

NZUAG SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORTS

Overall attendance (approx 399 delegates, excluding presenters)

Corridor managers TA – 150 NZTA -30 Rail -0

Utility Operators* Electricity – 39 Gas – 24 Telcos – 35 Waters - 34

Others Consultant – 35 Contractor – 34 Others - 14

* Vector and PowerCo have been recorded as Gas, to avoid double counting

Summary of Evaluation Ratings

| | Whole meeting | Met Expectations | Presentations Overall | Venue/catering |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Poor | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Fair | 5 | 7 | 6 | 25 |
| Satisfactory | 47 | 49 | 40 | 54 |
| Good | 105 | 110 | 99 | 17 |
| Very Good | 120 | 117 | 134 | 83 |
| Excellent | 10 | 14 | 20 | 42 |

WELLINGTON, Friday 1 May 2009

Responses (37 out of possible 54) came from:

Corridor Managers – 3 NZTA, 7 TLA

Utility operators – 9 gas, 9 telco, 2 waters, 1 electricity

Agents – 3 Contractors, 1 consultant

Others -2

Evaluations

| | Whole meeting | Met Expectations | Presentations Overall | Room | Food | Venue overall |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|------|------|---------------|
| Poor | - | - | - | 14 | | 1 |
| Fair | 1 | 1 | - | | | 2 |
| Satisfactory | 10 | 12 | 6 | | | 10 |
| Good | 14 | 16 | 15 | | | 8 |
| Very Good | 10 | 6 | 11 | | 1 | 5 |
| Excellent | 2 | 3 | 4 | | 11 | 3 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|--|--|--|
| | 37 | 38 | 36 | | | |
|--|----|----|----|--|--|--|

Comments

General:

- Encouraged the gathering of minds – I hope this works.
- Good attempts to keep to time-keeping.
- Very informative and good content.
- Good audience engagement and questions.
- Wasn't really aimed at the contractor level (*the second contractor rated everything GOOD and the third one rated everything VERY GOOD*)
- Need to reinforce this is an NZUAG initiative – change name tags of speakers. (*they were carrying the NZUAG logo so not sure what was the problem*)
- Flowed very well – relevant to current issues
- Still have concerns that the Code does not address varied requirements between different councils.
- In following scene of commonality – I expect all CM will be implementing a common electronic web based system for handling CARs, WANS etc
- Heavily focused on high level principles but wanted to learn more details.
- Long overdue to have a National Standard to work against.
- Great discussion, very worthy topics
- Clear and well-spoken
- Thanks for the update and networking opportunity
- Good coverage at a high general level.
- Very readable slides – not too much info.
- Suggestions for a slide showing the comparative timings for the Bill and the Code implementation were given (*Fiona will have a go at incorporating some of this.*)

Suggestions for these seminars

- Could separate some aspects for a discussion session rather than a presentation approach (maybe as a follow-up?)
- Would recommend that you shorten the session presented by Ian Cox in the morning session.
- More time spent on the actual code rather than the process and legislative requirements. (2)
- More detail on processes
- Time and content control in the morning needs a rethink

- I suggest a 5 minute break after each hour
- Need to read audience more
- Add in QUEST for quality systems
- The conversation of “The Terrace” may turn off other meetings (ie a shiny suit initiative from Wellington). Explain how this applies in Opotiki or Waimate
- Including people’s job title on the attendance list would be useful

Suggestions for the future:

- Needs time before more input sessions
- Will need to repeat after the passing of Bill and subsequent amendments to the Code
- As we now enter the period where the Code might be “road-tested” in the industry before final adoption legislation, will there be any feedback process to feed on experiences and lessons learnt?
- Risk assessment: especially power poles. Given the new Government’s “Safe Systems” vision, who/how and when will power poles subject to regular strikes by vehicles be assessed? Also ultimately where would the financial burden lie to protect or remove such poles on the roadside given the \$\$ gains are not purely safety (less maintenance for a utility?) This, I would suspect, would be in advance of any CAR.
- If all parties are to submit forward programmes to the CM, does he then collate these and issue them to all utilities to allow voluntary coordination, or does CM attempt to coordinate a number of utilities?

