

All Submissions that Selected Option B
B - Up to 49% public share offer (preferred option)

Submitter ID	pg
8.....	100
246.....	110
564.....	120
930.....	130
1291.....	140
1714.....	150
2105.....	160
2443.....	170
2725.....	180
3104.....	190
No commentary	200

Option Chosen

B - Up to 49% public share offer (preferred option)

Submitter	Commentary
Andrew Wallace Submitter #8 To be heard? No	i will happily help fund the proposed expansion as an local investor but want to have some certainty that the expansion will go ahead and not stall due to being strongly opposed
Bill Lowe Submitter #9 To be heard? No	Get local government out of business. belongs in the private sector managed by local body rules and regulations
Jeremy Riddell Submitter #13 To be heard? No	Having invested a small amount in Port of Tauranga many years ago I have watched it grow, with good returns for the shareholders and the local council to what it is today. This is the only way forward for the Port to grow with local shareholders and the council, and not the debt that would be otherwise inflicted on all ratepayers, with many years before ratepayers would see a return, or if. Every ratepayer would get a return with option B
Steve van der Linden Submitter #15 To be heard? No	I am in no doubt that listing on the share market is the best model. This option provides a transparent, fair and accurate market value for Napier Port and is a proven win win solution. HBRC will be the cornerstone investor and it allows for local shareholders. Model it on Tauranga Port and can't go wrong. I am against a referendum. Council need to make a firm decision and then go for it.
Rick Bower Submitter #18 To be heard? No	I believe the option to sell a minority shareholding via a public offer is the best option. This achieves the Council's goal of diversifying its investment risk, allows the Port additional capital to pursue the required capital expenditure and allow ratepayers to financially benefit from the growth of the region. As a Hawkes Bay ratepayer we are all wanting the region to grow and prosper, so I hope ratepayers will be given preferential status to allocation of shares either through first priority or a market discount. This will allow ratepayers to financially benefit from the growth of the region which will likely be reinvested back into Hawkes Bay, rather than some big out of town funds buying up all the shares leaving us individual ratepayers to buy shares on the stock exchange in the secondary market. Finally, I appreciate all the work the HBRC is doing to involve public in its decision and I hope a lot of the public is providing their opinion as I believe this is a great opportunity for the Council, Port and ratepayers. Regards, Rick
Craig Ford Submitter #19 To be heard? No	This is the best option in my opinion.
Chrissi Faber Submitter #21 To be heard? No	NO RATES increase for residents
Danny Eagleton Submitter #22 To be heard? No	As long as local residents or ratepayers receive preferential access to shares before the general public - similar to the government's float of power companies a few years ago.
Stuart Foote Submitter #23 To be heard? No	For all the reasons in the info booklet, but with the proviso that adequate provision is made for HBRC ratepayers get some priority in share allocation, that the majority of shares floated are not allocated to "big business".
Anita Finnema Submitter #24 To be heard? No	we still want to have control but really needs some outside funds to expand

Submitter	Commentary
Peter Walker Submitter #25 To be heard? No	No need to reinvent the wheel If it worked for Tauranga and the NZ market could do with more investment options
Antjedine Borchers Submitter #28 To be heard? No	- no increase in rates - anyone can purchase shares
Tim McKenzie Submitter #29 To be heard? No	I see this being a great opportunity to invest in our port as locals and not have to pay more on our rates. I think all locals of Hawkes Bay should be given the option to invest. We should be sent a link via email to register for shares.
Kathy Brunton Submitter #30 To be heard? No	I feel this is the best option as it frees up capital but still retains ownership
Pam Heays Submitter #32 To be heard? No	It seems like the best option from a taxpayers perspective
Jean Edney Submitter #36 To be heard? No	Control remains with the HBRC - there is no need to bring outsiders in to the Board of Directors but the option is there to acquire expertise if required.
Richard Morrish Submitter #37 To be heard? No	Yes selling 49% I believe is a good idea for the future enlargement of the Napier Port. If we wish to stay competitive with other Ports we need to keep the Port of Napier in a position of strength so as not to have cargo and passenger ships pass us by. We do not want to become an exporting port like Timaru, to keep ahead we need more wharfs to cater for the extra cargo that is coming in the next few years. I will be purchasing shares in the new Port of Napier when the shares become available
Tony Gray Submitter #39 To be heard? No	By getting investors, those who have the capital can invest. This will save those who don't have spare capital to not have to fund this. Putting a cost onto rate payers is too tough. I would buy shares.
Alexandra Gee Submitter #41 To be heard? No	I would like to have the opportunity to invest in my community, to assist economic growth, with employment opportunities for locals.
Gerard Sens Submitter #43 To be heard? No	So I can purchase shares in the ipo and have a stake in the growth of our region.
Peter Hunt Submitter #48 To be heard? No	I am of strong belief that the rate payers should not have to fork out the \$\$\$\$ I also believe B to be the correct option (public shares), not overseas interested parties. Ownership is then retained in NZ.
Tony Karantze Submitter #49 To be heard? No	In my opinion this is best for the ratepayers, I would invest, good for HB
Richard Newson Submitter #51 To be heard? No	With the proviso that the funds raised be used for Port development within an agreed timeframe.
Rodger Burn Submitter #53 To be heard? No	This seems the most efficient way and acceptable to most ratepayers. It works very well with Tauranga
Graeme Sunderland Submitter #56 To be heard? No	In an ideal situation I would prefer option A, however to grow, and to mitigate the financial cost of a natural disaster, option B looks the best. I lived in Tauranga for several years and watched that port develop very well. I would expect a clause somewhere that makes it impossible for public ownership to be less than 51%.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Garth Nimon Submitter #57 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Offer opportunity to local buyers first. Keep the asset value in the Bay.</p>
<p>Simon Walker Submitter #58 To be heard? No</p>	<p>1) Sale of 49% will provide greater oversight of the running of the port due to shareholder/fund manager interest.</p> <p>2) Selling 49% is the simplest way of funding the Port expansion.</p> <p>3) Selling 49% reduces the risk to the HBRC in case of a devastating natural disaster such as an earthquake that damages the port.</p> <p>4) While selling 49% of the port means that the HBRC will retain a smaller proportion of any profits and dividends, in real dollar terms, the ports expansion will likely mean that dividend payouts and profits will increase.</p> <p>5) In my view, retaining full control and ownership of the port via borrowing or rates is unfeasible as this will place a huge financial burden on many people within our community who are struggling. By contrast, offering 49% to the public means that those members of the local community who wish to purchase an interest in the port can, and those that don't want to (or can't) are not forced to via increases in rates.</p> <p>6) The HBRC owns the port. Ratepayers do not (this is a distinction that some people in our community do not grasp). For this reason, leveraging councils stake in the port on the back of ratepayers is, in my view unfair. That is, if rates are used to fund the port, then ratepayers are effectively 'forced' to purchase shares in the port without yielding any real benefit from this purchase. That is, ratepayers receive no dividend and they cannot sell their stake. Likewise, if ratepayers move out of the area or pass away, their interest in the port simply vanishes. Again, selling 49% to the public would allow individuals/families to take an interest if they want to. In my view, this is the fairest outcome.</p> <p>7) It is likely that a public offering of the Napier port would attract real interest from many investors in New Zealand, including Kiwisaver fund managers. For this reason, the HBRC may benefit from share-price increases, in addition to the annual dividends that they currently receive.</p>
<p>Guy Wilson Submitter #62 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Good mixed model similar to the Port of Tauranaga. Residents can buy shares in the company if they wish to stay connected. A great idea</p>
<p>Viv Smith Submitter #63 To be heard? No</p>	<p>If B, the public share option, has allowed Tauranga to become the Port that they are today, hopefully following their example, Napier can achieve similar heights to benefit Hawke's Bay.</p>
<p>Andrew Fulford Submitter #64 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Risk Management and Publicly listed shares are likely to value the port facility higher than non market valuations.</p>
<p>Ron Mawson Submitter #65 To be heard? No</p>	<p>logical to raise capitol buy flote . Would be happier if flote was no more than 45%</p>
<p>Louise Geerlings Submitter #66 To be heard? No</p>	<p>My preferred option is B and the shares should go first to the local people before it is going to the public share market/offering. I would be very interested in purchasing shares.</p>
<p>Paul Sweeney Submitter #69 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Its critical that Council retains overall control with more than 50% and that the shares are sold publicly, not to an investment partner that could seek to gain control. I am concerned however that individuals could over a period sell their shares resulting in a large proportion of voting shares being held by a few major investors.</p>
<p>Patricia Wareham Submitter #71 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I think it a great idea that local people can invest in the Port. It also retains the majority for the Regional Council</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Ray Sievert Submitter #72 To be heard? No</p>	<p>seems to be the best business option without loading ratepayers, time to look at what size would be optimal for all Hawkes Bay infrastructure re. tourists, freight, world wide there are a lot of problems with continued growth on countries resources. our farming industry, logging, tourism are just starting to show what impact uncontrolled growth brings</p>
<p>Beverley Turnbull Submitter #73 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It enables Council to retain ownership and management of the Port, frees up funds for future needs, and does not give an individual investor/shareholder too much control over the Port</p>
<p>Sue Stichbury Submitter #76 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Our Community has some ownership and is involved in decision making.</p>
<p>Graham Stichbury Submitter #77 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The Community will have a voice in decision making.</p>
<p>Iain Dick Submitter #78 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This allows investment in infrastructure at the same time as retaining control and paying down debt. It also allows a degree of local ownership. Leasing the Port operation would be a disaster. If the shambles in Australian ports (which I work with) is an example of this.... Napier Port should NEVER consider this option.</p>
<p>Alan Le Breton Submitter #79 To be heard? No</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would prefer the council does maintain an increase in the ownership buffer margin to discourage mischievous access and ownership issues from developing over the long-run, for reasons we could not reasonably foresee today; 2. Would prefer that a mechanism exist that does prioritise a portion of the share ownership of the Port by locals whom both love Hawkes Bay, want to participate with its long-term future and have the ability to invest directly in it.
<p>Valerie Noble Submitter #81 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I am a Shareholder in South Port. It seems to be doing well and pays a reasonable dividend. Tauranga systems seem to work well. I like to support local enterprises and I prefer a public share offer over the other alternatives.</p>
<p>Emma Koch Submitter #84 To be heard? No</p>	<p>release more capital than sale retain more influence than lease involve community investment relieve taxpayer obligation better</p>
<p>Mary Gray Submitter #85 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Retains majority community ownership and control</p>
<p>Gerard La Rooy Submitter #92 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I am in general agreement with the information given in the consultation document. Also I think the inclusion of 'outside' Directors with different skills and performance expectations will be beneficial.</p>
<p>Edgardo Beacon Submitter #94 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I do believe in a strong growth in Hawke's Bay and New Zealand in the next 10 years and the Port will keep on supporting the regional economy and its community.</p>
<p>Sally Holyer Submitter #97 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Council needs to retain control over the port which is a huge income earner for the region. Rate payers cannot afford to be hit by such a big suggested levy, however locals might want to invest via shares. This appears to be the most balanced option benefitting Hawkes Bay.</p>
<p>Kent Hendy Submitter #98 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would be willing to buy shares</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Benjamin Molineaux Submitter #99 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option B provides the best of both worlds. It reduces debt, diversifies rate payers risk, and increases the dividends ratepayers receive from the port asset, even with a reduced shareholding. At its most basic level, council is looking for someone, anyone, to pay off the Ports debt, so that operational surpluses can be used for growth and development.</p> <p>My worry is, why is the port in that situation, and what prevents that occurring again in 20 years; and we're back to square one. What I felt was missing from the consultation document was a longer term view of what might happen in 20-30 years. Will Council seek to buy back the shares to gain 100%, will oversight be improved so that debt levels don't need further bail outs to fund the 20-30 year capital requirements? Capital requirements are never ending, and I didn't feel that there wasn't sufficient detail on how rate payers (as shareholders in the Port via HBRC, as well as people who pay rates) will be impacted over the longer term.</p> <p>So yes to Option B, but Council needs to do more work to reassure the rate payers of Hawke's Bay that appropriate management and oversight of the Port means that the port will be prevented from getting into this level of debt again in the future.</p>
<p>Alexander Sutton Submitter #100 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I support Option B over the other option for the following reasons... A. Has no capital for reinvestment and the extra rate demand too much a burden. C. Future rates also an issue & an Investment Partner though minority, should trading situations change over time their role could become detrimental. D. Far too long a period. Too much could change.</p> <p>In support of option (B) i would also support including some sort of options or renounceable rights to be taken into the percentage equation, (eg total not to exceed 49%) as an extra per so many ordinary shares brought. These to be traded on the NZX, and exercised at the given price at the future aforementioned date. An opportunity could arise, Napier Port,s involvement may increase their holdings on behave of the people of Hawkes bay.....</p>
<p>Brendon Walker Submitter #104 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Maintain a mix of ownership</p>
<p>Martin Redwood Submitter #108 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Protects rates from large rises. Gives the Council flexibility in investment decisions and raises the necessary capital for port expansion.</p>
<p>Anton Douglas Submitter #109 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Achieves a premium to a private sale. Offers local residents a chance to participate and retain control. Gives council continued interest / control. While the lease option (D) looks to be financially superior, it results in loss of control and the length of the lease gives rise to unknown risks (operator performance, market changes, impact on community) and/or potential for new or unknown opportunities to be missed.</p>
<p>John Wehipeihana Submitter #110 To be heard? No</p>	<p>We need to expand port facilities, retain ownership and avoid rate increases. Share offer, on Tauranga model, seems best option.</p>
<p>Amy Pryce Submitter #112 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This proposal achieves good control, ownership and returns. I would like to see shares offered to hawkes bay residents first, then open to new Zealand citizens only.</p>
<p>Neil Eagles Submitter #113 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The Public of Hawke's Bay should have the opportunity to have a priority opportunity to invest in the port. This may avoid a large overseas investor taking control. Great that the assets held by the Port did not go down the Ruataniwha rabbit hole as we would have lost the lot. Funds are better spent on developing our port than for a few select farmers making capital gains. The work of the TANK recommendations can be carried out at the same time which is essential for the well being of all in the BAY. The future of Hawke's Bay is at stake here.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Beverley Coghill Submitter #117 To be heard? No	Would like share ownership in the Port.
Michael Coghill Submitter #118 To be heard? No	We would like to have shares in the Port
Dorothea Millen Submitter #120 To be heard? No	I support option B, or option A but do not support either C or D. My reasons are the local community should be given first option if there is a public share offer and the market will determine the value of the shares over time. If this is not accepted, then Option A is the only other option I can support, as this asset should not be sold to an investment partner or leased to a private investor...the likelihood of either of these options, is any downturn is going to fall on the rating base.
Judith Rooke Submitter #121 To be heard? No	To give the public the opportunity to invest in local business.
Martyn Lee Submitter #122 To be heard? No	Reduces risk to rate payers, provides diversification and importantly provides for residents to take some direct ownership in a local asset.
Peter Thomson Submitter #124 To be heard? No	Most straightforward option and the best way to get money quickly. Open to all New Zealanders for low risk investment. Tauranga is a successful model, if they can do it why can't we.
Graham de Gruchy Submitter #126 To be heard? No	Letter and follow up phone call with Graham de Gruchy Letter: Dear Sir As a Ratepayer and supplier of logs to the Port of Napier, I would like to make a submission in the Regional Councils proposal for sellingdown 49% of the Port and giving ratepayers first option on these shores. Yours sincerely, Graham de Gruchy. Follow up phone conversation by Jodie Skilton on 18 October 2018 Graham feels very strongly in proposing that the Council sells 49% to Ratepayers. He suggested looking into the Tauranga Port (works extremely well). So Regional owning 55% and Ratepayers owning 45%.
Tim McVeagh Submitter #127 To be heard? No	For the reasons you give in the well presented document "Our Port, Have your say". I am strongly against Option D
Bill Inglis Submitter #128 To be heard? No	We have read the Port's consultation document and agree with the Regional Council's recommended choice; a minority stake of up to 49% on the NZ stock exchange. And we would probably be happy to invest some of our own money in some shares.
Brett Robinson Submitter #130 To be heard? No	As per preferred option in the mailed brochure - No impact on Council debt or on Council rates. In my opinion, the best option for all stakeholders!
Velma Farquhar Submitter #131 To be heard? No	The public share offer should be New Zealand citizens only. Selling huge chunks to under cover overseas parties is deviant. Full transparency of where the money is used and managed returns to shareholders is key to success. We do. It want this asset to our region being bartered off to the Chinese. This asset requires investment from Napier City council so that the returns flow back to the peoOle who built and funded this facility. Napier has the money to fund this but Napier City council must invest on behalf of residents.
Vincent Veale Submitter #132 To be heard? No	This options has worked very well at other ports, no impact on rates (we need a rest from rate increases) Opportunity to buy shares in local industry.

Submitter	Commentary
Ronald Lane Submitter #133 To be heard? No	This currently similar model ones sees with AKL & Tauranga (partly privatized by public share offer)
James Heron Submitter #134 To be heard? No	Increase of Capital and no debt while still in control.
Richard Koch Submitter #135 To be heard? No	This option makes sense as the community will also have a say and have a vested interest in the port and its decisions.
Robert Shand Submitter #136 To be heard? No	Avoids a charge to the rate payer and enables me to invest in a successful local enterprise. I have been a very happy investor in Port of Tauranga and expect the same with Napier.
Brian Carter Submitter #139 To be heard? No	Don't want any other country getting control
Manmeet Singh Submitter #140 To be heard? No	"Ourport"....good job on a compiling a report which made it easy for us to understand. In my opinion option B is the one that I would like us to go for. Thanks and good luck.
chris Fletcher Submitter #143 To be heard? No	Great investment opportunity for Home Owners.
Graeme May Submitter #149 To be heard? No	With Hawkes Bay residents receiving full allocation. Thank you GM
Charles Alder Submitter #150 To be heard? No	Make sure that all Hawke's Bay residents are given the first option to buy, reasonably priced shares in the Port of Napier.
Kerry Rusbridge Submitter #153 To be heard? No	I consider that having a group of shareholders is preferable to an investment partner or a private investor. Also the share offer should be between 40 and 45 percent to allow a buffer between that and the HBRC controlling interest.
Bruce McGechan Submitter #154 To be heard? No	It works very well in Tauranga, and I believe it would work in Napier.
Paul Clothier Submitter #155 To be heard? No	This will reduce the pressure on the Regional Council to raise capital for the port and will give the public the opportunity to make a long term investment in a growing infrastructure asset. y retaining 51% the RC will retain overall control of the asset. This is a similar structure to the Port of Tauranga which has grown and prospered since it listed in the NZX.
John Gardner Submitter #158 To be heard? No	My reason is I bought shares in Port of Tauranga when it was listed and have seen the value that's been created for shareholders and the Regional Council.
Jenny Joll Submitter #159 To be heard? No	This seems to be the best option. As a ratepayer I am not in favour of an option which would lead to yet another rates increase. I don't want to see 49% sold to an investment partner who may not have the best interests of Hawkes Bay in mind, 49% is a sizeable portion to own. Leasing Port operations for up to 50 years could be a risky option.

Submitter	Commentary
Dyson Mantell-Harding Submitter #163 To be heard? No	Allows people who want to invest in bluechip investment another option. Having external input into the running of the port via shareholders should also increase the performance of the port. Still allows the council to have control and is a nice balance between those that want the port sold and those that want to retain the port.
Alison Saville Submitter #165 To be heard? No	It is the most sensible option and offers the opportunity for community support
Paul von Dadelszen Submitter #166 To be heard? No	This option B will give the public/rate payers the ability to retain an interest in the Port, not only through part ownership but also by having a say in its ongoing operation. Option A is clearly not viable, given that borrowing will be required, thereby imposing a burden on rate payers. Option C means that control will be largely in the hands of one "outsider". Option D means total loss of control to an "outsider".
Heather Dawson Submitter #167 To be heard? No	Wouldnt mind buying some shares
Jennifer Beale Submitter #169 To be heard? No	HBRC still has the controlling vote. This option seems to be working for Port of Tauranga. I do not want to have to pay a big increase in rates.
Margot McLennan Submitter #170 To be heard? No	It retains ownership of such a strategic asset, whilst providing funding for development and income to Council. Involves community (those wishing to avail themselves of shares) and there is no impact on rates. This can only be looked on as an investment for the future and whilst it is good to be able to pay off debt Option B offers the best of both worlds. I thought the consultation document was excellent, and really spelled it out clearly the various options for and against.
Ewan Hunter Submitter #171 To be heard? No	More effective community involvement and participation
Jonathan Oswald Norman Sainsbury Logan and Williams Submitter #177 To be heard? No	Best interests of local Community Local investors (retail) must be given first option to purchase shares (or a material proportion of the share float)
Malcolm Walker Submitter #178 To be heard? No	I believe that ownership control should remain wit the citizens of HB, but commercial pressure should be felt from diverse shareholding..
Mike Purvis Submitter #179 To be heard? No	As long as all ownership remains in New Zealand & by New Zealanders
Stuart Bailey Submitter #180 To be heard? No	No cost to rate payers
Mary Bailey Submitter #181 To be heard? No	Best for public interest
Mark Walwyn Submitter #182 To be heard? No	Best option to raise capital while retaining operating control, and while not putting further rates pressure on existing shareholders.

Submitter	Commentary
Tom Lovatt Submitter #184 To be heard? No	A share offer will be the safest option going forward. The council still needs to maintain a majority share holding and have the control of Napier Port so Hawks Bay interests are protected. The Hawks Bay people and buisnesses should get first option of taking up the share offer.
Kerry Christensen Submitter #192 To be heard? No	Provides capital for port development and an opportunity for public to have a a local investment.
Margaret McClellan Submitter #194 To be heard? No	I read the options and before I knew the Council 's preferred choice, I also had chosen B I think its the best option.
Jim McCormick Submitter #198 To be heard? No	No impact on debt or rates
Linda McCormick Submitter #200 To be heard? No	I support the HBRC preference
A Geoff Beale Submitter #201 To be heard? No	Council and community would retain better control, and this model has worked well for Port of Tauranga.
Chris Mitchell Submitter #202 To be heard? No	Shear offer means puplic have a chance in being part of the ownership of our port and keep port hawks bay and no extra cost to rate payers
Cathie Boyden Submitter #203 To be heard? No	I agree with the Council as this option has the potential to give a large number of local people a vested interest in our local Port.
Barry Boyden Submitter #204 To be heard? No	I believe this will give the public the option to to have "a say" in the development of our local Port going forward as well as a financial interest.
Jane Guilbert Submitter #209 To be heard? No	This option allows the people of NZ and particularly H.B. the opportunity to be actively involved in the Region. The Napier Port is pivotal in the future of H.B. and the industry of the Bay. Very important to tourism.
Helen Ball Submitter #211 To be heard? No	I prefer 40 - 45% not 49%. Cover the debt and get the new wharf up and running asap. The council must find other ways of financing other issues.
Andre Stehfest Submitter #213 To be heard? No	I intend to buy shares
Roger White Submitter #215 To be heard? No	Ideally leasing the port would be the best financial option but non financial issues make it a non starter. Option B becomes the only sensible option. As Wellington starts competing with us we have to offer "more" port than them. When the new Manawatu Gorge opens the Manawatu Inland Port will become a good option for north or south rail. If we don't move now to future proof the port there won't be a port as shipping companies don't owe us a living.
Norman McPhee Submitter #218 To be heard? No	Public share in a local business entity rather than fixed consortium taking all from the district.
Angela Hunt Submitter #219 To be heard? No	I think this is the best option as it doesn't increase rates and also retains ownership of the Port.

Submitter	Commentary
richard glendinning Submitter #220 To be heard? No	prevent major overseas ownership and abuse
Jocelyn Grant Submitter #221 To be heard? No	As it's our port all HB residents should have the opportunity to support and gain from expansion.
Leon Nicholson Submitter #222 To be heard? No	The offer of local investment to those who not only live and work in the region but want to have a interest in being part of the success. Also the ability to keep foreign interference to a minimum. So public and local offering is a yes from me.
Sarah von Dadelszen Submitter #224 To be heard? No	I would love to see us retain full ownership, however there are people in the community who will not be able to cope with a large rise in their rates, or not want that for other reasons. This way we retain a controlling interest without the associated risk full ownership has. As individuals we can invest through the markets if we want a great personal stake in it. This option also maximises our sale price to the public. I do not agree fully with not getting good value from selling to a minority investor, port and other core infrastructure is seen as a good investment for many in that area. However their strategic direction and desired outcomes could well be different from that of us as local owners so I prefer retaining the board room control at a localised level.
Anna Howley Submitter #225 To be heard? No	I like the idea that the community can buy the shares and be a part of the ports growth without having an increase in rates.
Malcolm Daley Submitter #226 To be heard? No	Option B is the preferred option for sound reasons, as explained in the consultation document.
Antoinette Martin Submitter #227 To be heard? No	I feel that ownership of the port remains in New Zealand, rates are not increased yet citizens of NZ (and hopefully the majority are Hawkes Bay Residents) are investing into a potentially exponential revenue earner for Hawkes Bay
Lathan Wroe Submitter #228 To be heard? No	Keep rate increase out of the picture. Benefit of perhaps port operating extremely efficient with other parties involved
Mark McGill Submitter #230 To be heard? No	It appears that if more capital is not injected into the port it could stall progress for all Hawkes Bay and we could see the port loosing cargo to other areas. This will give local people the ability to still have some say in port development. The proviso is that the shares should be offered to local rate payers before the NZ wide public. It is a local asset that is being sold and locals should have the first opportunity to retain part of this asset and leverage in future development.
Grant Burden Submitter #232 To be heard? No	The public share offer is the easiest way to sell something. It also allows local investors to benefit from investing in the port rather than just a single investor. Allowing Hawke's Bay investors the first option to buy shares like what happened with the power companies when they were floated. Grant Burden
Jim Sutcliffe Submitter #233 To be heard? No	Keep ownership of Port local and give the people of Hawkes Bay a chance to invest in their own asset. As an ex employee of the port, I feel I have contributed towards making Napier port what it is today and wore known for.uld appreciate the chance to invest in the successful import/export industry that Hawkes Bay and our port
Leo and Mia Gehlen Submitter #236 To be heard? No	This enables the people of Hawke's Bay to invest in something locally.
Wayne Smith Submitter #242 To be heard? No	Option B releases the most capital for development.

Submitter	Commentary
Trent Hedley Submitter #246 To be heard? No	I believe we as rate payers need to retain full control , everybody paying \$956.00 a year for nine years isn't an option , so floating 49% on the NZX is the best why to go 👉
Cushla Whitehead Submitter #248 To be heard? No	Port needs to grow. To have a vision. Embrace the future
Ben Hill Submitter #254 To be heard? No	I think this is a good idea. I would differently look at buying shares if they can up. There would need to be discussion on where the location of the new wharf is going and actually council need to start thinking 10-20 years ahead because may be we need a couple of wharf's. B
C Thorman Submitter #257 To be heard? No	Need pref share issue for Napier/HB residents.
Warren Elliott Submitter #259 To be heard? No	Float to Hawkes Bay people first. Offer on rates to buy shares.
Dean Roughton Submitter #260 To be heard? No	I would like to see HB residents have first option in buying shares into this regional asset. This asset needs to support a growing economy within HB. The residents of Hawkes Bay need to ensure a voice in this asset.
David Shipp Submitter #264 To be heard? No	Please use the sand dredged for the Westhore beach replenishment - survey the most cost effective option.
Grant Nicholson Submitter #266 To be heard? No	It means that there can be a reasonable chance that a large number of investors can take a stake - rather than one corporate investor who will insist on a say in how the Port is run one way or another.
James Phillips Submitter #273 To be heard? No	Best option for ratepayers as partial public ownership will give more clarity and openness on port finances and operations. PS Shares should be offered to ratepayers first
Mark Warren Submitter #276 To be heard? No	Option B - Let the commercial juices flow. Let those with the cash to invest have the most say.
Detlev Specht Submitter #277 To be heard? No	Using my rates to pay for the port what returns are in it for us.Let the port finance itself.
Doug Henderson Submitter #282 To be heard? No	We also like option B - to float 49% as an IPO allowing Private investors all makes for sound business planning. Ports of Tauranga is testimount to this. My only concern would be - By floating 49% on the NZX, obtaining the required funding is highly likely to be over subscribed. Therefore, if this was to happen, would or could HB investors have first priority to obtain shares before any scaling down in purchase volumn took place. i.e. HB residents first.
E.J.M. Moir Submitter #283 To be heard? No	To the HB Regional Council Dear Sirs, Madames With perhaps 45% on offer, Option B opens up untold capital lying in the a/c's of thousand of Hawkes Bay clubs, lodges, charities, trusts and other dormant money belonging to rate paying organisations, staff, citizens, companies, suppliers and banks. Give them preference in the IPO and I'm sure control will rest in the vested interests of Hawkes Bay.
Nico Klaus Submitter #285 To be heard? No	This works for the Port of Tauranga and will work for the Port of Napier without doubt.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Leslie Klaus Submitter #286 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Its working for Tauranga and should work as well for Napier</p>
<p>Steven Simkin Submitter #287 To be heard? No</p>	<p>JUST LOOK AT PORT OF TAURANGA</p>
<p>Wendy Booyens Submitter #289 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Retains control Provides investment opportunity for residents to invest in a local project of strategic importance Avoids cost of capital from borrowing Avoids horrendous rates implications - already really high in Wairoa</p>
<p>Wayne Hussey Submitter #290 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This gives locals the opportunity to invest in our region and possibly get a return.</p>
<p>Janet Levingston Submitter #291 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It has worked well for the Port of Tauranga and I would be a keen shareholder when shares are available to the public. I also don't mind a MINORITY shareholding, but it is important that the majority shareholdings remain under local ownership.</p>
<p>Valerie Poe Submitter #293 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Let the public decide how much the port should be expanded in the future. Start on the infrastructure first. Then sort the water.</p>
<p>Euan Wallace Submitter #294 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This allows the rate payers, assuming they have shares, to have some control over the port's general operations and expansion which will continue to be necessary into the future. Other New Zealand ports. ie Tauranga, operate effectively under this system and their business is expanding accordingly.</p>
<p>Brian Hawkins Submitter #298 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The Port should stay in the hands of New Zealanders. With the 49% share issue it is to be hoped that Hawkes Bay residents would subscribe to the share issue</p>
<p>Steven Chamberlain Submitter #302 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I support the B option because I do not want any further extreme rate increases. Also it provides locals with the opportunity to invest in the port, and they should have a priority in any share allocation.</p>
<p>Martha Cameron Submitter #303 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Hawke's Bay needs the port and many people would be happy to buy shares</p>
<p>Leonard Poon Submitter #304 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I take on board the Council's reasons for preference of a partial share float and would be interested in buying shares myself. People who say the capital investment should be funded by public loan or other increased borrowing do not appear to appreciate that loans need to be repaid, with interest. Would however prefer that an amount of less than 49% of the Port's capital value be floated, so as to assure continued Council control fully.</p>
<p>Jill McConnochie Submitter #309 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The Port must expand. I see the option to Invest In the growth as the preferred option - I don't see it as "selling the Port", but an opportunity to share in the growth. I see other ports picking up the business that Napier cannot cope with unless the expansion takes place. Tauranga is BOOMING.</p>
<p>Stuart Burden Submitter #317 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I am in support of either B or C option. I don't believe the port needs to remain in full public ownership but think the council should own a controlling share to prevent any entity taking advantage of the only viable shipping option for Hawkes Bay.</p>
<p>Howard Mcnamara Submitter #319 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Seems the only viable option. Perhaps the combination of being a ratepayer and a shareholder might allow a greater degree of community involvement in key issues around the Ports planned growth ie consideration for Ahuriri residents re noise pollution, extreme levels of heavy diesel particulate pollution and resultant potential community health issues.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Ian Lee Dine Submitter #322 To be heard? No	I believe it is the best way to finance the project and I would be prepared to invest.
Celia Owen Submitter #326 To be heard? No	Allow the people of Hawke's Bay to buy shares,mum and dad share holders,local.busines keep it in the bay,its a fantastic opportunity. Regards, Celia Owen.
Cecile Hurford Submitter #327 To be heard? No	It would increase the rates too much to have Option A and I think it should be paying for itself. As it will remain profitable in future, I would like to see the Council retain a majority share so opting for Option B in public shares, rather than a single investment partner.
Jurek Wypych Submitter #328 To be heard? No	It would be good to invest in our community and future
Richard Howell Submitter #329 To be heard? No	Would it be possible to offer the shares to HB rate payers as a first option? I think this would help you sell the idea. Thanks
Brent Hucker Submitter #330 To be heard? No	Busy way to raise capital without impacting on ratepayers Port of Tauranga has been very successful using a similar ownership structure
Teleni Jennings Submitter #331 To be heard? No	Mentioned was that 'no one option completely meets every requirement' with this in mind the preferred option is a combination of A & B. As a rate payer I would prefer a heads up on rate increases so we can plan for the additional expense. The Port is already carrying a debt, what is the strategy to manage and reduce this debt? As a rate payer the preference is to better understand existing debt management plans The opening points suggest that the volumes will only increase by 32% from 2018 to 2028 (first point 2016-2018 25%, second point 2016-2028 57%) please confirm if these figures are correct? Given that Wellington's Port has suffered earthquake damage how much sea traffic is diverted to Napier for road transport? Is Hawkes Bay being used as a Wellington govia port at the cost to Napier Port Customers? Regards TJ
Bryan Dew Submitter #333 To be heard? No	The council maintains a controlling interest but ratepayers still have an opportunity to participate in the ownership model through this medium.
Dennis Hebbberley Submitter #334 To be heard? No	If the Regional ratepayers are given first options on the shares that gives a chance for the people of Hawkes Bay to have ownership in the Port without burdening all ratepayers some of which cannot afford the increase.
Susan Gardner Submitter #335 To be heard? No	Just the best option.
Ian Ritchie Submitter #340 To be heard? No	Important Council staff pay the same price as the public. Favour a discount on share price for Hawkes Bay residents. Perhaps up to 10% Overall I think this is the best option as it attracts money from those who have money to invest and does not penalize those in our community who do not have spare money
Tania Hibbard-Nitz Submitter #341 To be heard? No	I would rather the port be owned by many investors rather than a minority - one or a couple. I would purchase shares in the Port. The potential for HBRC to diversify their investments will still benefit the rate payer. Depending on the type of investment HBRC looks at, the rate payer's benefit could be more than what we are currently getting from the Port. Win, win for everyone.

Submitter	Commentary
Joe Christensen Submitter #343 To be heard? No	The Port is not only an income generating entity is also, due to its location, an integral part of the Napier and therefore Hawke's Bay landscape impacting heavily on the lives of all who live and work in this region. Loosing operating control will also mean loosing the ability to make the Port develop to benefit the Bay. I ask that the Share Float be for a maximum of 45% and preferably 40% to ensure control stays firmly in the hands of Hawke's Bay Regional Council.
Bruce Martin Submitter #344 To be heard? No	I'd like to see diversification of HSBC's investment portfolio rather than having too many eggs in the Port basket particularly given the additional investment required.
Graham Smith Submitter #345 To be heard? No	B is the only viable option in my view as having some knowledge of development and maintenance urgently needed.
Jillian Miller Submitter #346 To be heard? No	I like that HBRC would be keeping majority ownership, but that it also allows for upgrades to be completed without putting the strain of paying for it onto the rate payers
Michael Ahrens Submitter #350 To be heard? No	The Regional Council's preferred option seems the most logical option which I support
Craig Whitcombe Submitter #352 To be heard? No	Helps retain as much of the ownership & potential profit in the bay.
Hilary Pearson Submitter #354 To be heard? No	It would be highly desirable as an individual to be able to invest in our local infrastructure through share investing. It gives us all a sense of responsibility to make it work.
Jill Travis Submitter #355 To be heard? No	Seems the sensible option
Johannes Jansen Submitter #357 To be heard? No	Best option for Napier Port, allows growing under majority ownership Best option for Hawke's Bay economy Best option for Hawke's Bay ratepayers
Jayne Simkin Submitter #363 To be heard? No	A "NO BRAINER"
Margaret Broad Submitter #364 To be heard? No	Option B is best:- - Provides required funds for future growth - Less liability for ratepayers - Offers a Blue Chip Investment opportunity for NZ investors preferably - Hawkes Bay ratepayers should be given preferential options to purchase shares
Dave Kale Submitter #366 To be heard? No	Only one sensible option
Murray Sinclair Submitter #370 To be heard? No	For all the same reasons that the council have.
Mary Halliwell-Fox Submitter #371 To be heard? No	I would like the shares for NZ residents only.
G Marple Submitter #373 To be heard? No	Option "B" for me too

Submitter	Commentary
Maureen Grapes Submitter #374 To be heard? No	(Have tried, unsuccessfully, to do this online) I suggest following Option B.
Michael Maynard Submitter #375 To be heard? No	My wife and I prefer that the Port of Napier remains in the control of the Hawke's Bay Regional Council. We believe that Hawke's Bay people should benefit from Hawke's Bay assets.
Geoff Mentzer Submitter #376 To be heard? No	It's the HBRC's preferred option.
Margaret Baker Submitter #379 To be heard? No	Let the local area have first option to purchase shares.
Thelma Hall Submitter #382 To be heard? No	* New Zealand only Share Holders
Paul Sampson Submitter #386 To be heard? No	As the HBRC Statement of Intent requires for a number of years the Port to be a significant source of non-rate revenue - hence lowering rates, it would not be equitable to significantly now increase rates - intergenerational inequity. Better to have the IPO and structure Port so private Hawke's Bay Investors can inject capital. This is a complex issue - No referendum. P.S. the Port of Tauranga/BOPRC has worked well.
Richard Hebblerley Submitter #387 To be heard? No	I agree with option B with a caveat - it would be preferable to find a way to give Hawkes Bay residents a first right to purchase shares ahead of an NZX float to give HB residents an opportunity to invest in assets and growth in their own region. This would also help regional growth as dividend income would come back into the local economy.
Stephen Glasspole Submitter #388 To be heard? No	From the information provided I believe that the retention of majority ownership by the community via the HB Regional Council is in the best interest of the greater Hawkes Bay district. By floating 49% of the Port Shares, the capital injection will provide the necessary funding required to enable the orderly development of the Napier Port without adding debt and thereby requiring increases to the local rates payable by the property owners. The increased income will in turn provide major benefits to the local economy via increased freight and tourism traffic and therefore to the people of Hawkes Bay.
Elizabeth Mayes Submitter #389 To be heard? No	the rest mean we lose our port in effect and any revenue as well.
Ana Daymond Submitter #393 To be heard? No	Just seems to be the fairest option, and hopefully will keep \$ in the Bay.
Bruce Downer Submitter #394 To be heard? No	Have been impressed by the information supplied & support the Regional Councils preference.
Jill Downer Submitter #395 To be heard? No	Useful information supplied helping me to support the Regional Councils preference.
Karen Hughes Submitter #396 To be heard? No	All Hawkes Bay ratepayers/residents should be given first option to purchase shares along the same lines as the NZ Government made available for the purchase of power company shares, i.e. Minimum investment of \$1000 with a maximum guaranteed allocation of 2000 shares.

