

CoPTTM Consult policy changes 1 October 2016 onwards

Set out on the following pages are the policy change CoPTTM Consult submissions received since October 2016. These are currently under consideration along with some submissions received prior to October 2016.


No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
1.		<p>This is a suggestion to include greater guidance in CoPTTM for the setting of levels, particularly those that are busy urban roads that might be candidates for Level 2LS.</p> <p>In AT's evaluation of roads for the setting of Level 2LS TTM levels for what would normally be Level 2, we identified some environmental features that we believe reinforce or influence the choice of either Level 2 or 2LS. I have thus tabulated this below. My suggestion is for similar information (whatever is appropriate) to be incorporated into CoPTTM with the incorporation of the recent Technical Notice on Level 2LS roads.</p>	<p>Refer to Guidance for choice of Level 2LS at rear of this document</p>		
2.	A5.8.3	<p>Please see below conversation currently in process.</p> <p>This is an issue that is currently covered in CoPTTM (responsibilities of the STMS A5.8.3) but there might need to be clarification.</p>			

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
		<p>John has not entirely correctly described the situation (which of course would happen when information is obtained third hand). The essence of the issue is correct regarding the fibre roll out but have omitted to refer to how overlapping sites are handled as documented in CoPTTM – refer A5.8.3. Thought also needs to be directed to the likely consequences. In the fibre situation, the Level 2 STMS are often experienced and competent whilst the Level 1 STMS' are not so much. As a result, the level 2 STMS have a problem accepting the poor set out of the adjacent site even though it often provides the side road warning for their site PLUS it is part of the same TMP and same approval (CAR).</p> <p>The proposal below of possibly having separate STMS' managing different aspects of what appears to be one Worksite (multiple workspaces) is inherently going to lead to challenges when one performs well and the other(s) don't as described above.</p> <p>In addition, safety officials have previously (organisation prior to Worksafe) made statements such as “one worksite, One STMS”.</p> <p>Happy to receive feedback on this.</p> <p>Refer to Combining worksites at the rear of this document</p>			
3.	B12.1.4 Channelling traffic C18.7 Delineation	<p>Where barriers are installed with chevrons on top (with appropriate road markings) in urban road environments, the need for other forms of delineation such as cones (C18.7) is removed. However, normally delineation in the urban road environment is spaced at 5 m centres whereas rural is at 10 m centres. Typically urban environments are constrained so the removal of</p>	<p>Recommendation: Consider matching spacing of chevrons with that of delineation, ie, spacing of 10 m rural and 5 m urban.</p>		

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
		need for			

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
		<p>Changes will be required to the above clauses if this recommendation is accepted.</p> <p>I note also that B12.1.4 requires the installation of chevrons (“must”: “Barrier systems must be fitted with reflective markers (chevrons) as shown over the page”). Currently, very few barrier systems (where cone delineation is present) would comply with this requirement.</p> <p>Should “must” be replaced with “may”? If the barrier system is behind a line of delineation, nothing is to be gained by having chevrons installed. Thus it is only if chevrons <u>and</u> markings installed that the need for cones is removed.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Consider making chevrons optional for barrier systems where cone delineation is present.</p>		

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action			
4.	C10.2.10	<table border="1" data-bbox="465 256 969 470"> <tr> <td data-bbox="465 256 571 470">C10.2.10 Cyclists impacted by MTC operation</td> <td data-bbox="571 256 884 470"> <p>Added the following:</p> <p>Cyclists tend to move slower and in a manner different to other traffic. If the route is narrow or rough, consider one of the following options for dealing with cyclists impacted by the MTC operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate cyclists from the other traffic by time. This can be achieved by releasing the other traffic first with the cyclists following and ensuring that no traffic follows behind them until they have cleared the area of stop/go operation. This will require additional communication between the MTC and the cyclists/drivers to ensure they understand the process Create a temporary cycle lane. If there is sufficient road width a temporary cycle lane may be established for the </td> <td data-bbox="884 256 969 470">Incorporating the Technical Note Guidelines for managing cyclists where cycle lanes impacted by a worksite</td> </tr> </table> <p>The options shown for cyclists proceeding through MTC operations are given in an order contrary to the similar scenarios for pedestrians.</p>	C10.2.10 Cyclists impacted by MTC operation	<p>Added the following:</p> <p>Cyclists tend to move slower and in a manner different to other traffic. If the route is narrow or rough, consider one of the following options for dealing with cyclists impacted by the MTC operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate cyclists from the other traffic by time. This can be achieved by releasing the other traffic first with the cyclists following and ensuring that no traffic follows behind them until they have cleared the area of stop/go operation. This will require additional communication between the MTC and the cyclists/drivers to ensure they understand the process Create a temporary cycle lane. If there is sufficient road width a temporary cycle lane may be established for the 	Incorporating the Technical Note Guidelines for managing cyclists where cycle lanes impacted by a worksite	<p>Consider reversing the order of these options to show 'separation of cyclists by space' before 'separation by time' as the former option provides more controlled and continuous safety segregation than the time separation option.</p> <p>Much like the pedestrian options – consider showing them 'in order of preference'.</p>		
C10.2.10 Cyclists impacted by MTC operation	<p>Added the following:</p> <p>Cyclists tend to move slower and in a manner different to other traffic. If the route is narrow or rough, consider one of the following options for dealing with cyclists impacted by the MTC operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate cyclists from the other traffic by time. This can be achieved by releasing the other traffic first with the cyclists following and ensuring that no traffic follows behind them until they have cleared the area of stop/go operation. This will require additional communication between the MTC and the cyclists/drivers to ensure they understand the process Create a temporary cycle lane. If there is sufficient road width a temporary cycle lane may be established for the 	Incorporating the Technical Note Guidelines for managing cyclists where cycle lanes impacted by a worksite						

