

BOARD PAPER

Paper no:	14/10/0867
Meeting date:	31 October 2014
Prepared by:	Phillip Eyles, Planning and Investment Manager
Recommended by:	Jenny Chetwynd, Group Manager (Strategy, Communications and Performance)
Board function:	Setting sector and organisational direction
Subject:	Funding Assistance Rate Review – decision on the methodology for setting normal funding assistance rates



PURPOSE

1. This paper will ask the Board to make the final decisions on the Funding Assistance Rates review that will set the normal funding assistance rates for individual approved organisations for the 2015-18 NLTF investment period and at the end of transition period in 2024.



SUMMARY

2. In May, the Board made many of the key decisions on the Funding Assistance Rates review: confirming the FAR principles and the Funding Assistance Rate Framework that underpins the funding assistance rates system, agreeing the overall NLTF co-investment rate, and agreeing that approved organisations would receive one funding assistance rate (the normal funding assistance rate) for costs of undertaking a land transport activity to achieve or maintain fit for purpose customer levels of service.
3. You deferred to this meeting, your consideration and decision on the inputs and method that will be used to set the normal funding assistance rate for approved organisations. In this paper we propose that following methodology: *centreline kilometres/capital value*, and the inverse of rating units (*1/rating units*) and the index of deprivation be used to identify the approved organisations that will receive an enhanced funding assistance rate.
4. The difference between minimum rate and the overall co-investment rate identifies the NLTF funds available to increase to NLTF contribution to the costs of the transport programme for some approved organisations (enhanced FAR). In May, the minimum rate was set at 52%.

Further analysis following that decision has found that the impact of the minimum rate of 52% is to increase the normal FAR for larger urban councils, primarily at the expense of smaller rural councils. While some change was expected, this outcome is not consistent with the objectives of the Review. The method for setting the funding assistance rates is not able to address this impact, and this paper recommends that the Board revisit its decision and reduce the minimum rate from 52% to 51%. To ensure that approved organisations have skin in the game, this paper also asks the Board set a maximum rate of 75% for approved organisations (85% for Chatham Island).

5. This paper also asks you make a series of decisions to support the implementation of the funding assistance rates review: keeping the funding assistance rates for special purpose roads at current levels for the next NLTF investment period, revisiting an earlier decision and agreeing that one of the Departments of Conservation special purpose roads “The Bruce”, should be eligible to receive NLTF investment, and, agreeing to funding assistance rates for specific activities (level crossings, stock effluent facilities). Finally, the paper will give you a progress update on development of the operational policy for emergency works and targeted enhanced rates.



RECOMMENDATIONS

6. That the New Zealand Transport Agency Board:

Funding assistance rates

- a. **Agrees** that the method for setting the normal funding assistance rates for approved organisations will use the following methodology: centreline kilometres divided by capital value (*centreline kilometres/capital value*), and the inverse of rating units (*1/rating units*)

and the index of deprivation, to identify the approved organisations that will receive a funding assistance rate higher than the minimum rate.

- b. **Agrees** to revise the minimum normal funding assistance rate received by any approved organisations so that it is 51% (two percentage points below the overall NLTF co-investment rate of 53%),
- c. **Agrees** that the maximum normal funding assistance rate for all local authorities will be 75% other than the Chatham Islands Council which will have a maximum normal funding assistance rate for of 85%.
- d. **Notes** that the Board has previously agreed that, following the completion of transitional arrangements, the normal funding assistance rates received by most councils will be 52% (one percentage point below the overall NLTF co-investment rate)
- e. **Notes** that Board has previously agreed that all changes to approved organisations funding assistance rates resulting from this review will be transition in over no more than nine years and will change by no more than 1 % over the 2015-18 NLTF investment period.
- f. **Agrees** the normal funding assistance rates for all approved organisations at the end of transition in 2024 will be those set out in attachment 1
- g. **Agrees** that normal funding assistance rates for individual approved organisations and the funding assistance rates for specific activities in the 2015-18 NLTF investment period will be those set out in attachment 1
- h. **Notes** that in the year prior to the National Land Transport Programme, the inputs used in the method for setting the normal funding assistance rate will be updated and normal funding assistance rates for each approved organisations recalculated.

Specific Activities

Special Purpose Roads

- i. **Agrees** that the funding assistance rate for Special Purpose Roads will remain at current levels for the 2015-18 NLTP, to allow approved organisations to develop individual plans to transition special purpose roads to the normal funding assistance rate by 2023/24.

