

Submission	Submitter	page
40	James Thain	1
41	Maree Leatherby	1
42	John boy Tamatea	1
43	Bernie Kelly	1
44	Paddy Maloney	2
45	Andrew Gifford	2
46	Colleen Knauf	3
47	Kathryn Bayliss	4
48	Clint Deckard	5
49	Steve Thrush	5

James Thain

Submission #40

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

Maree Leatherby

Submission #41

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

We need to act NOW and we need to fast track environmental projects. I don't believe that it is a huge increase or burden for rates payers.

John boy Tamatea

**** Submission #42**

2. 4.88% (\$849,332) rate increase

Bernie Kelly

Submission #43

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

In accepting a nearly 10 % rate rise as the cost to fast track the environmental projects identified, I would still like to know why profits from the Port company aren't being used instead and how on earth the now defunct CEO Andrew Newman was able to enlist Mai Chen with associated out of control costs related to the Government enquiry surrounding Havelock North water. Is it any wonder ratepayers get a tad cynical !

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

I strongly support the Council's option 3

I submit in favour of option 3 for the budget options and proposed rate increase to fund the 'Clean Up' of the 6 Hot Spots of environmental damage.

It is a disgrace that the environment has been allowed to degrade to the current position and remedial action should have commenced many years ago.

We have ignored these issues for far too long.

I fully support the Council's proposed work programme, it is now time to take seriously the required clean up work and this needs to be properly funded.

Although some people have complained about the costs involved and the proposed rate increase they do not seem to understand that we should have been paying for this work long ago, and also regulating the basic sources of the pollution.

They also do not seem to understand that the extra costs are very modest.

By my calculations the net increase above the current budget is 3 or 4 cups of coffee per household PER ANNUM. If there are 2 adults in the average household, then it is about 2 coffees each a year.

Even those who complain would never notice such a cost.

So I fully support the work programme and the increase in rates to fund it.

2. 4.88% (\$849,332) rate increase

I submit that HBRC should create an Environmental Kick-start Fund.

I submit that HBRC should not proceed with the proposed rate increase in the 2017-18 financial year.

My submission is based on the view that HBRC has moved its focus and activities in recent years away from its core function, protecting our environment, and toward regional economic development.

My strongly held opinion is that regional councils collect rates to enable them conduct their activities as an environment regulator and champion. The newly elected HBRC has acknowledged this by proposing to act immediately to clean up the hot spots they have identified. This is a re-focusing of their activities that I fully support.

However, the proposal to increase rates to fund this plan I cannot support. I do not trust HBRC to spend these additional funds in the most effective and efficient

manner. My preference is for HBRC to look within to identify cost savings and alternative sources of funding to allocate to the environmental kick-start project. Some options for the cost savings or alternative funding sources are:

1. HBRC has existing sources of funds that are currently allocated to other projects (eg. RWSS) Review all existing projects to find cost savings.
2. Wind-up HBRIC immediately. HBRC is an environmental regulator not an investment company. The Port of Napier has a perfectly good Board and management team, it does not need more governance from HBRIC. Use the funds from HBRIC operations for environmental purposes.
3. HBRC should not be involved in regional economic development, a subject an environmental authority has no expertise in. Use funds allocated to economic development initiatives for environmental projects.
4. HBRC should withdraw from the RWSS and offer the proposal to the farmers of CHB and private enterprise promoters, along the lines of the majority of the water storage schemes in the South Island. I believe HBRC could contribute funds to such a project but should not be the promoter and major shareholder in such a scheme.
5. The proposed amount of \$1.22 million can be saved by reviewing existing HBRC operating budgets and investments. For example, in the HBRC financial statements 2014-15 there is \$52.677 million in investment property assets. Time to cash up some property and spend it on core business such as the Environmental Kick-start project.
6. \$1.22 million from the Port of Napier dividend could be allocated to this project without hindering any HBRC operations.

In summary, I applaud the new council for its efforts to re-focus the organisation but feel that ratepayers should not be the source of additional funds for this project.

Colleen Knauf

Submission #46

2. 4.88% (\$849,332) rate increase

HBRC needs to learn to live within its budget like the rest of us. Do essential things rather than 'pretty'.

Saying the 10% is a one off is entirely misleading.

That figure is on going and multiplied by subsequent increases to rates.

As for an average \$170 increase, that is only for urban. Our increase will be \$770.

