

# Summary of Submissions – 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan

## Contents

<b>Civil defence &amp; emergency management</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Rural water quality risk assessments</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Dairy inspections</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Minimum flows – accelerated programme of work</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Deemed permit transition work from Water Management Reserve</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Queenstown public transport</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Queenstown office</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Lower Waitaki River Scheme</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Lake Snow</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Lake restoration scoping work</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Wallabies</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Climate change adaption</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Wilding trees</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Dunedin head office</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Air quality</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Biodiversity &amp; environmental enhancement</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Harbour matters</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Lagarosiphon</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Pest animals, plants and strategy</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Rates</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Funding requests</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Significance &amp; engagement policy</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Other submissions</b>	<b>77</b>
- Consultation document	77
- Council function, councillors	78
- Dunedin public transport	78
- Engagement	80
- Flood protection & control works	82
- Natural hazards	82
- Noise control	83
- Other comments	83
- Public transport	88
- Significant forecasting assumptions	89
- South Dunedin	89
- Support given	90
- Urban water quality	90
- Water	91

## Civil Defence and Emergency Management

Option 1 – Uniform targeted rate (\$25.89 per property). Everyone pays the same 515 submitters  
 Option 2 – 50% uniform targeted rate, and 50% general rate. 211 submitters

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that Option 1 be adopted as the funding model for civil defence and emergency management. The committee confirms that this activity is firstly about people, and that the nature and value of a property is not a key basis for which service are provided.

	Submitter comment
1	<b>Trustpower Limited, Tauranga</b> Agree that civil defence is about people not property, so everyone should pay the same. If based on CV would result in a disproportionality high rate for properties with high CV rates, which would be disproportionate in comparison to the services or benefits received.
23	<b>Barbara Weavers, Dunedin</b> Uniform rates hurt people on lower incomes as proportionally it takes a bigger chunk of their income.
37	<b>Neil Gaudin</b> What happened to the funds of the local authorities that used to employ the officers? The same number of employees amalgamated from different agencies should result in the same cost. There should be no funding requirement in the ORC rates.
89	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> Could central government pay the cost of civil defence as a huge portion of the population don't own a property so they are covered for CDEM at no cost to them. ORC to lobby government to sort this out.
91	<b>Neki Patel, Queenstown</b> Neither funding option. As the greatest population is tourists in Queenstown, why they are not part of the plan.
211	<b>Tom Lamb, Alexandra</b> In an emergency, civil defence requirements will apply more to people than buildings.
222	<b>Hillary Hutton</b> CDEM is about people. Some people have more money than others.
246	<b>Megan Hopper</b> People with the more expensive properties should pay more.
248	<b>Mark Kelly, Dunedin</b> Should be based on land ownership, if have more land, should pay more. The argument about nature and value of property is irrelevant. It penalizes the poor people by making them pay a greater proportion compared to people with a higher level of disposable income.
268	<b>Shane Montague-Gallagher</b> A flat rate unfairly puts the burden on the poorer members of the community. Equity and fairness should be at the heart of the ORC decision making - if you are wealthier you should pay more.

292	<p><b>Rober Morey, Dunedin</b> Every rateable property would count as 1 unit and every dwelling unit (house/flat/apartment) on that property counts as further rating units. This would be a more equitable way of paying for civil defence.</p>
311	<p><b>G Hudson, Dunedin</b> If this is now pooled with efficiency services, why is it costing more? Should be getting a reduction and not additional costs.</p>
372	<p><b>Lindsay Borrie, Cromwell</b> The problem with the options is that they do not relate to the number of people, but properties only. Need to have a rate that covers everyone who is living here and tourists - it's too difficult to tax.</p>
469	<p><b>Thomas Sobek, Dunedin</b> Option 1 penalises low income residents. Need to get more from those who can afford to pay and less from those who cannot.</p>
474	<p><b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> Proposal to appoint new staff – how many, and at what cost? Two choices given with no explanation, no transparency.</p>
509	<p><b>Jon Mitchell, Wellington</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The premise for option 1 is wrong in law and flawed in logic. After 15 years of the CDEM Act 2002 being in effect, the significant change in the scope from the Civil Defence Act 1983 is not known to ORC.</li> <li>• The justification for option 1 is disturbing as some key community, utility and commercial infrastructure is of higher importance than others in risk analysis, reduction, readiness, response and recovery terms. The CDEM Act, Sect 3 states that 'property' is now explicitly to be protected.</li> <li>• The emphasis on response to emergencies is also wrong in law. CDEM is defined broadly in the Act, where the responsibility is to include risk management and protection of property.</li> <li>• Option 1 is inappropriate and should not be applied. Option 2 reflects the intent of the Act and recognises the significant and growing risks that our natural, social, build and economic environments are exposed to. Encourage all regional councillors to read the CDEM Act, National CDEM Strategy and the National CDEM Plan, to familiarise themselves with this crucial set of responsibilities.</li> </ul>
513	<p><b>Ian Turnbull, Wanaka</b> Emergencies are regional (or national) in extent and property value is (or should be) covered by insurance. More money could be put toward natural hazard mapping and moving people /assets out of naturally hazardous areas.</p>
563.	<p><b>Gerry Eckhoff, Alexandra</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So few details provided, a \$2.4 million spend with no budget supplied, wage rates etc.</li> <li>• Likely to absorb huge amounts of cash while waiting for something to happen (may or may not happen). Are all staff based in Dunedin? What is overall chain of command? What local knowledge is applied and by whom? Unclear how civil defence will evolve.</li> </ul>
604	<p><b>Philip Temple, Dunedin</b> Households should have emergency kits but few have. Should be some form of financial encouragement. A model could be the way dog licensing works, with a full fee and a half fee for approved owners. People could be encouraged to have their own emergency kits by setting a noticeably higher targeted civil defence rate, reducible on application if they meet the kit standard on inspection. The savings in cost of lives, injuries and material would be immense.</p>
606	<p><b>Helen Jack, Dunedin</b> Do not know how Civil defence should be funded but supports the new funding as it has been underfunded for many years in Otago. It is imperative that the public information and education component of civil defence is adequately funded. \$2.5 million per year is a lot of money so expect to see top quality public education programmes and public information capability during emergencies.</p>

651	<p><b>Christine Ryan, Arrowtown</b></p> <p>Although civil defence is more about people than property, it is ok for wealthier landowners to subsidise others to some extent. Overall the amount is relatively tiny even for those with expensive properties.</p>
693	<p><b>James Sim, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rates based on each property regardless of values is a highly regressive tax policy, greatly favouring the very wealthy over the lower than average person in our community. Growing wealth inequality is creating major social stress throughout the world. We should play our part to prevent this tearing our societies apart. Where Councillors stand individually on this is clarifying with respect to whose interest they hold closest to their hearts.</li> <li>• Strongly favour a minimum use of uniform rating.</li> </ul>
697	<p><b>Val Goss, Dunedin</b></p> <p>People should all be treated the same. What happens to the money allocated by the district councils for CD? Is this not transferred to the ORC as we pick up the responsibility?</p>
698	<p><b>Brian Hawkins</b></p> <p>Levels of service will be higher in more populated areas than in the more remote parts of Central Otago. When one combines this with the fact that greater risk also exists in higher populated areas/coastal areas/South Dunedin, then option 2 is preferred.</p>
700	<p><b>Frankton Community Association, Glyn Lewers</b></p> <p>Encourage development of a comprehensive Otago wide CDEM group plan. Support option 1 for the rates structure, as agree is for prioritising people, not property. Expect increase in rates demand is in return invested in the Queenstown Lakes area, as this will feel the greatest impact of a seismic event. Would like to seen planning for a collaborative emergency response centre at the Queenstown Events Centre with QLDC.</p>
704	<p><b>Anna Hughes, Dunedin</b></p> <p>As value properties increase, fair to say income of the owner is also higher, so can afford to pay more towards services. This makes for greater equality.</p>
721	<p><b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b></p> <p>Emergency management is the responsibility of everyone regardless of property value and size. Option one should be retained with a uniform targeted rate across all properties.</p>
733	<p><b>Ronald Cunningham, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Would prefer a way to target the people of the district rather than property.</p>
737	<p><b>Queenstown Lakes District Council, Mayor Jim Boulton</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports ORC's critical role. Notes that QLDC, like all council's continues to make a financial investment in this.</li> <li>• If Option 1 is preference, would caution that the investment in resilience and response for Lakes District ratepayers is not disproportionate with areas of higher population.</li> <li>• Support for this initiative will be predicated on ensuring that an appropriate investment in resource and readiness specific to QLDC is made. Encouraged by the dialogue already underway with the regional EM office.</li> </ul>
743	<p><b>Nona James, Queenstown</b></p> <p>A general rate levied against a property's value unfairly penalises Queenstown ratepayers. Why should someone already struggling to make ends meet in the unaffordable Queenstown market pay a higher dollar amount toward civil defence than someone living in Dunedin where they can earn higher wages?</p>

777	<p><b>Ray Henderson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inflation is running between 0 and 2%. WDC is embarrassed that their rates may go from 1% to 1.5%. ORC rates going from \$35 to \$65. How dare ORC foist an almost 100% rate increase on the submitter. Increase due to emergency management charge. All insurance policies held have an EQC levy. Local rates have a CDEM levy.</li> <li>• ORC – stick to your knitting. Local council is sorting out erosion prone Beach Road, flood disaster at Otematata Boat Harbour, and erosion protection north of Oamaru Creek. Where is the regional council? Sitting in Dunedin in offices not grand enough.</li> <li>• Will make a sincere effort to stage a rates revolt, and have as many ratepayers as possible withhold payment in protest.</li> </ul>
782	<p><b>Federated Farmers, David Cooper</b> Strongly support option 1.</p>
788	<p><b>Ken McGraw, Cromwell</b> Confused as to where the CDEM officers now employed by ORC will be located. Assuming remain at respective local authorities, no detail given on how their employment provides the claimed improved efficiency result. Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will officers continue to be locally based?</li> <li>2. If yes, are the costs of manning needs for the Dn CDEM headquarters part of the \$2.4 million operations costs?</li> <li>3. Will TA's be required to maintain a locally based CDEM response plan and implementation team? If yes, how funded?</li> <li>4. Does \$2.4 million cover the cost and training of indicated employment of new staff and community based education?</li> <li>5. When are the community education and resilience programmes being implemented?</li> <li>6. Over what time frames will communities be considered as fully self-reliant in the event of a disaster?</li> <li>7. As part of major tourist destination, what response plans at regional and community level will be in place that prepares communities in their response to accommodating needs of visitors trapped by a major event?</li> <li>8. Has ORC communicated with tourism operators to understand levels of preparedness?</li> <li>9. Who will develop, prepare and co-ordinate community response plans that link with a regional response plan?</li> </ol>
790	<p><b>Remarkables Park, Shotover Park &amp; Queenstown Park, Brian Fitzpatrick</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to address issue of an Emergency Management Centre (EMC) for the Queenstown Lakes District. Would ideally be a dual use facility, serving other community functions when not required to manage an emergency.</li> <li>• Queenstown CBD susceptible to flooding, alluvial fan hazard etc., but also at risk of being isolated in the event of a major earthquake. Advantages to having a facility on high, flat, stable land away from hills, with ready access to alternative transport routes, and easy access. A location at Remarkables Park on the Eastern Arterial Road (adjacent to the airport) meets criteria suitable for a site.</li> <li>• QLDC in recent past has called for submissions on siting a hub library at Frankton. A well designed library building would share the key attributes of an emergency management centre.</li> <li>• Submit that ORC should work with QLDC on designing a hub library at Remarkables Park, Frankton, that would have dual use as an emergency management centre.</li> </ul>
792	<p><b>Dunedin City Council, Mayor Dave Cull</b> Notes change to a regional approach, and supports need to resource this change.</p>
793	<p><b>Disabled Persons Assembly, Chris Ford</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commends ORC on appointment of new personnel. Still to meet with the regional controller, hope to do so when he is able to make time.</li> <li>• Support proposed spend for new public information manager. Would welcome an opportunity to meet the new person to discuss how to make civil defence information and emergency communications more accessible and inclusive for all people. Acknowledge and support the purchase of screen reading technology for the CDEM website.</li> </ul>

796	<p><b>Hessel Van Wieren, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More communication and awareness needed, especially about CD centres and assembly points.</li> <li>• ORC and CODC need to actively communicate details of facilities and support. Example of concern, when the Community Response Plan booklet came out, several members of the leadership of the Presbyterian Church did not know the church was a CD centre. What steps are being taken to support these centres with supplies or access to generators, provision of roof water tanks with purification systems, emergency bedding, heating, food etc.?</li> <li>• Need to get out with well highlighted meetings.</li> </ul>
811	<p><b>Ronene Munroe, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Would pick option 1 on basis that the costs in my district council rates are adjusted down accordingly. It would seem that now paying twice for the same service.</p>
817	<p><b>Loretta Bush, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Rates should be shared out so richer people pay more, so support option 2 for civil defence.</p>

## Rural Water Quality Risk Assessments

Support for risk assessment programme	634
Opposed to risk assessment programme	73

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the risk assessment programme be implemented in at least two catchments in the first year, and that staff go back to council with options for a revised approach, taking into account the concerns and suggestions raised by submitters. The approach should be developed and monitored, working with key stakeholders.

	Submitter comment
7	<b>Terry Drayton, Wanaka</b> Water quality inspection may not be applied to all rural landowners, should be user pays.
30	<b>Ralf Schrubba, Dunedin</b> Apply 'user pays' i.e. an increase in targeted rated for both.
37.	<b>Neil Gaudin</b> The rural community should pay the total cost and there should be no component charged via the general rate.
64	<b>Graeme Furness, Lawrence</b> Rural water users should pay the true cost of water. Town householders do. Reduce dairying. Find industries more suited to the natural environment.
66	<b>Ellen O'Conner, Lawrence</b> Do fees have to increase? Most farmers are struggling already and most are doing their best to keep water clean, if they don't have clean water their animals suffer.
89.	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All farms, lifestyle holdings and residential properties in towns with no reticulated sewer systems should pay for this cost at 25% general rate.</li> <li>Dairy farms and intensive farmed day-stock properties should pay a targeted rate in addition to the general rate.</li> <li>Any farm or enterprise carrying greater stock numbers than a district average stocking rate for a particular soil type should pay a targeted rate in addition to the general rate.</li> </ul>
109	<b>Jeff Munro, Dunedin</b> The water quality scheme we adopted is totally inadequate, it is reactive not pro-active.
133	<b>W J Green, Oamaru</b> Dairying needs control to avoid the problems with effluent. Too many clean water recreational rivers and streams have become too damaged or lost altogether.
203	<b>Nigel Zega, Wanaka</b> It is cheaper to monitor, manage and maintain water quality than to try to recover it.
206	<b>William Chapple, Dunedin</b> This work should be done by DoC and Dept. for Primary Industries.
213	<b>Andrew Davis, Queenstown</b> ORC has to focus on the farms that are most likely to cause problems.

216	<b>Judith Fotheringham, Queenstown</b> Why is Queenstown's portion higher than the rest of Otago as there are no dairy farms in the Wakatipu Basin?
222.	<b>Hillary Hutton, Dunedin</b> Size of land should denote the amount paid. Would like to see them all monitored regularly.
245	<b>Tina Owen, Dunedin</b> Rural water is impacted mainly by dairy farms. Why do people who own 2 hectares, and are nowhere near water or do not farm, have to pay for monitoring. Do rural households pay for monitoring the Tahuna waste treatment plant or Ravensdown? Farmers make a profit and farming responsibly is their job so why should others pay.
246.	<b>Megan Hopper, Queenstown</b> Water quality monitoring and stewardship is the ORC's responsibility, supports us in this endeavour.
247.	<b>Lorna Schmidt, Cromwell</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not chlorinate the water supplies because of poor practices of North Island councils and farmers causing contamination in the North Island water supplies.</li> <li>• Stop the increase in intensive dairy farming and get the ones already doing it to stop expecting to get away with 'crapping up' the planet.</li> <li>• Look up Zeecol Ltd and see how zero impact farming can be undertaken and enforced. Luggate creek is badly polluted and its water and bed has steadily deteriorated in quality since Lake Mackay Station installed boom irrigation.</li> </ul>
251	<b>Delvina Gorton, Arrowtown</b> Need to urgently address water quality issues in the region and take action to improve it. Helping landowners to make changes to protect waterways from their activities through risk assessments and assessing the impact on waterways is a priority, focusing effort where it is needed most through this method is sensible.
253	<b>Ros Goulding, Albert Town</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need long term planning to not allow farm practices that can affect the environment in a massive way. Will be long term water quality reduction from increased irrigation and intensification of dairy farming. ORC to limit the amount of land that can support this type of use, rather than measuring the effects. Long term is about resource allocation within an environment to achieve sustainability.</li> <li>• ORC to fund a feasibility study towards this goal, with a view to reducing the requirement of testing when a problem has occurred or an environment is reduced, e.g., stream at Lauder adversely affected by dairy run off and effluent.</li> <li>• Need some controls by ORC of water quality run off from large scale residential developments due to massive earthmoving, and some controls in massive dust storms that occur from this type of development.</li> </ul>
254	<b>Lisa Ellis, Dunedin</b> This is a serious problem. Glad the ORC is increasing compliance monitoring.
255	<b>P Jackson, Dunedin</b> There should be one warning and then an eye-watering fine for non-compliance.
256	<b>Murray Stewart</b> Greater areas should be monitored closely and more frequently. Practical help is of more benefit and is received with more compliance than impracticable rule-making and being heavy handed.
264	<b>Jeannie Galavazi, Queenstown</b> Every effort possible should be made to preserve our regions excellent water quality, rather than let it degrade like the new Freshwater Standards would allow. As much monitoring as possible should be done on risk dairy farms.



265	<p><b>Tim Davis, Tarras</b> Education and assessments now may save time and money on enforcement actions later. This should only be in the budget for the next 3 years and after that another program organised similar to a risk-based approach in dairying.</p>
283	<p><b>Grant Norbury, Alexandra</b> Why does 25% of general rates covers this and why not 100% to rural landowners?</p>
303	<p><b>Andrew McColm</b> Rural water quality in the rivers needs attention as the whitebait do not want to come up them.</p>
351	<p><b>Peter Ireland, Queenstown</b> Model for charging needs research. Part should be general and part targeted. Locally, the impact on lakes is determined more via environmental practices in catchment areas than local impact. Key beneficiary in lakes area is the Tourism industry.</p>
387	<p><b>Brigid Hill</b> It is quite easy to update farming practice. No effluent should be able to get onto the land. Should look at EU practices. Well managed in Ireland re farmers keeping water clean.</p>
411	<p><b>Olive Martin</b> Why is Queenstown the most expensive? Not many farms here. Government needs to pay tourist costs.</p>
448	<p><b>Jean Hesselin, Oamaru</b> Cropping, horticultural and orchards should be considered for environmental impacts alongside dairy farms.</p>
480	<p><b>N &amp; G Woodrow, Wanaka</b> Should be funded 100% by rural ratepayers through a targeted rate, just like public transport in Dunedin and Queenstown.</p>
513.	<p><b>Ian Turnbull</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The risk assessment process means ORC will help landowners understand and mitigate the effects of their activities. Isn't this the landholders responsibility? Changing land use is creating the pollution.</li> <li>• A risk based approach to dairy farm assessment is in itself risky. Some properties may slip between the cracks. Once an aquifer is polluted, how it is going to be cleaned up? ORC cannot afford to ease up on water quality standards.</li> </ul>
565	<p><b>Margaret Hill, Roxburgh</b> All run-off from farming practices need to stop and when farmers are in breach of regulations, the penalties must be of a nature that will have the problems sorted. Ireland has a very good monitoring system in place for checking the run off into streams. NZ should look into it.</p>
567	<p><b>Craig Douglas, Arrowtown</b> Water quality initiative should be equally focused on urban and semi urban areas as well as rural.</p>
590	<p><b>John Holmes, Dunedin</b> Why use a flat rate charge for a risk-based farm assessment? Surely a farm at high risk of polluting should be charged more than a low risk one. Why they are not charged on capital value?</p>
616	<p><b>Stella Josephs, Oamaru</b> Hope ORC is looking at more environmentally sound targets than the National government are proposing.</p>
619	<p><b>AC Dawson</b> Increase the size to 5 hectares for our targeted rate.</p>

632	<p><b>Andrew Aitken, Glenorchy</b> Measures don't go far enough for dairy farms, which have a catastrophic effect on the environment. ORC to recruit more inspectors and come down hard on these criminals. This must be funded by the farmers and the likes of Fonterra, not ratepayers. The entire cost of minimum flows and deemed permit work must be charged to the dairy farms depending on their stock numbers.</p>
662	<p><b>Doreen Edwards, Balclutha</b> The decline in water quality appears to be related to the increase in intensive farming, especially dairying. Stronger controls need to be undertaken to restore waterways to pre 1960's quality, prior to the advent of widespread use of fertiliser and irrigation.</p>
665	<p><b>Dawn Agnew, Dunedin</b> Dairy farmers should be closely monitored and water quality standards strictly enforced.</p>
666	<p><b>Benjamin Rotto, Queenstown</b> More stringent controls and inspections should be in place with every dairy farm being routinely monitored, as a cost of doing business for dairy farms. More effort is needed to protect our waterways.</p>
669	<p><b>Chris Jacques, Wanaka</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see a clear protection scheme of all freshwater and saltwater systems under ORC's jurisdiction. Have a new regional bylaw including a 100m ban from the edge of any lake, tributary, stream or river of the use of any herbicides, nitrates, phosphates, fertilizers, pesticides (incl 1080) or other possible detrimental substance. The bylaw to state that pet excrement should be removed from within 100m of the edge of any waterway.</li> <li>• We have all seen the rapid degradation of waterways in NZ, particularly in the last 20 years.</li> <li>• Support the notion of infringement fines for all parties (including farmers, roading contractors etc.) who disregard or breach water quality standards or guidelines. Procrastination is expensive and preservation is more cost effective than restoration. You receive a fine for parking too long but not for polluting waterways. This must change to change the culture quickly to preserve what we have and restore what has already been damaged.</li> </ul>
671	<p><b>Roger Williams, Omakau</b> Lifestyle blocks should not pay the same as a farm that is run as a business. Their lifestyle block has no animals, but a lot of trees they have planted. If the funding requirement changed, they may change their opinion.</p>
674	<p><b>Noel Beggs, Queenstown</b> More detail needs to be provided on the impact of non-rural sources on Otago's water quality. The focus needs to reflect the often significant impact of urban activities.</p>
688	<p><b>George McLeod, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planting whole catchments in forest has a risk to stream health. Under farming practices with patches of native bush, the major creek was healthy with koura, frogs etc. Since 90% of the catchment is now planted with radiate pine there is no longer any water in the creek for 5-7 months most normal years. The old water holes are filled with forest debris and open areas have grass growing in the stream bed, no koura or stream life left, in spite of efforts to re-introduce them.</li> <li>• Minor streams in farmland catchments are still healthy in this area as is evidence by a professor from Auckland University sampling them.</li> </ul>
697.	<p><b>Val Goss, Dunedin</b> Should have a risk assessment programme by now. Want to see it put into action, not just assessing. Would change their choice to yes if it means action now. Not sure if the dairy inspection rate is \$478 per visit or per year. It should be per visit if there is no improvement.</p>

721	<p><b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation with key stakeholders and landowners is a very important investment. Visiting each landholder over the next three years will provide an excellent platform upon which a catchment based risk management assessment framework can be developed.</li> <li>• Carrying out assessments in five catchments each year (assuming they will be targeted based on risk), will help determine where additional restrictions and monitoring/compliance is required.</li> </ul>
724	<p><b>Fish &amp; Game, Nigel Paragreen</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Success of 6A important to Fish &amp; Game. Support the environmental risk assessment programme at the property level. Encouraged by planned assistance to help landowners achieve compliance standards.</li> <li>• Opportunity to utilise catchment management groups as supportive community structures to assist meeting 6A compliance. Adequate funding would assist smooth transition to improve water quality.</li> <li>• Support risk based approach to compliance and monitoring. Compliance and enforcement are critical aspects of improving water quality.</li> <li>• Support preliminary consultation of urban water quality plan changes, which complement 6A.</li> </ul>
726	<p><b>Raymond Millar, Wanaka</b></p> <p>Risk based approach – not just for dairy industry, we all need to look at our present actions and change.</p>
729	<p><b>Central Otago District Council</b></p> <p>The economic impact of all water quality proposals and plans must be considered carefully.</p>
738	<p><b>Irene Hawkins</b></p> <p>All farmers need to be monitored without notification, or how do you see the offending. The modern approach for self-regulation does not work as we see in other areas.</p>
743.	<p><b>Nona James, Queenstown</b></p> <p>Support more monitoring of all water quality and especially rural water quality. Intensive monitoring of dairy farms is required to send a clear message of zero tolerance. Support increased monitoring for dairy farms which have been found non-compliant in the past. But all dairy farms should be monitored at least once a year. Fines collected from prosecutions to be used to cover increased monitoring of those farms so the complying farms are not charged a higher rate due to the poor behaviour of other farmers.</p>
752.	<p><b>Sustainable Glenorchy, Trish Fraser</b></p> <p>Consider the Rees, Dart and Greenstone Caples catchments should be included in year one of the Rural water quality catchment study programme to help the head of the lake community gain a better understanding of the health of upper Lake Wakatipu region.</p>
765	<p><b>Oliver Yeoman, Alexandra</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support risk assessment programme but have concerns re the limits of E.Coli, nitrogen and phosphorous. Encourage ORC to set significantly more ambitious limits than those in the National Policy Statement, which are inadequate. Recent reports confirm water management is failing. A compromise between water quality and economic gain is not enough.</li> <li>• Swimability is a poor measure of freshwater health. The wellbeing of other organisms is a far better measure of freshwater ecosystem health.</li> <li>• Term pollute is a vague term, need ambitious limits. Concerned environmental risk assessments will merely inform and add understanding but fall short on enforcing higher standards.</li> <li>• Support the increase in rural water quality targeted rate.</li> <li>• Encourage ORC to be ambitious with its five catchment studies. Ask which catchments will be included (sizes vary significantly). If smaller catchments then extend number. ORC to look at land use and prioritise the study of those catchments most intensively farmed or other high risk industry.</li> </ul>

768	<p><b>Lloyd McCall, Tapanui</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is a commendable initiative targeting education, but will farmers buy into it? Note it requires an 86% increase in the rural water quality rate.</li> <li>• Concerned that by making the risk assessment voluntary, the only farmers to take advantage will be those already proactively making changes. Target group unlikely to invite ORC onto property to do assessment. Prohibited activity rules spotted by ORC are required to be forwarded to the compliance team. What farmer would risk this?</li> <li>• Need a form of regulation, reward or savings for farmers to take up any initiative.</li> <li>• Suggest a base plan for all farm business – would be an amalgamation of all current industry plans. Farm plan delivery should be privatised, removing issue of regulatory compliance and trust issues with ORC. Plan to be realistically achievable, measurable and time bound. Completion of accredited plan to be compulsory or of significant benefit to farmers.</li> <li>• Need to make crystal clear what the likely costs of consents will be if compliance thresholds are not met by 2020.</li> </ul>
770	<p><b>The Pomahaka Water Care Group, Lloyd McCall</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A support and advice based initiative as proposed is a good idea, but have some concerns.</li> <li>• Concerned that by making the risk assessment voluntary, the only farmers to take advantage will be those already proactively making changes. Currently disengaged farmers will remain disengaged. Farmers will be wary of allowing ORC onto their properties, if any possible compliance issues found, ORC are required to forward to the compliance team.</li> <li>• Need a form of reward or savings for farmers to take up any initiative.</li> <li>• As an established catchment group, ORC could better target resources in supporting the group to a greater extent than it currently does through funding.</li> <li>• Development of any environmental initiative should be done with industry groups and proactive farmers. Planned outcomes from assessment to be realistically achievable, measurable and time bound.</li> <li>• Completion of an accredited plan to be compulsory or of significant benefit to farmers.</li> <li>• Need to make crystal clear what the likely costs of consents will be if compliance thresholds are not met by 2020.</li> <li>• Supports targeted rating but increase is almost double the current allocation. On farm, water quality improvement initiatives are already a significant cost, so is unfair to propose such a significant increase.</li> </ul>
771	<p><b>Liz Angelo, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Too much water is used for irrigation and rivers are suffering, this should be limited as should water for dairy farms.</p>
774	<p><b>Department of Conservation, John Roberts</b></p> <p>Supports ORC undertaking catchment studies in five catchments each year, environmental risk assessments and the risk based dairy farm inspections.</p>
775	<p><b>Clutha Community Trust, Hamish Anderson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understand environmental risk assessments will be conducted, not using warrants to allow access to properties. Will be invitation only from property owners. Consultation document fails to mention that any breaches of plan would be referred to the compliance arm, as ORC rules say staff are obligated to do this.</li> <li>• Solution – use third party who are non-threatening and neutral. ORC do kitchen table exercise to establish risk, educate farmers on what water plan rules mean, and how at risk they are on their properties.</li> <li>• Water plan has potential to be the best in the country, provided farmers buy into it.</li> </ul>

