

# Attachment 1

## Summary of Submissions

---

### Introduction

This report summarises the submissions received on the PT Spine Study (PTSS). This is a joint study between Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC), Wellington City Council (WCC), and the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA).

### Consultation Process

The Regional Transport Committee released the results of the PTSS at the 19 June 2013 meeting (Report #13.668). The public feedback period commenced 24 July 2013 and closed 1 October 2013.

Information on the key findings of the PTSS was provided to the public via the following means:

- Public release of the study findings and study reports on GWRC and partner websites
- Distribution of the summary report and consultation brochure at Greater Wellington Regional Council and Wellington City Council receptions and Wellington Central, Kilbirnie and Newtown libraries
- Mail out (primarily via email) to over 100 stakeholders, interest groups and organisations
- Media stories and opinion pieces written about the results of the PTSS
- Advertisements in the Dominion Post, Wairarapa Times, and various local Wellington City newspapers
- FAQs published on GWRC and partner's websites
- Information and discussion through stakeholder engagement meetings

Feedback on the options was invited through submissions and through market research using online citizen panel tools. Submissions could be provided by email, by hard copy (a submission form was provided at the back of the PTSS Consultation Brochure) or by using the online submission form on the PTSS 'Have Your Say' website.

This report relates to the feedback received through the submissions. Feedback from the online citizen panels are provided in a separate attachment.

### Overview of submissions

**278 submissions** in total were received on the Public Transport Spine Study.

Around 26 of these were from agencies or groups and the remainder were from individuals. The summaries of the major organisations are provided at the end of this report.

The vast majority of submitters (79%) used the online submission form on Greater Wellington's 'Have Your Say' website. Others posted the hard copy brochure form or sent in submission letters.

One of the submitters, Generation Zero, created a petition in support of the themes within their submission that was filled out by 514 people. A summary of this petition is provided along with the full submission summary at the end of this report.

### **Key issues**

The most commonly identified or significant comments from the submissions were:

- Overall support for public transport in the region/city and a strong desire to see it improved
- Concern about poor travel times and unreliability for public transport currently
- Suggestions for alternative routes (either different routes through the CBD or extensions to the North and/or South)
- Need for the Spine to be integrated within the wider transport network in planning and implementation
- Desire for a better, safer cycling network
- General opposition to roading projects and RoNS
- Preference for new public transport vehicles to be electrically powered
- Strong agreement to trade off parking for better public transport services
- Some concern over the terms of reference for the Study, the need for more detail, and alternative network designs
- Further consideration of climate change and other environmental issues, urban liveability, public health and accessibility.

### **Comment on the three shortlisted options**

The most common comments in support or opposition of the three short listed options were:

- Statements in support of Bus Priority noted that it is the least expensive option and that it can be implemented right away (even if only as an interim measure)
- Statements in opposition to Bus Priority noted that it is not much of a change
- Statements in support of BRT focused on its overall value for money and effectiveness
- Statements in opposition to BRT focused on capacity and vehicle issues
- Statements in support of LRT focused on a perceived anti-LRT bias in the study, urban amenity values, environmental benefits, greater economic benefits and consumer preference for light rail
- Statements in opposition to LRT focused on this option's cost.

### Submission analysis

The consultation brochure form asked 6 survey questions as well as providing space for further comments. The analysis of the responses to these questions is provided below. Where other submissions covered the same issues and expressed a clear opinion the feedback from these has been included below. Percentages are given as the proportion of those who answered each individual survey question.

### Preferred option

The full question asked was:

*“Taking into account the costs and benefits of each option, which of the proposed options to improve public transport in Wellington City do you most prefer?”*

The following table shows how submitters answered this question.

Option	#	%
Bus Priority	23	8.7
Bus Rapid Transit	84	31.8
Light Rail Transit	130	49.2
Other	21	8.0
Don't know	6	2.3

Roughly half of the submitters identified LRT as their most preferred option. BRT came in next, followed by Bus Priority.

The ‘other’ options mentioned by submitters included cycle lanes, heavy rail, and pods. There were also bus network design comments such as looping services through the CBD and other alternate bus or BRT routes.

Some ‘don’t know’ responses indicated a wish to see a car-free CBD (sub#30), doubt over modelling assumptions (sub#227) and concern over loss of parking (subs#118, 269).

There were numerous alternative options described in the comments by submitters, both within and beyond the scope of the PTSS. They mainly related to alternative LRT or BRT routes, or desired modification to current bus routes, as well as improved cycling facilities.

### Parking

The full question asked was:

*“Please state how much you agree with the following statement – The loss of some on-street parking in return for faster more reliable public transport is an acceptable trade-off.”*

The following table shows how submitters answered this question.

	#	%
Strongly agree	171	68.4
Agree	48	19.2
Neither agree or disagree	12	4.8
Disagree	9	3.6
Strongly disagree	7	2.8
Don't know	3	1.2

Almost 90% of respondents agreed that removing some on-street parking is an acceptable trade-off. Roughly 6.5% disagreed with the trade-off.

One submitter suggested building more parking buildings on the fringes of the CBD with cheap shuttle loop services provided between these buildings and the CBD as an alternative (sub#48).

The comments provided were of a more mixed opinion on parking – with roughly equal amounts wanting more parking, or maintaining parking space numbers or removing parking spots. The main reasons given for maintaining or providing more parking spaces were to support local businesses (subs#83, 118) and residential areas (subs#20, 139, 201). A few comments calling for keeping or providing more parking were tied to specific areas – Adelaide Road, for example (sub#102), or “adjacent to the BRT route” (sub#50). Some comments indicated support for removing parking along main commuter routes so long as parking along side streets is increased as compensation (subs#214, 242, 269, 274).

Submitters who supported removing on-street parking mostly felt that the space taken up by car parks could be put to better use – bus priority lanes or cycle facilities (subs#18, 111, 186, 261). The other main reason was to support public transport patronage growth (subs#151, 174, 216, 248).

### **Restricting access**

The full question asked was:

*“Please state how much you agree with the following statement – Restricting access for general vehicles to parts of Lambton Quay and Willis Street during business hours in return for faster more reliable public transport is an acceptable trade-off.”*

The following table shows how submitters answered this question.