On top of that we farmers are expected to spend thousands on our own programs to improve water quality etc. Quit the double dip!

If you advertised the consultation meetings properly, I am sure there would have

been a lot more farmers there. However, my previous experience of 'consultation' meetings is that they are a farce. The plan is predetermined and will go on regardless.

Those with the biggest ideas, contribute the least in dollars.

You have us over a barrel and know it.

Kathryn Bayliss

Submission #47

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase (as detailed above)

1. I AM AGAINST ANY RATE RISE. (Especially if more ratepayer money is spent on water storage schemes and/or given to HBRIC) But I support HBRC continuing on a 'business as usual' delivery of Council's services and the proposal to kick-start action in six environmental hot spot areas. (Lake Tūtira, Ahuriri estuary, Whakaki Lake and Wairoa River, Lake Whatuma and Tukituki catchment, Karamū Stream, and the Coastal Marine Environment.) Instead of raising rates to do this HBRC should abandoned the RWSS plan and the Ngaruroro Water Storage plan. HBRIC should be liquidated. The Port of Napier should be brought back under HBRC management. Some of the money set aside for the RWSS and the Ngaruroro Water Storage Scheme could then be used to fund HBRC continuing on a 'business as usual' delivery of Council's services and the kick-start fund for action in six environmental hot spot. HBRIC is just another layer of complexities, risks and costs for more directors and a staff. It is inefficient and too costly to have two boards overseeing the Port of Napier as well as the HBRC. Land intensification should not be encouraged as this would contribute to increasing environment problems. 2. If HBRC truly cared for the environment and biodiversity they would not be building the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme which will affect approximately 450.18 ha. with a total of 185.18 ha of ecologically significant indigenous vegetation and habitats, and resident fauna, including DoC conservation land being destroyed. Plan Change 6 is suppose to improve the CHB environment including our rivers. Farmer's need to farm sustainably and prove they can work within Plan Change 6. Farmers should not be encouraged to intensive land use by providing water for irrigation. It the RWSS goes ahead more fertilisers and pesticides would be used. This will be more detrimental to the environment and the health of people. The RWSS is a huge risk to our environment as well as economically, financially and socially. 3. Ratepayers should not be seen as an endless source of money for HBRC and HBRIC and other businesses who the HBRC give grants to. HBRC and HBRIC should not risk ratepayer money in risky ventures such as the proposed RWSS, and the Ngaruroro Water Storage Scheme. HBRC should not give money to all the organisations and ventures who request it. It needs to stick to its basic roles.

4. Organic, GE free farming should be encouraged. We would be healthier and happier if Hawke's Bay was farmed organically and the earth and the environment wasn't poisoned or polluted. We need to make Hawke's Bay a clean, healthy, eco-friendly place to live and visit. We need to care for the environment and live sustainably if we want to help make the world a better place to live in now and for generations to come. Food grown here would be known for being safe and sustainable. If grown organically it could also provide more jobs on farms. Eco-tourism could also attract more visitors. 5. I support the HBRC in banning oil prospecting, development and production and hydraulic fracturing in Hawke's Bay. 6. I support making HB free of genetically modified organisms.

Additional Submission. I am against any rate rise if more ratepayer money is spent on water storage schemes. But I support HBRC continuing on a 'business as usual' delivery of Council's services and the proposal to kick-start action in six environmental hot spot areas. (Lake Tūtira, Ahuriri estuary, Whakaki Lake and Wairoa River, Lake Whatuma and Tukituki catchment, Karamū Stream, and the Coastal Marine Environment.) Instead of raising rates to do this HBRC should abandoned the RWSS plan and the Ngaruroro Water Storage plan and write them off. HBRIC should be liquidated. The Port of Napier should be brought back under HBRC management. Some of the money set aside for the RWSS and the Ngaruroro Water Storage Scheme should then be used to fund HBRC continuing on a 'business as usual' delivery of Council's services and the kick-start fund for action in six environmental hot spots.

Clint Deckard

Submission #48

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

Steve Thrush

** Submission #49

3. 9.88% (1,719,821) rate increase

I fully support the Regional Council getting out into our environment and leading the efforts to improve the quality of water, in all its aspects, in the Hawke's Bay Region. I hope that the extra money being raised now and in the future is going to spent on doing improvements in the field, rather than being spent on planning, consultants, meetings and administration.

Other regions have already done this. Please learn from them so that we can make the best of this extra funding.