782	<p><b>Federated Farmers, David Cooper</b> Support a targeted rate for new activities proposed, but consider a greater general rate contribution is warranted.</p> <p>Supports proposed environmental risk assessment (ERA) programme, but consider a refined approach trialling the programme in key catchments is warranted in the short term. Ideally include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A pilot ERA on three established catchments with specific, identified issues, and existing engagement with ORC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kakanui catchment</li> <li>• Pomahaka catchment</li> <li>• Central Otago (established voluntary catchment group).</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. A refined ERA approach working through these established catchment groups, as primary point of contact.</li> <li>3. Greater clarity around potential compliance implications e.g., 2 week amnesty on minor non-compliance issues, staff engagement through land relationship team rather than compliance team, and/ or clarity around processes ORC staff will use.</li> <li>4. Farm and catchment specific information attained is managed by and held by the catchment group rather than ORC.</li> <li>5. A clear protocol for support or follow up post each ERA is developed with each catchment group.</li> </ol> <p>Remains a need for ongoing effort from council to develop additional farmer facing information and extension programmes to assist farmers meeting the requirements of the water plan.</p>
788	<p><b>Ken McGraw, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matter of significance to all residents in Otago. Risk assessment planned will provide landowners with valuable tools to identify and put in place management programmes to address risk.</li> <li>• Support move to risk based dairy farm inspection regime.</li> <li>• As an urban resident demanding water quality water, feel a level of responsibility in sharing some costs. But not able to agree to a general rate contribution to what is essentially an on farm responsibility.</li> </ul>
790	<p><b>Remarkables Park, Shotover Park, Queenstown Park, Brian Fitzpatrick</b> RPL owns a 2,000 ha high country station, in which considerable investment has been made to improve farming returns. Also seeking to develop new long term tourist activities on the site. Accept concept of a targeted rate for rural properties to cover water quality issues, but the proposed rates for Queenstown are 37% higher than the average rates for same valued rural properties in four other districts. Insufficient justification is provided for the disparity and rates for the Queenstown Lakes rural properties should be brought into line.</p> <p>Disparity further compounded by the huge difference in values of properties. The services provided to rural landowners are not related to the value of the land, so inequitable to relate rates or charges to rural land values.</p>
795	<p><b>Waitaki Irrigators Collective Ltd, Elizabeth Soal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sector has been requesting ORC to turn its attention to implementation issues relating to consenting, compliance, monitoring, and enforcement. ORC has assured it will establish both an implementation group involving a cross section of interests, and an implementation protocol. Yet to see these, but heartened that ORC is turning its mind to implementation, and specifically the risk assessment programme.</li> <li>• Have some concerns around the framing and proposed delivery of this programme. Understand the proposal to be that farmers from anywhere across the region can volunteer to have an assessment undertaken. Could mean only one or a handful or even no farmers in certain areas or catchments might volunteer to participate.</li> <li>• Programme based on one off visit, with little or no follow-up. Real risk that resources put into the assessment will be wasted if no further engagement.</li> <li>• Unclear how the assessments will assist council in monitoring progress to reaching water quality goals. No clear link between monitoring and catchment study programmes.</li> <li>• Staff have repeatedly advised it is not their role to provide advice to landholders on action to be taken to ensure compliance, and this should be provided by external industry advisors. Agree is a role for external advisers but council should not absolve itself of this role. Council has been unable to say what its own approach will be to breaches of limits, so it is difficult for industry bodies to be able to provide advice on</li> </ul>

	<p>such matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme will be constrained if there is a lack of trust between landholder and staff undertaking the assessment. Trust will not happen through a one-time farm visit.</li> <li>• Concerned about proposal to provide a subject grading to each farm assessed. A farmer receiving a low grade with little follow up could be put off undertaking improvements to improve the grade, as issues may seem overwhelming or complex to easily and affordably address.</li> <li>• Due to water plan rules, there are farms not captured by Schedule 16, as do not have measurable discharges. Unclear how the risk assessment will meet their needs, or of those who may not be meeting the leaching thresholds modelled by OVERSEER.</li> <li>• Question if one year is long enough for the catchment studies. May be more effective to study fewer catchments over longer time.</li> <li>• Understand staff undertaking assessments will be split between the community liaison and compliance teams. Won't be effective or efficient. Split would make team approach more difficult and may undermine the trust needed to make the programme effective.</li> <li>• Concerned at level of rate increase required to fund the work. There are less staff now "on the ground" supporting farmers than use to have. Why rates increase needed to fill roles that once already existed?</li> <li>• Ask ORC to modify programme to better align with catchment studies. Recommend ORC takes proposed resources to undertake more intensive assessment, extension, outreach and education in specific catchments where water quality outcomes not being met. Targeting these "hot spots" is a better investment.</li> <li>• Assessment should be one step in an ongoing change process owned by ORC. On farm changes can be monitored over time and linked to changes in water quality.</li> <li>• Staff undertaking assessments should not be warranted, and work to develop long term relationships with the farming community.</li> </ul>
796	<p><b>Hessel Van Wieren, Cromwell</b>  Cannot support the programme because Government has allowed a problem to develop with land use, it will bow down to putting a price on water. The premise used is water is free. It is not free, as of no value unless you can capture it and reticulate it.</p>
799	<p><b>NZ Landcare Trust, Craig Simpson</b>  Support the risk assessment programme, and is a positive step to enhancing our water resources. Notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having a voluntary assessment is unlikely to get uptake from landowners. Need some impetus, e.g., financial to get higher uptake.</li> <li>• Little clarity on how assessments will operate and degree of follow-up support offered.</li> <li>• Little information on how data will be gathered and what will happen to the data.</li> </ul> <p>Suggested amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue as a desk top exercise, and inform landowners of outcome. Do this by charging a fee, or alternatively rates relief, i.e., make compelling for landowners to reduce their risk.</li> <li>• Monetary relief or additional charge based on if landowners have joined a catchment group, developed a farm environment plan, done water quality testing.</li> <li>• Would encourage farmers to use current industry tools, e.g., SMPs and LEPs, rather than replicating those already in place.</li> <li>• Part of proposed rate increase could go towards supporting catchment groups, and may not need to be so high.</li> <li>• Follow up to assessments to be undertaken by ORC with industry bodies and catchment groups.</li> </ul>
809	<p><b>Bruce McKinlay, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2020 is too long to be completed, should be completed by 2010 (?)</li> <li>• What else does the water management reserve fund? Not enough information to decide.</li> </ul>

816	<p><b>Dairy NZ, Shaun Burkett</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive that ORC now turned focus to the implementation of plan change 6A. For on farm change to occur, resource users must have clarity from the regulatory authority what is required of them.</li> <li>• Support the increase in resourcing. Direct regional council contact with farmers in an education and advisory role is key driver to engaging the sector.</li> <li>• Supportive of developing in greater detail a consenting pathway for those farms not meeting the permitted activity thresholds.</li> <li>• Have concerns about the risk assessments. Proposal lacks sufficient detail to confidently add value to farmers making positive change.</li> <li>• 6,500 farms over three years is huge ask, and will require resources in excess of the current community liaison team. Assume take 6 – 8 hours per property, then 9 further FTE will be needed. Based on one off visit. One visit with no other feedback other than grade and report will be of little benefit to landowners or environment. Visit will be wasted if no follow up to see if actions put in place to address any issues.</li> <li>• If dairy farmer requires help following visit, concerned there is no confirmed mechanism for assistance. Council may presume support will come from likes of Dairy NZ, but it is a “one to many” organisation.</li> <li>• Key element of programme is the assessments are voluntary, so only farmers agreeing to assessments will get one. Certain catchments – will be very little or no farms volunteer. No efficient use of council resources.</li> <li>• Farmers may not be keen to volunteer if they know they may get into trouble from a compliance perspective. Any assessment should not be a compliance check against the provisions of the plan. If non-compliance found during a visit, farmer should be given sufficient time to correct farming operation without threat of immediate enforcement action. This would be aided by visit from a community liaison team, not warranted compliance officers.</li> <li>• Another issue is grading of farm visit. Unsure of context of grade, as will have no regulation backing. Consider developing criteria for assessing a farm, where grade is fully understood by the farmer.</li> <li>• Need staff to know provisions of plan, and understand farming systems in Otago, and suitably trained. Putting new, inexperienced and untrained staff in this position will not lead to improved relationships.</li> <li>• Dairy NZ is uncertain how council will manage information gathered. Some may be commercially sensitive but remain on file and be publicly available. ORC to address this issue in development of the programme.</li> <li>• Alternative approach to run pilot study for 12-18 months focused on current “hot spot” catchments where water quality outcomes are not being met. Programme performance and impact can then be assessed. Suggest targeted catchments be located in South Otago and North Otago. Existing Kakanui science project could be linked in to.</li> <li>• Recommend establishment of a reference group for the development of the programme, involving council, Dairy NZ, Beef &amp; Lamb NZ, Federated Farmers and others.</li> <li>• Council to consider the development of a process to address non-compliance issues from any assessment visit, given the voluntary intent of the programme.</li> </ul>
822	<p><b>Barbara Guthrie, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Rural water quality and dairy monitoring critical for NZ.</p>

## Dairy Inspections

Support for risk based approach	649
Opposed to risk based approach	49

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the risk based approach to undertaking dairy inspections be adopted, and that the dairy rate be \$478 as consulted on.

	Submitter comment
1.	<b>Trustpower Ltd, Tauranga</b> The approach proposed is a suitable and efficient way to manage dairy farm compliance inspections.
24	<b>Verona Cournane, Arrowtown</b> Intensive dairy farming is the greatest risk to the quality of rural water. Poor water quality affects the life of the people who live near it and use it for recreation as well as the natural life that lives within it.
25	<b>Norma Crooks, Oamaru</b> This is hugely significant for future generations. Is far behind what should already be in place considering the damage done to our waterways. Hopes that rigorous inspection and compliance is achievable, and soon.
26.	<b>Jenny Aimers, Dunedin</b> Stop dairy farm expansion in sensitive areas.
57	<b>Ruth McIntyre, Dunedin</b> Why should lifestyle block that are not a dairy farm or GST registered pay for inspections when dairy farms that are a business can claim back the fee? Object to lifestyle blocks being included.
85	<b>Emily Tidey, Dunedin</b> There should be more monitoring. Don't reduce below annually with risk-based approach, increase for the high-risk farms.
111	<b>Ursula Davis, Queenstown</b> Farmers should pay for their own monitoring.
132	<b>Andrew Davis, Queenstown</b> Farmers should pay for own monitoring of farms.
143	<b>Ashely Kendrick, Dunedin</b> Agrees with more inspections for high-risk areas, but have yearly instead of every two years for low-risk areas as may result in a decline in low risk area's quality.
145	<b>C Smith, Dunedin</b> 2 to 3 visits per year at \$478 a visit when compliance does not occur - off to court - charges \$1,000 - \$15,000. This doesn't cover visits or court costs. Why is the penalty not higher? Too many dairy farms.
151	<b>Bart Wendlegelst, Dunedin</b> Should be user pays and pay per visit. ORC to grade farms e.g. A, B, C etc. and charge accordingly.
425	<b>Ian Stewart, Alexandra</b> Tighten up the control and permitting dairy farms in our area. This activity is affecting our rivers and must be controlled more vigilantly.



445	<p><b>Alan Pickard, Omakau</b> Some farms are a big problem. Set up a scheme that rates dairy farms into classes 1, 2 or 3. Class 1 would have no issues over one year, class 3 would require continual monitoring, the cost of which would be passed on to the farm.</p>
448	<p><b>Jean Hesselin, Oamaru</b> The risk based assessment to include information such as soil types, where water comes from, what vulnerability it has to additional N, whether there is a P load etc.</p>
492	<p><b>M Hess, Oturehua</b> Make yearly visits to check water quality compulsory. Needs to happen to all dairy farmers regularly. Lots of them over fertilisate(?)</p>
573	<p><b>Marie Marshall, Balclutha</b> Inspection fee to be kept at \$325 per dairy farm. The ones that are most at risk should be charged another \$325 for each extra visit made. Why are the farms that have invested money and effort into having good effluent practices made to pay for the ones that have not made the effort?</p>
650	<p><b>Jillian Hodgson</b> All farms should be checked and depending on the compliance levels then the period or re-checking would be determined based on the results.</p>
698	<p><b>Brian Hawkins</b> Supports the options given as cost probably inhibits a full/more comprehensive approach. The fee (\$478) seems very low for those farmers who are a problem. Have a regime where different fees exist for good/poor farmers to create an incentive for being compliant.  Any regime is only as good as the enforcement put in. Look at ECAN to see the effect of a solely 'education' approach, not an enforcement /education approach i.e. all the lowland rivers in Canterbury are degraded to just about the point of non-repair e.g. Selwyn.</p>
702	<p><b>Rob Adair, Dunedin</b> More inspections. Non-compliance should be enforced with prosecutions.</p>
722	<p><b>Victoria Bonham, Alexandra</b> Dairy farms should be rated according to size and risk, good practice should not be penalised because of irresponsible and reckless.</p>
730	<p><b>Ian Bryant, Dunedin</b> Need to know the criteria to be applied in "assessing risk" to comment.</p>
765	<p><b>Oliver Yeoman, Alexandra</b> Support risk based approach but have some concerns. High risk must receive at least 3 visits a year, but concerned low risk farms may get one visits every 2 years. Why only targeting dairy farms? Should investigate what other land uses might be having detrimental impacts and should be receiving regular inspections.</p>
768	<p><b>Lloyd McCall</b> Agree with risk based assessment, but should be complemented with a risk based payment system – users pays. All pay for one visit, additional visits charged to individual farmers.</p>
770	<p><b>Pomahaka Water Care Group, Lloyd McCall</b> Agree with risk based assessment, but should be complemented with a risk based payment system – users pays. All pay for one visit, additional visits charged to individual farmers.</p>

775	<p><b>Clutha Community Trust, Hamish Anderson</b></p> <p>Raising charge for inspections is inequitable. Property with low risk inspection 2 yearly will pay \$956 per visit, where high risk property with 6 visits over 2 years will pay \$159 per visit. Costs should be on per visit basis.</p> <p>Visits should be on operator risk, not soil type or topography, but infrastructure risk.</p>
-----	--

## Minimum flows – accelerated programme of work

Support for this work  
Opposed to this work

638  
76

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the accelerated programme of work to set minimum flows be adopted, as consulted on.

	Submitter comment
24.	<p><b>Verona Cournane, Arrowtown</b> To suck a river or stream dry is wrong. Farmers need clear and enforceable requirements. Their financial budgets including stocking, need to be based on the reality of how much water they are permitted to access, according to seasonal and climatic realities.</p>
25.	<p><b>Norma Crooks, Oamaru</b> Is concerned that minimum water flows will mean 'minimum' and maximum will be 'maximum' and questions if this is the best we can expect in the future.</p>
95	<p><b>Murray Bell, Alexandra</b> There has not been enough work done to quantify minimum flows in the Manuherikia river with the information that was put out to the public. Accelerating this programme of work by ORC would not be representative to ORC rate payers and water users.</p>
129	<p><b>Hawkes family, Ranfurly</b> Need to take our time determining minimum river flows. Understand ORC is not taking into account historic dry river beds from the 1800's onwards, because don't have scientific proof. More listening is required and reading old text books.</p>
204	<p><b>Central Otago Environmental Society, Brian Turner</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Central Otago the Manuherikia and rivers and streams are greatly valued recreationally and ecologically. But many suffer from over allocation resulting in dewatering in many reaches.</li> <li>• A lot of what is termed 'progress' and 'development' has resulted in degradation, destruction, or depletion.</li> <li>• Minimum flows at Ophir and elsewhere are insufficient.</li> <li>• Society is at a point where a high percentage of people see land and water as commodities belonging to us, rather than 'a community to which we belong'.</li> <li>• We need to be able to look after our lands and water and people and other species properly, but we are falling short. 'We don't inherit the world from our parents; we borrow it from our children'.</li> </ul>
222.	<p><b>Hillary Hutton</b> Would like to know what gets dropped before making a decision.</p>
237	<p><b>Laura Morrison, Dunedin</b> ORC to maintain water quality measurement criteria/standard rather than follow the national changes.</p>
265.	<p><b>Tim Davis, Tarras</b> Unsure how much of the science work has been completed on catchments that haven't yet commenced but this work shouldn't be rushed to meet a deadline. The hard catchments are still to be done. Don't think the process is working too well given what is/has happened on the Lindis catchment.</p>
411	<p><b>Olive Martin</b> Reduce rate if self-sufficient, rain tank, man-made pond/lake. Government to pay tourist costs.</p>

466	<p><b>Andrew Lonsie, Dunedin</b> In setting minimum flows and water take allocations for irrigation, ecological, recreational and cultural values must take precedent. Takes must be set at environmentally sustainable levels for the next several hundred years.</p>
474	<p><b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> Lack of information, but plenty of space on the page. How many ratepayers affected by this? How much money is in the water management reserve? Where is this fund invested?</p>
513.	<p><b>Ian Turnbull, Wanaka</b> The problem with conflicting water use has been looming for years. Work to determine minimum flows should have been accelerated years ago. The work should be largely funded by those who profit from using the water (the permit holders), rather than just from reserves which are there for all ratepayers.</p>
563	<p><b>Gerry Eckhoff, Alexandra</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum flow levels cannot be set with community agreement when Section 32 reports are not available, to balance environmental needs with social, historical, cultural needs of the various water user groups. When is a Sec 32 report to be available to the public that is credible?</li> <li>• Wrong to suggest as Fish &amp; Game do, that brown and rainbow trout have a very small impact on native fish and eel stocks. Low summer flows can greatly assist the survival of indigenous fish stock which are increasingly threatened by introduced species like brown trout. ORC seen as increasingly accepting Fish &amp; Game opinion as final word.</li> <li>• Note ORC staff member stated at Insight programme that “she hoped the outcome would have a significant effect in restoring the natural character of the rivers and hopefully seeing water under the bridge”. This is proof ORC has a predetermined position on flow levels in the water short area of Central Otago. Is also a matter for duly elected councillors’ deliberations. No chance 2021 will be met without a significant shift in council attitude and human resources being applied to this.</li> </ul>
565.	<p><b>Margaret Hill, Roxburgh</b> For the health of streams to be maintained, water must flow at all times. How often is the Lindis River dry at the bridge?</p>
602	<p><b>P &amp; M Hore, Wedderburn</b> Supports this where rivers do not already have minimum flows at strategic points with residual flows set in the community, to manage minimum flows and the need to allow farming to continue.</p>
613	<p><b>Bruce Lambie, Dunedin</b> Minimum flows need to be sorted out as soon as possible. Rivers like the Lindis River lower reaches have too little flow to support life.</p>
617.	<p><b>N H Smith, Cromwell</b> Need to get involved with minimum flows of water on all rivers.</p>
647	<p><b>John Lister, Cromwell</b> Minimum flows should be determined before any new or extended irrigation schemes are considered.</p>
650.	<p><b>Jillian Hodgson</b> Need to collect all the relevant factual information so that decisions can be soundly made.</p>

657.	<p><b>Gordon Stewart</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have grave concerns about the effects of the ORC minimum flow regime on local farmers and those down the valley sourcing water from springs fed by ground irrigation above them. For years, Bannockburn Valley has been irrigated from four water races bringing water into the catchment from the Nevis and Bannockburn Creek. Minimum flows in Bannockburn Creek will halt this and subsequent down-stream irrigation from Shepherds Creek will be seriously affected.</li> <li>• Turning the valley brown and reducing production during a dry summer so that Bannockburn Creek can flow is of advantage to no-one and nothing except perhaps trout. Eliminating willow along the banks would increase water flows significantly.</li> <li>• The rules being applied to the Lindis make no sense. Ceasing irrigation in the Tarras area will mean that the homes dependent on shallow bores for domestic water run the real risk of having their supply terminated through lack of run-off.</li> <li>• For 80 plus years the Lindis often had no flow crossing the bridge on SH8, and affected no-one. Creating flows may eliminate farming as it exists in Ardgour Valley. The benefits of maintaining flows are minimal and in no way balance up with the loss.</li> </ul>
669.	<p><b>Chris Jacques, Wanaka</b> Increase the minimum levels to allow for nature (e.g. a very dry summer), and decrease the chance of toxic algae phormidium occurring and creating potential health threats to animals, humans and fish and birds, who are potential spreaders of algae.</p>
671.	<p><b>Roger Williams, Omakau</b> Minimum flows are a massively important issue to their area. The social and economic effects from setting the minimum flows too high should not be underestimated. Need to find agreement from all parties on an acceptable flow and need resolution to move forward.</p>
675	<p><b>Patricia Vanderburg, Karitane</b> Supports the accelerated programme to determine minimum flows only if it allows adequate staff and robust community consultation and ensure a precautionary approach in setting flows.</p>
678	<p><b>Malcolm Moore, Alexandra</b> Do not support excessive setting of minimum flows. The minority users should not dictate minimum flows.</p>
698.	<p><b>Brian Hawkins</b> Central Otago is not conducive to intensive farming (particularly dairying). Important to ensure the environment is not degraded any further. Farming interests have also started to mount a campaign against this. Farmer's performance to date has been abysmal. If they have to de-intensify then so be it. How is the industry so special in comparison to tourism etc.?</p>
721.	<p><b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b> Given the importance of water for drinking water supplies and contact recreation, support any activity that improves supply security and quality. Effective allocation of water resources has the potential to do both; therefore, support any programme that accelerates the potential to mitigate risks to public health.</p>
728	<p><b>Jonathan Rowe, Omakau</b> Concerned there is some very miss-leading information being used to inform the public.</p>
729.	<p><b>Central Otago District Council</b> The hasty determination of minimum flows in the Central Otago District is of crucial importance so that irrigators know what level of take may be available following the expiry of deemed permits.</p>
739	<p><b>Murray Neilson, Dunedin</b> This programme needs greater funding and more extensive research than currently planned. See NZFWSS submission on this.</p>

747	<p><b>Reid Gare, Alexandra</b> Farming feeds the country and the world. Irrigation run off supplements low summer natural flows and has done so on the Manuherikia scheme for around 100 years. Trout and willows are introduced species. It is believed that the Manuherikia has run dry naturally pre-irrigation extraction. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.</p>
748	<p><b>Pauleen Gare, Alexandra</b> Before irrigation in Central Otago, some rivers ran dry. The Manuherikia River used to be puddles in a dry year before irrigation. Irrigation has enhanced natural flow. Concerned about erosion of property values if irrigation quota is reduced and the cost of having to put in place an efficient irrigation system. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.</p>
749	<p><b>Joel Vanderburg, Karitane</b> Must assure adequate staff to oversee. It requires serious community consultation. A precautionary approach must be used in setting minimum flows.</p>
761	<p><b>Coralie Reid, Alexandra</b> The importance of getting this right is paramount. Over the years have watched the Manuherikia's flow dwindle. Know it must be managed for the good of all.</p>
763	<p><b>Richard Anderson, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shepherds (Bannockburn area) would not exist for any irrigation, or at all, if it wasn't for the water takes out of the upper reaches of the Bannockburn, and the Carrick Water Scheme coming through Duffers Saddle, plus the flood irrigation from these schemes.</li> <li>• Bannockburn Stream is now home for hundreds of willow trees, so how can ORC even suggest a minimum flow in this situation?</li> </ul>
765.	<p><b>Oliver Yeoman, Alexandra</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support an accelerated programme, but must be rigorous and ambitious minimum flow requirements set. Maintain ecosystems and natural character – maintain is unambitious and insufficient. Many waterways are degraded, need to do more than maintain, need to restore and improve.</li> <li>• Concerned with ORC encouraging water management groups – those with economic interests will be over represented, those with ecological concerns, under represented. ORC must manage to ensure ecological bottom lines are met.</li> </ul>
774.	<p><b>Department of Conservation, John Roberts</b> Supports accelerating the minimum flow setting programme.</p>
782.	<p><b>Federated Farmers, David Cooper</b> Supports proposal to accelerate the minimum flow setting programme, and fund associated costs through the water management reserve.</p>
796.	<p><b>Hessel Van Wieren, Cromwell</b> This is not about water but land use intensification. Overall allocation of water would not happen if we had a regime of identifying land use maximums. Land and water are a limited sustainable resource.</p>
798	<p><b>Norm Bennetts, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All rivers need minimum flows capable of maintaining the health of the river and all forms of life. Taking water out of our rivers should be stopped.</li> <li>• Stop sewerage from townships being put into our rivers.</li> </ul>
800	<p><b>Blackstone Hill Ltd, Ralph Hore</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support an accelerated programme to determine minimum flows.</li> <li>• ORC and Manuherikia catchment water users to work together to establish minimum flows, and undertake water security and economic analysis.</li> <li>• Understand the significance of the 820 LPS Environment Court minimum flow ruling at Ophir. Permit expiry and environment court ruling are cornerstones of water use in the Manuherikia catchment. To consider that the Ophir minimum flow should change is wrong.</li> </ul>

## Deemed permit transition work from Water Management Reserve

Support for this work  
Opposed to this work

540  
91

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the deemed water permit transition work be funded from the Water Management Reserve.

	Submitter comment
1.	<b>Trustpower Limited, Tauranga</b> As a deemed permit holder, Trustpower would appreciate the opportunity to be consulted in the development of minimum flows.
6	<b>Bales Elliot, Middlemarch</b> Existing deemed permits are an obstruction to fair water allocation so best to deal with quickly.
30.	<b>Ralf Schrubba, Dunedin</b> Apply 'user pays' i.e. increase the targeted rate from those who use water not personally but commercially.
37.	<b>Neil Gaudin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current consents expire in 2021. Users can fund their own alternatives prior to this date.</li> <li>• All water takes should be reduced until every little stream or river is really swimmable year round.</li> </ul>
89.	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All water rights still held when due for renewal that are within the command area where there is an alternative community irrigation scheme (e.g. NOIC), should have their water take rights substantially reduced when renewed and then the natural water right slowly phased out over the next twenty years.</li> <li>• Funding of the deemed water use permit transition work should be paid by the individuals who hold the water rights.</li> </ul>
255.	<b>P Jackson, Dunedin</b> Permits granted at times of low populations need to be reviewed periodically. Should build in a time frame for the next renewal, maybe 10 years.
256.	<b>Murray Stewart, Alexandra</b> The quicker a problem can be assessed, a practicable solution achieved and accepted by all parties involved, the quicker we can move on and see the benefit to all, and the water users have clear guide lines to work with.
537	<b>Bridget Allen</b> Deemed permit renewal should not come out of general rates. Why aren't the people who are building massive irrigation systems being targeted to resolve water issues.
702	<b>Rob Adair, Dunedin</b> Gold mine water takes, once expired, should not be issued for farming, especially the Lindis catchment.
722.	<b>Victoria Bonham, Alexandra</b> As district councillor and Vincent community board member, been following transition closely, attended drop in's, workshops, and listened to ORC talk at council. Have asked many questions in writing, requested meetings and information, but heard nothing. Disappointed in the lack of communication on this, and shared by others on various boards. Such important decisions cannot be made without transparency, sharing knowledge, and discussion.