Submitter	Commentary
Ken upritchard Submitter #397 To be heard? No	Balanced risk and less impact on rate payers
David Watton Submitter #401 To be heard? No	I am a great believer that this is the best option for all major assets such as ports and airports etc as it allows the investment required to be obtained from a broader base thus the business can work in a work in a more dynamic environment.
James Anderson Submitter #405 To be heard? No	Although I believe "B" is obviously the best option, I also am encouraged to vote for this by my confidence in our "Worship", the Mayor of Napier, Mr Bill Dalton, who with his past experience with the share market knows the best path to making Napier Port move forward to a prosperous future.
Robyn O'connor Submitter #408 To be heard? No	I BELIEVE THE COUNCIL MUST RETAIN THE MAJORITY SHARE TO HAVE CONTROL FOR THE FUTURE, I ALSO BELIEVE THAT AS IT BELONGS IN EFFECT, TO ALL HAWKES BAY RESIDENTS, THEY SHOULD HAVE THE CHANCE TO BECOME PART OF THE OWNERSHIP OF THE PORT SO THEY CAN CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE PORT AND REAP SOME BENEFIT.
Bruce Rudland Submitter #410 To be heard? No	get on and get it done, cannot afford to keep turning ships away. need to progress like Tauranga, if we don't the port will be a small coastal port, which will only feed the likes of Tauranga. Napier city needs all the cruise ships we can get, only have to be in Napier when a cruise ship is in port to see the city come alive. We must do this and keep the whole area growing.
Peter Frizzell Submitter #412 To be heard? No	Option B ticks the boxes for; 1. HBRC retaining a controlling interest in the Port Operation 2. Still receiving a dividend to offset rates 3. Limit borrowing. 4. Negate rates increase 5. Future opportunity to raise more funds by rights offer to shareholders Port of Tauranga is a well proven case of a public share offer that has been a great success.
Mathias Berlin Submitter #413 To be heard? No	Seems to be the best option , have worked reasonable well for Tauranga.
Paul Rose Submitter #414 To be heard? No	This is the best option.
Shayne Pattison Submitter #417 To be heard? No	If it works successfully for the port of Tauranga, then I fully support the public share offer.
Janis Warren Submitter #418 To be heard? No	I am sorry about the state of this Document. The men from Chorus are installing Ultrafast Broadband cables in our Street and they filled my letterbox with muddy water.
Graeme Ford Submitter #419 To be heard? No	be great to keep it local with local people to own.
Ross Piper Submitter #420 To be heard? No	Option B gives the most benefit to the port and ratepayers of Hawkes Bay by retaining control of this asset.
Julie Goldingham Submitter #423 To be heard? No	So that ownership of the Port stays in Hawke's Bay through HBRC owning 51% and share holders, many of who will be HB residents, buying the remaining 49% shares. It is by far the most practical option.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Brian Gare Submitter #424 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I don't like the long term lease or sell to investment partner options, and although in some ways I prefer option A, I think the resultant increase in rates would make this a very difficult option, especially for low income families, of which there are many in Hawke's Bay, so I think I'd probably be interested in buying some shares in the port. However HBRC will have to present this option well to interested investors, and we'd want some sort of assurance that our investment won't just disappear into a "black hole"</p>
<p>R & R Gardner Submitter #425 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Don't end up like Darwin (owned by the Chinese)</p>
<p>V M Kramer Submitter #426 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It would be very good if something was done about the erosion on the beach. If it is not done we just have more and more damage. Floating on the Sharemarket is my preferred Option.</p>
<p>David Price Submitter #430 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It seems to be the best option and still retains the controlling interest</p>
<p>Jennifer Davis Submitter #431 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Out for shares BUT definately only to NZ residents. Nothing is to go overseas</p>
<p>David Davis Submitter #432 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Put on the sharemarket, BUT definately only for NZ residents. NOTHING to be sold to overseas buyers</p>
<p>Jason Pickering Submitter #433 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Allow a guarantee to each individual rate payer of up to \$20,000 worth of shares to be able to be purchased free of brokerage or transaction fees in the Initial Public Offering of the 49%. All other options do not make as much sense of a minority offering of shares.</p>
<p>Fran Rose Submitter #438 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Locals should own it to have our say. We don't want foreign ownership</p>
<p>John Berry Submitter #441 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option B is the only practical option as it will give the council flexibility in the future. Option A is by far the worst option available and I believe the council should only consider this option as a last resort. Given the recent rate increase by the regional council and to a lesser extent the district/city councils at a time when housing affordability is a significant issue I believe the council should be doing what it can to keep any future rate increases as low as possible. I do note that some commentators are against selling the port because they want the port to remain an asset of Hawke's Bay residents. I would suggest the council investigate options for giving preferential treatment to current ratepayers in the IPO so that these commentators and other ratepayers are able to do their part in keeping a significant majority of shares owned by Hawke's Bay residents.</p>
<p>Giles Pearson Submitter #443 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I support Option B. This provides a balance between public ownership, needs for capital, and not taking unacceptable commercial risks. I contrast Port Of Tauranga which certainly has not been held back by a wider ownership model. In the end the main requirement of the port is an efficient transfer of goods for Hawke's Bay businesses - who owns and funds it matters less.</p>
<p>Alice Symes Submitter #444 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Great investment for the individual - hopefully this is the way it goes! Would be great to be able to transfer kiwisaver accounts into it!</p>
<p>Brett Dallas Submitter #446 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I strongly believe that Option B is the best solution and support this option.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Denise Heays Submitter #450 To be heard? No	I just think its the best option to go forward into the future.
I. J. Wakefield Submitter #452 To be heard? No	I have considered the information regarding options for further growth of Napier Port. I am of the impression that Option B would be preferable. Overall, there appear to be consistently more benefits with this method and it remains in local control. I believe I have analysed this correctly and I appreciate the opportunity of perhaps buying shares at some stage, although, I warn you, the amount would be small. Thank you for this information and for seeking to know public desires. I wish you well. Thank you. Yours Sincerely Mrs I. J. Wakefield
G J Coleman Submitter #453 To be heard? No	But what has happened to the 80 million dollars that the Council had appropriated to the construction of the dam? Why is it not available for the developmen of the wharf. Very good material?
Moria McGana-Ratapu Submitter #455 To be heard? No	I the Port might be better to stay the way it is! If we can't afford it.
Mereaira Bennison Submitter #457 To be heard? No	I support this option in consideration of the future growth, protection and well-being of our current young people whom will be the Kaitiaki for their off spring. Unison is a priority, Rauora, Renengaro and Wainea of all users.
D Brock Submitter #459 To be heard? No	1) Thank you for producing the extensive leaflet thoroughly explaining the 4 options. Well done 2) In going with 'B' I would assume less than 49% would be floated were that to be possible.
L C Drager Submitter #460 To be heard? No	LET IT BE KNOWN THAT THE MORE YOU BUILD OUT THE MORE SAND DRIFTS BACK TO THE PORT NOT AN OVERSEAS EXPERT JUST A BOY FROM THE BAY OF ISLANDS
Noel Dymond Submitter #462 To be heard? No	It seems the best option.
Mrs Maria van der Linden Submitter #464 To be heard? No	1) Option B gives New Zealanders an opportunity to contribute towards Napier Port prosperity of development. 2) It distributes ownershuip shares widely. 3) The rates payments would not increase. 4) Income would rise to benefit Hawkes Bay from greater revenue generated by Napier Port. 5) More jobs would be generated by the income of greater post capacity from exports and imports.
Richard Puanaki Submitter #466 To be heard? No	I am happy with option B because it has a history of successful implementation in several other places. Also I like the retention of majority ownership and therefore control.
Zoe Latter Submitter #467 To be heard? No	I don't want it sold to one big investor Now or later i would prefer it to belong to Napier investors
TV Bala Fresh Fruits Company Ltd Submitter #468 To be heard? No	Will support Council's preferred option B. If Council are pushed to sell, then suggest contact DP World in Dubai. DP World do a very good job in Australia and it will be easy for them to manage. They have good name and operate all over the world !!
T N Page Submitter #474 To be heard? No	I can't possible know all the facts for or against. You were elected to govern this council Get on with it Trevor Page
Jeff&Jenny Nightingale Submitter #477 To be heard? No	But - how do you float r stop big businesses/super schemes etc from buying huge blocks of shares?)) - shares need to be available to all households in HB - how about offering minimum no of shares to all HBRC rate payers first before they hit the open market??

Submitter	Commentary
Laurel Christine Riley Submitter #480 To be heard? No	Being a pensioner I wouldn't want to see it sold off, as our rates are high enough with annual increases as it is. Would also hate to see a minority stake sold off as it would properly be an Asian stakeholder and that's a big no-no as their stake profits will go offshore. Lease option would bound to go under mind you you'd properly be able to buy back. These are only my personal thoughts cheap.
Jillian Milne Submitter #482 To be heard? No	'B' appears the safest option.
John Gemmell Submitter #484 To be heard? No	RATE PAYERS IN THE HBRC AREA SHOULD HAVE PREFERENCE IN ANY SHARE FLOAT
Andrew Palairet Submitter #485 To be heard? No	The port needs to grow with our region. Option B releases sufficient capital for this growth while retaining majority ownership with HB ratepayers, plus it is a tried and tested model at Port of Tauranga and South Port, where it works well. Furthermore, this option gives the chance for the general public to have a ownership stake in the port, if the IPO can be managed in a way that makes an appropriate proportion of shares available to HB residents in advance of other investors. The issue is not binary and therefore unsuited to decision by public referendum.
Bridget Pagler Submitter #486 To be heard? No	Gives the public a chance to invest in their port.
John Pagler Submitter #487 To be heard? No	Give local people a chance to invest in their port.
Peter Moore Submitter #490 To be heard? No	Preferred that new shareholders are NZ citizens or NZ fund operators. Not to include overseas investors.
K Andersen Submitter #491 To be heard? No	Definitely want it kept local even if means Ratepayer pays but firstly prefer B.
Peter Sapper Submitter #493 To be heard? No	Best option for port and region.
Iris Bundle Submitter #495 To be heard? No	Would prefer 1st sale of 35% 2nd sale of 10% if required.
Anonymous Submitter #498 To be heard? No	The Best option is one where the project can prove the need and economic profit by paying as high % as possible from the improved facilities and income from that. I put my preferences from 1-4 Thank you for this opportunity (Preferences were B-1 C-2 D-3 A-4)
Maurice Hall Submitter #499 To be heard? No	A good opportunity for local people to be able to invest in local Infrastructure. The Tauranga model appears to be working fine.
Marguerite Maude Crist Submitter #505 To be heard? No	WITH PRIORITY GIVEN TO N.Z. CITIZENS WITH H.B. GETTING PREFERENCE.
Judy Halkett Submitter #506 To be heard? No	- Share allocation added to rates with the increase perhaps allowing interested people who can not afford it perhaps have a share holding (eg payment over two or three years). - Please no more foreign investment.

Submitter	Commentary
Ted Bibby Submitter #508 To be heard? No	WOULD LIKE TO BUY SHARES & SUPPORT COUNCILS DECISION
G&J Hodder Submitter #510 To be heard? No	We agree This optio is probably best, as it has been used successfully in the Port of Tauranga
Ken & Robyn Graham Submitter #511 To be heard? No	We would differently support option B. For people like us pensioners any rates increase is very hard to cope with. Thanks for the info. Cheers Ken & robyn Graham
Steve Reaney Submitter #513 To be heard? No	Commercial sensibility and longer term sustainability.
Ed Vowden Submitter #516 To be heard? No	How much influence or what kind of influence do the shareholders have over the management and future direction of the ports activities. Thankyou for the opportunity of being included in the decision making process
A McInerney Submitter #522 To be heard? No	At date, I haven't received the consultation document in the mail.
Denni Lassuy Submitter #523 To be heard? No	Please don't add any more burden to tax-payers.
Mr & Mrs W Harris Submitter #526 To be heard? No	KEEP IN NZ HANDS AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.
Shirley M Coker Submitter #530 To be heard? No	I agree B. the best option and most important we do not want to turn away cruise ship's and larger ships due to lack of space. S Coker
Petronella Vorster Submitter #531 To be heard? No	I want to share in the wealth!
Gerald Beach Submitter #533 To be heard? No	Keeping everything owned by the people forever is the only way to go. Selling it to anyone exposes the on sale at a later date. The Council has a major obligation to future proof the port for all New Zealanders
Fiona De Barre Submitter #551 To be heard? No	Give the community a chance to buy shares as an investment return. People don't want their rates to increase along with every other basic living expense
Vanessa van Kampen Submitter #556 To be heard? No	Locals could have an opportunity to own some of our infrastructure
Ray Manning Submitter #559 To be heard? No	Spread the cost to all NZ citizens
Marjorie Manning Submitter #560 To be heard? No	Give All nz citizens a share in the port
Anita Aitken-Taylor Submitter #561 To be heard? No	Makes both economic and financial sense to publicly list to enable more capital for port expansion services

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Alex McDougal Submitter #564 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I trust that HBRC has done their research and therefore support the preferred option.</p>
<p>Barry Kenah Submitter #572 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would prefer no more than 45% to be offered for public share.</p>
<p>William Dent Submitter #573 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Port of Tauranga - model</p>
<p>Simon Bevan Submitter #578 To be heard? No</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. community members who wish a FURTHER investment (we ALREADY own the asset so are buying it from ourselves) can INCREASE their holding by taking part in the IPO and holding shares and receiving a REAL PERSONAL dividend. 2. the NEW port business will be judged against Port of Tauranga and other publicly traded shares bringing URGENCY to be more EFFICIENT / transparent. 3. My vote for option B is contingent on the CURRENT managers excusing themselves from buying the IPO and hiring managers who can STAY WITHIN PUBLISHED INFLATION FIGURES when setting annual rates demands which have EXCEEDED 'official' inflation #'s by more than DOUBLE since I have been paying HBRC rates (10 years). 4. Option B is correct if current managers EXCLUDE themselves from any and all benefits this may bring, other than as ratepayers in their personal property subject to HBRC rates. 5. Option B is correct if it's not a Lolly Scramble for INSIDERS (HBRC managers / directors). 6. Thank you for the opportunity to express my views as a long suffering ratepayer of HBRC.
<p>Brian D'Ath Submitter #579 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Floating 49% with public company is the best structure to raise the capital for Port expansion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HBRC ratepayers not obligated to contribute whilst retaining control. - HBRC rate payers risk limited. - Public Company Governance Structure can safeguard 51% share holder interests and should enhance performance and vision. - I believe it is imperative for this region to have viable Port to meet the future needs of local production and accommodate the ships that will carry it to markets'
<p>Brenda Colmore Submitter #582 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This seems to be the right choice. I do not like the idea of ratepayers having to pay for this</p>
<p>Megan Muir Submitter #584 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Retaining full ownership would be my preference, however I understand the need for the Regional Council to retain funds in case of an unexpected event. Also not all ratepayers would be happy with a rate increase, especially with uncertainty with the current economy and fuel price rises. Keeping majority share within the Councils control is the best option, however I feel retaining 55% is a better option than 51%. Instead of building the wharf at 350m, why not make it 400 - 450m, if space prevails and limited damage will be done to the environment, to ensure this process does not have to happen again in the future at a greater cost impact.</p> <p>Allow local rate holders the option to purchase shares of the Port at a reasonable price, before floating them to the public. This will allow the option to have more shares retained locally and let locals have the benefits, instead of 'other investors' being able to purchase the majority of available shares.</p>
<p>Philip Stephens Submitter #588 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Some public ownership through shares.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Vivian Stephens Submitter #589 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Some public ownership through shares</p>
<p>Michel de Vos Submitter #590 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Provides the best balance between funding future port growth whilst retaining majority ownership to the people of Hawkes Bay. Listing provides many other benefits including prestige and greater flexibility for future capital raising if required, whilst retaining the culture which makes the Port what it is today.</p>
<p>Graeme Ward Submitter #593 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option B = - no impact on residents' rates - Hawke's Bay Regional Council retains 51+% of the value of ownership of the Port</p>
<p>Edward Carson Submitter #596 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Apply for regional economic development fund for a portion of the development and look to an investment partner.</p>
<p>Michael Reaburn Submitter #601 To be heard? No</p>	<p>OPTION B is the best way to get capital needed for continued development of an efficient and cost effective port for the growth of Hawkes Bay. Maintains core public ownership and gives hbrc opportunity to invest in other assets for the community. Currently all hbrc assets are in one investment, the port which is not a sustainable investment strategy.</p>
<p>Robin Shirkey Submitter #602 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It would appear to be the best of the options presented for the port to meet its growth forecast to support the region. I would prefer that New Zealanders were at the front of the queue for share sales.</p>
<p>Graeme Robson Submitter #604 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Port of Tauranga a very successful operation</p>
<p>Johan Ehlers Submitter #608 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The capital is needed to fund growth and will no doubt generate a reasonable return. It is not an asset sale because the funds raised will be used to create new assets and on that basis I support the public share offer. The share offer will provide an opportunity for new capital to be invested without HBRC (and therefore Hawke's Bay ratepayers) losing control.</p> <p>Ratepayers should be given preference when shares are allocated to help keep wealth that is created through the share offer in Hawke's Bay. From your summary consultation document it appears that the amount of capital that is required equates to about \$956 per ratepayer which seems reasonably modest. Ratepayers should be first in the queue for allocation of shares.</p> <p>If ratepayers oversubscribe the share issue then scale the requests from ratepayers back by cutting the maximum number of shares allocated to any individual ratepayer (trim the top and leave the base). This will limit the number of shares that institutional buyers can purchase and maximise the number of shares available for local people. Ratepayers with multiple properties will have access to more shares than people who own just one property but it beats a large chunk of the wealth associated with ownership of the port leaving the region.</p> <p>If shares are left over after orders from ratepayers have been filled, then allocate the balance of the shares as for any share issue. This would mean that a portion of the wealth associated with ownership of the port will accrue outside the region but at least HB will still enjoy the benefits associated with the enlarged port.</p>
<p>John Wilson Submitter #609 To be heard? No</p>	<p>My reason of choice is because B is the preferred option and I am sure that most rate payers do not want a \$956 increase over 9 yrs.</p>
<p>Gwilym Lloyd Submitter #610 To be heard? No</p>	<p>the struggle to pay rates is real. do not increase them further</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Helen Powdrell Submitter #612 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It still allows us control of the Port whilst providing us with the funds to do required upgrades, without excessive cost to ratepayers.</p>
<p>George Spiers Submitter #614 To be heard? No</p>	<p>If selling 49% to a 3rd party is the final choice please be very careful. 3rd party buyers almost invariably have ulterior motives for such purchases and these are seldom transparent to the vendor, sometimes for several years. Depending what these motives are they maybe not good for the long term future of the region. I've had more than 40 years experience working with foreign buyers and have seen what goes in behind their scenes. If you do a public share offer (my preference) try and limit foreign ownership as this is an easy way for foreign buyers to access ownership and gain representation on the Board.</p>
<p>Darryl Sargent Submitter #615 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option B makes the most sense and reduces risk and cost to ratepayers.</p>
<p>Olga Protasova Submitter #616 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Happy with option b</p>
<p>Lloyd Fitness Submitter #617 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Ratepayers of Hawkes Bay should be given a preferential opportunity to purchase shares in the Port before any unsolicited Public Offer is made. The model of part public ownership with Shares listed on the NZX works successfully as a capital raising instrument & I see no reason why it cannot be duplicated with our Port. I do however feel strongly that Hawkes Bay ratepayers should be given preference in any IPO if that is legally possible.</p>
<p>Anthony Masters Submitter #619 To be heard? No</p>	<p>We don't want rates increased and we want to try to keep it in NZ hands.</p>
<p>Paul Geertson Submitter #620 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This gives Hawkes Bay residents the chance to invest individually in the port</p>
<p>John Brasell Submitter #621 To be heard? No</p>	<p>To keep ownership & control</p>
<p>Mary Brasell Submitter #622 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Mainain ownership</p>
<p>Clarke Curtis Submitter #623 To be heard? No</p>	<p>My preference is for HBRC rate payers to maintain a majority share holding and control of this important regional asset. Option B has the benefit that HB people can directly invest in the business and have direct ownership.</p>
<p>Billie Charman Submitter #629 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I am a Napier resident and I would only like the shares made available to locals. Billie Charman</p>
<p>John O'Donnell Submitter #631 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I totally agree with the Regional Council's preferred option.</p>
<p>Ken Maclaren Submitter #636 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Public / private ownership has been a proven way to increase investment and improve the business for all. I doubt that anyone in the Bay of Plenty would want to go back to the total public ownership model.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Harvey & Elaine Bateman Submitter #641 To be heard? No	We vote for preferred option B.
Jack Gilberd Submitter #643 To be heard? No	Seems to have worked OK in Tauranga
Emma Merry Submitter #648 To be heard? No	My question is, how would/will the increasing traffic/freight/'business' of the port be addressed, in terms of impact on roading, other infrastructure and environmental impact? Especially trucks using Marine Parade, which are already hazardous. This information has not so far as I know been made publicly available.
JH & SA Boustead Submitter #650 To be heard? No	Shares should be offered to HB rate payers first.
G Herrington Submitter #651 To be heard? No	I WOULD CONSIDER INVESTING IN SHARES TO RETAIN THE PORT IN H.B. HANDS
Sue Stables Submitter #655 To be heard? No	enabling Local community Mum & Dad's to invest.
Nick Heesterman Submitter #656 To be heard? No	Give ratepayers preferential share options i.e. first right to purchase and float the remainder or apportion share float to ratepayers and stock xchange - like the government did with meridian & Genisis
Joy Mintorn Submitter #657 To be heard? No	Seems to make sense financially
Robert T Ingham Submitter #661 To be heard? No	OPTION (B) RETAIN 51% + BY H.B.R COUNCIL BALANCE A.C.C., RETIREMENT FUND, AND I.W.I TO GET HOLDING RESERVE % FOR LOCAL RATE PAYERS WHO WOULD LIKE TO INVEST. BALANCE OPEN INVESTERS ON STOCK EXCHANGE.
John Stratton Goudie Submitter #664 To be heard? No	Option B gives local residents the opportunity to buy in a stake of their choice, to support the availability of a local industry. I hold a small stake in Ports of Tauranga who have just published an impressive annual report. Previous to this I held shares in Ports of Auckland. "I like my Ports". Option B is the way to proceed. Go for it!
Peter Everett Submitter #665 To be heard? No	(B) is obviously the ONLY option to consider. Port Tauranga is a prime VERY successful decision which Napier should follow for everyone's benefit
Mrs D A Roberts Submitter #666 To be heard? No	PREFER 45% (SUITS TAURANGA!). WOULD BE MOST INTERESTED TO KNOW @ WHAT PRICE THE NZX WOULD LIST AT! SOME INDICATION MUST BE IN YOUR HEADS AND IMPORTANT FOR PROSPECTIVE FINANCIAL SHARE-HOLDERS TO KNOW. iFOR ONE WILL "WATCH THIS SPACE" WITH GREAT INTEREST. D A Roberts
Graham Duff Submitter #667 To be heard? No	Retain ownership in Hawkes Bay preferred so 49% should be offered to HB entities first, then others if allocation not filled.
John Ewen Submitter #675 To be heard? No	WHAT ABOUT DEBENTURES?
J&M Mabbett Submitter #676 To be heard? No	AGREE. CERTAINLY THE No1 OPTION!

Submitter	Commentary
ALICE SIMKIN Submitter #677 To be heard? No	NEEDS TO BE A TOTALLY COMMERCIAL BUSINESS
Russell & Rebecca Yates Submitter #681 To be heard? No	Good luck, Hope big HB Companies buy in
Murray Revell Submitter #684 To be heard? No	TAURANGA PORT HAS A SIMILAR OPTION TO "B" AND HAS PROVEN TO BE VERY SUCCESSFUL.
Graham & Linda Eagle Submitter #687 To be heard? No	We would prefer the Napier Port to stay 100% locally owned, but feel that the increase in rates to fund this, would be more than the average ratepayer could afford, so we prefer option B.
Kas and Sharon Fairey Submitter #689 To be heard? No	We chose this option as we believe the Port Assett should be in NZ control.
Tom Cartwright Submitter #693 To be heard? No	I'M NOT A FINANCIAL EXPERT, SO I ASSUME THE H.B. REGIONAL COUNCIL HAS A LOT MORE KNOWLEDGE ON THESE MATTERS, THAN I DO. IF THEY ARE HAPPY WITH OPTION "B", AND IT DOS'NT INVOLVE A RATES RISE, THEN OPTION "B" IS THE WAY TO GO!! Tom C
Keith Gant Submitter #694 To be heard? No	Most sensible preferred option.
Ian Ellengold Submitter #704 To be heard? No	I support Option B as it is the same system that the last Government moved to in the case of Air NZ and that has proved to be successful. It frees up Capital whilst still having control of the company, a win/win result.
Vicki Butterworth Submitter #706 To be heard? No	Important HBRC retain control but have resources to carry out what is needed and not increase rates.
Rodger Bloomfield Submitter #711 To be heard? No	To maintain our port for Hawkes bay.
Ronald Skews Submitter #712 To be heard? No	Because it's the smart option.
Derek Scott Submitter #715 To be heard? No	The preferred option B model seems to work well for Tauranga. Should work for HBRC. Would prefer minority interests to be limited to 45%.
Todd Dawson Submitter #717 To be heard? No	Provides best option for flexibility and meets both the ports and councils needs for funding as well as ability to attract and retain ownership by NZ shareholders and port staff and cargo owners
Larry Southon Submitter #721 To be heard? No	While I feel that option B would be the best method of raising additional funds required for the expansion of the port I would prefer that only up to 35% be floated on the NZX. This would guarantee that the HBRC retains majority ownership in all possible future scenarios. The shortfall in funds raised by a 35% float in comparison to a 49% float could then be made up via option A as and when necessary. This would greatly reduce the amount that would need to be funded by borrowing/rates increases.

Submitter	Commentary
Lyndal Johansson Submitter #722 To be heard? No	I do not want foreign investment owning our Port.
Dexter Sharp Submitter #723 To be heard? No	Be a good investment for shareholders
Heather Gregory Submitter #725 To be heard? No	Like the public share option as the local community can buy in if they wish
Hamish Cairns Submitter #735 To be heard? No	Works well in Tauranga
Bruce Meusop Submitter #740 To be heard? No	- GIVES INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITY TO LOCALS IF THEY WISH - HAWKES BAY RATEPAYERS SHOULD HAVE PREFERENTIAL RIGHTS TO ANY SHARE ALLOCATIONS
Chris & Audrey Geddis Submitter #741 To be heard? No	Suggest the float is issued to HBRC RATEPAYERS first, and then general Public. This way Hawke's Bay shares in their own Port, before outsiders. We already have shares in Port of Tauranga Auckland airport and Infratil amongst others in our portfolio of investments
Beth Boag Submitter #743 To be heard? No	* I would prefer floating up to 45% on the NZX. If Port of Tauranga can limit the float to 45% Port of Napier should be able to work within the same parameter. Should shares be consolidated overtime in one shareholder 49% is too close to controlling. * If there is some way of keeping shares limited to New Zealanders I would prefer this. However not sure if this is possible.
Nick McMinn-Collard Submitter #747 To be heard? No	The Port is a business. Ratepayers should not pay. It should be dealt with as a viable business.
Mrs M Carr Submitter #748 To be heard? No	Agree with Council as No 1. As on a Single Super cannot afford any more in rates which No 2. means Council etc would have to apply to WINZ for extra. Just imagine that
Helen White Submitter #750 To be heard? No	Share to be offered to HB residents before open to general public. Float 25% to begin with, never more than 49%
DR&JM Pledger Submitter #752 To be heard? No	We absolutely oppose HBRC charging ratepayers for this. You want it you should not expect ratepayers to fund any part of it.
Rex Bartlett Submitter #757 To be heard? No	I agree with your preferred option
Paul&Ginny Trass Submitter #758 To be heard? No	Need to also invest in replacing sand and erosion control in the harbour
Lorraine Fraser Submitter #760 To be heard? No	New Zealand owned only.
Roger Taylor Submitter #763 To be heard? No	OPTION B MAKES SENCE

Submitter	Commentary
Jackie Patterson Submitter #766 To be heard? No	BEFORE THE FLOAT ON THE NZX, THERE SHOULD BE A 7 DAY PERIOD EXCLUSIVELY AVAILABLE TO HAWKES BAY RESIDENTS, ONLY AFTER A GENERAL FLOAT
Bruce & Trudy Fannin Submitter #769 To be heard? No	B our option.
K J Hoskin Submitter #771 To be heard? No	Prefer to only put 45% maximum on NZX.
S McMillan Submitter #772 To be heard? No	Let Ratepayers have first option to Buy shares to be held for 5 years Stu McMillan
AC & M Fraser Submitter #773 To be heard? No	THERE is No Doubt THE Port NEED To Grow - and MAYBE CHANGE NAME TO PORT OF HAWKE BAY
R Gill Submitter #774 To be heard? No	A referendum on this is a terrible idea. You have done the research take leadership.
David John Withers Submitter #779 To be heard? No	Fully support the preferred option
Alastair MacGregor Submitter #780 To be heard? No	GIVE HB REGIONAL RATE PAYERS FIRST OPTION TO PURCHASE SHARES.
Glenn Ditchburn Submitter #788 To be heard? No	Having read an article in the local Hawkes Bay Today newspaper by Martin Williams, I am now convinced that 25%-33% sale on the NZX is a far better option. From the start I have worried about future option taking when the wharfs are found to be small again.
BR&HJ Holdsworth Submitter #789 To be heard? No	With preference ging given to HB shareholders.
Kay & Lindsay Pinker Submitter #795 To be heard? No	Great Example: Auck International airport
Terry Davies Submitter #799 To be heard? No	Hope you stick to your word not to increase rates.
Richard Smith Submitter #802 To be heard? No	The port would largely remain under council/community control and would raise the funding required for the port & give local people a chance to invest in the port.
Peter Blummont Submitter #803 To be heard? No	People can't keep sustaining rate rises so (B) is only option
Diane Fussell Submitter #811 To be heard? No	As long as the shares are offered to the local HB community first then NZ only.

Submitter	Commentary
Jessica Saw Submitter #815 To be heard? No	Does not affect ratepayers and provide an investment opportunity to the public.
Dee Hibberd Submitter #818 To be heard? No	As I am a Pensioner I would prefer B option, as the Rates are high enough now with Regional added on as well. Q. What will the "shares" cost? How long will the "Shares" run for, before they will be repaid?
Haley McCoskery Submitter #819 To be heard? No	Can/will HB rate payers have first options to buy these shares? Thanks Haley Mccoskery
Barry Gollan Submitter #821 To be heard? No	This is the best option we think. The example set by P.O.T. shows how successful this could be.
J & Y Pitcher Submitter #827 To be heard? No	With option B would HBRC rate demand paid annually be reduced due to 40% owned by stakeholders?
Ross Mitchell Submitter #830 To be heard? No	Makes most financial sense
Dale Prebble Submitter #831 To be heard? No	This appears to be the best option for the province and the future of the Port. Giving some form of preference for Hawkes Bay residents to purchase shares would make it even more local.
Alan Webby Submitter #837 To be heard? No	New Zealand
ADAM SIMKIN Submitter #840 To be heard? No	ABOLISH CURRENT BEAURACRACY, RUN IT AS A PROPER COMMERCIAL BUSINESS LIKE PORT OF TAURANGA. WIN/WIN SITUATION
Rachel Cornwall Submitter #846 To be heard? No	Will provide long term the best funding platform for funding, and ongoing monitoring of performance and outcomes
Gabby Morris Submitter #848 To be heard? No	Not easy finding this online. You don't make it easy. Also I still haven't found on original form where the cut off date is. It's no doubt there but again hidden from plain sight. We are all busy. Make the forms easy to read as well as online.
Elizabeth Leys Submitter #851 To be heard? No	I would prefer to get cash in but still retain majority ownership rather than have loans and rates to be paid by the people, or lease to an unknown investor who could do whatever?
Wayne Norrie Submitter #855 To be heard? No	keep control NZ to share ownership optimise debt refresh the Board
Gary Vincent Submitter #856 To be heard? No	You only need to look at the Tauranga Port to see how this can be succesful. My preference is to sell up to no more than 45%. This option will provide the funding and keep greater control.
David Appleton Submitter #864 To be heard? No	Overall, option B appears to be the soundest, though the possibility of Unison being a major partner should be investigated, Unison being a locally, wholly publicly owned trust. However, it is considered preferable for public share holding to be less that 49%, if possible less than 45%. It would seem doubtful that the general public would accept a major rates increase to fund the port, the overall figure required probably being beyond the means of many home owners to pay.

Submitter	Commentary
Jason Fleming Submitter #865 To be heard? No	I support Option B. Development of the Port to fulfill our regions supply chain issues is best achieved via an informed and suitably resourced investment network. I believe this option will achieve the greatest outcomes for a wide range of stakeholders now and for the future.
simon Scannell Submitter #867 To be heard? No	By listing 49% on the stock exchange the port will obtain funding at no cost or repayment pressure and can grow the port to meet the regions growing requirements. This will make the port a commercial enterprise which will be answerable to its shareholders and will need to be run commercially by well qualified directors and not by bureaucratic Councillors and unqualified people.
des lock Submitter #872 To be heard? No	sounds like the best option
A M Rae Submitter #873 To be heard? No	Prefer option B but only if it was open to "Mum & Dad" investors with Hawke's Bay ratepayers having priority before other bigger investors
Gavin Yortt Submitter #876 To be heard? No	If option B is option that is agreed , local ratepayers should have preference in any share float by way of allocation.
Jill Hankin Submitter #881 To be heard? No	I agree that it should be put to public share offer. Rate payers then could have the opportunity to buy shares if they so wish. There are many people in our region who could not afford to pay extra in rates, so this way, the people that can afford it and are happy to buy shares can be the funders of the new wharf.
Ed Kight Submitter #883 To be heard? No	Sensible to bring in outside capital to fund the expansion. No need to retain 100% ownership. Better to be a small part of a big thing rather than all of a smaller entity
Aaron Thompson Submitter #884 To be heard? No	I believe this option will keep jobs within the port safer, but I also believe in only selling the minimum shares as possible to raise the resources needed for expansion as majority vote will still be hard at 51% for Napier Port
Peter Halstead Submitter #892 To be heard? No	As long as rate payers get a firm allocation of shares before general public.
shelley Halstead Submitter #893 To be heard? No	As long as firm allocation goes to ratepayers before public
Dianne Anderson Submitter #897 To be heard? No	the port needs to grow and improve but it makes a profit and the rate payers should not be funding it.
Margaret Everitt Submitter #898 To be heard? No	sounds best option for everyone.
Hayden Mckee Submitter #899 To be heard? No	It's simple, diversified risk. Let's not have all our eggs in one basket. If Napier gets hit by another 1931 earthquake then the Council will be up for 100% of the repairs of the Port alongside the Insurance companies. This way we can spread our risk and let NZ's all over the country invest in our Port. You only need to look at the success of the port of TGA to see that with the right management team and investment strategy, the success can be significant. The money raised though needs to be put to exceptional use for growth of the region - larger airport, securing long term water supply, more jobs and business investment etc. thanks Hayden.