Venue – other than room size for the number of delegates, and catering

- Parking and directions very poor – embarrassing if this is the standard Wellington provides.
- Venue not accessible by public transport

List of organisations attending

WELLINGTON 1 MAY: CAPITAL HOUSE CONFERENCE CENTRE

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Aidan Kelly Contracting | 1 |
| AJBroom Road Products NZ Ltd | 1 |
| Capacity Wellington Water Management | 2 |
| Chorus | 4 |
| Citylink | 1 |
| Downer EDI Engineering | 2 |
| FX Networks Ltd | 1 |
| Hutt City Council | 1 |
| Infratrains | 2 |
| Linework and Stones Ltd | 1 |
| Marlborough Lines | 3 |
| Nelson City Council | 1 |
| New Zealand Transport Agency | 6 |
| Porirua City Council | 2 |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Powerco | 9 |
| Ruapehu District Council | 1 |
| Transfield Services | 3 |
| Transpower NZ Ltd | 2 |
| Upper Hutt City Council | 1 |
| Vector | 1 |
| Wellington City Council | 4 |

CHRISTCHURCH, Wednesday 6 May 2009**Responses (49 out of possible 71) came from:**

Corridor Managers – 3 NZTA, 17 TLA

Utility operators – 0 gas, 5 telco, 8 waters, 6 electricity

Agents – 4 Contractors, 5 consultant

Others -4

Evaluations

| | Whole meeting | Met Expectations | Presentations Overall | Venue catering |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Poor | - | 1 | - | 2 |
| Fair | 3 | 2 | 3 | 10 |
| Satisfactory | 11 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| Good | 16 | 17 | 14 | 15 |
| Very Good | 18 | 19 | 21 | 9 |
| Excellent | 1 | - | 1 | 3 |
| | | | | |

Comments

- I felt as a contractor that the afternoon sessions were really not for me, but for councils to brainstorm implementation of the Code.
- Also though under the above light, that it was quite expensive
- Having attended previous workshops, found little value in attending all day
- At the price paid, it is estimated total to come in around \$15,000 for the seminar. Not bad. Expect better facilities
- We look forward to its implementation – long time coming but worth the wait.
- Had a good informative day
- Good overview of Code. Slides were well –prepared and contain the important overview to pass to others
- Programme got the point across – some presentations were a little long, and some info was covered more than once.
- Content was a little too good and now leads to more work
- A lot of the subjects are being observed or complied at CCC
- Interesting but little use to contractors at this point. Councils have a lot of work to do to nail internal systems and communication so contractors don't get caught in the middle.
- Re-iterated some content from previous seminars that could have been left out to allow new content on items such as how Code can/will operate in real life.
- Good representation across the engineering sector. Questions related to different aspects of due consideration
- Repeated many issues discussed at previous workshops and often left questions open-ended in response. Correction- this changed at the end of the afternoon session.
- Each presenter well versed in the Code and its implications for all utility providers and RCAs
- The session morning tea- lunch was too ;on- we were too hungry to ask questions
- Overall, NZYUAG has done a good job. I appreciate it must have been difficult to balance the wishes of all parties. Well done.

- Excellent overview of Code requirements and role of council as CM. Also useful to hear comments from UOs in attendance.
- We have accepted the Code- don't need to sell it to us- ie much of morning session not necessary. Get into detail – filling out forms, risk analysis, team exercises, debate between sectors
- Thanks for the time and effort to keep us informed
- Too much opportunity for people to hijack the meeting with random or ill-informed questions and comments
- First couple gave a direction on where the seminar was headed but after that the presentation lacked direction
- Little added that couldn't be found by reading the Code
- This workshop was very expensive for what it was, certainly compared with LTSA which are free.
- Good to see contractors here. A broadening interest and perspective
- I have heard this before – not much new
- Good to see PowerCo
- It needs to happen – we're nearly there!