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
5.	Safe Gate for temporary pedestrian	<p>One of our teams would like to use the attached “Safe Gate” around telecommunications cabinets, open telecommunication pits, around ladders and small hand dug excavations in the berm (for installation/exposure of pedestals) as a physical separation between public and workers in place of cone bars and cones (attended). See examples at bottom. They would not be used as a safety fence.</p>			
6.	C15.2.2 “MTC’s at Site Access Points”.	<p>For as long as I can recall it has been considered to be a safe practice to stop traffic to allow plant and equipment to enter or exit a working space within an established worksite using a MTC (Stop /Go) person on all levels of road with the exception of Level 3.</p> <p>This practice is “condoned” in effect by clause C15.2.2 “MTC’s at Site Access Points”.</p>	<p>(a) This type of activity is currently permitted under D2.1.5 and the type of mobile activity would be in the form of a rolling closure of the lane / or alternate lane. This could be achieved by introducing a shadow vehicle to the lane and slowing the traffic flow gradually to maybe a complete stop for a maximum of two minutes. The position at which the traffic flow should be halted will be at the start of the taper which moves the existing lanes around the carriageway. The minimum equipment required on the shadow vehicle will be two flashing amber beacons and an arrow board in caution mode . A TV4 Pass with Care and a TD6L/R signs must not be used.</p>		

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
		<p>C15.2.2 MTCs at site access points</p> <p>Given this, the rules under which this is applied are non-existent and as a result we are being placed in a difficult position in some areas of the country where it is being suggested that the established site will need a full suite of MTC signage and cones thresholds to be install prior to the short term stoppage of traffic being permitted using a MTC.</p> <p>This can be a problem in that the primary TTM that is installed (say alternate lanes moved across the roadway) , does not require a full MTC set up for the majority of the time that the site is active.</p> <p>I guess that using MTC's to stop traffic for short periods of time is / has become a common practice to allow entry and exits to working spaces and to allow short duration work in Live lanes and that some rules need to be developed to at least manage the way this can be undertaken.</p>	<p>MTCs may be used o of vehicles into and o but they cannot slow</p> <p>Entry and exit to the e site access point.</p> <p>Note on a level 2 road this vehicle would be a Shadow TMA truck.</p> <p>(b) To operate single lane MTC closure within an established static work site, the work site must have advance warning and direction and protection signs including an approved temporary speed limit sign(s). The MTC shall be located on the left hand side of the road, behind at least 5 cones extending from the start of the taper or a point opposite the start of the taper . The MTC must have at least 120m clear visibility in both directions and clear visibility to the temporary closure position. The MTC must have a RP4/RP41 Stop /Go sign. Please note for this type of short term intermittent closure it is not necessary to install a TA2 Flagman sign, a RS1/TG1 30km/h Temporary Speed limit sign and a full MTC cone threshold treatment.</p>		

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
		<p>For your consideration here are some thoughts on a way to handle short term intermittent closures as above:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The maximum time permitted for the closure is 2 minutes ✓ The maximum number of times that this can be used on an established site is 4 times a day and no less than 60mins between each closure period. ✓ There are two main methods that can be used to achieve the closure, (a) mobile operation within an established static work site and /or (b) a single lane MTC closure within an established static work site, details of each type as follows: 			
7.	C18	Currently there is very soft wording surrounding the use of temporary road safety barrier systems and a lack of guidance as to when to deploy temporary barrier systems.	Instead of using statements such as "Temporary road safety barrier systems can be used" or "Generally barrier protection may be justified where there is..." use words such as must and should to strengthen the desire and need for safety barriers. Currently when discussing with contractors the use of barriers is optional and if they do not wish to deploy them they respond with "well we will just install delineation and a		