	#	%
Strongly agree	154	61.6
Agree	57	22.8
Neither agree or disagree	14	5.6
Disagree	12	4.8
Strongly disagree	9	3.6
Don't know	4	1.6

Again, the overwhelming majority of respondents support restricting access to parts of Lambton Quay and Willis Street, with 62% strongly agreeing with the trade-off. The comments indicate that this is due to the desire to improve public transport.

Those who strongly disagreed tended to oppose the loss of all on-street parking, stating that there are more important priorities (sub#30) – or had concerns for local businesses (sub#118, 242).

### **Alternative route**

The full question asked was:

*“Please state how much you agree with the following statement – Using an alternative route for some peak bus services through the CBD in return for faster more reliable public transport is an acceptable trade-off.”*

The following table shows how submitters answered this question.

	#	%
Strongly agree	104	41.8
Agree	83	33.3
Neither agree or disagree	32	12.9
Disagree	15	6.0
Strongly disagree	9	3.6
Don't know	6	2.4

A strong majority (75%) support alternative peak bus routes, with over 40% strongly agreeing.

In the comments, explicit support of an alternate route for some buses had to do with reduced conflict with LRT (sub#249) and timetable reliability (sub#213). Comments also included several suggestions for moving all public transport services off the Golden Mile and onto one

of the side streets. These included a Featherston / Victoria alignment (sub#69, 107) and Jervois Quay (sub#16, 212, 246) and Wakefield (sub#16, 212, 213).

Disagreement with an alternate bus route focused around legibility of the network (subs#216, 251, 274) and the belief that a single transport spine should be designed to handle expected patronage without need of secondary alignments (subs#215, 243, 247).

### **Willingness to pay**

The full question asked was:

*“The average household currently pays around \$300 a year in regional rates. Some of the costs of the public transport spine options are likely to be passed on to ratepayers through increased rates. For each of the options how much extra would you be prepared to pay each year in addition to your regional rates to make it happen?”*

The following table shows how submitters answered this question.

<b>Amount</b>	<b>Bus Priority</b>		<b>Bus Rapid Transit</b>		<b>Light Rail Transit</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Not willing to pay more	66	29.1	36	15.8	33	14.6
\$1 - \$10	41	18.1	25	11.0	9	4.0
\$11 - \$20	32	14.1	38	16.7	13	5.8
\$21 - \$40	29	12.8	28	12.3	15	6.6
\$41 - \$60	5	2.2	27	11.8	27	11.9
\$61 - \$100	11	4.8	23	10.1	35	15.5
More than \$100	11	4.8	17	7.5	64	28.3
Don't know	32	14.1	34	14.9	30	13.3

*Note: Not all submitters provided responses to all three of the options and the percentages relate to the proportion of people who responded for that option.*

Each option had its own unique willingness-to-pay profile. In general, people are willing to pay more for their preferred option. Also, the more expensive the option was, the higher amount in rates submitters were willing to pay. Those who preferred LRT (the most expensive option) were more willing to pay more for their preferred option.

One submitter (sub#249) objected to this survey question believing it to be misleading.

The following sections analyse further the willingness-to-pay of each option.

### **Bus Priority**

The willingness-to-pay for Bus Priority (BP) is on the lower end of the scale, garnering the most “not willing to pay more” selections of the three options. For those whose preferred

option was Bus Priority (the least expensive), they were more likely to want to pay a small amount for their preferred option. They also had a similar willingness to pay for the other two options.

### **Bus Rapid Transit**

BRT had the most even spread of results. Those who chose BRT as their preferred option were willing to pay a moderate amount. They were also more likely to be willing to pay a small amount (up to \$20) for BP. For willingness to pay for LRT, those who preferred BRT were rather polarised with the most respondents either not willing to pay at all or willing to pay more than \$100.

### **Light Rail Transit**

LRT has the highest willingness-to-pay results of the three options, with a majority claiming they are willing to have more than \$100 added on top of their current rates, however many others also said they are unwilling to pay more.

For those whom LRT was their preferred option, they were more likely to be willing to pay smaller amounts for the other two options. They were also willing to pay medium-high amounts for BRT.

### **Priority**

The full question asked was:

*“Thinking of the overall priorities for the future of Wellington’s transport network what priority would you give implementing the final public transport spine option chosen for Wellington?”*

The following table shows how submitters answered this question.

<b>Priority level</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
High	177	71.7
Medium	46	18.6
Low	10	4.0
Not a priority	8	3.2
Don’t know	6	2.4

A strong majority believed improving public transport in Wellington City is a high priority. Other high, or higher, priorities mentioned in comments were earthquake strengthening (sub#28), reduced peak fares (sub#29) and cycling (sub#92).

## **General comment analysis**

A further question on the feedback form asked for general comments. Some individuals and several organisations sent in free-form letter submissions. All these submissions have been included in this section.

## **Options comment analysis**

### **Bus Priority**

*Submissions: 20, 54, 69, 88, 117, 127, 131, 139, 146, 147, 164, 165, 232, 234, 242, 266, 269*

Those who supported the Bus Priority option liked the flexibility of buses to deal with terrain, weather, and disruptions. They also commented that BP can be implemented immediately, had the lowest costs of the three options (use existing infrastructure and avoid buying dedicated vehicles), and can best co-exist with private cars.

Those who opposed the BP option indicated that it was only a short-term fix, would add to congestion, and had higher OPEX costs and lower BCR.

Although this option itself was not well supported, adding more dedicated bus lanes was supported in comments as an immediate interim step before one of the other options is implemented.

### **Bus Rapid Transit**

*Submissions: 33, 47, 70, 71, 78, 79, 86, 103, 107, 131, 132, 136, 147, 163, 164, 165, 174, 183, 193, 197, 203, 208, 214, 215, 225, 230, 237, 242, 244, 250, 253, 256, 265, 275*

Those who supported BRT noted the option:

- Has highest BCR / cheaper, easier to implement
- Greater route flexibility / cheaper and easier to expand routes
- Reduces need to transfer
- Most passenger growth
- Proven worldwide
- Reduces number of buses / improves congestion, reduces pollution.