730	<b>Ian Bryant, Dunedin</b> There should be a targeted rate component to fund this activity.
731	<b>J Ledgerwood</b> There should not be a reserve for minimum flows work.
738.	<b>Irene Hawkins</b> This should be a cost to the farms etc. that use it. Ratepayers do not have an endless supply of funds but are expected to pay for everything. User pays, and then they will use it more efficiently.
743.	<b>Nona James, Queenstown</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost of this work should be a targeted rate charged to the permit holders. User pays is the most equitable method for allocating costs as this work benefits those deriving an income from the water use. It is completely untenable to fund this work through general rates.</li> <li>• The inequitable allocation of cost is particularly alarming for a Queenstown ratepayer who pays a much larger and unfair burden of the general rates.</li> </ul>
754	<b>Earnsclough Irrigation Ltd, Tony Lepper</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The economic wellbeing of Central Otago will be determined by the outcome of the renewal of deemed permits. The need for minimum flows on all rivers and streams should have been established by now so that planning for the future can take place in a timely and sensible manner. When setting these flows an economic impact analysis needs to be completed.</li> <li>• Residents are more interested in the multimillion dollar investment that relies on water than they are in some utopian view that 100 years ago the stream looked different to the way it does today.</li> </ul>
765	<b>Oliver Yeoman, Alexandra</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned using the water management reserve will leave it with very little left. Interested to know what is included in “tagged for use for community water management purposes”. What was the original intent of the fund? With other community water management issues be neglected if dip into this fund? Should this work not be funded from individual permit holders applying for resource consents?</li> <li>• Advised infrastructure built under deemed permits has inadvertently had the positive impact of protecting many native fish species. If infrastructure is removed in process of landowners transitioning to resource consents, our freshwater species will be at risk of predation. Must have plan to manage this transition.</li> </ul>
778	<b>Billie Marsh, Tarras</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2021 not far away, and long process to get to this stage. Local farmers have engaged ORC in an obstructive and hostile dialogue at every consultation, and stance will never change. Funding to encourage water management is a good idea, but not convinced all water users groups could work together. Some permit holders have not accepted changed and will battle ORC to the bitter end.</li> <li>• Public opinion has woken up to the fact that water quality is under severe threat, and needs to be protected. ORC will be harshly criticized if rivers are allowed to be pumped dry for irrigation and our water degraded.</li> </ul>
784	<b>S C Yeoman, Dunedin</b> Use of reserve should only be in part, as will be significant private benefit when new permits are issued.
788	<b>Ken McGraw, Cromwell</b> Replacement of deemed water use permits will at last provide an opportunity for ORC to correctly and sustainably manage water use for agricultural benefit. Concur with view that irrigators need certainty on how much water is available for use. Anticipate some will be disappointed. View flood irrigation as wasteful, and in some cases an unintentional contributor of on farm nutrients flushed into waterways.
790.	<b>Remarkables Park, Shotover Park &amp; Queenstown Park, Brian Fitzpatrick</b> Not opposed to using part of the water management reserve to assist permit holders make the transition to new resource consents. However, the same level of assistance needs to be provided to other landowners seeking resource consents to irrigate rural properties during this period.



## Queenstown public transport

Support increase in subsidy of public transport 457  
 Oppose increase in subsidy of public transport 202

Support extending rating area to include Jacks Point 489  
 Oppose extending rating area to include Jacks Point 152

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the increased subsidy for public transport in the Wakatipu Basin be adopted, and that the special rating area be extended to include Jacks Point.

	Submitter comment
6.	<b>Bales Elliot, Middlemarch</b> The current situation with airport traffic resembles Auckland rush hour and will support a subsidy if this helps.
16	<b>Marielle Craighead, Alexandra</b> People living in the Wakatipu basin should be paying for their transport, given submitter has to pay for her own.
23	<b>Barbara Weavers, Dunedin</b> Public transport should be subsidised to the greatest possible extent.
24.	<b>Verona Cournane, Arrowtown</b> ORC has failed to take the bus routes into the two new major retail precincts in the %- Mile (?) area. Depend on bus transport to access these locations for essential products. Cannot locate the same or similar retailers in other locations and it is extremely unsafe to negotiate the nearby main highway to enter these precincts.
30.	<b>Ralf Schruba, Dunedin</b> There is not enough information provided to make an informed decision.
87	<b>Debbie Healy, Queenstown</b> Need to ensure the bus route in Fernhill which goes along Sainsbury Road is maintained for the College Hall of Residence and Novotel Hotel. The new bus route doesn't include Sainsbury road in Fernhill, Queenstown.
83.	<b>Peter Fitzgibbon, Dunedin</b> Would like to see it become self-supporting.
89.	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> ORC should not be involved in any public transport services at all, this should be provided by private companies, it should not be a cost to ORC ratepayers.
91.	<b>Neki Patel, Queenstown</b> The transport plan is flawed and still needs to be discussed. What is being supported - crap old buses. Have no ferry, electric buses or buses that run every hour in winter.
101	<b>Malcolm Pollits, Alexandra</b> Re Jacks Point, has any study has been done to check the viability and relevance.
117	<b>Kris Vermeir, Queenstown</b> ORC is not subsidising public transport enough in the Wakatipu.
143.	<b>Ashley Kendrick, Dunedin</b> This could be possible in future years but not yet. Should search for other possibilities first.

206.	<b>William Chapple, Dunedin</b> This work is for Queenstown District Council to do.
208	<b>Blake Holden, Arrowtown</b> Queenstown has been allowed to sprawl without good planning. With the nature of business (being tourist support and very little 9-5 workers), public transport will only work for a small minority.
210	<b>Peter Hill, Queenstown</b> Supports the improved traffic options as the benefits of the improved Kawarau bridge and road behind the airport will be short-lived due to population growth.
224	<b>Mike Wright, Queenstown</b> Use smaller or more fuel/cost efficient busses, improve the quality of the bus shelters and have better routes e.g. include Goldfield Heights Road in the route proposals.
246.	<b>Megan Hopper, Queenstown</b> Supports subsidising public transport in the Wakatipu. Should include water based transport, not just land based as there is not congestion in the water. Support a bus to Jacks Point but only if it is viable.
251.	<b>Delvina Gorton, Arrowtown</b> Supports proposals to create demand for public transport and a shift in behaviour away from the reliance on cars. Cost, reliability and accessibility are key determinants of public transport use and this change is helping to achieve this.
255.	<b>P Jackson</b> A good bus service is about more than reducing inner-city congestion, they encourage people to get out and make friends which is vital with ageing populations.
256.	<b>Murray Stewart, Alexandra</b> Have witnessed massive increases in transport congestion. Improving public transport so it becomes more practical, affordable and the preferred form of transport is beneficial to all visitors and residents.
260	<b>Gabrielle Marsh, Queenstown</b> Direct bus routes from Lake Hayes estate and Jacks Point should be considered at rush hours rather than buses all going through the Frankton hub, as this would encourage more patrons to use them.
264.	<b>Jeannie Galavazi, Queenstown</b> More than \$600,000 should be allocated to public transport, as traffic, congestion and associated parking is at critical levels affecting quality of life and tourist experience. Public transport needs to be very cheap and frequent. Support transport to Jacks Point, but have trial first to determine requirements.
269	<b>Craig Allan, Queenstown</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs should fall where the benefit arises and not be further subsidised by ratepayers.</li> <li>• Supports initial subsidisation of the buses to establish a market presence but the user should now pay.</li> <li>• Does not support a capital rating based cost as there is no relationship between access to bus services and the value of property. If a fee must exist, it should be a minimum flat rate across all rateable properties with the majority of the cost being paid directly by the user.</li> <li>• Have to budget for family's annual transport costs, so strongly disagree with funding the subsidisation of public transport for others going forward.</li> <li>• The route for the said services does not pass by their property. Unlike a community service such as library services, this proposal is not a social cost they are prepared to pay.</li> </ul>
329	<b>Lisandra Macaes, Queenstown</b> Review the transport subsidy after 1-2 years as an increased volume may pay for all costs and/or very low use may reduce the service frequency.

332	<b>Cleone Blomfield, Queenstown</b> Subsidised public transport to get reduced car use is a must do.
333	<b>James Penwell, Queenstown</b> For subsidies for public transport in the Wakatipu. Will be an expensive failure, as it has been before.
343	<b>Brian Erickson, Queenstown</b> Transport should be user pays. Do not agree to subsidy on our rates.
350	<b>Michelle Kitchen, Queenstown</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsidy to include free transport to any large public event, e.g. winter festival, New Year's eve fireworks.</li> <li>• See more fit for purpose type of coach used. Large oversize buses do not fit will with narrow street.</li> <li>• A fit for purpose bus introduced for the Airport route that has internal luggage carrying facilities.</li> </ul>
351.	<b>Peter Ireland, Queenstown</b> If service one area, then service all areas so agree with Jacks Point. The increased service is ill conceived as substantial growth in tourism vehicles is major issue. They will not get buses around town while using cars to get to diverse areas outside Queenstown. Residents being asked to give up convenience and time via a much less direct transport medium to solve a road problem driven by inadequate investment.
361	<b>Ian Eckford, Queenstown</b> The increased subsidy for public transport should instead be spent on double-laning the Grant Road/airport roads to alleviate congestion. Support research into public transport alternatives.
362	<b>Greg Eaden</b> Ratepayers shouldn't subsidise public transport, it should be user pays.
364	<b>Mark Spence</b> QLDC and NZ government should pay for public transport in the Wakatipu.
393	<b>Hunter Leece, Queenstown</b> It is unfair to rate areas that do not have access to the proposed bus service e.g. bus stops within feasible access or park and ride options. The subsidy should be paid by those that have access to the network.
411	<b>Olive Martin</b> Government must pay tourist costs, as this is for both residents and visitors.
448	<b>Jean Hesselin, Oamaru</b> Public transport to be left up to private business, as won't be used by the wealthy. Workers, tourists etc., should be catered for by private businesses. Other places, e.g., Oamaru, need public transport first.
451	<b>P Taylor, Garston</b> If Wakatipu wants public transport, it pays, not people in Kingston etc.
452	<b>Kevin Thomason, Wanaka</b> Voted no re Jacks Point, because don't believe it will be sufficiently patronised.
489	<b>Cath Gilmour, Queenstown</b> Needs to be frequent enough to use, with decent connections from the hub. Currently, from Kelvin Peninsula, the schedule and Frankton connections are so inadequate that submitter never uses it. Would be keen to use if it didn't take an hour plus each way.
496	<b>Chris Hurley, Wanaka</b> Proposal benefits Wakatipu community and visitors, including those from other parts of Otago. Consider a 10% general rates contribution.

503	<p><b>G Brishn, Queenstown</b> Eventually would support extending transport to Jacks Point, but until Jacks Point/Headly Downs grows to have a significant population, suggest hold in the meantime. At present, most inhabitants have cars that do not add significantly to traffic congestion.</p>
509.	<p><b>Jon Mitchell, Wellington</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support more engaged and strategic approach taken, but does not go far enough. The amount allocated is inadequate and too broadly targeted in its funding.</li> <li>• A “Lakes Central Otago Strategic Public Transport Fund” of at least \$2 million would be more meaningful and better meet the rapidly expanding needs of the district. The fund could be applied subsidising commercial public bus services, and to part funding carpooling, enhanced bus stops and other strategic initiatives in partnership with QLDC and CODC in the next few years.</li> <li>• Waiting for next year and beyond to engage with and part-fund the pace of response to increasing congestion in the Queenstown Lake area is conservative and gives the impression that ORC is following rather than leading in this crucial regional council responsibility.</li> </ul>
513.	<p><b>Ian Turnbull, Wanaka</b> Supports the initiative taken with increasing the investment in public transport. A similar need has arisen in the Upper Clutha - linking Wanaka, Luggate and Hawea. ORC needs to be putting funds aside to address this issue now and not in a 10-year time frame.</p>
515	<p><b>Peter Pont, Wanaka</b> Is used by many non-ratepayers. Rate payers should not be subsidising tourists or businesses.</p>
535	<p><b>Heather Thorne, Wanaka</b> Why the ORC is involved in public transport? Why can't ORC be innovative and look at public transport in Wanaka also?</p>
566	<p><b>Maisey Chan, Queenstown</b> Assume Jacks Points residents are required to pay rates to ORC and QLDC.</p>
567.	<p><b>Craig Douglas, Arrowtown</b> Probably too soon to extend to Jacks Point. Maybe should wait until Hanley's Farm is being populated.</p>
575	<p><b>Greg Dorn, Queenstown</b> Need to have more parking in central Queenstown not less. Should have increased public transport and increased parking options.</p>
600	<p><b>Lewis Anderson, Auckland</b> Public transport in Queenstown is very important for the tourist industry. Should look at supplying an airport bus to Dunedin airport.</p>
606.	<p><b>Helen Jack, Dunedin</b> Good to trial a cheaper bus service in Queenstown to hopefully ease congestion there.</p>
648.	<p><b>Lynne Stewart, Clyde</b> Public transport should be run by a transport company and not the Regional Council.</p>
650.	<p><b>Jillian Hodgson</b> All areas and suburbs in the catchment should be treated fairly.</p>
657	<p><b>Gordon Stewart, Cromwell</b> Why is ORC spending money on public transport in Queenstown? This is a Wakatipu problem. The population there should be funding the buses.</p>

666.	<b>Benjamin Rotto, Queenstown</b> Public transport is the way of the future. Should look around the world to see how far behind we are. Further use of public transport has a positive effect on our environment and less wear and tear on our roading infrastructure.
671.	<b>Roger Williams, Omakau</b> Traffic jams in Queenstown are a joke. Simple solution, have no cars into Queenstown unless you live there or are serving housing or businesses. Car parks at Frankton and a shuttle train or bus into town.
682.	<b>Roy Roker, Dunedin</b> The subsidy of buses in Queenstown should be a trial period only to see if it would be supported.
697.	<b>Val Goss, Dunedin</b> Was in the area recently and it was a nightmare on the roads and with parking. Public transport should alleviate some of the problems experienced.
698.	<b>Brian Hawkins</b> As ORC will not fund or assist transport (apart from limited mobility assistance) in the region outside of Dunedin and Queenstown, will not support either option. If a more equitable/fair approach was adopted, then view would alter considerably.
700	<b>Frankton Community Association</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome proposal including extending to Jacks Point. Expect it to be fully supported by ORC during implementation and operation, and a permanent part of the LTP with adequate levels of funding.</li> <li>• Disappointing implementation of a GoCard \$2 fare is not included in Section 14.3 of Annual plan document. Also note deceptive question in consultation document “do you support the increased subsidy of public transport in the Wakatipu Basin?” What existing subsidy? ORC worst performing regional council in encouraging public transport.</li> <li>• Performance target of 8% patronage growth is insufficient. Current unsubsidised system is underutilised considerably. Target lacks ORC vision, grasp of growth, and resulting limited fund allocation. Target should be minimum of 15%, and a further target of limiting traffic movement growth to less than 1%.</li> <li>• Funding statement has no allocated funding for any capital works to meet additional demand, terminals, bus shelters, ticketing systems etc. Note the \$1.3 million surplus for transport – this is a lazy balance sheet and there is far greater scope and availability of funds to invest further with QLDC public transport matters.</li> </ul>
721.	<b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed improvements should serve to reduce vehicle emissions and increase physical activity in the area.</li> <li>• Physical activity is associated with many positive health outcomes for individuals, including reducing the risk of obesity.</li> <li>• Extending support to the Jack’s Point area will be beneficial as subsidised fees will enable the community to access service in Queenstown/Frankton more easily. Extending the area will ensure that people will utilise these subsidised services and reduce traffic congestion and associated pollution. Suggest Hadley Downs be included because it will contribute to future proofing for intended growth of the area.</li> </ul>
722.	<b>Victoria Bonham</b> Bus service mostly used by tourists and students, not locals. People living in Jacks Point likely to be higher socio economic area, and would choose their own transport methods. Future planning best served by linking towns.
733.	<b>Ronald Cunningham, Alexandra</b> Should be decided by the people of the area concerned, as they should be paying for it, not anyone else.
737.	<b>Queenstown Lakes District Council, Mayor Jim Boulton</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports ORC contribution of \$600,000 towards matching contribution by QLDC (subject to consultation), and NZTA funding.</li> <li>• ORC needs to join with QLDC in some innovative thinking beyond a standard metro fix, i.e., bus transport. Unique environment calls for unique solutions, e.g., ferries.</li> <li>• A risk adverse or process bound response carries risk of impugning the reputation of the district and</li> </ul>

	<p>experience of ORC ratepayers, residents, and visitors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A second stream of work will also be required in the Wanaka area.</li> <li>• Critical for ORC and QLDC to work together to ensure proposed transport solutions in both annual plans be implemented as soon as possible. Would like a discussion on implementation within the next two months.</li> <li>• Ask matter becomes an ORC delivery priority, particularly given the additional risk component of \$300,000, in addition to \$600,000 that QLDC has put to the project. Project must succeed; need to get on with it.</li> </ul>
743.	<p><b>Nona James, Queenstown</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support the subsidy of public transport in the Wakatipu Basin, but cannot support the proposed funding model.</li> <li>• Queenstown ratepayers pay towards the Dunedin stadium when it has no benefit to the Queenstown area, yet other areas in Otago which benefit from Queenstown's tourism hub are not expected to reciprocate and assist with funding to address the congestion on all the roads in the Wakatipu.</li> <li>• Tourism in Queenstown is the driving force behind the congested roads, from rental vehicles and the increased number of workers that must be accommodated to service the growing tourism industry. It is time for someone beside the poor ratepayers in Queenstown to start putting some funding in to address the problems caused by tourism.</li> <li>• Public transport that is supposed to solve our road congestion problems is to be funded entirely by Wakatipu ratepayers, albeit thinly disguised by splitting the rate increase between ORC and QLDC. If so, then do not support the proposal. Let the National government build the roads needed to accommodate the tourism increase they are promoting.</li> </ul>
746	<p><b>Bill &amp; Kirsty Sharpe, Queenstown</b> Improvements in bus services most welcome.</p>
757	<p><b>Heidi Ross, Queenstown</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If people can afford to live in Jacks Point, then they won't need public transport, Arrowtown would be better served.</li> <li>• Public transport is not the answer to the traffic congestion. Stop building until the infrastructure can catch up.</li> </ul>
766	<p><b>Barbara Blatt, Wanaka</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More to be attributed to this issue, and ORC to also support the Upper Clutha basin. Public transport is needed now in and around Wanaka, to avoid being in the same situation as Queenstown is today.</li> <li>• Public transport isn't the only way to help with traffic, roading and parking issues. Solutions such as car-pooling, park and ride (bikes), and commuting on foot or by bicycles should be, by appropriate infrastructures and communication campaigns.</li> </ul>
771.	<p><b>Liz Angelo, Dunedin</b> Support any increase in public transport. A pity the subsidy was not implemented in Dunedin, but good luck to Queenstown. Like the local council input to public transport.</p>
782.	<p><b>Federated Farmers, David Cooper</b> Support use of targeted rate for this activity.</p>

790.	<p><b>Remarkables Park, Shotover Park, Queenstown Park, Brian Fitzpatrick</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully supports new routes, more regular series and much reduced fares to encourage use of public transport.</li> <li>ORC has made an incorrect assumption about the proportion of jobs based in the CBD. At 2012 approx. 55% of jobs were in the CBD, but significant changes since then, with growth in jobs in Frankton, and new development of businesses, new school due to open etc. Estimate that over half the jobs are already at Frankton. Must take into account when designing the bus routes, so sufficient services provided to allow Frankton workers to commute.</li> <li>To cater for workers at Shotover Park and businesses along Glenda Drive, some Route 2 services at early morning and late afternoon should travel to the Frankton depot via Glenda Drive and the Eastern Arterial Road.</li> <li>A shorter turning route at Remarkables Park would better serve the new high school, three new hotels and the Remarkables Park Town Centre (an amendment to Route 1).</li> <li>ORC should also commence investigations into subsidising a public transport ferry service on Lake Wakatipu and the Kawarau River.</li> </ul>
793	<p><b>Disabled Persons Assembly, Chris Ford</b></p> <p>Commend ORC for including accessibility requirements as part of future service specs for contractors. All buses should be super low floor, wheelchair user friendly, and have sufficient internal lighting and audio announcements for vision impaired and other users.</p>
796	<p><b>Hessel Van Wieren, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't support piece meal minor solutions. QLDC's own making allowing development to outpace its long term infrastructure planning.</li> <li>Create other transport corridors, e.g., fast ferry from airport end into Queenstown wharf, light rail from Frankton to Queenstown. All expensive but use alternative funding solutions like Reserve Bank Credit at nil interest.</li> </ul>
801	<p><b>CCS Disability Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the \$2 bus fare proposal and provision of services to Jacks Point.</li> <li>To ensure greatest benefit gained from improvements, ORC to work closely with QLDC to ensure associated infrastructure (bus stops, footpaths etc.) are accessible. Failure to do this will mean a significant part of the community will be excluded from using public transport.</li> <li>Total mobility is only method for may disabled in the Wakatipu. A return journey from Arrowtown to Frankton shopping centre using a mobility taxi is around \$105 (after subsidy). Bus return fare is \$15. Current price of travel is a significant barrier. Price difference with \$2 fare will allow low income earners and disabled people choices to move around the community, seek employment as could afford to travel.</li> <li>Ask that ORC consults with the disabled community and access professionals to ensure accurate information regarding access requirements is gathered. Systematically measure access needs by undertaking technical street audits and pedestrian street audits.</li> </ul>

## Queenstown office

Option 1, establish an office in 2017/18

327

Option 2, delay proposal until the next LTP

356

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that office space be leased in the 2017/18 year, to provide for 1 – 2 fulltime staff, along with “hot desks” for those staff needing to travel to Queenstown from time to time. It is further recommended that the office would not be located in the Central Business District, but in a more accessible are of Queenstown.

	Submitter comment
5	<b>Guy Hughes, Queenstown</b> The district has been hopelessly under protected by the current regime. Our lakes are a disgrace. Need ORC Councillors there locally to do the work that has not been done remotely.
7.	<b>Terry Drayton, Wanaka</b> Why does the office have to be in Queenstown, why can we not choose to have the office in Wanaka?
24.	<b>Verona Cournane, Arrowtown</b> Office to be sited outside of the Queenstown CBD, and in one of the outlying retail precincts (but not Terrace Junction), as this will make it easily accessible to the local ratepayer.
28	<b>Melissa Hinves, Arrowtown</b> Should delay the build of the Queenstown office and use the finances to tackle the wilding pine issue.
83.	<b>Peter Fitzgibbon, Dunedin</b> Could be shared with someone, the same as Alexandra.
85.	<b>Emily Tidey, Dunedin</b> The costs could be worked out better and prepared for than rushing into it right now. How many people are expected to need a counter and could online access be improved?
87.	<b>Debbie Healy, Queenstown</b> Definite oversight not retaining our presence in Queenstown.
89.	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open the office in Queenstown but all costs to administer should be a targeted rate on all properties in Queenstown Lakes district only.</li> <li>Close the Oamaru office and work with either the WDC or another service provider such as NOIC, and share office facilities and personnel.</li> </ul>
213.	<b>Andrew Davis, Queenstown</b> It is important to have a presence in Queenstown given its significance to Otago.
253	<b>Ros Goulding , Albert Town</b> More sensible to open an office in central area like Cromwell so Wanaka people can access it. Difficult to access in Queenstown. Cheaper rents in Cromwell would be more economical.
260.	<b>Gabrielle Marsh, Queenstown</b> It is important that as Queenstown’s growth soars, ORC should be represented physically, especially so they can work with QLDC and other key stakeholders within the district.



264	<b>Jeannie Galavazi, Queenstown</b> More monitoring of consents, waterways and impact of development needs to happen as soon as possible.
265.	<b>Tim Davis, Tarras</b> Is this really necessary given that most processes can be done online or by phone and its only 30 mins from Cromwell for staff to travel to the area. Could this be a shared service instead with QLDC?
316	<b>Annette Gillies, Milton</b> If we open an office in Queenstown, how are staff going to manage the very high costs of accommodation?
351	<b>Peter Ireland, Queenstown</b> One office in Cromwell should be able to serve whole area.
361	<b>Ian Eckford, Queenstown</b> Do not support a new Queenstown office.
390	<b>Fiona Lawson, Queenstown</b> With Queenstown growing it is important to have a delegate in Queenstown as really need help with infrastructure.
422	<b>Morley Williams, Cromwell</b> Why does the office have to be in Queenstown and not Cromwell, it has more space and would be cheaper.
437	<b>John Hesketh, Dunedin</b> Why open an office in Queenstown when Central Otago business could be centralised in Cromwell. Save money allowing staff to live in cheaper area, and cut travelling expenses.
453	<b>Colleen Topping, Wanaka</b> No real costs supplied for opening an office. In 12 years, never visited office, not convinced change is needed.
474	<b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> Complete lack of information. How many staff need space? Why Queenstown? How much will it cost?
497	<b>Roger Gardiner, Wanaka</b> Support an office in Queenstown, or alternative to have it in Wanaka.
506	<b>E Simpson, Queenstown</b> Could the office be part of the QLDC offices?
509.	<b>Jon Mitchell, Wellington</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORC has to immediately re-establish its presence in the Queenstown area to attempt to restore the credibility it lost when it unilaterally closed its office there.</li> <li>• ORC should look to partner with QLDC and central government agencies to establish a local and central government precinct in Frankton Flats in the next few years. A joint feasibility study should be in the 2017-18 annual plan. \$100,000 would demonstrate ORC's commitment and leadership for a more collaborative and efficient approach to government services.</li> </ul>
513.	<b>Ian Turnbull, Wanaka</b> The sooner ORC has an effective and visible presence in the Queenstown Lakes district the better. Issues such as wilding pine control and water quality are becoming severe and ORC must be seen to be actually doing something on the ground and not just making plans. If the Queenstown office is large enough, it could hopefully ease the pressure on the Dunedin premises.

531	<b>Anon</b> Queenstown is a rat race, keep right out of it. Stop wasting rate payer money. New bridge is an example. Need people with common sense, not high flyers. Better get the second bridge downstream underway.
535.	<b>Heather Thorne, Wanaka</b> Supports if it means the Central Lakes area gets better service and attention from the ORC.
563	<b>Gerry Eckhoff, Alexandra</b> In nine years on council, received no requests to visit, or phone calls re the lakes district. Need for separate office not shown to have any value to the area, and is merely a political tactic during election time. If to be additional staff, would be more sensible to base staff in Cromwell or Alexandra, so as to service Wanaka as well.
567.	<b>Craig Douglas, Arrowtown</b> Queenstown office requirements may change if the LTP alters the spread of offices across the region.
583	<b>Geoff Gardyne, Dunedin</b> Should not establish a new office but instead share an office with QLDC, similar to what is shared in Alexandra.
603	<b>Bruce Hebbard, Wanaka</b> Move all staff that deal with rural/farming issues to this office so they are in touch with issues on a daily basis. It is closer to the action in Central Otago and only slightly further to North and South Otago than Dunedin. This may save the need for a new building in Dunedin.
605	<b>Gillian Hopkins, Queenstown</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not have closed the last office as this is our fastest growing region with multiple issues. Need to have people who live and work locally, who are aware of what is occurring in the region, and who are impacted by ORC decisions, so they can feedback to Dunedin what is needed, and the best way ORC can help.</li> <li>• Long overdue that ORC has more of a presence and commitment in Queenstown. Establishing an office will be a good start. If unable to get office space, at least have people working and based in the area that are mobile and can get out to see people.</li> <li>• Don't let the lack of office space hold up the process. Start small. Build it up. Don't try and recruit a big team and build an office first as will struggle to do this in this market. Share office space or let people work remotely. Get it up and running as soon as possible. ORC has a reputation of being disinterested and not invested in the area, and for being slow with making decisions and implementing things.</li> </ul>
634	<b>Queenstown Grey Power</b> The previous office should never have been closed. Support a new office ASAP.
647.	<b>John Lister, Cromwell</b> Do not put a new office Queenstown but put it in Cromwell instead. It will cost much less and cover the area just as well.
650.	<b>Jillian Hodgson</b> The sooner the better, but if comes at the cost of the bus subsidy, then hold off until the later time frame.
651.	<b>Christine Ryan, Arrowtown</b> As the hotspot of growth, ORC should absolutely have a representative in Queenstown.
656	<b>GW &amp; JM Morris, Alexandra</b> Given housing costs and availability of housing in the Wakatipu area, an extension to the office in Alexandra makes more sense. Consider staffing as no doubt more would be required. Use common sense.