Department of Conservation

- j. **Agrees** that that the Bruce Special Purpose Road is now eligible to receive NLTF investment.
- k. **Notes** that the Chief Executive will work with the Department of Conservation to identify a programme of transport activities on carriageways managed by the Department that are eligible for NLTF investment.

Level Crossings

- l. **Agrees** that from the start of the 2015-18 NLTP, the costs of maintaining level crossings will be funded at approved organisations' normal funding assistance rates.
- m. **Agrees** that the funding assistance rate for level crossing improvements will remain at current levels for the 2015-18 NLTP and transition to the relevant approved organisations normal funding assistance rates thereafter.

Stock effluent facilities

- n. **Agrees** that the funding assistance rate for stock effluent facilities will remain at current levels for the 2015-18 NLTP as set out in attachment 1, and will transition to normal funding assistance rates thereafter.



BACKGROUND

7. At its May meeting the Board made a number of key decisions to address the key issues with the status quo, in particular
 - Confirming both the FAR principles and the Funding Assistance Rate Framework to underpin the policy for the funding assistance rates system
 - Agreeing that the split of costs between direct land transport system users and local communities (the overall NLTF co-investment rate) should be 53% and 47%
 - Agreeing that approved organisation would receive one funding assistance rate for costs of undertaking eligible land transport activities, but that enhanced targeted funding assistance rates may be used in exceptional circumstances and for time limited periods to either:
 - Facilitate an activity that is particularly important from a national land transport perspective where it is highly likely that the activity would not proceed within an appropriate timeframe if additional assistance was not provided; or
 - Give a kick start to encourage and enable an approved organisation to make a step change.
8. To address local government concerns around the impact of sudden change, you also decided in May, that the changes to approved organisations' funding assistance rates resulting from this review should be transitioned in over nine years starting in the 2015-16 financial year, and that

no council's funding assistance rate should decrease by more than one percentage point per year from that council's "starting point"¹. Finally, you made specific decisions on:

- Special Purpose Roads: that by 2023/24, the funding assistance rates for local road special purpose roads will be transitioned to the relevant council's normal funding assistance rate.
 - Emergency Works policy framework: setting the threshold for NLTF contribution for emergency works (greater than 10 % of the overall maintenance, operations and renewal programme) and the elevated emergency works FAR (normal FAR plus 20%).
 - Department of Conservation: That NLTF contribution to the Department's existing carriageways that are eligible for NLTF funding, will following nine year transition period be 52%
 - Waitangi National Trust estate. A 100% funding assistance rate will only apply in relation to the existing Tau Henare Drive and Hobson Memorial Loop Road.
 - Level crossings. That in principle a local authority's share of the costs of level crossing warning devices at local road/rail level crossings should be funded at the council's normal funding assistance rate.
9. You deferred to this meeting, your consideration and decision on the inputs and methodology that will be used to set the normal funding assistance rate for approved organisations. The methodology will identify those approved organisations that will receive the lowest rate, and those who will receive an enhanced funding assistance rate.

¹ Funding Assistance Rates (FAR) review - some key aspects of the approach to setting rates: Attachment 2 - Starting Points for Transitioning-in Changes to Council Funding Assistance Rates. Board Paper 14/05/0818 2nd May 2014



THE METHODOLOGY FOR SETTING APPROVED ORGANISATIONS NORMAL FUNDING ASSISTANCE RATES

10. The key decision for the Board at this meeting is to confirm the method that will be used to set the funding assistance rates for individual approved organisations. When setting the funding assistance rates for individual approved organisations, three elements come together, the overall co-investment rate, and the methodology used to identify the relative position of individual approved organisations and the minimum rate.
11. The overall co-investment rate is the “big lever”, identifying how the overall costs of transport task is split between direct land transport system users (NLTF) and local communities (local share). Because, the funding assistance rate system can only redistribute the funds that are available within the NLTF, the difference between minimum rate and the overall co-investment rate is the “envelope” of NLTF funds that can be used to increase to NLTF contribution to the costs of the transport programme for some approved organisations (enhanced FAR). Identifying the size of contribution for individual approved organisations relative to other approved organisations is based on the outputs of the methodology.