Suggestions for the future:

- *(gave suggestions for content which have been included in the file for suggested changes)*
- My fear is that the CM will need to report information to someone eg NZ Govt. Next Audit NZ will pick up on this and that's another paragraph in the LTCCP
- Funding should be a set \$ fee on each CAR
- Cost to run NZUAG could be done on a cost per CAR.
- Need to focus on outside parties- known utilities is a quality issue: this can manage that.
- Will require commitment from utilities to ensure WCNs are filled out and sent back by contractors. Difficult for RCA to pursue out of town contractors to carry out remedial work.
- Include industry accredited training
- Suggest to manage these processes will be challenging to monitor – local maintenance obligations in particular
- In most cases, existing RCAs approve landscape tree planting and management. Why does such work in the road not come under the scope of the CM to ensure other utilities are not compromised – as they frequently are! It appears every-one works around trees but tree planters must consider no-one.
- Sign-off by iwi should be obtained by the designer. CM and UO can then confirm during the CAR application that this has been done to the correct level during the timeframe.
- Investigate private utilities in road reserve, and how to handle them
- Looking good
- Questions will be posed on-line for general viewing in terms of FAQ. NZUAG will provide valuable guidance for CM and UO in the future until quality agreed systems are in place.
- I accept that the code relates to UOs but the non-utility operators ie private water schemes, are significant
- Future could be as an NZ Standard document- \$\$ will be found when change is needed

- The UO should as-built all parts of their infrastructure installed within the corridor. The as-built could clearly indicate the private UO ownership and responsibilities. At least this would be a good guide to the other UOs of the existence of a utility.
- The Code is good. However at CCC we use the 2002:2003 handbook so it is significantly the application and use of the Code that is important to move forward. NZUAG will need to work with coordinated planning of TLAs and UOs as the first and most important step.
- Payment for location of services and supply of plans

Venue –

- Paid the price for sitting in the back seats. Poor design, uncomfortable and hard in the back for long periods
- Need bigger space, parking convenience,
- Space was not optimal for the number of delegates (several)
- Lack of tables for all , and congested at lunch/coffee time.
- The people I sat next to were so squashed that we had to take turns standing up
- Nice venue but a bit cramped and a bit hard to hear without a sound system
- Quite warm

Sound

- Acoustics were not very good

Catering

- Food should improve
- Food/catering was very good
- It's a shame you ran out of lunch
- Water bottles not refilled
- Food was a pleasant surprise

CHRISTCHURCH 6 MAY: OLD PROVINCIAL CENTRE

| | |
|--|----|
| Alpine Energy Ltd | 2 |
| Bore Tech Ltd | 1 |
| Buller District Council | 1 |
| Chorus | 4 |
| Christchurch City Council | 11 |
| Christchurch City Networks Ltd | 1 |
| Connectrix Southern Ltd | 1 |
| GHD Limited | 1 |
| Hurunui District Council | 4 |
| Infratrain | 2 |
| Isaac Construction | 1 |
| Mackenzie District Council | 1 |
| Mainpower Contracting Ltd | 4 |
| Marlborough District Council | 2 |
| Network Waitaki Limited | 1 |
| NZ Transport Agency | 3 |
| NZTA-Marlborough Roads | 1 |
| Opus International Consultants | 4 |
| Orion | 2 |
| Project Design & Construction (2007) Ltd | 1 |
| Selwyn District Council | 1 |

| | |
|--|---|
| SICON Ltd | 1 |
| Tasman District Council | 1 |
| TelstraClear | 2 |
| Timaru District Council | 5 |
| Trifecta Global Infrastructure Solutions | 1 |
| Waimakariri District Council | 3 |
| Waimate District council | 2 |
| Waugh Infrastructure Management Ltd | 1 |

BALCLUTHA, Thursday 7 May 2009**Responses (37 out of possible 44) came from:**

Corridor Managers – 3 NZTA, 13 TLA

Utility operators – 0 gas, 3 telco, 10 waters, 3 electricity

Agents – 0 Contractors, 3 consultant

Others -2

Evaluations

| | Whole meeting | Met Expectations | Presentations Overall | Venue catering |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Poor | - | 1 | - | - |
| Fair | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Satisfactory | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Good | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Very Good | 25 | 20 | 19 | 17 |
| Excellent | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 |
| | | | | |