657.	<b>Gordon Stewart, Cromwell</b> Why need an office in Queenstown? Have water, air quality and pests become a major issue in that district all of a sudden? ORC already has a staffed depot in Cromwell.
675.	<b>Patricia Vanderburg, Karitane</b> This will hopefully take the pressure off the staff in Dunedin to better serve Dunedin area residents.
680	<b>BR &amp; JL Lietze, Alexandra</b> Establishing an office in Central Otago would be more central in Cromwell and cheaper for office space and accommodation, leading to lower rates.
682	<b>Roy Roker, Dunedin</b> One office in Central Otago, either in Alexandra or Cromwell should be sufficient, why add extra overheads.
697.	<b>Val Goss, Dunedin</b> Not enough information, but buildings are expensive. Could some arrangement be made to share an office with QLDC? This would give a presence of ORC onsite in Queenstown and by then the LTP could have some definite proposals with costing presented.
699	<b>Nicholas Bollen, Dunedin</b> Queenstown ratepayers are better placed than most to pay extra to fund this office. To look for a way of doing this.
700.	<b>Frankton Community Association</b> Supports establishing an office in the 2017/18 year. Prudent to collaborate with QLDC to see if sharing of facilities could be arranged in the future for the benefit of both organisations.
715	<b>Myles Lind, Queenstown</b> Must give serious consideration to co-sharing office space with QLDC. A separate office is inefficient and will result in confusion for customers. Please share an office with QLDC.
721.	<b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b> Given the increased population, the environmental needs and a need to service the new urban transport arrangements effectively, support the establishment of a new office as soon as practicable.
722	<b>Victoria Bonham, Alexandra</b> More urgent issues that warrant spending. Non urgent projects should not have priority. Tax payer squeezed enough.
726	<b>Raymond Millar, Wanaka</b> New office for what?
727	<b>Megan Williams, Wanaka</b> Why should a new office be based in Queenstown. Should consult with the community to establish where it will best be located. Suggests Cromwell or Wanaka, by adding onto current facilities. Agree to more presence and activity in Central Otago.
730	<b>Ian Bryant, Dunedin</b> Do not support this, should be located in Cromwell, better location to service whole area, and cheaper to establish and run.
731	<b>J Ledgerwood</b> If going to open an office in Queenstown, open it in Frankton and not 'downtown' Queenstown, cheaper rent and more convenient.

733	<b>Ronald Cunningham, Alexandra</b> Loaded option, if agree to either then agreement to an office being opened. Does not agree with opening an office.
737.	<b>Queenstown Lakes District Council, Mayor Jim Boulton</b> Support this in principle, but would like to be further engaged on this proposal.
743.	<b>Nona James, Queenstown</b> Why are Queenstown ratepayers (who already pay an unfair share of general rates due to higher capital values), provided a lesser level of service than those communities that are being subsidised by general rates collected from Queenstown.
746.	<b>Bill &amp; Kirsty Sharpe</b> The previous office should never have been closed. Establish new office asap.
749.	<b>Joel Vanderburg, Karitane</b> This must not affect the number of staff in the Dunedin office, allowing the Dunedin staff to concentrate on local Dunedin issues.
752.	<b>Sustainable Glenorchy, Trish Fraser</b> Support the establishment of an office in Queenstown
771.	<b>Liz Angelo, Dunedin</b> Don't need more offices, less travelling and to use skype.
778.	<b>Billie Marsh, Tarras</b> Definitely needed in Queenstown, the growth is phenomenal.
782.	<b>Federated Farmers, David Cooper</b> Can find no information on the potential cost. Given current distribution of offices and fast growing nature of Queenstown, support leasing an office and assessing level of service after a short time.
788.	<b>Ken McGraw, Cromwell</b> Undertake an assessment of the existing shared customer arrangement with CODC against Queenstown and Cromwell as potentially better location options.
790.	<b>Remarkables Park, Shotover Park, Queenstown Park, Brian Fitzpatrick</b> Agree with proposal to re-establish an office. If ORC wants the community to have better access to it, then note that Frankton / Remarkables Park is more central than the CBD. Resident community does not live in Queenstown Bay but a number of pods, e.g., Arrowtown, Lake Hayes Estate etc. that adjoin or surround Frankton. Should have office in place that reduces rather than compounds vehicle congestion on Frankton Road, and reduces demand for CBD car parking.
815	<b>S &amp; L Robinson, Dunedin</b> Would have been more informative to have costings for establishing a Queenstown office, to help make decision.

## Lower Waitaki River Scheme

Option 1, 10% of scheme cost paid for as part of the general rate	334
Option 2, leave all costs as 100% targeted rate to the scheme	305

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the revenue policy for the Lower Waitaki River Control Scheme be amended to fund 10% of the costs from general rates, in line with the recommendations from the Castalia review.

	Submitter comment
89.	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> Central government should be providing some funding towards this as it is protecting NZ's natural assets.
474	<b>Jim Moffit, Palmerston</b> Trade off between ORC and ECan is pure voodoo. Who did the external review? How much did it cost? What benefits does the scheme provide beyond the targeted rating area?
509.	<b>Jon Mitchell, Wellington</b> It is only reasonable that the wider benefits to the region derived from the scheme be funded from the rest of the region. This approach should apply to functions and assets elsewhere in the region, as appropriate.
567.	<b>Craig Douglas, Arrowtown</b> Highways are funded by TNZ, railway and transmission lines are assets of private enterprises so not sure the argument stands up.
606.	<b>Helen Jack, Dunedin</b> This is a similar approach taken by Environment Canterbury. It is appropriate to have some of the scheme funded from general rates given the protection it gives to other assets.
702	<b>Rob Adair, Dunedin</b> Land user pays. Make sure farmers are not encroaching on the river bed, as it has been reported.
721.	<b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b> While this is more likely to affect ratepayers in the Lower Waitaki area, there is a high probability of benefits for the whole region and therefore a portion should be allocated from general rates.
743.	<b>Nona James, Queenstown</b> Funding work that specifically benefits those in the Lower Waitaki through a general rate levied on CV is preposterous given the high capital values in Queenstown unfairly allocate a proportionately larger general rate cost per household to those already struggling to make ends meet in an unaffordable market.
782.	<b>Federated Farmers, David Cooper</b> Support option 1 with 10% general rates funding.
788.	<b>Ken McGraw, Cromwell</b> As can't identify similar transfers to any other scheme in Otago, confused as to why such a concession should be considered. Until better understand this request, cannot support.
795.	<b>Waitaki Irrigators Collective Ltd, Elizabeth Soal</b> Appropriate that Meridian continues to fund a substantial portion of the scheme, and important that the river management scheme continues to be funded to a sufficient level to ensure benefits of the river and scheme can be enjoyed by the whole community. Support the change to the current rating split, so part is funded through general rates.

## Lake Snow

Support for this work  
Opposed to this work

654  
64

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the contribution of \$100,000 to research on lake snow be provided for as proposed in the consultation document.

	Submitter comment
89	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> Comments that control costs should be paid for only by those in Queenstown Lakes district as a targeted rate with 10% general rate only, comments that the Lower Waitaki situation is similar.
91.	<b>Neki Patel, Queenstown</b> Not enough being spent on rock snot.
96	<b>Biggs Family, Queenstown</b> ORC does not understand the need to act now regarding lake snow.
159	<b>S Conland &amp; R Miller, Wanaka</b> Current estimates by academics and researchers place the cost of lake snow at 5 times the amount suggested by the ORC.
209	<b>Darren Ballantine, Cromwell</b> The term Lake Snow is very soft and forgiving. It should be called a weed, that way it clearly identifies it as an issue that needs dealt with.
251.	<b>Delvina Gorton, Arrowtown</b> The response to this has been too slow and inadequate for its seriousness. Support more investment and action in understanding and controlling it.
374	<b>Yvonne Roberts, Oamaru</b> If lake snow is a biosecurity issue, shouldn't it get biosecurity funding? What about ERMA?
474	<b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> Why not contract out the research? Is there any government funding?
513.	<b>Ian Turnbull, Wanaka</b> Lake snow and other issues of water quality - Lake Hayes especially - have been raised by locals for years but with little results. The causes and solutions to lake eutrophication are well known and the longer the delay in addressing these issues, the costlier it becomes to alleviate the problem, action now not just strategies please.
546	<b>P &amp; R Hellebrekers</b> Need to spend more than \$100,000 for lake snow.
606.	<b>Helen Jack, Dunedin</b> Good to see progress on the lake snow issue.
634.	<b>Queenstown Grey Power</b> \$100,000 not enough for research, should be doubled. There are reports of lake snow blocking washing machine filters. QLDC has paid for water filters to be unblocked in council water supplies. This is an urgent matter.

697.	<b>Val Goss, Dunedin</b> Opposes because other areas have the research. Want to see an action plan.
700	<b>Frankton Community Association</b> \$100,000 insufficient given high profile that Lake Wanaka, Wakatipu and Hawea have to the tourist industry. Funding to be set aside to investigate, with QLDC, a low cost, fit for purpose, pre-treatment filters to obviate any large capital expenditure QLDC would have to make to screen lake snow from potable water supply, while research is being conducted. Consider funding to contribute to post graduate research at University of Otago.
721.	<b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b> Have had evidence to suggest that lake snow has been affecting the efficacy of domestic water treatment systems in the Queenstown-Lakes district.
722.	<b>Victoria Bonham, Alexandra</b> Understand that weed and algae compete, remove weed creates opportunity for algae. All for cleaning up waterways, by encouraging restoration to own ecosystem, by removing pollutants, chemical run off and sprays.
724	<b>Fish &amp; Game, Nigel Paragreen</b> Supports funding for Lake Snow research.
729.	<b>Central Otago District Council</b> CODC is very concerned with the level of lake snow in nearby lakes. Trusts the funding allocated is adequate. Ensuring that lake snow is prevented from becoming a problem is vitally important.
745	<b>Friends of Lake Hayes Soc., Richard Bowman</b> Given high level of concern about water quality in Lakes Wanaka, Hawea, Wakatipu, Hayes and others, surprised only \$100,000 provided for research. This is only one issue, and not the wider issues of water quality. Would like to see plan amended to give greater recognition to water quality issues in the Southern Lakes.
746.	<b>Bill &amp; Kirsty Sharpe</b> Urgent action needed to deal with this. Firstly adequate research to identify the problem, then action to get rid of it. Would like to see more finance allocated to this.
750.	<b>Guardians of Lake Hawea, Alison Brown</b> Welcome the investment, but difficult to assess the size when no dollar value on staff time or how much assigned to Lake Hawea.
774.	<b>Department of Conservation, John Roberts</b> Supports ORC increasing the resourcing required to deliver lake snow research work.
781	<b>Upper Clutha Water Group, Megan Williams</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group is various agencies and groups concerned with waterways. Has formulated a strategic plan.</li> <li>• Small commitment of \$100,000 to research the problem is very concerning. QLDC and community have invested hugely to manage this issued in domestic water supplies for almost a decade. Scale of investment is unacceptable. Submit that ORC work with QLDC and the community to produce a solution based plan.</li> <li>• Submit that ORC offset an increase and solution based fund for work from considerable reserves (\$13m). Note have two river management reserves for Wanaka and Wakatipu, may be appropriate to use these.</li> </ul>
786	<b>Duncan &amp; Lynne Kean, Dunedin</b> Research and removal needs to be paramount before rivers and lakes become clogged.
788.	<b>Ken McGraw</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is undesirable pest, not unlike didymo. Despite enormous amount of funds for research for didymo, nothing changed. Support research that provides a direct benefit to lake users, and not just for the sake of research.</li> <li>• Like to see focused research maximising use of limited funds, to be centred on Lake Hawea, which is the most concentrated location, but with impacts identical to Queenstown and Wanaka.</li> </ul>

## Lake Restoration Scoping Work

Support for this work	661
Opposed to this work	61

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the lake restoration scoping work be undertaken as proposed in the consultation document.

	Submitter comment
75	<b>James Cutler, Lowburn</b> Would like the Lowburn Inlet restored. The weed is so bad, will not be long before boats and swimming is impossible.
89.	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> This should be paid for by the communities who benefit from the restoration.
132	<b>Andrew Davis, Queenstown</b> More funds to be allocated to improve water quality in Lake Hayes.
257	<b>Gwynnedd Somerville, Dunedin</b> The proposal for this is too vague. Tomahawk lagoon seems just right with plenty of bird life etc. Asks what we actually have in mind.
281	<b>David Hastie, Milton</b> Why is Lake Waihola not in our restoration plan as it has become an oversized effluent pond? Used to fish and swim in it but now cannot take grandchildren or dog to it. This is all due to mismanagement of land use with dairy and intensive farming draining the surrounding swamp. Stop the slaughter of our land.
414	<b>Philip Merchant, Dunedin</b> Lakes and rivers are in a dreadful state. Don't want them to end up like the Selwyn in Canterbury.
621	<b>Deborah Dixon, Alexandra</b> Concerned that ORC is not committed to doing anything but continual testing of our at-risk lakes, such as Lakes Dunstan and Hayes. Too little has been done for too long. A real commitment is required now.
634.	<b>Queenstown Grey Power</b> Applaud the scoping work proposed but ask that resources be allocated to improvement of the quality of Lake Hayes. The problem has been identified for decades and remedial work is required.
669.	<b>Chris Jacques, Wanaka</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suspend all use of diaquat (or other herbicides) in Lakes Wanaka, Dunstan and Wakatipu. Allow a resting period of 3 years for Lake Wanaka to recover. May then be able to ascertain whether the sludge suffocating plant and ecosystems has not been caused by the slow release gel Diaquat capsules.</li> <li>• Suggests a new bylaw to include a 100m ban from the edge of any lake, tributary, stream or river the use of herbicides, nitrates, phosphates, fertilizers, pesticides (incl 1080) or other possible detrimental substance. The bylaw to state that pet excrement should be removed from within 100m of the edge of any waterway.</li> <li>• Would be happy to give any consultants a tour if requested. Have seen green algae at Boundary Creek Beach disappear in a two-week period and have also seen different pockets of the lake degrade very quickly and fish life disappear because the ecosystem beneath is no longer healthy. Clogging of people's filters is the least of the worries. Look at creating a storm water management programme, so that storm water and its contaminants are piped away, managed and utilised like bio-solids.</li> <li>• The plan needs to consider future projected growth in the region as more growth creates more hydrocarbons, more roading, more pets, more heavy metals and more contaminants. Lake Wanaka is</li> </ul>



	<p>already in a very compromised position which naturally will compromise all downstream of it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests a UV filtration system for Lake Wanaka similar to the very effective filter currently in Lake Hawea.</li> </ul>
697	<p><b>Val Goss, Dunedin</b></p> <p>There are too many talk fests - ORC presenting action plans. Communities don't need to meet to set a vision, they want healthy clean lakes so involve them in practical ways with ORC to achieve this.</p>
700	<p><b>Frankton Community Association</b></p> <p>Funding allocation is insufficient, lake restoration is \$90,000 over 3 water bodies so \$30,000 for Lake Hayes? Article in ODT in April 17 suggested immediate effective restoration option for Lake Hayes would cost no more than \$250,000. Time for scoping has long past. Need immediate rectification with funds made available now.</p>
701.	<p><b>Otago Peninsula Community Board</b></p> <p>Appreciate clearing of Tomahawk Lagoon channel during heavy rain in 2017. ORC has done excellent work in informing and consulting the community re the Algal Bloom issue. In the 2015 floods, the lagoon caused damage to the community hall, costing \$120,000 to repair. Request the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate management of the weir that controls water levels in the lagoon complex.</li> <li>• Development of a public management plan that provides opportunities for the community and council to work together.</li> <li>• Revegetation of riparian edges to promote wider biodiversity and recreation gain.</li> <li>• Continued programme of monitoring, reporting and liaison that informs the community of the health of the lagoon.</li> </ul>
722	<p><b>Victoria Bonham, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Family lived at Lake Hayes for 40 years. Slowly watched it deteriorate, accelerated by the development of the walking track. Contributing factors are pollution of contributories from golf course pesticide run off, fertiliser, chemical sprays, live enzymes used for snow making, human excrement and rubbish around the water edge, and over allocation of water for residential areas and new subdivisions. Sort out the contributing issues, and won't have a problem.</p>
726	<p><b>Raymond Millar, Wanaka</b></p> <p>Would be interested in working with a group on lake restoration.</p>
727.	<p><b>Megan Williams, Wanaka</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Money for lake restoration work is woefully inadequate with lake snow one of the obvious issues the lakes are facing. By the time the impacts become obvious, the actions required to return a lake to a 'healthier' state are expensive and will have negative impacts on the community.</li> <li>• Successful management is facilitated with community engagement, alongside regulators and scientists. The community wants to be proactive and develop and implement a water management plan. ORC should be a key lead in this with substantial investment.</li> </ul>
737.	<p><b>Queenstown Lakes District Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan appears to contain \$30,000 towards a vision and action plan to restore the quality of Lake Hayes, and \$100,000 for Lake Snow, which is seriously impacting Lakes Wanaka, Wakatipu and Hawea.</li> <li>• Disappointed in the limited approach being proposed the research the problem. Is concerning to community and QLDC who have been investing hundreds of thousands of dollars to manage this issue. Now facing prospect of investing millions for filtration equipment. ORC investment has been widely criticised, QLDC shares concern.</li> <li>• Ask ORC to work with QLDC to produce a solution based plan. QLD ratepayers facing largest ORC rate increase, so not suggesting funding this through rates.</li> <li>• Submit that ORC offset an increase and solution based fund from reserves (\$13 m). Note ORC holds two river management reserves for Wakatipu and Wanaka (\$1.2 million – page 80 of annual plan). May be appropriate to use this.</li> <li>• Alternative funding option may be to reconsider allocation of the special dividend \$3m over next 2 years, or ability to dispose of assets as proposed in change to Significance and Engagement policy.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request funding for Lake Hayes to be increased to \$200,000 (solution already understood) to fix problem permanently. Is a straight forward fix.</li> <li>Concerned that reduced targeted rate for river management in Wakatipu from \$200,000 to \$150,000. Please clarify why investing less.</li> </ul>
740	<p><b>Diana Bonham</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have seen Lake Hayes change from a beautiful healthy scenic lake to a stagnating lake with algae. Think about what has happened since then, and try to fix or even reverse some of the changes, e.g. reinstating wetlands, the natural filter for any waterway.</li> <li>The pure spring water the fed the lake is now being used by many residences. Maybe a bore beside the Kawarau river could take the pressure off the spring.</li> <li>Water weed and algae fight for sunlight to photosynthesize. No too long ago there was a huge clearance of weed in many local waterways, and more is being contemplated, at great cost. While fixing one problem, it seems to be creating another.</li> <li>Perhaps certain areas could be instated with good healthy weed which would encourage tiny wild life that fish naturally feed on. Help cleans waterways, and reinstate the delicate eco-system.</li> <li>Need to look at Mill Stream and its catchment, which is mainly the Coronet Peak ski field. Question fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides or additives (especially for snow making) being used, and naturally washed into Mill Stream.</li> </ul>
741	<p><b>Ecotago, Andrew Innes, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecotago has made a successful application for funding from the Participatory Science Platform (PSP), to facilitate a water quality monitoring project for Tomahawk Lagoon.</li> <li>Have community teams gathering data monthly, to understand water quality in from an upper stream site to a site adjacent to the lagoon outlet. Project started in February 2016, so now have 14 months of data. Also have data from the Zoology Department (Otago University) who have had field days going back 20 years.</li> <li>ORC should assist Ecotago in improving the quality of the data base. Steps to be taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meet with Ecotago and the TL advisory group that facilitate the programme.</li> <li>Organise to have parallel monitoring days, to improve quantity and accuracy of data, and incorporate elements of quality control.</li> <li>Establish a data Sonde to collect more frequent data points of some aspects.</li> <li>Constructive commentary on “science stories” for facebook or a developing website.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
745	<p><b>Friends of Lake Hayes Soc. , Richard Bowman</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ask ORC to increase water quality monitoring in Lake Hayes. This additional information will help understand the factors contributing to the eutrophic state of the lake, and how it can be restored.</li> <li>Degraded state of the lake has caused major concern, and risks impacting on public use and the lakes international status as a NZ tourism icon.</li> <li>Recently commissioned a report on the restoration and monitoring of the lake by Marc Schallenberg. Will be released publicly in next week or so, and made available to ORC on its release.</li> <li>The report evaluates the various restoration activities to accelerate the recovery of the lake. Four most promising are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Food web bio-manipulation</li> <li>Enhanced flushing by using surplus irrigation water from the Arrow River.</li> <li>Alum dosing to flocculate and bind phosphorus in the lake bed.</li> <li>A focus on land use activities in the catchment to reduce nutrient and sediment losses from land to water.</li> </ul> </li> <li>These strategies were scrutinised and some costings determined, allowing the development of a restoration strategy, potential timelines, and targets to measure success. Also covers monitoring options to help track recovery and effectiveness.</li> <li>Society would like to offer support and assistance to ORC, in that the society could provide direct assistance to resampling the Mill Creek catchment (have society member with professional expertise) . Would like to make a formal offer of support, and is considering make an application to the Environmental Enhancement Fund towards the cost of sample collection and analysis. Trust offer will be received favourably.</li> </ul>

746	<p><b>B &amp; K Sharpe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional councils were put in place to deal with water quality. Please get on and deal with it. Extra money must be allowed for research, then action to bring Lake Hayes back to full health.</li> <li>Not fair to put all of the costs of protection into the QLDC ratepayers, as have a huge resource in need of urgent attention compared to other Otago areas. Much could be funded from reserves and rates.</li> </ul>
751	<p><b>John Walker, Wanaka</b></p> <p>Priority to be given to preserving clean lakes and rivers by allocating more resources with more funding.</p>
766.	<p><b>Barbara Blatt, Wanaka</b></p> <p>Supports Mayor Boulton in his submission on behalf of the QLDC. Merely researching the problem is not sufficient, action needs to be taken as soon as possible. ORC offset an increase and solution-based fund for this work in 2017-18.</p>
774	<p><b>Department of Conservation, John Roberts</b></p> <p>Supports funding for scoping work, and working with communities to develop vision and action plans.</p>
788.	<p><b>Ken McGraw, Cromwell</b></p> <p>Support scoping work programme.</p>
792	<p><b>Dunedin City Council, Mayor Dave Cull</b></p> <p>Supports proposals, particularly on Tomahawk Lagoon. ORC should support the Tomahawk community with proactive management of the lagoons, undertake a management plan process for conservation, biodiversity, community safety and recreational values. DCC will engage on this work to ensure future flood events are mitigated and damage to DCC assets, such as the Domain Hall, is minimised.</p>

# Wallabies

Support for this work  
Opposed to this work

599  
124

## Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the funding of wallaby control work from general rates be adopted.

## Comments made:

	Submitter comment
5.	<b>Guy Hughes, Queenstown</b> Wallaby control and eradication to be a crucial priority. If they get into Fiordland they will be there forever and it will be ORC's fail. Take total eradication as a test case for the govt. proposed total eradication of pest policy, and ask the govt. for funding to get rid of them.
7.	<b>Terry Drayton, Wanaka</b> The options are a bit broad and a lot depends on whether there is chemical control or environmentally sustainable control. What about rabbits, no mention and a major issue.
26	<b>Jenny Aimers, Dunedin</b> Finds the image used for wallaby control offensive and the cartoon like approach does not respect this as a sentient being as defined by the Animal Welfare Amendment Act 2016. Agree they need to be controlled, but should be transparent about the fact this relates to a sentient being and not a cartoon character.
89	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> The cost of control should come from general rates (both urban and rural) and at a flat rate per rateable property.
183	<b>Geoff Simms</b> Get the wallaby problem controlled by eliminating them in the South Island as the ongoing cost will be a lot more.
283	<b>Grant Norbury, Alexandra</b> This should not be from general rates but from affected landowners.
374	<b>Yvonne Roberts, Oamaru</b> Are wallabies edible? Goats were a pest on the east coast of the North Island but now farmers protect them because somebody had the bright idea of buying them from the farmers.
416	<b>Marco Brenna, Dunedin</b> Who is responsible for the introduction of wallabies to Otago? They should be made to pay.
437	<b>John Hesketh, Dunedin</b> Instead of having specialised Wallaby control, work with DoC and reform old pest boards, which could cover a range of pests. If pest boards had not been disbanded, the rabbit problem would not have escalated to today's proportions.
451	<b>P Taylor, Garston</b> Being spread by hunters, not farmers, but they would pay the rates.
474	<b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> Lack of supporting documentation. Why not financially support research into domesticating them for export as was done for deer and the Northland possums to Taiwan some years ago?

485	<b>R Robertson, Dunedin</b> This is a story like flood control.
520	<b>Malcolm Garner, Alexandra</b> Hope it is a high priority.
544	<b>Pauline Sargisson, Wanaka</b> Wallabies affect rural areas and farms, not suburban dwellers. Target those that will benefit most from any proposed controls.
582	<b>Brian Jackson, Otarehua</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Movement of wallaby from Canterbury to Otago caused by DoC incompetence. DoC created the Oteake Park in 2008, and farm stock was subsequently removed, causing unchecked growth of pasture and weeds, causing a colossal fire hazard in summer, and providing lush habitat for feral animals once domestic stock had been removed.</li> <li>• DoC should be billed for cost of wallaby control, and enforced through court based procedures. Land should be vested in District council, and could lease back land for grazing.</li> </ul>
584	<b>John McKenzie</b> This is two years too late. Should undertake the program when the snow is on the hills in winter.
677	<b>Maniototo Pest Management Inc., Ranfurly</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank ORC for releasing funds so immediate work on wallabies could start. Fully support funding needed for ground staff and technology. Needs to be a lot of communication and pressure on ECan to stop wallabies crossing the Waitaki River at its dams and bridges, and reducing numbers on their side. Landowners and public also need to be educated on what wallaby sign is.</li> <li>• Have shot 2 wallabies in the Maniototo, and identified several locations with wallaby sign.</li> </ul>
722.	<b>Victoria Bonham, Alexandra</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Talk of a virus being introduced to control wallabies and rabbits. Totally opposed to releasing viruses, as incredible biosecurity danger, and cruel and inhumane. Risk of transmutation possible. Galloway Station has won a national award for pest control, reducing rabbit population to nearly zero.</li> <li>• Would like information confirming the wallaby migration into Otago, how significant and what damage is being done?</li> </ul>
729.	<b>Central Otago District Council</b> As with lake snow, CODC is very concerned about the spread of wallaby into the District. Trusts the money allocated is enough to address the issue.
733	<b>Ronald Cunningham, Alexandra</b> This is a commercial responsibility of the farmers, in their interest to get rid of this pest. ORC should only be involved if there are any biological solutions, or if problem is on ORC property.
774	<b>Department of Conservation, John Roberts</b> Supports wallaby control programme and funding.
809	<b>Bruce McKinlay, Dunedin</b> Should be specific rural rate, not general rates.

# Climate Change Adaption

Support for this work 527  
 Opposed to this work 146

<b>Hearing Committee Recommendation</b>
It is recommended that the scoping work for the Clutha delta be funded from the Kuriwao reserve as proposed.

	<b>Submitter comment</b>
6	<b>Bales Elliot, Middlemarch</b> Sea level rising in years to come is speculative and alarmist. How will scoping prevent nature's course?
147	<b>Pamela Robertson, Dunedin</b> South Dunedin flood protection is essential. Please keep this as a priority for working with the DCC.
189	<b>Sarah Harrison, Dunedin</b> Prioritise climate change adaption and mitigation efforts, including encouraging the use of public transport, and protecting biodiversity.
262	<b>Bruce Cloughley, Dunedin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy relating to South Dunedin regarding climate change is not realistic. Having buildings a metre or so off the ground is no help if the streets are flooded. The relocatable idea would work except how many buildings could that apply to in 25 years? Building and maintenance will stop but people will still live there, so an engineering solution would be a better option until the situation is impossible. Is our policy is going to extend to Portobello Rd and the Tahuna waste treatment plant? Believe it will not as the money will be provided to lift Portsmouth Drive and Portobello Road and the treatment plant will have dewatering spears installed. Everyone else will be left on their own.</li> <li>If sea levels do lift 600mm then troubles would also be apparent in Mosgiel in heavy rains, Marne St, Tomahawk, Taieri Mouth and other reclaimed areas of Dunedin. More comprehensive thought is required about more than cause and effect, to immediate climate threatened locations.</li> </ul>
442	<b>Gina Huakau, Dunedin</b> Needs to be more focus on climate change adaptations. Minimal information about South Dunedin. Need clearer outputs – due date for draft response plan, dates for community consultation. Golder Associates are carrying out a review – what is the cost of this?
448	<b>Jean Hesselin</b> Need significant increase in education about what is causing it, what people can do, and effects. Whole region needs a strategy. Need for science communication, would be a great project for people studying Sci Communication at university.
474.	<b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> Why didn't ORC prosecute the DCC for neglect of its drainage responsibilities? Is a toothless tiger when dealing with dodgy local bodies.
534	<b>J Cunningham, Dunedin</b> Dollars spent on coastal defence wasted, water always wins.
632.	<b>Andrew Aitken, Glenorchy</b> Forget about climate change adaption. Put money towards tight control of the root problem. The #1 global contributor to greenhouse gases, environmental degradation and pollution - animal agriculture.