Those who opposed the BRT option noted:

- Doubt that BRT could run efficiently beyond the Spine
- Capacity constraints
- Difficulty fitting Wellington's narrow, winding streets
- Higher OPEX costs
- Vehicle / technical issues (acceleration, boarding / alighting times, short lifespans).

There was also some concern over the lack of detail on what the BRT vehicle will look like, and that BRT buses are more likely to be diesel powered.



## **Light Rail Transit**

*Submissions: 12, 15, 24, 33, 35, 37, 38, 46, 48, 59, 60, 64, 77, 79, 88, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 103, 115, 127, 129, 131, 136, 139, 144, 151, 163, 164, 165, 168, 171, 174, 177, 179, 182, 183, 184, 187, 193, 194, 203, 204, 208, 210, 213, 215, 222, 226, 229, 235, 236, 237, 238, 242, 243, 249, 250, 251, 259, 262, 264, 270, 271, 274, 275, 276*

The LRT option garnered the most comments in support.

For those opposed to LRT, they primarily mentioned the option's cost and the distant time horizon to implementation. Other comments against LRT included its inflexibility to disruptions from accidents and natural hazards, and the lack of projected passenger growth to justify costs.

Apart from the comments on the perceived bias against LRT in the Study, submitters supported LRT for the following reasons:

- Higher capacity to carry more passengers
- Greater attraction of new public transport users and tourists
- Higher property value / commercial uplift
- Amenity values of vehicles (comfortable / iconic / smoother ride / faster on-off times)
- Better accessibility for elderly, disabled, children and cyclists
- Better for urban design outcomes
- Safer for pedestrians and cyclists
- Better integration with heavy rail from the North
- Fewer emissions and other pollution, less noise / more environmentally friendly
- Better timetable reliability
- LRT is more modern / future-proofed option.

## **Current network**

*Submissions: 2, 5, 8, 15, 24, 26, 61, 64, 75, 87, 134, 137, 141, 144, 146, 152, 156, 176, 181, 184, 185, 194, 204, 206, 245, 251, 256*

Overall there was a strong desire for public transport to be improved from the current status quo. Topics in this area ranged from concerns about delivered services and vehicle design issues. Often these comments were used to lead into desired route design changes, the most common of which are highlighted below.

Submitters had several concerns on how the current bus network functions. The most frequent were:

- Slow bus travel times
- Too many buses in Golden Mile causing congestion
- Unreliable timetables
- High bus fares.

Suggested improvements included reducing bus queues, improving reliability of the services, reducing fares for short journeys, and ensuring public transport is flexible to avoid disruptions and delays.

Submitters were split between reducing the number of bus stops to improve travel speeds and concern that fewer bus stops will reduce accessibility to public transport.

There was also mixed opinions, but overall support, for the current trolley buses. Those who supported the trolley buses did so because they are electrically powered and lead to less vehicle emissions pollution. Those who supported removing the trolley buses felt the overhead wires were unsightly and an earthquake risk.

### **Critique of Study process**

*Submissions: 12, 15, 19, 53, 59, 61, 66, 71, 77, 87, 99, 105, 106, 110, 124, 127, 137, 139, 144, 157, 165, 166, 168, 171, 178, 179, 192, 193, 196, 199, 200, 202, 209, 210, 213, 215, 216, 222, 223, 224, 226, 227, 233, 234, 236, 237, 239, 241, 243, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 256, 257, 259, 265, 266, 269, 271, 272, 275, 277, 278*

A common theme in the comments was an accusation of the PTSS being biased against LRT. The reasons given were:

- LRT is inappropriately expensive
- Inclusion of a second Mt. Victoria Tunnel for LRT but not BRT
- Patronage figures underestimated for LRT
- Less viable route for LRT deliberately chosen
- LRT received harsher scrutiny in the Study than BRT
- Study downplayed LRT's economic and development benefits.

There were concerns that the different route characteristics (most notably the LRT tunnel) undermined a proper and impartial examination of the three options by not allowing a like-for-like comparison between them. Submitters also felt the three options were limited or had been compromised by including the Roads of National Significance in the analysis.

Submitters believed the Terms of Reference were flawed in that it focused the PTSS on too narrow a geographic area. There was a belief that the Railway Station is not a natural transport hub and/or it should not have been considered as the northern terminus of the Study area. This is related to comments on wider network and strategic alignment issues highlighted below.

Submitters also stated that the Study should have been designed to meet the public transport patronage and climate change targets in the Wellington 2010 RLTS. Related to this were comments that the transport model shouldn't have been used to calculate patronage and economic benefits because it is a car focused model. Another perceived inconsistency was the difference between the public transport patronage growth forecasts in the 2010 RLTS and the Study – with the RLTS patronage forecasting significantly higher than the Study's patronage growth forecasts.

Another critique was that the PTSS did not take into account the whole of Wellington City's Growth Spine (ie up to Johnsonville), and was therefore inconsistent with the WCC Transport and Urban Development Strategies. Submitters making this point tended to call for seamless public transport services between Johnsonville, through the CBD and ending at the Wellington International Airport.

There was also concern that the PTSS did not adequately examine the environmental, social and health impacts of the three short listed options.

Several submitters called for an independent assessment of the PTSS or to scrap it altogether and commission a new one. These comments were almost uniformly related to the perceived bias against light rail mentioned above.

### **Alternative options**

*Submissions: 24, 31, 45, 48, 57, 61, 70, 98, 107, 166, 186, 211, 235, 237, 238, 239, 245*

Some submitters indicated that they preferred other modes that were previously looked at through the PTSS process and discounted at the long or medium list stage. These included heavy rail and ULTra pods.

One submitter (sub#57) endorsed monorail from the rail station to airport.

### **Alternative routes**

*Submissions: 15, 16, 24, 28, 40, 46, 54, 57, 59, 61, 62, 78, 81, 100, 102, 106, 107, 110, 119, 122, 141, 144, 151, 164, 165, 171, 176, 183, 192, 193, 198, 199, 202, 204, 210, 211, 212, 213, 216, 221, 222, 235, 237, 244, 246, 247, 249, 250, 251, 256, 264, 269, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 277*

A major theme was suggestions of alternative routes for the public transport Spine – either through the CBD or connections to suburbs. The most commonly suggested routes through the CBD were:

- along the waterfront / Wakefield Street
- Featherston Street
- Victoria Street.