Submitter	Commentary
Kathleen Rodgers Submitter #901 To be heard? No	Option B would be my preferred option. The public share offer should not be taken up totally by any off-shore company as this has happened at some ports in Australia. Kathleen Rodgers
Penelope Margaret Graham Submitter #902 To be heard? No	49% seems a bit high. Maybe 45% would be a better proportion.
Brian Gibbs Submitter #904 To be heard? No	HAVING BEEN ON THE OLD HB HB THIS IS THE ONLY TO GO. TAURANGA IS A GOOD EXMPLE How IT SHOULD WORK. I WILL TAKE SHARES WHEN THEY ARE FLOATED HOPE THIS GOES THROUGH
Simon Hartree Submitter #905 To be heard? No	float no more than 40\$ leaving 9% as a back up for future emergencies or projects
Adrian Hussey Submitter #910 To be heard? No	I think it would be good to let new Zealanders invest in it and keep it New Zealand's
Peter Robin Submitter #911 To be heard? No	I'm happy with Option (B) provided the 49% investment isn't dominated by overseas investors ie; Chinese.
Angela Pidd Submitter #912 To be heard? No	First option to purchase shares on the NZX should be offered to HB ratepayers, and if there any left over, they can be sold to general investors. A J Ridel 1/11/18
Ross & Margaret Haliburton (Haliburton Family Trust) Submitter #913 To be heard? No	We have ticked option B with the provision that these shares are offered to New Zealanders only, and to a level of 40% with the rest funded by ratepayers. We would be willing to have our rates increased by \$100 a year. The Port of Napier is too valuable an asset to local growers and exporters, for it to go into other, especially overseas, hands.
Gertrude May & Alexander Keith Thomson Submitter #917 To be heard? No	The CEO, Hawkes Bay Regional Council, Private Bag 6006, Napier 4142. Dear Sir Consultation Document re: Our say on Financing 'Our Port' We favour HBRC's Option B 'Up to 49% Public Share Offer' Includes Finance & Construction of New Wharf 6. My Wife & I will take a reasonable number of shares in the cost of a new wharf (Wharf 6) and other miscellaneous works to improve the operation to suit larger passenger liners and larger container ships. We know that dredging work will be necessary to deepen the entrance to the birthing area and beside some wharfs. Yours Sincerely Alexander Keith Thomson & Gertrude May Thomson
Ian Sharp Submitter #919 To be heard? No	I would prefer you sold up to 25-30% on the NZX with maybe the option to notify the market a further say 10% would be sold in 3-5 years time. Maintaining 51% does not give the council/community control.
Belinda Sleight Submitter #922 To be heard? No	Option B seems like a good balance.
Hope Steele Submitter #927 To be heard? No	Would the profit be shared with the people? Rates decrease? Would locals get a first option on the shares? How does this directly benefit Hastings?
C S Ramlose Submitter #928 To be heard? No	Make them NZ Shares. Only sold to NZ Residents and can not be traded outside of NZ. If you don't get the full amount. HBRC Could finance the difference.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Carol Robertson Submitter #930 To be heard? No</p>	<p>SUPPORT FLOATING 40-45% BUT MAKING SHARES AVAILABLE TO HBRC rate payers only.</p>
<p>Deby Mills Submitter #931 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Ideally I'd like Hawkes Bay landowners to be the first people to be offered the share offer - so that local people can feel connected/take ownership of local direction of their asset. I'm encouraged by Tauranga Port's model for public share offer.</p>
<p>Neil Armitage Submitter #932 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I concur with the PWC review of capital structure options that investment partners should be the preferred option(s). Whilst I would be happy with a Minority Share Holding option my sentiments are swayed to the IPO option. With the IPO option the HBRC would remain as the major shareholder, whilst governance becomes the responsibility of a Board of Governors. As an observation, public concern about 'loss of ownership' is irrelevant. Responsibility for the port rests with the Directors not the HBRC who, like all shareholders are investors. That said HBRC must reinvest, in proportion to their majority shareholding, if additional capital is raised through an issue of new shares.</p>
<p>Gary Elliott Submitter #934 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Floating shares is a very good way of raising capital whilst remaining in control of this important asset. It also gives the public a chance to invest in a growing asset. The Port of Tauranga is a good example of this.</p>
<p>Nicki Batey Submitter #935 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Important that the major ownership is from within Hawke's Bay. That ensures the Greater interests of our tegion remain the overall focus. Would not like majority ownership to be from foreign overseas interest.</p>
<p>Anthony Rule Submitter #937 To be heard? No</p>	<p>A share issue via the New Zealand Stock Exchange is likely to be well supported by investors (as is demonstrated by other port companies in New Zealand). An issue of shares to the public will provide a simpler and more flexible structure if, in the future, changes to the company's capital are required.</p>
<p>Brian Martin Submitter #938 To be heard? No</p>	<p>With the income from sale you can FIX the water, rather than merely chucking chlorine at it.....</p>
<p>Peter Roberts Submitter #940 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Napier Port needs a new wharf. The projected increase in containers handled, log exports and bulk cargo in the next ten years will clearly require significant investment. The rationale for a new wharf and its proposed development are covered in detail at www.napierport.co.nz . This website contains a lucid exposition of the facts. What is not clear is just how this expansion project should be funded. The outstanding performance of the Port of Tauranga following its move to public listing in 1992 makes a compelling argument for some form of public/private ownership going forward. Brian Gaynor's article in the NZ Herald of 2 June, 2018 eloquently sums up the result of a public listing of the Port of Tauranga. "The Bay of Plenty Regional council retained majority control with 56.1% of the shares with the rest going into public ownership. Since listing in 1992 the Council has received dividends of \$513M and a capital repayment of \$37M and the value of its shareholding has risen by a factor of 50. Port of Tauranga's success has been based on a simple formula: prioritising productivity gains, appointing senior executives with industry expertise, having staff share schemes and sticking to its knitting." I there any reason why this model would not achieve a similar outcome for Napier Port?</p>
<p>Edward Te Paki Submitter #948 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Please offer shares to rate payers first</p>
<p>Carissa Delaney Submitter #950 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I think its the best option.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Ms C R Crarer Submitter #951 To be heard? No	Lets hope that with more growth (which is a two edged sword as growth causes much destruction as well), that more rail is used instead of all these large dangerous Trucks on N.Z, roads now.
Mr & Mrs Philip Povey Submitter #952 To be heard? No	Can't afford a rates increase so definitely NOT option A
Mrs J A Ward Submitter #960 To be heard? No	CONTINUE TO HAVE LOCAL OWNERSHIP.
Janet & Tim Cullwick Submitter #964 To be heard? No	Our preference is to sell only up to 35%. With the proposed development expansion the port owned returns to HBRC want to be maintained at existing levels or better. Port of Tauranga is a very good model to work from/consult. This is the most pragmatic solution. Obviously urgent action is required.
Keith Bland Submitter #966 To be heard? No	I would hope the ratepayers would have preferred options to purchase shares.
Glenys Ritchie Submitter #969 To be heard? No	Build a new port at Whirinaki for cargo, timber etc Retain current one for enough cargo to fund it and for cruise ships etc. Whirinake already has road and rail although they would need upgrading. A storage facility in the industrial area for collection containers would be a sensible option, and could still utilise Prebensen Dr.
Martin Wilson Submitter #970 To be heard? No	Prefer the percentage of shares sold would reflect long term viability for the expansion of the port.
Charles Pattison Submitter #978 To be heard? No	Must remain locally owned by rate payers.
J Hargood Submitter #987 To be heard? No	- DON'T TOUCH OUR RATES -
Constance Hinewai Gilbert Submitter #989 To be heard? No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ratepayers should not be made responsible 2. I agree to "Retaining community ownership." All Napier people should be responsible. 3. Our people to Buy shares to help our Port. 4. The value of shares:- \$1000 down to \$10.00 even \$5 FOR LOW INCOME EARNERS
Ron & Sue Boyd Submitter #990 To be heard? No	this is our choice - no foreign investors please.
Graham Walker Submitter #991 To be heard? No	RATEPAYERS PAY FOR ENOUGH NOW. FLOATING GOOD OPTION, SMALL INVESTORS, MORE OPINIONS
Allan C Cochran Submitter #999 To be heard? No	If, as you say, the Napier city council owns the port, then that directly means the rate payers are already shareholders. The current level of rates is probably very close to the max, that many elderly like ourselves and people with young families would not be able to handle a 53% rise in any given year. As rate payers we all contribute to the land ownership on the port facility thats already there - that's O.K. Both my wife and self vote for "B" and pray all other rate payers do likewise Thank you Allan C Cockran
K Fafeita Submitter #1003 To be heard? No	Kept Profits in the port for further investment Some Rate payers mostly could not to afford to Pay this amount.

Submitter	Commentary
Annette Bretherton Submitter #1005 To be heard? No	Keep it local. HB Ratepayers can have a chance to invest in our region for future growth.
Lynne Tarplett Submitter #1010 To be heard? No	Being on the pension I would have to vote against in rate rise so hopefully this is the better option Thanks for the opportunity to vote and be included in this major decision for Napier. L Tarplett
Malcolm Wilkie Submitter #1011 To be heard? No	Locals must be given 1st chane to invest and this needs to be clearly worded ie laymans terms Please!!
David N Swain Submitter #1014 To be heard? No	I WOULD PURCHASE A SMALL PARCEL OF SHARES TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE CAUSE. I COULD NOT AFFORD ANY INCREASE IN RATES AS I AM A SINGLE PENSIONER
F&D Manson Submitter #1015 To be heard? No	DEFINITELY B WE BELIEVE THIS WOULD BE REALLY GOOD FOR NAPIER, ENCOURAGING THE PUBLIC TO TAKE A MUCH MORE SERIOUS INTEREST IN WHAT HAPPENS TO THE PORT AND SURROUNDING AREA
FG&S Hook Submitter #1021 To be heard? No	A Many rate payers would find a rise in their Regional Rates by 53% difficult: Retaining full ownership would be ideal if not. Option B
J M McCardle Submitter #1022 To be heard? No	Reserve a number of shares for local investors
David Todd Submitter #1027 To be heard? No	Of the options presented Option B appears the most palatable. In the absence of more specific detail Option A appears difficult to support given the level of debt that appears to be required. There seems to be particular emphasis in the information provided on the impact on rates - but not a lot of detail about the likely impact that this option would have on the dividend stream being returned to HBRC. Full ownership, on suitable terms, would be ideal. Key words in Option B it are " up to". As per the Taraunga model perhaps closer to 40% might be a good starting point, particularly keeping in mind possible "watering down" over time that could occur with financial changes. This option does allow ratepayers to invest in it as shareholders in their own right, as well as by default in their capacity as ratepayers. The future projections, and current volumes, do not clearly explain the impact, very positive I believe, that the recent earthquake damage to the Wellington port has had - and/or the sustainability of that. My assumption is that that has been factored in.
Elizabeth Lamburn Submitter #1028 To be heard? No	Although I have ticked B. I would prefer H.B Regional Council to retain more than the 51% proposed. I would also like to see local people given priority to invest, all profits retained within Hawke's Bay. If legal, selling of investments purchased, could not be re-sold, without the permission of the present holder the Hawke's Bay Regional Council
James Graeme Francis (JP) Submitter #1030 To be heard? No	I like retaining majority ownership and control. Encouraging us as residents to invest in a vital asset such as the port. The Tauranga model shows how it Can be done. And the impetus is there to keep the port (Napier) as a vital part of the regions on going growth.
Peter Craig Submitter #1033 To be heard? No	Must only be 49% floating and be made Future proof with buy back option by regional council if required
Mrs C G Gould Submitter #1034 To be heard? No	It's a shame to lose some ownerhip of the port. But it's clearly the most practical option for a good outcome.

Submitter	Commentary
Mrs J Baker Submitter #1035 To be heard? No	A TOO MUCH FOR RATE PAYERS C WOULD PROBABLY BE AN OVERSEAS INVESTER D TOO LONG
Sandra Simpson Submitter #1043 To be heard? No	B, seems to be the most sensible option.
George & Marjorie Hare Submitter #1046 To be heard? No	We would be interested in buying shares.
Margi Butler Submitter #1058 To be heard? No	Plan A I prefer but concerned about the Rates going up looking forward and as a retire person it would affect us hugely financially.
Wayne Harman Submitter #1059 To be heard? No	Option B appears to provide a better opportunity to introduce greater transparency and solid governance.
Ian Elmsly Submitter #1060 To be heard? No	The local Regional Council must retain controlling shareholding/ownership of the Port. Placing 49% of shares in the local share market with perhaps covenants restricting the larger investors to a maximum percentage of say 3-5% to control external influence. Maybe other options are to raise capital via what used to be known as Local Body Bonds (I believe the legislation remains in place) for 5-20 year terms. Such bonds were able to be traded much like shares and would likely be attractive to the many super funds now in NZ.
Grayham Burden Submitter #1061 To be heard? No	I think it is good that New Zealanders are able to invest in major NZ investments. I think it would be good that the people of Hawkes Bay are given preference when the shares are allocated. To ensure people hold their shares & don't sell them as soon as they appear on the NZX, consideration should be given to bonus shares being issued to those that hold their shares for 2/3 years. I think it is vital that off-shore investors are excluded especially the Chinese.
Peter Dingley Submitter #1067 To be heard? No	Looks like the best option to grow the port and to retain some control on what will be happening to it in the future.
Richard Hooker Submitter #1073 To be heard? No	With options offered to ratepayers (sell it to the community first).
Bruce Inglis Submitter #1075 To be heard? No	OPTION "B" BUT ONLY IF THERE IS AN UNDERTAKING TO BUY BACK THESE SHARES IN TIME AS AND WHEN CIRCUMSTANCES ALLOW - THIS BUYBACK WOULD BECOME VITAL TO FUTURE PROFINZ THE PORT FOR ANY FUTURE EXPANTION OR DEVELOPMENT. AS ANY SELL OF OF SHARES WOULD PUT THE PORT INTO A MINORITY SHARE HOLDING
Tim Hindmarsh Submitter #1076 To be heard? No	If floated on the NZX current ratepayers should be entitled to purchase as many shares as they wish, or at least with a very high limit, during the allocation of shares. It is very important this happens prior to outside investors recieving allocations. R Hindmarsh
Paul Friend Submitter #1079 To be heard? No	I would like to see the public being able if they wish to support and share in the hopefull continued success of the port.
Trevor Keighley Submitter #1084 To be heard? No	Make shares avail to ratepayers before floating on NZX.

Submitter	Commentary
Dirk Clark Submitter #1086 To be heard? No	Keep it in the Bay, for the people.
N Chittenden Submitter #1090 To be heard? No	I prefer a Bond Issue in the name of individual N.Z. holders. (no others!) Is this possible. No way would I like to see overseas interests have access to even a minority stake
Pauline Taylor Submitter #1092 To be heard? No	As long as we can keep the majority number of shares and it is possibly for people who are resident in New Zealand only
Brent Redding Submitter #1097 To be heard? No	Enables rate payers to be involved
Leonard Reeves Submitter #1098 To be heard? No	The rate payers are paying too much now and don't need those extra cost on top of what they already have to pay. Let those that want the Port growth pay for it.
Denise Redding Submitter #1099 To be heard? No	HB can be involved
Joseph Schofield Submitter #1102 To be heard? No	Sell to local new Zealanders with a no foreign ownership clause
Donald Mudford Submitter #1104 To be heard? No	It is the safe and proper Financial method so that the Hawke's Bay Regional Council retains a majority Shareholder
Delwyn Wilson Submitter #1107 To be heard? No	Seems like the best option to Still have some control and raise the amount of money needed to keep the port current.
David Sheffield Submitter #1112 To be heard? No	Port is for Hawkes Bay and district. !!!!!
Tim Meredith Submitter #1113 To be heard? No	B is the best option to mitigate future risk to the rate payer. I see this expansion as very high risk and won't be buying shares.
Philippa Reid Submitter #1114 To be heard? No	Keep the benefit in The Bay. Please give HB ratepayers the first opportunity to purchase and/or give them priority shares over other NZ residents and a third tier of international investors only if necessary.
Neville Hoare Submitter #1119 To be heard? No	Yes go right ahead with your share offer. It is the most sensible option without loading yourself up with risky debt. It's working well in Tauranga and it will work well here. You were elected to make these decisions so do it.
Sandra Bishop Submitter #1126 To be heard? No	As a homeowner I think Ratepayers pay enough on there rates and what do we get, keeps going up every year..going back to 2013/2014 our rates were \$127.51 now \$539.57=\$2,163.33...now we're pay Hawkes Bay Regional Council Rates, then we started paying \$23.92 in 2003/2004 now they go up every year as well which we're now paying \$198.81. So what's the point of having our say when I think use don't listen any way..but go ahead anyway, that's how I fee.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Jim Scotland Submitter #1128 To be heard? No</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Submitter #1128 To be heard? No</p> <p>I am in favour of Option B as the preferred option with two significant points that need further analysis and explanation.</p> <p>The first consideration is it is unclear from the document how the capital from the sale of shares is raised. Is it via an issue of new capital by PONL, a sale of shares by HBRIC to third parties, or a combination of both options. The choice of the sale method has implications for PONL and HBRIC as two separate companies, and HBRC as the ultimate shareholder of both companies.</p> <p>The document suggests a sale of 45% will raise funds of \$181m by PONL, that \$83m will be passed on to HBRIC in some undefined manner, and that \$98m will be retained by PONL to pay costs of the issue and retire existing debt. Alternatively IF HBRIC is the vendor of 45% of its shareholding and pays the cost of the sale how is the \$86.5m transferred to PONL?</p> <p>In my view the most sensible and straight forward outcome is for the PONL to issue new shares to raise the capital it requires and for HBRIC to sell enough shares to meet its lower risk and alternative investment objectives and provide HBRC with any funds it deems necessary for it's other objectives.</p> <p>I appreciate this detail may not be necessary for a choice of option to be made, it is relevant to the ultimate structure and Financial Position of the three entities involved if option B is adopted.</p> <p>The second point that is not clear from the notes of option B is the decision to sell up to 49% of PONL shares. While this retains majority HBRIC ownership of PONL it gives no flexibility to HBRIC to not take part in any future capital raising, or any merger or acquisition opportunities that may be beneficial to PONL. There may be opportunities that require HBRIC to invest further to protect its majority position. This would require HBRIC or HBRC to borrow funds to participate.</p> <p>The assumption to invest in a Future Investment Fund would mean that the Fund may have a constraint in the long term requiring it to hold sufficient liquid assets to meet any future HBRIC cash requirements. This would limit long term investments such as those made by ACC and the NZ Super Fund whose target and actual return on funds are significantly greater than the 5% assumed by HBRC.</p> <p>My personal view is that while the modelling has been prepared on retaining 55% ownership, at least 60% should be retained in the medium term.</p> <p>The benefits of independent directors, stock exchange listing, higher public profile, local investment, and staff ownership are still met. This gives PONL more flexibility in the medium term to raise further capital when and if it may be required.</p>
<p>Phil Motley Submitter #1132 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would like to have chosen option A but consider it would have too much of a financial cost to the local ratepayers. Therefore I have ticked option B as the next best method for financing the future development of the port.</p>
<p>Craig Goodson Submitter #1133 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Nice balance between maintaining control and return without over investing in one thing. If possible, 60/40% split would be more desirable. Be nice if HB rate payers could have first option to buy shares.</p>
<p>Mrs Linley O'Connell Submitter #1139 To be heard? No</p>	<p>B Floating up to 49% on the NZX looks the best choice at this time. L J O'Connell</p>
<p>Sue Nisbet Submitter #1140 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Great idea.</p>
<p>R Ashby Submitter #1148 To be heard? No</p>	<p>If it works for Tauranga it would seem a 'no-brainer'</p>
<p>Harold & Jo Manning Submitter #1149 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This is the best option, then we as ratepayers still control this wonderful asset. Also become share holders</p>
<p>Gary Frater Submitter #1155 To be heard? No</p>	<p>EXPANSION IS CRITICAL. I trust our elected officials to do the best option for the people of HB.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Brian Cranstone-Hunt Submitter #1159 To be heard? No	Best outcome for all but still held under local control
Graeme Ingram Submitter #1160 To be heard? No	It has worked well in other regions by floating 49% to the public & so still retaining the majority share. The region will benefit from the upgraded port so why not also benefit by having money invested in it as well
Adam Pearse Submitter #1162 To be heard? No	To borrow as opposed to local investment through shares for required upgrades to me is a no brainer. Borrowing will incur interest payments, shares will not, and local ownership will be good as local business being invested will help grow the port. And put profits back into the community. As long as shares are limited to local community ownership only, no foreign investors. Otherwise option A would be better.
Jo Loney Submitter #1164 To be heard? No	I appreciate that the port needs to grow in response to trade and tourism demands. To help pay for this, I favour offering a public share rather than money being raised through an increase in rates, a selling to an investment partner or leasing the port to a private investor.
Karen Wilson Submitter #1165 To be heard? No	No ratepayer input with this option.
Stuart Masters Submitter #1166 To be heard? No	With this proposal there is the ability to appoint independant directors who would be more likely to ask the hard questions and require detailed answers. My view on wharf 6 is that in the proposal there may still be lost opportunity to move the western end of wharf 6 north to allow more space for the extra container movements required by the larger ships. Obviously this would require substantial reclamation. The port needs to be able to work more efficiently than at present.
John Dent Submitter #1167 To be heard? No	Seems the most obvious.
David Kane Submitter #1168 To be heard? No	The success of Ports of Tauranga operating under the proposed preferred option makes it a no brainer.
Vivienne Waterer Submitter #1173 To be heard? No	Retains operating control and income without increasing debt
Donald Marshall Submitter #1176 To be heard? No	The best option for growth.
Christine Marshall Submitter #1178 To be heard? No	This is my preferred option because it takes financial pressure off rate payers and gives the public an opportunity to invest in the Napier port.
Christopher Minehan Submitter #1184 To be heard? No	Shares should be offered to ratepayers first before anyone else as we are already owners of the port and should be given the opportunity to invest ahead of other outside individuals or corporates.
Janice Chapman Submitter #1186 To be heard? No	This will enable the people of Hawkes Bay to retain ownership and put their views to the board. It will also make the local people feel as if they are doing something worthy to support their regions growth etc.
Cyril Goulsbro Trust Submitter #1190 To be heard? No	Our considered best option

Submitter	Commentary
Peter Blythe Submitter #1191 To be heard? No	I understand the need for growth but would like to make sure that, if a GFC were to occur, that the impact of that does not affect rate payers of Hawkes Bay. Ratepayers already have enough to pay for local services, roads and amenities, adding the port costs for expansion, would, in my opinion, be too much to bear for ratepayers.
Donald Wilson Submitter #1192 To be heard? No	I feel it is important that we retain ownership and control of our port with no unnecessary impact on the ratepayers.
David Fraser Submitter #1194 To be heard? No	Keep benefits in Region
Jessica Uri Submitter #1204 To be heard? No	Just like it
Coral Gardiner Submitter #1207 To be heard? No	This option has worked very successfully for Port of Tauranga. It retains Regional Council ownership and control as major share holder and does not increase Regional Council rates. It also brings the benefit of shareholder ownership and scrutiny to the business, allowing the potential for extra wealth building for the HB Regional Council and the shareholders from the community.
Nigel Hales Submitter #1209 To be heard? No	I support this option, but it must be transparent. Accordingly, the Ports Executive team or any Council Staff must not be allowed to participate with the share offer if they are recommending this option. Definitely no discounted shares to be offered to the Executives, Staff or Associated Council Staff as give me's, so called rewards or bonuses.
Jonathan Lannie Submitter #1210 To be heard? No	Hopefully will give locals an opportunity to invest in their port
Warwick Alderton Submitter #1212 To be heard? No	investment opportunities for the public and no rate charges
Greg Brown Submitter #1213 To be heard? No	Allows for any interested party to consider the investment option, rather than restricting it to a select few. Is it possible for ratepayers to have the first option?
Peter Bull Submitter #1214 To be heard? No	Think retaining majority ownership and reducing HBRC investment risk is important. There is a need to "future proof" the port in order that it will be considered as an alternative to the Tauranga port in the future. Any investment must be to a level that the Napier port is able to accept the largest ships coming to NZ now as well as expected growth in ship size in the future-ie compete with Tauranga as with the new large ships NZ port calls could be restricted to only one in each island in NZ. This public share offer should best cater for this as I suspect the expansion costs will end up higher than forecast. An appropriately priced infrastructure IPO like the Napier port with good projected cashflow should be attractive to kiwisaver funds and other long term investors.
Jeff Arnold Submitter #1215 To be heard? No	The port needs to expand, ratepayers should be given first option to buy shares
Glenys M. Offergeld Submitter #1216 To be heard? No	The Napier Public will have a future say in Port developments
Hans-Joerg Offergeld Submitter #1217 To be heard? No	The control of the Port will stay in Napier

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Brad Maloney Submitter #1219 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Think this is the best option that suits the general community, rate rises are always going to happen so this will minimise that.</p>
<p>Sam Faulknor Submitter #1220 To be heard? No</p>	<p>To whom it may concern I would like the opportunity for Hawke's Bay residents to buy and own part of this key asset. In addition, I am strongly in favour of the HBRC retaining a majority share of the port. I would not agree with any future decision allowing a foreign entity or country to obtain a majority share of the port (as has occurred in other parts of the world). Therefore I would expect the HBRC to own in perpetuity 51% of the port. Regards, Sam.</p>
<p>Cyril Farquhar Submitter #1223 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The best option to retaining control of the Port and enabling local investors to have an ownership stake in the Ports profitability.</p>
<p>Michael Broughton Submitter #1224 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It has too stay in New Zealand hands NO over Seas ownership at all !!</p>
<p>Margaret Paton Submitter #1225 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Napier port is the port for Hawkes Bay produce of all descriptions going overseas and very necessary to our economy. We need to retain as much value in the port as possible and as a large amount of money is required for enlargement a 49% public share offer would seem the most fair to the locality.</p>
<p>Gary Rose Submitter #1230 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Tauranga is an excellent model of a successful port</p>
<p>Elsie Colleen Rose Submitter #1231 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I want the Port to Progress.</p>
<p>Daniel Porter Submitter #1232 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Injects the capital needed to expand the port, protects ratepayers from rates rises, reduces the RC's investment risk, and New Zealanders get to keep ownership and control and a return from the investment. The thing i can't understand is how it is going to cost about \$11.4 million to do the IPO, unless my maths is wrong.</p>
<p>Dave Cox Submitter #1234 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Way of raising required funding for port development while retaining majority ownership by the HB community</p>
<p>Robert Drinkwater Submitter #1238 To be heard? No</p>	<p>As with most large businesses shareholder equity keeps it afloat.</p>
<p>Grant Cawston Submitter #1241 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Using examples of very successful expansions like port tauranga as an efficient way to maximise ratepayers investment but allow sensible expansion as is required by port napier.</p>
<p>Ian Macdonald Submitter #1249 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Hawkes Bay people have supported the port for many years and have helped it grow into a successful enterprise. These same people, as well as others in the future, will be able to continue their support in a positive way and thus ensure the prosperity of one their greatest assets.</p>
<p>Sue Calcinai Redcliffe Homestead Partnership Submitter #1252 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Leaves the option for locals to invest in the port without placing the necessary cost burden of expansion on all ratepayers</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Rex Addis Submitter #1253 To be heard? No	I think that the Hawkes Bay locals should have the chance to buy shares in our port The Napier port is part of our heritage and selling up to 49 percent to an investment partner ,I think would cause to much friction in the running of the port and in my view selling the port operations to a private investor for up to 50 years i believe would see the port going backwards not forwards. The local public of Hawkes bay and surrounding areas should have, should get the chance to invest in our port.
Stew Hughes Submitter #1254 To be heard? No	This way the ownership still stays with local rate payers - assuming the 49% is primarily offered to rate payers and fully subscribed by rate payers.
Marina Brown Submitter #1258 To be heard? No	It's the better option
Josephine Cotter Submitter #1260 To be heard? No	Best option
Michael Richards Submitter #1261 To be heard? No	Putting this option forward so that the shares are offered to locals first, then the open share market.
Tautahi Brown Submitter #1263 To be heard? No	Best option
Shirley Ferguson Submitter #1264 To be heard? No	Agree the best option
Harold Neal Submitter #1265 To be heard? No	51% ownership means overall control by council. And public share option so not biased by a single investor.
Robert Ferbar Submitter #1268 To be heard? No	It should enable the local community and port staff directly invest in our Port.
Lisa Exeter Submitter #1273 To be heard? No	It stays NZ owned. Hawke's bay rate payers should get 1st option on the shares
Nicholas Wakefield Submitter #1277 To be heard? No	For the Hawkes Bay region to reach its potential then it is imperative that the port grows to handle future demands. The share float is a sensible way of raising capital while still maintaining controlling shares. Go for it.
Virginia Suckling Submitter #1279 To be heard? No	I think it is the best option.
Charles Suckling Submitter #1281 To be heard? No	I think this is the best option.
Ken Kibblewhite Submitter #1286 To be heard? No	The shared equity will ensure the HB maintains full capability to meet all future needs and will demand efficiency in operation.
Neil Pritchard Submitter #1289 To be heard? No	Public share is a watch dog and we can see how it is run

Submitter	Commentary
Pauline Clayton Submitter #1291 To be heard? No	I think that Port users should have the opportunity to purchase shares to help keep costs realistic. I think the ratepayers have already been hit hard enough so don't want rates to rise again.
Tirath Lakshman Submitter #1292 To be heard? No	I hope the public offer is first given to the rate payer of Napier, the NZ residents/ citizen, not oversea owned
Michael Kemsley Submitter #1307 To be heard? No	To have the option to share in the success of the port and the region.
Tony Clifford Submitter #1308 To be heard? No	I support Option B. Growth of Port capacity and infrastructure is critical to economic growth and hence wellbeing for all of HB region and adjoining regions. Share float provides capital required while retaining control and diversifying risk of HBRC. Alternative options A and C would be second choices while option D is a very distant last. There would be little motivation (other than contractual) for a leaseholder to invest major capital without any certainty of gain in that being returned at end of investment period. Maximising income would be paramount for that type of investor - significantly driving up costs to users without Commerce Commission ability to regulate.
Robert Love Submitter #1309 To be heard? No	Hawke's Bay residents are already under pressure from ever increasing rates plus increased costs for petrol and essential living such as food, medical, housing which oversubscribe any increase in wages, salaries or welfare support. Those on fixed incomes such as beneficiaries and superannuitants have no capacity to keep absorbing these charges, as once there is an increase, there is never any decrease. So, option A is not acceptable. Option C and D risk overseas partners to participate which is also not acceptable. Option B: This option allows local investors the opportunity to have a vested interest in their own backyard and to participate in future development without any further burden on HB residents.
Dean Green Submitter #1312 To be heard? No	Perfered option
Jeanette Jenkins Submitter #1315 To be heard? No	probably able to get more business savvy and experienced people on board.
Janet Dixon Submitter #1316 To be heard? No	Would like the Port to stay in NZ control and profits stay in NZ
bryony lovatt Submitter #1318 To be heard? No	I would like to see the shares offered to the Hawks Bay community first and only 45% of the shares sold.
Alison Oliver Submitter #1319 To be heard? No	Option B appeals as it keeps the Port 'locally' owned and controlled with limited impact on rate payers as rates are already high in Napier.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Pene Johnstone Submitter #1324 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I understand the reasons behind selling a share of the port but I would like the Regional Council to consider the sale of less than the 45%. The amount needed is \$86m. Why sell more shares in the port to turn around and invest in "Managed Funds". Historically these have not always been a secure investment. I would have thought more risky than owning the Port shares and with very little control from Council. My understanding is that you already have \$50m invested from the sale of the leasehold land to ACC. A very bad decision from the previous Council. It seems to be a trend that Council is wanting to sell all it's local income earning assets to invest elsewhere. Was this really what was intended when the Council was gifted the assets? Is there any way the Council could offer any shares that are being sold to the public or businesses of Hawkes Bay so that they may be kept local?</p>
<p>Philip Sharp Submitter #1325 To be heard? No</p>	<p>No Burden on ratepayers</p>
<p>Ben Goodridge Submitter #1326 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Keen to see Napier port expand, however needs public investment</p>
<p>Fay McGarvey Submitter #1327 To be heard? No</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not increasing Council debt, or rates. 2. Using money from other than Council sources, favouring local people. 3. Similar plan has been very successful in Tauranga, although that is a bigger operation than Napier's would be. (I have shares in Tauranga port) 4. Opportunity for locals to share in the hoped-for success . 5. I would prefer 45% holding to be kept by Council. 6. I also quite like the idea of a long-term lease to a carefully selected operator, but for say 20 year term, without right of renewal, but a very second choice.
<p>Paul Siddles Submitter #1328 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would buy shares Retains control and uses other people's money, allowing them to invest in our region</p>
<p>Richard Brown Submitter #1329 To be heard? No</p>	<p>From a financial perspective option B would appear to be the best bet. My only questions would be the ability to fully expand in the current location without adverse impact to Ahuriri and its surrounds, both in design of the Port itself, the environmental impact and transportation into and out of the Port. I assume this would be fully taken into account with any proposal.</p>
<p>Frances Jones Submitter #1330 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I'd prefer to see a combination of options A & B, as it looks to me like the other options will have an impact on raising rates anyway, and A & B will keep the Port ownership more local.</p>
<p>Libby Young Submitter #1332 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Best way of managing conflicts and most opportunity to be gained with this option.</p>
<p>Antony Bloomfield Submitter #1334 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This way the region will not incur more debt but still remain in the public's control</p>
<p>Katrina McNicoll Submitter #1335 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Seems to be the best option, with minimal cost to rate payers.</p>
<p>Kaye Heasman Submitter #1339 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Would prefer we retain control seems like a mid line action to take.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Tony Harting Submitter #1340 To be heard? No	gives the public a choice to invest for the future
Simon McHardy Submitter #1341 To be heard? No	A great investment opportunity for Hawke's Bay people & organisations to be a part of the projected growth by purchasing their own shareholding
Patricia Plummer Submitter #1342 To be heard? No	Everyone who wishes can have a share in Port. 2nd option for me would be Lease Port operations
Michael Wilkin Submitter #1345 To be heard? No	I don,t think rate payers should have to pay high rate rises to pay for this. I think they should have a public share offer for those who want shares in the port.
Tamaterangi Hema Submitter #1351 To be heard? No	Want the port to grow for the future
Natasha Paterson Submitter #1356 To be heard? No	I am sure that the council has thought long and hard about what the best LONG TERM option is for the benefit of the region.
Anthony Broad Submitter #1357 To be heard? No	Would like to see it offered to hawkesBay residents before any are sold out of town.
Kay Clayton Submitter #1359 To be heard? No	Very keen to retain it in local ownership, and great for locals to be able to invest in this great asset.
Rebecca Peterson Submitter #1361 To be heard? No	I support the councils preferred option with a serious disclaimer. I understand the need to maintain control and investment but there is no mention throughout the discussion document around climate change and the effect of the ports growth on this. It is essential the Council acknowledge and demonstrate to tax payers and citizens of the region how the council balances economic growth, debt and the environment.
Lisa Hardie Submitter #1362 To be heard? No	Control retained, access to funding without rates and debt increases.
Mira McCarthy Submitter #1363 To be heard? No	I agree with the council's considerations regarding keeping control of our port.
Andrew Hicks Submitter #1366 To be heard? No	Good balance between retaining ownership but raising capital to undergo necessary expansion, and prefer general public has chance to invest rather than corporate investors.
Allan Morton Submitter #1375 To be heard? No	If the information provided by HBRC is accurate, then this option appears to be the best.
Cameron McKinnon Submitter #1376 To be heard? No	It is part of our region and should be funded by us.
Tony Baxter Submitter #1383 To be heard? No	TOTALLY AGREE WITH OPTION B. IT'S GREAT TO HEAR THAT HAWKES BAY IS GROWING IN THIS AREA. THANK YOU FOR THE INFORMATION AND OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE A SAY.

Submitter	Commentary
S MacKenzie Submitter #1389 To be heard? No	Give option for local rate payers to purchase shares first before opening the schedule to persons outside H.B. Preferably NO overseas sales.
Andrew Pattullo Submitter #1397 To be heard? No	offering a shareholding will allow rate payers to have a more active interest in the port of they decide to purchase shares. Having an external shareholder structure will create stronger and more accountable directorships to manage the port and enhance its activity and value.
Shane Miringaorangi Submitter #1398 To be heard? No	I think to help get our port bigger without using our rates
Douglas Dickson Submitter #1401 To be heard? No	Of the options I prefer B as I don't want outside investment or control to the % discussed
Elizabeth Friend Submitter #1405 To be heard? No	I would like to see local people share in the success of the port. I think it is only fair that the public should have an interest in our local port.
Larry Grooby Submitter #1409 To be heard? No	We need rapid growth in order to maximize the opportunities that present for export trade
Elizabeth McLaughlin Submitter #1410 To be heard? No	To enable council to retain ownership and allow investment. Also most cost effective for ratepayers.
Shirley Norton Submitter #1411 To be heard? No	I believe this option keeps the decision making where it belongs, and gives New Zealand residents the option to choose whether to contribute or not, and also realise a return on investment in the long term.
Lauren Smith Submitter #1412 To be heard? No	This seems to be the balanced option that keeps the majority of power but protects ratepayers from an already increased cost of living in Hawkes Bay.
Richard Painter Submitter #1413 To be heard? No	Infrastructure operations that are floated on the stock exchange become more efficient, more profitable, and often return a higher dividend to the majority stakeholder at 51% ownership, than they ever did at 100% ownership. Government and local body departments are generally not skilled at running business operations, however a controlling 51% stake will ensure the HBRC and its ratepayers still have the final say in the overall strategic direction of the Port. There is also a lack of new IPO's on the NZX. This would give Hawkes Bay residents an opportunity to benefit personally by the success of the port either directly through share ownership, or indirectly through Kiwisaver funds. This support is with the Caveat that HBRC rate payers should have the first option of buying shares before being made available to the public to ensure as much of the proceeds of the future financial success of the port stay in Hawkes Bay as possible. Whilst not everyone will be able to afford to buy shares, a more successful Napier port will bring economic growth to the region, providing more jobs, which will help to benefit those not able to buy shares.
Karin O'Kennedy Submitter #1418 To be heard? No	It will provide a good investment opportunity
Frances&John McLay Submitter #1425 To be heard? No	SUGGEST 40% FLOAT

Submitter	Commentary
Alan Colbert Submitter #1431 To be heard? No	As long as the council holds a majority I consider this the best option. The port of Tauranga has used this option and is obviously successful. An alternative would be to have an unsecured bond issue which would no doubt be popular.
brian white Submitter #1432 To be heard? No	I believe that this option will enable the public of Hawkes Bay if they want to, to participate in the ownership of the Port. The funds raised through the IPO should enable the Port to carry out their plans without any impost on ratepayers and return to the HBRC a dividend each year. Perhaps it could be stipulated that packages of shares be allotted to ratepayers on the proviso that they be held for say 2 years before being on sold on the market. Another incentive to ratepayer involvement would be to issue shares nett of fees.
Peter Scammell Submitter #1436 To be heard? No	I think Rate Payers should get First OPTION on these shares
Diana Spooner Submitter #1441 To be heard? No	While option A would be the ideal solution The expected rate rise would be too crippling for many rate payers
Henri Hasselman Submitter #1444 To be heard? No	Private investment means that all people and organisations can invest in a business that needs finance to make this port a professional organisation so it can be competitive with other ports around New Zealand! E.g Port of Tauranga. That can only be done with strong professional leadership and not by people who can have there say every 3 years and are really not professionals at all ! This port is so important to the Bay and is the life line to our region called all Hawkes Bay!
Frank Bell Submitter #1446 To be heard? No	Tauranga region and port are doing well under a share option.
Jill Tobin Submitter #1447 To be heard? No	I feel it is the logical choice.
Kenneth Neil Thorsen Submitter #1448 To be heard? No	Funds are needed for port development. Selling a minority share , maybe in a couple of tranches is the best method of fundraising. HB ratepayers should be given a preferential discounted offer for, say, 2000 shares
Bruce & Alison Small Submitter #1453 To be heard? No	Whilst I feel this is the best option for our present port, it is completely wrong to build a port on a point in the coast which gets weather from the south, through the east to the north only the west is protected. I would suggest that the right place for the port of Hawkes bay to be built is along the coast towards Haumoana where it would be protected from the south and the north, ther eis also plenty of land from further development.
Mr R Temperton Submitter #1455 To be heard? No	This is the only option. R.T.
Mrs J Husheer Submitter #1456 To be heard? No	Follow the example set by Tauranga. It is working well. J. Husheer
Dave Charlson Submitter #1458 To be heard? No	Would shares be offered to HB ratepayers prior to listing on the NZX?
Kate Jefferd Submitter #1462 To be heard? No	A change in investment for HBRC which is good. A chance for public to invest in a growing asset/enterprise HBRC still retain majority of the asset and therefore control, with public consult on any big decisions.

Submitter	Commentary
G C Kirby Submitter #1470 To be heard? No	ALWAYS MAINTAIN MAJORITY SHAREHOLDING
bernard nathan Submitter #1471 To be heard? No	generates most money and yet does not effect rates
Roger Wakefield Submitter #1475 To be heard? No	This would seem the most sensible option. The council will still have the controlling interest and will be able to direct where and what is done. The port needs to grow and to do that needs capital. This capital will ensure that business continues to go through the port and that it expands. With expansion the region as a whole will prosper with job creation and the security and the associated benefits of that.
Grant Johnson Submitter #1477 To be heard? No	Looking at the port of Tauranga, the best outcome for ratepayers and to fund growth the port needs
Mr Anthony Beddows Submitter #1478 To be heard? No	My NZ Great Grandfather was Captain Petersen, who piloted a Tug Boat at the Port.
L & W Andrew & Sergeant Submitter #1482 To be heard? No	45% only
Joseph Barrie Brough Submitter #1483 To be heard? No	selected B
Ian Barnes Submitter #1485 To be heard? No	Question: would rate payers be aloted shares if required, before shares went to IPO?
N Bernstone Submitter #1486 To be heard? No	Floating on the stock X certainly seems the best option. My preference from the beginning. Investors will love it!
Julie Isaac Squawk Holdings Ltd Submitter #1489 To be heard? No	Best option to enable expansion without further debt and cost to ratepayers. Also gives ratepayers an option to partake in a share placement (would ratepayers be given first priority?)
John Lawrence McCormack Submitter #1495 To be heard? No	I would consider this to be a great investment for our local people.
Sarah Pattullo Submitter #1496 To be heard? No	I wish to be able to have a chance to purchase shares in our port. I believe that having directors appointed by the shareholders, will enhance the ports value. Tauranga is a good example of this.
Mrs Hilary M Lyons Submitter #1498 To be heard? No	Retains control of daily running & planning of port. Involves people in the company to a much wider degree.
John & Debbie Simmiss Submitter #1511 To be heard? No	This clearly is the best option as it gives the people of HB the ability to own shares in their port. Great decision by the board.