Comments

- A little bit too general, more detail would be helpful
- Would have been good to see contractors attending
- Very well prepared, very informative
- Quite new, and a lot of info to digest
- Not a lot new from what we had from previous workshop
- Lots of reading to do!
- Later session more discussion and more focused on actual issues
- Probably a little bit generic – need working detail of what things really mean and how NZUAG expects things to work
- Good mix of presenters, clear slides, well heard
- Done well
- More chocolates appreciated, and test/ teasing our minds
- Discussions were held long enough to get views and cut out of it stating to recycle
- Very informative
- Too long spent in consultative process – more details of processes for implementing
- Good range of speakers with thorough knowledge of Code
- Good presentations, venue and timing
- Very good coverage of the subject, well prepared and organised. Good presentations and added zest through quiz etc
- On the mark for the topic and at the right level for attendees. Good length of presentations and good use of data show to break up text/speech
- A bit boring
- Good facility to improve knowledge on something we don't manage to assign time to during normal business pressures
- Excellent open informative workshop with some great discussion

- A damn good workshop that really gave some real clarity to the Code and its history – along day though.
- The papers were focused and very self-explanatory. A huge amount of info in a short time.
- Presentations varied a little but all were informative
- Good synopsis of the CoP
- Need to remember separation between CM role against RCA job – quite different
- Needed participation of Nelson presenter to get full benefit

Suggestions for the future

- I see this as quite onerous for our consultative requirements, and how do we capture no UOs who work in the road, such as stock underpasses
- Morning overview would be achieved if participants had read the Code
- Want details on what people are doing for special and local conditions
- Would like to coordinate a regional mailing list
- Some clarification of specific clauses eg what is a congested area?
- Work towards a national qualification in utilities installation, including pipe laying, pipe welding, trenching, sawcutting, use of levelling instruments, backfilling procedures, TMP, cable laying, health and safety, problem solving techniques, trench reinstatement techniques, testing etc.
- Initiation of clusters is probably the biggest benefit
- There is a need for NZUAG to maintain the Code (ownership) we are users of the system. Someone needs to be the owner.
- Given the focus on the CM from a more operational focus to strategic planning, what skills/competencies are expected of the CM?
- Overall the Code is a good piece of work by the group. Important to continue through implementation and improvement phases. Keep up the good work.
- Monitor progress and flag central government needs
- Extend Code to other corridors ie DoC administered land, waterways etc, and to private roads

Venue

- Room temperature fan on/off (several)
- Climate control not too flash
- Air con noisy, but necessary to stop room being stuffy. Lollies/mints often needed in air conditioned environment
- Accommodation a bit too congested
- Peppermints were missing (several)
- Nice toilets and plenty of parking
- Great facility and food/drink very suitable for the occasion.
- Venue was bad as was too far to travel, but catering was very good.
- Venue is excellent
- Room size good

Catering

- Very good selection of foods
- Food was fantastic, plenty of water and coffee
- Would be good to have some fruit available for lunch (several)
- Catering excellent

Location

- Great for Clutha DC people (Clutha)
- 2.5 hours drive from Oamaru, and 3 hours to go to ChCh. Closer would be appreciated (Oamaru)
- Would be happy to travel to Balclutha or Dunedin. Invercargill would be too far so would go to ChCh (Oamaru)
- Balclutha is not quite central for us from Queenstown, Gore would be better (two)
- Balclutha good- reasonably central (Dunedin)

- Balclutha is a good location, central for Southland and Dunedin (Southland)

List of organisations attending

BALCLUTHA 7 MAY: ROSEBANK LODGE

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| BureauCo Ltd | 1 |
| Chorus | 2 |
| Clutha District Council | 4 |
| Downer EDI Engineering | 1 |
| Dunedin City Council | 3 |
| Fulton Hogan | 1 |
| Gore District Council | 5 |
| Infratrain | 1 |
| Invercargill City Council | 3 |
| MWH New Zealand | 3 |
| Opus International Consultants | 1 |
| Powernet | 3 |
| Queenstown Lakes District Council | 3 |
| Southland District Council | 8 |
| Waitaki District Council | 2 |

PALMERSTON NORTH, Friday 15 May 2009**Responses (61 out of possible 71) came from:**