Alternative routes to the East were commonly suggested to avoid a separate Mt. Victoria tunnel for LRT. These included using the existing bus tunnel and on through Hataitai or routing a single spine from Newtown to Kilbirnie via Constable Street. Other suggestions included LRT travelling via a tunnel between the zoo and Coutts Street or rerouting the Spine to avoid the Basin Reserve, either through the bus tunnel or to the West of the Basin.

The most commonly suggested extensions to the Spine routes were out to the Airport and/or Johnsonville. Other suburbs suggested (usually as eventual add-on connections) were Miramar, Seatoun, Island Bay and Karori. Another potential route was a loop, either between the rail station and Courtenay Place or between the rail station, Newtown and Kilbirnie. A

few submitters also suggested extending LRT services to the Hutt City CBD / Hospital (subs#24, 46).

### **Wider network issues**

*Submissions: 15, 21, 24, 30, 46, 48, 54, 57, 58, 69, 70, 75, 76, 98, 99, 107, 117, 127, 130, 139, 150, 156, 157, 165, 166, 174, 181, 186, 196, 198, 200, 214, 215, 216, 234, 235, 236, 238, 241, 243, 244, 247, 248, 250, 251, 253, 265, 277*

Several submitters commented on wider network concerns. These included:

- Integrated planning and implementation of Spine improvements with the rest of public transport and wider transport network
- Better connections from outer suburbs, primarily Johnsonville to the CBD
- Future Spine routes should be designated and protected against incompatible development and service updates
- Suggested bus network design changes.

### **Transfers**

*Submissions: 21, 83, 86, 87, 168, 246, 247, 250, 251, 252, 256, 262, 265, 269, 274*

While a few submitters opposed the idea of forced transfers, most submitters who commented on this issue noted that well designed transfer points are not necessarily a disadvantage if they are well signposted, safe, comfortable, and accompanied by integrated ticketing.

The idea of transfers was mostly brought up in comments by submitters who supported LRT as a rebuttal to the PTSS's conclusions or as a means of reducing the number of bus routes that go through the Golden Mile.

Other similar comments included placing commuter hubs at either end of the CBD. There was also support for improving the current rail / bus interchange at the Wellington Rail Station.

### **Other considerations**

*Submissions: 2, 7, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 35, 37, 40, 44, 47, 48, 56, 61, 69, 71, 72, 73, 76, 81, 83, 84, 85, 88, 89, 90, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 104, 105, 107, 109, 110, 113, 115, 117, 127, 129, 132, 136, 137, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 151, 152, 154, 158, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, 174, 175, 176, 177, 180, 181, 183, 184, 185, 190, 192, 193, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 207, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 219, 221, 223, 225, 226, 228, 230, 231, 232, 234, 236, 237, 238, 241, 242, 243, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 256, 257, 258, 259, 261, 262, 266, 267, 269, 270, 271, 274, 276, 277, 278*

Submitters made a number of comments about other matters to be considered as part of the public transport Spine. By far the most numerous of these were with regard to improving cycling and support for electric public transport vehicles. Many submitters wanted dedicated cycle lanes through CBD that connected to the suburbs, as well as better integration between cycling and public transport. There was also strong support for alternative energy sources for

the public transport fleet. The most common being electricity, as well as hybrid and battery powered vehicles.

Other considerations that submitters mentioned include:

- Opposition to roading projects and RoNS in particular
- Other comments on roading projects included grade-separating more intersections and ensuring bus priority and cycle facilities are incorporated into RoNS and other road projects
- Concern with pedestrian and cyclist safety with regard to buses along the Golden Mile
- Support for improved pedestrian facilities
- Support for integrated ticketing and expansion of real time information displays
- Need for a corresponding urban design strategy
- Support for a car-free CBD or a fully pedestrianized Golden Mile with cycle lanes
- Need for Wellington to reduce its carbon emissions, improve air quality, and become a more sustainable and liveable city.

### Costs

*Submissions: 5, 7, 13, 21, 22, 29, 47, 53, 55, 70, 74, 98, 109, 117, 123, 130, 137, 139, 144, 150, 154, 172, 198, 203, 204, 206, 219, 226, 241, 242, 248, 249, 251, 253, 256, 257, 260, 266, 273, 274, 275*

Several submitters commented on costs in their submissions. Commenters wanted costs (rates and fares) kept low. They suggested some alternative means of financing public transport – the most common were a petrol tax, tolls, and congestion and parking charges.

Submitters also had suggestions for fare policy changes – the most common being different peak / off-peak charges and free inner city trips subsidised through fare increases on longer trips.

### Summary of main points from organisations

The following section also provides a summary of the main issues identified by submissions from major organisations.

#### Automobile Association

Submission number: 127

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Study		Wonders why the PT Spine appears to have been taken out of context with the rest of the network.
Study	Shortcomings	Requests a clear statement of the agreed transport outcome. Concerned that the initial objective to improve bus service reliability has become an objective to increase public transport use by discouraging car use by removing on-street parking, limiting off street parking and increasing private car travel times.

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
General		Due to short journey lengths in Wellington City, the layout of the inner city street system and the transfer requirements, it is of little surprise that the user benefits are well short of the cost of the options
LRT	Oppose	Does not generate enough benefits to justify further consideration, with or without the suggested Mt Victoria tunnel. While LRT can replace bus routes, operating just a single route is unlikely to be cost effective
Bus Priority	Support	Able to be implemented incrementally, most cost effective, can use existing road infrastructure, and doesn't necessitate the purchase of a new breed of vehicle. Interesting to see analysis of the effectiveness of current bus priority measures prior to their further introduction across the City.
Alternative options	Wider network	Construction of the RoNS should incorporate provision for bus lanes to provide bus priority because it will be more cost effective to undertake than at any other time
Other considerations	Roads	Wishes to assist to understand how best to mitigate any adverse effects the proposals will have on motorists
Other considerations	Transfers	Arrangements for transfers need to be shown to operate at minimal dis-benefits to provide the confidence needed to make a major investment in specialised buses

### Strathmore Park Progressive Association

Submission number: 181

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Current situation	Bus	Urgent need to reduce bus queues in the inner city. The introduction of the bus review is taking far too long and has now been put back to 2015.
Alternative options	Wider network	Priority will be needed to the Airport since its minimal distance from CBD is such that the business community & majority of the public will continue to prefer the door to door convenience of their cars, taxis & shuttles over public transport. The poor loading factors of the flyers are an example of why the Airport as a destination will never justify a light rail connection.
Other considerations	Roads	Failure of bypass to offer grade separation of East/West from North/South is the biggest issue to be solved in order to provide more timely bus & public transport journeys. Grade separation is urgently required at more of the interchanges at Taranaki St, Victoria & Willis Sts. Vivian St paired route must be planned to be integrated with the Buckle St bypass to remove through traffic from a section of the CBD which is fast becoming a residential precinct unsuited to the pressure of through traffic.