645.	<p><b>Elizabeth Kerr, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ignore false political theories on climate change and false computer models that have driven the global corporate push for climate change thinking. Has resulted in fear tactics and false predictions of accelerated man-made global warming, sea level rise, inundation, groundwater level rise and carbon cycle model etc.</li> <li>• It is time for ORC and Otago local authorities to get real and seriously grounded to avoid 'climate change hyperventilation'. Exercise greater scepticism to the climate change head-bangers.</li> </ul>
669.	<p><b>Chris Jacques, Wanaka</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To consider population growth and the impacts of that on our environment, specifically; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increase in concrete creating more storm water run-off, housing and roading creating heat and increasing gradient temperature.</li> <li>○ Increase in dust due to development creating potential microclimatic changes.</li> <li>○ Increase in populations and development without securing green belts and reserves to offset the climatic changes created by local development.</li> <li>○ Increase in pets means pet bio-solids need to be managed to avoid becoming contaminants. A solution for pet waste management could be active worm farms at or near high use tracks for the disposal and conversion of pet bio-solids.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Look at cemeteries and burial. Should adopt an approach similar to Germany and Belguim and start cemetery forests, where the cremated remains are planted with a tree, creating unique and usable greenbelts and ecosystems to offset climate change.</li> <li>• Would like to see ORC lead the change in re-educating the public toward an environmentally appreciative and sustainable future.</li> </ul>
697.	<p><b>Val Goss</b></p> <p>It is a bit like the previous question on lake restoration, experts need to tell us the action plan. If all these questions became action and not talking around plans, would say yes.</p>
704.	<p><b>Anna Hughes, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Like to see huge increase in amount put towards climate change adaption across Otago. Need to create resilience into the future. Money spent now to secure our safety based on scenarios scientists suggest will be money well spent.</p>
721.	<p><b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b></p> <p>Along with the work in the South Dunedin area, supports any funding towards investigation and initiatives to deal with potential sea level rise associated with climate change.</p>
733.	<p><b>Ronald Cunningham, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Support using reserves for investigations, but if should come to building any infrastructure, ratepayers must be consulted.</p>
774.	<p><b>Department of Conservation, John Roberts</b></p> <p>Supports climate adaption projects.</p>
792.	<p><b>Dunedin City Council, Mayor Dave Cull</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCC has set a goal of being resilient and carbon zero through its Environment Strategy. The biggest challenges to emissions reduction are around agriculture and transport. Welcome ORC support and involvement in progressing planning and implementation of actions to achieve the strategy goal.</li> <li>• Welcomes continued support and commitment from ORC to work collaboratively on South Dunedin. Looks forward to developing and delivering a response plan for South Dunedin.</li> </ul>
793	<p><b>Disabled Persons Assembly, Chris Ford</b></p> <p>Strongly commend ORC for work on flood prevention and coastal erosion caused by sea level rise. Commends ORC for its engagement with the DCC on developing a South Dunedin response plan.</p>

## Wilding trees

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the contribution by council to the community groups be doubled, increasing the targeted rate from \$100,000 to \$200,000. It is further recommended that the full amount be distributed equally between Central Otago and Queenstown Lakes.

	Submitter comment
18	<p><b>R Henderson, Queenstown</b> Greater investment in wilding pine management and regional biodiversity appropriate given role and statutory responsibilities of regional council.</p>
21	<p><b>Clayton Lightfoot</b> Would like to see more work on ensuring land owners control wilding pines on their land as part of their purchase agreements, or more support for community groups to make a difference in these areas.</p>
24.	<p><b>Verona Cournane, Arrowtown</b> Supports the wilding pine tree control.</p>
28	<p><b>Melissa Hinves, Arrowtown</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions the proposed \$1 per household, and if we think the \$100,000 budget is sufficient. ORC report suggests a hectare coverage of around 300,000+ is being effected and that 'It is estimated that wilding conifers are spreading at around 5% annually.</li> <li>• Unless we increase the budget to tackle the scale of the issue we are simply wasting taxpayer's money. \$100,000 will only scuff the surface and within a year growth rate will outstrip any removal.</li> </ul>
31	<p><b>Christopher Wozniak, Arrowtown</b> The Queenstown/Arrowtown basin has major issue with wilding pines and firs which is being boosted by the council-owned forest below Coronet Peak. More priority, funds and community support to be allocated to controlling the issue as a lack of progress will change the landscape within a 20-year period.</p>
32	<p><b>Richard Denney, Queenstown</b> The wilding pine problem is accelerating especially in the Wakatipu Basin area. The \$100,000 allocated is not enough. Community groups are doing what they can but with the size of the area affected and the alarming rate of spreading, indigenous biodiversity, high country farming and tourism are all under threat. Council to increase the amount to at least \$500,000 in the QLDC area.</p>
36	<p><b>Arj Schenk</b> Need to increase the funding for wilding conifer control. The hills behind Arrowtown are fast becoming a pine forest. Local group is trying to make a start but funding and support from ORC is needed. Why this is not an item on the consultation document?</p>
61	<p><b>Will Grant, Queenstown</b> The wilding tree funds should be used for controlling more invasive species, broom, briar and gorse.</p>
72	<p><b>N E Himberg, Alexandra</b> Wilding tree control is a waste of time and money because you can't stop nature.</p>
75	<p><b>James Cutler, Lowburn</b> Wilding pines on the 'South' slopes of Sugar Loaf continue to grow and spread.</p>



83	<b>Peter Fitzgibbon, Dunedin</b> Why there is no box to tick for wilding pines as this is important?
94	<b>Wayne Tuck, Dunedin</b> Owners of forest blocks should be rated for removal of wilding tree control.
105	<b>Phillip Krugor, Balclutha</b> Why we are spending millions of dollars of public money on wilding trees when they could be a good carbon trap.
111	<b>Ursula Davis, Queenstown</b> Wilding pines needs ratepayer money spent.
132	<b>Andrew Davis, Queenstown</b> Wilding pines budget is too low, it should be \$1,000,000.
182	<b>Raleigh Wells, Dunedin</b> Disagree with wilding pine destruction, for environmental, economic and aesthetics reasons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental concerns – criminal to destroy natural forestation of barren land, which does not have the ability to retain moisture as a reservoir. Planting trees on both sides of waterways will improve water quality. Historically the whole of Central Otago was forested.</li> <li>• Economic concerns – criminal waste of money destroying pines. In time these pines would become a commercial asset. Money better spent on projects included in the annual plan.</li> <li>• Aesthetic concerns – forested mountains are more pleasing than barren. Know of no other country wilfully destructing pines.</li> </ul>
213.	<b>Andrew Davis, Queenstown</b> \$100,000 for this is ridiculous. The community has informed the ORC they want action. We have the opportunity to ensure the high country is saved from this introduced pest. Spending only \$100,000 is effectively doing nothing. Spend more because this is a disaster waiting to happen. Act responsibly and act now.
214	<b>Andrew Mercer, Dunedin</b> ORC to increase the funding and activity for wilding pines in Central.
220	<b>Fergus Sutherland, Owaka</b> More money is needed for control, which should include encouragement to individual landholders. Consider grazing management in individual circumstances.
224.	<b>Mike Wright, Queenstown</b> Leave the pine trees alone instead of wasting money and resources in trying to destroy them and creating new future problems.
242	<b>Mike Barra, Cromwell</b> The funding for eradicating wilding pines should be increased to at least \$100,000.
251.	<b>Delvina Gorton, Arrowtown</b> The response to wilding pines is inadequate. A much stronger response and contribution towards their control is needed.
264	<b>Jeannie Galavazi, Queenstown</b> Please continue to support. Is a major threat to our ecosystems and should do everything possible before problem is too big.
266	<b>Gaye Cowie</b> Would like to see more money put towards wilding pine control.

351	<b>Peter Ireland, Queenstown</b> Wallaby gets \$274,000 while pines get \$100,000. Pines much bigger issue. Needs a lot more investment than currently available. ORC and councils to push Government to do more.
353	<b>Saskia Van der Geest, Arrowtown</b> Like to see a budget to control problem around Arrowtown. Like to see Otago yellow tussock covered hills, not green pine hills. Need big effort to protect Arrowtown's changing colours at Autumn.
374	<b>Yvonne Roberts, Oamaru</b> Wilding pines could be turned into a business, e.g. pine oil, as this has worked in other places.
408	<b>Greg Thompson, Queenstown</b> Double the money on wilding pines as the amount is not enough.
425.	<b>Ian Stewart</b> More control is required on the Raggedy range and around Alexandra.
478	<b>Eion Edgar, Queenstown</b> Substantially increase contribution to wilding control.
490	<b>Duncan Ritchie, Wanaka</b> Supports all efforts to control wildings, including ORC rates for this.
492	<b>M Hess, Oturehua</b> ORC neglecting wilding tree control. More funds need to be allocated to control this pest.
509	<b>Jon Mitchell, Wellington</b> Should be funded to a far higher level by ORC. A funding stream of \$1 million annually, from general reserves would be the most appropriate option while a more strategic approach is developed.
513.	<b>Ian Turnbull, Wanaka</b> ORC has finally started to contribute to this issue but only after a public scolding. The funds allocated are trivial. ORC should boost its contribution by educating landholders and then enforcing a requirement to remove wildings and other noxious weeds. The efforts of volunteer organisations are undermined by a lack of action on many properties which are infested with wildings.
516	<b>Rachel Baxter, Alexandra</b> More money needed for wilding trees. Increase the rates to cover as this could help awareness of the serious problem. More money now is means less down the track. Put in a targeted rate for infested landowner not willing to deal with the problem and forest blocks.
522	<b>RJ George, Alexandra</b> More needs to be done. Mild weather creating huge growth. Willing to pay more for this.
546	<b>P &amp; R Hellebrekers</b> Need to match the MPI contribution dollar for dollar for wilding pines as they are going to be out of control otherwise.
563	<b>Gerry Eckhoff, Alexandra</b> ORC wilfully negligent over this matter. The tokenism towards this problem is a disgrace to all who are genuine in their concerns over landscape values. Every green wilding is a monument to ORC's lack of leadership on this issue.
579	<b>John Alexandra, Arrowtown</b> Want to see more action taken on the wilding pines issue and not just in the Wakatipu, but throughout the region.

588	<b>David O'Brien, Clyde</b> Support a continued endeavour to control wilding trees.
605.	<b>Gillian Hopkins, Queenstown</b> There is nothing in the document about wilding pines. Appears to be left largely to the volunteer efforts of the Arrowtown community. ORC needs to do more in this space.
613.	<b>Bruce Lambie, Dunedin</b> Wilding pines need to be controlled before it becomes impossible due to their spread.
618	<b>Brian Hogg, Queenstown</b> Do not support the wilding tree control in its current form, especially the boom spraying of larger areas. Please review our approach.
629	<b>Sampsa Kieru, Alexandra</b> The money used for wilding pine control should be directed to climate change adaption. Trees are a carbon sink and pine are beyond control.
634	<b>Queenstown Grey Power</b> These are increasing at an alarming rate. On top of the government subsidy of \$1.2 million, only \$100,000 had been allowed for in the plan. This figure should be at least double.
637	<b>Mark Dowling, Wedderburn</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legislation should be introduced where forestry/plantation owners be made responsible for all the costs of controlling wildings that have established due to seeds spreading from their plantations. At present, plantation owners have no incentive to control the spread because they are not accountable for the consequences.</li> <li>Submitter owns property by the Naseby forest. Has been losing grazing land over the last 20 years to wildings spread from the adjacent forest. Work is ongoing to keep clearing the land of wilding pines mainly at their own cost. Ernslaw One (forest owner) should be responsible for the costs of clearing the land of wilding pines.</li> </ul>
642	<b>R Margrath, Alexandra</b> Need more wilding pine work in all of Central Otago.
650.	<b>Jillian Hodgson</b> Should increase the amount of funding available to tackling, monitoring and replanting native shrubs and trees.
651.	<b>Christine Ryan, Arrowtown</b> Support funding wilding pine control. Urge ORC to support the QLDC Coronet forest management plan that recommends harvesting coronet forest early in order to remove the wilding seed source. Can see the extent of wildings becoming established as a result of seeds from the forest and this has rapidly become worse.
653	<b>Anon</b> Need more funding for wilding tree control in lakes district area.
666.	<b>Benjamin Rotto, Queenstown</b> Further work is needed on wilding pine control in the Wakatipu Basin, if it's left it will only become more expensive over time. Best to tackle as much as possible early as it has a significant detrimental effect on natural bio-diversity and has increasing ongoing control costs.

667	<p><b>Nita Smith, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Wakatipu Restoration Trust would like to see the amount allocated towards control increased significantly. Wilding exotic conifers are a huge threat to losing even more of the already limited and vulnerable native ecosystems.</li> <li>Grant Lensman (chair of the Wakatipu Wilding Conifer control group) has said, “controlling the trees (in the Wakatipu only) cost the group about \$1.3 to \$1.4 million a year”, and “if we don’t get continued funding and if we don’t get ultimately rid of the seed sources, then any investment we make is wasted. This is a long haul. We’re winning... (but) we can’t win this unless we do get rid of those seed sources”.</li> <li>\$100,000 for the entire Otago area is a pitiful contribution from the ORC would like to see this increased substantially.</li> </ul>
671.	<p><b>Roger Williams, Omakau</b></p> <p>Would like to see wilding pines controlled around Alexandra, the longer we wait, the more seeds are grown.</p>
674.	<p><b>Noel Beggs, Queenstown</b></p> <p>Fully support and encourage greater financial contributions to wilding control work, including increasing rating if necessary, to allow this.</p>
700	<p><b>Frankton Community Association</b></p> <p>Meagre effort addressing wilding tree control. Request fund be increased to \$500,000, and include gorse and broom control.</p>
703	<p><b>Wakatipu Wilding Conifer Group, Queenstown</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asks ORC to be the lead agency in recognising and addressing the large wilding problem in Otago. Work on establishing an RPMS that includes all wilding species that spread seed onto vulnerable, low or non stocked land, or wilding free areas. Provide technical assistance in planting the right trees in the right places.</li> <li>ORC to continue financial support for control programmes. Thank you for \$40,000 in 16/17, but ask for increase to \$100,000 in 17/18. Ask to plan for incremental increases beyond 17/18.</li> <li>Asks for vigilant enforcement or ORC’s RPMS control .</li> <li>Asks for a collaborative working partnership with wilding community groups. Ask that ORC supports the actions and objectives of the draft NZ Wilding Conifer Management Strategy.</li> <li>Asks that all administration, planning and involvement costs on the wilding programme are covered by ORC internally, as does QLDC who contributed \$438,063 to the programme last year.</li> </ul>
717	<p><b>B Roundhill</b></p> <p>Supports funding for wilding pines.</p>
722	<p><b>Victoria Bonham, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Need to focus on planting more trees, removal of wildings should be replaced with native trees. Contribute to erosion prevention. Spraying should never be used because of environmental impact and potential to contaminate soil and water ways.</p>
733	<p><b>Ronald Cunningham, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Is a commercial responsibility of the farmers, in their interest to get rid of this problem ORC should only be involved if there are any biological solutions, or if problem is on ORC property.</p>
738.	<p><b>Irene Hawkins</b></p> <p>The amount set aside for wilding pines is woefully inadequate, \$100,000 for the Otago region is not enough. Realise ORC is concentrating in Naseby but wouldn’t it be more effective to also start in other areas before they become as much of a problem as Naseby.</p>
746	<p><b>Bill &amp; Kirsty Sharpe</b></p> <p>Want bigger financial commitment to this work. Like to see \$500,000, about \$5 per ratepayer.</p>

767	<p><b>Michael Ramsey</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wilding pine control budget is out of control. It has been captured by a special interest group and supported by ORC, at the expense of other activities. There is virtually no funding for rabbit control, no policy regarding broom and gorse control, the removal of prickly rosehip bushes and the removal of dead wilding pines, especially Oregon (aka Douglas fir). These trees do not rot away, they sit for years on skylines everywhere detracting from the regions beauty. Oregon is an entry level hardwood and once dried out, unlike pinus radiata, repel water.</li> <li>• Asks for a policy of tree removal after the trees have been poisoned. Request some balance in the application of funding for environmental purposes, instead of one special interest group receiving an out-sized share of the limited funding resources.</li> </ul>
774	<p><b>Department of Conservation, John Roberts</b></p> <p>Supports continued funding of the community groups, but \$100,000 not seen as a significant investment. Expect it would increase significantly each year.</p>
776	<p><b>Mokihi Trust, B D Armstrong, Cromwell</b></p> <p>The amount being spent is too small.</p>
786	<p><b>Lynne &amp; Duncan Kean, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Is a major issue. Spraying and removal leaves erosion problems.</p>
809	<p><b>Bruce McKinlay, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Need larger commitment from ORC. Suggest RPMS rules.</p>

## Dunedin Head Office

<b>Hearing Committee</b>
The Hearing Committee noted that the building will be consulted on separately once a build option is scoped and costed. Consultation will include options (build, lease, remodel existing site) along with pro's and con's of each, so an informed decision can be made. Funding of \$665,000 provided for in 2017/18 is to continue, to complete the design / scoping work to inform the consultation only, and to undertake the consultation.

	<b>Submitter comment</b>
5.	<b>Guy Hughes, Queenstown</b> No to a Dunedin building until we have proved our worth.
6.	<b>Bales Elliot, Middlemarch</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans to build a new head office in Dunedin is outlandish, wasteful and will be squandering ratepayers money. There are probably many existing premises potentially elsewhere (Invermay). Get on with the main functions of the Regional Council and shelve grandiose plans.</li> <li>Regional Council 'bit' ratepayers unfairly when donating \$37 million to the stadium and then disallowed objections at the time by saying it was not in the annual plan. Apart from this, ORC is doing a great job.</li> </ul>
11	<b>Lachlan Sutherland, Cromwell</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot understand why \$14 million needs to be spent on a new building. In comparison spending \$100,000 on the lake snow problem in the southern lakes is a drop in the ocean. If allowed to develop further what effect will this have on the region with our clean, green image gone, Tourists and industry gone.</li> <li>The money allocated to the building should be scrapped and more money poured into the cause of lake snow and remediating the lakes. Money could also be used towards total eradication of wallabies.</li> </ul>
24	<b>Verona Cournane, Arrowtown</b> The new ORC building should be sited on the waterfront.
43	<b>W Jordan, Dunedin</b> Keep original property. Do not build on the foreshore-harbour area. With climate change these areas will eventually flood in 100-200 years.
45	<b>Cameron Grindlay, Dunedin</b> Do not waste \$14 million on a new building. Spend it on or put it towards the emergency fund and environmental management.
53	<b>H R Kiddle, Queenstown</b> It is shocking to see the disparity between the HQ building costs and regional programmes.
67	<b>WJ &amp; LI Townsend, Alexandra</b> Adamant ORC should not be building a new headquarters in Dunedin with the many possibilities becoming available such as Invermay, Cadburys, Dunedin and Wakari hospitals, Carisbrook, Hillside etc. If amalgamation occurs, may not have to build or buy a bigger building than we already have.
72	<b>NE Himberg</b> Don't need to spend \$14 million on a new building because we already have one and should make do.
89.	<b>Graeme Isbister, Oamaru</b> ORC to combine with DCC as one headquarter office and down size the staff numbers in administration as office services could be shared.
91.	<b>Neki Patel, Queenstown</b> No - we are overspending our money in Dunedin already.

93.	<b>Miriam Lippers, Alexandra</b> Requests that we do not spend anymore the \$15 million on a building as there other environmental issues are more important to be funded.
101	<b>Malcolm Pollits, Alexandra</b> Questions the relevance to 'invest' in a new HQ building.
106	<b>Rodger Bell</b> Do not get a new headquarters but put the money back into the work programme.
108	<b>Ross Taylor</b> Do not need a new building.
109	<b>Jeff Munro, Dunedin</b> Should forget a new building, instead rent one or adapt an existing building.
111	<b>Ursual Davis, Queenstown</b> Don't spend money on new offices.
132	<b>Andrew Davis, Queenstown</b> Don't spend money on new offices.
141	<b>J A Wright</b> Disappointed still going ahead with a very costly Dunedin headquarters. Modern technology and communications should make this no longer necessary.
164	<b>Julie Hawcett, Dunedin</b> Why need a new building in Dunedin? \$14 million could be better spent elsewhere.
172	<b>Richard Scott</b> Opposes the proposed new building. Should lease a refurbished building instead as there are plenty available.
181	<b>Shona McRae, Dunedin</b> Supports the new building.
210	<b>Peter Hill, Queenstown</b> Having seen the cost over-runs in Auckland on council buildings, the \$14 million proposal is light.
219	<b>Mary Bradshaw, Queenstown</b> Should not waste ratepayers money on an expensive and totally unnecessary new building in Dunedin.
229	<b>Bernice Armstrong, Dunedin</b> Why do we need a new building in Dunedin? Should not take any car parking from the CBD. If have to build, build away from the CBD.
240	<b>M &amp; R Whitworth, Cromwell</b> The new headquarters in Dunedin should not be built.
247	<b>Lorna Schmidt, Cromwell</b> An office in Queenstown is more central than Dunedin, so we should be based in lakes area and not Dunedin.
278	<b>N &amp; M Roberts, Oamaru</b> Do we need a new ivory tower? Should live within our means.

288	<b>John Wilson, Cromwell</b> Why the need to spend \$14 million on a building when there are plenty of buildings to rent such as Invermay.
295	<b>Charlotte White, Queenstown</b> Unsure about spending \$14 million on a new office.
300	<b>Paul Webb, Dunedin</b> Opposed to a new headquarters in Dunedin. Ratepayers are burdened enough. Money should be spent on more important issues such as river levels and pollution of waterways.
306	<b>David Cottle, Dunedin</b> Should lease or buy an existing building instead of building, e.g., the Invermay site or an old heritage building in the city.
333	<b>James Penwell, Queenstown</b> Forget this – it is an expensive and unnecessary vanity project.
335	<b>Russell Read, Roxburgh</b> Do not spend major sum on a new building. Already have adequate offices. Central Otago Lakes region will eventually have more population than the Dunedin area.
365	<b>Paul Frude</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased an office will soon be in Queenstown. Up till now this area has not been receiving its appropriate share of ORC resources or attention.</li> <li>• Due to the rapidly increasing population and large tourism presence, the environmental and infrastructural needs of the Queenstown Lakes area are far greater on a per ratepayer basis than in other areas.</li> <li>• If the building reserve must be spent on buildings, then a significant portion needs to be allocated to Queenstown, to house the ‘on the ground’ support staff this district badly needs.</li> </ul>
367	<b>John Chetwin, Kakanui</b> Opposes funding a new headquarters in Dunedin as it is not the focal point for most of ORC’s activities and it is not geographically central. If ORC really needs a new building, it should not be in Dunedin.
372	<b>Lindsay Borrie, Cromwell</b> Questions if a new building is really needed, and will there be other tenants in it to recover some of the costs.
411	<b>Olive Martin</b> Costs should be shared between ratepayers and government.
414	<b>Philip Merchant, Dunedin</b> Hard to see how new office is justified. Take up space in the many ex offices and warehouses in the historic precinct. Should be prudent.
430	<b>K Dundass, Ranfurly</b> Great work done restoring Dunedin historic buildings, now usable and complement the city era. Please no ugly glass monoliths on the skyline. Dunedin tourists love the history of the region, let not lose it for greedy gains.
461	<b>J &amp; M Jack, Dunedin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queenstown office supported only if combine with local council office.</li> <li>• Should use existing building in Dunedin for new office, even if need to modify, otherwise seen as empire building with public money.</li> </ul>
474	<b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> Just because a reserve, is no reason to splash out on a new headquarters. If invested, and earned say 3%, would mean about \$420,000 available to spend on Lake Snot, or better, reduce rates a bit.



478	<b>Eion Edgar, Queenstown</b> No need to build a new head office. Seriously consider distribution of all assets and responsibilities to the respective city and district councils.
558	<b>Anon</b> Questions the need for a new headquarters.
559	<b>Garry Dodd, Dunback</b> The sooner the ORC gets a new building the better. A new building will lift the performance of the ORC and the mood of the staff.
563	<b>Gerry Eckhoff, Alexandra</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project is unlawful, as no consultation has occurred, as required under Sec 83 of LGA. It is simply a proposal until consultation. ORC completely failed test of good faith on this issue, and is determined to proceed without public opinion until the project is finalised.</li> <li>• Council should have consulted at a pre-consultative stage before deciding the building project will go ahead. A proposal should be either to build, remain in the existing site, or consider alternatives, with public input. The decision to build nullifies the consultation process as the site in the Dowling St car park has been formally chosen by the ORC. Now it is a simple matter of agreement between ORC and DCC. No maximum dollar figure has been set or even discussed, so what exactly are the special consultations to be based around? ORC's feedback document states that consultation will occur "once we have concepts and costs prepared", so consultation will not include whether the shift to Dowling St or elsewhere should occur in the first place.</li> <li>• The saleability of the Stafford St building is vital information for the public during consultation. Presumably expressions of interest will soon be called to better assess the financial impost of this project on the ratepayer. Leasing an existing (historic) building has been dismissed without consultation. The special consultation process will not ask for alternatives. Given ORC's predetermination, a judicial review of the special consultative process and predetermined decision is needed.</li> </ul>
583	<b>Geoff Gardyne, Dunedin</b> A new building in Dunedin is not necessary. Should either restore a heritage building or share accommodation with the DCC.
609	<b>Janice Pont, Dunedin</b> Careful consideration should be given to the replacement of a new headquarters. Maybe an existing vacant building could be transformed for the purpose.
630	<b>DM &amp; AK Dodd, Ranfurly</b> Councils should lease office premises, not own them. Let someone else pay for new buildings.
631	<b>Trevor Tambyln, Clyde</b> No need for any new buildings until it is decided if a regional council is required.
636	<b>Grant McKenzie, Dunedin</b> No question has been asked regarding the potential move of the ORC headquarters. The ORC continues to build a reserve at the cost of ratepayers for this potential expenditure.
638	<b>Julie Garter, Balclutha</b> Is real concern in Balclutha over the lack of staff at the Balclutha office. ORC people management skills leave a lot to be desired. Too top heavy in management and not enough staff on the ground.

645	<p><b>Elizabeth Kerr, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the motion from Cr Michael Laws at the meeting on 22 Mar 2017, that the \$665,000 for further development of the ORC Head Office building design be removed from the 2017/18 Annual Plan.</li> <li>Strongly agree with Cr Law's argument that spending money on design for a proposed building was "putting the cart before the horse". ORC must consult with the public long before it can approach doing the building. ORC shouldn't be actively involved in design investigations and contracting parties before consulting the public using the special consultation process.</li> <li>At least one of the regional councillors has a real and perceived conflict of interest due to his pronounced involvement in the construction industry.</li> <li>Monitoring, control and eradication of invasive weeds in lakes and waterways, as well as wilding pines must be intensified and sped up by ORC and partner agencies. Need greater ORC budget allocation in all the years following. A regional office in Queenstown is necessary to step up and co-ordinate environmental management efforts. This is more important than building a new headquarters in Dunedin.</li> </ul>
648	<p><b>Lynne Stewart, Clyde</b></p> <p>Don't need an office in Queenstown as almost everyone has a computer and we can all contact ORC members. Having another office and a new office in Dunedin is not necessary. ORC's strategic assets are our waters and lands, not buildings.</p>
649	<p><b>Diane Yeldon, Dunedin</b></p> <p>The \$665,000 for further development of the ORC head office building design should be removed from the 2017/18 annual plan.</p>
664	<p><b>G &amp; B Mitchell, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ORC does not need to own the building it occupies. There are many buildings that could be refurbished to ORC's requirements and rented. The money not used in refurbishment and rental costs could be diverted into improving Otago's environment.</li> <li>Building up and maintaining significant reserves are questionable when there is a guaranteed income from rates. There are many environmental issues needing more focus and funding. Reserves should be used for environmental projects not buildings.</li> </ul>
700	<p><b>Frankton Community Association, Glyn Lewers</b></p> <p>Against moves for new office while neglect of the Lakes region continues. Money should be allocated towards ORC's primary duties, instead of a building that does not contribute to the wellbeing of the Queenstown Lakes District.</p>
702	<p><b>Rob Adair, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Do we need an office in Queenstown? Does the office in Dunedin need to be there? How about Mosgiel?</p>
731	<p><b>J Ledgerwood</b></p> <p>Reconsider empire building policy.</p>
733	<p><b>Ronald Cunningham, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Empire builders are out again. Rent or lease a building, and reallocate reserves for projects like Lake Snow and Lake Restoration. Not in favour of buying or building.</p>
736	<p><b>R Tait, Dunedin</b></p> <p>The majority of the activity is rural. ORC headquarters should be located in Alexandra, to cover rural areas, therefore not needing another office in Queenstown - reduce the overheads.</p>
751	<p><b>John Walker, Wanaka</b></p> <p>Reserve accumulated funds before spending anything further on buildings. A building will not contribute anything to an environmental legacy that is already overly degraded due to lack of governance.</p>

762	<p><b>Jenny Frost</b>  ORC does not need a new building, but should find an existing one. ORC are servants of the ratepayers, not lords and ladies. Spend the money on clean water.</p>
776	<p><b>Mokihi Trust, B D Armstrong, Cromwell</b>  Accumulated funds for expensive buildings must be reallocated to the environment. Spend \$500,000 on new carpet, heat pumps, a paint job. Dunedin doesn't need a tajmahal, Queenstown doesn't need a building. Put the money into what is happening in the region.</p>
779	<p><b>Barbara Armstrong, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queenstown office - this is empire building. There is one in Cromwell that is adequate.</li> <li>• One office in Dunedin, Cromwell and maybe Balclutha is sufficient. Gross waste of money to spend \$35 million on a fancy building in Dunedin and another in Queenstown.</li> <li>• Think of dismal effort gone into rabbits, how much spent on this, and how much allocated to new building. ORC has lost its way.</li> </ul>
788	<p><b>Ken McGraw, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No argument the Dunedin building is not fit for purpose. Concerned at ongoing attitude that council stuck on an entirely new build costing millions more than the \$14 million in reserves.</li> <li>• Have question on ownership vs leasing vs remodelling existing. Ask the building review consultation process includes a range of alternative options for consideration.</li> </ul>
793	<p><b>Disabled Persons Assembly, Chris Ford</b>  Support construction or purchase of new ORC chambers. Would prefer new chambers to be fully accessible, central and flat level site, and building should incorporate universal design principles.</p>
797	<p><b>Christopher Girling, Dunedin</b>  ORC is a service organisation that does not need a high profile building in any expensive part of town. Focus on a head office that is functional and relevant to its role. Don't occupy a valuable bit of land in the centre of Dunedin that could be put to better use.</p>
817	<p><b>Loretta Bush, Alexandra</b>  Don't think is necessary.</p>

## Air quality submissions

<b>Hearing Committee</b>
The Hearing Committee noted the development of an Air Strategy, which will then lead into the review of the Regional Plan Air. The Hearing Committee is recommending declining the request for putting an air monitor in Frankton.