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
			<p>lateral safety zone.</p> <p>A Barrier decision matrix such as for TSLs would further assist in getting Contractors on board.</p>		
8.	Organisation Non-Conformance (Org NC)	<p>CTOC a few areas of this document need to be reviewed for clarity and intent. '3 strikes within a 12-month period' – CTOC feels this could be interpreted by contractors in various ways. E.g. a 12-month period could be 01 January 2015 to 01 January 2015. If an organisation has two NNCs in November and then one in March, they could try and say they felt the wording was not clear to them.</p> <p>'Any warnings and sanctions are applied at the branch level of a company' – CTOC feels this should be changes to either region or RCA boundary. For example, City Care in the CTOC boundary have at least 6 branch, this wording would make it easy for organisations to try and push the blame onto branches that don't have Org NNCs and effectively 'spread the load' so they don't get any sanctions. We recognize that ultimately CTOC will be issuing the Org NNC and can put them to the branch they feel it at fault, but this is likely to cause unnecessary friction between organisations and the RCA.</p>	<p>No specific wording suggested, just a reconsideration on the wording.</p> <p>No specific wording, consider changing to RCA boundary, region or at RCA discretion.</p>		

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
		It is mentioned several times that the NZTA will issue a letter to the organisation / subcontractor', there needs to be more clarity about to which level and/or who this letter is send to. Is it the head office or the branch specifically? We have had several organisation in our region advise us that they have not received a letter(s). CTOC would also like to receive a soft copy of these letter for our own records.	No specific wording, add clarity to where the letter is sent. Add internal process to send copy of letter to RCA.		
		Under 'Other sanctions which may be applied by RCA', this needs to be updated to allow for other sanctions as the RCA see fit. For example, we would look at revoking there generic TMPs/service agreements.	No specific wording, add flexibility for RCAs to add sanctions not mentioned.		
9.	D2.1.2 Workers on the back of a working vehicle	This clause might need rewording. For example, if the work vehicle is parked in a legal parking bay off the live lane on a Level 2 or 1 road, and workers access the back of the vehicle, they should not need a shadow. This is not what the existing clause states.	<small>D2.1.2 Workers on the back of a working vehicle</small> <hr/> <small>Workers on the back of a working vehicle must be protected by a shadow vehicle at all times.</small> <hr/>		
10.	N/A	When proposals are considered for change within CoPTTM there is a lack of consultation prior to CGG working parties beginning research into possible changes. This current practice does not allow for capturing already used guides or methods adopted by RCAs locally.	Proposal that CGG or COPTTM edit team to call for submissions and already used materials prior to working parties beginning research on specific subjects. This will provide a chance to capture already used guides and tested method changes, to CoPTTM, through Lops or policies of local RCAs.		

No.	CoPTTM Edition 4 reference	Error	Correction	NZTA decision	Action
11.	N/A	Currently there is a lack of knowledge from the public and road users as to what Temporary Road works signs mean and a misconception regarding usage at unattended sites.	CGG to propose that the NZ Transport Agency Road Code to be updates have a section included within it to show what different signs mean and represent. This will increase knowledge by road users and thus creating a safer journey for all by increasing awareness of what hazard warning signs mean.		
12.		There is no description in CoPTTM covering correct procedures for delivering goods. I am currently approaching local businesses involved in kerbside collection, however this doesn't cover skip delivery/collection or furniture removals (for example).			

John Boyson submission on revised L2/3 STMS NP training material

Neil and Tony to review and amend as required

Thank you for the revised L2-3 STMS NP refresher workshop material. I shall implement this from 1 July 2016 as directed in line with your later email covering L1 material. However I have a number of enquiries/suggestions (I have responded to you on these since you were the point of contact sending out the material. Obviously I understand that you will not be able to respond to the points I have made directly, however please can you pass them to the relevant party for a response:

Slide 6: There is a reference to an evaluation test, however the presentation does not have a slide showing its location in the presentation. When Neil Greaves and I discussed this material for NZTA we agreed that it would be better as a final test since I get a reasonable number of attendees who need the qualification but do not regularly use CoPTTM between the workshops. I do not believe it is reasonable for them to have to re-familiarise themselves with the code before attending the workshop.

Slide 6 refers to an opening test which is the Familiarisation test. The point of the familiarisation test is to give the attendees an opportunity to search or locate information in electronic or hard copy of CoPTTM. The time allocated for the test is an opportunity for the trainer to engage with the attendees to assist them with an understanding of how to locate items in CoPTTM.