**Miramar / Maupuia Progressive Association**

Submission number: 201

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Parking	Keep	Concerns about off-street parking in the residential streets
Service standards		Wonders how commuters can be encouraged to take the alternative route back to home base.

**Mana Coach Services**

Submission number: 209

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Study	Shortcomings	Concerned that BRT has been unfairly favoured over BP. BRT and BP given different routes with BP getting a less favourable route. No legitimate reason for BRT to travel between rail station and hospital faster than BP. BRT should be less reliable than BP due to difficulty removing failed or out of service vehicles from bus ways, inability of units to pass one another, expense and operational challenges of maintaining additional or replacement vehicles, diverting BRT units in the case of events or power failure. Greater patronage increase for BRT than BP from southern suburbs is not justified. Greater property value increases for BRT than BP is not justified.
Process	Flaws	The PTSS is a feasibility study, not a plan. This consultation should have been on a plan. The public are being asked to comment on a small and misleading part of a highly complex feasibility study. A plan might have included an impact report on the effect of a rapid transit system on the CBD in human terms, if a city famous for events could function with a PT express-way running through it, discussed existing and/or parallel PT networks and needs of a 24hr PT system, not only in the peaks. Study is largely devoid of people and it fails to consider scale.

**Cycle Aware Wellington**

Submission number: 212

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
General		Support both of the rapid transport options – BRT and LRT
Other considerations	Cycling	Separated cycle lanes along the entire transport spine, bikes allowed on public transport vehicles, bike parking at main stations and the termini. Waterloo / Customhouse / Jervois Quays have ample room for cycle lanes. Reroute spine away from the Golden Mile to make this a pedestrian / cycle only
Alternative options	Different route	A 'Jervois Mile' would consist of a two-way public transport route along Customhouse / Jervois / Wakefield Quays, continuing on to Kent / Cambridge Terraces.

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Other considerations	Roads	The BRT / LRT cross sections show cycle lanes on the outside lanes of Kent / Cambridge Terraces and rapid transit lanes in the middle. Ensure that the spine does not remove cycle facilities put in place through the NZTA Basin mitigation

### Architectural Centre

Submission number: 215

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Study	Shortcomings	Study does not ask what motivates Wellingtonians to use, or not use, public transport. Nor does it consider urban design in a way that is sensitive to the city fabric, and improve the public realm. The study is silent on internal vehicle environment.
Service standards		Strongly encourage provision of free wifi as a way to attract public transport users. Submission lists several other convenience related issues that the study should have addressed to increase attractiveness. Concerned that the proposed reduction of bus stops in the CBD may reduce the convenience of public transport
General		As our population ages it is not unreasonable to expect additional public transport patronage from this group
Service standards	Integrated ticketing	Supports
Alternative options	Different route	Suggests a seamless transport spine from Ngauranga through the CBD, past the Basin to the Airport. First step is to better integrate the Lambton Quay bus interchange with the railway station into one elegant transfer station with integrated information, way-finding, and timetabling.
BRT	Oppose	The preferred design will be unable to meet forecast capacity from when it begins to operate.
Secondary spine	Oppose	A high quality Spine along the Golden Mile must be designed to accommodate appropriate capacity without the confusion of a secondary parallel route
LRT	Support	LRT will provide the best quality and most robust public transport system
Implementation	Interim-steps	Strongly encourage implementation of bus priority measures immediately as part of the longer process

### Living Streets Aotearoa

Submission number: 216

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Alternative	Different	Supports Golden Mile route and extensions to Newtown and



Topic	Subtopic	Comment
options	route	Kilbirnie. Suggests creating a loop between Newtown and Kilbirnie and extension to Airport. Mt. Victoria tunnel should not be used - investigate use of existing bus tunnel
Other considerations	Walking	Like to see better analysis of the interaction between pedestrians and the PT network design and vehicle options. There are no proposals to resolve the problems facing pedestrians as they leave the Wellington railway station. Oppose a 'shared path' along Ruahine Street on the existing footpath
Modelling		Expected growth in public transport use seems very modest and much higher level of public transport (as in the RLTS) should be modelled
Service standards	Vehicles	Analysis of vehicle options should include ease of getting on and off, reliability, impact of walkability. There is no analysis of ease of use.
Other considerations	Safety	Higher capacity should be achieved through the fewest number of vehicles
Other considerations	Externalities	There is no analysis of environmental impacts
Process	anti-LRT bias	The benefits of LRT were underplayed and in particular, benefits to pedestrian safety, reliable level boarding, and potential for increased accessibility for wheelchair users. LRT seems to be the only mode that increases capacity along the Golden Mile significantly while reducing vehicle movements
Secondary spine	Oppose	With a duplicated spine legibility is lost. This is a serious issue.
Alternative options	Wider network	Service levels to Hataitai should be maintained or improved. Improve PT service to Thorndon Quay and Kaiwharawhara.
Parking	Remove	Supports coordinated approach to managing all vehicle parking in the central city and the effect this has on efficient public transport and pedestrians
Study	Shortcomings	The PTSS was based on a faulty network design. All modes should be tested against the same network design and operational standards
Implementation	Interim-steps	Immediately to establish bus priority measures as a first step towards the development of a high quality, high frequency public transport spine

### Newtown Residents Association

Submission number: 225

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
BRT	Support	We favour BRT because its urban format still allows for future

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
		LRT.
Other considerations	Walking	Riddiford Street from Rintoul to Constable is the core of Newtown's urban heart, it is important to protect our pedestrian friendly, character filled, street-treed, slow zone.
Other considerations	Roads	Strongly support BRT turning off at Rintoul Street and extending to Island Bay (sharing with other vehicles) and not ever go to Constable Street. (If it were to continue up Constable Street it would also share with other traffic.)