	<b>Submitter comment</b>
<b>242.</b>	<b>Mike Barra, Cromwell</b> Air quality work should be given a higher priority as the work has lapsed. Our focus is now on water and we should do both.
<b>415</b>	<b>Jan Barron, Dunedin</b> Air quality is poor. Can't go for walk, open windows for fresh air because of smoke from fires. Like more action to limit the installation of wood fires. Suggest existing wood fire owners are strongly encouraged to install heat pumps or go gas or solar power systems. Said this last year, but no improvement.
<b>500</b>	<b>S Kremser, Alexandra</b> Need to take the air quality issue in Alexandra more seriously. Only monitoring it won't fix it. It is bad in winter and a reason why submitter would choose to live somewhere else.
<b>651</b>	<b>Christine Ryan, Arrowtown</b> Staff should be visiting households in Arrowtown that are obviously emitting excessive smoke and provide some education on wet/dry wood, how to drive their log burners and make them aware of the clean burner subsidy.
<b>700.</b>	<b>Frankton Community Association, Glyn Lewers</b> Ask that air monitoring be established in Frankton during the winter months to ascertain a baseline of air pollution due to increased traffic gridlock and use of inefficient burners.
<b>725</b>	<b>Barbara Sloan, Waikouaiti</b> On 9 May 2017 were in Waikouaiti and experienced a smoke full day from a rural burn off between Palmerston and Waikouaiti, sending smoke as far as Dunedin. Most properties in Waikouaiti experienced an ash snow phenomenon, which apart from mess, possibly caused health concerns for many. Such an event should not be allowed. Makes a joke of emissions from home wood burners. Sees farming properties have a preference over anyone else burning off rubbish.
<b>737</b>	<b>Queenstown Lakes District Council, Mayor Jim Boulton</b> Commend ORC role in monitoring air quality but submit that it includes additional funds to establish monitoring at Frankton. Further recommend that ORC shift from educational and monitoring to commence enforcement in the Arrowtown area due to the ongoing emission of some dwellings.
<b>771.</b>	<b>Liz Angelo, Dunedin</b> Stop the selling and burning of coal in Otago, this is long overdue and overseas visitors must be shocked to see in our 'clean, green NZ'.
<b>793</b>	<b>Disabled Persons Assembly, Chris Ford</b> Commends ORC for assistance given towards clean heating appliances in areas of high smog. Ask why programme is not more widely publicised, or is information only targeted at home owners in high smog areas?

## Biodiversity & Environmental Enhancement Submissions

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

The funding made available for the Environmental Enhancement Fund each year is considered appropriate, and reserves are the best way to fund these community projects as they benefit all ratepayers. Funding operational costs, which are ongoing, is not supported. It is noted that the Biodiversity Strategy is underway.

	Submitter comment
355	<p><b>Orokonui Ecosanctuary, Colin Campbell-Hunt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government’s Predator Free NZ campaign is challenging the conservation community to eliminate the most dangerous predators by 2050. Government does not expect to assume primary responsibility for resourcing the work to be done.</li> <li>• The scale of the challenge will require active involvement of community groups, territorial authorities and individual land owners. ORC is the institution that can engage with this challenge at the appropriate scale.</li> <li>• Biodiversity strategy for Otago requires coordinated action on multiple fronts – predator control, enhancement and extension of appropriate habitat, re-introduction of species, education and training.</li> <li>• Sustained declines in biodiversity in NZ suggest ORC, like other regional councils, will have to do more if declines are to be halted and reversed. The scope suggests the Environmental Enhancement Fund will need to be made available for non-capital grants also. Biodiversity strategy will help develop criteria for the use of these funds.</li> <li>• Request increasing the fund to \$500,000 per annum, by bringing in a uniform charge of \$5 per household (same as Environment Waikato) to meet the growing challenge of biodiversity loss.</li> </ul>
648	<p><b>Lynne Stewart, Clyde</b></p> <p>Support the increase in planting and/or protection of Otago native plants in Otago. ORC to support ecological restoration widely. If we control wallabies, we should also control stoats, ferrets and feral cats.</p>
705	<p><b>Landscape Connections Trust, Jinty McTavish</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anticipates that once drafted, the biodiversity strategy will be consulted on prior to adoption. Wish to express strong support for public consultation during 2017/18.</li> <li>• May be overlap between actions in ORC’s strategy and those in Te Ao Turoa/Dunedin’s Environment Strategy. Ask councils to work closely together to ensure any potential for collaboration is maximised.</li> <li>• ORC to start considering how new programme elements identified by the strategy are to be funded, and make provision in the next LTP.</li> <li>• Very grateful for funding provided to the HALO project. Express support for the retention of the fund, but will be a need to grow it. Note Waikato Regional Council has an annual budget of \$1.25 - \$1.35 million for similar purposes. Asks ORC to consider a staged increase to the budget, planned and implemented over a number of years.</li> <li>• Concerned fund is allocated from reserves rather than from rates. Reserves seem a less transparent approach. Preferable ratepayers are aware they are being rated to support this fund. Then would be in a position to advocate for growth or reduction of the fund. If reserves are required for some other purpose, a future council may consider this fund to be the casualty. Ask that Council rates directly for the fund.</li> <li>• Anticipate the criteria for the fund will be refined with the Biodiversity Strategy. Would like an opportunity to comment on that through that process. Note that operational costs are some of most difficult to fund, especially for bait and labour. Ask consideration be given to making explicit provision in the fund criteria for funding operational costs.</li> <li>• Commend ORC on becoming a signatory to the Predator Free Dunedin Memorandum of Understanding.</li> <li>• Commends work programme underway to establish a Biodiversity Strategy for the region.</li> </ul>

742	<p><b>Otago Peninsula Biodiversity Group, Moira Parker</b></p> <p>Very pleased a strategy is being developed. Suggest consultation is undertaken with private sector organisations, community trusts and others seeking to maintain and enhance biodiversity values. Would provide awareness of activities, avoid duplication and omission.</p> <p>Pleased to receive \$27,000 from the fund for analysis of data from rodent, bird, vegetation, lizard and invertebrate monitoring projects, but disappointed that ORC declined to fund project management time to coordinate and communicate information to the community. Ask ORC to reconsider the criteria for this fund with respect to labour. As group, could not function without volunteers, but for then to be trained, motivated and organised, is essential to have a paid part time person as coordinator.</p>
772	<p><b>Forest &amp; Bird Waitaki, Chloe Searle</b></p> <p>Encourage ORC to provide more funding for protecting and enhancing biodiversity. Increase funding to ensure monitoring and compliance of environmental standards.</p> <p>Support more funding to deal with weed issues. ORC must keep focused on ensuring our environment is not degraded but enhanced.</p>

## Harbour Matters

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that ORC accepts the offer from the Dunedin City Council to jointly resource a Harbourside Management Plan. It is also recommending a review of consent fees and charges, including consents that are being “rolled over” during 2017/18.

	Submitter comment
98	<p><b>Ron Sim, Oamaru</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who is responsible for the Oamaru Harbour? As a boat owner, is a lack of delineation as to who does what. Have no appointed and equipped mooring inspections person. Should appoint Kevin Waters (from Carey’s Bay) to do this work. Appears to be waiting list for people wanting a mooring. Many sit on doubtful moorings, and crafts break loose on a regular basis.</li> <li>Whose job is it to maintain and inspect the Oamaru Harbour entrance?</li> <li>Two launch ramps are privately owned. Should there be a public ramp?</li> <li>With pressure on the harbour, should there be a floating jetty?</li> </ul>
352	<p><b>Port Chalmers Fisherman Society, Ant Smith</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represent local commercial fishermen in Otago. Members contribute \$20 million plus per annum to local economy. Have good working relationship with Port Otago Ltd. Concerned with gradual deterioration of the wharf facilities at the Careys Bay wharf complex.</li> <li>Society owns a building on leased land, and members lease wharf berths individually. With all parties (commercial and recreational fishers, Port Otago, ORC) can future proof this valuable facility for future generations.</li> <li>Main priorities are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain wharf piles at an increased rate</li> <li>Dredge berths, slipways and extend to Careys Bay recreational pontoon.</li> <li>Reinstate Rocky Point pile and swing moorings.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Currently have 4 people illegally living on vessels at the Careys Bay wharf complex, which is a health and safety concern. Have many layers of sub leasing of berths, but understand berth leases prohibit sub leasing, however this has never been enforced.</li> <li>Have previously encouraged Port Otago to increase commercial berth rate from \$800 to \$3,000 per year. A similar increase in recreational berths would increase income for the maintenance. Would like to be involved in any discussion or decisions we may have.</li> </ul>
701	<p><b>Otago Peninsula Community Board, Paul Pope</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A safe, navigable, maintained Eastern Channel is important to retain access to jetties and ramps on the Otago Peninsula. Currently difficult for recreational craft and the Coastguard to navigate this channel, given the silting up of the harbour. Ask ORC to work with local boating clubs and the Coastguard to identify especially shallow areas that may be able to be addressed in the short term, and consider long term plan for dredging the Eastern Channel.</li> <li>Cross boundary relationship between ORC and DCC over accessibility and use of the harbour are strong, but not bought out strengths or potential of the harbour from a social, cultural and recreational perspective. Ask that a working party of ORC, DCC, DoC, Runaka and other groups is formed to develop a Harbour Management Plan, looking at recreational, social, cultural and environmental management of the harbour, from a marine and terrestrial viewpoint.</li> <li>Years ago, ORC provided signage on bylaws and management of small craft and vessels in the harbour around its various access points. Many markers have deteriorated, become outdated or vandalised. Ask ORC to review all navigational markers and signage, especially on the Peninsula side of the harbour, working with boat clubs and Coastguard to identify areas of concern, and ensure replaced, updated and relocated where necessary.</li> <li>In recent years, consenting fees for boatsheds have risen considerably. Often boatsheds have been on the same site for generations and largely unchanged, so effects of occupation have not altered. Submit that</li> </ul>

	resource consent fees for such occupations, including ramps and moorings, be standardised to recognise that effects have not changed, rather than requiring complicated and costly assessment of environmental effects.
773	<p><b>Careys Bay Historic Hotel, Joanne Kidston</b></p> <p>Disappointed to see an absolute minimum spent on Dunedin's greatest asset - the Otago Harbour. Support the submissions of the Aramoana League Inc. and Aramoana Wharf Restoration Trust.</p>
783	<p><b>Port Chalmers Yacht Club, Graeme Wall</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask ORC to investigate and instigate a dredging programme for Back Beach, Port Chalmers and Careys Bay. These are areas of high aquatic recreational importance, and serve a public ramp along with public pontoons. The depths have become extremely compromised, with recreational value diminishing, and long term viability threatened.</li> <li>• Responsibility for maintaining Back Beach sits with Port Otago. ORC sole shareholder.</li> <li>• Minimal dredging would go a long way to ensuring long term viability.</li> <li>• Need clear logical regime for fees, especially when undertaking changes to their conditions. Would like a clear understanding as to obligations around the 5 yearly inspections of consented structures such as jetties and wharves. Happy to organise and pay for an inspection by a registered engineer, and have report furnished to the ORC, but fail to understand why ORC would replicate the inspection with a non-engineer, and then invoice for the service. Suggest a review of how moorings and structures are managed in a manner suiting the users within the harbour.</li> </ul>
787	<p><b>Vicki Wilson, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Disappointed there is nothing on Otago Harbour, its maintenance or its assets. ORC is responsible for this hugely valuable asset.</p>
791.	<p><b>Aramoana League Inc. , Bill Brown</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORC has neglected duty to maintain the greater areas of the Otago harbour. For example, dredging the mouth of the Leith River, maintaining tidal training rock walls (e.g., Long Mac groyne).</li> <li>• Maintenance helps scower the channel and smaller cross channels used by recreational boat users. Otago Yacht Club has spent hours raising money to pay for dredging the boat harbour but ORC has not maintained the silting up of the mouth of the Leith.</li> <li>• Concerned silt will eventually fill up the boat harbour again. Boat launching ramps and jetties at Port Chalmers, Careys Bay and the Otago Peninsula are silting up, especially in Back Beach. There is no natural scower since the reclaimed area for Port Otago warehousing was built.</li> <li>• Recreational areas are in poor state of repair. Erosion of beaches and sea walls in the lower harbour are of great concern. Suggestion from ORC that the community seek grants and fundraise to pay for erosion (as with Te Raurone) is unacceptable. Clearly ORC's responsibility to carry out these duties.</li> <li>• ORC has received approx. \$150 million in dividends from Port Otago over the years. If had put aside a small amount for harbour maintenance annually, say \$200,000, would have \$6 million to spend to date.</li> <li>• What is the \$404,000 for in the annual plan re harbour management? If to cover salary of a harbour master, expenditure needs to be greatly increased.</li> <li>• Positive aspect in the annual plan is the Coastal Strategy for Otago. Finally this will allow coastal projects to move forward.</li> </ul>
792	<p><b>Dunedin City Council, Mayor Dave Cull</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see joint planning for harbour and harbour access. Would welcome ORC agreement in resourcing a Harbourside Management Plan, e.g., dredging of Careys Bay, Otago Yacht Club and the Eastern Channel, and improve navigational aids to make the harbour safer.</li> <li>• Supports appointment of a dedicated harbour master. Encourage ORC to use its ownership of Port Otago to further enhance Dunedin's waterfront and harbour surrounds.</li> <li>• As that ORC continue to provide support and commitment to seeing stage 1 the Te Rauone beach project completed by winter 2018.</li> </ul>



## Lagarosiphon

<b>Hearing Committee Recommendation</b>	
It is noted that while ORC is not responsible for controlling this weed, the implementation of a pathway management plan for Lake Dunstan will reduce the risk of transferring the weed into high value waterbodies. It is recommended that \$25,000 be provided to LINZ, to be funded by general rates from the Central Otago and Queenstown Lakes districts.	

<b>Submitter comment</b>	
<b>40</b>	<b>Barbara, Cromwell</b> There is no mention of dealing with the growing lagarosiphon weed problem in Lake Dunstan and it spreading into the Clutha River. Would rather money was spent on this than millions spent on new offices.
<b>172.</b>	<b>Richard Scott, Cromwell</b> What is ORC doing about lagarosiphon research, control, and management in Lake Dunstan? To develop, fund and lead a co-ordinated strategy for addressing this issue.
<b>177</b>	<b>M &amp; L Wardill</b> ORC to take the lead in tackling lagarosiphon in Lake Dunstan as the efforts to date are shameful. This must be ORC driven.
<b>209.</b>	<b>Darren Ballantine, Cromwell</b> Disappointing there is no mention in the draft plan. Appears no-one wants to deal with the issue. With the lower water levels recently, a large amount of growth has occurred over the last few years. Do not ignore the issue as it will keep growing and become a major problem.
<b>228</b>	<b>Ralph Clifford, Alexandra</b> The lack of reference to lagarosiphon in Lake Dunstan is beyond comprehension as this is a noxious weed that is slowly suffocating a wonderful facility.
<b>241</b>	<b>Elaine Rae, Cromwell</b> Why is no money is being spent on Lake Dunstan clean-up of lake weed.
<b>288.</b>	<b>John Wilson, Cromwell</b> Lake Dunstan is in urgent need of weed control or we will lose it. Spraying has a proven record of results and \$1,000,000 will clean it up. 'Use it or lose it'.
<b>410</b>	<b>Patrick O'Neill, Cromwell</b> What about Lake Dunstan weed problem?
<b>529</b>	<b>Howard Anderson, Cromwell</b> Understand ORC gives \$50,000 to monitor and control this weed. This more a joke than helping control this pest weed. Get your head around it, it is a big problem.
<b>545</b>	<b>Pauline Copeland, Cromwell</b> Lake weed in Lake Dunstan is also serious.
<b>586</b>	<b>Bruce Rolston</b> More money should be spent on weed control in Lake Dunstan.
<b>617</b>	<b>N R Smith, Cromwell</b> Should take a more active role to control lagarosiphon weed in Lake Dunstan so the rate payers can enjoy the lake.

634.	<p><b>Queenstown Grey Power</b> No mention of this oxygen weed in the annual plan. It is apparently present in parts of the Kawarau river so it is only a matter of time before it reaches Lake Wakatipu. Resources must be allocated to contain its spread.</p>
649.	<p><b>Diane Yeldon, Dunedin</b> Have \$100,000 for mitigations and management of lagarosiphon in the lakes and waterways of Otago.</p>
652	<p><b>Guardians of Lake Dunstan</b> Seek funding and physical commitment from ORC in the fight to control Lagarosiphon in Lake Dunstan, as well as other noxious weeds.</p>
664.	<p><b>G &amp; B Mitchell, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no mention about the need to control and eradicate lagarosiphon in Lake Dunstan.</li> <li>• The surface of the upper lake where the Clutha River flows into the lake is almost completely covered. Guardians of Lake Dunstan estimate that there are about 500 hectares clogging up the lake but authorities can only deal with about 70 hectares in the 'high value' areas such as boat ramps and swimming spots.</li> <li>• Control involves cutting one metre from the 5 metre plant, is not working. Boaties, fishermen etc. wanting to access and swim in Lake Dunstan have cancelled their plans due to the problem.</li> <li>• The weed is present in other Central Otago lakes upstream of Lake Dunstan. The health of the lakes needs to be addressed as not only is lagarosiphon present but also didymo and lake snow. A comprehensive solution for all the lakes needs to be found.</li> <li>• The establishment of a Chair in Lake Management and Restoration at Waikato University has directly resulted in improved health in several lakes in the areas, especially around Rotorua. ORC could set up a similar Chair at the University of Otago. The cost to the ORC is possibly around \$500,000, only double the amount to investigate wallaby control. The benefits of the Chair would be in attracting Ph.D and Masters students, to investigate ways of improving the health of all lakes in Central Otago.</li> <li>• Research overseas indicates aquatic pests such as lagarosiphon, didymo and lake snow are notoriously difficult to eradicate but that is no reason not to try and as such there needs to be an overall strategy, not just piecemeal attempts by various organisations.</li> </ul>
700.	<p><b>Frankton Community Association</b> Note no funding for Lagarosiphon. Weed is now at the head of the Kawarau River, but no action highlighted in the annual plan to stop its spread into Lake Wakatipu. Is ORC ignoring the problem, abrogating their responsibility, like it has with Lake Dunstan?</p>
739.	<p><b>Murray Neilson, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aware a petition is like to be presented to ORC, asking for funding Lagarosiphon control in Lake Dunstan. Opposed to this proposal, as more important priorities, such as deemed permit replacement programme.</li> <li>• The recently signed 10 year Lake Dunstan Lagarosiphon control plan is sufficient and appropriate. Those who signed the plan, including the Lake Dunstan Guardians (behind the petition), should abide by its proposals, including appropriate review periods, rather than trying to subvert it in its infancy. Lagarosiphon is not ORC's responsibility under the Biosecurity Act.</li> </ul>
746	<p><b>Bill &amp; Kirsty Sharpe</b> Nothing allocated in the annual plan. Understand it is at Kawarau Falls, and will come into Lake Wakatipu. Cannot afford to endanger this lake. Meaningful resources must be allocated to deal with this. If gets into Wakatipu, control would be almost impossible.</p>
788	<p><b>Ken McGraw, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understand ORC is not the lead agency on this matter, LINZ are. Such a restriction does not extend to assisting lagarosiphon control in Lake Wanaka.</li> <li>• Want genuine leadership from ORC on responsibility for water quality in Lake Dunstan. Agree is a joint responsibility, but community feels very fobbed off by the agencies responsible.</li> <li>• Request Lake Dunstan lagarosiphon issues be included in the annual plan via a support and possible funding plan.</li> </ul>

## Pest animals and plants, and Strategy

### Hearing Committee Recommendation

It is noted that a review of the Pest Management Plan for Otago is planned for the 2017/18 year, and that the issues raised will be considered as part of that review.

	Submitter comment
52	<b>Donald Young, Cromwell</b> More money and effort is required in rabbit research.
62	<b>Alastair McIlwhick, Queenstown</b> There is no mention of rabbit eradication. Vast areas are infested by rabbits. Needs to be a more aggressive plan to get rid of them.
77	<b>Royden Thomson, Cromwell</b> Wilding pines and other noxious plants such as broom and budlea, are a growing problem. An increase in funding for mitigation purposes would be a sensible move, even if 'step 1' is an educational exercise.
159	<b>S Conland &amp; R Miller, Wanaka</b> ORC to expand its target to other wilding species apart from conifers and trees as weeds seem to be overwhelming the ORC region.
200	<b>Anon</b> We ask for feedback but do nothing about the rabbit problem and this is why people can't be bothered voting.
216	<b>Judith Fotheringham, Queenstown</b> Can goats be labelled as pests to be dealt with e.g. culled?
290	<b>Robyn Young, Gore</b> Wilding pines, gorse, broom and rabbits are also concerns.
325	<b>Trudy Weinberg, Queenstown</b> Rabbit control is needed immediately.
344	<b>Joyce Brown, Cromwell</b> Introduce new strain of rabbit virus as a priority.
444	<b>Peter McNab, Owaka</b> Need to develop a strategy for dealing with possum's post TB control. It must be funded taking into account the significant regional benefits from low possum numbers.
565.	<b>Margaret Hill, Roxburgh</b> Need to be more vigilant to prevent the introduction of things like dydimo and lake snow etc. as it is very hard to eradicate or control these things once they are here.
568	<b>Peter Dowden, Dunedin</b> Sycamore trees to be added to the list of target plant species, to be controlled along with wilding pines.
602.	<b>P &amp; M Hore, Wedderburn</b> Continued control of pests and weeds is important. The effective work on wilding pine control must continue. Wallaby control is a must before it is impossible. Work on weeds in lakes also important.

603.	<p><b>Bruce Hebbard</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have funding to control the rabbit problem in Otago, to target rabbits on land under ORC's control to the same standards it demands of private landowners under its regulatory powers. Funding could be allocated in three parts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For consents required and the application of the Korean virus in the autumn of 2018.</li> <li>2. For control of the rabbit population from now until the virus is introduced, the numbers will balloon until the virus can be deployed at the earliest of autumn of 2018.</li> <li>3. For eradication of those rabbits not killed by the new virus. Have never seen rabbit numbers in the Upper Clutha as numerous as they are now.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Have observed rabbits coming from the Clutha /Cardrona Rivers onto private land. QLDC say they are not controlling rabbits on their land because ORC has not asked them to.</li> <li>• ORC has advised the new virus would be in use this autumn after testing in Australia. ORC is tardy in obtaining the necessary consents.</li> <li>• Funding needs to be sufficient to eradicate rabbits on ORC land and enforce regulations on land controlled/owned by councils and landowners. Only when ORC shows leadership in dealing with this problem, can they ask landowners to control pests on their land.</li> </ul>
634.	<p><b>Queenstown Grey Power</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goats are a real concern for Queenstown with goats coming off Queenstown Hill and the Ben Lomond reserve. Property owners are not permitted to shooting them under the Firearms Act. ORC to take some leadership on this issue.</li> <li>• Concerned at the increase of rabbits. Finance to be set aside to combat this problem. They are not just a rural problem. They are a real problem at the Lake Hayes reserve, Queenstown Golf Club and generally Arrowtown. Council to deal with this problem ASAP.</li> </ul>
670	<p><b>Lisa Russell, Dunedin</b></p> <p>A huge amount of money and expertise was invested into 'solving' Didymo to no avail. To be effective this organism needed to be isolated when first discovered.</p>
700	<p><b>Frankton Community Association</b></p> <p>An equivalent effort to be made with rabbits as is being proposed with wallabies.</p>
701.	<p><b>Otago Peninsula Community Board</b></p> <p>Rabbit problem on the Peninsula is high, with increased numbers of mustelids surviving on rabbits. Creates a high risk for iconic species of birdlife (penguins). The Otago Peninsula Biodiversity Trust has made excellent inroads in possum numbers and has formed a model of community led control. Now required to extend that model onto rabbits/mustelid issues on the Peninsula. Submits this should be a priority for ORC. Resources in control, research and advocacy are required from ORC to support landowners and organisations. Opportunity for information and resource sharing.</p>
705.	<p><b>Landscape Connections Trust</b></p> <p>Notes the difficulty in dealing with feral cats. The Trust is considering fundraising to run its own microchipping service and registry for cats in the Inner Halo, but not preferred option, as not their role. Talking with other groups (University, SPCA, Veterinary Association) about a pilot in the Beyond Orokonui area. Have requested DCC involvement in discussions. Ask ORC to add weight to calls for more proactive approach to cat management in Dunedin, including a microchipping programme led by the DCC.</p>
724	<p><b>Fish &amp; Game, Nigel Paragreen</b></p> <p>Planned review of Pest Management Strategy supported, along with the development of the Biodiversity Strategy.</p>
731.	<p><b>J Ledgerwood</b></p> <p>Asks for release of rabbit virus now.</p>

737	<p><b>Queenstown Lakes District Council, Mayor Jim Boulton</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In consultation document could swap word wallaby for rabbit, to outline serious threat the escalating rabbit population poses to Central Otago. QLDC does not support any delay in solutions for rabbit eradication. Could fund through reserves.</li> <li>Support ORC's commitment to both wilding pine and Lagarosiphon control, noting ORC and QLDC have successfully together lobbied LINZ to establish a working group on Lagarosiphon for Lake Wakatipu.</li> </ul>
742	<p><b>Otago Peninsula Biodiversity Group, Moira Parker</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategy currently ignores possums. Given nationally recognised as a serious pest, urge ORC to include possums in the revised strategy. Both Southland and Canterbury include possums in their plans. Canterbury's objective is to contain possums below a 10% residual trap catch, or below in high value environmental sites. Southland requires containment at 5% or below residual trap catch.</li> <li>The value of the work done by OPBG should not be overlooked, in keeping the Peninsula Tb free.</li> </ul>
746	<p><b>B &amp; K Sharpe</b></p> <p>No longer a rural problem, rabbits getting into gardens at Kelvin Heights. Attend to this urgent problem, and spend what is needed to get on top of it.</p>
757.	<p><b>Heidi Ross, Queenstown</b></p> <p>Why just wallabies, why not help with possum and stoats?</p>
763	<p><b>Richard Anderson, Cromwell</b></p> <p>As for wallaby control, many have been fighting pests for a life time, rabbits, briars, now pigs and wilding pines. Never had pigs until 10 years ago, now a lot, and convinced released from other areas, and being breed.</p>
766	<p><b>Barbara Blatt, Wanaka</b></p> <p>Wallaby control should be replaced by rabbit control, then would support it.</p>
776.	<p><b>Mokihi Trust, B D Armstrong, Cromwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Every catchment could have a paid for rabbit who could move around the district with full entry rights. Would cost less than \$1m per year. Push pest destruction and give the region their land back.</li> <li>Want more money spent on invasive weeds, including pine, and more support given to environmental groups involved in the planting and care of native plants.</li> </ul>
780	<p><b>Reuben Morison, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Darwins Barberry is a significant issue throughout coastal Otago, including Signal Hill. In last ORC 10 year plan, were to remove Darwins Barberry and Gorse from Signal Hill but no work has even been started. Needs to be put on the invasive weed list and proactively removed from public and private land. If not dealt with soon will invade into native bush.</p>
792.	<p><b>Dunedin City Council, Mayor Dave Cull</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports continued funding on wallaby and wilding tree control. Would welcome an integrated approach to pest and plant control and support greater coordination and cooperation between agencies and communities.</li> <li>Dunedin community has broader concerns around the scope of invasive flora and fauna that need managing, from sycamore trees to mustelids. DCC has objectives under its environment strategy to protect ecosystems and increase biodiversity. Recommends ORC should provide policy and resourcing support to help achieve these ambitions.</li> </ul>
804	<p><b>J A Howe</b></p> <p>No mention of rabbits!</p>

## Rates

<b>Hearing Committee Recommendation</b>	
With respect to requests for a greater use of targeted rates, it is noted that a review of the council's revenue policy would be undertaken during 2017/18 as part of the Long Term Plan process.	