Methodology

12. The first step in developing a method for setting individual funding assistance rates is to identify factors or inputs that we would use in the methodology. The inputs must reflect the objective of the Review and identify those approved organisations that have factors materially affecting their ability to deliver transport outcomes. They must also be robust, repeatable, stable and independent. The inputs that we consider best meet those outcomes are:

- **Centreline kilometres:** A measure of the length of the road network which must be maintained or serviced to be available to all transport users.
 - **Capital value:** Capital value is used by most local authorities to set rates, and is a measure of the assets that local authority can potentially raise local share from.
 - **Number of rating units:** Using an inverse function, we are able to identify those communities who have the smallest number of ratepayers.
 - **Index of Deprivation:** Applying a range of measures the index identifies relative wealth of communities.
13. To set the funding assistance rates for individual approved organisations, we use the methodology to identify which approved organisations have the greatest need i.e. factors materially affecting ability to deliver transport outcomes. We then use the outputs from the methodology to identify the NLTF contribution to individual approved organisation transport programme. This is their individual funding assistance rate. This process is described in the following two paragraphs.
 14. To identify which approved organisations have the greatest need, we use the following methodology: *centreline kilometres/capital value, plus 1/rating units, plus index of deprivation*. Centreline kilometres/ capital value identifies what must be spent to maintain the network, relative to the rating base that can be used to raise the local share. The index of deprivation and an inverse of the number of rating units ensure that the least wealthy and smallest communities receive a higher score. Standardising the inputs so they are of a comparable scale, they are added together using methodology, giving each individual approved organisations a “score”, which is then used to calculate their funding assistance rates.
 15. The potential NLTF contribution to approved organisations transport programmes is set by the overall co-investment rate. The NLTF funds available to be allocated as an enhanced rate are

the difference between the minimum rate and the overall co-investment rate. Using a common number to multiple the scores of all individual approved organisations, we work from the top of the list (i.e. local authorities with the highest scores), to progressively increase the NLTF contribution for each approved organisations transport programme until all the available NLTF funds are distributed. An approved organisations normal funding assistance rate (expressed as a percentage) is the NLTF contribution to their transport programmes. Any approved organisation that does not receive an enhanced rate will receive the minimum rate. Funding assistance rates are also capped at a maximum rate.

Weighting

16. We considered whether we should weight any of the inputs we use to “score” the approved organisations. However, we found that weighting the core measure centreline kilometres/capital value and rateable units had a marginal impact on relative “rank” of approved organisation. Weighting the deprivation index tended to favour urban councils, at the expense of other approved organisation.

Regional Councils

17. We acknowledge that centreline kilometres are a key element of the proposed methodology and that regional councils are not road controlling authorities so therefore have no road network. However, they do utilise that road network for much of their transport task and plan for the regional transport network. And to repeat a point from above, the primary function of the methodology is to identify approved organisation’s ability to deliver transport outcomes relative to other approved organisations, not provide a measure of their actual transport task.
18. We are able to regionalise the application of the methodology so as to apply it to regional councils. Regional councils’ transport focus is variable across the country with regional councils in Wellington and Christchurch having a significant public transport role while other regional

councils are focused only on transport planning. Unitary councils, in particular Auckland Transport also have a significant public transport role.

19. While an option is to fix the funding assistance rate for regional councils at the minimum rate, in our view, applying a different approach to regional councils does not reflect that five unitary councils perform the same task. In practical terms, applying the methodology to regional councils will mean that Southland, Westland and Northland regional councils will all receive an enhanced rate.

Triennial Review

20. One year prior to the following National Land Transport Programme we will update the inputs based on the latest available data. This will ensure that funding assistance rates reflect any changes in capital values, demographics or distribution of wealth that may have occurred. This may mean that the normal funding assistance rates for individual approved organisation could change. Following the update, the Board will be asked to approve the rates for the following National Land Transport Programme.



THE MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM FUNDING ASSISTANCE RATES

Minimum rate

21. The national co-investment rate in combination with the minimum funding assistance rate has the most a significant impact on approved organisation's normal funding assistance rate. The Board agreed in May, that the minimum FAR would be 52%, one percentage point below the

national co-investment rate of 53%. At the time, this was considered sufficient “headroom” to enable the councils who needed it to receive an enhanced funding assistance rate.