Submitter	Commentary
Graeme Hale Submitter #1514 To be heard? No	Great idea
Rodney Earnshaw Submitter #1517 To be heard? No	I would prefer this option, however, I don't think that HBRC should instantly sell 49% I think that shares should only be issued to meet current funding requirements. This would allow for future releases if required.
Nyall Webb Submitter #1518 To be heard? No	Good investment in a local company
Richard&June Clifford Submitter #1519 To be heard? No	1) The success of Tauranga's Port through shareholder investment is a good example of regional planning. Port employees are encouraged to invest with help from the Board through subsidy of share cost - this is an example which produces a consistent work force, who are happy . 2) The foresight of previous governance of Napier Harbour in building the existing wharves and maintaining dredging is also an example to follow - Napier will go backwards without further improvement - the status quo will result in stagnation.
David Potter Submitter #1520 To be heard? No	However, I believe this could be achieved by floating a smaller %. My preference is 39%. Should the 49% option be chosen then ratepayers should be given 1st option to buy shares.
Graeme Algar Submitter #1521 To be heard? No	This is the most suitable option as far as I am concerned.
Tony & Bev Millson Submitter #1522 To be heard? No	It is important to retain majority ownership and control within Hawke's Bay. Option B should allow the funds to finance the essential expansion and growth of the Port. It will also allow local people to Invest in a local operation.
T.D. Atkins Submitter #1523 To be heard? No	Not in favour of selling to overseas interests or allowing NZ buyers to on sell to overseas interests. We could if this happens lose control of the port
Lily McGowan Submitter #1524 To be heard? No	Re OPTION 'B' FLOAT ONLY 30% MAXIMUM ON NZX. HAWKES BAY RESIDENTS GIVEN FIRST OPTION TO PURCHASE. NO INTERNATIONAL BUYERS. Any SHARES BEING SOLD OR TRANSFERRED AT A LATER DATE MUST BE SOLD OR TRANSFERRED THROUGH NZX STOCKMARKET. Lily McGowan 6/11/2018
Athol Curtis Submitter #1525 To be heard? No	Seems preferable to the other options as it allows the port to expand with little impact on rates while still maintaining local control
Peter & Judith Gannon Submitter #1526 To be heard? No	Stay in N.Z. ownership - shares offered to H.B. residents first and then put on NZX - transparency on financials situation at the port - it should be profitable. Fred Robinson's letter in HB Today is very interesting - you are obligated to provide the facts and be transparent to us all.
Richard Knight Submitter #1527 To be heard? No	This option makes more sense than the others, though I would favour a 45% Public Share
Noreen Farrell Submitter #1528 To be heard? No	NZ only ownership of shares. No overseas shareholders at all. Lay groynes along Westshore to stop the shameful erosion.
Margaret Miskelly Submitter #1529 To be heard? No	I live in Napier and if I could I would buy shares in our port.

Submitter	Commentary
Russell & Jill Brokenshire Submitter #1532 To be heard? No	Not 49% please. 25-33% is better. What is missing from the info here is how efficient the port returns are compared to the investment?
Margaret M Jones Submitter #1533 To be heard? No	Reading the media the port usage is increasing every year but it appears that your every day costs are not covered. Why increase warfage for overseas liners? Are these people paying for the capital costs?
Jan Appleby Submitter #1534 To be heard? No	HB needs to retain ownership however, we are already paying a lot in rates and being rural , getting little in return. Between HDC & HBRC, we are paying \$3400 a year and I would not be able to afford such a significant rate increase
John Elliott Harvey Submitter #1547 To be heard? No	I accept B is your preferred choice. I would hope it is quite an amount less than 49%. I believe the shares should be offered to Business Groups eg Fruit Growers Fed or Govt groups e.g. ACC the HBRC ratepayers before the general public are offered the chance to purchase shares.
Ian Jones Submitter #1555 To be heard? No	There will be a much better result for the region if the port was a listed company. This will increase its efficiency and in the long term give a better result to the rate payers. It will also remove the need for the rate payers to come up with the capital to expand the port operation.
A M Connor Submitter #1558 To be heard? No	I am a ratepayer. The shares should be offered to H.B. residents first.
Sue Rodda Submitter #1561 To be heard? No	Would like to see Napier Ratepayers to have first option buy any shares
Kevin Shipp Submitter #1575 To be heard? No	If that the preferred option, you should be better qualified to make that decision than me, With limited knowledge of the ports needs and finances.
Richard Bowker Submitter #1576 To be heard? No	We still retain ownership without increasing rates
Alannah Ross Submitter #1577 To be heard? No	I agree from a rate payers prospective that this is the most secure and financially viable solution.
Kim Cook Submitter #1588 To be heard? No	seems the best option
Alison Francis Submitter #1591 To be heard? No	I understand why this is the preferred option. I agree we shouldn't have all of our eggs in one basket. I would like the shares to be offered to Hawkes Bay residents first before going on for public sale.
Nadja McKellow Submitter #1592 To be heard? No	I do not want my rates to skyrocket and I do not want an overseas investor. Option C sounds ok as well, but it seems that there's an impact on rates as well.
Ashley Hawkins Submitter #1593 To be heard? No	It seems to be the best option where the rate payers would be concerned. It will still keep the employment of local people at the port.
Jean Lemmon Submitter #1594 To be heard? No	I would like to see the shares offered to Hawkes Bay residents first

Submitter	Commentary
Gillian Shipp Submitter #1595 To be heard? No	I'm happy to accept your preferred option as i assume you know better than we do as to the best option.
Francine Toki Submitter #1597 To be heard? No	Giving locals a chance to buy shares and be more invested in their local business is a great idea
Frank McCarthy Submitter #1598 To be heard? No	This option has been very successful with Tauranga Port and it is the only option so that large costs eg new wharf can be financed and the Port to be competitive in achieving growth (imports,exports, tourism-Cruise ships etc)
Maree Gladstone Submitter #1602 To be heard? No	As a rate payer would like to have the opportunity to purchase shares in a local company.
Leonard Bell Submitter #1607 To be heard? No	council should have a better understanding the workings to make the right decisions
Denise Wild Submitter #1610 To be heard? No	I BELIEVE THE PEOPLE HAVE TO START BEEN RESPONSIBABLE FOR OUR N.Z. AND NOT LEAVE IT UP TO OUTSIDERS.
Rex J Wenham Submitter #1614 To be heard? No	EX SHAREHOLDER PORT OF TAURANGA AND RECOGNISE THE VALUE OF SUCH A MOVE.
Alison Ritchie Submitter #1619 To be heard? No	Overall ownership must be retained, but it is good to spread the risk.
Ian McSparran Submitter #1627 To be heard? No	Would 2021 be to late for a investment of around \$1m
Alastair Nelson Submitter #1629 To be heard? No	Is the 20% of annual income all dvidends or does the council earn operational income from the Port. If it is dividend will the lag between selling 49% & future growth create a situation where the council has a short term reduction in income & therefore require a rate increase to cover it?
Robert Pentreath Submitter #1630 To be heard? No	40%. Does not need to be 49% to raise capital.
Pam Medcalf Submitter #1634 To be heard? No	Better not have more put on our rates
Vin Merwood Submitter #1653 To be heard? No	Would prefer if shares were offered to HB rate payers and port workers rather than to others outside of our Provence. Definitely not overseas buyers.
Graeme Fairey Submitter #1657 To be heard? No	An amalgam of A and B; say 25% Public Share offer and a small demand on rates
Christina Thomas Submitter #1660 To be heard? No	WE NEED TO RETAIN MAJORITY OWNERSHIP. MUST NOT LOSE CONTROL OF OUR ASSET.

Submitter	Commentary
David Matson Submitter #1661 To be heard? No	Using Port of Tauranga as an example. I believe this to be the most successful method of operation.
Faye Milner Submitter #1670 To be heard? No	I believe that the Port should be paying for itself in the long term.
Alan Mahy Submitter #1672 To be heard? No	The Napier Port should be paying for itself
Glenys Single Submitter #1673 To be heard? No	Prefer public shares 45% or less that Council retain control.
Kevin Sigglekow Submitter #1679 To be heard? No	Makes best sense out of the available options.
Michael Lynam Submitter #1680 To be heard? No	Works really well for the Port of Tauranga.
David J Hale Submitter #1683 To be heard? No	I would hate to see us loose control of our port as I think it is the life-blood of Hawkes Bay. Having delt in stocks and shares over many years, I also think this would be the best and safest way. D J Hale
Nopera Wall Submitter #1685 To be heard? No	IF PROPOSAL A IS ACCEPTED, I WOULD EXPECT TO RECIEVE A DIVIDEND.
Irene Lynam Submitter #1690 To be heard? No	Works well for the Port of Tauranga
Frank&Christine Packer Submitter #1691 To be heard? No	THIS GIVES LOCAL PEOPLE THE OPPORTUNITY TO BUY SHARES IN THE PORT.
Moira Scammell Submitter #1698 To be heard? No	If at all possible, please give HBay rate payers first option of purchase (smiley face).
Ruth Holmes Submitter #1703 To be heard? No	I believe that the local district will feel more invested in the progress of the port, which I believe is important for the region, if they are literally allowed to invest in the port.
Bryan Rudd Submitter #1704 To be heard? No	Would prefer that the 49% sale is to NZ individuals or NZ owned financial institutions or companies, in other words the ownership remains totally in NZ hands.
Michael Dillon Submitter #1708 To be heard? No	The sooner you move on the "B" option the better for H.B. to continue to move ahead just as Tauranga has!
Teri & Ruth Flanagan Submitter #1710 To be heard? No	B : 1st D: 2nd
P & L Hann Submitter #1712 To be heard? No	B or C, C or B! Of the best offer comes from "B" it may be from another port company or shipping company, who at any time may re-direct cargos to another Port. "C" looks like the safest option- more H.B. control

Submitter	Commentary
Colin Leach Submitter #1714 To be heard? No	Should have no impact on rates
Dorothy O'Kane Submitter #1715 To be heard? No	IT APPEARS IN HB TODAY THAT CONSENT IS granted AND THE DECISION IS MADE. WHY IS YOUR DEBT SO HIGH? - MAYBE YOUR FINANCIAL ADVISORS NEED MORE GUIDANCE AND LOOK AT YOUR USERS OF THE PORT LOOK AT THEIR CHARGES.
Robert Capes Submitter #1716 To be heard? No	I think this is the best option and at a later date combined with the Dam for necessary water it will make Hawkes Bay a most productive & profitable province as well as a most desirable place to work and live.
Mr & Mrs Branch Submitter #1720 To be heard? No	What happens when timber prices full & no logs go through port?
T Tuhaka Submitter #1722 To be heard? No	Do not wish to see port be taken from Napier. People have worked hard to get it to where it is at.
Miss S O'Sullivan Submitter #1726 To be heard? No	Option B does seem best would mean no increase for ratepayers good all round!
Errol F Simmons Submitter #1730 To be heard? No	I would like to see the Napier/Regional ratepayers given first option to buy the shares (no initial overseas holding)
Ken McEwen Submitter #1737 To be heard? No	N.B. Float max of 40% - only to N.Z. Residents
Michael & Sherrill Heard Submitter #1741 To be heard? No	Option B makes the most sense in every way Using less of the highly toxic sprays involved in logging leaving our Port would be a great benefit for the health of Port workers and adjacent neighbours. Is the port leaving itself open to high costs in claims from those whose health is damaged in the future?
Rosalie Griffiths Submitter #1742 To be heard? No	My landlord works at Napier Port, I would be afraid that my rent would go up. I live in a rental flat I have read through the paper about Napier Port and I feel B. Floating up to 49% on the NZX a preferred option.
Robyn Jamieson Submitter #1744 To be heard? No	As this is the preferred option I think it is better than borrowing from the rates as this would put the rates up and I pay huge regional rates because I live by the river, and this way everyone can buy shares if they wish
Des Kavanagh Submitter #1745 To be heard? No	(Attached letter to submission) 6 November 2018 I would like to record my support for Option B, as recommended by Hawkes Bay Regional Council. I have studied the Port Consultation Document and have based my support on the information provided within the document. Given the input by experts and highly qualified Financial Consultants associated with the Port development, I feel comfortable the Hawkes Bay Regional Council has recommended the best option. I have also read a number of opinions expressed in various newspapers and other publications and, although well intentioned, most are not privy to the very complex mechanisms required to make a truly informed analysis. Unfortunately, many public submissions will be based on Emotion and others who have difficulty balancing their own household budgets, profess to have an understanding of the complexities of a major Port's financial activities and requirements. Yours sincerely Des Kavanagh
Janet Ellingham Submitter #1747 To be heard? No	Believe this is best option for Port and for locals to have access to shares.

Submitter	Commentary
Sean Bevin Submitter #1752 To be heard? No	The most logical choice in terms of meeting the Councils and Port Company's goals for the future development of the Port and the HB economy.
Desmond Culver Submitter #1754 To be heard? No	I consider this to be the best option for the port.
John Brock Submitter #1761 To be heard? No	Should work well
Veronica Isherwood Submitter #1763 To be heard? No	Gives the public of Napier and surrounding areas a chance to have ownership and a say in the administration.
Craig Robinson Submitter #1766 To be heard? No	I believe funding is required to expand the port for the benefit of Napier and Hawkes Bay but the regional council should still hold a majority shareholding. Ratepayers should not have to take the burden of 100% funding.
Mrs D P Bloxham Submitter #1768 To be heard? No	In the event of option B being the chosen choice, would like to see ratepayers & employees given first option to purchase shares.
Warwick Kent Submitter #1776 To be heard? No	You didn't listen to my feedback about the Ruataniwha dam to the whole of Hawkes Bay's detriment
Penelope Riddell Submitter #1778 To be heard? No	Whilst I understand the need to raise money to fund the Port expansion, I think it is important for majority ownership to remain with HBRC and the people of Hawkes Bay. If there is a way that shares can be offered to rate payers ahead of the general, investing public, I would support that option.
Neil Burden Submitter #1779 To be heard? No	N.Z. Revenue & ownership only Any dedging material should be discharged between Perfume Point and Bayview close to the shore.
Tony Wrightson Submitter #1780 To be heard? No	To ensure that capital support for the proposed development is both available and accessible for continuing local ownership
Mr L.R. Shannen Submitter #1792 To be heard? No	Alternative B seems to have worked very well for the port of Tauranga. I assume that local residents would have access to the float at slightly better rates than buyers from outside the region? Thank you for the opportunity to speak up.. Yours faithfully ..Shannen
Rodney Kay Submitter #1794 To be heard? No	Option B allows the Port to achieve it's objectives and still maintain control and provides the opportunity for locals to invest in a local business.
David Barker Submitter #1799 To be heard? No	SIR, GET THE PORT READY FOR THE BIG SHIPS PLEASE DO NOT GET THE PORT TO SMALL, REMBER THE WORD DOES NO STAY STILL. THINK BIG AS THE SHIPPING COMPANY WILL, DO NOT THINK SMALL LET ALL OFF US HAVE SHARE IN THE PROT SHARES TO ALL
Graeme&Joy Thomas Submitter #1803 To be heard? No	Perhaps the initial float could be offered to Hawke's Bay ratepayers only.
Barry Sergent Submitter #1806 To be heard? No	This is a no brainer, just get on with it thats why we vote for a council to do the best for us.

Submitter	Commentary
Norman Knight Submitter #1807 To be heard? No	Please do an environment report, to stop erosion of west shore and to return sand.
Cherry Metz Submitter #1809 To be heard? No	Having read the Consultation Document I think Option B is my preference.
Fiona Graham Submitter #1811 To be heard? No	Choosing option B as I believe it is ideal to have locals possibly able to purchase shares in Napier Port. Some rate payers would not be able to afford an increase in rates, so option A not ideal.
Kate Hindmarsh Submitter #1812 To be heard? No	To provide sufficient capital to expand the port and manage risk. All ratepayers should have the opportunity to purchase shares in our port and not be limited to small amounts of shares.
Kevin Hall Submitter #1813 To be heard? No	No-brainer, option B reduces risk for the rate-payers and raises the necessary funds.
Beverley Dunlop Submitter #1814 To be heard? No	Need cash injection to ex pand/
Charlotte Hall Submitter #1815 To be heard? No	The last thing I want is another rates increase.
Vicki Rushton Submitter #1818 To be heard? No	It is too expensive to add to homeowners rates and,we need it to stay in our majority ownership
Linda Hurlstone-Smith Submitter #1820 To be heard? No	Costs not falling on ratepayers only or using up all council reserves. Allows local community the opportunity to invest, and keeps asset in New Zealand hands. The people most affected by the decisions governing the port will have the opportunity to input, rather than potential overseas investors.
DAVE SAWRS Submitter #1825 To be heard? No	To increase the availability of capital in order to allow the Port to grow to its full potential for the benefit of HB
Steve Butler Submitter #1827 To be heard? No	As a retired person, speaking on behalf of most retired persons. I believe that our finances are stretched to the max. We do not need extra drain on our finances. Thus no extra rates they have increased to much over the past 10 years. I have done my 50 years in the work force and do not need stress on additional expensives. I would like to see the best outcome for the bay but can't afford to pay for it.
Mary Rowlands Submitter #1828 To be heard? No	It protects rate payers from rate rises. It retains majority community ownership. Allows those who wish to to invest in the port.
Michelle McDonald Submitter #1836 To be heard? No	The Port of Tauranga is very successful - I lived near there for 10 years and could see the impact the growth of the wharf had on the growth of Tauranga, with a flow on effect to neighbouring areas.
Graham Duley Submitter #1840 To be heard? No	Development of Port essential for our region. Borrowing/rates not a good option - ratepayer resistance to rate increases would likely constrain the Port getting enough money needed for the deveopment needed. Air New Zealand and Port of Tauranga are good public/private partnership examples where majority public ownership has been successfully maintained.

Submitter	Commentary
Graham Kidd Submitter #1847 To be heard? No	I hope as a ratepayer to HBRC we are offered shares at a reasonable price to support the local economy. I do not want Chinese investment into the port. Keep it NZ owned and supported.
William Beckman Submitter #1848 To be heard? No	It's the only common sense option. It also gives the public a safe option for a safe investment.
Patricia Kidd Submitter #1849 To be heard? No	A chance to invest in our local community and pride in our local region
Jan Bartlett Submitter #1854 To be heard? No	This is an opportunity to invest in the future of our area
Helen Paton Submitter #1857 To be heard? No	It would provide the opportunity for local people to invest in the port which is such an important part of our economy.
Patricia Burden Submitter #1858 To be heard? No	It would be good if the public would be able to purchase shares in Napier Port. The shares should only be available to New Zealand citizens, and not to overseas individuals or governments.
Mark Dunford Submitter #1862 To be heard? No	a good way to spread the councils investment risks while still retaining majority ownership.
Judy Todd Submitter #1863 To be heard? No	I think that this is the best option, look what happened in Tauranga. It will help those that can't pay for rate rises.
A Dunford Submitter #1864 To be heard? No	A good way to spread the council's investment risks while still retaining majority ownership.
Tony Fulton Submitter #1867 To be heard? No	Rates must reduce. This will help achieve this.
Graeme Clinton Submitter #1868 To be heard? No	Retains control while raising the money needed for the development and gives an opportunity for individuals invest on the Port if they wish.
Martin Wall Submitter #1869 To be heard? No	Not only is majority control maintained, and rates are not increased, but it also allows the public to invest in a local major asset if they choose to do so.
Gilbert Duncan Submitter #1879 To be heard? No	Probably the easiest and most effective way of raising sufficient funds for future works. But please offer to HB residents first
Michael Harris Submitter #1886 To be heard? No	This seems to be most likely to keep the port in New Zealand ownership, whilst not incurring an added burden to local rates.
Kevin Stewart Submitter #1887 To be heard? No	I would be very keen to purchase shares in the PON, as I hold shares in other NZ companies and understand this would be a great investment. I also use the port on a daily basis through Toll container division. Port of Tauranga has thrived from being particularly listed. I believe PON would thrive too under a partial listing.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Ian Holyoake Submitter #1890 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I beleive it has been well researched and by the people who know the most about the situation. Hence I agree with their stated preference.</p>
<p>Ray Sinclair Submitter #1892 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I think the port should stay in Hawkes bay ownership, and only allow N.Z. shares</p>
<p>Denis Mann Submitter #1897 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would like to maximise any external shareholding to 45%. I would like local people to be given preference in any initial share issue, with up to an agreed maximum, them being allowed to maximise their holding if the issue is over subscribed. Another issue that doesn't appear to be addressed is that of log ships being put back outside at anchor when cruise ships are in port. Presumably the port has to pay demurrage when this happens and ideally cruise ships should not interrupt normal cargo operation.</p>
<p>B J Mactaggart Submitter #1898 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I support the sale by public share offer of a minority stake but I would also add that it would seem both sensible and worthwhile to offer HBRC ratepayers a preferential/priority opportunity to purchase such shares in an IPO [along the same lines the NZ government adopted when selling stakes in power/utility companies].</p>
<p>Richard Hall Submitter #1899 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would like to buy some of the shares. That's all</p>
<p>Philip TeKoaia Keefe Submitter #1905 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Shares should be offered to rate payers and not go outside of the Hawkesbay area</p>
<p>Amanda MacLeod Submitter #1909 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The port does need to grow and be able to accommodate these bigger ships and I think Option B is the best way to do this. I don't want to pay more rates and I think being on the public share offer will help the continued growth of the port long term</p>
<p>Neil Peacock Submitter #1912 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Better probality to retain ownership locally feel decision already made and public consultation is just an appeasement for the locals. My vote seems least of all evils. What I feel the public should know what really is the port really doing? Are we trying to compete with Auckland,Tauranga, possibly Wellington for the future container trade utilizing larger and larger ships on more and more restrictive routes and unloading polnts?? If so what is the shipping industries veiwpoint and plans with regard to this and the potential Advent of inland ports for redistribution and collation of loads this I feel is the Crux of the matter are we chasing the golden gooseonly to find it has died,or about to.or do we accept that this is happening already and are wishing to extract capital from a potentially depreciating asset . Although unlikely I believe such scenarios should be investigated and reported and cosidered,perhaps opened up to further public discussion before a final decision is made</p>
<p>Helen Hill Submitter #1913 To be heard? No</p>	<p>An opportunity for anyone to share in the ownership of the Port</p>
<p>Kathleen Hughes Submitter #1921 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Local investment benefits the Region.</p>
<p>Graeme Etheridge Submitter #1922 To be heard? No</p>	<p>My preference would be a share float that would clear the Port's debt and provide the funds for the building of No6 wharf. After 18/24 months into the wharf build, a reassessment of finances would be made and a further issue of shares to existing shareholders be made. I would hope that the Hawke's Bay Regional Council retain a 60% ownership and the public 40% to hopefully reduce the possibilty of a takeover of our Port Of Napier. I support a public share offer.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Charles Clement Submitter #1928 To be heard? No	Quite simply it strikes the right balance between public and private ownership
Kristen Schnauer Submitter #1931 To be heard? No	It would be interesting and helpful to compare the financial results of the Port each year against other Ports throughout NZ, to see how the Napier Port stacks up.
rob robertson Submitter #1932 To be heard? No	the people of Hawkes Bay should be invited to take part in the growth of the port
Pam Robertson Markem Holdings Submitter #1933 To be heard? No	the only one that makes sense
Bryce Neil Submitter #1941 To be heard? No	Give the people of HB to invest personally in a key strategic asset. No increase of rates.
John James Arnold Submitter #1949 To be heard? No	I am satisfied with our council's decision.
Alison Winmill Submitter #1952 To be heard? No	Port control needs to stay in the Bay to ensure that profits are used for the benefit of local peoples.
John Robert MacLennan Submitter #1957 To be heard? No	Port of Tauranga is very good and has had great success. Why not do the same
Elaine Moriarity Submitter #1959 To be heard? No	Only sensible thing to do.
Lynaire Tucker Submitter #1962 To be heard? No	gives people a chance to invest in their own region and possibly get a return.
John Simons Submitter #1963 To be heard? No	Best option available for all rate payers.
Merlene Tichborne Submitter #1964 To be heard? No	I like the idea of only letting 49% be floated on the stock exchange. Our local Regional Council MUST retain the greater share.
Allan Dean Submitter #1970 To be heard? No	Offer people bonds or shares in the project
Peter Feltham Submitter #1972 To be heard? No	This option has worked very well for the development of Port of Tauranga and Southport. The result of floating a minority share has provided sufficient capital to facilitate appropriate development and resulted in a more efficient business. All this with control kept in local hands with very manageable debt levels.
Earl Hartstonge Submitter #1976 To be heard? No	B - Stock Exchange

Submitter	Commentary
Brian Young Submitter #1977 To be heard? No	Most important, Ratepayers must have the right to buy shares first. Ratepayers can still have a stake in the Hawkes Bay Port, and therefore have a say, but only if Ratepayers have first option to buy shares. After allocating the shares, Financial Institutions and Sharebrokers around NZ can buy the balance.
Glenda Fallen Submitter #1978 To be heard? No	No overseas investors.
John Draper Submitter #1983 To be heard? No	Most logical one to do
david st george Submitter #1990 To be heard? No	don't want to pay more for rates
Elizabeth Bassett Submitter #1991 To be heard? No	I do not want the port sold to overseas investors.
Arthur Hughes Submitter #1994 To be heard? No	Investment retained for the region. Only NZ residents should have access to purchase shares.
Brian Slader Submitter #1998 To be heard? No	We cannot afford to fund the development from rates and yet we need to invest in it for the future of Hawkes Bay. The only option is to retain control but bring in new investment by way of a share float
Carl Winterburn Submitter #2001 To be heard? No	I like the idea of investing my money in a business I work at and also supporting our local community.
Pauline O'Donnell Submitter #2006 To be heard? No	I believe this is the best choice.
Howard Reese Submitter #2007 To be heard? No	DO NOT FLOAT 49% - NOT AN OPTION. MAXIMUM FLOAT 45%. Your figures state MAXIMUM FLOZT 45% ON 45% - Get the FACTS RIGHT. OR GET OUT. DO NOT TRY TO DEGRADE US AS STUPID or INCOMPETENT Like some on your Council would like to think we are.
John O'Donnell Submitter #2008 To be heard? No	Best possible option.
Ross Brooking Submitter #2016 To be heard? No	Forward thinking. Dont wast money on stupid things as do all Government run things think ahead we would not be in this Position. It alway costs a lot more for harbour and Councils etc to do things than the private business sector1 big thing is wages and big salaries R Brooking
John Foot Submitter #2020 To be heard? No	The public share offer still leaves the council in control of the port
W R Scott Submitter #2021 To be heard? No	Along with the HBRC I in my Humble opinion believe Option B for the Benefit of Hawke's Bay, is The best one. I hang my hat on the Port of Tauranga and hope it will work for Hawkes Bay W R Scott
Robert Love Submitter #2022 To be heard? No	I feel the HBRC has had ample time to make provision for this need. The option chosen is not my preffered option, but mis-management forces this on us.

Submitter	Commentary
Dorothy Merna McGrail Submitter #2023 To be heard? No	My opinion is this seems to be the most reasonable option.
Ian Thomson Submitter #2026 To be heard? No	Even better if incentives can be put in place to encourage local shareholdings, such as pre-public offering to HB residents, and selling to HB residents at a discount
Mr & Mrs Brookie Submitter #2036 To be heard? No	Hawke's Bay people/residents given the chance to buy shares 1st - for limited amount of time, PLEASE
R & K Bray Submitter #2038 To be heard? No	Would like ratepayers to be offered shares.
Doreen E Robertshaw Submitter #2043 To be heard? No	I consider 49% too high!
Reuben Christian Submitter #2046 To be heard? No	Make the float less maybe up to 30% which would allow up to 19% to be used at a later time should it need be.
Bernard Caccioppoli Submitter #2047 To be heard? No	It would be unfair to expect another rise in the rates as lots of people have difficulty paying out especially us older folk.
Steve Todd Submitter #2051 To be heard? No	I thought that this was the obvious choice and have noted the success of Tauranga port, since they moved in the same direction.
Cliff Johnston Submitter #67 To be heard? Yes	I totally agree with the option B to sell a percentage to the "public share offer" providing local Hawkes Bay people, businesses and port staff get first option. I own quite a few shares in Tauranga Port and would be very interested in buying shares in Napier port. Hawkes Bay is an exporting region and a tourist destination so needs the port to expand As a Hawkes Bay land owner and residential property investor I would not want to see a rise in our rates to fund the port expansion
Geoff Harman Submitter #115 To be heard? Yes	The move by the shipping industry to very large container ships, 20,000 plus containers and a draught that the Napier port will not accomodate, these ships are expensive to run, so the future of these ships is major off load at deep water ports, some of these containers will travel to other destinations by rail, road, or feeder ships, all down to cost effectiveness. The large container ships are some 400 metres in length and some 60 metres in width. I like the idea of a public share offer as it spreads the risk
Owen Spotswood Submitter #2065 To be heard? No	49% to me appears far to high. I believe 20-25% will give you enough capital to build the new wharf. It would be wroth to dispose of 49% just to have money in the bank. I am also concerned that I never received this notice in the mail. What went wrong & why? Because of what has happened in the past I don't have a lot of respect for some Councillors.
D. F. Daunton Submitter #2067 To be heard? No	This option will allow the in better times to repurchase the 49%
Alistair John Macdonald Submitter #2076 To be heard? No	I am opposed to options C & D as running of the Port will be out of Council control.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Barry Joseph Greene Submitter #2077 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Floating up to 49% on the NZX my preferred option</p>
<p>Peter Exeter Submitter #2078 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Only if the shares are offered firstly to rate payers.</p>
<p>Margaret Stubbs Submitter #2080 To be heard? No</p>	<p>How soon will we be able to board cruises in our Port?</p>
<p>F J E Wilkins Submitter #2085 To be heard? No</p>	<p>DEFINATELY B</p>
<p>Michael Tuck Submitter #2086 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I agree to the building of a long wharf with deep water as proposed. The port is limited by the lack of close cargo storage land. The protected wharf area is also not large. (The port has outgrown it's site). Massive reclaiming would be needed and expensive as is double cargo handling. I believe after building this proposed wharf, no more large spending on developing this port site. With this present site - the port should concentrate on working the six wharves with modern machinery for the handling of cargo so that it can work efficiently, profitably, and safely. Future growth - look to create a working relationship with the Port of Tauranga, our nearest large deep water port.</p>
<p>George Thomas Abraham Submitter #2087 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Give locals the option to invest in their port.</p>
<p>D Lewers Submitter #2090 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Can't see any other practical way to attain the ports goal.</p>
<p>Joe Mattner Submitter #2091 To be heard? No</p> <p>My name is Joe Mattner from the port city of Bremerhaven, Germany.</p> <p>Good and long standing friends from Hastings -Graham and Rossie Ellery - sent me your very interesting "Consultation Document, Our Port Have Your Say" recently, along with "The Chatham Islander", the monthly paper from the Chatham Islands, with which you do business as well.</p> <p>Graham and Rossie have been the editors of the Chatham paper until some years ago.</p> <p>I've roamed the seas as a radio operator in my younger years and therefore know countless harbours almost world wide, every port in NZ -Chathams included.</p> <p>To try to get to the point I'd like to tell you that I first came to New Zealand in 1983, came back numerous times until my last visit in 1999, so I grew a definit "love" for the country and its people.</p> <p>In hindsight I have to say that sometime between 1983 and 1999 I detected a much 'cooler social climate' in New Zealand due to growing unemployment which in turn was due to privatization of the railways and selling/part selling State owned housing companies, harbours etc.</p> <p>On page -3- of your very professionally made "Consultation Document" in the top left corner you write:</p> <p>"Napier Port is proudly owned by the people of Hawke's Bay. The Regional Council is committed to keeping it that way."</p> <p>!!! can only encourage you to keeping it that way!!</p> <p>Never sell to the big boys from China, Arabia or somewhere else! They ONLY see the money, not the people!</p> <p>You as the Regional Council see the money AND the people which is a fundamental difference!</p> <p>Good on ye!</p> <p>Interesting 'coincidence':</p>	

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>The US\$ 250 million Yacht ULYSSES from your NZ billionaire Graeme Hart has been in Bremerhaven recently to be outfitted completely for over a year. I've 'visited' it (only looking from the outside) frequently until it was gone one day very early in the morning. (attached picture of Ulysses)</p> <p>If you can convince Graeme to invest in a growing New Zealand asset in buying shares from Napier Port, the money remains at least in the country; so I hope.</p> <p>Cruise ships!</p> <p>Some years ago I worked voluntarily for the "Lutheran Seamen's Mission" here in the Port of Bremerhaven. We visited the container ships to assist the crews. If they were not able to leave ship we sold them phone-cards/sim-cards and asking them if they had any personal or other problems, which we dealt with on the spot, if possible.</p> <p>If they had some free time on hand we took them to the Mission House down town with a 9 seater van. The trip lasted about 10-15 minutes depending on the traffic.</p> <p>There they had free emails, skype, coffee, TV, books and friendly personnel to talk to. A quiet and separat chapel and a Chaplain was also available.</p> <p>Then the cruise ship business picked up from one or two per week to sometimes 4 or 5 per day and we treated the crews the same way as the above mentioned crews. But we had to buy a second van and hire voluntary drivers. These crews alone were a considerable spending factor! (not to mention all the passengers) The cruise ship business is still rising globally.</p> <p>You as the Regional Council certainly know all that and the Consultation Document makes that quite clear. What I meant by mentioning the cruise ships is the fact that a considerable part of your port is used for the storage of timber.</p> <p>The question arises which commodity would be of more value to the port? Could the timber be shifted to another place within the harbour or to somewhere else? To Havelock North?</p> <p>When looking on page 2 of your 'Document', in the lower right corner of the picture the free space of water could be filled in and converted into another storage place for timber next to the existing ones there.</p> <p>Your engineers know best how to do that in a fairly short time.</p> <p>This would give the port more space for bigger container ships/cruise ships, at least until the money for the new wharf 6 is secured. In the meantime commodities of more value bring in more money.</p> <p>Well, I felt I had to have "my say" for a great little harbour in The Bay! Which I gladly did!</p> <p>Supplementary submission content:</p> <p>Fact is, the port needs investment NOW!</p> <p>For if you turn away clients for lack of space/money too often, they'll look for other ports/options and are therefore gone for good!</p> <p>Option -A- is a favoured one. But Hawke's Bay is a predominant rural area and I do not know if the community is able to stem the kind of investment needed..NOW.</p> <p>Option -B- would be able to 'find' a minority stake of 45% 'relatively quickly'(hopefully) AND relieve the ratepayers somewhat.</p> <p>Option -C- As far as I know a bought minority stake can be sold on, so there is uncertainty/danger in that option. I do not think that Mr. Graeme Hart can be 'nailed down` on a stake that he'll not sell one day..</p> <p>Option -D- depends strongly on what will be decided on between the Port and a private operator over such a long period of time.</p> <p>So -B- is my preferred option.</p> <p>All my best wishes for the great little harbour of Napier</p>
<p>Jan Taber Submitter #2092 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Definitely cannot afford to pay anymore rates. As a superannuitant with a mortgage as we opted to purchase our leasehold land, funds are tight as I am now a widow.</p>
<p>N Bullivant Submitter #2097 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I am writing to submit support for the Regional Council's preferred option: Option B as regards the ownership of Napier Port.</p>
<p>Gavin Ramsay Submitter #2104 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Port of Tauranga works well. As long as preference is given to local people as well</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Margot Logan Submitter #2105 To be heard? No	Because we are sick of rate increases
M A Lunny Submitter #2106 To be heard? No	I would hate to see more than 49% sold as has happened in other concerns
Phil Beilensohn Submitter #2107 To be heard? No	But offer shares to HB Ratepayers. Keep it HB owned if possible or can share be offered to NZ residents only?
John Bebarfald Submitter #2109 To be heard? No	The port is a commercial business best managed in this manner. Other ports on the NZX have performed well, lets do it here.
Brad & Leanna Carthew Submitter #2111 To be heard? No	We would prefer you float in a public Share Offer available in \$1,000 unit lots so that it is available to "Mum & Dad" investors like the SOE offers of the electricity companies. (Genesis, meridian, Mercury).
Nelson Wong Submitter #2122 To be heard? No	(45% preferred) Take note of other listed port in NZ & their success.
Mark Williams Submitter #2128 To be heard? No	In a geeky sort of way the Port is actually quite a tourist attraction. Maybe we could make some revenue from tours or something like that. I love watching the port in action but alas I am a geek Go the Port!! Ta
Kerry Natrass Submitter #2129 To be heard? No	My preference would be to see ownership retained in N.Z.
Colin Gregory Submitter #436 To be heard? Yes	Local residents need to have a quality local investment opportunity that they can see first hand the value that the Port brings to the community via employment including transport operators and many other service providers. An investment gives a sense of ownership and reward recognition being involved in an essential local industry. Issuing of shares could be in the same format as used by Meridian Energy and or Mighty River Power when they where floated on the market, the latter issuing special shares for initial holdings being held for 2 years ?, this I believe reduces speculators making applications. Also the split payment that Meridian used is worthy of consideration so that more non affluent rate payers may have an opportunity to become a shareholder by making payment in two installments. Another option is to list redeemable preference shares that say pay 5% interest for 5 years and convert to ordinary shares at a given time etc.
Molly Steevens Submitter #2134 To be heard? No	Preferre option B. Sale to New Zealand share holders only. Please do not let outsiders buy shares. Keep it NZ only.
Peter Thompson Submitter #2137 To be heard? No	YES OBVIOUS ONE
Philip Poole Submitter #2156 To be heard? No	The best option raising the capital and retaining ownership within the region.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Jay Lamburn Submitter #2161 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I support the public share offer option with two caveats. First I believe that regional council ratepayers should have a significant proportion of any shares available to them as preferential purchasers. Keep the investment in HB as much as possible. Second I ask the council to seriously reconsider the stated need to 'diversify' its assets. Councils are not private business, where diversification makes economic sense. Selling off a productive asset to invest mainly overseas, please no. Sell off only enough to raise the funds needed to expand the port etc, but keep HB money in HB, rather than sending it outside the region. Here in HB we already own a major local asset, tried and true, it's kept us ahead of the game through the ups and downs of the share market. Once that significant share is gone we will never get it back.</p>
<p>Judith Roberts Submitter #2167 To be heard? No</p>	<p>GIVE HAWKE'S BAY RATEPAYERS THE CHANCE TO INVEST</p>
<p>Derry & Catherine Gordon Submitter #2173 To be heard? No</p>	<p>We agree with B We must own our own facilities. Whenever we give up that ownership or part of that ownership we cause problems for the next generations. At least this way we control our own.</p>
<p>C S Dockary Submitter #2179 To be heard? No</p>	<p>DEFINATELY NOT FOR SALE</p>
<p>James Patrick McGrail Submitter #2180 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Because it is more Hawkes Bay people chance to buy shares and have involvement in this important project.</p>
<p>Barbara Lucas Submitter #734 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>Dear Regional Council, I have concerns regarding this process that if we do get the public share offer, that the money raised by this process could be diverted outside the port. There needs to be complete transparency and accountability provided to the ratepayers. That way we will have access to the progress of how the growth at the Port is lining up with how this consultation is being projected. There is a lot at stake and the Port of Napier needs to have a Regional Council fully backing a successful outcome. Yours sincerely Barbara Lucas</p>
<p>John and Elizabeth Mary Benson Submitter #2208 To be heard? No</p>	<p>BEST OPTION OF THE FOUR WITH NO IMPACT ON RATES.</p>
<p>Peter Charles Amon Submitter #2211 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I only need to look at the success of the Port of Tauranga operation. The rate payers can then have a chance to be involved as shareholders.</p>
<p>R M Campbell Submitter #2212 To be heard? No</p>	<p>NOT A - rates are dear enough now. People are struggling to pay their bills on time.</p>
<p>Don & Anne Lauchlan Submitter #2214 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Jane Hiscock Submitter #2220 To be heard? No</p>	<p>So we have the opportunity to invest in our region to see it grow and generate returns</p>
<p>Neville Bradshaw Submitter #2221 To be heard? No</p>	<p>As long as locals get chance to buy shares.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
R & A Ellingham Submitter #2223 To be heard? No	We would prefer a 60/40 controlling interest.
Eric Stewart Lamb Submitter #2224 To be heard? No	Keep control and allow investment from all other sources.
Amanda Pipe Submitter #2233 To be heard? No	It was between A & B for me & if electricity and fuel weren't also increasing option A would have been my choice. There are only so many extra few \$\$\$'s here and there that most households can take - especially without a direct income increase or massive overhead cost reduction. Best of luck with this difficult decision.
Fay Janice Cross Submitter #2234 To be heard? No	I think it could be a fairer options for ratepayers and would let locals to invest in it too.
Bill Tamatea Submitter #2238 To be heard? No	My reason being for Iwi incorporation land settlements to fund investing in shares to finance the costs with the surplus kept as interest for future allocations to the ratepayers of Hawkes Bay.
Joyce Anne Harding Submitter #2240 To be heard? No	BETTER TO KEEP IT LOCAL HOPFULLY, OTHERWISE THE PROFITS COULD GO OVERSES LIKE THE BANKS
Susan Lane Submitter #2243 To be heard? No	Seems the best option to retain ownership in Hawke's Bay and NZ hands.
Jan Rowlands Submitter #2248 To be heard? No	Money needs to be raised. However would prefer that the ratios were wider. I.e. 55%_45%
T. D. Nowell-Usticke Submitter #2249 To be heard? No	I'd want management to be sure the forecast volumes weren't influenced by the "blip" of freight diverted from Centreport after the Kaikoura earthquake.
John Worden Submitter #2250 To be heard? No	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to speak on the Our Port decision.</p> <p>My first comment is on our ability as submitters to trust the information we are given.</p> <p>At P10 of the information booklet, the port debt is stated to be approximately \$86.6m. The analyses of the options to sell down shareholding state that the application of \$86.6m from proceeds will (p12) see "port debt significantly reduced". Reduced to what? Why not fully cleared? I raise this because we are asked to trust the projections in the booklet as a basis for our input, but this anomaly undermines that trust.</p> <p>There is a significant difference in expected return (about \$34m) from a public IPO and selling to a minority investor. The difference is about 20%, which is significant. The rationale for the size of the difference is weak in the booklet.</p> <p>I wonder if risk has been adequately discussed. You give us projections of booming trade, bigger ships and more cruise passengers over the next 10 years. While the projections have to be considered, because doing nothing if they turn out to be right is not a good option, there are signs that both trade and global finances may be affected by the actions of the US in particular. So some discussion about risk to returns if there is a recession would have been good to let us see a bit about risk.</p> <p>If the IPO price fails to reach expectations, the analysis and options presented may change vis a vis each other. If the conomics of the sell down options change markedly, will there be any threshold at which the community might be asked to affirm or alter its advice to date?</p> <p>The Regional Council tells me that water is over-allocated. I note that much of the boom in the coming decade will be from log exports and apples, which are being planted in great quantities and more densely. There are projections of drier and hotter seasons associated with global warming. If there is an over-allocation of water now, before all that production comes on stream, what happens over the next decade to the projection of export volumes. Perhaps another risk to be discussed during consultation.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>I generally agree with the assumptions made about diversification of investment, minimization of risk, and that doing nothing is not an option. I'm not totally in agreement that an overriding consideration is to protect the ratepayers from the obligations of their ownership of the port. They get reward from dividends to their Council, but accepting some risk should not be automatically off the table.</p> <p>I do not prefer Option A, because of concentration of risk.</p> <p>So I support some form of cashing up and re-investing. I think there is too much risk in Option D leasing, because I think proposals will be predominantly offshore, and the risk of lessee behaviour during adversity cannot be fully managed. Walking after a natural disaster with words like "so sue me in Beijing" come to mind.</p> <p>Of options B and C, C may be stronger in bringing a smart shareholding to the enterprise, rather than a more passive generalize shareholder pool. There is no discussion of the merits or otherwise of this.</p> <p>However, selling down about 30% would cover liquidation of the existing debt. So Option B or C effectively has a range of 30-49%. Option B is preferred only on the basis that the projection of lower IPO price for option C is valid.</p> <p>My view is that selection of a point on that range should be carefully considered. If the IPO price is not as expected, sell down at the lower end, and retain some shareholding for later sell-down.</p> <p>John Worden</p>
<p>F. J. Kilkelly Submitter #2251 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Best wishes in your planning.</p>
<p>Shaun Fredsberg Submitter #1053 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>No to Chinese shares. Open the shares to the Hawkes bay public first and also set a share rate for everyone.</p>
<p>Tony Lane Submitter #1368 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>It's the best way to secure ongoing capital for port expansion</p>
<p>Kenneth Buchanan Submitter #2258 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Happy for Hawkes Bay ownership and control, while allowing the public to invest, great option</p>
<p>Christine Robin Wilkins Submitter #2259 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I believe this is the best option provided that the shares are made available to low income residence and pensioners. Ie \$50 or \$100 shares. And when shareholders wants to sell their shares, they must be sold back to Hawkes Bay Regional Council only (no overseas buyers)</p>
<p>John Conlan Submitter #2261 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It will give the ratepayers the opportunity to have a greater interest in the Port</p>
<p>Olive Turley Submitter #2265 To be heard? No</p>	<p>B. This is the only option that makes sense obviously this option is proven to work as shown by Ports of Tauranga. Why change a winning working system. I understand why you have to get approval from consultation but it seems a waste of time and money. It is a pity you just can't get on and just do it. I hope everybody gives approval to this because it makes sense. Some people will probably say no just because it is the best way. I hope you go with B no matter what the outcome of this is.</p>
<p>Arthur Rankin Submitter #2279 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Let the shares first be offered in \$10k lots to rate payers who register to get them. Then float the rest a couple of months later. It's our port so we should have first option on the shares.</p>
<p>John Palaret Submitter #1907 To be heard? Yes</p> <p>Option B is the standout option , floating up to 49% of the company as it is the only option to satisfy the Port's capital funding needs to enable growth , achieves the best outcome for diversification of investment risk ,has no rate impact and provides a stable minority shareholding base.</p> <p>The remaining options all have in view disadvantages as detailed below:</p> <p>Option A</p> <p>This option contemplates HBRC borrowing from the Local Government Funding Agency to recapitalise the Port balance sheet and retaining 100%shareholding.</p>	