Slide 24: The definition of the closure is wrong. It must be the area of **road corridor** from which the **public** are excluded. (Workers can also be road users in terms of compliance with land transport rules.) NB CoPTTM may also require updating in this regard.

The definition has been aligned to the glossary definition **Closure** - *The area from which road users are excluded*

Transferred to all packs following wording - The area that road users are excluded from

Slide 38: The reference to shoulder closures should be **static** shoulder closures. NB CoPTTM may also require updating in this regard.

Leave as is. This slide is referring to static closures. The definition of a mobile closure is *A normally continuously moving activity or work operation carried out within the road reserve that may also stop briefly at a particular location for a period of no more than 10 minutes. We have added a note under the slide to this effect.*

Slide 43: Nothing wrong with the slide, however my contact details on the NZTA website are incorrect: My contact telephone number is 021 901 405. Priscilla and I now have no land line number as was previously advised. The site also should note that I am

the ROPE contact nationwide not merely the upper north island. In fact the location distinction should be removed from all references since trainers can and do train anywhere where they receive a request.

Requested Kim to amend the information on accredited trainers list for John

Slide 49: The number of sections of the site record should be 6 not 5 as stated at the top of the slide.

Amended

Slide 72: The title should refer to multiple stacking of cones not simply double stacking. NB CoPTTM may also require updating in this regard.

Awaiting amended wording from another submitter. Will review and make changes once suggested wording is received

Slide 77: I believe the compliance date should be 1 July 2016. July 2016 is too vague.

We are now past July – this is not an issue any more

Slide 93: I prepared a suite of slides which better cover the speed limit selection matrix process as part of the work I did with Neil as noted above. I believe these should be used instead of what is provided here. I am requesting NZTA approval to continue use these to explain the process since it is a key area of TTM design which is not currently being well handled. I suggest that the workshop material be adapted to use these as well. I shall continue to use the slides I have created on this basis until I am directed otherwise by NZTA.

Your decision matrix slides have been included in the optional slides for other trainers to use if they want

Slides 153 and 154: There are a number of details that require clarification and CoPTTM direction. Specifically:

- What is a semi static ramp closure? This is not identified or referenced anywhere in CoPTTM!
We have removed the word ramp. It is now states (options include traffic/ramp signals or a semi-static closure)
- What is 5km point prior to the rolling block referenced to:
 - Where the block vehicles start to slow?
 - Where they come to near rest?
 - The back of the queue they are predicted to generate?
- What messages should the required electronic signs display?

All of the above points are also CoPTTM issues that require clarification

The slide has been amended as follows

Advance warning of queues ahead must be provided:

- **5km** in advance of the rolling block, and
- **1km** from the point where the block vehicles commence slowing of traffic, and
- **500m** in advance of the furthest extremity of the predicted queuing

If you feel you require further clarification of a rolling block, please put in a CoPTTM Consult

Amended STMS NP as well

Tests

All tests require a place to record total marks awarded

Agreed

Familiarisation (final?) test

I suggest 30 minutes would be necessary for this given the research required.

See comment 1

Test A:

General: there is no reference to the relevance of the CoPTTM reference boxes. Are these to be completed? I assume so, based on anecdotal information received. If so, how are they to be marked? There is no direction on this unlike the familiarisation test above.

A note has been added to the slide as a reminder to the trainer to explain the CoPTTM reference field

Question 2 is ambiguous: It specifically needs to state that the person is not entering the working space.

It now reads Where a visitor is wearing a compliant high visibility vest this will be enough to enter the worksite (excluding the working space). No further PPE is required.

Question 3 Suggest the question refers to an inspection not an audit. The terminology must be consistent with CoPTTM and CoPTTM must be consistent within itself.

Question now reads On a level 2 worksite, how long is the STMS allowed to be away during a drive through to gain access to the front of the worksite?

Test B:

Resize this to fit on one page, this is just wasting paper.

Suggest using double sided printing to save paper

Question 3: suggest the CoPTTM reference box is extended to cover answer b

Done

Question 4: there is no reference to the relevance of the CoPTTM reference box. Is this to be completed? I assume so, based on anecdotal information received. If so, how is it to be marked? There is no direction on this unlike the other boxes.

Question has now been removed

Question 4 The required response is ambiguous: What is the rear of the barrier? The correct statement is the side facing away from traffic. The rear of a barrier is the end facing the downstream flow of adjoining traffic Likewise the front is the projecting end which requires end treatment to protect oncoming vehicles. NB this is a CoPTTM issue.

Question has now been removed

Test C:

Resize this to fit on one page, this is just wasting paper.