	<b>Submitter comment</b>
<b>37.</b>	<p><b>Neil Gaudin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed 14% increase is outrageous and any increase over the current inflation rate is effectively mis-management. Local councils have a regulated maximum rates increase and the ORC has a moral obligation to plan and work within this constraint.</li> <li>Year after year the ORC rates go up by ridiculous amounts and to try and pass this off as 'the total dollar increase is relatively low' is almost criminal deception. The 14% increase is totally unacceptable and relatively high in comparison to other costs in the real world.</li> </ul>
<b>61</b>	<p><b>Will Grant, Queenstown</b></p> <p>Rates need to be based on income and not property values.</p>
<b>87.</b>	<p><b>Debbie Healy, Queenstown</b></p> <p>An increase in rates should only come into effect when services have improved. ORC has sufficient cash reserve funds to initiate the changes like the subsidised bus route in Queenstown.</p>
<b>112</b>	<p><b>Sue O'Conner, Arrowtown</b></p> <p>Submitter is a pensioner but still supports rates increase as ORC work needs to be done to a high standard so funding it is necessary.</p>
<b>226</b>	<p><b>J &amp; G Thompson, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Why charge higher rates to the people with higher value properties. The value of your house doesn't reflect your income or the use of council services received.</p>
<b>247</b>	<p><b>Lorna Schmidt, Cromwell</b></p> <p>Opposed to the rates increase. It should be illegal for increase to be above the annual pension increases. Councils are getting more money from the increased resident numbers in Otago. Don't defer debt payment. Use money already supplied for staff to do the job properly. Do not add more infrastructure as that encourages lazy practices and costs more.</p>
<b>289</b>	<p><b>Ian Hall, Alberttown</b></p> <p>The increase in the QLDC rating area is disproportionate, especially on top of the proposed QLDC rates increase. Similarly, year on year increases do not represent effective management and efficiency gains. The reserves look excessive with significant scope for much better management of assets.</p>
<b>299</b>	<p><b>Geoff Higgins, Herbert</b></p> <p>Would like to see more of the rating dollar targeted. Keep paying but see nothing in their area in return. Feels it is just another tax.</p>
<b>341</b>	<p><b>Lukas Von Grunigen, Gore</b></p> <p>General rates should only increase in line with inflation rate.</p>
<b>395</b>	<p><b>R &amp; J Barrett, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Proposals are worthy but the 14% increase is extreme. Inflation and incomes are under 5%. Reduce the wants e.g. transport subsidies.</p>

474.	<b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> Page 12 – the transparency of this section is appalling.
514	<b>Anon</b> When an organisation like ORC ask for a rates hike, it always results in a pay rise for staff and nothing changes.
546	<b>P &amp; R Hellebrekers</b> Why are ORC rates based on capital value? Property gets the same or less service than a similar property in Dunedin or Central Otago.
558	<b>Anon</b> Submitter is a Dunedin city property owner only. Do not think the options in the consultation document have any direct impact on them. Why are their rates higher than the rural?
584.	<b>John McKenzie, Middlemarch</b> A user pays system works the best on all rates. Targeted rate are best, as a general rate does not make the ratepayer care about the issue.
634.	<b>Queenstown Grey Power</b> While Grey Power members would normally only support a minimum or nil rates increase; they acknowledge that a huge amount of work needs to be done to preserve our once pristine environment.
659	<b>M L Soal, Dunedin</b> Council needs to prioritise its budgeting skills. Submitter attempts to operate 100 hectares as a unit under ORC rules and further restrictions are applied by the territorial authority. Do not have a captive market where they can increase their income by 14%, their other costs are also increasing.
707	<b>Peter Milford</b> Remember most ratepayers are stretched to pay ever increasing rates, and that staff are employed by ratepayers, not a moneymaker. Keep operating costs to a minimum. The face of the paying public is watching your decisions.
718	<b>William Bishop, Dunedin</b> 14% increase in rates, when inflation is less than 2% is grossly irresponsible, and empire building at worst. Reduce services to statutory requirements and reduce rates to less than 2%. A 20% general rate increase in Dunedin is totally unacceptable.
743.	<b>Nona James, Queenstown</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All costs specific to an area should be funded by targeted rates, not general rates, which are disproportionately charged to each household in Queenstown due to the higher capital values.</li> <li>• Why are those in Queenstown required to fund wallaby control while those in the Waitaki are not contributing through a general rate to the cost of wilding pine control in Queenstown. Pines are also a pest and stopping their spread benefits the wider community as much, if not more, than wallaby control.</li> <li>• ORC needs to seriously consider the funding model for general rates. The huge difference between capital values between Queenstown and other parts of Otago results in a disproportionate rate levy on the Queenstown community. Charge a fixed rate for all households at or less than the median value for their particular region, as this would equalise the current inequities where Queenstown households pay a disproportionately higher cost for the same general services. Properties with CVs over the median value could then be charged a general rate on the excess of their CV over the median to ensure that those who can afford to pay more do so.</li> </ul>
760	<b>Wendy Harris, Dunedin</b> Let Otago rates go to flood and drainage, 3% not enough. Let each area pay for own unless national disaster.

782	<p><b>Federated Farmers, David Cooper</b>  Notes the overall rate increase of 31%. Agrees additional spending proposed is warranted. Supports use of special dividend to smooth the overall rating impact. Asks council to review policy of recovering 25% of general rate through UAGC. Significant scope for this to be increased.</p>
790	<p><b>Remarkables Park, Shotover Park &amp; Queenstown Park</b>  Notes a typical Queenstown property are 46% higher than for a typical Dunedin residential property, 56% higher than a Central Otago property, and more than twice as high for Waitaki and Clutha districts. Understand the bus service will increase rates in the district, but unable to find any justification for the rest of the disparity. This disparity needs to be eliminated or considerably reduced.</p>
804.	<p><b>J A Howe, Oamaru</b>  Water target is 40 cents, ok, but transport 4 cents – this could be increased. Hazards is 7 cents, more than transport, why?</p>



## Funding Requests

	Submitter comments	Recommendation
259	<p><b>Rotary Club of Dunedin, Bill Thompson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rotary Club commenced a project in January 2013 to enhance the edges of the cycle/walking trail between the Dunedin Boat Harbour and Maia. DCC has accepted maintenance responsibilities. Budget \$200,000 for all products, trees, shrubs, signage, and exercise equipment.</li> <li>Ask ORC to fund a double burner BBQ, designed for public use in a picnic environment, cost being \$12,818 (incl. GST). Concrete pad and housing shelter being donated by JG Gardner.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommend declining the funding of a BBQ as this is outside of our areas of responsibility. Note submitter may apply for funding for an environmental component of this project from the Environmental Enhancement Fund.</p>
695	<p><b>Irrigation NZ, Andrew Curtis, Lincoln</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request \$10,000 per annum for 3 years to co-fund INZ's Sustainable Farming Fund Application – SMART Tips &amp; Tools for Irrigators.</li> <li>Irrigators are facing significant challenges, achieving water quality, setting of minimum flows and mining privilege replacement. The SMART application will help address these through working with Council and irrigators to understand and communicate barriers and benefits to change, and provide more readily available knowledge on how to achieve good practice, be efficient irrigators.</li> <li>Environment Canterbury, Hawkes Bay Regional Council and Bay of Plenty have confirmed involvement in the project to date.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommend this application be declined. The project is around providing farm advice, which we do not consider to be our core business.</p>
720	<p><b>Russell Garbutt, Clyde</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of small group wishing to establish a Community Heating initiative. Wish to set up a Trust, proposed members being Jono Conway from Bodeker Scientific, Fraser Jonker – Pioneer Energy, Geoff Kernick – Heating Engineer, and Russell Garbutt – Vincent Community Board member.</li> <li>Would like to progress a programme of investigating ways of heating community areas, liaising with community groups, raising funds to implement installations, promoting sustainable heating sources, and promoting research into technologies to advance the aims of the Trust. Aware desire of ORC and community to find alternative sources of heating that could mitigate high levels of air pollution in Alexandra in winter.</li> <li>Request approximately \$2,000 for the legal costs of setting up a Trust.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommend declining this application as funding of legal costs is not our role. If Trust is established, may be some future opportunity to work with and assist this group.</p>

723	<p><b>NZ Marine Studies Centre, Tessa Mills</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports strategies for efficient monitoring. Essential to maintain and protect a healthy natural environment. ORC activities to highlight the sea and human impacts on it would be valued. Ask ORC to give financial support for a local Seaweek coordinator. Seaweek is an annual event held in March. Currently only have a voluntary coordinator, but could do much more with a paid coordinator.</li> <li>• ORC needs baseline data, which means monitoring the quality of our seawater and the biodiversity of marine life. NZMSC has developed a project “Marine Metre Squared (Mm2). Anyone can participate by monitoring a 1m x 1m square patch of local shore once every season. Data uploaded onto a website. Project used in schools, and used in the “Sediment and Seashores” project developed in 2016 to study impact of dredging and sediment disturbance. Has developed guides, videos, and other supporting material. The adoption and promotion of the project by ORC would be mutually beneficial.</li> <li>• The Healthy Harbour Watchers project, developed in 2004, is a community based water quality monitoring programme that facilitates analyses of the water in Otago Harbour on a regular basis.</li> <li>• Ask ORC to support and promote Seaweek, adopt the Mm2 project and adopt the Healthy Harbour Watchers project.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommend declining this application. It is not council policy to fund operational costs, i.e., the paid coordinator position. The development of a Coastal Strategy is in our current work programme, leading to a review of our Coast Plan.</p>
769	<p><b>3F Food, Farms, Freshwater, Chris Arbuckle</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In March, 3F applied to the government’s Freshwater Improvement Fund (FIF). The application to test and implement 3F focuses on 4 regions throughout NZ, including the Lake Wanaka catchment. Application has over \$326,000 of committed funds from private funders and Regional Councils.</li> <li>• During application process, 3F encouraged ORC to partner on the Lake Wanaka work. Submission is to support earlier request for ORC to co-fund the 3F Lake Wanaka project FIF application. Request \$30,000 per annum for 2 years from the rural water quality budget. Also request ORC use the Wanaka catchment as one of its 5 intensive sampling catchments.</li> <li>• 3F project is to scale the Taupo Beef model to enable food producers to take an economically profitable route to enhance the quality of waterways within their farm business. 3F will establish a nationwide environmental verification system grounded in catchment science for all farmers to improve their environmental performance, and create a value chain for verified products, initially focusing on the red meat sector.</li> <li>• Framework will use regulatory limits and standards in the ORC water plan as a bench mark of environmental performance.</li> <li>• Why Lake Wanaka? – community considers the lakes future water quality vulnerable to further urban development and farming practices. Is significant footprint of extensive sheep and beef farming, and deer is also prevalent.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommend declining this funding application. In terms of council’s water quality implementation project, whilst Lake Wanaka is a highly valued and important water body, there are other catchments that have more intensive land use, are degraded, and have greater risks, and as a consequence, are currently a higher priority for council.</p>

781	<p><b>Upper Clutha Water Group, Megan Williams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask ORC to support the community led and collaborative (regulatory, science, community) implementation of a Lake Wanaka and Upper Clutha Community Water Management Plan.</li> <li>• Request funding of \$150,000 per annum for the UCWG to facilitate the community response alongside science and regulatory bodies. Group has developed a strategic plan of action and the funds would support the ongoing management of this alongside the development of any similar plans for Lake Hayes and Lake Wakatipu. An oversight group could be set up to manage activities and funds alongside ORC and QLDC.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommend declining this application, noting the project proposes a process that differs from the approach taken in our water plan, i.e., this is a nutrient loading programme. In terms of council's water quality implementation project, whilst Lake Wanaka is a highly valued and important water body, there are other catchments that have more intensive land use, are degraded, and have greater risks, and as a consequence, are currently a higher priority for council.</p>
-----	--	---

## Significance & Engagement Policy

<b>Hearing Committee Recommendation</b>
It is recommended that the Significance and Engagement Policy be amended to include the additional wording as consulted on.

	<b>Submitter comments</b>
<b>30.</b>	<b>Ralf Schrubba, Dunedin</b> The document does not clearly define what strategic assets are, thus leaving it to be decided by just a few behind closed doors, instead of by us, the public.
<b>85.</b>	<b>Emily Tidey, Dunedin</b> Notification should still be necessary but not full consultation.
<b>436</b>	<b>Dennis Kestila, Dunedin</b> This section reads as 'gobbledegook' and could be interpreted by a sceptic as a cover for disposal of assets currently specified as protected e.g. let's sell Port Otago to pay for a new palace.
<b>536</b>	<b>Neil James, Dunedin</b> Would expect ORC to report on non-strategic acquisitions or sales.
<b>548</b>	<b>Joan Mawson, Dunedin</b> Unsure about this section. Who decides what assets are significant? Would affected locals have input?
<b>614</b>	<b>John Chappell, Dunedin</b> Agree in principal but suggests we consider a public list of assets, with non-significant items flagged.
<b>721.</b>	<b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b> Support changes to the significance and engagement policy as it relates to upgrading assets aimed at improving the efficiency of the flood control scheme. There will be need to dispose of 'old' flood control assets, therefore changes will be necessary so they can be sold or otherwise disposed of without having to go through a public consultation phase.
<b>733</b>	<b>Ronald Cunningham, Alexandra</b> Who decides what is significant?
<b>744</b>	<b>Julia Wilson, Dunedin</b> Concerned the new wording is vague and could result in different definitions of 'significant decisions' depending on who is on the Council.
<b>782</b>	<b>Federated Farmers, David Cooper</b> Recognise overall drivers for proposed change. Expect that any landowners affected by decisions under the revised policy would be treated fairly and equitably irrespective of the changes.
<b>784</b>	<b>S C Yeoman, Dunedin</b> Strategic assets must be extended to include reserves, natural areas and some non-built environments that are vital to water conservation and maintenance of biological diversity.
<b>791</b>	<b>Aramoana League Inc., Bill Brown</b> Do not support change as do not support the idea of not consulting on items that may or may not be significant to that scheme.

## Other Submissions

	Submitter comments	Staff Comments
	<b>Consultation Document</b>	
302	<b>A Gillespie, Omakau</b> Disgusted Council printed information regarding water quality with a picture of an effluent irrigator. Should be printed with a picture of a healthy river.	Thanks for feedback, the irrigator relates to the work farmers need to do to contribute to water quality outcomes.
470	<b>Diana Noonan, Owaka</b> Other than the photos of the councillors, 11 people are clearly identified in the illustrative material. Of these only 2 (possibly 3) are female. Would like to see a greater proportion of women, especially in work roles, represented in material sent out by the ORC.	Thanks for feedback, will consider this in future publications.
543	<b>Malcolm McKenzie, Oamaru</b> Got the consultation document through a free paper in a visit to Dunedin so missed out on attending any meetings in Oamaru. Why was the consultation document not placed with the free paper in Oamaru?	It also went in the Oamaru Mail.
552	<b>Brian Kreft, Wanaka</b> The survey is very one-sided and as a consequence, it will give the ORC the outcome it wants. Support a lot of what is being proposed, but believe that not enough is being done.	
563	<b>Gerry Eckhoff, Alexandra</b> ORC's yes/no response is an unacceptable method of determining public opinion, as so many issues require a far greater response.	The opportunity to provide further comment was given to submitters.
697	<b>Val Goss, Dunedin</b> Thank you for giving the public the opportunity to provide feedback on the ORC plan.	
474	<b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Booklet was over produced, on high value paper. Newsprint would have been effective and cheaper. What did this publication cost? Helpful to have photos of councillors, shame didn't include brief resume on each and annual payments. Ratepayers entitled to know what their reward for service is.</li> <li>Information about staff completely absent. No staff numbers, profiles or qualifications of senior staff.</li> <li>Photo (page 2) of happy men enjoying a 'cuppa', but no caption explaining it. This photo would make any hard boiled feminist jump up and down in outrage.</li> <li>Where the ORC dollar is spent is shear window dressing. What is the total dollar take? What is the actual dollar spent on staff, cleaning and maintenance of nine buildings? Transparency? Reference to accessing the on line calculator – is a complete lack of sensitivity towards the mature ratepayer who may not have a computer, or cell phone.</li> </ul>	Each year, Councillor remuneration is published in the council's Annual Report. A brief resume of each councillor is provided for in the draft annual plan, which is available on our web site.  The on line calculator is well used by those who do have computers. Anyone unable to access the information is welcome to contact the council for further information.
483	<b>Marjau Lousberg, Clyde</b> The document provided is excellent and clear, makes it easier to give an opinion. One gripe, the last question (significance and engagement	Thanks and noted.

	policy), required googling of what was meant. Could have been better clarified, e.g., reference to relevant page.	
	<b>Council Function, Councillors</b>	
81	<b>Anon</b> Have women genuinely invited onto Council. Give consideration to younger minds of both genders and for fresher outlooks.	Councillors are elected by the community.
255	<b>P Jackson, Dunedin</b> The main function of Council is to look after the needs of the people so flood and slip control are priority with water quality next. Water should be free from visible pollutants and harmful organism which prevent bathing. It would be lovely if you could drink river water, currently too much e-coli around hill country huts, never mind downstream.	Otago water plan seeks to maintain good water and improve that quality where it is degraded.
269	<b>Allan Craig, Queenstown</b> ORC functions should be lean and targeted and regular dialogue with councillors and staff should be encouraged. Online surveying is cost effective for feedback.	
308	<b>Margaret Anderson</b> Supports and trusts the decisions made by the people have elected, to act for the good of the region. Appreciate our dedication and commitment to our responsibilities.	
405	<b>Anon</b> Regional council be disbanded and replaced by a provincial council. This would do away with the fragmented and expensive councils.	
702	<b>Rob Adair, Dunedin</b> Would like to see more diverse bunch of councillors. Looks too white and too male.	Councillors are elected by the community.
	<b>Dairy Farms</b>	
26.	<b>Jenny Aimers, Dunedin</b> Stop to dairy farm expansion in sensitive areas.	Water plan addresses discharge quality from all rural activities.
425	<b>Ian Stewart, Alexandra</b> Tighten up the control and permitting dairy farms in our area. This activity is affecting our rivers and must be controlled more vigilantly.	Water plan addresses discharge quality from all rural activities.
702	<b>Rob Adair, Dunedin</b> Look at land use. Dairy farms in alluvial river beds, dry arid areas. Drive north of Omakau and smell the dairy effluent. How was this given resource consent?	
	<b>Dunedin Public Transport</b>	
19	<b>Dan Windwood, Dunedin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measurement of bus reliability in Dunedin is poor - 95% of buses may leave the terminus on time but they don't keep to the timetable for long. When is Dunedin going to provide real time bus information at stops and online.</li> <li>Could the numbers 1 and 2 buses run at weekends? Some people who live in the city would like to go to the Waitaki coast in the weekends.</li> </ul>	The bus reliability parameter is considered appropriate for the Dunedin network. Realtime system under development. An improved timetable for Harrington point is included in the current tender. There is no allowance in existing budgets for an extension of the northern service

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asks that the Harrington Point service runs more often and terminates nearer to Taiaroa Heads as that would be handy for tourists and locals.</li> </ul>	into the weekends. Improved daytime frequency is included for consideration in 2019.
137	<p><b>Terence Morris, Dunedin</b> We need an affordable bus service between Dunedin and the airport as the monopoly shuttle service is a rip-off and embarrassment.</p>	This is being addressed.
306	<p><b>David Cottle, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed bus hub is in the wrong place. It is in a vibrant shopping area and will damage retail businesses and reduce car parking.</li> <li>Transfer the Dunedin public transport back to the DCC or listen to and act on what patrons want. ORC should not be involved in public transport, it is a local body issue for local councils and private enterprise.</li> </ul>	The bus hub has already been consulted on.
701	<p><b>Otago Peninsula Community Board, Paul Pope</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With widening of the Peninsula road, cyclists will increase on the road, but will possibly use bus to take bike one way, and bus home. Ask that buses accommodate cycles inside as they do in other countries.</li> <li>Ask ORC to investigate having Wi-Fi on the buses.</li> <li>Concerned at loss of bus stop platforms as the Portobello/Harrington Point road is widened. Need to retain bus stops in locations that will increase patronage, and relevant to needs of residents and visitors. Ask that in collaboration with DCC, any bus stop changes to be well canvassed with the community before changes are made.</li> </ul>	<p>Cycle rack will be on all buses in the Dunedin network by the end of this year.</p> <p>WiFi is being considered as part of new route tenders.</p> <p>Bus stops are being reviewed and provision being made by DCC in the widening project, the rationalisation of pick up points is occurring as improved pedestrian access is created through the widening project</p>
706	<p><b>Bus Go Dunedin, Peter Dowden</b> Ask ORC to fund and DCC to install bus stops at the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Tool Shed, Hillside Road</li> <li>Outside and opposite Pak n Save, Hillside Road</li> <li>Crawford / Jervois corner</li> <li>Crawford / Jetty corner</li> <li>Outside and opposite in Marne St / Somerville St, Andersons Bay</li> <li>Opposite / adjacent to Clarendon Hotel, McLaggan St</li> <li>Both sides near busy end of Canongate / Serpentine Ave hairpin corner</li> <li>Both sides Portobello Rd near Portsmouth Drive/Shore St corner.</li> </ul> <p>Request following stops to maintain bus service accessibility in the Octagon, when the bus hub is built:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposite / adjacent to Bracken Court, Moray Place</li> <li>Opposite / adjacent to library steps</li> </ul> <p>Request the following further improvements to bus services:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Immediate reinstatement of half hourly frequency during week days on City to Belleknowes, and rapid introduction on Waverly end. Unfair to treat differently.</li> <li>Buses after 6 p.m. Sundays and public holidays</li> <li>Full public holiday services on Christmas Day, Good Friday and Easter Sunday. Otago Heritage Bus Society have demonstrated a clear unmet demand</li> </ol>	<p>These are operational details that will be considered in due course.</p> <p>Allowance is made for ongoing service and infrastructure improvements in the existing budget.</p> <p>Responses are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheduled for July 2018</li> <li>Consider once new network is in and operational and demand is assessed.</li> <li>Not recommended at this stage.</li> <li>Investigation of feasibility in the current programme,</li> <li>Recommend a review of all concessions for the Dunedin network in the 17/18 financial year</li> <li>Not recommended but consideration will be given during the detailed design of the new ticketing system to making this available through the online top-up (desirable to minimise the</li> </ol>

	<p>4. Introduce an Airport Bus.</p> <p>Request the following changes to fares:</p> <p>5. Community services card discount to replace limited beneficiary discount.</p> <p>6. Minimum top up to be \$5 to make Go Cards more accessible.</p> <p>7. Go Card Adult fare to set as the standard fare, with discount and cash fares calculated from this.</p> <p>8. Support publicly notified fares being declared maximum, with council staff and/or bus operators being given discretion to offer discounts from time to time.</p> <p>9. Consider weekly/monthly bus pass.</p>	<p>number of cash transactions on bus,</p> <p>7. Recommend a review of all concessions for the Dunedin network in the 17/18 financial year</p> <p>8. Support the fares being maximum fares and allow Council the discretion to adjust fares in response to outside influences e.g. fuel price, special events etc.</p> <p>9. Refer 5 above.</p>
771	<p><b>Liz Angelo, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Requests the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reinstatement of the Cannongate, Russell St part of the Belleknowes No 19 bus route in Dunedin.</li> <li>• Immediate reinstatement of half hourly frequency during off peak hours on the City to Belleknowes end of route 19.</li> <li>• An airport bus to be introduced</li> <li>• Pass over management of Dunedin buses to the DCC asap, the ORC's efforts have been a failure.</li> </ul>	<p>Under review at present with consultation being undertaken. Frequency change due for July 2018 subject to assessed demand.</p>
792	<p><b>Dunedin City Council, Mayor Dave Cull</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes lack of real time information at bus stops. Strongly supports a new ticketing system and WiFi on buses, boosting Dunedin's status of being a GigCity.</li> <li>• View of the DCC that bus services would, in principle, and for purposes of integrated transport planning, sit better with the DCC. Would support working with ORC to advance a decision on the transfer of this service as soon as practicable.</li> </ul>	<p>Real time and ticketing system are current projects. WiFi is a consideration under the current tender round.</p>
793	<p><b>Disabled Persons Assembly, Chris Ford</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully commends ORC for beginning recent roll out of more modern accessible buses and changes to the total mobility scheme.</li> <li>• Still need to listen to voice of bus users when setting future service routes and enforcing standards.</li> <li>• Would like to be involved in work around electronic ticketing, ensuring it is accessible, inclusive and user friendly for all.</li> </ul>	<p>The network is defined within the RTP and review is through the statutory process defined in the LTMA.</p> <p>Public feedback is always considered. The new ticketing system is being developed through the consortium framework. Accessibility is a key component of the detailed design.</p>
	<p><b>Engagement</b></p>	
96	<p><b>Biggs Family</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan does not contain enough detail on the proposals. There is not enough space for proper feedback.</li> <li>• All the assumptions of 'no issues' shows just how poorly the ORC understands QLDC growth issues.</li> <li>• There is not enough information to explain the office plan and the investment in emergency management needs to be sufficient for QLDC' key issues.</li> <li>• ORC needs to invest more in QLDC.</li> </ul>	<p>Full document has more detail, and is available on the council's website. Additional comments are always welcome.</p>



191	<b>Mark Pearson, Cromwell</b> The community info session times do not suit people who work e.g. Cromwell 1.30-2.30pm. These are unacceptable times as they only suit retired people.	Noted for the future.
222	<b>Hillary Hutton, Dunedin</b> The brochure is a good idea and the meetings were also good.	Thank you.
271	<b>Andrea Ledermann, Oamaru</b> Would have like to attend the public meeting in Oamaru but did not receive the consultation document until after the meeting was held.	Sorry to hear this, we also advertised in print and online.
339	<b>Phil Wilson, Queenstown</b> Good to see a re-engagement in the Wakatipu.	Thank you.
406	<b>Rodney Tate, Dunedin</b> Don't waste money posting these documents out as we must have everyone's email by now. Those who want to respond will do it online.	Unfortunately we do not have everyone's email, and not all of the community have computer access.
434	<b>Iain McGilchrist, Dunedin</b> Can't find fault with the plan and proposals. Thanks the ORC.	Thank you.
528	<b>M Forrest, Dunedin</b> Presumptuous for Dunedin townies, like submitter, because it is expected, to comment on matters of concern to Lakes District and rural people, and not really Dunedin people.	We are managing regional issues and all in the Otago region are invited to comment accordingly.
750	<b>Guardians of Lake Hawea, Alison Brown</b> Consultation document makes no mention of monitoring lake water quality, nor directs reader to sources for more detail. Detailed information is either non-existent or difficult to find on ORC's website. Find search engine is very poor at identifying relevant documents. This needs to be rectified.	Website is currently undergoing an upgrade.
763	<b>Richard Anderson, Cromwell</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disappointed with the session in Cromwell. Led to believe could walk in at any time and ask individual questions, but no.</li> <li>As Central Otago ratepayer, cannot comment on subjects in other areas without a lot more information.</li> </ul>	
793	<b>Disabled Persons Assembly, Chris Ford</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does ORC have any plans to use Speak Reader for its website? Could some funding be put aside for this?</li> <li>Ask ORC to review consultation processes to make them more fully inclusive and meaningful. Had good degree of improvement over last 3 – 4 years, still need further refinement. Too tight timeframes and holding consultation before Christmas/New Year (bus hub) should be avoided where possible.</li> <li>Could hold public / stakeholder forums for people to give feedback on priorities and issues to both Councillors and staff, rather than formal hearings, as DCC has done.</li> </ul>	Plans for this on the CDEM website. Will then look at further application to ORC's website