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>The impact on rate payers would be material and an unacceptable burden on some ratepayers .Significantly the Regional Council's balance sheet would be close to optimum leaving little or no headroom for further borrowing , again an unacceptable position for a local body.</p> <p>Option C</p> <p>This option proposes a sale of up to 49% to a single or group of investment partners</p> <p>Having a significant shareholding concentrated in one or a small number of shareholders carries its own risk.</p> <p>A shareholders agreement would usually provide for agreement on certain major strategic decisions and while there might be compatibility initially between shareholders such an investor would wish to have the ability to sell after a period of time and HBRC would not be in a position to exercise its pre-emptive rights of purchase. It remains possible that over time a significant investor shareholder would have divergent views on strategy and dividend expectation leading to board division.</p> <p>Such a shareholding concentration should be avoided in my view.</p> <p>Option D</p> <p>This option involves a long term operating lease (up to 50 years) of the Port operations.</p> <p>Certainly in the medium term this presents the best financial outcome and has no impact on rates.</p> <p>However I agree with the view expressed that binding future Councils to such along period " regardless of the changing commercial, environmental and social context " is a step too far.</p> <p>Retention of control and commitment to regional values overrides the financial advantages of this option.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Option B therefore as been correctly identified by Council as the preferred option .</p> <p>I would be desirable I believe to float say 45% leaving the opportunity for a further sale of 4% later although I accept that this will depend on the share price estimates .</p> <p>I note that the process over a two year period has been rigorous .</p> <p>The decision in March 2017 to appoint a Capital Structure Review Panel comprising Council members, Port representatives and Independent members provided an ideal base as expressed in their April 2018 report to underpin the work undertaken by Council in finally producing the consultation document and a preferred option.</p> <p>I note further that Councillors were over an extended period subject to many meetings , presentations and workshops before arriving at their preferred recommendation.</p> <p>This is one of the most important long term decisions for our region and I am confident that preferred option is the right one and the process has been sound.</p>
<p>Sue Holloway Submitter #2288 To be heard? No</p>	<p>it is the best manageable option</p>
<p>Scott Campbell Submitter #2289 To be heard? No</p>	<p>We will retain overall control without excessive borrowing, no impact on Council debt and no major increase in rates - all the points outlined in Option B seem to make sense, in my opinion.</p>
<p>Christopher Kellond Submitter #2056 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>Maintain the Profits distributed to Pensioners which pays their HBRC Rates and a little of the NCC Rates too.</p>
<p>Graeme Roadley Submitter #2291 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I think it will give people a choice. Regional council keep asking people to put there hand in their pocket way to much. Not everyone can afford to do this. Rates have gone up over 100% in last five years. This is got to stop.</p>
<p>Leander Archer Submitter #2292 To be heard? No</p>	<p>You have all the detailed information so HBRC's preferred option is probably best.</p>
<p>Les Bridgwater Submitter #2293 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It keeps rates down and has been successfully employed in Tauranga.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Ronald Wilkins Submitter #2257 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>I believe this is the best option, provided that the shares are made available to low income residents and pensioners. I.e \$50.00 or \$100.00 shares. That when the shareholder wishes to sell their shares they must be sold back to Hawkes Bay Regional Council only (not to overseas buyers living outside of New Zealand) Do you wish to speak to your submission = YES</p>
<p>Ron Wilkins Grey Power Hastings & Districts Assoc Inc Submitter #2280 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>Letter submitted by the Committee: Our Choice Option B Up to 49% public share offer Reasons: We believe this is the best options, provided that the shares are made available to low income residents and pensioners. i.e. \$50 or \$100 shares. And that when the share-holder wishes to sell their shares they are sold back to Hawkes Bay Regional Council ONLY (NOT OUTSIDE OF NEW ZEALAND TO OVERSEAS BUYERS). We agree that ratepayers paying to retain full control and ownership is far too expensive for many ratepayers. However we are reluctant to see our ownership disappear and to see overseas ownership take the place of local ownership and control. Yes - wish to speak to the our submission at the hearing on the 4-5 December. Submitted by Committee members: President Ron Wilkins Secretary Lorraine Smart Vice President Marie Dunningham</p>
<p>Philip Horan Submitter #2297 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Allowing Public Investment will strengthen the Ports ability to remain competitive and ensure that low socio economic residents are not unduly impacted but large rate rises. I would also suggest that the initial offer be made to Hawkes Bay residents/companies/organisations so that locals have a chance to invest in their port.</p>
<p>BS & VJ Noell Submitter #2655 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>Strongly support option but should be no more than 45% sold - 40% even more preferable. Spreads risks and responsibilities better especially in case of disasters' Wharf and associated works necessary now. Maybe more thought should be given to disposal of waste. As port continues to grow, this option gives better abilities to purchase and replace equipment when necessary.</p>
<p>P & J Farnworth Submitter #2301 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Max 45%</p>
<p>B & M Pearce Submitter #2303 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Floating is by far + away the best option + we control the outcome.</p>
<p>Geoff Yates Submitter #2305 To be heard? No</p>	<p>To provide a solid funding structure not only for the immediate requirements, but also for future financial requirements, "Option B" is the most practical and workable model.</p>
<p>Jacqui Margerison Submitter #2307 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Two reasons 1. To reduce the burden on the ratepayer 2. It is a proven model used elsewhere</p>
<p>Bill Dalton on behalf of Napier City Council Submitter #2309 To be heard? No</p>	<p>RE: SUBMISSION PROCESS PORT OF NAPIER LTD</p> <p>We write to support the Hawkes Bay Regional Council as they seek to raise funds for the expansion of The Port of Napier. The port needs to grow to meet the increasing demands of industry in Hawkes Bay, Failure to provide the resources to allow expansion of the port would result in the eventual demise of the port as a viable entity and would be catastrophic for the entire region.</p> <p>We support the selling down of up to 49% of the shares in the Port of Napier Ltd but have some reservations as to the methodology. It is our view that a full business case should be prepared showing exactly what funding is required for the current port expansion proposal.</p> <p>Only those shares required to be sold to fund that expansion proposal should be sold. It is the view of Council that selling down only to the level required will assure the Port of Napier has further expansion opportunities in the future. We would also respectfully ask that HBRC investigate the possibility of reserving some shares in the issue for Hawkes Bay shareholders only to ensure as many as possible are held by local residents.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Stephen Domino Submitter #2311 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Best option for retaining a majority interest though from past history, HBRC does not have a good record for running things in the region. Model should be based on the Tauranga Port Authority which has been highly profitable! Kind Regards, Stephen Domino</p>
<p>Hetty McLennan-O'Connor Submitter #2315 To be heard? No</p>	<p>However I would like the shares to be offered in teh first round to Hwkes Bay Rate payers as the Port is currently a rate payers assest.</p>
<p>John Stace Submitter #2316 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Hawkes Bay's positive economic growth and its geographic locality demands a modern safe Port that can accommodate not only the size of today's vessels but also the growing demand for berths. I have never understood why New Zealanders are so precious in their views of infrastructure ownership. It is an absolute "handbrake" on the Country's ability to grow and compete internationally. Hawkes Bay is earthquake prone and as such ratepayers are exposed to considerable risk in owning 100% of the Port of Napier. I totally support HBRC in its determination to offer up to 49% in a public share offer. It is the only way forward.</p>
<p>Angela Annear Submitter #2319 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Offer ALL Regional council rate payers the opportunity to participate in this float</p>
<p>Jane Moir Submitter #2322 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I agree with the preferred option. I think the public should be involved with running the port.</p>
<p>Dianne Vesty Submitter #2326 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Would like rate payers in HB to have first option for share purchase.</p>
<p>Paul Snaddon Submitter #2327 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Should Option B be adopted, suggest retail investors are allocated a sizeable ration of IPO and there are restrictions regards overseas investments.</p>
<p>Megan Winter Submitter #2333 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Its not just home owners and commercial property owners who benefit from the Port yet these people will be financially impacted when they are already financially struggling to cover basic living costs. Those who are financially in a position will have an opportunity to invest by listing on the NZX</p>
<p>Jocelyn Streeter Submitter #2336 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The Port is a Napier Assest and needs to be retained in local ownership.</p>
<p>Julia Smith Submitter #2339 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The Port needs to be expanded especially to enable larger cruise ships to dock - this creates a lot of revenue for our local businesses.</p>
<p>Kelvin Kelly Submitter #2341 To be heard? No</p>	<p>SEEMS TO HAVE WORKED ELSEWHERE.</p>
<p>Greg Cassidy Submitter #2342 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option B is by far the most preferred option in my opinion and i would like to see a preferential allocation of shares to to Hawkes Bay ratepayers before offering them to the wider public.</p>
<p>Annika Bennett Submitter #2344 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Can the shares be initially available to H.B. to purchase before coming available to others? So all locals who want a stake gain a greater chance of doing so?</p>
<p>B Janes Submitter #2347 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Your preferred option, in my opinion is the best.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Cherie Sowman Submitter #2350 To be heard? No	Agreed - retain ownership and growth
Rosemary Lee Submitter #2353 To be heard? No	I would want to see first option shares to be offered to Napier residents first.
Keri King Submitter #2356 To be heard? No	Shares to be offered to locals first.
Lisa Richardson Submitter #2358 To be heard? No	Local Hawke's Bay residents should be offered first chance to buy shares in affordable blocks.
Herbert Francis Submitter #2359 To be heard? No	I consider option B is the best option for allowing the port to be able to handle the increasing size of both passenger and cargo ships.
<p data-bbox="165 790 411 824">Geoffrey Whitehead</p> <p data-bbox="616 790 817 824">Submitter #2361</p> <p data-bbox="1018 790 1219 824">To be heard? No</p> <p data-bbox="165 831 879 860">MODIFIED SEE ATTACHED PROPOSAL TO CENTRAL GOVERNMENT</p> <p data-bbox="165 869 1422 931">To: Prime Minister and Minister for Heritage: Rt Hon Jacinda Ardern; Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister: Rt Hon Winston Peters; Defence Minister Hon Ron Mark; Napier MP Hon Stuart Nash</p> <p data-bbox="165 940 464 969">From: Geoffrey Whitehead</p> <p data-bbox="165 978 248 1008">131118</p> <p data-bbox="165 1055 847 1084">Dear Jacina Adern, Winston Peters, Ron Mark, and Stuart Nash</p> <p data-bbox="165 1093 1219 1122">Napier Port consultation document: proposed government statement on national security issues</p> <p data-bbox="165 1131 1366 1193">This document has been released with a closing date for submissions of 15 November and a timetable for final decision-making running through 2019.</p> <p data-bbox="165 1202 1422 1328">Four options have been put forward, but none takes into account matters of national interest and so funding options do not envisage a financial partnership with central government. The Regional Council's preferred option is to retain a majority shareholding and to release up to 49% through a share market listing, which will open the door to purchases by, or on behalf of, governments pursuing an expansionist policy such as China.</p> <p data-bbox="165 1337 1422 1462">I suggest that, whatever the recent precedents like Tauranga and some Australian developments, a high-level central government decision in principle needs to be taken as a matter of urgency to ensure that the Napier port development - and, importantly, the upcoming Lyttleton port development - should be wholly New Zealand owned. This is because:</p> <ul data-bbox="165 1471 1422 1883" style="list-style-type: none"> - New Zealand is in a strategic geographic location in relation to the south-west Pacific and to Antarctica; - This is recognised by major states like China, the United States and the United Kingdom as well as Australia, all of which have bases in Antarctica; - New Zealand is one of very few countries in the world to be used as a jumping off point for servicing these bases, whose future use has yet to be determined by international agreement; - New Zealand has historical close ties with small states in the south-west Pacific. - New Zealand itself has one of the biggest Exclusive Economic Zones in the world because of its outlying islands. - In the last decade, China has begun to develop a 'blue water' navy including its first aircraft carrier; it has acquired bases in the eastern Mediterranean (Piraeus, Greece) and in the Horn of Africa (Djibouti) and will be on the lookout for commercially-led opportunities elsewhere in the world. A Chinese company has recently bought a long lease of Darwin's port, causing the US to activate a small Marine base nearby. President Obama had not been advised of Darwin's plans. <ul data-bbox="165 1892 1422 2018" style="list-style-type: none"> - I suggest that it is in the national interest for the government to flag, as soon as possible, its willingness to take up the 45% shareholding envisaged by the Hawke's Bay Regional Council, perhaps accompanied by a symbolic immediate financial grant to be followed by a stakeholding from central government resources to be identified in the first half of 2019. <p data-bbox="165 2027 1422 2089">I write as a former Director-General of Radio New Zealand who was, therefore, also a member of the national civil defence emergency committee. Further, as Director of the NZ Historic Places Trust I - along with the British High</p>	

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>Commissioner and US Ambassador - was a member of the Antarctic Heritage Trust. In that capacity I facilitated the first heritage conservation report on Scott Hutt, which led to a major project recently completed to preserve this sole example remaining of the first human building in a newly-recognised continent.</p> <p>As a young man I was an observer in a Fleet Air Arm anti-submarine squadron and, later, a member of the special Branch of the Royal Naval Reserve assigned duties for convoy organisation in the event of an imminent attack, and so have a personal knowledge of the importance of maritime basis.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Geoffrey Whitehead</p>
<p>David Brent Christison Submitter #2365 To be heard? No</p>	<p>1. Make a first option on shares for rate payers to have opportunity to purchase. 2. Make the float only 45% so that the masses clearly see that they still own it.</p>
<p>Jenny Andrews Submitter #2367 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I trust the professionals that work at HBRC</p>
<p>Antony and Christine Smith Submitter #2377 To be heard? No</p>	<p>We assume that the possibility of direct investment from the Regional Development Fund has been considered, and for some reasons this is not possible. Otherwise, this would be a very attractive approach. The major positives of the sale of up 49% of the shares to the investing public are the reduced exposure to risk as a consequence of a more diverse investment portfolio, the dilution of the demand for further investment, and the stronger balance sheet of the Port. The reduced share of the direct investment returns that will arise from the growth of the Port is a negative, but the economy of the region as a whole will still benefit from such growth.</p>
<p>Antony Smith Tontine Family Trust Submitter #2379 To be heard? No</p>	<p>A sound commercial decision that will help to ensure ongoing growth and development.</p>
<p>R J Gunson Submitter #2384 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would like to see HB investors given first preference to buy shares.</p>
<p>Clive & Peggy Scotton Submitter #2394 To be heard? No</p>	<p>So long as ownership and control remains with the council and no more than 49% is floated.</p>
<p>G. F. Martin Submitter #2397 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Be careful to whom you float too</p>
<p>Karl Rieter Submitter #2398 To be heard? No</p>	<p>With the "B" option I'm actually interested in investing. Important I feel that ratepayers in the region have the first option to invest before others</p>
<p>Helen Scott Submitter #2399 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The port definitely needs extending for the large amounts of freight that it deals with but not an increase in cruise ships, the town (city) is struggling to cope with the influx now, we've enough.</p>
<p>S. J. Niki Keehan Submitter #2403 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Hope it may be possible for Grannies like me to have a minimum parcel of shares to enhance my children's inheritance. Kind regards, Niki Keehan</p>
<p>W M Henderson Submitter #2411 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I favour floating some on the NZX But 49% is far too much. Float only what is needed and no more 30% might be enough</p>
<p>B Searle Submitter #2412 To be heard? No</p>	<p>B: Floating up to 49% on the NZX</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Malcolm Fergusson Submitter #2414 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Floating up to 40% on NZ market but with a limit anyone person/company or group/associates of 20% or thereabouts. Not entirely convinced that fully extended new wharf needed - use dolphins at extremities.</p>
<p>AA, WA Griffiths Submitter #2420 To be heard? No</p>	<p>PLEASE = DO NOT GIVE CHINA OR ANY OTHER FOREIGN COUNTRY A MINORITY STAKE IN THIS IMPORTANT PART OF OUR DISTRICT</p>
<p>Phyllis Jane Submitter #2427 To be heard? No</p>	<p>You do what you see fit for us all thanks</p>
<p>Raymond Moriarity Submitter #2429 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I am in favour of the indicated option, but would be happier if the float was held to a limit of between 45%-48%. This would allow for another limited option in the future, if required. Over time this "limited-reserve" option is likely to increase in value, while preserving the majority stake-holding of our port and facilities.</p>
<p>Doreen Chatvick Submitter #2432 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It would be great for the people of Hawkes Bay to be able to have shares</p>
<p>Graeme Perry Submitter #2436 To be heard? No</p>	<p>All for retention of control and therefore profits, however despite the Port's shipping being congested there are several other issues to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Road Access. What we currently have is inadequate and guides heavy vehicles along Marine Parade, from the North despite swinging past Ahuriri, the trucks really can't help but affect local traffic. As the High Mass limit goes up so too does the impact on roads and city centres. Over the next 15 years the congestion on the roads to the Port will become untenable without intervention now. - Rail Access. The Port has one of the largest sidings areas in the Country and yet rail comes and goes via a single track in and out, North and South. To divert traffic will require improved and upgraded rail links. In my opinion without HBRC and local Council's investing heavily in access it doesn't matter how large a wharf you build, it cannot function effectively is access is strangled by road restrictions, with rail being hampered by lack of foresight in the past. <p>The Port isn't just 'a Port' it is a transport hub and requires highly improved access to and from to enable it, the Port, to operate effectively. Don't just invest in the Port, failure to address the supporting infrastructure will see us saddled with a huge White Elephant.</p>
<p>James Boocock Submitter #2437 To be heard? No</p>	<p>B the only option</p>
<p>Anthony John and Olga Rae McLagan Submitter #2438 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Preferred option is B. Other option is C. In either case there should be no Chinese investors. New Zealand investors only.</p>
<p>Laurie Sokolich Submitter #2835 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>This option gives the ratepayers the only true measure of the efficiency the port...compared with other ports and other businesses.</p>
<p>Mr Noel Brinson Submitter #2441 To be heard? No</p>	<p>B is by far the best option, nobody wants a rates increase, the port is an asset to all in HB not just the ratepayers. I would buy shares absolutely, much prefer that than the other options.</p>
<p>JA & MI Taylor Submitter #2442 To be heard? No</p>	<p>My wife and I both support option B as being the prudent business decision. It is a no brainer to us.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Mrs L S Berney Submitter #2443 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I listened to a gentlemen saying that more research is needed to find out the cost of a new wharf and only sell shares to cover this leaving the option to sell more at a later date to cover other expenses. The emphasis being on floating UP TO 49% of shares.</p>
<p>Ian Mayne Submitter #2444 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I believe that a public share offer provides the greatest transparency, flexibility and accountability to the people of Hawkes Bay. If the Port needs to raise additional funds it can raise them through its shareholders or by way of debt which ever is the better option at the relevant time of the economic cycle.</p>
<p>Zonia Fuller Submitter #2447 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would like to see Hawkes Bay ratepayers given priority over general investors</p>
<p>Sir Graeme & Lady Avery Submitter #2458 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The ONLY real option</p>
<p>Neil Graham Bayliss Submitter #2463 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Sound approach to future & development of Port. A lesser share offer i.e. 33% would give greater ownership and control to present owner.</p>
<p>Alister Buchanan Submitter #2466 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I am in favour of the sale of up to 49% but would prefer the maximum to be more in the region of 40%. Don't like the debt option as it can lead to issues when interest rates rise as they are bound to do. Option C is basically B under another guise. You will get a lot of emotional flak about selling "our Port" but if you make the first priority of offering shares to local ratepayers and they do not take up the offer then they can have no comeback</p>
<p>John O'Sullivan Tumu Group Submitter #2856 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>The number one priority is to ensure the necessary port development occurs to maintain and grow this critical infrastructure asset for the Hawkes bay region. The sooner this gets underway the better so our region's exporters, importers and the tourist sector are able to grow and prosper with sufficient port capacity available.</p> <p>It is particularly concerning that we have to currently turn some cruise ships away to the detriment of our tourist sector. This situation will only compound should the port expansion not proceed. People are living longer and cruising vacations are increasingly popular. They show our region off to these passengers who may then return for a specific holiday in Hawkes bay.</p> <p>Selling up to 49% in a public share offer is a sensible way of raising capital prudently without placing undue risk on the majority owner, the HBRC. I believe this offer should give a priority allocation to anyone that is a HBRC ratepayer. This way the port is giving the local ratepayers the opportunity to become shareholders and support the growth of this critical regional infrastructure asset without burdening everyone with additional rates. It would be disappointing if the up to 49% public shareholding progressed without priority given to local ratepayers. No doubt this offer would also be supported by some Kiwisaver funds. It makes good sense for the Hawkes bay region to receive inward investment of Kiwisaver funds to help grow the region for the ultimate benefit of all our citizens. Many Hawkes bay residents contribute to Kiwisaver where this money is invested elsewhere in NZ and also offshore. This is a good opportunity to get some of those Kiwisaver funds flowing back to benefit our region.</p> <p>It is also sensible risk mitigation by not over exposing the HBRC balance sheet to a single asset and the resulting financial risk exposure should a disaster strike like a major earthquake.</p> <p>With the HBRC retaining a controlling shareholding you are able to ensure that the regions best interests are maintained. Recent case studies have shown that the Tauranga councils sell down of some of its shareholding in the Tauranga port has been far more rewarding financially for it and the BOP area than the Auckland regional councils retention of its 100% ownership in the Auckland port.</p>
<p>John Cotterill Submitter #2471 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE SHARE OFFER GO FIRSTLY TO H.B RATE PAYERS</p>
<p>Anne Mitford-Taylor Submitter #2476 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Common sense</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Wayne Smith Submitter #2477 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Would be happier with same percentage share that Tauranga has since it seems to be a proven example. Also prefer any share option to be with HB interests to keep profits etc. in the Bay.</p>
<p>Millicent Elaine Harvey Submitter #2483 To be heard? No</p>	<p>As a rate payer I don't think it should be put on rate payers. That's why I prefer B</p>
<p>Bronwyn Calder Submitter #2491 To be heard? No</p>	<p>"ourport" B is my preferred option but I'd rather only 40% be floated on NZX</p>
<p>Peter L Joll Submitter #2493 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option B would appear to offer the benefits needed without placing an undue burden and risk on rate payers.</p>
<p>Lois Marion Joll Submitter #2496 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would be prepared to buy shares. I don't think rate payers should shoulder the debt.</p>
<p>Neil & Judith Craigie Submitter #2506 To be heard? No</p>	<p>THE PORT IS VITAL TO H.B.s PROSPERITY AND MUST BE UPGRADED AND MAINTAINED TO KEEP UP WITH FARMING FORESTRY AND OTHER INDUSTRIES OUTPUTS FOR EXPORT</p>
<p>M D Kean Submitter #2510 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I can only see good, option B, for the Hawkes Bay Region. All the best.</p>
<p>Valerie June Read Submitter #2517 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I think it will be better all round will raise more money and not make our rates go up</p>
<p>J H Connolly Submitter #2519 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Ex BOP</p>
<p>Linton Byfield Linton Byfield Napier Port Ownership / Development Funding Firstly, thank you for the opportunity to comment / contribute. My contribution is made from a background in corporate finance, corporate treasury, as a successful personal investor and as a former company director of an infrastructure company. I make my comments without having a detailed understanding of either the Port or the HBRC financial positions. That said, I think that deciding on the high level principles are the key to arriving at the right decisions. I believe the guiding principles should centre on: 1. Provide for the real beneficiaries of the Port? In my view the beneficiaries have to be the people and businesses in Hawkes Bay. Whilst most corporate models will require the owner to strive to look after their market and in turn optimise profit, I believe an infrastructure asset such as Napier Port must have controlled input from the beneficiaries. I could write reams about why, but that is my view and I am sure the view of many others who have an understanding of regional infrastructure assets. That said, not all ratepayers will see themselves as beneficiaries. There is an argument supporting the case of the ageing population, beneficiaries, youth and wage earners do not receive a direct benefit from the Port. This is of course debatable, but the point is that many of them will think that way and hence will not be comfortable payers of increased rates to fund an assets from which they do not see an direct benefit. 2. Control for Hawkes Bay In my view retention of control of the Port asset is essential, irrespective of how the funding is achieved. There are sufficient corporate precedents which highlight the peril of losing control of regional infrastructure assets such as a Port. The separation of Line and Energy debacle thrust upon the power industry in 2000 is a good example of how</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Submitter #2520 To be heard? No</p>

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>well run local power companies largely lost control due to a politically imposed structure. The result is now clear to see.</p> <p>3. Who is best placed to take the risks?</p> <p>I could write pages in addressing this question. However, my conclusion will be a mix of the local control entity (HBRC) and an active expert shareholder / manager. It is clear that HBRC should not increase their / our exposure. In fact they need to reduce their exposure to the Port as the risk is too high for such an entity in my view — the sun will not always be shining and that is when you do not want to hold all of the risk.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>My approach would be to either sell a minority stake to an infrastructure investor / operator (like an Infracore — but not them!) or to go the IPO route, but with a Cornerstone shareholder, ideally with infrastructure / Port management skills.</p> <p>On balance, I believe the HBRC will extract the best value via an IPO, so that is my preferred option, but with a cornerstone shareholder with a long term infrastructure mentality. Such an investor could be the NZ Super Fund or an offshore pension fund. The downside to having the cornerstone share holder could be a discount in price, but prior discussion with such an investor will no doubt consider this issue and HBRC can keep their options open. So my priorities are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IPO with control and a cornerstone shareholder 2. IPO with control and no cornerstone 3. Control with minority shareholder <p>In recognition of the considerable work clearly undertaken to date, I have purposely not gone the "war and peace" approach.</p> <p>I wish you well with the process going forward.</p> <p>Regards, Lynton Byfield</p>
<p>Annette C. Dunlop Submitter #2521 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It is important that the port stays with the citizens of Napier, as it is a great asset.</p>
<p>Genera Teoraiti Liddall Submitter #2523 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I quite like the idea of investing my money into such a worthy cause as our port. Maybe not for my personal benefit but for the future of my offspring. Not necessary to speak to submission, I think its fairly obvious.</p>
<p>Sally Hansen Submitter #2524 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Only option</p>
<p>Alan Petersen Submitter #2525 To be heard? No</p> <p>Submissions on Napier Port Consultation Document From Alan Petersen 15/11/2018 Dear Councillors;</p> <p>I have lived on Seapoint Road, Napier for about 20 years. I lived in Te Puke and Tauranga for some years and observed the tremendous development of the Port of Tauranga. The ownership model is an obvious success for all to see. Contrast that with the Port's of Auckland, somewhat strangled by its location and being 100% owned by Auckland City Council.</p> <p>At 18 Seapoint Rd my partner Christine Snook and I are exposed to noise and light spill from Port activities and associated truck and rail traffic. The intensity increases as the Port throughput grows.</p> <p>I agree and support Option B with up to 49% public share offer and the development of Wharf 6. I oppose options A, C & D. Ever since moving to Napier I have thought the Napier Port ownership should be set up on the same business model as the Port of Tauranga</p> <p>For many reasons Option B provides the most logical and acceptable balance between the Council maintaining a majority interest (on behalf of the people of Hawkes Bay) but to float a minority stake of up to 49% on the New Zealand Stock Exchange.</p> <p>On the floating of shares there should be a mechanism to set aside so a reasonable block of shares are available for the people of Hawkes Bay.</p> <p>Funding of public good and mitigation</p>	

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>But I submit that the Council should set aside some of the proceeds for mitigation of the adverse environmental effects of the Port; historical, present and future. As the majority shareholder it should also ensure the Port company shares the cost where appropriate.</p> <p>Noise compensation</p> <p>It is appreciated that after many years of struggle the residents adversely affected by noise are having noise attenuation upgrades to their houses largely organised and funded by the Port and/or HBRC. Whilst this is some measure of mitigation it does not mitigate the adverse effects of constant noise around the resident's outdoor and open spaces.</p> <p>I request that Council establish an annual noise compensation scheme. The proposed expansion and ongoing future growth will inevitably produce increased noise in residential areas nearby (spatially identified in the noise zones in the Napier City Council District Plan). There is also additional noise from rail and road traffic to/from the Port that adds to the daily cacophony.</p> <p>It would also be of considerable appreciation to directly affected residents if the Port took a more balanced and helpful position on its inputs into changes to the District Plan in regard to rules on its adverse environmental effects. In the past it has used its commercial muscle to quite aggressively "protect its commercial interests" on such matters.</p> <p>Just remember the residential land use next to the Port was established well before the development of the modern Port. Those directly affected by Port activities (the few) should be compensated by the people of Hawkes Bay (the many) who benefit from a progressive and profitable Port.</p> <p>A panel of experts including a noise consultant should be established to formulate a fair and reasonable ongoing compensation package for directly affected residents.</p> <p>Breakwater Beach protection, maintenance and enhancements</p> <p>The Seascape Society did much to ensure the small Breakwater Beach (a gem) was protected from future reclamation and development by the Port. It is important to the residents of Bluff hill, Ahuriri, and the rest of Napier and Hawkes Bay that this safe swimming beach continues to be protected from Port expansion. I request the Port and/or Council fund the enhancement and maintenance of this beach as a part of its mitigation of past development that has significantly modified the unique Bluff Hill coastline. This protection, maintenance and enhancement should continue as the Port grows.</p> <p>Pania Reef</p> <p>This unique marine feature located just off the outer breakwater used to be a diver's paradise before marine life was destroyed by Port development such as dumping of dredging sands. It is a feature that the Port and Council should protect (as a marine reserve) and re-establish it to its pre-Port natural state.</p> <p>Renourishment of coastline from Westshore north to Whirinaki.</p> <p>There has been much study and debate over many years on the protection of the beaches north of the Port; Westshore, Bay View and Whirinaki.</p> <p>It is the Port Breakwater that has blocked the natural net northerly drift of gravels from the rivers and Cape Kidnappers south of the Port. The Regional Council has part-funded renourishment since 1986 (in conjunction with Napier City Council). The Port and/or the Regional Council should fully fund renourishment and other beach protection works (as planned for the south end of Westshore) on a long-term basis as some mitigation of the adverse effects caused by the Port's "headland extension" and breakwater and channel. Takis Koutsos, a previous engineer with Council told me an analogy of the renourishment scheme he developed for Westshore. "It's like a bank account, if too much money is withdrawn it needs to be replaced". It's that simple. It is affordable and sustainable compared to other options.</p> <p>I learnt much about the Napier coastline from managing the appeal to the Environment Court of a coastal hazard zone from Gill Rd to Franklin Rd; (Foreworld v NCC & HBRC). The decision reduced the width of that CHZ.</p> <p>I understand that when the Harbour Board was dis-established in 1989 there were funds set aside for coastal protection works. In view of the Port's future works and predicted sea-level rise such a fund should be re-established.</p> <p>The above submissions on public good and mitigation funding will be presented in my submissions when Council amends the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan once a decision is made on the Port ownership model and funding.</p> <p>A question of legality;</p> <p>What are the legislative provisions that allow the Regional council to sell shares it holds on behalf of the people of Hawkes Bay? From the heading of page 2. "Napier Port is proudly owned by the people of Hawkes Bay".</p>

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>It seems to be a conundrum that the people of Hawkes Bay will be entitled to buy shares which they already collectively own.</p> <p>A high-level legal opinion may be required to be certain Council is not acting ultra vires on this matter.</p> <p>Alan Petersen</p>
<p>Roger Morrison Submitter #2530 To be heard? No</p>	<p>"Our Port" - I recommend Option B with limitations on the share offer to local private investors initially.</p>
<p>Alicia Tamara Tamainu Submitter #2533 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would prefer that Ngati Kahungunu Iwi Inc. were offered shares before the general public. The only reason I am choosing 'B' is because we need to increase capacity to keep our economy going.</p>
<p>Shirley & Gordon Vogtherr Submitter #3115 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>Agree with Council decision, Option B but want HB Regional Council ratepayer to have a prior option to purchase shares in Port before outsiders. Suggest priority time one month.</p>
<p>Roger Dickie Roger Dickie (NZ) Ltd as the administrators and managers of 56 different rate paying forests in the HBRC region Submitter #3434 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>The Port urgently needs capital injection, to upgrade service to clients of the Port. There is much more that we wish to say that this submission form does not allow for. We are forecast to ship more than 9 million tonne of logs through Port Napier over the next 17 years. The service forest owners are being offered now is not competitive with other ports and is costing us a significant amount. This needs to be rectified as we have choices with our Wairarapa logs and our Wairoa area forests, unless we are delivered better and more competitive service we will not continue to use Napier port with approximately 50% of our logs.</p>
<p>Kaylie Bowman Submitter #2541 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I like the thought of local people being able to buy shares and support the port. I would love to have the opportunity to invest in something local. The living costs in NZ are already too high and we struggle to pay our bills week-to-week. The thought of rates increasing is overwhelming and I'm sure many other people feel the same, therefore, I don't see this as a good option. I would hate for the local council to loose control over the port, or have an large overseas investor involved.</p>
<p>Deborah Ellery Submitter #2543 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I like that the majority ownership is retained and that the public & investors have the chance to invest into the port also. I would prefer only 45% was released.</p>
<p>Yvette Laporte Submitter #2546 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Keep it local !!!</p>
<p>Helen Walker Submitter #2547 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This is the most efficient option to manage publicly owned assets</p>
<p>Malcolm Ross Submitter #2548 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The HBRC Retains control of the port and the rate payers and the region continue to benefit from the profits. I would like to see shares offered to HBRC ratepayers first, then the remainder sold on the usual market</p>
<p>Janice Larrington Submitter #2549 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I believe that local people through our representatives on the HBRC should still maintain control and have input into the future direction of the port. The port is very important to the future city, and the city, through its workers, contractors and local industry is important to the future of the port. If the ownership of the port goes "offshore" then you can bet that within 5 - 10 years, the port will close or be severely down graded.</p>
<p>Stephanie Hall Submitter #2551 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Good choice for region without a big rates hike. D is my second choice.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Wayne Jeffries Submitter #2552 To be heard? No	Option B Local ownership and investment will ensure continued support
Andrew Fergus Submitter #2553 To be heard? No	This provides the funds needed for expansion, and allows locals to invest in the Port.
Paula Morgan Submitter #2554 To be heard? No	Because it is in best interests for all concerned
Garry Atkins Submitter #2555 To be heard? No	The port is a long-term valuable asset for the people of the region, however, from time to time there are large demands for financial resources to achieve growth. These demands exceed the ability of the present shareholder to contribute without placing added burdens on the ratepayers in the region. A public offering is the simplest way forward and a retention of the controlling interest will allow continuing ownership of the asset in this region.
Ron Barrett Submitter #2556 To be heard? No	Those likely to benefit will take up the offer.
Sarah McAllum Submitter #2557 To be heard? No	Reasons outlined by HBRC are solid. Like the idea of locals being able to directly invest in the port. Also this model has been very successful in Tauranga.
Sue Mitchell Submitter #2559 To be heard? No	It's a fantastic opportunity for New Zealander's to be an active part of the growth and success of the region. It's important however to ensure that the IPO provides for a 'reasonable' entry point financially for individuals to be able to participate, together with the appropriate advice on how to buy shares. Historically I have found that a) the financial entry point for such an offering is too high (eg minimum \$5,000 investment); and b) the process around the purchase and ownership of shares is onerous and full of legalese that puts people off. As a result, the majority of buyers are serious investors and the opportunity for Mum & Dad investors is lost. If this is a genuine offer for locals to invest, then it needs to be made truly accessible. Many thanks Sue
Matt Gibson Submitter #2564 To be heard? No	Retains majority ownership and control. Rates are high enough already.
Rosemary Dawton Submitter #2567 To be heard? No	Option B would deliver the funding to enable better and faster development whilst maintain operation control and majority ownership. I would hope that the public share offer would be a slightly lower figure of 45%, and would love the shares to be offered to residents of Hawkes Bay first if that is possible. Options C and D are not an option as I don't believe that would be in the best interests of Hawkes Bay.
Ted Dickie Harvest Logistics Ltd Submitter #3437 To be heard? Yes	Delays at the Port are having Financial implications on our Export Log Cartage in the Hawkes Bay - Cruise ships having priority in port over Log boats, causing delay's in boat loading and often leading to log cartin restrictions. - Logs being split between different blocks in the Port meaning trucks have to line up twice to unload. - Infrastructure in port causing delays in unloading i.e 1 loader unloading trucks in different Blocks. - Loss of Gantry crane, meaning trucks can only get trailers lifted from 6am-6pm. Outside these hours trucks can not get trailers lifted/
Andrew Lessard Submitter #2574 To be heard? No	It is clear that doing nothing is not an option as the region needs the Port to grow and help continue to grown the HB economy. This is the best of both world's as it allows the council to remain in control without going into greater debt.