Resized - Suggest using double sided printing to save paper

Question 1: This should be reworded to read: *“Using the level 1 worksite layout tables and associated notes provide answers to the following.”*

Amended – removed s on tables

Question 3a: is ambiguous. It does not specify whether taper is an initial or subsequent taper.

Amended to: What is the length of an initial taper where the permanent speed is 70km/h?

Question 4 All the responses are correct as far as they go. They may all be required depending on the circumstances. The point is that c must be applied, the rest will depend on the circumstances. NB the reference to cones is too specific and needs to be deleted. There other delineation options available and necessary particularly for long term sites with barriers which typically and correctly use road marking to temporarily delineate lanes.

Options amended - now read

- a. A temporary speed limit must be installed on the ramp
- b. The site must be protected by a TMA shadow vehicle with the TMA pad deployed to protect the site

c. The ramp on which the activity is being carried out must be closed



Question 5a use worksite instead of closure (closures from which the public are excluded do not have TSLs since the land transport rules do not apply within them.)

Amended

Question 5b This is ambiguous. What level of road is being referred to? The answer depends on this; and if L2, the permanent speed limit then influences the answer. The question also needs to clarify whether it wants both the side of the approach lane and the centreline to be counted.

Amended What is the minimum number of cones to be used on the lane line for the approach threshold?

Question 5c The 30 metre taper is an absolute not a minimum. It must be neither more nor less than 30 metres.

What is the required taper length?

Test D:

Resize this to fit on one page, this is just wasting paper.

As above

Question 2: All the responses are correct. The reference to the availability of the shoulder is also not clear in the context of the question. (possibly this refers obliquely to the 3km absolute maximum). The missing word is “maximum” in the question. Alternately put the distance range in the options.

Amended to read What is the maximum distance required between the AWWMS and a shadow vehicle when there is a shoulder available?

Question 4: Again the word “minimum” is missing from the question. Options b and c are currently correct answers.

Amended to read The minimum distance between the work and shadow vehicle is...?

Question 4 All the responses are correct as far as they go. They may all be required depending on the circumstances. The point is that c must be applied, the rest will depend on the circumstances. NB the reference to cones is too specific and needs to be deleted. There other delineation options available and necessary particularly for long term sites with barriers which typically and correctly use road marking to temporarily delineate lanes.

????

Question 6 This comment applies to all tests and questions but is particularly relevant here. There must be model answers for trainers to assess against. I have reviewed this question and have found 9 things that could be construed as wrong, however this is just my interpretation of what I could see:

- AWVMS states operation is mower but it is more than this.
- No chevrons on AWVMS
- Wrong top arrow on shadow vehicle.
- Shadow vehicle too close to first work vehicle
- Second work vehicle too far from first work vehicle (but it is more than 2 metres from lane therefore is this OK: just throwing it out there?)
- No pass with care plate and RD6 on second work vehicle (could be 2 responses)
- No high visibility material on arms of overalls on worker beside first work vehicle
- No flashing beacon on second work vehicle
- Unnecessary mower sign on front of lead work vehicle

Thanks John we will add them in

- AWVMS states operation is mower but it is more than this.
- No chevrons on AWVMS
- Wrong top arrow on shadow vehicle.
- Shadow vehicle too close to first work vehicle
- Second work vehicle too far from first work vehicle
- No pass with care plate and RD6 on second work vehicle (could be 2 responses)
- No high visibility material on arms of overalls on worker beside first work vehicle
- No flashing beacon on second work vehicle
- Unnecessary mower sign on front of lead work vehicle

Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004

7.11 Exceptions to application of requirements relating to use of child restraints and seat belts

- (1) The requirements of [clauses 7.6 to 7.10](#) do not apply to a driver (whether imposed in respect of himself or herself or any child), or to a passenger in any motor vehicle, if the driver or passenger produces to an enforcement officer, whenever required to do so by that officer, a certificate from a registered medical practitioner certifying that the restraining of the person who would otherwise be required by those provisions to be restrained by a child restraint or seat belt is impracticable or undesirable for medical reasons.

(2) A driver or passenger who is required to produce a certificate to an enforcement officer under subclause (1) has 7 days, after the day on which the requirement is imposed, to do so.

(2A) If the certificate produced to the enforcement officer was issued on or after 1 October 2011,—

- (a) the certificate must specify the date on which it was issued and its expiry date; and
- (b) the expiry date must be on or after the day on which the certificate was required to be produced.