## VUWSA

Submission number: 226

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Service standards		Wellington needs to have a public transport system that allows a high number of students to get to University efficiently.
LRT	Support	A modified LRT is the best way to move Wellington forward. LRT has capacity for patronage growth well beyond 2040 - while BRT does not. Supports Tom Pettit's research.
Process	anti-LRT bias	Independent investigation is needed to assess the alternative route along Constable St rather than having a costly second tunnel built. This would dramatically reduce LRT's capital cost and lead to a fairer assessment of the options.
Other considerations	Carbon emissions	While all options have the potential to be electric, LRT is most efficient in terms of energy per passenger/km. This would lead to the lowest carbon emissions out of the options presented.
Other considerations	Walking	Separate dedicated cycle-ways are essential. These should be integrated along the spine route to enable commuters to use a range of transit modes.
Cost	Fares	Fares must be equitable and encourage patronage; hence tertiary concessions should be introduced immediately and maintained on any future public transport system.

## WCC Accessibility Advisory Group

Submission number: 230

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
BRT	Support	Easiest option to get right in terms of accessibility provided the supporting infrastructure and fleet are designed and procured with accessibility in mind.
Other considerations		Key areas of commitment for accessibility are the built environment (e.g. transfer time and distance at interchanges could be challenging if they are located in the centre of the road); Signage (both at stops and on the buses themselves); affordability; communication to the public of Information about the new system

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Service standards	Vehicles	Accessible information needs to include: timetables that are easy to read in printed, electronic and audio versions; clear well lit signage at stops including information in braille; using large print and high contrast colours, real time indicators of bus arrival times (in visual and audio form); and on board visual displays and audio announcements of imminent arrival at stops
Other considerations	Walking	Pedestrian routes need to be built with the visually impaired in mind

### Wellington Electricity

Submission number: 231

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Other considerations	Power source	Wellington Electricity supports the Study and are willing to discuss further options for electrified Public Transport or for the augmentation of the present trolley bus system.

### Regional Public Health

Submission number: 241

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Alternative options	Wider network	The chosen public transport system must be integrated with plans, policies, and land use, in order to be successful and of high quality
Other considerations	Health	Public transport benefits are not always considered in their widest sense, many health and social benefits are overlooked in economic analyses. These benefits should be widely scoped and quantified.
Service standards		Spine should benefit the transport disadvantaged, including elderly, disabled
Cost	Fares	Consider affordability for users.
Alternative options	Wider network	Integration with other transport modes, especially active modes, is important to maximise health benefits.
Other considerations	Safety	A high quality spine provides reductions in private vehicle use, decreased congestion and improved personal safety and injury rates.
Process		Recommend that the options are formally peer reviewed. Assumption that LRT requires a separate tunnel and the background reasoning needs to be subject to independent consideration.
Implementation		Recommend that the chosen option is implemented within a reasonable timeframe

**Wellington Employer's Chamber of Commerce**

Submission number: 242

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Subtopic</b>	<b>Comment</b>
BRT	Support	Highest overall BCR and the highest transport benefits, flexibility to carry on further than LRT. WECC member businesses who felt they had enough information on the three options, 43.4% prefer BRT. Modern, efficient and environmentally friendly buses are able to match LRT without excessive up-front costs
LRT	Oppose	Track installation expense and dedicated tunnel as well as relative inflexibility. LRT not expected to create a significant increase in passenger numbers over BRT
Other considerations	Roads	Preventing cars from accessing Lambton Quay and Willis Street to drop off or pick up passengers disadvantages local businesses which rely on ease of access for their customers as well as employees
Parking	Keep	Any reductions in car park numbers would require parking capacity on nearby streets. Opposes restricting car park numbers or increasing parking charges as a means of boosting passenger transport numbers.
Cost		Suggests congestion charges and tolls will be a far better way of modifying transport behaviour.
Implementation	Interim-steps	Strongly support Bus Priority Measures being put in place in the interim
Secondary spine		Certainty around a secondary spine along Featherston Street and the Quays will be needed before final decisions are made.

**Wellington Civic Trust**

Submission number: 247

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Subtopic</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Process	Flaws	Study is inconsistent with N2A - does not cover the full length of the Corridor, and WCC TS - none of the options allow for the required seamless system, and RLTS - designed around a patronage increase significantly less than the rate needed to achieve the RLTS outcome. Needs to be revised to facilitate those strategies.
Alternative options	Transfers	Study is inconsistent with the WCBR by claiming fewer transfers mean more passengers. Does not improve Rail/bus transfer at Rail Station - distances between platforms and bus stops are long, poorly signposted; bus and train timetables not co-ordinated; little way-finding information and signage
Implementation	Interim-steps	Full bus priority should be introduced along the Golden Mile as a matter of urgency
Other considerations	Capacity	Bizarre to build a high-quality spine that is of insufficient capacity from day one. Any issues that reduce capacity need to be identified and addressed, rather than avoided by the use of a solution that is clearly second best
Secondary spine	Oppose	Public transport should be focussed on the Golden Mile. Any solution that does not permit this needs to have its limitations evaluated very closely, and bottlenecks addressed
Alternative options	Transfers	Depending on the design of Newtown/Hospital interchanges, it may make access worse if to reach the hospital from directions other than the North a change is required at Newtown.
Alternative options	Different route	Extend Newtown route to Kilbirnie, either via Constable St or a new Zoo-Coutts St tunnel, connectivity and accessibility would be significantly improved
Alternative options	Wider network	Kilbirnie BRT or LRT route serves no significant intermediate points such as Hataitai shops, unlike current buses.
Other considerations	Safety	Interaction between pedestrians and buses is a significant issue; overseas experience indicates that pedestrians and LRT mingle much more successfully. This factor does not appear to have been taken into account.
Other considerations	Power source	Consideration has not been given to quality of the urban environment and its economic and social effects. No provision has been made for an electric power supply in the BRT option
Process	anti-LRT bias	LRT appears to have been dismissed for challengeable reasons including, inability for overhead wires in road tunnels, depot for LRT but not for BRT, new Mount Victoria tunnel, LRT's ability to run down narrow streets, diverting traffic to alternate routes. Higher capacity and better urban environment integration do not appear to have been taken into account. Need to be peer-reviewed.