Submitter	Commentary
Jane Wall Submitter #2579 To be heard? No	This means the port can raise the necessary funds to expand and that any individual can invest if they wish to. I like this option also because our rates won't go up.
Emil Baer Submitter #2585 To be heard? No	Retain majority ownership (!) and have an opportunity to invest in our local future.
Daniel Cash Submitter #2590 To be heard? No	I would like to see a Business such as this stay in the hands of local people not overseas investors, and have ratepayers become shareholders with no limits on how many shares a person can purchase.
Brian McAleer Submitter #2591 To be heard? No	To retain ownership to the people of Hawke's Bay As rate payers should be given first options I believe that regional council are nagating their responiability for the erosion at Westshore
Rona Simons Submitter #2593 To be heard? No	I find that this will be the best option for the future of the port.
Warren Temperton Submitter #2594 To be heard? No	So long as Hawkes Bay ratepayers and residents get first opportunity to purchase the shares in the port
Amy Bowkett Submitter #2595 To be heard? No	I don't believe Regional Councils should own large assets. But I do believe ownership should stay local. An IPO should be available firstly to Hawkes Bay residents only, then to NZ residents only. I don't feel that the statistics used to 'prove' the growth of the port are fair. Wellington Port was closed so we got a lot of their traffic. This should be noted next to these statistics.
Lesley Carthew Submitter #2596 To be heard? No	Best option look at Port of Tauranga!
Philip Carthew Submitter #2597 To be heard? No	No brainer, look at POT
DBK Properties Ltd Submitter #2598 To be heard? No	Hawkes Bay needs to retain the ownership off it's port and at the same time it needs to finance further development. We feel it is a good option but would like to see Hawkes Bay rate payers and residents given first option to purchase shares.
Donald de Barre Submitter #2599 To be heard? No	As long as the shares stay within New Zealand
Richard O'Mahony Submitter #2607 To be heard? No	Cheapest for me
john merritt Submitter #2617 To be heard? No	Best for all
Craig Bishop Submitter #2620 To be heard? No	Enables Growth protects ratepayers from rates rises Keen to buy shares myself retains majority community ownership & control Enables port staff and Local community to directly invest
Jennifer Young Jennbring Fruit Ltd Submitter #2621 To be heard? No	Currently owned by HBRC Ratepayers, so they should have first option to buy those shares.

Submitter	Commentary
Brian Young JBAR Properties Ltd Submitter #2622 To be heard? No	HBRC Ratepayers currently own the port, so we should have first option to buy the shares in the port.
Jenny Young Submitter #2623 To be heard? No	Best option for HBRC Ratepayers. We should have first option for buying the port shares
William Dickie Roger Dickie NZ Lt Submitter #3447 To be heard? Yes	Roger Dickie NZ Ltd manages over 20 Pinus Radiata forests in the Hawkes Bay region and a further 12 in the Wairoa region, totalling almost 9000 hectares, which will all use the Napier Port for exporting logs to overseas markets. 5 of these forests are currently harvesting and 8 are due to start in the next 12 months. We are currently experiencing significant delays getting our products onto ships and we only see this problem escalating as we bring more forests to harvest. This is increasing costs and therefore reducing returns to our forest investors. Having Logging ships removed from port to allow Cruise ships access is not acceptable for our company and investors We feel that significant upgrades to the Napier port are essential and cannot happen soon enough. We strongly support option B and encourage the development to happen as soon as possible.
Andre Geelen Submitter #2633 To be heard? No	Very important for HBRC to retain ownership so that future direction is not jeopardised. Also do not want to have investment partner to be a single entity or even just one or two entities as this would create a potentially bigger tension than many smaller shareholders should there be upcoming differences.
Susan harrison Submitter #2634 To be heard? No	I wish to purchase shares as do my family, this is our port our place and our back yard, and it needs to stay local.
Adrienne Simcox Submitter #2638 To be heard? No	Option B in my opinion allows us to retain the majority share without the need to increase rates. The best for HB & the tax payer.
<p>Xan Harding on behalf of Hawke's Bay Winegrowers' Association Incorporated Submitter #3477 To be heard? Yes</p> <p>This is a submission on the future ownership of the Napier Port.</p> <p>1. Who we are: Hawke's Bay Winegrowers' Association Inc. (HBWG) HBWG is the industry representative body for grapegrowers and winemakers in Hawke's Bay. All growers and wineries receive automatic membership through payment of industry levies. HBWG is affiliated to and receives most of its funding from New Zealand Winegrowers and has a local membership comprising 65 grapegrowers, 79 winemakers and a number of associate members.</p> <p>The wine sector is one of the largest intensive land-users in Hawke's Bay, comprising around 5000ha in production, predominantly on the Heretaunga Plains. Annual grape production in Hawke's Bay is around 40,000T, the second-largest region after Marlborough.</p> <p>HBWG carries out a range of services for its members including education, research, wine promotion, media hosting and advocacy and was formed in 2007 from the merger of the members of 2 longstanding local associations - Hawke's Bay Grapegrowers' Association Inc. and Hawke's Bay Winemakers Inc.</p> <p>2. The specific areas on which we wish to comment are as follows: - HBWG's preferred option – Option B - Matters we urge the Council to address</p> <p>3. Support for Option B HBWG supports Option B, share market float of a minority stake in the Port.</p>	

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>HBWG agrees that it is impractical for either Council or the Port itself to fund the desired expansion but that a complete divestment of the Port is inappropriate. We are satisfied that Council has received appropriate advice to guide it to a sound decision to prefer a share market float over private placement or lease options.</p> <p>4. Matters we urge the Council to address</p> <p>In reaching its final decision, HBWG urges the Council to consider need for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The desirability of adopting a policy commitment to retention of long-term absolute majority control of the Port rather than just majority at the point of the initial disposition, to guard against unintentional dilution of control over time. <input type="checkbox"/> The need for an updated capital and investment policy to maintain clear boundaries between funds intended to be held as long-term capital investments and other financial resources, and to ensure prudent investment of Council's divestment proceeds. To put it bluntly, the liquid assets generated by the divestment should not become subject to lesser capital controls by virtue of their liquidity and the additional liquidity means that it is appropriate time to revisit Council's policies on investments. <p>We wish to be heard in support of this submission.</p> <p>DATED at Hastings this 22nd day of November 2018</p>
<p>Jeffery Parsons Submitter #2642 To be heard? No</p>	<p>While we are not qualified to fully understand the options submitted , I would expect that due diligence will have been applied by professionals in the interests of the port company and the rate payers of Hawkes Bay, without Political motivation or influence</p>
<p>Robyb Orton Submitter #2647 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I'd like to become a part of the process via purchasing shares.</p>
<p>Anthony McLagan Napier Arts Club Submitter #2648 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The club committee considered the proposal at their last monthly meeting of Wednesday, 14 November. The club is not in a position to pay higher rates to support the port. Option B would normally allow for buyback of shares when the port is profitable. There was consensus that there should be no direct Chinese investment</p>
<p>Madeleine Anne Vink Submitter #2650 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The success of this option can be seen in the operation of the Ports of Tauranga.</p>
<p>Anne Vink Kane Carding Co Ltd Submitter #2652 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Retaining the Port 100% is not an option. Monies are required to grow the port and NO council should own & operate public assets - the competition there today requires committed, experienced & professional management.</p>
<p>Rosemary Lillian Simmonds Submitter #2662 To be heard? No</p>	<p>By floating 49% of the Port on the NZX, this definitely is my preferred option. There are people out there that think Napier should pay! Where does the produce: forestry for export go from outlying districts? To the Port to be exported. Everyone gets huge benefits from the Port for this region.</p>
<p>Campbell Leckie Submitter #2663 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Definitely option B - we (the community) retain control of the asset and the rates cost is lower!</p>
<p>Derek Squires Submitter #2664 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I support your preferred option with one proviso! Is it lawful to limit the number of shares any one individual, company or institution can purchase to reduce the likelihood of a takeover further down the track. Derek Squires</p>
<p>Kurt Franz Wurm Submitter #2669 To be heard? No</p>	<p>A balanced option, keeping majority of ownership with HBRC, giving Napier ratepayers opportunity to buy shares in Port of Napier.</p>
<p>M Quelch Submitter #2675 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Will these shares be available to local rate payers prior to general distribution?</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Ann Tylee Submitter #2689 To be heard? No</p>	<p>1. This is the preferred, recommended HBRC option. 2. It retains majority ownership, and means ratepayers can choose to invest, rather than option A, which forces an unrealistic "investment". 3. Options C & D mean too much insecurity and/or loss of ownership for the region.</p>
<p>Diana Stannard Submitter #2691 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This option will increase the funds so that the existing loan is covered and funds are available to future proofing the Port. It also leaves majority shareholding with the people of Hawkes Bay. I, among many, would find the option in increasing rates disturbing as many would not have sufficient income to cover the dramatic increase required.</p>
<p>Charles Davis Submitter #2693 To be heard? No</p>	<p>(1) Napierportairport trust for the people off HB Combine the Napier Port /Napier Airport as one share offer.give say 100 shares (estimate) each to Rate payers to keep or sell there choice.This way Rate payers can keep the Dividend to help pay the Yearly Rates,Offer the other shares if any to Rate payers they can can purchase if they wish. Shares not sold HBRC Retains shares and offers them at a later date.</p>
<p>G R Geenty Submitter #2696 To be heard? No</p>	<p>My preference would be to take a majority interest but that is not possible. I do not want anotehr investor as interested as C above. I am interes in a floating vote as outlined.</p>
<p>Helma van den Berg Submitter #2702 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I think our port is an irreplaceable + unique asset to Hawke's Bay, a gateway to export + imports, to tourism visitors by ship, to fishing boats + container ships critical to our manufacturing, wines, farming, forestry, orcharding + horticulture. We need to stay with the other main ports of N.Z. - modern, efficient + profitable, Environmentally responsible.</p>
<p>Janine Thompson Submitter #2706 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I hope rate payers get first choice to purchase some shares.</p>
<p>Bruce Malcolm Ross Submitter #2715 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Protecting rate payers rate rises. Retaining local ownership.</p>
<p>Robert Jasper Herrick Submitter #2718 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The Port of Tauranga is doing very well and Council will still have control. Perhaps sell off 45% and retain 55%.</p>
<p>John & Heather Murphy Submitter #2719 To be heard? No</p>	<p>A good idea, as long as the shares are only sold to H.B. or N.Z. residents. I don't want the profits going overseas, like the banks have done.</p>
<p>George Bernard Farnin Submitter #2721 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would vote for B up to 49% but not for Chinese or overseas business just New Zealand.</p>
<p>D B Steedman Submitter #2722 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option B. Sounds good - seems to work for Tauranga port but would be good if local exporters who use the port be 'encouraged' to take up a sizeable percentage so they have 'skin in the game'.</p>
<p>Nicola O'Keefe Submitter #2724 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would be interested in purchasing shares. But, of concern to me as a resident are 2 points. 1. documents were not received in the post in a timely manner, I believe not at all for some residents and others. As residents we are DIRECTLY affected by this expansion and the consultation process on this has been less than satisfactory. 2. No-where in these documents did I see any potential affect on the environment mentioned. I am sure the environment will be directly affected by the Port expansion, and this is a major concern to myself and others I have spoken with..</p>


Submitter	Commentary
Doris Day Submitter #2725 To be heard? No	TO ENCOURAGE INVESTMENT IN THIS REGION AND IS NO EXTRA COST TO RATE PAYERS
Terry Zame Submitter #2726 To be heard? No	Proven successful at Tauranga why not Napier.
David Frank Day Submitter #2727 To be heard? No	I consider that our Port should remain in ownership by the City and Ratepayers of Napier. I would be very interested in purchasing any future shares in our Port, if offered the chance. David Day
Trudy Neilsen Submitter #2731 To be heard? No	Offer shares out to ratepayers
Lois Riddell Submitter #2733 To be heard? No	Rather have 35% on NZX
Ian Redshaw Submitter #2735 To be heard? No	Provides the best option to fund future critical development whilst retaining control of the company and creating the opportunity for local investment. Any IPO should allow preferential allocation for H.B.R.C. ratepayers.
Beverley Anne Le Proo Submitter #2736 To be heard? No	ALLOWS PORT TO GROW, WITHOUT BURDEN ON RATE PAYERS COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL ENABLES COMMUNITY TO DIRECTLY INVEST IN OUR PORT IF THEY SO WISH TO DO SO.
Davis Charles Canning Submitter #2739 To be heard? No	WELL RESEARCHED, WELL PRESENTED. MOST SENSIBLE OPTION AS PORT MUST BE ABLE AND ENABLED TO CONTINUE TO GROW IN THE FUTURE. HB OWNERSHIP IS PROTECTED. RATEPAYERS PROTECTED.
Ngawaiata Russell Submitter #2741 To be heard? No	rate payer
Gary William Barford Submitter #2742 To be heard? No	On a fixed income hard enough finding rate money now let along finding extra money G W Barford
John Tucker Submitter #2743 To be heard? No	It keeps local ownership and allows for the necessary investment. Questions How valid is the comparison with Tauranga? - It is close to Auckland, Napier is geographically isolated - It has a much larger forestry component - When you see the growing piles of logs on the wharves it suggests Napier cannot cope now, so where would the investment come from?
Forbes Bennett Submitter #2747 To be heard? No	This is such a complex & commercial issue, my decision is guided by the Regional Council. Thank you
Diana Green Submitter #2749 To be heard? No	I would have thought a Bond Issue would have been well subscribed - however feel Option B next most suitable. Has there been any approach to the Provincial Growth Fund for a possible grant? I have not heard anything in that regard.
Mr Te Ariki Holloway-Puia Submitter #2750 To be heard? No	I ALSO PREFER'S OPTION B THANKS T A H Puia
W & K Lowe Submitter #2751 To be heard? No	Thoughts on making shares available to NZ business/people so no overseas investors. Otherwise Option B (Submitter had crossed out all other options other than B on the form)

Submitter	Commentary
Moirá Hynes Submitter #2756 To be heard? No	B/ seems to be the only viable option. I definitely don't want C or D. Would like A but it is too expensive for, I would guess, the majority of ratepayers.
Paul & Catherine Bailey Submitter #2758 To be heard? No	The preferred option is the right one with the template for future certainty closely aligned to Ports of Tauranga. This is the example that is tried and true and has comfortably dealt with future expansion and investment. Because of the land mass of Hawkes Bay, its fertility and desirability both investment and population will grow and will demand amenities to meet their requirements. Please do not get side-tracked by side issues, such as Green ideology that promotes "let us wait and see". In commercial practice the board, an elected body, should make the decision. Very best wishes for the future. P.S Bailey 14.11.18
Milton & Val Beattie Submitter #2765 To be heard? No	B would be our preference. We need to maintain ownership and profits generated from the port. This is vital for our growth.
Sandra Hilton Submitter #2772 To be heard? No	Ratepayers have had enough.
D J Browning Submitter #2775 To be heard? No	I PREFER OPTION B.
Ronald Jack Submitter #2782 To be heard? No	This seems to me to be the best option. Giving all NZ residents the opportunity for a long term investment and retaining the control of the port in Hawkes Bay hands.
Patricia A. Price Submitter #2787 To be heard? No	We must use our port for overseas trade.
Leslie Davies Submitter #2788 To be heard? No	"B" is my preferred option
Janet Mary Brownlie Submitter #2805 To be heard? No	Selling to People of H.B. consider a time before they could be resold.
James Bowden Submitter #2813 To be heard? No	Gives locals an opportunity to invest in a profitable company and makes the Council more accountable to the shareholders
Julie Johnson Submitter #2819 To be heard? No	Port of Tauranga has this system, which seems to work. However we are not happy with 49%. We think that it should be offered to NZ residents only and no more than 45% with 55% being held by HBRC.
Javiera Otero Submitter #2823 To be heard? No	According to the situation at the Tauranga port, this option is the most viable. The people from Hawke's bay will own the port still, the regional council will keep the 51% of the shares, and also we will be able to buy some shares from the public offer.
Linda Akers Submitter #2824 To be heard? No	I prefer this option if Napier rate payers are given first option to buy shares before this goes out to the wider public/business. Otherwise option A would be my preferred option, but again, can council guarantee once this is paid for that rates would go down, or invested into sea walls, education and other important bay issues??
Bernard Hough Submitter #2825 To be heard? No	I would prefer any monies needed for port development to be funded by selling shares in preference to increasing rates or borrowing monies from an institution.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Kelly Emus Submitter #2832 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would be keen to invest and help grow a local company.</p>
<p>Elaine Hebberley Submitter #2833 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Would like the opportunity to invest in the port. The shares should initially only be available to ratepayers via an appointed share broker.</p>
<p>Peter Seligman Submitter #2834 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I believe in a share-owing democracy. Expansion is obviously vital. Spreading the ownership between multiple investors makes it less likely that the council will have a serious rival for control & direction. If we should return to a situation where borrowing is very, very cheap I think that share buy-backs should be strongly considered: so as to consolidate the benefit for the community in the long term.</p>
<p>Malcolm Burr Submitter #2836 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Clearly Hawkes Bay and the Port needs to grow so let's get on with it the sooner the better. Make the Public Share offer available to New Zealanders first, then open up to others if required.</p>
<p>John Overend Submitter #2838 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Rate payers should not be forced to contribute to this. The port should be able to fund its own expansion program. This is something that should have been in the port planning over the last 25 years. This not a justifiable rate payers expense.</p>
<p>Denise Nickel Submitter #2840 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would prefer about a 45% public share offer if possible. Could Hawkes Bay residents have first option on purchasing the shares.</p>
<p>Liz Ross Smith Submitter #2843 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would prefer 49% of the Port of Napier was owned by local shareholders, because environmental considerations are decisions in which the community can have some say.</p>
<p>Heidi Stiefel Submitter #2845 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Too much risk for Napier rate payers to own 100%</p>
<p>Leslie Ross Smith Submitter #2846 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I support selling 49% assuming there will be a return on investment. I would like to see it offered to registered local people to keep ownership in Hawke's Bay with a limit on shareholding size and resale limits. e.g. 2 years. Sales could be back to HBRC thereby limiting speculation and any attempted corporate takeover</p>
<p>Erena Fussell Submitter #2850 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I like the idea of local residents owning shares in this asset.</p>
<p>John O'Sullivan Submitter #2855 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The number one priority is to ensure the necessary port development occurs to maintain and grow this critical infrastructure asset for the Hawkes bay region. The sooner this gets underway the better so our region's (and neighbouring regions) exporters, importers and the tourist sectors are able to grow and prosper with sufficient port capacity available.</p> <p>Selling up to 49% in a public share offer is a sensible way of raising capital prudently without placing undue risk on the majority owner, the HBRC. I believe this offer should give a priority allocation to anyone that is a HBRC ratepayer. This way the port is giving the local ratepayers the opportunity to become shareholders and support the growth of this critical regional infrastucture asset without burdening everyone with additional rates. No doubt this offer would also be supported by Kiwisaver funds. It makes good sense for the Hawkes bay region to receive inward investment of Kiwisaver funds to help grow our region for the ultimate benefit of all our citizens. Many Hawkes bay residents contribute to Kiwisaver where this money is invested elsewhere in NZ and offshore. This is a good opportunity to get some of those Kiwisaver funds flowing back to benefit our region.</p> <p>It is also sensible risk mitigation by not over exposing the HBRC balance sheet to a single asset and the resulting exposure should a disaster strike like a major earthquake.</p> <p>With the HBRC retaining a controlling shareholding you are able to ensure that the regions best interests are maintained.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
John Cotter Submitter #2860 To be heard? No	Expansion required to grow the HB Region. Try to retain ownership with the HB rate payers.
Penny Andersen Submitter #2867 To be heard? No	Believe shared ownership, Ports & NZers particularly Hawkes Bay community allows all to have a vested interest in an important asset
Lorraine Rawcliffe Submitter #2869 To be heard? No	Gives the local rate payers a chance to have a interest in the local port
Desmond & Lorraine Rawcliffe Submitter #2871 To be heard? No	Local Ratepayers should be entitled to buy shares in the port
<p data-bbox="164 707 360 741">Ewan McGregor</p> <p data-bbox="616 707 818 741" style="text-align: center;">Submitter #2874</p> <p data-bbox="1018 707 1220 741" style="text-align: right;">To be heard? No</p> <p data-bbox="164 748 1406 842">I understand that a Hawke’s Bay Today Talking Point I recently wrote on this subject was circulated to Councillors. This represents my views, so here I will briefly reiterate them as my formal submission. Thank you for the opportunity to do so.</p> <ol data-bbox="164 853 1426 1491" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Port of Napier is the industrial gateway of this region, and beyond. Since the resolution in 1934 of the intractable division as to the very location of the port, development of the breakwater harbour has been in lockstep with the industrial growth of its catchment. This is just as it must remain as far into the future as we can see. That means accommodating increased tonnage and ever-larger vessels. The ideal outcome would be for the HBRC to retain 100% ownership of the Port, thus being the sole recipient of its dividend. But does the ratepaying public have the wherewithal – and the willingness – to provide the required funding? That is a political decision for the Council to make, but it would appear not to be so. However, if there is a clear willingness by an overwhelming majority of ratepayers to foot the bill, then maybe go for it. But beware of the risk of a ratepayer revolt, or a substantial number who are genuinely unable to meet their substantially increased rate bill. What then? 2. I therefor favour the preferred option of opening up Port ownership to public shareholding, up to, but not necessarily to, 49%. This, incidentally, has not seemed to have done the Port of Tauranga, arguably the country’ most successful port, any harm. 3. A requirement must remain that all shippers who meet the conditions of the company have access to the Port. 4. It is preferable that public investment be confined to New Zealand citizens, and this is certainly the preference of the public. However, I am not sure that such would be legally possible. 5. The manner that you are seeking public opinion on this question is the correct one. This is not a matter for a referendum as the issue has several dimensions. In any case, referenda are all too commonly the tool of the populist afraid to nail their colours to the mast, assuming, that is, they have any. <p data-bbox="164 1503 344 1603">Good luck! Ewan McGregor Member Hawke’s Bay Harbour Board 1980-89.</p> <p data-bbox="164 1615 1217 1641">Addendum: That all funds raised in the name of Port of Napier Development be applied to same.</p>	
Diana Gillum Submitter #2875 To be heard? No	Sale of up to 49% by public share offer of New Zealand residents but limit any share holding to a maximum of no higher than 19% to try to avoid major holdings gaining control.
Graham Barrie Submitter #2879 To be heard? No	Just makes sense to float on the NZSX. There would be strong demand for the shares, council would still have control and a definite increase in value for the council. Just look at how well Tauranga Port has prospered after listing on the NZX
Trish Morgans Submitter #2881 To be heard? No	I would prefer option A but opted not to select it for fear of Rates increasing to pay for it. Option B hopefully means Port is retained and Napier resident have opportunity to be part of that ownership without a rates increase.

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Joan Sye Submitter #2886 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Did wonder if debenture stock would be an option. But do want the revenue to benefit local economy and not to be sent overseas eg like the foreign owned banks.</p>
<p>John & Pat Swinburn Submission from J B & P P Swinburn HBRC & Port of Napier</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Submitter #2893</p> <p style="text-align: right;">To be heard? No</p> <p>The review of Council ownership of the Port is timely because of the need for further investment to fund the port's development and competitiveness.</p> <p>The options selected are relevant, logical, and adequately presented.</p> <p>Transport Infrastructure:</p> <p>The current state of development of NZ ports has been the result of the focus on centres of exports and not around an integrated national port infrastructure. An integrated infrastructure would include the centres of production and the efficient transport by road and rail options to export from our ports. We do not have that infrastructure. Our roads and rail suffer from underinvestment and consequent on that underperformance the result is a national ports' structure, which is diverse and compensates for land based infrastructure neglect.</p> <p>Were our land based infrastructure to be improved the prospect of better utilization of ports would be presented. Then, there would likely be fewer ports, amalgamation of ports, and closure of ports where adjoining ports had the advantages of better infrastructure and economies of scale.</p> <p>As improvement is made in land based infrastructure rather than the consequence of ports becoming more profitable per se ports will need to review their catchments and adjust accordingly.</p> <p>Port of Napier Ltd's catchment is based on its provincial location and has limited scope to expand its provincial catchment so will likely remain a specialist port to service locally sourced exports and some imports. The location and catchment of the port are both limiting and protective. The location and source of exports are a protection against predatory commerce from adjoining ports. The volume of exports will not challenge adjoining ports.</p> <p>Port investment:</p> <p>The convention that ports are publically owned previously by harbour boards and now councils is part of our history. At a time when significant investment is required we should ask how is this to be paid for? It should also be asked if it is prudent for the HBRC assuming the port is an investment to have all or most of its investment eggs in one basket or if the HBRC should continue to own shares in the Port?</p> <p>The port is an investment. It provides an investment return by way of a dividend and from time to time as now requires additional investment from its shareholder(s).</p> <p>There is no appetite for total sale of the HBRC's interest in the Port.</p> <p>The investment principle of diversification should apply to HBRC. It is noted that the HBRC has implemented some diversification by its investment in Wellington real estate.</p> <p>AND funds from its divestment in the Port must be ring-fenced as a investment fund and under no circumstances subsumed into the general funds nor operating expenses of the council.</p> <p>IPO:</p> <p>Listing on the NZX should provide benefits to the company and its shareholders. The disciplines of listing will provide more transparency. Financial reporting will follow NZX standards and there will be heightened focus on sustainable profitable trading.</p> <p>An IPO gives local investors the opportunity to have a direct investment in our port. As wide a range of investors as possible is preferred. This could be better achieved by offering shares payable by instalments. A larger number of shareholders can add unavoidable costs in the administration of the shareholder register and this has to be accepted.</p> <p>The council should aim to retain the maximum possible shareholding and it should not be a given that its holding be sold-down to 49%. The extent of the sell-down will largely be decided by the market at the time of the IPO and the only control that the council will have is the extent to which it sells-down its holding. The extent of the sell-down must not be at the cost of devaluing the investment by selling more shares than there is demand for. The maximum sell down should be limited to 45%.</p> <p>Once the Port shares are listed the future ownership of those shares will be beyond the control of the council and subject only to the rules of NZX. e.g a cornerstone shareholding could be acquired by a competitor port of a predatory investor.</p> <p>There would be no control of future ownership of the listed shares.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>Listing requirements would provide greater transparency to shareholders and in turn the ratepayer and this would be a benefit to all.</p> <p>Future Port investment:</p> <p>The balance shareholding in the Port will continue to provide an income by way of dividends to the council. However, should further investment capital be required in future and this is likely the Council will need to invest to avoid its shareholding in the Port being diluted. Retention of shares is concurrent with acceptance that the ownership implies a willingness and need to invest to fund future port development.</p> <p>Consultation:</p> <p>Our understanding was that the Consultation Document was to be provided to ratepayers. Within our circles the expectation was that the document was to be received by post. It is unfortunate that the expectation, which seems to have currency was not met.</p> <p>Presentation:</p> <p>We do not wish to appear to present our submission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, John & Pat Swinburn</p>
<p>Annie Dundas Hawke's Bay Tourism Submitter #2894 To be heard? No</p>	 <p>Submission to Hawke's Bay Regional Council from Hawke's Bay Tourism Napier Port November 20, 2018</p> <p>Tourism in Hawke's Bay is growing and represents approximately \$645m into our regional economy each year growing at 5% per annum. Cruise ship passengers make up a small but important part of the visitor economy. Passenger expenditure in Hawke's Bay rose 41.5 per cent, over the previous year with passengers spending \$23.1m over the 2017/2018 summer season on activities and attractions, food and beverage. The other important factor which can't be dismissed are the number of cruise passengers who return to spend nights in Hawke's Bay based on their initial cruise experience. Hawke's Bay Tourism and its Board fully support Option B proposed by HBRC. We wish for tourism to grow and to provide our sector with future opportunities. More cruise lines will require local tourism business to expand with confidence, new businesses to emerge and therefore employment to be generated. Enabling our Port to grow will generate more returns for the Hawke's Bay community.</p> <p>Annie Dundas General Manager Hawke's Bay Tourism</p>
<p>J. M. Klingender Submitter #2897 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would prefer "up to 45%". Not so easy for a foreign share takeover.</p>
<p>I & E Curley Submitter #2901 To be heard? No</p>	<p>As elderly pensioners, the last thing we need is an increase in rates.</p>
<p>Ann Elizabeth Ridley Submitter #2904 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Wish to keep majority ownership in local hands</p>
<p>Sam Ngarimu Submitter #2905 To be heard? No</p>	<p>As a rate payer I support the preferred option "B"</p>

Submitter	Commentary
TeArohanui Ngarimu Submitter #2907 To be heard? No	As a rate payer I support the Option B
Junior Tuakana Submitter #2912 To be heard? No	Would only support this option if Hawke's Bay residences were given priority to purchase shares. This way there would be a more vested interest if in the ownership of Hawke's Bay locals. If possible having a condition that if on-selling that the transfer of shares will have to be purchased by Hawke's Bay residences only.
Frank Bayly Submitter #2916 To be heard? No	Able to invest in a HB organisation without having to go to Auckland or Wgtn or ChCh
Jo-ell MacDonald Submitter #2919 To be heard? No	seems to be the best option
Ian Cadwallader Submitter #2924 To be heard? No	we need to allow the Port to grow inline with the district, this way we do not lose control every as there will be ownership from 49% of investors, Not just 1 investor and also allows dividends back to the residences of HB to be managed inline with the financial requirements of the Port
Julien Rae Brown Submitter #2926 To be heard? No	1. (B) Hugely preferred option 2. (C) Possibly attract a company such as Infratil (for example) - Acceptable to me 3. (A) I'm to accept the predicted increase in forecast rate rises 4. (D) Hard to predict quality and experience of of Lessee Operator.
Claire Campbell Clausen Submitter #2930 To be heard? No	My husband (a Danish infrastructure Engineer) and I support this option. Napier C.C. should never give up a controlling share of this lucrative port.
Melissa Treadway Submitter #2938 To be heard? No	As rate payers we do not want to have to pay more in rates as the amount that will be needed is far too much of an increase per family. Also as rate payers we are very keen to buy shares in the port which hopefully we would be entitled to have first allocation to this.
Bruce Jans 4 listed Submitter #2960 To be heard? No	Bruce Jans Trust Taheke Trust Linden Investments Interconimex NZ Ltd
Michael Jaine Submitter #2966 To be heard? No	I think its the only manageable option.
Riki Dawson Submitter #2969 To be heard? No	We need to retain ownership for our port!
Rod Newson Submitter #2972 To be heard? No	This option would provide funds to expeditiously finance infrastructure development at the Napier Port. Shares should initially be offered on a preferential basis to Napier - or Hawkes Bay ratepayers. The share offer should be limited to 45% so there is no "close call" to any take over opportunity. Regional Council does not need to extract as much as they do and this would mean there would be a greater share of the full ownership option.
Mark Maconaghie Submitter #2980 To be heard? No	The Napier Port and the Hawke's Bay Regional Council will retain full management and control of our huge asset. An efficiently run business will receive increasing dividends on the 49% share holding in the market place in keeping with the tide of inflation. Best result for investors and the rate payers of Hawke's Bay. Any other option, especially D, would be an absolute stab in the guts for the rate payers of Hawke's Bay. Regards Mark Maconaghie

Submitter	Commentary
Debbie Trolove Submitter #2983 To be heard? No	Retains control and does not impact rates, while enabling the port to grow to support our growing economy.
Rosemary Newport Submitter #2986 To be heard? No	The local public will be the ones to benefit the most from the expansion and growth of this valuable asset so why shouldn't we have the option to invest in its long term plans? Cheaper than borrowing money overall as well so more cash efficient. This business already employs a lot of people here and could be employing more as it grows.
Shelley Adams Submitter #2992 To be heard? No	Seems like the lowest personal impact, while Council still keeping control of the Port
Nick Edmundson Submitter #3003 To be heard? No	I'd like to support local investment
Jodi Hussey Submitter #3004 To be heard? No	I think it's better for New Zealanders to have the option to buy shares in such an important and vital investment rather than foreigners
Erin Foster Submitter #3005 To be heard? No	Sensible option.
Robdert Foster Submitter #3006 To be heard? No	Ownership should be held by public preferably local rate payers but i realise this is probably not possible.
Robert McCool Submitter #3007 To be heard? No	Considering all the options outlined, this seems the most practical solution.
Robyn McCool Submitter #3009 To be heard? No	On the basis of reading information on all of the options outlined above, this option appears to offer the most practical, forward-thinking and locally-focused solution.
Kevin Murphy Submitter #3012 To be heard? No	Based on all the information available covering the future needs of the Port and taking into account all the benefits it offers to the district of Hawke's Bay and the massive expansion the district is experiencing which will result in very large extra tonnage being shipped it is very obvious that the extra equipment required and the new wharf are an absolute must. The stable employment that the Napier Wharf offers to this area is also a strong factor. The ever increasing size of the Cruise Liners which will need the extra length Wharf is also very important in maintaining the support for small business in Napier city. The most important factor in my decision in choosing option B is the significant success achieved by other major Ports in NZ, particularly Tauranga & Taranaki and the opportunities it offers to all of us who care the chance to own just a little bit of this Hawke's Bay icon by becoming share holders !! I appreciate there are plenty of knockers out there who will always take the opposite view to those that really care and those that look at everything in a "glass half full" attitude BUT for once lets all get behind the HBRC & the Napier Port and support the option they consider to offer the best outcome. My only other preference would be for a maximum public share offer of up to 45%.
Steve Bradley Submitter #3014 To be heard? No	Letting the general public share in the ownership of the port makes it more their port while retaining control makes sense.
Anthony Edwards Submitter #3017 To be heard? No	Diversify HBRC Investment risk and hopefully allow greater investment by locals