(3) The requirements of [clauses 7.7 to 7.10](#) do not apply to a driver (whether imposed in respect of himself or herself or any child), or to a passenger in any vehicle, if the person who would otherwise be required by those provisions to be restrained by a child restraint or seat belt—

- (a) is the driver and, while complying with the requirements of those clauses, could not reasonably operate effectively any of the following items of equipment:
 - (i) footbrake or handbrake controls:
 - (ii) headlamp or foglamp:
 - (iii) direction-indicator control:
 - (iv) horn:
 - (v) windscreen-wiper control:
 - (vi) choke:
 - (vii) driver's sun visor; or
- (b) is the driver of a vehicle that is travelling in reverse, and would not be able to reverse the vehicle in a safe manner if the driver were to comply with the requirements of those clauses; or
- (c) is the driver of a taxi plying for hire; or
- (d) is a person who—
 - (i) is engaged in the course of his or her employment in the delivery or collection of mail or newspapers or other goods, or the servicing of the vehicle, or meter reading or other similar duties, or spraying or other similar duties from the vehicle; and

- (ii) for that purpose is required to alight from and re-enter the vehicle at frequent intervals, so long as the vehicle is travelling at a speed not exceeding 50 km per hour; or
- (e) is an enforcement officer or prison officer travelling with another person who is not an enforcement officer or prison officer in circumstances in which it is impracticable or undesirable to wear a seat belt.

(4) [Clauses 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, and 7.10](#) do not apply to the driver of a bus.

(5) The requirements of [clause 7.6](#) do not apply to a driver (whether imposed in respect of himself or herself or any child), or to a passenger in any vehicle, if the driver—

- (a) is driving a passenger service vehicle in which no appropriate child restraints are available; or
- (b) *[Revoked]*
- (c) is driving a motor vehicle first registered before 1 January 1955 in which no seat belts are available; or
- (d) is driving a motorcycle; or
- (e) is driving a motor vehicle that is being used by an enforcement officer in the execution of the officer's duty.

Compare: SR 1976/227 [r 30C](#)

Clause 7.11(1): amended, on 1 November 2013, by [clause 9\(1\)](#) of the Land Transport (Road User) Amendment Rule (No 2) 2013 (SR 2013/278).

Clause 7.11(2): substituted, on 1 October 2011, by [clause 16\(1\)](#) of the Land Transport (Road User) Amendment Rule 2011 (SR 2011/307).

Clause 7.11(2A): inserted, on 1 October 2011, by [clause 16\(1\)](#) of the Land Transport (Road User) Amendment Rule 2011 (SR 2011/307).

Clause 7.11(4): substituted, on 1 November 2009, by [clause 26](#) of the Land Transport (Road User) Amendment Rule 2009 (SR 2009/253).

Clause 7.11(4): amended, on 1 October 2011, by [clause 16\(2\)](#) of the Land Transport (Road User) Amendment Rule 2011 (SR 2011/307).

Clause 7.11(5)(b): revoked, on 1 November 2013, by [clause 9\(2\)](#) of the Land Transport (Road User) Amendment Rule (No 2) 2013 (SR 2013/278).

Also the following link is helpful

<http://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/roadcode/heavy-vehicle-road-code/about-driver-responsibility/safety-belts-and-child-restraints.html>

ABOUT DRIVER RESPONSIBILITY

SAFETY BELTS AND CHILD RESTRAINTS

Safety belts and child restraints protect people by holding them in their seats when there is a crash or when the vehicle stops suddenly. If you don't wear a safety belt and you're involved in a crash, you could be thrown out of your vehicle.

Not all heavy vehicles are required to be fitted with safety belts. However, if your vehicle does have safety belts, you must use them.

Always remember to fasten your safety belt before you drive off.

See [About your vehicle](#) for more information about the legal requirements for safety belts in your vehicle.

Responsibility

As the driver you are responsible for making sure passengers under the age of 15 are using an approved child restraint or safety belt.

- Children under seven must be correctly secured in an approved child restraint.
- Children aged seven must use an approved child restraint (if one is available) and if not, any child restraint or safety belt that is available.
- Children aged eight to 14 must wear a safety belt.

The safety belt must be worn correctly and kept securely fastened while the vehicle is in motion on the road.

Passengers 15 years and over are responsible for making sure that they wear their own safety belts correctly and that they keep them fastened while the vehicle is in motion.

Bus drivers in vehicles with passenger safety belts are not responsible for ensuring passengers wear them except passengers under the age of 15 sitting in a front seat alongside the driver.

Special exemptions

You don't have to wear a safety belt if you:

- hold a doctor's certificate that says you don't have to wear a safety belt for medical reasons
- are driving and you're unable to reach the controls (for example, brake, signals, dip switch) with a safety belt on
- are a taxi driver plying for hire (your passengers, however, must wear safety belts)
- are a driver or passenger who is getting in and out of the vehicle often to read meters, deliver goods, etc. In these situations you must not travel faster than 50km/h
- are reversing and it is difficult to see while wearing a safety belt.