**Wellington City Youth Council**

Submission number: 248

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Process	anti-LRT bias	Dissatisfied with evaluation of LRT, does not cover whole spine which negatively affects BCR, question its evidential reliability. Requests a second expert opinion on the viability of LRT to assess the validity of concerns, produce new costings, and takes into account a more practicable model
Study	Shortcomings	Time savings are not particularly important. Most important factors in ensuring public transport success are frequency, reliability, and ticket prices.
Alternative options	Wider network	Maintaining “balanced growth” in transport will not meet the stated goal of increasing public transport patronage mode-share. Study has contradictory aims. Simple matter of segregating public and private transport into respective corridors. Wonder why more steps have not already been taken to this effect
Parking		Increased parking needs to be managed in order to improve public transport mode-share
Other considerations	Carbon emissions	Deeply concerned that climate costs were not considered in the cost-benefit analysis.
Cost		Regard should be given to transport policy - to increase mode-share make private transport relatively less attractive. Costs should be spread as widely as possible. Support increased parking charges. Congestion charges and petrol taxes should be considered. Targeted rate on property value increases.
Cost	Fares	While there may need to be an increase in fares this should be kept to a minimum to ensure that public transport remains accessible

**Ora Taiao**

Submission number: 249

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Other considerations	Carbon emissions	Climate change considerations are absent in the PTSS
Other considerations	Health	Better provision of active and public transport will provide other more immediate and major health benefits as well as the longer term health gains from slowing climate change.
Study	Shortcomings	In assessing the costs, there is no mention of climate change or oil prices, nor any sensitivity analysis around various scenarios for oil and carbon costs
LRT	Support	LRT has advantages: better for the climate, safer for pedestrians and cyclists, higher capacity, greater passenger

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
		appeal, easily accommodate cycles and people with disabilities, better urban design, higher increase in property values
Alternative options	Different route	LRT via Constable Street with extensions to Karori and Island Bay as quickly as possible
Other considerations	Roads	Oppose the RoNS
Implementation	Interim-steps	Work should begin within months for bus priority lanes and designated cycle-only path on main commuter routes, heavy restrictions on private car storage.
Secondary spine	Support	With LRT, it may make sense to run some buses on an alternative route to the Golden Mile
Cost		Object to the fundamental premise of question 5 in the survey and consider it unanswerable by any respondents, as it is misleading by not including benefits and costings of the options are questionable
Parking		Supports restricting parking and access for private vehicles so long as allowances are made for emergency vehicles, disability parking permits and delivery vehicles within limited hours

### Trams-Action

Submission number: 250

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Process	Flaws	Terms of reference are flawed. Rail station not a natural hub.
Alternative options	Wider network	No consideration was given to integration of various PT modes and the role of the CBD spine for the entire region, especially connections to the north
Study	Shortcomings	LRT and BRT were not compared on an equal basis. Different routes, separate tunnel and additional depot for LRT only (Matangi depot could easily be used).
Process	anti-LRT bias	LRT and BRT were not developed to the same extent. The degree of scrutiny of the two options was also different, with inadequate assessment of BRT
BRT	Oppose	Details on BRT are vague and unclear. Not suitable for CBD where there are severe space restrictions, unclear if buses are diesel or electric. BRT is a con and in reality no more than the bus priority option with bigger buses
Modelling		The standard GW transport models are not suitable for analysing travel times on streets with shared public and private vehicle traffic.
Alternative options	Transfers	Patronage effects of transfers were flawed. Well managed transfers in appropriate places do not have significant

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
		patronage effects overseas.
Study	Shortcomings	Does not meet RLTS outcomes and inconsistent with conclusions of the Wellington Bus Review
Alternative options	Different route	Hubs should be Johnsonville, Kilbirnie and Newtown, closing loop between Kilbirnie and Newtown. Route LRT through current bus tunnel connecting Hataitai
LRT	Support	LRT will allow full integration of regional PT network from Kilbirnie and Newtown, through to Johnsonville, Lower Hutt CBD, Upper Hutt CBD, and the various CBDs along the Kapiti line
Other considerations	Power source	Electric vehicles are essential
Implementation		In some cases good design principles were sidelined due to short term costs and implementation issues. Better for implementation to be delayed than to spend more on a flawed design
Process	Flaws	As the study progressed, the degree of input to the work dropped to essentially nil, affecting the credibility of the outcome. All key parties ended up dissatisfied. Should have generated unity of direction in fact created new controversy and dissention.
Other considerations	Capacity	Passenger capacity of different options is inaccurate. Patronage predictions for different options were not in keeping with observations elsewhere

## Public Transport Voice

Submission number: 251

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Process	Flaws	Terms of Reference were too limited in terms of connections to the wider network, and integration with other modes
Process	Flaws	Inadequate use of the reference groups leading to dissatisfaction and lack of credibility of study outcome
Study	Shortcomings	Study should have identified the spine route first and then evaluated different vehicles on that route.
Current situation		Agree that main problem is bus congestion on the Golden Mile
Study	Shortcomings	Study does not achieve RLTS outcomes and targets for patronage growth, comparable transit times with cars and affordability
Alternative options	Transfers	Study abandoned an efficient hub and spoke network design form. This was a mistake. An efficient network design should be developed, firmly adopted, and progressively implemented.
Secondary	Oppose	With a duplicated spine, legibility is lost



