

Responses to Questions on Notice

Received at the 26 November 2020
Ordinary Meeting of Council



Mark Arnold
General Manager

QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE

1 Economic Analysis in the Multi Use Railway Corridor Report3

QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE

Question with Notice No. 1	Economic Analysis in the Multi Use Railway Corridor Report
5 File No:	I2020/1921

At Council's Ordinary Meeting held on 26 November 2020, David Michie asked the following question which was taken on notice:

Why were options 3 (Active Transport Basic), option 4 (Active Transport multi-use) and option 5 (Electric Driverless Vehicles) not considered with travel behaviour change incentives such as pay parking in town centres?

It seems that behaviour change incentives alone shifted the Hi-Rail option from a BCR of less than 1 to a BCR of more than 1, thus making it the preferred option in the report.

Options 4 and 5 actually scored the same or better than the Hi-Rail option before the behaviour change incentives were applied.

I'm concerned that conclusions have been drawn in this report without all options being considered equally.

Response Director Infrastructure Services:

Advice has been sought from the consultant authors of the report who advises that due to the former out sourcing of this component of the report work, it will cost in the order of \$30,000 to recover the associated model and complete the analysis. Council has no budget for this work.