Child restraints

Under sevens

Children under seven years old must be correctly secured in an approved child restraint.

The only exceptions to this rule are where the child is travelling in a taxi that doesn't have an approved child restraint, travelling in a bus or has a medical certificate exemption. In these situations, the child must sit in a back seat.

Children aged seven

Children aged seven years old must use an approved child restraint if available and if not, any child restraint or safety belt that is available.

If no child restraint or safety belt is available, they must sit in the back seat.

For more information about child restraints [click here](#).

Thanks,

Combining worksites

We added an additional section to our On-site record to document any conflict of worksites. It also prompts the STMS to proactively communicate with the adjacent worksite and communicate where their jurisdictions begin and end.

Pre-Existing and/or Adjacent Site(s) - recorded details of any TTM within vicinity that directly or indirectly affects your site.

STMS Name:	Transit No:	Contact Detail:
Company Name:	Closure Type:	TMP No if known:
Please provide notes and amendments of any changes/merging of TMP. (use page 8 if more space is needed)	<u>Notes/description</u>	

NZ-QHSE-FORM-021

30 June 2016

Page 6 of 10

Kind Regards,

Ben Isdale

National Training Manager

Evolution Road Services Group

National Support Office: 27 Normanby Rd, Mt Eden

PO Box 99 698 | Newmarket | Auckland 1149

P 0800 630 7200 | **M** 021 187 9062

E ben.isdale@evoroadservices.co.nz

From: Anderson, Cushla - FH Auckland [<mailto:Cushla.Anderson@fultonhogan.com>]

Sent: Thursday, 27 October 2016 9:00 AM

To: Alan Gardiner <alan.gardiner@heb.co.nz>; Andrea Williamson [FCC Infrastructure] <AndreaW@fcc.co.nz>; Andrew Mackintosh <andrew@trafficsafe.co.nz>; Andrew Seavill <andrew.seavill@evoroadservices.co.nz>; Barbara Britton (Barbara@traffic.co.nz) <Barbara@traffic.co.nz>; Beesafe Traffic Control <office@beesafe.co.nz>; Ben Isdale <ben.isdale@evoroadservices.co.nz>; ben.burrowes@liveablestreets.co.nz; Bob Campbell (bob.campbell@tscgroup.kiwi.nz) <bob.campbell@tscgroup.kiwi.nz>; Bob Thomas (bobthomas@traffix.co.nz) <bobthomas@traffix.co.nz>; Goodall, Bruce - FH Auckland <Bruce.Goodall@coastline.net.nz>; Chris England <chris@trafficmanagementnz.co.nz>; Dave Hill (ak1@trafficmanagementnz.co.nz) <ak1@trafficmanagementnz.co.nz>; Dave Tilton (dave@parallaxx.co.nz) <dave@parallaxx.co.nz>; David Russell <david.russell@csppacific.co.nz>; Dean Keibell <dean@trafficmanagementnz.co.nz>; Derek Stembridge <D.Stembridge@higgins.co.nz>; Don Gorrie (operations@gorrietraffic.co.nz) <operations@gorrietraffic.co.nz>; Eddy MILLIGAN <Eddy.MILLIGAN@northpower.com>; Geoff Shackell <geoffs@jfcld.co.nz>; Glen Ruma <glen@ittraffic.co.nz>; GNC Traffic Ltd <gnctrafficld@xtra.co.nz>; Ferguson, Grant <Grant.Ferguson@coastline.net.nz>; Ian Leach <ian.leach@ama.nzta.govt.nz>; Jade Fonotoe <Jade@absolutetraffic.co.nz>; James Scully <James.scully@ama.nzta.govt.nz>; Tofilau, Joe <Joe.Tofilau@coastline.net.nz>; John Fishburn