Corridor Managers – 3 NZTA, 22 TLA

Utility operators – 1 gas, 6 telco, 7 waters, 7 electricity

Agents – 1 Contractors, 8 consultant

Others -4

Evaluations

| | Whole meeting | Met Expectations | Presentations Overall | Venue catering |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Poor | - | - | - | - |
| Fair | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| Satisfactory | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Good | 21 | 20 | 17 | 13 |
| Very Good | 29 | 26 | 33 | 24 |
| Excellent | 4 | 5 | 4 | 22 |
| | | | | |

Comments

- We support the Code and its implementation. Mainly commonsense stuff and benefits all. One of our main concerns is about resources for attending liaison meetings with so many CMs
- Most of the content I was already familiar with, but there were a few new items. Interesting to see most councils (apart from Transit) seemed to welcome the Code and its contents
- Excellent providers who knew their subject. Pity that OHP sometimes dropped out.
- Good overview. Clear, well understood speakers
- Preaching to the converted
- Needed more detail of procedure
- Great- explained the procedure of the code well
- Well done to NZUAG (*was alongside the whole page*)
- Rather static but more relevant than I expected
- A little repetitive, clear presenters
- Too long- had enough by 1 and 2pm
- Good clear presentation of all issues, process well understood by all presenters.
- Good attendance
- A useful introduction. Presenters knowledgeable but difficult to hear at the back at times.
- Very good and informative. Content should make things easier for every-one
- First stage went over old ground, not necessary
- After lunch preaching to the converted
- Bit of a pity that some of the presenters couldn't attend, but beyond their control
- Good meeting- great turnout
- Should utilise the parking lot a lot more for control of time
- Was my first time for seeing the material – informative and a great way forward.
- These gatherings are great networking chances and give members a chance to old workmates who are now in positions of responsibility
- Thought provoking- good to identify issues needing attention

Suggestions for the future

- Keep developing the guide- it's an evolving document so it needs to be continued to be supported by NZUAG'
- WAN documentation should read "commence" in 6 months, not "complete" in 6 months
- Agree that quality issues, retention of contractor competence, qualification criteria are ones that NZUAG could usefully develop for nationwide consistency
- The Code will be great to get CMs implementing a consistent method of managing the transport corridors
- Details on funding for training requirements
- Reference to OSH to be taken out of Code- obsolete now.
- 1. National Code. 2. Standard- working in the Road. 3 local conditions
- Great to see comments/feedback has been incorporated into the Code. Very happy to see greater consensus and clarification with this being legislated. Will be much easier to enforce with contractors.
- Devil will be in the detail. Good and bad experiences should be reported on the website.
- NZUAG to be incorporated with membership by CM and UO for a base fee and then funding by applications for CARs. Member surveys and reporting helps with KPIs and justification
- Managing conflicts between code and RMA
- We will require all parties to respect and deliver the intended outcome of this Code
- How can we make the utility operators to reuse their service ducts instead of congesting the corridor reserve?
- Keep taking the load until processes become embedded.
- Need to confirm training/workshopping for contractors who work on the assets
- How will breaches of the code be dealt with? Will penalties be applied? These questions could be discussed further
- I still got the feeling there is US and THEM, the CM versus UO
- More input from contractors who work for both parties may bring it together better.
- To be incorporated into LGNZ or Ingenium? Last thing we need is another industry group.
- Code should be an NZ Standard or independent act – legislation can make Code/NZ Standard a requirement. Eg Trans[port Corridors Act requires compliance with NZS45
- If Treasury Infrastructure group broadens its scope beyond Govt assets, this may be the best agency to manage the standard. This dovetails into greater national asset management issues.
- Time to implement
- Notification process could lead to delays
- What about delay clauses if LA cannot inspect on UO timescale?
- Additional cost of preferred contractors? Who should pay?
- Bring up-to-speed councils together with under-performing councils to bring them up to speed. No need to reinvent old wheels
- Develop mediation team
- Review the code at least 3 yearly
- Clarify whether the Code will be a Standards NZ document
- Procurement – several seminars have already been conducted by Ingenium and NZTA so no need to repeat
- Can't help thinking that this process has probably been in place in highways engineering in UK, Europe, USA etc. Has NZUAG looked at any of the current models and methods in place in the above countries that we could perhaps adopt and use in NZ. What is being done in Australia?