Topic	Subtopic	Comment
spine		
Alternative options	Different route	Strongly oppose placing the spine through the Mount Victoria Tunnel. Loop route through current bus tunnel, Hataitai town centre, Kilbirnie, Newtown, CBD. Avoid the Basin, maybe split route as early as Manners Street.
Alternative options	Wider network	Inconsistent on connections to the North. Argues for a dual spine to avoid forced transfers of bus passengers, but removing the current forced transfer at the railway station is not required.
LRT	Support	LRT allows services to bypass the railyards/station area (opening up additional capacity for Kapiti/Hutt services) providing high capacity service for Kaiwharawhara/Thorndon Quay retail and residential areas. Allows reliable level boarding, less hazard to pedestrians, better urban amenity.
Process	anti-LRT bias	Concerns about LRT capacity to the north are based on invalid assumptions. Not all services need go through the CBD, modern articulate LRT vehicle can have the same capacity as Matangis. It is possible to run more flow than counter-flow services. Even if PTSS arguments are valid, they're only problematic during a narrow part of the peak. Need for tunnel changes not properly evaluated, cost of converting northern line not insurmountable
Other considerations	Externalities	Good urban amenity should be a key consideration in choosing routes, in route design (e.g. number and location of stops/stations), in vehicle choice, and in the detailed implementation work
Other considerations	Power source	Spine must be electric, to avoid emissions and reduce noise
Other considerations	Walking	Location of stops/stations should minimise walking distances from key destinations/high density areas. Choice between direct walking routes up hills and more easy gradients.
Cost		LRT is far more affordable than suggested. Likely to be just as expensive over long term to purchase high capacity buses as to rail rolling stock, and track laying should be a relatively low additional cost to any other spine design work. In-road infrastructure will need to be adjusted/moved anyway. Manners St works to accommodate buses was far more extensive than Christchurch tram
Study	Shortcomings	A problem throughout was the lack of definition of what BRT was. The current study does not truly define and evaluate BRT

### New Zealand Retailers Association

Submission number: 253

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
-------	----------	---------

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
BRT	Support	Support in principle as it reduces the number of buses on the Golden Mile, lowering congestion and pollution, particularly at peak hours
Service standards		Concerned at the reduction of bus stops in the CBD.
Parking	Keep	Concerned at the loss of parking
Alternative options	Wider network	Concerned at the redirection of some general traffic away from the Golden Mile and localised road widening.
Process		Needs to be considered in conjunction with current Wellington bus policy review and the possible WCC retail strategy.
Cost		Comprehensive cost benefit analysis needed on how BRT will be paid for before any final decisions are made

### KiwiRail

Submission number: 254

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
General		Supports improving facilities, infrastructure and onward travel options for rail passengers in metropolitan areas, creating greater opportunities for increased use of the railway network. Notes the trade-offs and in general supports any measures that deliver faster public transport times though the Golden Mile.

### Generation Zero

Submission number: 256

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
Modelling		Transport planning and modelling has not caught up with rapid behavioural shift and have trouble predicting the effects of transformational public transport projects, healthy scepticism should be applied to future transport projections.
Alternative options	Different route	Single spine from the Railway Station to Newtown and then to Kilbirnie over Constable Street and Crawford Road was unduly dismissed in the study. It should be possible by removing parking and slightly narrowing footpaths.
Process	anti-LRT bias	No consideration for the higher ridership appeal of LRT over BRT. Figures quoted are way out of line with international experience and warrant strong scrutiny. Significantly downplayed the economic benefits of LRT (and possibly BRT too).
Other considerations	Capacity	Support Kerry Wood's points (submission 165) concerning the lack of capacity of the BRT option.
Alternative	Transfers	Questions need to be asked about the "transfer penalty", while

Topic	Subtopic	Comment
options		lower than often used overseas, if the results are so strongly at odds with observed outcomes in NZ and abroad.
BRT	Oppose	Big buses or bendy buses are unlikely to fit on Wellington's tight streets, residents may not tolerate them.
Study	Shortcomings	Study assumed no extra infrastructure cost outside main study area for BRT despite extensive BRT routes to suburbs
Reliability		BRT buses venturing out of the corridor are bound to get delayed in traffic causing variable trip times. Don't believe this factor was considered. Supposed 3 minute time saving of the split route to Kilbirnie simply be eaten up by buses getting stuck in car traffic
Other considerations	Roads	The existence of RoNS is part of the reason the modelled results of the spine solutions are so mediocre
Study	Shortcomings	Study options don't meet the RLTS and Climate Change Action Plan targets
General		Question whether GWRC and WCC are serious about their public transport and greenhouse gas targets by not attempting to design a system to meet these targets.
Other option		Supports Fast Forward Wellington plan
General		Created a quick online tickbox form for people to show their support for Generation Zero's asks, receiving over 500 responses.

Generation Zero also created an online tickbox form for people to show support for the themes within Generation Zero's submission, receiving a total of 514 responses. The numbers at the end indicate the amount of support for that particular statement.

- We want Wellington to have a world-class public transport system. (503)
- We support a dedicated public transport corridor from the Railway Station to Newtown and Kilbirnie, with capacity for significant future growth in ridership, as a high priority for Wellington's future. (478)
- We request an independent reassessment of light rail on a route via Constable Street in Newtown, avoiding the need for a tunnel. (458)
- We support building light rail if the reassessment indicates it's cost-effective, or else improving the bus rapid transit option to deliver higher capacity and reliability. (489)
- We advocate for clean renewable electricity or sustainable local biofuels to fuel Wellington's public transport systems. (490)
- We support prioritising use of road space for public transport as required to deliver faster, more reliable service. (488)
- We want to see things happen fast, beginning with establishing bus-only lanes and other priority measures along the designated route. (477)

- We want to see more frequent off-peak rail services, and a free bus service connecting the Railway Station and Courtenay Place trialed as an interim step before integrated ticketing is introduced. (467)
- We request that city and regional councils act to consider the broader Fast Forward Wellington plan and provide a formal response. (483)

The online tickbox form also allowed people to make additional comments. These comments were not materially different from the main submissions. Topics of these additional comments included:

- Overall support for improved public transport
- Support for cycling and pedestrian improvements and improved safety
- General support for LRT
- Opposition to roading projects and RoNS in particular
- Desire for a more environmentally friendly city.

Generation Zero's submission also included their "Fast Forward Wellington" concept. This proposed network design includes the Constable Street LRT alignment with connections out to Karori, Island Bay, Miramar and Strathmore; bus lanes out to Brooklyn from the CBD; segregated cycle lanes across the city; and several carshare stations. It also includes a wider regional public transport and cycling concept design.

Seven submitters to the main submission page (subs#15, 166, 223, 234, 240, 243, 268) indicated support for "Fast Forward Wellington".