(john@chevtraffic.co.nz) <john@chevtraffic.co.nz>; John Fonotoe <t.c.s.auckland@gmail.com>; John Glen (traffnz@orcon.co.nz) <traffnz@orcon.co.nz>; Karl Hitchcock <karl@trafficsafe.co.nz>; Wright, Lance <Lance.Wright@coastline.net.nz>; Levi Crewther <levi@trafficsafe.co.nz>; Marius Van der Merwe (marius@oss.kiwi.nz) <marius@oss.kiwi.nz>; Lobdell, Mark <Mark.Lobdell@coastline.net.nz>; Mike Marsden - AMA <mike.marsden@ama.nzta.govt.nz>; Nick Lamb (Nick.Lamb@downer.co.nz) <Nick.Lamb@downer.co.nz>; Pauline Nobbs <Pauline.nobbs@sh16causeway.co.nz>; Peter Brooks (Peter.Brooks@csppacific.co.nz) <Peter.Brooks@csppacific.co.nz>; Rau Tangiiti <Rau@ittraffic.co.nz>; Sean Oneill <sean.oneill@downer.co.nz>; Leung, Sherman <Sherman.Leung@coastline.net.nz>; Moir, Trevor <Trevor.Moir@coastline.net.nz>; Troy Campbell <troy@tscgroup.kiwi.nz>; Vaueli (Voss) Vatau <V.Vatau@higgins.co.nz>; Viliame Kolinisau <Viliame.KOLINISAU@northpower.com>; Wayne Harding (wayne@t8traffic.co.nz) <wayne@t8traffic.co.nz>

Subject: Combining Worksites

Hi there,

Please see email below from John Glen.

Kind Regards,

Cushla Anderson | Professional Services Manager, Traffic Management Department | **Fulton Hogan Ltd** | 40 Flexman Place | PO Box 305, Silverdale, 0944, New Zealand | Ext 9336 | Phone +64 9 421 9896 | Fax +64 9 427 9382 | Mobile +64 27 274 2892 | Web www.fultonhogan.com

From: traffnz@orcon.co.nz [<mailto:traffnz@orcon.co.nz>]

Sent: Wednesday, 26 October 2016 6:11 p.m.

To: Anderson, Cushla - FH Auckland <Cushla.Anderson@fultonhogan.com>

Subject: Traffic Assn

Can you forward this to members ASAP.

Work sites overlapping, who is responsible.

I am aware that audits are being undertaken by AT where sites overlap.

AT's view is that although there may be permission between the two parties to occupy the site in common the liability for the management of the sites rests with the 1st occupier company and STMS

This mean the site STMS for site 1 is now responsible for the second site as well.

Options available.

1. Those occupying Site 1 refuse permission for any other Company to operate within their existing site boundary.
2. Advise the second company that their CAR operates till (Date ..) and they will advise them when they vacate the site.

This appears to be the only option available at the moment to protect the STMS of site 1 from any adverse audit on site two.

AT are auditing as if it is the same site.

There are risks associated now with the second site being incorporated within yours.

I am aware that the Fibre optic roll out the Contractors have a CAR for their Level 1 side road but the Principal engages directly a Level 2 Competent Company to manage the L2 road. Note the CAR incorporates the L1 and L 2 road so as soon as the L 2 site is established the L2 STMS according to AT now is responsible for the L 1 road even though they are not getting paid .

Options available .

1 Have the TMPS split , Car for the L 1 site , and Car for the L 2 site

2 Have a contractual arrangement with the principal Company to receive remuneration for accepting responsibility for the L 1 site.

I have had communication with Stuart Fraser re this situation and have sent off a request for clarification re responsibility for overlapping sites. This has happened in Christchurch and a common sense directive was sent out to the RCA's and it is working according to him.

I have requested that such a directive be sent out Nationally to address this situation.

If a common sense approach is no forth coming there will be project delays due to AT's interpretation of site liability.

If in doubt refuse permission.

Submission to Stuart in brief was

In essence the two STMS's Companies jointly agree that the second company can occupy the site and that a common boundary be agreed where each STMS assumes responsibility from A to B and the second from B to C.

This to be documented as a site hand over and on the daily job sheet and be communicated via email between both parties. Either party vacating the site will advise verbally and in writing that they are vacating the site (Date) etc.

And the remaining party needs to reestablish their previous signage.

If anyone gets adverse audit in this situation can you please send them to me asap.

Call me any time.

John 0273666099

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Guidance for choice of Level 2LS

Feature	Level 2LS	Level 2
Speed (permanent)	< 50 km/h: 2LS recommended 50 km/h: 2LS probable	60 km/h: 2 probable
Number of lanes	Two lane two way road: 2LS recommended	Multi-lane either direction: probable 3 or more lanes in one direction: 2 recommended
Shoulder presence / usage	Parking both sides of road: 2LS Recommended	Limited parking for most of section length: 2 Recommended
Distance between controlled intersections	Shorter distance between intersections: 2LS Recommended	Greater distance between intersections: 2 Recommended
Proximity to Level 2 or higher roads	N/A	Adjacent to Level 2 or Level 3 road (> 65 km/h): 2 Recommended
Number of Turning movements (especially without dedicated turn lanes)	High number of turning movements onto or off road from within lane: 2LS recommended	Road is primarily environment for through traffic (low number of turning movements): 2 recommended