Venue

- facility up to its usual high standard
- better venue than last time
- more toilets and 2 tables to speed drinks
- needed microphones for speakers and questions from the floor (several)
- nice to be able to sit down for lunch
- plenty of parking (several)
- room a little too long- made it hard to hear at the back due to external noise (cleaning up from lunch)
- easy to get to and away from for out of towners
- great interest in the photos and jerseys on the wall

Catering

- food and coffee were cold
- food was very good (several)
- catering staff could have been friendlier
- food is tasty and plenty of choice

**List of organisations attending
PALMERSTON NORTH: 15 May
2009**

MASSEY UNIVERSITY SPORTS and RUGBY INSTITUTE

| | |
|--|---|
| BureauCo Ltd | 1 |
| Chorus | 6 |
| Department of Labour | 1 |
| Duffill Watts Ltd (CPG) | 3 |
| Hastings District Council | 4 |
| Horowhenua District Council | 2 |
| Kapiti Coast District Council | 1 |
| Manawatu District Council | 9 |
| Masterton District Council | 1 |
| MWH New Zealand | 3 |
| Napier City Council | 1 |
| New Plymouth District Council | 4 |
| NZ Transport Agency | 5 |
| Opus International Consultants | 3 |
| Palmerston North City Council | 5 |
| Powerco | 9 |
| South Taranaki District Council | 2 |
| Tararua District Council | 2 |
| Transfield Services | 1 |
| Trifecta Global Infrastructure Solutions | 1 |
| Wanganui District council | 2 |

ROTORUA, Tuesday 19 May 2009**Responses (59 out of possible 73) came from:**

Corridor Managers – 1 NZTA, 22 TLA

Utility operators – 3 gas, 6 telco, 9 waters, 9 electricity

Agents – 2 Contractors, 7 consultant

Others - nil

Evaluations

| | Whole meeting | Met Expectations | Presentations Overall | Venue catering |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Poor | - | - | - | - |
| Fair | - | - | 1 | 4 |
| Satisfactory | 19 | 18 | 20 | 8 |
| Good | 23 | 22 | 21 | 12 |
| Very Good | 16 | 18 | 16 | 28 |
| Excellent | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| | | | | |

Comments**General:**

- Someone should have been downstairs to meet/greet and inform people where to go for breakfast food
- What implications does this Code have for District Plans?
- Very well presented
- No real expectations prior to attending so good outcome
- Rated Satisfactory because I'd been to the "draft" seminar which was quite similar – Good afternoon session though
- Good to get an overview and examples from others
- I think if every-one worked together it would be great but not holding my breath on that
- Time will tell
- Very impressed with the focus on the need for communication between all parties
- Workshop was good to get out information on Code in plain English
- Still in the dark
- Interesting content
- Good ideas
- Good managers don't always make good presenters
- Steps in the right direction – consistency
- Tough topic – could have been delivered better
- Good uniform process. Certainly standardises the notification process
- Really good progress since 2007. Suggest Transit reps (Beca, Opus, EDI) attend this presentation as it's at this level we experience problems
- Covered the subject well – competent experienced practitioners
- More directed at utility owners than contractors

Funding:

- Individual accounts to each TA and each industry

Suggestions for the future:

- NZUAG needs to maintain the document in its living state – always keep it up to date
- Booklet- summary to distribute to stakeholders
- Send out regular updates on web or email
- More publicity on who NZUAG are, what they do apart from the Code, and the structure (current)
- How is the transfer of documents to be handled? What database, if any, to house the requests, approvals or to notify the warranty period is up
- 2 year warranty more than capital works maximum 1 year
- 2 year warranty not practical to implement – shouldn't be necessary if all other QA/QC testing and inspections had been adequate. Recommend 4 month- 1 year.
- Delete the 2 year maintenance period NOW! (telco) (several)
- 2 year warranty is ridiculous – do not take responsibility away from contractors, rather create a better supervision structure requirement
- Rotorua has this process underway
- Gave me a better understanding of implications and issues relating to the Code
- Believe that utility assets should be GPS recorded
- Would be useful to have this presentation specifically geared towards policy planners/strategic planners as it will become legislation
- How will transgressors be punished? What process?
- The process regarding as-built information handover needs to be coordinated so that existing services identified are dimensioned also
- Perhaps Napier could be considered for a venue for any future workshops
- Keep us included in the process by email