Submitter	Commentary
Shaun Reay Submitter #3020 To be heard? No	Still have full control and on the nz market not overseas investment
Karla Reay Submitter #3021 To be heard? No	Port still has the majority of control.
David Sunnex Submitter #3024 To be heard? No	As a busy port and an attraction for cruise ships we want to keep our port working as previously worked, and prepare for a busier port needs more finance and room
Raymond Dreaver Submitter #3028 To be heard? No	It will be the quickest and cheapest method of raising capital to get the extensions completed. If the port is run along the same lines as Tauranga then in a few years time the Council will recover all of the capital it surrendered in the float.
Val Sunnex Submitter #3030 To be heard? No	Can be made so profitable with all the extra cargo
Peter Wenley Submitter #3037 To be heard? No	The Tauranga Port was very successful with their float. We could be faced with buying a new dredge in the future 45%
Lorae Tot Submitter #3041 To be heard? No	My preferred option is B provided the Chinese cannot buy up shares for the next 50 years. Keep them out at all costs.
Anneliese Stewart Submitter #3042 To be heard? No	I like to see the asset kept in the community and people having the opportunity to be part of it and also benefit from it. I also like to see that people of Hawkes Bay Region have first choice of buying the shares and only the amount left goes nationwide for funding.
Dean Kane Woods Submitter #3050 To be heard? No	Yes, we think option B is the best for our region and gives the opportunity for locals to invest.
Toro Waaka Ngati Pahauwera Development Trust Submitter #3057 To be heard? No	<p>It is Ngati Pahauwera's position that a 49% sell off should be undertaken by an IPO. It is also Ngati Pahauwera's position that locals, in particular iwi groups be given first preference for share options as it is this local economy which has created and continues to drive and contribute to the success of this asset. Ngati Pahauwera would consider a \$3-5 million investment with a 2-year non-sell agreement on shares where a discount was applied to the general offer.</p> <p>Ngati Pahauwera believe that HBRC will take a position that offers the local community first option to buy shares at the listed rate and consider that as being acceptable. The risk with this strategy is that the offer is not fully subscribed from local interest and large, cornerstone investment from within the region will not be secured. By way of example, this approach would likely see Ngati Pahauwera investing at levels around the \$100,000 only. By HBRC's Information Memorandum, Ports are subject to earthquake risk, so from a portfolio risk perspective, Ngati Pahauwera is better to invest across multiple ports than simply one unless there is an incentive. This is particularly important as the Port expansion carries risk in its own right. It is for these reasons that HBRC should seriously consider the manner in which an IPO is presented to the public and the benefits that large, cornerstone investment from local iwi would bring to the table.</p>
Douglas & Lyndley Neilson Submitter #3059 To be heard? No	With first preference for purchase of shares to Hawkes Bay Regional Council rate payers so we can invest in our Port

Submitter	Commentary
Jenny Milne Submitter #3067 To be heard? No	I don't think the city can cope with larger cruise ships. Shopping hours don't meet international standard or norms.
Gillian Cochran Submitter #3070 To be heard? No	Providing it is only offered to NZ's and not offshore investors with Hawkes Bay Residents being given first option. I definitely do not want to see any overseas partners or investors involved with the port. A is definitely not an option. Many families and the elderly are already struggling without further Rate increases. D could be an option if leased to NZer's eg local Iwi. An C if Investment Partner is not off-shore.
R A Marshall Submitter #3071 To be heard? No	When is this Regional Council going to stop putting up rates on these grand schemes that cost millions of dollars and come to nothing (Dams, Water, etc). Thousands of ratepayers are very poor & struggling to pay essentials, let alone hefty increases, every year, with very little results to show for it. Come on Councillors, you can probably pay, many of us can't.
Angela Pivac Submitter #3074 To be heard? No	I have voted for this option as I believe it is a good opportunity for local people to invest in a local growing business.
T G R Mackie Submitter #3085 To be heard? No	I Think 49% Too much. 35 - 40% would be Better
Geoff Hansen Submitter #3087 To be heard? No	Ownership stays local perhaps an preferred shareholder could be offered to HB Residents as I would be interested in purchasing shares in the Port
Dorothy Ferguson Submitter #3088 To be heard? No	Retain majority shareholding Remaining shares to remain under control of NZ investors
Liz Hole Submitter #3090 To be heard? No	A BIG NO to C - selling
Joan R Kuzmich Submitter #3095 To be heard? No	I prefer the option (B) - please keep it local by limiting the number of shares any one person (in HB) can buy
Bryan Samuel Moore Submitter #3098 To be heard? No	Keep it HB Hands
John Jeffrey Woodyard Submitter #3099 To be heard? No	Selling shares will provide citizen ownership while providing enough funds for future development
Max Goodall Submitter #3101 To be heard? No	I want to have public awareness and involvement in the running of the Port.
L J Hellyer Submitter #3103 To be heard? No	PARTNER WITH UNISON & LOCAL H.B. OWNED ORGANISTIONS FLOATING UP TO 45% (NO MORE) OR GET MONEY FROM REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND (GOVT)


Submitter	Commentary
<p>J R & A J Moynihan Submitter #3104 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Firstly, why is it necessary that the Port pay a dividend to the Regional Council, surely to pay of Port debt is more sensible for both parties. Perhaps the best way to raise funds is to allow 49% of the Port to be floated on the NZX, would it be possible to limit shares to New Zealanders only, none to be sold off overseas and none to be sold to other New Zealand Port Companies. Before there are any moves to construct a new wharf, the Port must have a commitment that the major Container lines and Cruise Companies remain committed to calling at Napier. If there is a negative response, existing wharves must be brought up to standard, it is my understanding some wharves are in urgent need of repair.</p>
<p>June Clarke Submitter #3113 To be heard? No</p>	<p>For all the reasons outlined in your consultation document in your Option B preference on page 4.</p>
<p>Anthony Clarke Submitter #3117 To be heard? No</p>	<p>For all the reasons you have outlined in your consultation document</p>
<p>Nick Cordery Submitter #3118 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Agree action/investment funds required. Option D is most undesirable creating a real risk of 'mining' the asset by failing to continue investment for the long term. Option A does not match the timescales of payer and beneficiaries, that is current mature rate payers would pay without the long term benefits.</p>
<p>Diana Joan Mathers Submitter #3120 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Very good opportunity for members of the public to invest in regional infrastructure - contributing to economic growth for the region.</p>
<p>Leonard Lambert Submitter #3123 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Has worked well for Tga. One thing I would query: the true value of cruise ships to the local economy, and is this really such a factor in port congestion? I would also like to know precisely how much these cruise liner companies pay for berthage.</p>
<p>James Duncan McPetrie Submitter #3125 To be heard? No</p>	<p>THE PORT MUST EXPAND. THE BEST OPTION FOR THE RATEPAYER IS OPTION B WHICH HAS MINIMAL IMPACT ON RATE PAYER BUT ENSURES THAT CONTROL REMAINS IN LOCAL HANDS</p>
<p>Onswey J Rolls Submitter #3130 To be heard? No</p>	<p>RATEPAYERS SHOULD HAVE FIRST PRIORITY TO THE PURCHASE OF SHARES BEFORE THEY BECOME PUBLIC</p>
<p>Dennis Smith Submitter #3132 To be heard? No</p>	<p>THE REGION NEEDS GROWTH AND THE PORT EXTENTION WILL ACHIEVE THIS. IF THE REGION DOES NOT GROW IT WILL STAGNATE D Smith 19/11/18</p>
<p>Bede Conal Houlahan Submitter #3133 To be heard? No</p>	<p>THE PUBLIC HAVE A SHARE AND SOME CONTROL OVER THE ASSETT</p>
<p>David Jackson Submitter #3138 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I guess you people have given this a great deal of thought. I would think you are doing the best for the rate payer, so I trust your choice and go with {B} Cheers.</p>
<p>Kerry Royal Submitter #3139 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It is important that council retains control of such an asset and major part of our local economy.</p>
<p>Andy Gifford Submitter #3140 To be heard? No</p>	<p>1/ The preferred option is the best of a bad bunch. Public ownership has drained the port of development funds (HBRC dividend payments). 2/ Introducing private money to pay for the infrastructure required is unfortunately now an inevitable outcome. 3/ If commerce is the reason the port needs to grow then commercial interest should take the risk & benefit; HBRC should sell 100% of the Port.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Michael Spensley Submitter #3143 To be heard? No	If the float proceeds, and if it is over-subscribed, could priority be given to smaller investors resident in Hawkes Bay.
Les Silson Submitter #3146 To be heard? No	Please ensure the float allows ratepayers to participate.
Jeanette McMillan Submitter #3153 To be heard? No	It has worked for Tauranga and that Port has gone ahead. Our port is a hub for Napier's infrastructure and prosperity and needs to be expanded to reach its potential.
Winifred Barnett Submitter #3157 To be heard? No	Present success of this option is provided by Port of Tauranga experience. It retains majority community ownership and control.
Joseph Barnett Submitter #3158 To be heard? No	Past/present success of this option is provided by the Port of Tauranga experience. It retains majority community ownership and control
Michael Coombe Submitter #3160 To be heard? No	Option B is preferred. But, the port must be operated to prioritise the best interests of local ratepayers. Shares should not be available to foreign interests.
Sharon Vial Submitter #3161 To be heard? No	It is important to retain majority ownership of our port. Option B has fewer disadvantages than the others.
Maureen & Maurice Guillemot Submitter #3164 To be heard? No	Our thoughts are that with the public having shares in the company the concerns of the Port will be monitored by people with a financial interest therefore ensuring a more open disclosure of the business. People with money invested in any organisation are always going to make sure their shares are being used to the best advantage & the business is open to scrutiny.
Murray Keith Wiggins Submitter #3169 To be heard? No	To have a interest in a local project
Andrea Kathryn Gambirazzi Submitter #3170 To be heard? No	To have a interest in a big local project.
Jocelyn McKenzie Submitter #3179 To be heard? No	I do not want to pay extra rates
Bruce McConnon Submitter #3200 To be heard? No	As local people have the opportunity to purchase shares if they wish .This gives more control over our assets .
Sally Sisson Submitter #3204 To be heard? No	Enables the port to remain in community ownership and develop for the future also without placing a debt burden on the region or increasing rates. We would like to think that the shares are offered to HBRC ratepayers initially.
Tobias Gerald Simcox Submitter #3205 To be heard? No	I believe that if it is an absolute necessity to gain more access to funds for Napier Port then it should be offered to NZ public in the first instance. The Port is a huge asset to Hawkes Bay and to sell off a huge chunk to overseas investors would extremely upsetting. With the decision of the public share offer to New Zealanders I believe it should be offered in the following order. 1st allocation Port employees including superannuation options 2nd allocation HB Public 3rd and last allocation NZ public

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Steve Bell Submitter #3206 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Less burden on rate payers and hopefully a share option for HB residents</p>
<p>Susan Goodege Submitter #3207 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This seems the most benefits for all concerned and if individual rate payers can by individual lots we will all have a stake in our port</p>
<p>Jenny Cox Submitter #3212 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Whilst this option says "up to 49% public share", I would prefer it to be about 45%. Of the options proposed I feel this one gives the greatest level of disclosure to the ratepayers of this region.</p> <p>Option A, to me, is a non-starter because not all ratepayers would be able to afford large rates increases.</p> <p>With options C & D, I'm sorry to say I'm not confident that the lump sum received would be invested wisely & with the future benefit to the region in mind.</p>
<p>Kathie Bamber Submitter #3214 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I agree this is the best option and that at present the regional council's investment portfolio is too heavily weighted on the Port of Napier. I think it would be an unfair burden on many ratepayers if the council retained full ownership. However, I think it would be better if the council retained 55% ownership rather than 51%, as has been done at the Port of Tauranga.</p>
<p>Guillaume Thomas Submitter #3215 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would like a mixture of the A, B and C. Retain main ownership (70-80%) from HBRC will give the region its investment back in the medium term, and allowing other investors (public via share - 10 to 15%) will allow not to have to raise the rates too sharply. A private investor (15-20%) could bring good dynamics and expertise if involved in similar activities.</p>
<p>Gary Curtis Submitter #3229 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This option has advantages for both the HBRC and HBRC ratepayers. I am also supporting this option based on the HBRC's stated intention of considering priority access to shares for the local community and port staff.</p>
<p>Ann Bowen Submitter #3244 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Still in our region, but still letting the general Public having part of the investment. All while allowing progress to be made to our community</p>
<p>Viacheslav Latik Submitter #3250 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This is OUR PORT! Understandable, money needed for the development. Do not really like to put all of this to the shoulders of each rates payer. No way, would accept to sell it to the investor or lease it.</p> <p>Believe the option B is the best one. Only would add, that the port employers should and the Hawkes Bay residents should have the priority/opportunity of buying the shares first.</p>
<p>David Mackie Submitter #3255 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Would prefer share offer stay closer to 45% shares offered</p>
<p>Mike Smith Submitter #3263 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Having read the material, and seeing that HBRC rate payers would have first rights to the shares, I believe this is the best option. It pays down debt, and therefore reduces the interest bill, and raises new capital for the wharf.</p> <p>I believe that the opportunity cost of NOT doing this will be much greater than any perceived loss from selling some of the business. It is clear that the port needs funds to be able to invest further to ensure it stays as an attractive calling point to shipping companies which ultimately means the economy can thrive from the exports.</p> <p>There is NO value in making the port a bottleneck for exports. If it is accepted that investment is required then generating the capital from local shareholders and institutional shareholders achieves the criteria of retaining control while still being locally owned. It would also allow local shareholders to use the dividend they would receive to at least partially offset any increase in HBRC rates.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Geoffrey Greer Submitter #3264 To be heard? No</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Submitter #3264 To be heard? No</p> <p>You have not given the option of no growth or better more efficient use of the port. There is an assumption that no growth is not a choice. As you have threatened us with the possibility of increasing rates if we don't vote for selling off you put everyone in a hard place.</p> <p>If the port can't generate the funds needed over time or another process to generate the investment money needed then it may not be operating effectively and if the HBreg council need to put its rates up by the amount indicated then it appears they aren't very effective. They may need to cut back their spending like any council without an asset like our port.</p> <p>All in all I think the that while there are some reasonable arguments put up for selling off such as divesification for the HBRC I am not sure that the long term benefits are there for the ratepayers. If it's such a good deal from a port profit perspective we will be losing that future dividend income stream if 49% is sold off. Maybe they should look for a more innovative option. I've voted for the 49% sell off only because you really don't give a choice that is acceptable.</p>
<p>Denise Bavidge Submitter #3266 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would not be in favour of selling off or leasing such a valuable asset. The option of 49% as a public share offer hopefully will retain majority ownership. I am not in favour of an increase in rates or borrowing. Also of concern is the environmental impact of continuous growth. Growth obviously is good for the region, however this must be tempered with the negative consequences of this growth.</p>
<p>Dianne Redman Submitter #3273 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option B as that way we can still retain ownership and control, however bearing in mind that the Board makes the best decisions going forward for the Port and shares are retained at a reasonable price in order for profit to be put back into the account for the Port for future improvements.</p>
<p>Jennifer N Ryan Submitter #3282 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Surely Shane Jones could be approached for this regional project.</p>
<p>Tom Allan Submitter #3288 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Is the HBRC considering an advanced or preferred offer of shares to HBRC ratepayers?</p>
<p>Dr Ram Roy Submitter #3290 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I think this is one of the most economically feasible and successfully implemented paths followed by many infrastructural development projects globally. This option B provides HBRC with adequate controls on the strategies, policies, and governance of the port's operations plus saves the rate payers from some extra financial burdens. This option also offers ample opportunity to HBRC to generate additional funding in future if needed for further expansion or refurbishments.</p>
<p>Anita Steinberg Submitter #3297 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option B, having the port "stay in the [Hawke's Bay] family", is my preferred option, as well. The public can invest if they want, have the chance of a return into our community, but aren't negatively affected (with raised rates) if they don't. I also chose this option because it doesn't increase Council debt and leaves the Council with some measure of flexibility.</p> <p>My proviso in choosing Option B would be that first right to invest goes to HB residents, and, after a specified time limit, to then open the shares up to the wider NZ market. This port's success impacts our HB whanau most greatly, and therefore, our chance to build our stake needs to be given priority over others' opportunity to gain. It would be a great disappointment if shares were purchased by foreign investors who can't (by distance and disassociation) recognize that they are investing in the success of a community, rather than in the accrument of their personal fortunes. I would also, conservatively speaking, prefer to see the majority ownership at a higher percentage (55%+).</p>
<p>Maposua Fealofani Lima Submitter #3301 To be heard? No</p>	<p>This is the good option. A chance for the people of Hawke's Bay to borrow funds directly from the Port - instead of borrowing from other financial institutions. The interest of the money being borrowed will go direct to the Port.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Louise Foote Submitter #3305 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Most important for the future of the region.</p>
<p>Noel Foote Submitter #3307 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Important for the future of the region.</p>
<p>Richard Hay Submitter #3323 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Seen how the Tauranga model has benefited Bay of Plenty region</p>
<p>S A Hibberd Submitter #3327 To be heard? No</p>	<p>These shares must be made available to Hawkes Bay rate payers, before being opened up to the wider market.</p>
<p>Angela Broomhead Submitter #3328 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Only choice for me!</p>
<p>David Prescott Submitter #3329 To be heard? No</p>	<p>B is a sensible option. It worked in Tauranga so there is no reason why it cannot be successful in Hawkes Bay. It's value is that control of the future development of the port remains with the Port Authority.</p>
<p>Barry Cole Submitter #3333 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It is imperative that we maintain a larger percentage stake as possible. The port is the jewel in the H.B. crown and is most important for future prosperity. B Cole</p>
<p>Mark Purviss Submitter #3335 To be heard? No</p>	<p>ONLY REALISTIC AND FAIR CHOICE FOR LOCAL PEOPLE?</p>
<p>George Turner Submitter #3340 To be heard? No</p>	<p>A fair option.</p>
<p>Dulcie Betty McCormick Submitter #3351 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I think the Port is very important for jobs. Thank you</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>A Clifford Enclosed article from HB Today should be looked into. Also, money from leasehold land should be used as, if I remember rightly, was earmarked for use on waterfront areas which surely the Port is.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Submitter #3358 To be heard? No</p> <p>LETTERS TO THE EDITOR</p> <h2 style="text-align: center;">Council needs to be proactive over Napier's water system</h2> <p>Napier's water system is not broken. There's nothing wrong with our source water.</p> <p>Half the council's bores have now achieved Interim Bore Security status from the DEH Drinking Water Assessor.</p> <p>According to Jon Kingstford Napier City Council director of Infrastructure this means that "our bores are compliant for potability risk at the bore head and that UV treatment of raw water is not required".</p> <p>The biggest risk we face in Napier is that council still rely on contaminated water and ignore the need to replace infrastructure until we have a disaster.</p> <p>At this week's infrastructure committee meeting councillors were told that bores should be good for 50 years.</p> <p>Napier City Council has 18 bores, five are more than 30 years old, and two are 40 years old.</p> <p>With the recent population growth in Napier the council needs to be proactive. Waiting until contaminated surface water gets in through holes in well-casings is not a good plan.</p> <p>We need to start drilling new municipal bores now so that we've got sufficient backup capacity.</p> <p>The last thing we need is a repeat of last December's threat of dry taps in Napier.</p> <p>Shawn Bates Napier</p> <p>"Waiting until contaminated surface water gets in through holes in well-casings is not a good plan."</p> <p>Shawn Bates</p> <p>Unison cheques</p> <p>Giles Pearson's comment in HB Today, Thursday, November 15, seems to suggest he is unaware of the history of our Unison cheques.</p> <p>Around 25 years ago the householders in Hawke's Bay acquired the ownership of Unison, a site was held to sell or keep ownership.</p> <p>Hawke's Bay voted to keep ownership, other areas voted to sell. The Waikato for example, each household getting upwards of \$3000.</p> <p>So when we stand today we are simply shareholders, with the consumers trust managing our affairs, the same as money managers or one's sharebroker.</p> <p>No why does Giles Pearson believe that the people of Hawke's Bay should divest their dividends to a charitable trust? I should guess, Giles may have shares in the market, if so, I challenge him to donate his dividends to a regional development or other charity -- is there any difference?</p> <p>James Anderson Gimnastodorus</p> <p>Reserve Bank funding</p> <p>The consultation on how to fund Napier Port is like looking for a needle in a haystack. It is impossible to regulate and thereby give the council the facility to ignore the submissions in favour of advice from vested interests.</p> <p>To sell a half share in a thriving business may be in the best interests of potential purchasers but decidedly not for the Hawke's Bay ratepayers.</p> <p>In a few years the same issue would arise, leading to a further sale or higher rates.</p> <p>Instead, as we monetary reformers have been saying for many years, the council should be joining others to petition the Government to make funds available through the country's central bank as recommended in a 2012 report from the International Monetary Fund.</p> <p>Reserve Bank funding could be provided at a nominal interest charge, with repayments matched by the income an expanded port would provide.</p> <p>The legislation is already in place in the Finance Act that allows the minister to set up funding arrangements from the bank.</p> <p>As it happens the Government has already signed off on interest-free loans of \$18 million for Tauranga, \$32m for Auckland and \$18m for Hamilton, the money coming from taxes or borrowing. If the money was sourced from the Reserve Bank the result would be a fit for purpose port that would assist with the expansion of economic activity in the region.</p> <p>So there is a better way to proceed, that does not require selling our assets and does not require borrowing money from overseas banks which in any case have invested that loan for no cost in them whatever.</p> <p>Dick Ryan Havelock North</p> <p>■ Dick Ryan is a member of the Social Credit Party and is a candidate at the next election.</p>  <p>The council should be joining others to petition the Government to make funds available to expand the port through the country's central bank, says writer Dick Ryan.</p> <p>HB Today 17/11/18</p> <p>22 NOV 2018</p>
<p>Richard Bax R & V Bax Partnersip Submitter #3365 To be heard? No</p>	<p>this leaves the option open for local retained ownership.</p>
<p>Susan Hobbs Submitter #3369 To be heard? No</p>	<p>would not like to see the port controlled by outside enterprise</p>
<p>Denys Scott Submitter #3391 To be heard? No</p>	<p>C. as second option</p>
<p>Marjorie Robinson Submitter #3392 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The local ratepayers to be offered first refusal on investing in this. They will not be able to on sell until after a period of 5 years.</p>
<p>Guy Wellwood Submitter #3401 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I have had considerable support from informed sensible people to my recent "Talking Point" article in Hawkes Bay Today which set out my preference for Option B. Many suggest incorporating in the float the right of HBRC ratepayers to get first preference for shares. It could be pointed out that Auckland Council BOUGHT BACK all its port shares and by ALL MEASURES Auckland ratepayers are WORSE OFF.</p>
<p>Bill White Submitter #3402 To be heard? No</p>	<p>UNLESS OPTION "B" IS FOR "PREFERENCIAL SHARE OFFERS TO THE REGISTERED RATE PAYERS" OPTION "A" WOULD TAKE PRIORITY.</p>
<p>Jan Davis Submitter #3410 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The Port is a business. If a business wishes to raise funds for expansion/improvement, it shouldn't look for these monies needed from friends/neighbours/associates to 'chip in' (i.e. ratepayers) The funds should be borrowed and paid back from the business' profits OR the funds needed should be raised by a public share offer.</p>
<p>Margaret Price Submitter #3411 To be heard? No</p>	<p>(1) Public Rate payers should have a change of share holding. (2) 1 question, why more of the dividends paid out from the Harbour Board were not paid to the bank to repay loan, as per dividends. (3) Then the harbour Board may have been able to re-borrow off the bank to extend wharf</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Sonia Dawson Submitter #3428 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Napier ratepayers to have priority share options</p>
<p>William Dickie Roger Dickie NZ Lt Submitter #3446 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Roger Dickie NZ Ltd manages over 20 Pinus Radiata forests in the Hawkes Bay region and a further 12 in the Wairoa region, totalling almost 9000 hectares, which will all use the Napier Port for exporting logs to overseas markets. 5 of these forests are currently harvesting and 8 are due to start in the next 12 months. We are currently experiencing significant delays getting our products onto ships and we only see this problem escalating as we bring more forests to harvest. This is increasing costs and therefore reducing returns to our forest investors. Having Logging ships removed from port to allow Cruise ships access is not acceptable for our company and investors We feel that significant upgrades to the Napier port are essential and cannot happen soon enough. We strongly support option B and encourage the development to happen as soon as possible.</p>
<p>Jennifer lesley Peters Submitter #3463 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Retain local control Follow POT model Able to select wider board representation Able to complete new work at high spec not cheapest for ratepayer ability to pay It needs to be done for Hawkes Bay</p>
<p>Alexandra Ferguson Submitter #3464 To be heard? No</p>	<p>As a resident we are keen to have a stakehold in the future of the port & help retain some element of control over our local resource.</p>
<p>Gill Appleton Submitter #3465 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would have preferred port ownership to have remained with HB ratepayers but recognise that this unrealistic. Floating is a lottery. Are any port users likely to invest?</p>
<p>Carol Buckland Submitter #3472 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I do not want to see foreign ownership or lease of the port. Profits should stay within the region. I would like to have an opportunity to buy shares as a rate payer.</p>
<p>Karen Bloor Brownrigg Agriculture Group Ltd Submitter #3483 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Agree with the need to invest Control remains with the Council Funds released should be ring fenced to fund the Councils share of future investment</p>
<p>Maryanne Macintosh Submitter #3484 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I believe it will be a very attractive investment. I think it should be offered to the local residents first and then to other New Zealanders. Please keep our port in New Zealand hands.</p>
<p>Josh Boston Submitter #3485 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Retaining majority ownership (and control) without having any other shareholder holding too much influence.</p>
<p>Mark Guy Submitter #3497 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Want it owned by the community</p>
<p>Alayne Cullen Submitter #3500 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I think the public should have the chance to buy limited shares in Napier Port</p>
<p>Aaron Lavery Submitter #3501 To be heard? No</p>	<p>To spread risk as outlined in the consultation document. To cater for the future investment required in the port without the constraint/burden on the HBRC and its rate payers.</p>
<p>Christine Hardie Submitter #3503 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I am not confident that HBRC should be allowed to have sole control [after the Ruataniwha dam debacle]; nor do I like the idea of HB losing majority control of the port so, a little reluctantly, I will nominate option B. Overall I am not keen on incurring more debt but at the moment this is the least objectionable of the four options on economic grounds.</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Dean Ferguson Submitter #3504 To be heard? No	key stakeholder control and vision for the future plus I want to save the penguins
Christopher Gillies Submitter #3506 To be heard? No	Meeanee
Rachel Sedger Submitter #3509 To be heard? No	Why should the public not be given the option to buy shares? I agree the Port needs finance in order to grow and develop its business. It is a valuable asset to the Bay.
WA & P C Wrightson Submitter #3516 To be heard? No	I would prefer to have the funding ceiling lowered to 40% if another cash injection is required in the future another 5% could be floated. Selling to ACC, NZ Superannuation, Unison would be more acceptable than the share market.
Brian Lindsay Pattullo Submitter #3523 To be heard? No	Option B works very well for Taurang Port where I have a few shares so lets try it at Napier!
Tom Libby Submitter #3524 To be heard? No	In favour of B. Perhaps sell 45% at most. 2nd Option A.
Chris Gibson Submitter #3528 To be heard? No	Allows individuals to participate in future growth Good secure investment opportunity Hopefully local Hawke's Bay people get preference when shares are listed (i.e. local get first chance to purchase)
Nigel Lomas Submitter #3541 To be heard? No	Would buy shares to support & invest locally
Paul Ferrick Submitter #3542 To be heard? No	Floating up to a lesser percentage of the Port's value - and only with PREFERENCE SHARES (NO VOTING RIGHTS). Decisions for the Port should be made locally and by locally elected officials. Even by maintaining 751% of ownership, decision making will be less conclusive to efficiency & openness. Rather than simply following other ports in NZ, we can be leaders in this area.
Chrissie Gray Submitter #3550 To be heard? No	* However - would rather the HBRC look at other alternative options as suggested by the excellent Robin Gwynn in the HB Today dated Tues 20.11.18. Why give such huge dividends? The good old Tax payer is expected to pick up the tab, and/or - any shortfall. We certainly don't want the B,C or D options mentioned above!!
Frank Spencer Submitter #3567 To be heard? No	HBRC should continue to have the controlling interest and be prepared to re-invest (even if by reduced dividend) into the Port as further capital is required. I support a public share offer but my support is conditional upon an offer being only to the extent required to extinguish debt and/or to invest in to the Port. The minimum proportion of shares to achieve those targets should be offered, with the maximum offer being 49%. The Port dividend policy should be reviewed to accumulate substantive retained earnings for reinvestment into the Port. This will have an impact on HBRC accounts going forward,
Helen Heather Millar Submitter #3569 To be heard? No	I hope that floating on Nzx would not have any foreign imput, that it is still NZ owned and support and the HB locals can invest and support. Helen H Millar
Jen Speedy Submitter #3580 To be heard? No	* Majority Bay Owned * no increase to ratepayers * opportunity for \$\$ on NZX * increased employment opportunities with expansion X - increase in pollution with increase/expansion?? What are the strategies in place for increased improvement in Environmental pressuses the expansion of the port will most certainly create??

Submitter	Commentary
Frederick Swain Submitter #3584 To be heard? No	Floating up to 49% on the NZX initial float could be 35% with early preference to HB District rate payers.
Randall Terrence Simcox Submitter #3586 To be heard? No	H.B. people first choice on shares then rest NZ NO overseas buyers
Ray Puddy Submitter #3590 To be heard? No	Retains ownership and control and provides capital for growth.
Mrs Barbara Hutchinson Submitter #3591 To be heard? No	Once something is gone you never get it back
Jan & Graeme Tonkin Submitter #3594 To be heard? No	Has worked well at other ports.
Tony Keefe Submitter #3595 To be heard? No	I'd rather not see our Napier Port in foreigners hands. Its one of our NZ assets.
Michael Tylee Submitter #3596 To be heard? No	Options A, C, D are not as satisfactory
Cameron Jones Submitter #3599 To be heard? No	While I am hesitant about selling off any council assets, I can see the associated development of an investment fund would be a net positive. I also recognise the benefit of a similar sale with the Port of Tauranga. But, it is worth noting that the increase in rates under 'Option A' is not a significant factor in my decision, as contributing an extra \$12 per month towards maintaining a community owned asset is perfectly acceptable to me.
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> David Cullwick Submitter #3602 To be heard? No </div> <p data-bbox="164 1310 1425 1534">I am in support of selling down up to 45% of the shareholding provided the Port implements the principles of an effective public private partnership which has been achieved for example by the Port of Tauranga - a model which I understand very well. Up to 45% is proposed so that the wider stakeholder group is in no doubt there has been no loss of control of the Port by the community. I am against the option involving an investment partner as it will bring its own agenda which may or may not be aligned with the best strategic direction for the Port. A leasing option is in my view an abdication of community responsibility. Your information on Option A suggests strongly that the Port would be hamstrung as it seeks to capitalise on future opportunities.</p> <p data-bbox="164 1545 1425 1736">The sell down option will give access to increased capital both now and in the future and an ability to effectively use debt. However the benefits will not be achieved unless the Port Company and its local government shareholder(s) absolutely commit to ensuring the Port through its Board can operate independently from any regional or local political agenda. Yes there is a need for the Board and the majority shareholder to agree through a Memorandum of Understanding on the strategic KPIs, but once done the Board is accountable to deliver performance</p> <p data-bbox="164 1747 1425 1803">Key principles that in my view will be the foundations of business and funding success after a share sell down include:</p> <ol data-bbox="164 1814 1425 2072" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="164 1814 1425 1848">1. No political interference in the governance of the Port <li data-bbox="164 1848 1425 1948">2. A Board of directors with a diversity of commercial skills and likely to include several from outside the region. Clearly the present Board has a wide range of skills including input beyond the Bay, but it is the overall governance framework in my view which will determine the ultimate success. <li data-bbox="164 1948 1425 2072">3. Most directors appointed by the Board itself by due good governance practice; and only say two who are appointed by the local government shareholder. The Port of Tauranga has used a model involving an independent appointment panel for Quayside directors (the holder of the POT shares) from which group one person is appointed; and one from the Council subject to approval by the Panel. The recommendations for these two 	

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>appointments are subject to approval by the Council. Informal feedback is that this overall process has contributed strongly to an effective governance framework at that Port and good understanding between the Port Board and the Regional Council</p> <p>4. While there will be variants in respect of what governance design the Port of Napier will pursue, the Port Options documents focus mostly on funding issues whereas consideration of governance principles will ultimately determine in my view whether the gains from the selldown option if adopted will be achieved.</p>
<p>Tim & Jocelyn Williams Submitter #3603 To be heard? No</p>	<p>We would add Port of Napier to our existing portfolio with Forsyth Barr</p>

The following submitters selected “Option B” however added no commentary or reason for their choice.

	Sub ID	To be Heard
Harrison Foster	17	No
Emily Ford	20	No
Reuben Horn	31	No
William Papple	50	No
Tony Littleford	55	No
Mike Welsby	60	No
Sebastien Hamilton	68	No
Helen Stonehouse	74	No
Ashley Blatch	86	No
Jenny Dee	93	No
Nicola Simmonds	106	No
Rowan Campbell	107	No
Gerald Grocott	111	No
Bob Irwin	114	No
Danny Smith	119	No
Trevor Hewett	129	No
Halina Rowling	138	No
Tonni B Pedersen	147	No
Mrs B Harford	148	No
James Donnelly	152	No
Aroha Phillips	156	No
Eric Opperman	160	No
Kaye Stoddart	162	No
R Wilson	164	No
Mervyn and Francie Bryant	173	No
Bruce Hantler	174	No
Alison Kerr	187	No
Jeanette & William Trewheellar	188	No
Barry Nichol	197	No
Alan Fleming	206	No
John Sumner	207	No
Brett Hooker	208	No
Kristyn Stehfest	212	No
Ngaio Blackwood	216	No
Brent Fuller	217	No
Roger King	223	No
Roxanne Pienaar	234	No
James Henderson	235	No
A Olsen	237	No
Gary Williams	238	No
Barry Daly	239	No
Mathew Holden	240	No
Allaster Holman	243	No
Warren De Lacey	245	No
Gerrit Remmelzwaal	249	No
Errol Kalmancsi	250	No
Kevin and Glenda West	252	No
Steve Roberts	253	No
Les McKee	255	No

Jane McKee	256	No
Kevin Douglas	258	No
James Douglas	268	No
Russell Epplert	270	No
Jane Taylor	271	No
Brian Whitehead	272	No
Roy Mills	274	No
Pablo Ocampo	275	No
joelle Specht	278	No
Janice Hantler	281	No
Sandra Prue	296	To be heard? No
Allan Austin	297	To be heard? No
Wayne Spencer	306	To be heard? No
Rachel Adams	314	To be heard? No
Wayne Vibert	315	To be heard? No
Alex Hedley	Submitter #316	To be heard? No
N R Webster	Submitter #318	To be heard? No
Brendon & Emma Morgan	Submitter #321	To be heard? No
Wendie Redding	Submitter #323	To be heard? No
Lynn Walch	Submitter #332	To be heard? No
Craig Priest	Submitter #339	To be heard? No
Camellia Ahrens	Submitter #347	To be heard? No
Marie Ewens	Submitter #348	To be heard? No
Jeff Cook	Submitter #358	To be heard? No
W R Webb	Submitter #362	To be heard? No
Diane Joyce	Submitter #365	To be heard? No
David Taylor	Submitter #367	To be heard? No
Margaret & Mike Martin	Submitter #368	To be heard? No
Lorraine Smart	Submitter #369	To be heard? No
Bell Huggins	Submitter #372	To be heard? No
J Scott	Submitter #381	To be heard? No
patricia Wooten	Submitter #383	To be heard? No
Graham Bailey	Submitter #384	To be heard? No
Richard Choat	Submitter #391	To be heard? No
George Driberg	Submitter #402	To be heard? No
Rodney Ditchburn	Submitter #403	To be heard? No
Raewyn Elizabeth Anderson	Submitter #404	To be heard? No
Aleshea Addis	Submitter #409	To be heard? No
Dennis Beets	Submitter #411	To be heard? No
Bruce Lochhead	Submitter #415	To be heard? No
Ross & Nancy Alexander	Submitter #406	To be heard? No
Ian Mitchell	Submitter #427	To be heard? No
L Charlton	Submitter #428	To be heard? No
Paul Hipkin	Submitter #434	To be heard? No
Richard Etheridge	Submitter #435	To be heard? No
Mason Sutcliffe	Submitter #439	To be heard? No
Robin Huntelerslag	Submitter #442	No
Brett Dallas Direct Imports NZ Ltd	Submitter #445	To be heard? No
Kevin Geange	Submitter #456	To be heard? No
Valerie McDonnell	Submitter #458	To be heard? No
Carole Hicks	Submitter #463	To be heard? No

Ivan Hall	Submitter #472.....	To be heard? No
Mathew Arcus	Submitter #479.....	To be heard? No
Neville Rofe	Submitter #483.....	To be heard? No
David & Morag Black	Submitter #488.....	To be heard? No
D W Helmore	Submitter #494.....	To be heard? No
Leigh Bath	Submitter #497.....	To be heard? No
Johan Johansen	Submitter #501.....	To be heard? No
R. W. Watson	Submitter #502.....	To be heard? No
Sandeep Saini	Submitter #503.....	To be heard? No
T W & J M Johnson	Submitter #515.....	To be heard? No
Nellie Bond	Submitter #517.....	To be heard? No
Mrs J Hatwell	Submitter #524.....	To be heard? No
KW&GM Richardson	Submitter #525.....	To be heard? No
Terence Manning	Submitter #528.....	To be heard? No
Christine & Alan Ingle	Submitter #532.....	To be heard? No
Jeanette Jabey	Submitter #534.....	To be heard? No
Helen Griffith	Submitter #535.....	To be heard? No
Larry&Greta Robinson	Submitter #536.....	To be heard? No
B. Kitchen	Submitter #537.....	To be heard? No
John Paton	Submitter #538.....	To be heard? No
Charles Pagler	Submitter #544.....	To be heard? No
Neil Barclay	Submitter #547.....	To be heard? No
Marilyn Barclay	Submitter #548.....	To be heard? No
Mike Lewis	Submitter #557.....	To be heard? No
Patrick Tonizzo	Submitter #562.....	To be heard? No
Vivien Barnes	Submitter #565.....	To be heard? No
Janet Hogan	566.....	No
Shirley Callaghan	568.....	No
Rob Smillie	574.....	No
Phyllis Smillie	575.....	To be heard? No
Shane Mitchell	580.....	To be heard? No
Casey Broad	585.....	To be heard? No
Mark Moot	586.....	To be heard? No
Stefan Thevessen	Submitter #592.....	To be heard? No
James Barnes	Submitter #597.....	To be heard? No
Christina Grouden	Submitter #598.....	To be heard? No
Emily Gifford	Submitter #600.....	To be heard? No
Sukhvinder Kooner	Submitter #603.....	No
John Agnew	Submitter #605.....	No
John D’Ath Tollemache Orchards	Submitter #607.....	No
James Simons	Submitter #618.....	No
Maggie Bergman	Submitter #624.....	No
Cyril Bergman	Submitter #625.....	No
Arthur Rowlands	Submitter #626.....	No
Glenda Banks	Submitter #627.....	No
L P & B A Hodgson	Submitter #630.....	To be heard? No
Brian Rabbitte	Submitter #633.....	To be heard? No
Mrs C Lee	Submitter #634.....	To be heard? No
Frank&Deirde Nieuwland	Submitter #635.....	To be heard? No
Doug Joines	Submitter #638.....	To be heard? No
Chrissy & Pete Avery	Submitter #640.....	To be heard? No

