'Fire and Life Safety for tunnels and viaducts (and underground and above ground stations).	Orange – Update	Noted.
(New) 29.8 ML	Need to ask how the operation management and control will be provided (e.g. ops control centre) and how this will be integrated and link back to AT whole of transport system operational controls. Including emergency response and business continuity.	Red – Update	Noted. Operating Strategy section amended.
30.1.1 AP	Delete bullet points as too detailed. Recommend outlining when overhauls would be undertaken, the type of work that this would entail, ability for customers/client to influence customer experience related work in overhauls, and expected life of the assets, and maintenance windows for track and structures.	Orange – Update	Accepted and incorporated.
31.2.2 AmT	Include depot as a specific area of concern	Green – Update	Included within Technical Requirements section.
31.2.2 NP	Noise and vibration effects in heritage buildings Effects on settlement on heritage buildings	Green – Update	Noted. Included in the RRD is a comment on managing impacts on any conservation and heritage assets (at para 32.2.2).
31.3 JS	While it has been identified that land beneath the route will remain in public ownership it doesn't say whose ownership and it doesn't specifically ask how this will be managed.	Orange – Update	Adjusted to reflect land being purchased by the Government.
31.4.1 JS	Re PWA will it just be Govt who acquires or also Council?	Orange – Update	This level of detail is not required in the RRD.

31.4.5 JS	Re commercial/development purposes - there may be the ability to purchase land for stations and the like which include a commercial component also	Orange – Update	Noted.
31.5 NP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What consents are required • What consenting strategy is proposed • Level of design and documentation required to support consents i.e optioneering • Programme including hearing, conditions • What other RMA consents and non RMA consents are required? i.e arch authorities, reserves act approvals • Will the respondents become Requiring Authorities? 	Red – if the level of design and acquisition details are to be provided, the consenting strategy and programme is imperative in achieving these	Consenting Approach section has been updated to reflect these comments, where appropriate.
31.8 NP	What other legislative approvals are needed to implement the proposal – i.e. road stopping notices, changes to LTMA so LRT can exclude private vehicles from transit right of way	Orange – Update	Respondents are required to list all legislative or regulatory changes required for the delivery of the Project, as stated in section 32.5. This would need to include the approvals stated in the comment.
31.8 PM	Suggest that legislative changes are identified and then ask the project proponents for their views on whether this would enable the delivery model that they are proposing to take place and then make any necessary modifications	Orange – Update	This comment is addressed in Legislative and Regulatory Changes (section 32.5).

32.1.5 NP	They also raised concerns around affordability of land and housing post ALRT, i.e. concerns about being priced out of Mangere and Mt Roskill and their communities	Green – Update	Noted.
32.1.6 AP	yes - including design	Green – Update	Noted.
32.1.7 NP	Social procurement i.e. like on CRL	Green – Update	Noted.
33 PM ML	<p>[PM] This section does not reflect the limited knowledge that the public have about the project. For the limited engagement that there has been, it would be useful to summarise the key concerns raised.</p> <p>Also what is the role of MOT / NZTA / AT in communications and engagement?</p> <p>It would help to explicitly state that dedicated communications and engagement leaders are needed within the project team – our experience from the new network delivery is that having a dedicated communications team is essential. Ideally one that is divided up along the route to allow specific people to cover specific sections</p> <p>[ML] We should ask for a detailed community and key stakeholder engagement, consultation and communications plan.</p>	Orange – Update	Noted. Respondents are asked to provide a Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Plan.
33.1.5 NP	Delete specific stakeholders mentioned in brackets in bullet point 3 - Add AT Advisory Panels as well	Green – Update	Superseded. Section removed.
33.1.6 NP	How will feedback be incorporated into design?	Green – Update	The Ministry envisages that feedback (where sought by Respondents) will be incorporated throughout the Proposal Process. Any feedback from the Ministry (or sought from other agencies through evaluation) will be discussed with the Preferred Delivery Partner for incorporation.

33.1.10 AP	first bullet, yes I agree it would be useful if the respondent includes a section on this	Green – Update	Noted.
34 ML	<p>Recommend that the key roles moving forward post proposal acceptance and contract award are reinforced for AT and Auckland Council including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AT: Transport Authority for Auckland. Integrator and specifier of the transport system in Auckland. Road Controlling Authority. Public Transport Authority. As such will require to provide input and approvals on service specification, route, transport outcomes. Will set ticketing and fares and collect fare revenue. Will be the operational client specifier. Will provide access to roads (other than State Highways, which is NZTA). • Auckland Council: Unitary Authority. Community and public realm representation. Co-funder(?) certainly of operating costs. 	Red – update	Noted. Ministry have included descriptions of roles where appropriate and where useful for comparing Responses.
36 NP	Remove references to 'specifically' at start of each requirement section and change to 'including but not limited to' as list becomes exclusionary	Red – update	Accepted and incorporated.

Proactively released by the Ministry of Transport

36.3 AmT	Should include something around operational noise and vibration effects – summary of avoid/remedy/mitigate as identified in 31.2.2. This is important to achieve ‘quality urban communities’ as sought by obj 3, and will be telling in an above-ground vs at grade vs below ground solution. NB. This space overlaps objectives 2 and 3.	Orange – Update	Noted. Incorporated elsewhere as a response requirement.
36.4.1 NP	Bullet point to be added around successful integration of transport and land use	Orange – Update	Noted.
36.4 AmT	Town and city centre revitalisation should be specifically mentioned here.	Orange – Update	Incorporated elsewhere.

Proactively released by
the Ministry of Transport