Venue –

- Room setting was a little daunting, felt like we were going back to school rather than discussing implications of the Code
- A circular venue would be better for involvement by the whole group
- Excellent parking and venue location (several)
- Hard to find if you don't know your way around
- Great venue, facilities, sound system, catering, well done

Sound –

- need to use microphones (several)
- questions difficult to hear (several)
- needs consistency for future presentations – missed lots of conversations spoken

Catering:

- not enough food for lunch or morning tea - several
- good selection of fruit
- hot items were cold

- catering poor- asked for pregnancy friendly food and everything had cold meat or soft cheese, except the cake and fruit.
- food good and varied
- coffee hardly warm enough
- great food
- salmon was bloody fantastic!

List of organisations attending

ROTORUA: 19 May 2009

ROTORUA ENERGY EVENTS CENTRE

| | |
|--|---|
| Beca | 1 |
| Castlecorp-RDC | 2 |
| Chorus | 5 |
| CPG New Zealand Ltd | 3 |
| Electrix Ltd | 1 |
| Gisborne District Council | 2 |
| Hamilton City Council | 3 |
| Hauraki District Council | 1 |
| Infratrain | 2 |
| MWH New Zealand | 1 |
| Napier City Council | 4 |
| NZ Transport Agency | 3 |
| Opus International Consultants | 6 |
| Rotorua District Council | 5 |
| South Waikato District Council | 2 |
| Taupo District Council | 3 |
| Tauranga City Council | 4 |
| Tenix Alliance | 1 |
| Transfield Services | 1 |
| Transpower NZ Ltd | 1 |
| Trifecta Global Infrastructure Solutions | 1 |
| Unison Networks Ltd | 6 |
| Vector | 5 |
| Waikato District Council | 5 |
| Western Bay of Plenty District Council | 1 |

AUCKLAND, Wednesday 20 May 2009

Responses (62 out of possible 89) came from:

Corridor Managers – 8 NZTA, 17 TLA

Utility operators – 3 gas, 10 telco, 9 waters, 7 electricity

Agents – 6 Contractors, 5 consultant

Others - 1

Evaluations

| | Whole meeting | Met Expectations | Presentations Overall | Venue catering |
|--------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Poor | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Fair | - | 1 | - | 7 |
| Satisfactory | 3 | 5 | 2 | 25 |
| Good | 25 | 27 | 23 | 19 |
| Very Good | 32 | 28 | 34 | 11 |
| Excellent | 1 | - | 2 | - |
| | | | | |

Comments

- thought there was to be more about the Code
- very good presentation; thanks for all the effort that obviously went into this.
- We heard a number of good presenters
- Good networking opportunities. Also provided good ops for discussion/feedback
- Helped me get my thinking straight in a couple of areas.
- Workshops like this allow the opportunity for catch-up and networking
- Good inclusive discussion format
- Very little discussion about cost share issues, and it seems not much will change, but in reality there are still challenges in determining cost shares based on different interpretations of the utilities by different organisations eg definition of filling, scope of work, timing of works, (meeting delivery programmes) and consequential follow-on impacts
- Case studies good
- Good coverage and involvement by presenters
- Some issues raised have been addressed by other organisations/countries – why reinvent the wheel? (eg UK Streetworks Qualifications Register)
- More examples of Auckland road opening situations would have been useful

- Felt the content could have been covered more quickly- didn't need a whole day
- Well done (several)

