# ABSTRACT SUBMISSION FORM

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Primary author – for all correspondence | | | | |
| **First name** | James | | **Surname** | Tinion-Morgan |
| **Organisation** | Tonkin + Tay;or | | | |
| **Postal address** | 105 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket | | | |
| **Email address** | jtinnionmorgan@tonkintaylor.co.nz | | | |
| **Phone number** | 093556000 | **Mobile** | | TBC |
| 2nd co-author | | | | |
| **First name** |  | | **Surname** |  |
| **Organisation** |  | | | |
| 3rd co-author | | | | |
| **First name** |  | | **Surname** |  |
| **Organisation** |  | | | |
| Paper details |  | | | |
| **Paper title**  **(limited to 6 words)** | Choosing appropriate Rapid Transit alternatives to improve urban accessibility | | | |
| **Overview of presentation** (300-word maximum)  In light of the general election stances by both National and Labour in relation to the needs for rapid transit in Auckland; this paper considers that there is in fact a need to deliver a process that can be adopted that provides for an Alternatives Analysis to output the most comprehensive solution to the problem – rather than the most convenient, pre-defined, or populist solution.  For a comprehensive, and fundamentally unbiased, analysis to be carried out there needs to be an integrated approach to the needs of urban transport within either the city as a whole, suburbs, specific corridors or sub-areas; and the approach may be to consider a ‘standard’ households requirements for daily transport – and aim to achieve this as a blue print for the alternatives analysis. In many cases this may be a combination of Public Transport (PT), Non-Motorised Transport (NMT), Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS)and the road infrastructure, operations, management and public transport service improvements to comprehensively address the urban transport problems including but absolutely not limited to congestion.  The analysis focuses on making public and non-motorized transport safer and more attractive; whilst trying to achieve the cost effectiveness for the user and the authority, and there are certain factors that will impact the mass transit mode requirements that range from Strategic goals and objectives (Transport, Land use, Social, environment, economic etc) to current and future general travel and any existing rapid transit market; to the future multi-modal transport network size, condition, performance and future land use patterns…offset against the financial resources, current and future needs.  It is noted that the alternatives analysis for rapid transit is not merely a traditional feasibility study; it is grounded in the need to consider the modes choices and achieve multi-modal system integration as a critical delivery – by making each alternative as competitive as possible.  Only then can the process ensure that all investment decisions are, and should be, ‘political’ and that the alternatives analysis provides the decision support information and stakeholder buy-in to support the decision made. Only then, once the selection is made, can the process results and stakeholder relationships be maximised to build momentum for the project.  Ultimately “the process” must achieve the objective of the improvement of performance of Multi-Modal Transport System in moving people and goods and the delivery of the correctly considered rapid transit mode and corridor. | | | | |