22. Further modelling has found that the increasing the normal funding assistance rate of those approved organisations (generally those councils with the largest programmes) at the “bottom of the list to the minimum rate, causes significant portion of NLTF funding to be transferred from rural to urban councils. While some decreases in the normal FARs for rural councils were expected (due to increasing capital values), that impact is more significant than was expected.
23. We have attempted to address this through inputs we use in the methodology and the weight we apply to those inputs, but these efforts have been unsuccessful. In short, more “headroom” is required. We tested the impacts of decreasing the minimum rate to 51% and 50%. Both these options flatten the increases for urban councils. However, setting the minimum FAR at 51% appears to achieve the best outcome, enabling a larger group to receive an enhanced FAR, addressing the impact on rural councils as a group, and spreading the impacts of the transition to the new FAR regime more evenly.
24. Our recommendation is that Board revisits its earlier decision to set the minimum rate at 52%, and reduces the minimum rate by one percentage point to 51%. While resetting the minimum FAR does have risks, we consider that, overall; this change will deliver an outcome that is more consistent with the outcomes of the review.
25. The Boards decision in May will have created an expectation that the minimum rate will be 52%. Some approved organisations may have made commitments on this basis. While, in many cases reducing the minimum rate to 51% still results in an increased FAR compared to the status quo, we believe we should recognise that councils may have made commitments. In our recommendation to you on the normal funding assistance rates for the 2015-18 NLTF investment period, any approved organisation that would have received the minimum rate for the 2015-16 financial years, will receive 52%. The minimum rate 51% will apply from 2016-17.

Maximum rate

26. To ensure that approved organisations have “skin in the game” we propose that we cap the maximum funding assistance rate for mainland approved organisations at 75%. Applying similar approach, we propose that the Chatham Island funding assistance rate is also capped at 85%.
27. This would decrease funding assistance rates for Chatham Islands by 5% (down from 90%). While modest in percentage terms, the low number of rating units (555) means that decrease will (over the nine years) mean significant percentage increase in local share (47%).



FUNDING ASSISTANCE RATES FOR 2015-18 NLTF INVESTEMENT PERIOD

28. In May, the Board decided that the changes to approved organisations’ funding assistance rates should be transitioned in over nine years, (starting in the 2015-16 and finishing at the end of the 2023-24 financial years), and that any council’s normal funding assistance rate will decrease by no more than one (1) percentage point per year from that council’s ‘starting point’. This paper does not recommend any change to those decisions.
29. The normal funding assistance rates for individual approved organisations are set out in appendix 1. The sets out for each approved organisation their funding assistance rates for each year of the next 2015-18 NLTF investment period, and the funding assistance rates for specific activities (discussed below). The appended table also includes individual approved organisations normal funding assistance rates at the end of the transition period in 2024.



SPECIAL PURPOSE ROADS

30. The Board has decided that by the end of the 2023/24 financial year the funding assistance rate for local road special purpose roads should be transitioned to the relevant council's normal FAR, but that local road special purpose roads will be transitioned down separately from the transition process used for councils' normal funding assistance rates with the specific transition approach to be used to be determined following discussions with the relevant councils.
31. The total cost of special purpose roads (including emergency works) is currently \$ 35 million over a three year investment period. This cost does not include any investment that may be required as part of transition plan for the special purpose roads. The costs to the NLTF at the end of transition period (2023/24) are estimated to be around \$23 million over a three year investment period based on the assumption that local authorities will increase their local share to \$ 12 million dollars to maintain the current levels of expenditure.
32. The Transport Agency's regional Planning and Investment teams have begun discussing with affected approved organisations, the development of transition plans to identify what (if any) "works" may be required so that the road can be absorbed into the local road programme. It is expected that for some roads these discussions will also identify any other transition issues i.e. those things that cannot be resolved by a programme of works (or at least not at an affordable cost).
33. There has been good engagement between the Transport agency and the affected approved organisations. However, the change to the FAR for special purpose roads happens in the context other changes to the normal FAR and emergency works that directly impact on these local authorities. Taking into account both factors, we believe that we should maintain the existing funding assistance rates for special purpose roads over the 2015-18 NLTP. This will allow the Transport Agency and approved organisations to complete the development of

transition plans and relieve some of the pressure on those councils as they implement the FAR review outcomes.



DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

34. Currently the Department of Conservation only receives funding for Special Purpose Roads. In May, the decision was made to exclude the Bruce Road from the roads that are eligible for NLTF funding. Following further discussion with the Department, we believe that there are issues (and evidence) that indicates we should revisit the earlier decision to exclude the Bruce Road to ensure that our approach on other special purpose roads, in particular the Ohakune Mountain road. We are recommending to the Board that the Bruce Special Purpose Road should be eligible to receive NLTF investment. The Bruce road will still be subject to the transitioning arrangements that apply to all eligible land transport activities controlled by Department of Conservation
35. Looking forward, the Department of Conservation have indicated that they wish to develop their capacity to operate as an approved organisation. The Department believe that up to 961 km or 40% of their 2400 km network could be eligible for NLTF funding (at their normal FAR 51%). They accept that any proposal for NLTF funding would still have to meet the Transport Agency's assessment criteria, but they have limited expertise to undertake the work required to develop a funding application. We have offered to assist the Department to develop a funding application, and have agreed that in the short term (2015-18) any funding proposal would stay with the existing fiscal envelope of approximately five million dollars. Our expectation is that we build a programme from the current portfolio of special roads, lowering the FAR to reflect any increase in programme size.



LEVEL CROSSINGS

36. In May the Board decided that in principle that council costs (approximately 1.5 million dollars per annum), in relation to local road/rail level crossing should be funded at the territorial authority's normal funding assistance rate. This recognises that level crossings provide benefits to local communities in the same way that other safety activities do.
37. In considering how to give effect to the Board's decisions, we have separated the level crossing improvements from the maintenance of existing level crossing. In our view, the ongoing maintenance of existing level crossings should be included in approved organisations asset management programme and funded as required from their maintenance programme. We recommend that from the 2015/16, the maintenance of the level crossing should be funded at an approved organisations normal funding assistance rate.
38. However, the issues associated with level crossing improvements are more complex. At the heart of the issue is the question of how the Transport Agency, Kiwi Rail and Territorial Authorities work together to develop and implement an agreed national level crossing programme that addresses safety priorities. Further work is required across all the partner organisations is required before we have a clearer pathway forward on how to address this issue. A strong signal that funding assistance rates for level crossing improvements will transition to local authority's normal funding assistance rates following the 2015-18 NLTF investment period will provide an incentive for these discussions.

STOCK EFFLUENT FACILITIES

39. Historically, the NLTF has contributed fifty percent of the costs of stock effluent facilities. Most of the programme for the development and construction of stock effluent facilities has been completed, but we propose that current funding assistance rate be maintained for the 2015-18 NLTF to allow the remaining parts of that programme to be completed, and then transition to normal funding assistance rates thereafter.

PROGRESS UPDATES

40. The following reports back to the Board on progress or further work on specific activities that are included in the FAR review.

Emergency Works

41. The Board's decisions in May set out the framework for Emergency Works policy, defining the threshold for NLTF contribution (greater than 10 % of the overall maintenance, operations and renewal programme) and the elevated FAR that would apply to emergency works (normal FAR plus 20%). A number of submitters had sought more detail on how emergency works policy would work in practice, and the Board asked that we work with the sector on how the policy will work in practice.
42. We have developed and tested that operational policy with the sector. Two key issues emerged. The first was to ensure that the policy would allow the Transport Agency to respond to extreme events, e.g. the 2004 Manawatu floods. Options to respond to those extreme

events include, a targeted enhanced FAR or by adjusting the emergency works FAR to “front-load” the costs, and these options have been included in the operational policy.

43. The second issue was the need to identify a nationally consistent definition for a qualifying event. The definition of what events will qualify as an emergency work is a key threshold for the application of the policy. Like the 10% threshold, the definition of a qualifying event should create an incentive to ensure that “ordinary” events are not identified as emergency works. In practical terms, the lack of a nationally consistent definition of an emergency works has impacted on the transparency of decision making around emergency works.
44. We have explored whether an empirical measure (e.g. rainfall return periods) could be used to identify what could be a qualifying even, but found the natural variability across the country made this impractical to apply. Our conclusion, is that we will need to continue to rely on the judgement of regional staff, but by identifying a combination of return period (1 in 10), cost of event (\$100,000) and impact on level of service we will be able to ensure that emergency works funding is allocated appropriately, consistently and transparently.