Suggestions for the Future

- Essential to have one national body managing the Code ongoing- NZUAG or similar
- Will waterways be included or considered in the code in future?
- With ref to 11.4 Stop work orders, there needs to be consideration to this authority as it could create an unsafe situation
- not every-one who should have attended did attend. We will spread the message. Good to get a copy of the presentations in CD form.
- Re one CM for Auckland or many: I believe that is not appropriate for NZUAG to comment. Many CMs could manage better as long as work as a team. Let's communicate!! Cluster
- Re non-utility operators, must be controlled under this Code
- Lack of process around RMA works that affect utilities
- Need to cover water/stormwater/ sewer in the legislation
- Why different timeframes for approval of specific dates (5-10 days from CAR) versus 2 days for TMP?
- What about a centralised recording system/ non-private organisation for all utilities
- Discussion today was critical of the picture on the cover of the Code- perhaps we should have an image of an appropriately managed site.
- Please keep contact with all parties
- Focus on services provided by asset not the assets
- More emphasis on future maintenance needs
- Training of contractors- less auditing may be required
- Doing it Right booklet should be updated after the Code has been adopted- do it once, do it right!
- Accuracy of horizontal (plan) records need to be tightened to at least + or - 0.1m, same as vertical plane accuracy.
- Align NZUAG with or being part of Ingenium
- Develop a simple presentation to deliver the message to those who have not attended the seminar. Talk to all groups who will listen!
- Perhaps more coverage on the content of the Code as not every-one has the time to read the whole book.
- What's the difference between the new Code practice and the current process in the LGAct?

- Support more involvement with the town planner profession, rather than just the engineers, even though the NZUAG may not want to be involved with RMA issues – the industry can't avoid to talk on these issues and involvement from planners also helps to enhance their awareness of the issues you guys are facing...
- Prioritise the next most important steps eg training standards
- Pipe location should be in reference to a recognised grid such as NZ map grid
- Consideration to be made of private services in the corridors.
- Keep monitoring website and update Code as required
- Needs some flexibility for time frames recognising different issues in various regions/clusters
- Keep up the good work
- Need some clarification on specific items that relate to NZTA Auckland
- UOs need to get message out to frontline project managers: many not even aware of Code
- Perhaps help run regional workshops to educate frontline project managers and principal contractors
- Let's get the Code into use to see how it is used and if it meets the objectives set for it – then tweak it to address the shortfalls or weaknesses. Keep the momentum going!!
- Need another type of workshop- how to implement to specific work area.
- Cost share- need to assure the costs are actually 50/50 if this is adopted. RCAs may be paying full cost because we are not aware of real costs

Venue

- Excessive ambient noise (lots)
- Too stuffy
- Bloody cold
- Lighting levels poor (several)
- a/c was a bit cool, otherwise fine
- convenient location (2)
- limited parking off site (lots) – why couldn't we use the car parking in the grounds?
- PA system needs tweaking (several)
- This is a rugby park with a rugby stand attached to it – not a conference room with the correct facilities. Try North Harbour Stadium next time.
- Chairs too hard (several)
- Location= prefer North Harbour Stadium as I come from north

Catering

- probably a little under-catered at lunch
- Food no good- stale old croissants
- Food marginally OK
- NO peppermints!
- Prefer water jugs on tables
- Catering was good

Offer of assistance from Caitlin Metz of Chorus to help on equivalence, implementation of NES, contract management

List of organisations attending

AUCKLAND: 20 May 2009

MT SMART STADIUM

| | |
|---|---|
| Auckland City Council | 9 |
| Auckland Motorway Alliance | 4 |
| Auckland Road Maintenance Alliance- West | 1 |
| Chorus | 5 |
| CJN Technologies Ltd | 1 |
| Counties Power | 4 |
| Downer EDI Engineering | 4 |
| Downer EDI Works Ltd | 1 |
| Electrix Ltd | 1 |
| Franklin District Council | 2 |
| Fulton Hogan | 1 |
| Infratrain | 1 |
| Kaipara District Council | 1 |
| Manukau City Council | 3 |
| MWH New Zealand | 1 |
| North Shore City Council | 5 |
| Northpower | 7 |
| NZ Transport Agency | 5 |
| Opus International Consultants | 1 |
| Papakura District Council | 4 |
| PipeWorks | 2 |
| SafeTTM Ltd | 1 |
| Tasman District Council | 1 |
| The New Zealand Refining Company Ltd | 1 |
| Transfield Services | 2 |
| Trifecta Global Infrastructure Solutions | 1 |

| | |
|------------------------|----|
| Vector | 4 |
| Waitakere City Council | 1 |
| Watercare Services Ltd | 12 |