

| | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Wynyard Quarter Transport Management Association | | Meeting No.12 |
| Board Meeting | | |
| Date and time: | Wednesday 25th July 2018 10am | |
| Attendees: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anita Potgieter (AP), Fonterra – Chair • Tim Fitzsimmons (TF), Goodman • Adam Davis (AD), Sanford • Lester McGrath (LM), Auckland Theatre Company • Dave Luxton (DL), Precinct Properties • Louise Baker (LB), WSP Opus • Peter Busfield (PB), NZ Marine • Murray Helm (MH), Bulk Storage Terminals • Fred Botica (FB), Stolthaven Terminals • Pippa Coom (PC), Waitemata Local Board Chair • Bernard Trevor (BT), ASB • Miguel Menezes (MM), Auckland Transport | |
| Apologies: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiona Knox (FK), Panuku • Brigid Rogers (BR), WQ TMA Coordinator | |
| Notes taken by: | Anita Potgieter | |
| Meeting Held at: | NZ Marine | |

| Item | Discussion and Action | By who |
|-------------|---|---------------|
| 1 | Apologies and notes from last meeting / matters arising Apologies as noted above. Notes from the last meeting were held over to allow MM time to review the wording. | |
| 2 | Presentation: Downtown Infrastructure Delivery Programme update No presentations were made as the presenters did not attend. | |
| 3 | Funding updates TF - has sent letter to John Strawbridge (AT) – no response yet. AP – received response from SE, CEO of AT advising that he is in the process of confirming AT’s internal position on the funding request. Good discussion followed; main points and questions raised are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LB – should we be reaching out to Auckland Council (AC)? • PC – Advised that AC is not where it sits; it might be pushed back to the City Centre Advisory Board, but putting pressure on the America’s Cup Alliance group could be an option. • MM – No firm funding update as yet. AT could not justify the amount requested by the TMA; the view of AT is that the funding should be reduced this year; AT comfortable that there’s enough AT involvement in WQ through surveys etc. and therefore no more than \$30k should be expected. AT is very keen for TMA to keep moving forward but challenged whether the TMA model is the right one. • LB – Advised that the model for successful TMA’s worldwide are those funded by government and therefore the challenge for us is that there’s no evidence of success with a model where govt. only funds a part time co-ordinator. | |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DL - reminded MM that as a Board we are committed to change behaviours, not meet to tick a box and therefore we need ongoing operational funding that will include updating business cases etc. • LM – How will AT deal with the WQ without TMA, taking into account that there are regulatory obligations involved • MM – advised that AT is currently seeking legal advice on that • LM – responded that this is timely as the Board has governance responsibilities; also asked what expectations AT has regarding the \$30k funding. • MM – there will be certain expectations, similar to his year, but wanted to stress the point that AT resources are already working with businesses in the WQ. An example given was the work in KPMG building including a travel Expo • TF – responded and acknowledged that AT resources were involved in that specific project but it was actually pulled together by BR and wouldn't have happened had it not been for BR's tenacity. • AD advised this was also the case for Sanford – none of the work was done by AT. • BT mentioned that ASB had been struggling to get AT Expo for their staff and that BR had been pushing that on their behalf. • TF – Clarified for MM that the WQ TMA is more than an AT resource. The TMA represents most businesses/sectors in WQ and aspires to change transport behaviours of individuals and businesses. AT is part of the TMA and the funding requested is far less than the amount contributed by businesses on the Board over the past year (over \$160K in time alone). Should the TMA cease to exist due to a lack of support from AT, AT might struggle to get the same level of goodwill and input from WQ members. | |
| <p>4</p> | <p>Future direction of WQ TMA</p> <p>Good discussion by all. Clear decision to keep the WQ TMA moving forward regardless of AT funding. Main points are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PB – Option: Key opportunities need to be specific projects and administration; identify which projects will be helpful to move us forward; will be helpful if we go back to Panuku with specific relevant projects including funding required and agreed outcomes. ○ LB – We need to be 100% sure we know what we need ○ TF – Suggested a step back: What do we know ○ All – Admin support; funding for business case; advise on funding and funding sources; Great opportunity with America's Cup – consulting, events etc. We need to integrate with that plan then we will have specific milestone projects to be signed off with specific budgets. That will shape year 1 + ○ TF consolidate – What is the baseline for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Admin / co-ordinator / responses / web updates etc. ➢ Identify projects pretty quickly ➢ America's Cup – important / what is their expectation and how will we manage that ➢ Aspirational objectives ➢ Cannot compromise on baseline re requirements outside of America's Cup – keep pushing for baseline funding ○ PB – WQ TMA presents very good advantages and opportunities for co-ordination and thus we should keep meeting monthly. ○ AP – utilise existing funds, new years membership fees and \$30k from AT to keep moving forward. Will discuss with BR re her availability on this basis. Both as secretary and co-ordinator ○ Motion: New budget should be prepared clearly showing two options i.e. a) Best case scenario b) worst case <p>Moved by LM; Second PB</p> | |