Targeted Enhanced Rates

45. Targeted Enhanced Rates are a key element of the FAR framework. They allow the Board to set a FAR higher than an approved organisation’s normal FAR, to accelerate the delivery of specific land transport outcomes in exceptional circumstances. A targeted enhanced rate can only be used for a limited time period and at a specified investment rate. In deciding whether or not to use a targeted enhanced funding assistance rate, the Board will need to be satisfied that three criteria can be met:
 - The outcomes intended to be achieved by the proposed rate align with the results identified in any relevant GPS.

- The intended outcomes will address an exceptional, unforeseen and immediate need that will deliver our priorities brought forward ahead of funding capability in the short term.
 - The sector will be able to deliver on the outcomes sought from the application of the targeted enhanced rate.
46. Following the Board's decision in May, policy and guidance have been developed to inform the Transport Agency and sector about when it is likely to be appropriate to recommend the use of a Targeted Enhanced Rate to deliver on a specific transport outcome. The Board holds the delegation for approving of any targeted enhanced rate.



RISKS

47. There is a continuing perception that the review outcomes will work against rural affordability by favouring metropolitan areas at the expense of rural areas. Further modelling since May has identified that there is a significant impact on smaller rural councils as a group. While changes in the funding assistance rates for rural councils were expected the systemic impact on approved organisations as a sector or as a region was not. This outcome is not consistent with Review principles and is likely to affect local government and other's reception of the FAR review outcomes. Reducing the lowest rate by one per cent to 51% spreads the impacts of rate changes much more evenly across all approved organisation groups.
48. There is an expectation that the minimum rate will be 52%. Some approved organisations may have made commitments on this basis. However, in many cases a reduction to 51% still results in an increased FAR compared to the status quo. To recognise those councils may have made commitments, we are recommending that, for the 2015-16 financial year, the minimum rate be held at 52%. In the following year, 2016-17 and thereafter, the minimum rate will be 51%.

49. For some Council's, their transition to the funding assistance review will include adjusting for changes to their normal funding assistance rate, changes to emergency works policy and changes to the funding assistance rates for special purpose roads. To reduce the cumulative impact of those changes, we recommend that we maintain the existing funding assistance rate for special purpose roads FAR to allow for the implementation of transition plans over the 2015-18 NLTF investment period.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

50. The impact to the NLTF of the FAR review is financially neutral in keeping with the original review objectives to not reduce the amount invested with approved organisations. There are impacts to individual approved organisations where the review reduces or increases the FAR that they would have under the status quo. Under the recommended minimum 51% FAR the impacts of the review (FAR increases and decreases with a group compared to the status quo) are evenly distributed across rural, provincial and urban territorial local authorities. Regional councils and the Department of Conservation may consider themselves as negatively impacted compared with their current FARs although regional councils have been on a glide path to a 50% FAR in the long term so the 51% minimum FAR in the future represents a positive long term impact.

COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGEMENT

51. Many of the key decisions on the FAR review have already been made and communicated to the sector, but identifying approved organisation's normal FAR will be of significant interest to

both approved organisations and the wider transport sector. Reducing the minimum rate will attract additional attention.

52. Our regional offices will lead engagement with local government and we are providing them with support and resources so that they are able to confidently communicate
 - The FAR story: what the Review was about, the outcomes it is seeking to achieve in the context of review principles, and how the review fits into the wider investment story and the Transport Agencies four goals.
 - The "decision story: the what and why of both the May and October 2014 Board decisions, and how they give effect to the funding assistance rate framework
 - The "council stories": what an individual council's new rates will be, and how that will impact on their individual transport programme. We have analysed the impacts of both changes to funding assistance rates, and the impacts of the emergency works policy to provide regional staff with a "picture" of the potential impacts on local share, and rates.
53. For those councils who will have an increase in local share (decrease in FAR), we have analysed in detail, the reasons for the change. We will work directly with Regional Directors, and Regional Managers in those regions to develop an engagement strategy to communicate the outcomes of the review.
54. Prior to the Board meeting, we have circulated an A3 (attachment 2) to our regional offices to provide an update on decisions to come. This document will be updated following the Board meeting with final decisions and commentary. The A3 will be attached to a letter sent to all Mayors, and Chairs of regional Councils informing of them of their new rates.
55. We are also working with national stakeholder groups, in particular Local Government New Zealand, and transport advocacy groups to ensure that those stakeholders understand the changes in a wider "transport and investment conversation" context.



ATTACHMENTS

56. There are two attachments:

- Normal Funding Assistance Rates for the 2015-18 NLTP
- At End of Transition and October FAR update