Ross Probert Submitter #644.....To be heard? No
Anna Vignolini Submitter #649.....To be heard? No
Angus John Gordon Submitter #653.....To be heard? No
Ron Dawson Submitter #654.....To be heard? No
Robert Leece Submitter #658.....To be heard? No
Zoltan Hegyi Submitter #662.....To be heard? No
Anne Donovan Submitter #663.....To be heard? No
A Everett Submitter #669.....To be heard? No
John McDonnell Submitter #673.....To be heard? No
Renall Trust Submitter #682.....To be heard? No
Trenton Sydney Johnson Submitter #683.....To be heard? No
Barbara Cassidy Submitter #685.....To be heard? No
Godfrey Jensen Submitter #686.....To be heard? No
W Le Bas Submitter #688.....To be heard? No
Robin Baker Submitter #690.....To be heard? No
David Ryder Submitter #692.....To be heard? No
Godfrey Te Uki Submitter #695.....To be heard? No
Jean Warner Submitter #697.....To be heard? No
Kay Bailey Submitter #698.....To be heard? No
RL&CJ Joseph Submitter #699.....To be heard? No
Tracey Bailey Submitter #700.....To be heard? No
Kate O'Keeffe Submitter #702.....To be heard? No
Lenva Clark Submitter #703.....To be heard? No
Gurvinder Singh Submitter #705.....To be heard? No
Stephen Sheard Submitter #707.....To be heard? No
Michelle Mitchell Submitter #714.....To be heard? No
Tatyana Gis Submitter #733.....To be heard? No
Clare Hollings-Hatton Submitter #746.....To be heard? No
Ken Rodgers Submitter #753.....To be heard? No
Mr & Mrs T Anderson Submitter #755.....To be heard? No
Vera Walker Submitter #756.....To be heard? No
JG & GM Fitzpatrick Submitter #761.....To be heard? No
Mr A J Matheson Submitter #762.....To be heard? No
Lynda Otter Submitter #765.....To be heard? No
A Fontein Submitter #767.....To be heard? No
Helen Gestro Submitter #768.....To be heard? No
B D & J L Mackie Submitter #770.....To be heard? No
F H Desborough Submitter #775.....To be heard? No
Kenneth Rae Submitter #776.....To be heard? No
James & Anne Smith Submitter #777.....To be heard? No
P R Taylor Submitter #778.....To be heard? No
R J Anderson Submitter #783.....To be heard? No
B F & P A Mahoney Submitter #787.....To be heard? No
Noel Cawston Submitter #790.....To be heard? No
Wendy Cook Submitter #791.....To be heard? No
Paul Koefoed Submitter #792.....To be heard? No
J T Clarke Submitter #793.....To be heard? No
Noel & Paula McMillan Submitter #794.....To be heard? No
Yvonne Forrest Submitter #796.....To be heard? No
Teresa Marriott Submitter #797.....To be heard? No
Terence Eaton Submitter #798.....To be heard? No

Dean Mitchell and Sharon Nunns Submitter #801.....To be heard? No
B R Taylor Submitter #804.....To be heard? No
Ann Plummer Submitter #805.....To be heard? No
B&D Dibben Submitter #806.....To be heard? No
Kevin Hall Submitter #807.....To be heard? No
M E L Halpin Submitter #809.....To be heard? No
M Lindsay Submitter #810.....To be heard? No
Virginia Moore Submitter #812.....To be heard? No
Michael Macdonald Submitter #813.....To be heard? No
P Champion Submitter #820.....To be heard? No
C G Tresidder Submitter #823.....To be heard? No
M R Levet Submitter #824.....To be heard? No
John Walsh Submitter #825.....To be heard? No
C Walker Submitter #828.....To be heard? No
V Byczkow Submitter #829.....To be heard? No
Ford Stuart-Gray Submitter #832.....To be heard? No
Rose Wiggins Submitter #835.....To be heard? No
Sandra Hall Submitter #839.....To be heard? No
Jessica Stichbury Submitter #841.....To be heard? No
William Faulknor Submitter #843.....To be heard? No
Grant Husband Submitter #845.....To be heard? No
Daniel Finley Submitter #849.....To be heard? No
Bruce Smith Submitter #852.....To be heard? No
Carol Smith Submitter #853.....To be heard? No
Susan White Submitter #854.....To be heard? No
Beverley Scott Submitter #858.....To be heard? No
Justin Magon Submitter #871.....To be heard? No
Neil Silverwood Submitter #885.....To be heard? No
mary taylor Submitter #894.....To be heard? No
fred taylor Submitter #895.....To be heard? No
Lance & Diane Hare Submitter #900.....To be heard? No
Gwendoline Harper Submitter #903.....To be heard? No
R M & M C Greenway Submitter #906.....To be heard? No
Maurice Allison Submitter #909.....To be heard? No
Susan Elstone Submitter #914.....To be heard? No
Ian Gunning Submitter #918.....To be heard? No
MA & K Herd Submitter #920.....To be heard? No
D & D Cadwallader Submitter #921.....To be heard? No
Nick Stewart Submitter #924.....To be heard? No
Brian Nathan Submitter #925.....To be heard? No
Natasha Thompson Submitter #941.....To be heard? No
Vanessa Whaanga Submitter #942.....To be heard? No
John Linley Submitter #944.....To be heard? No
V Speakman Submitter #953.....To be heard? No
Mr P McDonald Submitter #955.....To be heard? No
Ken Holloway Submitter #956.....To be heard? No
Mary Brophy Submitter #957.....To be heard? No
W M King Submitter #958.....To be heard? No
J Meikle Submitter #959.....To be heard? No
Melody Harrington Submitter #962.....To be heard? No
John Frehner Submitter #963.....To be heard? No

MD & SM James	Submitter #965	To be heard? No
G Gudsell	Submitter #967	To be heard? No
Philip Furmer	Submitter #968	To be heard? No
Daniel & Ashlee Gale	973	To be heard? No
John Stairmand	974	To be heard? No
Denny Jarvis	975	To be heard? No
Evelyn Johnson	976	To be heard? No
David McHenry	977	To be heard? No
George Allan	979	To be heard? No
Pam Skews	980	To be heard? No
M Jeffares	981	No
Murdene Vennell	983	No
Jenny Davies	985	No
H N Morris	986	No
Sharyn Tate	988	No
Stuart Gunn	996	No
Stave Yeo	998	No
Mrs Mary Marden	1001	No
Bruce&Wendy Giorgi	1002	No
Leonie Bennett	1004	No
Mr Sidney Palmer	1012	No
Clark Nicol	1017	No
Clark Nichol	1019	No
Basil Diack	1024	No
E J Alan	1025	No
Marylyn Mace	1029	No
Geoff Drake	1031	No
M A Johnson	1036	No
R F Nielson	1037	No
Marlene Gaby	1038	To be heard? No
A G H Parker	Submitter #1040	To be heard? No
John & Yvonne McKinnon	Submitter #1041	To be heard? No
S Twentyman	Submitter #1044	To be heard? No
Mrs B Harding	Submitter #1047	To be heard? No
T M Cumming	Submitter #1049	To be heard? No
Nancy Bryan	Submitter #1051	To be heard? No
Stefan Olsen	Submitter #1052	To be heard? No
Todd Glore	Submitter #1056	To be heard? No
Dan McKnight	Submitter #1062	To be heard? No
C K Knowles	Submitter #1066	To be heard? No
BF&KJ Hamilton	Submitter #1069	To be heard? No
P O'Sullivan	Submitter #1070	To be heard? No
L Holmes	Submitter #1071	To be heard? No
David Hughes	Submitter #1074	To be heard? No
Mr & Mrs PM Brewer	Submitter #1077	To be heard? No
Neil Dent	Submitter #1081	To be heard? No
Mrs V Brittin	Submitter #1082	To be heard? No
Allan Richard James	Submitter #1087	To be heard? No
Anthony Brown	Submitter #1088	To be heard? No
J&JE Giddens	Submitter #1091	To be heard? No
Therese Van den Ende	Submitter #1093	To be heard? No

Ms Heather Trask Submitter #1095.....To be heard? No
Lilian Meyer Submitter #1105.....To be heard? No
Barry Clarke Submitter #1106.....To be heard? No
Bradley Draper Submitter #1108.....To be heard? No
Noelene Probert Submitter #1110.....To be heard? No
Stanley Br Newman Submitter #1116.....To be heard? No
Peter Dalrymple Submitter #1120.....To be heard? No
Lynette Bennett Submitter #1122.....To be heard? No
Brenda Calnan Submitter #1124.....To be heard? No
John Allan Submitter #1130.....To be heard? No
Ronald Smith Submitter #1131.....To be heard? No
James Clark Submitter #1135.....To be heard? No
Robyn Kershaw Submitter #1142.....To be heard? No
Alan & Trish Brownell Submitter #1146.....To be heard? No
Belinda Smith Submitter #1147.....To be heard? No
Colin Ioveridge Submitter #1150.....To be heard? No
Arthur&Janet Peake Submitter #1151.....To be heard? No
Mrs Estelle Ward Submitter #1153.....To be heard? No
Colleen Davies Submitter #1154.....To be heard? No
Andrew & Rebekah Beck Submitter #1156.....To be heard? No
Anna Inglis Submitter #1158.....To be heard? No
Tony Davis Submitter #1161.....To be heard? No
Bryan King Submitter #1171.....To be heard? No
Bronwyn Watkins Submitter #1185.....To be heard? No
Judith Drysdale Submitter #1188.....To be heard? No
Todd Alexander Submitter #1195.....To be heard? No
Bert Taylor Submitter #1200.....To be heard? No
Judith Curtis Submitter #1203.....To be heard? No
Kingsley Smith Submitter #1221.....To be heard? No
Rodger Pilbrow Submitter #1226.....To be heard? No
Barbara Pilbrow Submitter #1227.....To be heard? No
Travis Woon Submitter #1228.....To be heard? No
Alison Prins Submitter #1229.....To be heard? No
Stephanie Sullivan Submitter #1233.....To be heard? No
Gerrit Raichle Submitter #1243.....To be heard? No
Bernadette Raichle Submitter #1244.....To be heard? No
Richard Coombe Submitter #1247.....To be heard? No
Leon Davidson Submitter #1248.....To be heard? No
Robyn Fagence Submitter #1250.....To be heard? No
Peter Walsh Submitter #1256.....To be heard? No
Dillon Green Submitter #1267.....To be heard? No
Faye Stewart Submitter #1271.....To be heard? No
Colin Stewart Submitter #1272.....To be heard? No
Barbara Mansfield Submitter #1283.....To be heard? No
Ian Mansfield Submitter #1284.....To be heard? No
Sarah Johnston Submitter #1294.....To be heard? No
Alfred Hawkins Submitter #1301.....To be heard? No
John Carlyon Submitter #1302.....To be heard? No
Jacobus Engels Submitter #1310.....To be heard? No
Norma Jean Spriggins Submitter #1320.....To be heard? No
Jason Smith Submitter #1333.....To be heard? No

Betty Wilkin Submitter #1344.....To be heard? No
 Neville Baker Submitter #1347.....To be heard? No
 Luke McCarthy Submitter #1365.....To be heard? No
 Margaret Douglas Submitter #1381.....To be heard? No
 Graham Shapland Submitter #1382.....To be heard? No
 J Williams Submitter #1384.....To be heard? No
 C Loke Submitter #1385.....To be heard? No
 Michelle Hodson Submitter #1387.....To be heard? No
 Rachel Palmer Submitter #1388.....To be heard? No
 Diane & Mike Smith Submitter #1390.....To be heard? No
 Alastair Forbes Submitter #1391.....To be heard? No
 Helen Lloyd Submitter #1392.....To be heard? No
 Jon Howard Dudding Submitter #1393.....To be heard? No
 Michael Brown Submitter #1399.....To be heard? No
 Andrew Ranyard Submitter #1400.....To be heard? No
 Brian Underwood Submitter #1402.....To be heard? No
 Chris Crompton-Smith Submitter #1408.....To be heard? No
 Margaret Brook Submitter #1415.....To be heard? No
 Byron Brook Submitter #1416.....To be heard? No
 Tim Dorward Submitter #1424.....To be heard? No
 P Hirst Submitter #1426.....To be heard? No
 K D Cleland Submitter #1429.....To be heard? No
 G&W Currie Submitter #1434.....To be heard? No
 Mike&Shirley Pudney Submitter #1437.....To be heard? No
 David Wills Submitter #1438.....To be heard? No
 Gary Barclay Submitter #1439.....To be heard? No
 Sherryl & Sid Kemsley Submitter #1440.....To be heard? No
 Meme Nairn Submitter #1451.....To be heard? No
 Barry Hebblerley Submitter #1452.....To be heard? No
 Stuart Reeve Submitter #1457.....To be heard? No
 Scott Richardson Submitter #1461.....To be heard? No
 Allan Thomas Submitter #1464.....To be heard? No
 Michael & Helen Blow Submitter #1466.....To be heard? No
 Eric Hooper Submitter #1467.....To be heard? No
 Roger Hall Submitter #1468.....To be heard? No
 Glenys Mary Johnson Submitter #1479.....To be heard? No
 Marian Curtis Submitter #1480.....To be heard? No
 Mrs C D Davey Submitter #1481.....To be heard? No
 Donald Pearson Submitter #1484.....To be heard? No
 Alan Marsom Submitter #1499.....To be heard? No
 Jennifer Marsom Submitter #1500.....To be heard? No
 Vicky Steddart Submitter #1502.....To be heard? No
 Cam Wylie Submitter #1504.....To be heard? No
 Harold & Anne Boyle 1505.....No
 Patrick William Brady 1508.....To be heard? No
 G.R. & J.M. Fear Submitter #1512.....To be heard? No
 Penny Woolward Submitter #1516.....To be heard? No
 W.R. Hawkins Submitter #1530.....To be heard? No
 Carol Cameron Submitter #1531.....To be heard? No
 S J Skeet Submitter #1541.....To be heard? No
 Jenny Sargison Submitter #1544.....To be heard? No

Jill Hammond Submitter #1546.....To be heard? No
Neil Hammond Submitter #1548.....To be heard? No
Mr I A & Mrs S F Brown Submitter #1549.....To be heard? No
Mrs Eleanor Eyles Submitter #1552.....To be heard? No
Miss C McColl Submitter #1553.....To be heard? No
Robyn Anne Bauer Submitter #1557.....To be heard? No
Graham Hont Submitter #1560.....To be heard? No
WJ & FR Hunter Submitter #1566.....To be heard? No
Robert Jones Submitter #1568.....To be heard? No
Alex Riach Submitter #1574.....To be heard? No
Neil Huntley Submitter #1581.....To be heard? No
Ros Stewart Submitter #1582.....To be heard? No
John Gommans Submitter #1584.....To be heard? No
Phillip Trafford Submitter #1600.....To be heard? No
Lizzie Atkin Submitter #1603.....To be heard? No
Doug Atkin Submitter #1604.....To be heard? No
Bridget Bell Submitter #1608.....To be heard? No
Elizabeth St George Submitter #1611.....To be heard? No
Janina Morrison Submitter #1612.....To be heard? No
John Crook Submitter #1613.....To be heard? No
T W & M A Gregory Submitter #1616.....To be heard? No
Ross Clark Submitter #1620.....To be heard? No
Russell Wyeth Submitter #1626.....To be heard? No
shirley kean Submitter #1635.....To be heard? No
Nancy Young Submitter #1645.....To be heard? No
Mrs Pay Submitter #1646.....To be heard? No
Rayewyn Hansen Submitter #1647.....To be heard? No
merv rigby Submitter #1655.....To be heard? No
Alistair Harvey Submitter #1659.....To be heard? No
Kathleen Ryan Submitter #1662.....To be heard? No
Trevor Hipgrave Submitter #1663.....To be heard? No
Arthur Ryan Submitter #1665.....To be heard? No
S M Cosham Submitter #1666.....To be heard? No
Alice McCool Submitter #1667.....To be heard? No
PR Arthur Worsop Submitter #1668.....To be heard? No
Robin Nathan Submitter #1671.....To be heard? No
Michelle Ballin Submitter #1675.....To be heard? No
Kevin Cushing Submitter #1676.....To be heard? No
V & J Thurston Submitter #1681.....To be heard? No
R Glen Submitter #1682.....To be heard? No
Van Etten Submitter #1688.....To be heard? No
Yvonne Bayford Submitter #1693.....To be heard? No
dennis smith Submitter #1694.....To be heard? No
C.K. Davidson Submitter #1702.....To be heard? No
Don Wilson Submitter #1705.....To be heard? No
D Davidson Submitter #1706.....To be heard? No
Joy Palmer Submitter #1709.....To be heard? No
Myron Bird Submitter #1711.....To be heard? No
D O McLeod Submitter #1717.....To be heard? No
Allen Svendsen Submitter #1718.....To be heard? No
Sheila Merrick Submitter #1723.....To be heard? No

Kthryn & Craig Marsh Submitter #1724.....To be heard? No
 John Merrick Submitter #1725.....To be heard? No
 Douglas Honor Submitter #1727.....To be heard? No
 J & GN Chambers Submitter #1731.....To be heard? No
 Rod Petty Submitter #1732.....To be heard? No
 Mr S B Knowles Submitter #1733.....To be heard? No
 Barbara Johnston Submitter #1734.....To be heard? No
 K & T Hawkins Submitter #1736.....To be heard? No
 C A Salmon Submitter #1739.....To be heard? No
 Dave Pink Submitter #1743.....To be heard? No
 Gracen Bull Submitter #1748.....To be heard? No
 Norma Haskell Submitter #1755.....To be heard? No
 D.G. Davey Submitter #1757.....To be heard? No
 Hamish Fraser Submitter #1758.....To be heard? No
 John Brenton-Rule Submitter #1760.....To be heard? No
 Mrs Forman Submitter #1765.....To be heard? No
 Frank Hosegood Submitter #1769.....To be heard? No
 K Egan Submitter #1770.....To be heard? No
 Natalie Rogers Submitter #1772.....To be heard? No
 C M August Submitter #1777.....To be heard? No
 P Coleman Submitter #1786.....To be heard? No
 Valda Hampton Submitter #1789.....To be heard? No
 NJ & RG Groombridge Submitter #1790.....To be heard? No
 Diane Brown Submitter #1793.....To be heard? No
 Lorraine & Denis Standring Submitter #1795.....To be heard? No
 A Fox Submitter #1797.....To be heard? No
 Ray McKee Submitter #1804.....To be heard? No
 Garry & Margaret Redrup Submitter #1808.....To be heard? No
 Richard Field Submitter #1816.....To be heard? No
 Bert Hughes Forest Enterprises Submitter #1829.....To be heard? No
 Donald Grooby Submitter #1837.....To be heard? No
 Christina Duley Submitter #1839.....To be heard? No
 Ann Logan Submitter #1843.....To be heard? No
 David Lum Submitter #1846.....To be heard? No
 Anastasia Greene Submitter #1850.....To be heard? No
 Bill Halpin Submitter #1852.....To be heard? No
 Frann Halpin Submitter #1853.....To be heard? No
 Bridget Broadhurst Submitter #1856.....To be heard? No
 Brendan Gilmour Submitter #1859.....To be heard? No
 Hamish D'Ath Submitter #1860.....To be heard? No
 Maree Leatherby Submitter #1861.....To be heard? No
 Sacha Robinson Submitter #1880.....To be heard? No
 Chris Turney Northumberland Trust..... Submitter #1894.....To be heard? No
 Peter Watson Peter Watson Family Trus..... Submitter #1895.....To be heard? No
 Vanessa Lange Submitter #1908.....To be heard? No
 Susan Jackson Submitter #1916.....To be heard? No
 JOHN SAIT Submitter #1920.....To be heard? No
 Fiona Edwards Submitter #1924.....To be heard? No
 Colin Walling Submitter #1926.....To be heard? No
 Rhonda Kitching Submitter #1938.....To be heard? No
 Carlyle Hirt Submitter #1943.....To be heard? No

Lyn Parkes Submitter #1946..... o be heard? No
 Gordon Mace JP Submitter #1948..... To be heard? No
 Michael Roser Submitter #1951..... To be heard? No
 Cheryl Jackson Submitter #1954..... To be heard? No
 Richard Grant Submitter #1955..... To be heard? No
 Dorothy Ellen Gray Submitter #1958..... To be heard? No
 R & J Wilton Submitter #1967..... To be heard? No
 B Jessop Submitter #1971..... To be heard? No
 J. P. Desdieux Submitter #1973..... To be heard? No
 Regan Judd Submitter #1980..... To be heard? No
 Robert Bassett Submitter #1992..... To be heard? No
 Hannah Bassett Submitter #1993..... To be heard? No
 Joyce Hirt Submitter #1999..... To be heard? No
 Paul Staub Submitter #2000..... To be heard? No
 Jan Liley Submitter #2005..... To be heard? No
 Peter Stedman Submitter #2009..... To be heard? No
 Trevor Stewart Submitter #2014..... To be heard? No
 Terry Rapley Submitter #2017..... To be heard? No
 Craig Manning Submitter #2018..... To be heard? No
 Richard & Diane Gregory Submitter #2019..... To be heard? No
 M J Russell Submitter #2025..... To be heard? No
 Graham Clegg Submitter #2028..... To be heard? No
 Antonie Simpson Submitter #2029..... To be heard? No
 Elizabeth Curtis Submitter #2030..... To be heard? No
 Noel Sangster Submitter #2034..... To be heard? No
 Vivienne Ellis Submitter #2035..... To be heard? No
 Mrs Ursula Monica Fowler Submitter #2039..... To be heard? No
 Rodney Douglas Webb Submitter #2041..... To be heard? No
 Hans Paaymans Submitter #2048..... To be heard? No
 B Leipst Submitter #2049..... To be heard? No
 Tony Page Submitter #2050..... To be heard? No
 D Michael Lucas Submitter #2062..... To be heard? No
 Allan Tinning Submitter #2364..... To be heard? No
 Margaret McCrostie Submitter #2369..... To be heard? No
 Cindy Elrick Submitter #2370..... To be heard? No
 E B Greenslade Submitter #2373..... To be heard? No
 David Sayner Submitter #2374..... To be heard? No
 Ralph McLean Submitter #2378..... To be heard? No
 Greig Harvey Submitter #2380..... To be heard? No
 Mrs Betty Blades Submitter #2383..... To be heard? No
 Peter Smith Submitter #2387..... To be heard? No
 Roha Thompson Submitter #2389..... To be heard? No
 Mildred Horne Submitter #2391..... To be heard? No
 Michael & Pauline Harris Submitter #2400..... To be heard? No
 Jill Rangi Submitter #2401..... To be heard? No
 Desmond G Harris Submitter #2404..... To be heard? No
 Keith & Lesley Browning Submitter #2407..... To be heard? No
 Jenny & Jim Middleton Submitter #2409..... To be heard? No
 R. & K. Cooper Submitter #2410..... To be heard? No
 R N Cutler Submitter #2413..... To be heard? No
 Diane Searle Submitter #2415..... To be heard? No

H Cutler	2416	No
S. E. John	2417	No
M. J. King	2418	No
Joy Kittow	2419	No
Bryan Gilbertson	2421	No
Roger Mole	2422	No
D R Masterton	2424	No
Mrs G Paterson	2425	No
Murray Christison	2426	No
Norma Bowater	Submitter #2428	To be heard? No
Richard Finnimore	Submitter #2430	To be heard? No
Mrs D Gilbert	Submitter #2431	To be heard? No
Mitchell & Emily Hawke & Young	Submitter #2433	To be heard? No
Mark Ansford	Submitter #2439	To be heard? No
Mrs Elizabeth Murray	Submitter #2445	To be heard? No
Anthony Ives	Submitter #2446	To be heard? No
Joshy Joseph	Submitter #2449	To be heard? No
Margaret G	Submitter #2450	To be heard? No
Tom Skinner	Submitter #2451	To be heard? No
Ron Bone	Submitter #2455	To be heard? No
Mary Ellen Bayliss	Submitter #2467	To be heard? No
Ed & Ke Strachan	Submitter #2472	To be heard? No
Melanie Eagle	Submitter #2475	To be heard? No
E J Gardner	Submitter #2478	To be heard? No
Mervyn John Morgan	Submitter #2481	To be heard? No
Wayne Mowat	Submitter #2485	To be heard? No
Bruce Hastie	Submitter #2487	To be heard? No
Phyllis Marguerite Barwood	Submitter #2488	To be heard? No
Johanna Cameron v Poppel	Submitter #2497	To be heard? No
Julian Alexander Riddell	Submitter #2501	To be heard? No
Karina Campbell	Submitter #2504	To be heard? No
Waituhi Graham	Submitter #2505	To be heard? No
John & Marie Dawson	Submitter #2507	To be heard? No
Robyn Clayton	Submitter #2509	To be heard? No
Cecil Mills Childrens Trust	Submitter #2511	To be heard? No
Cheryl Jarven	Submitter #2514	To be heard? No
Jill Campbell	Submitter #2515	To be heard? No
Judith Sprott	Submitter #2522	To be heard? No
Lynn Burton	Submitter #2527	To be heard? No
Diane Mohi	Submitter #2531	To be heard? No
Jasvir Singh	Submitter #2540	To be heard? No
Tye Husheer	Submitter #2558	To be heard? No
Kazimierz Gwozdz	Submitter #2561	To be heard? No
Jan Donaldson	Submitter #2563	To be heard? No
Michael Maddever	Submitter #2568	To be heard? No
Glen Morton	Submitter #2577	To be heard? No
Sera Chambers	Submitter #2578	To be heard? No
Frank Nieuwland	Submitter #2588	To be heard? No
Dirk Nieuwland	Submitter #2601	To be heard? No
Ken Drury	Submitter #2604	To be heard? No
Lorraine Guillemot	Submitter #2605	To be heard? No

Laurie Guillemot Submitter #2606.....To be heard? No
Dorothy Galloway Submitter #2610.....To be heard? No
David Halliday Submitter #2612.....To be heard? No
Sue Halliday Submitter #2613.....To be heard? No
Philippa Seidelin Submitter #2614.....To be heard? No
Rachael Hinchco Submitter #2616.....To be heard? No
Alanda Rafferty Submitter #2624.....To be heard? No
colin Rafferty Submitter #2625.....To be heard? No
Beverley Caves Submitter #2738.....To be heard? No
James L H Williams Submitter #2740.....To be heard? No
L Rennett Submitter #2744.....To be heard? No
David Hansen Submitter #2746.....To be heard? No
Jan Bennett Submitter #2748.....To be heard? No
Guy White Submitter #2752.....To be heard? No
Denise Millar Submitter #2754.....To be heard? No
Quentin Bennett Submitter #2761.....To be heard? No
Josephine Carpenter Submitter #2762.....To be heard? No
G K & P M Murdoch Submitter #2763.....To be heard? No
E Baker Submitter #2767.....To be heard? No
Mark Fisher Submitter #2768.....To be heard? No
Nicole Sattler Submitter #2769.....To be heard? No
Mark Fisher Summit Property NZ Ltd Submitter #2770.....To be heard? No
Robert McAndrew Submitter #2771.....To be heard? No
A D Beagle Submitter #2773.....To be heard? No
Patricia Small Submitter #2776.....To be heard? No
W J Cooper Submitter #2777.....To be heard? No
G Wilson Submitter #2778.....To be heard? No
Audrie Norma Smyth Submitter #2781.....To be heard? No
Greg Porcer Submitter #2786.....To be heard? No
Glenys Plowman Submitter #2797.....To be heard? No
David Plowman Submitter #2798.....To be heard? No
Christine Kerr Submitter #2799.....To be heard? No
Patrick & Carol Nesdale Submitter #2801.....To be heard? No
Nick Hatherill Submitter #2803.....To be heard? No
Moe Grant Submitter #2804.....To be heard? No
Peter Pattullo Submitter #2807.....To be heard? No
Meda Hawkins Submitter #2810.....To be heard? No
O. S. Mudgway Submitter #2811.....To be heard? No
Anne Hayfield Submitter #2827.....To be heard? No
Peter Hayfield Submitter #2828.....To be heard? No
Rod Halpin Submitter #2830.....To be heard? No
Nicole Taane Submitter #2857.....To be heard? No
Alyce Kelly Submitter #2859.....To be heard? No
John Cotter The Proprietors of Tahora No 2C1 Section 3..... 2861..... No
IJAP Ltd Submitter #2863.....To be heard? No
Warren Buckland Submitter #2866.....To be heard? No
Marius van Niekerk Submitter #2868.....To be heard? No
Lorraine Rawcliffe Submitter #2870.....To be heard? No
Warwick Thomson Submitter #2876.....To be heard? No
Andy & Jane Meyer Submitter #2882.....To be heard? No
Gay Jull Submitter #2888.....To be heard? No

Tom Kerrisk	Submitter #2889	To be heard? No
Mary Fredriksen	Submitter #3147	To be heard? No
Lisa Pretious	Submitter #3149	To be heard? No
Allen McMillan	Submitter #3150	To be heard? No
J Saathof	Submitter #3151	To be heard? No
John Whyte	Submitter #3152	To be heard? No
Eileen Linton	Submitter #3166	To be heard? No
Malcolm Campbell	Submitter #3198	To be heard? No
Jack Doherty	Submitter #3211	To be heard? No
Jackie Hurst	Submitter #3218	To be heard? No
E Davis	Submitter #3223	To be heard? No
Donna Tahere	Submitter #3238	To be heard? No
Delfin Jr Lagudas	Submitter #3254	To be heard? No
Scott Wills	Submitter #3283	To be heard? No
Shirley McKay	Submitter #3299	To be heard? No
Rennie Woolf	Submitter #3302	To be heard? No
Gaye Winiata	Submitter #3304	To be heard? No
Paul Winiata	Submitter #3306	To be heard? No
John & Gail Baker	Submitter #3310	To be heard? No
John Loverson Cole	Submitter #3313	To be heard? No
Hilda Amaru	Submitter #3315	To be heard? No
William Amaru	Submitter #3316	No
Kasana Walker	Submitter #3332	To be heard? No
Rose Isabella Keogh	Submitter #3337	To be heard? No
Mary-Ann Wesst	Submitter #3338	To be heard? No
Tony Blades	Submitter #3341	To be heard? No
Raewyn McCarthy	Submitter #3344	To be heard? No
Noel & Faye Gerken	Submitter #3345	To be heard? No
Philip D Mardon	Submitter #3346	To be heard? No
Jonathan Makhlar & Michelle Bishell	Submitter #3348	To be heard? No
David & Margaret Bickerstaff M.J. Bickerstaff Trust	3352	No
Winifred Bickerstaff	Submitter #3353	To be heard? No
Greg Brittin	Submitter #3396	To be heard? No
Barbara Jean Cairns	Submitter #3407	To be heard? No
Debbie Miller	Submitter #3421	To be heard? No
Barb Abbott	Submitter #3429	To be heard? No
Dawn Hope	2645	No
Marilyn Coutts Family Trust	2646	No
Perry Hornby	Submitter #2653	To be heard? No
Barry Gardner	Submitter #2660	To be heard? No
David Walton Gilmour	Submitter #2665	To be heard? No
Margaret Evans	Submitter #2666	To be heard? No
Geoff Bibby	Submitter #2667	To be heard? No
Jean Robertson	Submitter #2668	To be heard? No
Anne Thain	Submitter #2671	To be heard? No
Michelle McGuinness	Submitter #2672	To be heard? No
Jay Hi	Submitter #2673	To be heard? No
Sandra Gimblett	Submitter #2677	To be heard? No
Alan Niethe	Submitter #2680	To be heard? No
DB Gibson	Submitter #2686	To be heard? No
B W Ackerman	Submitter #2687	To be heard? No

Johann Geelen de Kabath Submitter #2688.....To be heard? No
 Jane Abel Submitter #2694.....To be heard? No
 D. Patrick Submitter #2695.....To be heard? No
 Roger and Anne Parore Submitter #2710.....To be heard? No
 Craig Riley Submitter #2730.....To be heard? No
 Barbara Vanessa Atkins Submitter #2732.....To be heard? No
 Tim Ryan Submitter #2069.....To be heard? No
 Josephine Palmer Submitter #2070.....To be heard? No
 Lester & Isobel O'Brien Submitter #2075.....To be heard? No
 Rosemarie Aldridge Submitter #2081.....To be heard? No
 R J Drieberg Submitter #2088.....To be heard? No
 Helen Sherratt Submitter #2094.....To be heard? No
 Wendy Wallace Submitter #2096.....To be heard? No
 Joan McKinnon Submitter #2098.....To be heard? No
 Robert Bowie Submitter #2100.....To be heard? No
 Mrs M Wilhelmsen Submitter #2102.....To be heard? No
 N B Congdon Submitter #2113.....To be heard? No
 Rebecca Ranford Submitter #2114.....To be heard? No
 V Winstanley Submitter #2115.....To be heard? No
 J Sloan Submitter #2116.....To be heard? No
 Graham Wade Submitter #2120.....To be heard? No
 Russell Louis Maurice Submitter #2121.....To be heard? No
 Johannes Christiaans Submitter #2123.....To be heard? No
 I N Jenkinson Submitter #2124.....To be heard? No
 Jean & Frank Gibbins Submitter #2127.....To be heard? No
 D A & G L Bromwich Submitter #2172.....To be heard? No
 Brian Frost Submitter #2200.....To be heard? No
 Pauline Stone Submitter #2203.....To be heard? No
 Patricia Winter Submitter #2207.....To be heard? No
 Graham Ramsay Submitter #2209.....To be heard? No
 Mr & Mrs R V Latimer Submitter #2213.....To be heard? No
 Lee Adams Submitter #2135.....To be heard? No
 Judy Fletcher Submitter #2136.....To be heard? No
 Aaron Eastwood Submitter #2140.....To be heard? No
 Nola E Dykes Submitter #2141.....To be heard? No
 George Barker Submitter #2162.....To be heard? No
 Barry Curphey Submitter #2164.....To be heard? No
 J M Schinkel Submitter #2175.....To be heard? No
 Mrs H G Avery Submitter #2176.....To be heard? No
 Sheryl Pledger Submitter #2177.....To be heard? No
 Sharon Wellwood Submitter #2181.....To be heard? No
 Dean Hogg Submitter #2183.....To be heard? No
 G Taylor Submitter #2187.....To be heard? No
 Kaye Pratt Submitter #2188.....To be heard? No
 Kylee Speirs Submitter #2190.....To be heard? No
 Moira Lindsay Submitter #2193.....To be heard? No
 Dr Esmail A Samy Submitter #2195.....To be heard? No
 K. H. Millar Submitter #2222.....To be heard? No
 Audrey Lochhead Submitter #2228.....To be heard? No
 Denice Ronner Submitter #2235.....To be heard? No
 Anthony Grant Dasent Submitter #2237.....To be heard? No

Maureen Astridge Submitter #2239 To be heard? No
 W. E. Nutsford Submitter #2244 To be heard? No
 Karen & Phil Marham Submitter #2252 To be heard? No
 Georgia D. McLeary Submitter #2254 To be heard? No
 Leigh Perry Submitter #2255 To be heard? No
 Colin Noakes Submitter #2256 To be heard? No
 Peter Culloty Submitter #2283 To be heard? No
 Leonie Selby Submitter #2284 To be heard? No
 Robin Owen Submitter #2285 To be heard? No
 Cyrus Ramari Munro Submitter #2290 To be heard? Yes
 Marlene Wallace Submitter #2298 To be heard? No
 Patricia Graham Submitter #2302 To be heard? No
 George & Pyllis Lomas Submitter #2313 To be heard? No
 Carol Snaddon Submitter #2328 To be heard? No
 Lindsay Roy Manning Submitter #2330 To be heard? No
 Tina Gray Submitter #2338 To be heard? No
 B Marlow Submitter #2348 To be heard? No
 Pam Street Submitter #2357 To be heard? No
 Greg White Submitter #2360 To be heard? No
 Trevor Newton Submitter #2899 To be heard? No
 Noeline Ruth Davies Submitter #2906 To be heard? No
 Kathleen Turley Submitter #2908 To be heard? No
 Aaron Duff Submitter #2911 To be heard? No
 Jo Duff Submitter #2913 To be heard? No
 Valerie Moates Submitter #2917 To be heard? No
 Kieran Smith Submitter #2922 To be heard? No
 Jeanneke Howard Submitter #2927 To be heard? No
 Kim Ansford Submitter #2947 To be heard? No
 Philip Beck Submitter #2952 To be heard? No
 Philippa Chambers Submitter #2954 To be heard? No
 Nickie Delamere Submitter #2955 To be heard? No
 Joe Dale Submitter #2965 To be heard? No
 Gary Mayo Locke Investments Submitter #2979 To be heard? No
 Melinda Randall Submitter #2988 To be heard? No
 Rosemary New Submitter #2989 To be heard? No
 Corey Randall Submitter #2990 To be heard? No
 Kathy Olsen Submitter #2998 To be heard? No
 Chris Olsen Submitter #2999 To be heard? No
 E Smith Submitter #3013 To be heard? No
 Robert Davis Submitter #3033 To be heard? No
 Lois Mary Davis Submitter #3035 To be heard? No
 Sarah Hodgson Submitter #3044 To be heard? No
 Diane Watt Submitter #3045 To be heard? No
 M H Gibbs Submitter #3046 To be heard? No
 Graeme Setford Submitter #3048 To be heard? No
 Catharina-minke Nobel Submitter #3049 To be heard? No
 Winston Howard Submitter #3053 To be heard? No
 Heather Lomas Submitter #3061 To be heard? No
 R Vanderwert Submitter #3066 To be heard? No
 Josh Lynch Submitter #3069 To be heard? No
 Shirley Hosking Submitter #3082 To be heard? No

Karen & Alan Wius	3083.....	No
Alison Carter	3086.....	No
John Brown	3094.....	No
B Kellett	3096.....	No
Beth Driver	3097.....	No
Peter Martin	3108.....	No
Elizabeth Todd	3121.....	No
William Reuben Moore	3122.....	No
Jeanette Denholm	3126.....	No
Wendy Hedely	3466.....	No
Darryl Hedley	3468.....	No
Jan Appleton	3470.....	No
Fred Lewis	3479.....	No
Jo Hutchinson	3481.....	No
Jo Hutchinson	3482.....	No
Marilyn Wells	3488.....	No
Mijin Jones	3494.....	No
Ivana Guy	3498.....	No
Nicola Salmond	3507.....	No
Robert Halkett	3517.....	No
Lynne Harrison	3519.....	No
Craig Hansen	3525.....	No
John Pearcey	3526.....	No
Anthony & Brenda Jackson	3527.....	No
Jeff Reid	3529.....	No
Kalena Sale	3530.....	No
Amy Reid	3532.....	No
Ann Barrett	3534.....	No
A L N Smith	3537.....	No
Ian Hunter	3543.....	No
Charles & Annette Goodley	3546.....	No
Mrs Andranida Mawson	3548.....	No
Mrs M J Clark	3549.....	No
Iris Crozier	3558.....	No
Margi York	3560.....	No
Alan Thompson	3563.....	No
WP (Bill) & CR (Carol) Nelson	3568.....	No
Anita Mollie & Erin Eileen Louisson	3570.....	No
G Johnston	3572.....	No
Alison Trousdell	3573.....	No
Neville Robert Stewart	3578.....	No
Mrs A Godwin	3583.....	No
Mrs Mary Beran	3585.....	No
Gillian Spriggs	3587.....	No
RG & A N Anderson	3589.....	No
Warren Petrie	3592.....	No
T Burns	3597.....	No
Penelope Jull Simcox	3598.....	No