	<b>Flood Protection &amp; Control Works, Rivers</b>	
267 ..	<b>Barbara Sloan, Waikouaiti</b> Creeks should be cleaned out more regularly. The Palmerston Creek is disgusting. It hasn't been cleaned out in years, is full of weeds and it flooded over the past weekend. It has flooded badly in the past.	
700	<b>Frankton Community Association</b> Suggest the Shotover flood protection rating area be extended to include Jacks Point/Hanley Farm residential area, as receive same benefits as the Frankton and wider urban areas of the Wakatipu.	
708	<b>AL &amp; HE McKillop, Dunedin</b> Very aware of need to maintain flood control and river drainage at a high level.	
724	<b>Fish &amp; Game, Nigel Paragreen</b> Supports ongoing management of rivers for flood protection. Important to balance ecological and human needs. Supportive of continued development and implementation of river morphology and riparian management plans.	
730	<b>Ian Bryant, Dunedin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that lack of work on willow and other vegetation, and sediment build up is reducing capacity of the main Lower Taieri River to handle high flood flows. Evidence shown in photos (attached to submission).</li> <li>Choking of channel by willows generally from Outram to Henley. Problem extenuated by breaking off of large branches and logs being trapped in various bridges.</li> <li>Railway bridge at Otokia there are four main channel spans. Two of the spans now carry minimal flows because of willow, vegetation and major sediment build up. Previously, sediment removed but not done for many years. Is choke point in flood channel.</li> <li>Ask ORC ensures willows and sediment build up removed. Ask that ORC hold a ratepayer meeting to explain the works programme for the proposed 9.75% rate increase for this scheme.</li> </ul>	Staff will contact the submitter and undertake a joint inspection with them.
	<b>Natural Hazards</b>	
97	<b>Jim Dennison, Oamaru</b> Erosion is continuing and encroaching into the town of Oamaru. Rock protection is necessary to continue north from present protection work to freezing works at Red Castle Road. Waitaki Boys High school is losing land and eventually will be threatened.	
276	<b>Stan Waller, Dunedin</b> Have recently experienced QLDC handing out consents for new builds while completely ignoring existing water courses and allowing building over flood channels without consent from the ORC. Also other issues of negligence due to a lack of due diligence.	
700	<b>Frankton Community Association</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual plan notes flood events are key focus for council. This is misplaced, and should be more concerned with large seismic events. Flood events are usually predictable and have a warning period. Seismic events are sudden and unable to be predicted.</li> <li>The general devastation, expenditure of social capital and potential</li> </ul>	

	<p>time of isolation for communities is far greater than a flood event of the same return period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest a seismic event preparedness campaign be held in tandem with the proposed flood awareness campaign.</li> </ul>	
755	<p><b>Lyndon Weggery</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORC to move more quickly on upgrading sea level recordings at Green Island to world network status.</li> <li>• Currently ORC staff are feeding UN generated 'computer modelling' data to DCC which doesn't appear to line up with hard data coming from Port Chalmers.</li> </ul>	Staff will meet with the submitter to explain how data quality is assured.
	<b>Noise Control</b>	
824	<p><b>Paul Keast, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Introduce noise pollution controls so orchards can't use bird scarers, and noise control on frost fans so they don't keep people awake at night.</p>	Land use activity effects controlled through district plan by territorial authorities
825	<p><b>Sue Keast, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Like a process for dealing with excessive and ongoing noise from bird scaring guns and sirens, and cheap and noisy frost fans during the night. How does one complain?</p>	Land use activity effects controlled through district plan by territorial authorities
	<b>Other comments</b>	
7.	<p><b>Terry Drayton, Wanaka - Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with the summer diversion of the Cardrona River, it is not acceptable to leave it dry.</li> <li>• No mention of farmer burn offs, this has been unregulated for too long.</li> <li>• Need to address intensive use of fertilisers, run off into streams and rivers, grazing on water edges, as this is still happening in Wanaka. If want to address water pollution, look at the obvious sources.</li> </ul>	Current situation reflects management through deemed permits. Minimum flow and allocation for the future currently being established.
30.	<p><b>Ralf Schrubba, Dunedin - other</b></p> <p>The plan lacks a confirmation to spend money locally i.e. engaging local contractors where possible, even though slightly higher costs might be associated with it. It is not sustainable to outsource everything like waste disposal or work on a new ORC building in Dunedin (local consultants and contractors).</p>	
108	<p><b>Ross Taylor – Port Otago</b></p> <p>ORC should sell shares in Port Otago.</p>	Council has indicated a review of ownership will be undertaken in due course.
110	<p><b>NR Ford, Alexandra - Tourists</b></p> <p>ORC to stop tourists 'defecating' all over the place and on the rail trail.</p>	
123	<p><b>Thomas Baird, Dunedin – Good work</b></p> <p>ORC to keep up the good work and is looking forward to seeing the changes implemented.</p>	

148	<p><b>Philippa Robertson, Dunedin - other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The booklet is very clearly written and set out.</li> <li>• Concerned rabbits and wilding pines not mentioned.</li> <li>• Concerned for South Dunedin which was only given one sentence in the booklet.</li> </ul>	
154	<p><b>Robert Rout, Invercargill - Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORC allow for 3 values regarding water. There is no need for cultural or ecological necessities as there is no global warming or sea-level rise. Maori cultural consideration is balderdash, made by men and conceived by their heathen godless minds.</li> <li>• Takes offence to the Maori greeting used because English is the language of this land.</li> </ul>	
162	<p><b>Tom May – Satellite imagery</b> Is it possible to get the satellite image of property in the Central Otago area (Clyde) updated as it is very old on Google maps.</p>	
167	<p><b>Roy Baker, Dunedin - Costs</b> Need to remember to keep our costs down.</p>	
206	<p><b>William Chapple, Dunedin - Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORC appears to swallow resources in administration and achieve little as it is a desk-bound organisation.</li> <li>• Local issues should be dealt with locally and national issues dealt with by central government.</li> <li>• ORC should be disbanded stopping the requirement for offices anywhere.</li> </ul>	
229	<p><b>Bernice Armstrong, Dunedin – Dunedin Hospital</b> Everybody must support the hospital rebuild and a medical school is a must for Dunedin.</p>	
253	<p><b>Ros Goulding, Alberttown – Long Term Planning</b> Need provision for longer term planning for the region, such as 50 years. Could get land use and transport more co-ordinated. Have 2 fast growing towns, Queenstown and Wanaka, with very little structural planning from the region. How does the region connect, what will effect environments the most over the next 30-40 years?</p>	
277	<p><b>Liz Herrick, Wanaka - Compliance Monitoring</b> Everybody is aware of dairy farms and their need for compliance but what about other businesses and individuals? What are they putting down their drains? More education is needed. Where does paint go? How often do businesses get inspected? Follow up is needed.</p>	Urban water quality strategy looks to this goal of empowering everyone with a sense of responsibility for water quality.
298	<p><b>Doug Champion - other</b> More needs to be done on possum control and pollution from dairy industry.</p>	
324	<p><b>Roslyn Seaman, Clyde - other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about help with cycle tracks?</li> <li>• Weed in Lake Dunstan?</li> <li>• Removal of dead pine trees above Clyde?</li> </ul>	

342	<p><b>Leith Brew, Wanaka – Freedom Campers</b>  Problem will increase re cost of cleaning up and maintenance of facilities which are often abused. Freedom camping should be outlawed unless vehicles fully self-contained.</p>	This is a city/district council matter.
344	<p><b>Joyce Brown, Cromwell – Nutrient Management</b>  Implement scientific research specific to ORC area on nutrient management.</p>	
353	<p><b>Saskia Van der Geest, Arrowtown – Economic Development</b>  See the council is employing an Economic Development manager. What is happening with the budget? Like the region’s economy to be more diverse, creating jobs outside of tourism and construction, attracting more high knowledge jobs.</p>	There are no plans to employ an Economic Development Manager, but it may be that a territorial authority is planning this.
358	<p><b>Terisha Hubbard - Farming</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mention of supporting or encouraging organic farming (to ameliorate pollution and help with run-offs etc.).</li> <li>• No mention of revegetation of lake and stream margins.</li> <li>• No mention of limiting or capping the number of farms and number of cows per farm.</li> <li>• Money seems to be for risk assessment rather than solving or improving water quality.</li> <li>• Have learnt of the inhuman treatment of cows. Must stop the horror of industrialised farm practices.</li> </ul>	Otago water plan seeks to maintain good water and improve that quality where it is degraded. To this end, farmers are free to implement their own methods to manage the quality of farm runoff to achieve defined results.
446	<p><b>Zak Burnett, Queenstown - other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not want water chlorinated in Arthurs Point, use UV treatment instead.</li> <li>• Ban the use of 1080.</li> <li>• Housing shortage could be solved in part by enforcing empty holiday homes to be rented out or owner occupied for at least 6 months.</li> </ul>	
474	<p><b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston – Young River Valley Dam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is reportedly 579.2 metres deep and 1.5 km long, and formed as a result of a land slip in 2007, no consent. Still it has no safety regulation inspection. In ODT in 2013, DoC issued a high alert for the dam. ORC has statutory powers to take action against dams if deemed dangerous, and act immediately if considered a dam posed “an immediate danger to people, property or the environment”.</li> <li>• Why hasn’t ORC kept public informed about this illegal dam? Why weren’t legal duties outlined in consultation document? What has been done re policies for dangerous dams such as this one?</li> </ul>	<p>The dam is a natural feature. It is 100 metres high. ORC regularly inspects the dam.</p> <p>Dam is not illegal, being a result of natural processes.</p>
475	<p><b>Waitaki Community Gardens, Sophia Leon de la Barra - EnviroSchools</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking support to bring the EnviroSchools programme to schools and students in the Waitaki District. Have considerable support from school staff, parents and local ratepayers.</li> <li>• EnviroSchools staff in Dunedin are happy to support the WDC to develop and implement the EnviroSchools initiative. WDC would need to fund training and employing an EnviroSchools facilitator for North Otago, as well as enviroschools kits for each participating school.</li> <li>• Waitaki Community Gardens employs a School Gardens’ Coordinator and works with 12 local schools. If WDC supports, the</li> </ul>	We have commenced discussions with WDC regarding this. The cost of a facilitator is usually funded by the territorial authority.

	facilitator role it could be contracted out to the Waitaki Community Gardens. Estimated annual cost for 12 schools is \$24,945.	
488	<b>Felicia Wade, Dunedin - other</b> The general public are not scientifically literate nor given enough data to make assessments of management and policy decisions. These should be determined by suitably qualified and experienced people with strong science and management backgrounds.	
492	<b>M Hess - other</b> Build some cattle grids over the bridges of the Waitaki.	
497	<b>Roger Gardiner, Wanaka – Monitoring Buoy, Lake Wanaka</b> Upper Clutha residents would support a targeted rate to raise \$80-\$90k to install a monitoring buoy in Lake Wanaka. Measurement and recording is long overdue.	Being considered as part of the State of the Environment network review.
564	<b>Neil Sloan, Alberttown - other</b> Water quality, wilding pines, pests and tourist controls are all critical issues.	
582	<b>Brian Jackson, Oturehua – Manuherikia riverbed &amp; land management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ownership presently with DoC, resulting in increased volumes of broom, gorse and willow tree weeds, creating fire hazard. Farmers can't sue DoC as cause of fire not usually known, but DoC can obtain compensation from a hapless farmer.</li> <li>• Farmers adjacent to land can't obtain DoC responsibility to remedy excess growth. Habitat for feral animals is increasing, permitting larger TB spread, and areas for illegal drugs.</li> <li>• ORC should encourage farmer entry on to river bed for vegetation and feral animal control, and bill DoC for the cost of providing management not done by DoC. ORC should pay farmer costs, and recover from DoC. Land should be vested in District council, and could lease back land for grazing.</li> </ul>	
591	<b>Michael Harris, Queenstown – other</b> Hope the ORC can do a better job of civil defence than we have with Arrowtown air management and Lake Hayes water quality.	
594	<b>Michael Evans, Arrowtown - Planning</b> Several plans have fallen behind or are inadequate in the region, especially for increased population and tourism in Central Otago.	
620	<b>Kelly Jordon - Other</b> Place limit on the number of wifi stations and cell phone towers unless non-industry funded. Research conclusively disproves health impacts.	
646	<b>Trevor Nimmo - environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORC seems to be taking a direction that the environment is more important than people's livelihoods.</li> <li>• It is easy to ask the public if they want clean air and water, impose new standards, and then dish out huge fines on people for breaching those standards. Someone decided that our water has to be a certain standard to swim in yet many people are happy to wade and swim in mud. Most seem to survive, unlike some farmers on whom these rules and regulations weigh so heavily, that in some</li> </ul>	Resource management outcomes are largely driven by the RMA, national policy statements, and environmental standards.

	cases they take their own lives. ORC to back off a notch or two.	
649	<b>Dianne Yeldon, Dunedin - Dividend</b> Port Otago dividend to be increased from \$7.5 million to \$10 million.	Dividend is determined by the Port Directors and within the parameters set out in the Statement of Corporate Intent.
686	<b>M P Brooke, Gore – Online survey</b> Found our recent online survey regarding wilding pines to be a propaganda exercise of the worst kind. The survey company asked loaded questions to extract the answers the ORC required. Decided not to answer such a ridiculous farce, all at the rate payers expense.	
698	<b>Brian Hawkins - Waterways</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the noise made by one recently appointed Councillor results in concentration on Lakes Wanaka and Wakatipu to the detriment of other waterways.</li> <li>ORC is doing a good overall job. Have confidence that economics will not win out over the environment on a similar level to what has occurred in the ECAN geographical area.</li> </ul>	
701	<b>Otago Peninsula Community Board – Te Rauone Beach project</b> Board continues to support the community on this project. Look forward to lodgement of consent in 2017, and commencement of work to its completion. Submits that ORC continues its ongoing support of this project through to completion.	
732	<b>James Sutherland, Alexandra - other</b> What ORC is doing is great for the future generations and we are now targeting issues that need to be fixed before they get out of hand.	
737	<b>Queenstown Lakes District Council – strategic investment in Queenstown</b> Submission form does not ask strategic question of whether ORC investment in QLD, the fastest growing district in NZ, is adequate. Overall impression is that the annual plan does not reflect a strategic approach, and therefore inadequate proposed investment in the district.	This is an annual plan for 2017/18. A longer term view will be considered in the 2018-28 LTP.
766	<b>Barbara Blatt, Wanaka – Queenstown growth</b> ORC needs to recognise the significant and unprecedented growth in the Queenstown Lakes district and more effectively partner with QLDC to find critical solutions to challenges, and become more strategic in its forecasting to meet future challenges.	
779	<b>Barbara Armstrong – activities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rabbit extermination – no excuses</li> <li>Wilding pine removal</li> <li>Clean up the waterways</li> <li>Nurture the wilderness.</li> </ul>	
789	<b>Judy Stevenson, Oamaru - Environment</b> If don't look after mother nature, she will come back with a pitch fork. Perfection not required, but while talking, water disappears, weeds grow, wilder seed, wallabies breed like rabbits. Devolution and the diffusion of responsibility are not stopping the creeping degradation of	

	Otago compared with the past.	
792	<p><b>Dunedin City Council – Waste minimisation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCC keen to support the participation of ORC at the Regional Waste Network meetings to help plan and address waste disposal issues and opportunities, promote waste minimisation and resource recovery.</li> <li>• Key issue coming up is expiration of the Green Island landfill resource consent. Options to consider are reapplying for the consent, or creating another new landfill. Collaborative thinking and partnership will be required to create an outcome sensible for all.</li> <li>• Would like to see ORC fund a review of its Regional Plan Waste. Is an urgent need to update this to reflect changes in legislation and best practice guidelines for waste facilities, including non-levied fills. If review happened soon, it could then be incorporated into the planning and decision making around the Green Island landfill.</li> </ul>	
804	<p><b>J A Howe, Oamaru – Fees &amp; Charges</b></p> <p>Technical / scientists charges hourly rate increased. Why?</p>	Charges reflect actual cost of doing the work.
819	<p><b>James Cowie, Wanaka - other</b></p> <p>ORC needs to lift its game in the Lakes and Upper Clutha districts, i.e., be seen to be more proactive on issues such as fresh water quality and wilding pines.</p>	
	<b>Public Transport</b>	
80	<p><b>John Gourlay, Dunedin</b></p> <p>Roads in new subdivisions to easily accommodate buses to allow for bus services to extend to them in the future. Roads in some subdivisions, may not be able to allow buses to pass parked vehicles.</p>	Noted this is a planning issue for the TLA's and should pass on the comment. Note staff provide comment on planning applications when appropriate
107	<p><b>M Elliot, Oamaru</b></p> <p>ORC should not be involved in public transport. It should be the role of the district councils or private businesses.</p>	It is ORC's statutory responsibility.
267	<p><b>Barbara Sloan, Waikouaiti</b></p> <p>Why this can't be a uniform targeted rate? It is unfair that it goes with the CV.</p>	
370	<p><b>Richard Sidey, Wanaka</b></p> <p>Requests an affordable public transport be introduced between Wanaka and Queenstown.</p>	In progress.
435	<p><b>AR Wilson, Balclutha</b></p> <p>ORC should not be involved in public transport in Dunedin or Queenstown. Should stick to our rural responsibilities.</p>	
474	<p><b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b></p> <p>What is a regional body doing being engaged in public transport? Sell if off, allow real entrepreneurs to do the work.</p>	It is ORC's statutory responsibility.
500	<p><b>S Kremser, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Need public transport in Central Otago. Having a bus a day (or less) going to Dunedin or Queenstown, none to Wanaka, is not enough.</p>	



533	<p><b>Anon</b> Consider traffic flows in Wanaka before it gets as bad as Queenstown. Provide a public transport service and develop a bypass via Ballantyne Road.</p>	Noted
649	<p><b>Diane Yeldon, Dunedin - Total mobility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORC to allocate ten times the present budget and make the scheme easier to access. Make the scheme cover round trips instead of only one way as at present.</li> <li>• Scheme is a valuable supplement to bus routes and is cheaper in the long run when efficient transfer systems are provided for the majority of users fit enough to get on and off buses more than once in a single journey.</li> </ul>	The scheme rules are set by NZTA. Recommend a review of the subsidy in 2017/18
792	<p><b>Dunedin City Council</b> Under the RLTP, needs to be some strategic multi-mode analysis work as too many key freight routes have no alternative for other modes. Provision and priority for cycle routes should be driven by benefits to other modes, but not funding is provided for this analysis.</p>	
797	<p><b>Christopher Girling, Dunedin</b> Cannot understand why ORC is involved. Should be responsibility of local councils.</p>	It is ORC's statutory responsibility.
	<b>Significant Forecasting Assumptions</b>	
700	<p><b>Frankton Community Association</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disturbing to read ORC's expected levels of activity are not sensitive to population growth. Suggests ORC does not have a full account of what is occurring in the Queenstown Lakes District, or ORC is negligent.</li> <li>• Ask ORC to investigate actual growth concerns of the district and implements a programme to adequately address core responsibilities.</li> </ul>	
737	<p><b>Queenstown Lakes District Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QLD is experiencing unprecedented growth. ORC assumptions in annual plan assumes no impact on level of ORC activity in next 10 years. Population projections have growth of 102% by 2048, population of 66,355.</li> <li>• Need to take some detailed analysis to adopt a programme that meets the needs of growth.</li> </ul>	
	<b>South Dunedin</b>	
147	<p><b>Pamela Robertson, Dunedin</b> South Dunedin flood protection is essential. Please keep this as a priority for working with the DCC.</p>	
262	<p><b>Bruce Cloughley, Dunedin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy relating to South Dunedin regarding climate change are not realistic. Having buildings a metre or so off the ground is no help if the streets are flooded. The relocatable idea would work except how many buildings could that apply to in 25 years? Building and maintenance will stop but people will still live there, so an engineering solution would be a better option until the situation is impossible. Is our policy is going to extend to Portobello Rd and</li> </ul>	

	<p>the Tahuna waste treatment plant? Believe it will not as the money will be provided to lift Portsmouth Drive and Portobello Road and the treatment plant will have dewatering spears installed. Everyone else will be left on their own.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If sea levels do lift 600mm then troubles would also be apparent in Mosgiel in heavy rains, Marne St, Tomahawk, Taieri Mouth and other reclaimed areas of Dunedin. More comprehensive thought is required about more than cause and effect, to immediate climate threatened locations.</li> </ul>	
442	<p><b>Gina Huakau, Dunedin</b> Needs to be more focus on climate change adaptations. Minimal information about South Dunedin. Need clearer outputs – due date for draft response plan, dates for community consultation. Golder Associates are carrying out a review – what is the cost of this?</p>	
474	<p><b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> Why didn't ORC prosecute the DCC for neglect of its drainage responsibilities? Is a toothless tiger when dealing with dodgy local bodies.</p>	
792	<p><b>Dunedin City Council</b> Welcomes continued support and commitment from ORC to work collaboratively on South Dunedin. Looks forward to developing and delivering a response plan for South Dunedin.</p>	
	<p><b>Support given</b></p>	
782	<p><b>Federated Farmers, David Cooper</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lake snow</li> <li>• Lake restoration</li> <li>• Wallaby control</li> <li>• Wilding tree control.</li> <li>• Cautiously support climate change adaptation, but consider longer term costs should be funded by TLA or through a specific targeted rate.</li> </ul>	
790	<p><b>Remarkables Park, Shotover Park &amp; Queenstown Park</b> Supports proposals for lake snow, lake restoration (particularly Lake Hayes), and contributing to the wilding tree problem.</p>	
	<p><b>Urban Water Quality</b></p>	
474	<p><b>Jim Moffat, Palmerston</b> No mention of this. How rigorous is the connecting pipe construction between the two parts of the Palmerston sewerage scheme? What is the chance of a major flood busting the connecting pipe that runs through (underneath) the Shag River?</p>	<p>Otago water plan seeks to maintain good water and improve that quality where it is degraded. Water plan changes will address urban sources of negative effects on fresh and coastal water quality.</p>
700	<p><b>Frankton Community Association</b> Acknowledges ORC effort in researching adverse effects of urban discharges on water quality. Implementation of urban discharge controls to be hastened with additional development of an Urban Water Quality Risk Assessment. Only fair urban activity be held to account in similar fashion to rural activities.</p>	<p>Urban discharges are being addressed in the 2017/18 year.</p>

721	<p><b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b> Understand that preliminary consultation on a plan change to address human sewage including septic tanks is a focus over the next year. Support investigations to determine the collective effects of septic tanks in townships and for subdivision e.g. Clyde and Glenorchy.</p>	Note support.
752	<p><b>Sustainable Glenorchy, Trish Fraser</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community is facing pressure to pay close to \$30,000 per household for a reticulated town waste water scheme. Emerged that there is no certainty of what standards such a scheme would have to comply with under plan change 6B, and that no monitoring has been undertaken to provide a baseline of the existing treatment regime.</li> <li>• Clear picture of state of groundwater needs to be ascertained. Undertake in 2017/18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monitoring / sampling to determine if any detrimental effects detectable to groundwater quality beneath the township, and margins of the lake, and if so, determine the source.</li> <li>○ Monitor existing consents to ensure compliance with conditions.</li> <li>○ Sample river water quality entering the lake.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• As rates are increasing by over 20%, this work could be funded from that increase.</li> </ul>	Urban discharges are being addressed in the 2017/18 year.
	<b>Water</b>	
39	<p><b>Alan Whitaker, Alexandra</b> Requests that we include publicised numerical data on water quality measurements with comment from appropriate specialists.</p>	This is done on the ORC website and LAWA site.
92	<p><b>Anon</b> Wants water metres disconnected and the water charges in Clyde stopped as promised before the dam was built.</p>	This is a matter for Central Otago District Council.
93	<p><b>Miriam Lippers, Alexandra</b> We need to have just one plan change for water quantity and one plan change for water quality, as it gets very confusing and hard to keep up with all the plan change numbers.</p>	We have a single plan for water management, both quality and quantity of surface and groundwater.
113	<p><b>Stewart Pile, Queenstown</b> ORC does a good job and our focus on improving and understanding water quality issues over the next few years is pertinent and timely.</p>	
115	<p><b>Sarah Cross, Dunedin</b> Standards for water quality and quantity in NZ are too low. What we consider acceptable in NZ is considered 'red zone' in Europe.</p>	Otago water is generally clean. Under the National Objectives Framework, NPS for Freshwater Management and the Water Plan, we seek to maintain water at high quality.
119	<p><b>H G Jones, Oamaru</b> More resources are required to enforce compliance in water levels and contamination run-off. Happy to pay higher rates to ensure our rivers and lakes are protected.</p>	

136	<p><b>Moira Styles, Dunedin</b> Water quality and use is a major issue.</p>	Otago water plan seeks to maintain good water and improve that quality where it is degraded.
173	<p><b>Malcolm Donaldson, Dunedin</b> Water is the most important thing and there is only so much to go around. Areas of the province that were never irrigated previously are now being irrigated.</p>	
354	<p><b>Environmental Communication Ltd, Auckland</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports funding to enable changes to the Regional Plan: Water, that support the reduction of erosion and sediment run-off from urban development during the construction phase and ongoing storm-water runoff in the post-development phase.</li> <li>• This would include enabling staff to take part in a proposed national initiative to share expertise and accelerate the development of cost-effective measures.</li> </ul>	Otago water plan seeks to maintain good water and improve that quality where it is degraded. Water plan changes will address urban sources of negative effects on fresh and coastal water quality.
396	<p><b>J Neilson &amp; P Goodwin, Dunedin</b> Water quality is of paramount importance, both in terms of quality and flows. Need the most stringent regulations possible to enable the return to and maintenance of excellent clarity and river health, and have year round flows that enable flora and fauna to be abundant.</p>	Otago water is generally clean. The National Objectives Framework, NPS Freshwater Management and the water plan, seeks to maintain water as high quality.
408	<p><b>Greg Thompson, Queenstown</b> A much greater commitment to water quality research/enhancement in the southern lakes is needed.</p>	Otago water is generally clean. The National Objectives Framework, NPS Freshwater Management and the water plan, seeks to maintain water as high quality.
424	<p><b>Pam Kennedy, Dunedin</b> Is a big yes to improving water quality and the fairness of distribution.</p>	
432	<p><b>John Haakma, Alexandra</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farmers face increased costs of compliance with water quality requirements (establishing protection, maintenance, reduce flexibility, loss of land). A limited term task force should be set up to provide financial and advisory assistance to help with changes to operations.</li> <li>• Land use changes should not be supported, to discourage environmentally damaging development.</li> </ul>	Otago water plan seeks to maintain good water and improve that quality where it is degraded. To this end, farmers are free to implement their own methods to manage the quality of farm runoff to achieve defined results.
445	<p><b>Alan Pickard, Omakau</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not believe the ORC data on water quality. Everywhere it is getting worse. Very focused work needed to begin to improve things. Why have we not required riparian planting and fencing on all farms?</li> <li>• All water takes must be public, with amount, owner, company listed, and if company, all owners listed by name.</li> </ul>	Otago water plan seeks to maintain good water and improve that quality where it is degraded. To this end, farmers are free to implement their own methods to manage the quality of farm runoff to achieve defined results.
447	<p><b>John Galloway, Waihola</b> The Treaty of Waitangi made provision for Maori who had an aquatic derived diet. Water that sustained the traditional fishing grounds was vested in local iwi. Waihola catchment complies with the Treaty provisions. It is not for us to define their water's quality.</p>	Consultation with Maori is a requirement of water management under the RMA.

502	<b>Ray Wright, Alexandra</b> Surprised the fund is a small proportion of the reserve funding and of the work programme, especially when water quality monitoring and water resource allocation is such a crucial part of ORC's work to 2021.	
535	<b>Heather Thorne, Wanaka</b> Water quality in the region has been neglected, and must focus on addressing this. Maggie Lawton was on the right track with her aims and objectives. The lack of effective management of water resources cannot be allowed to continue.	
541	<b>I Chapman, Dunedin</b> Must still ensure reliable supply of water to farmers.	
601	<b>Shona McKee, Wanaka</b> Stop putting Diquat in Lake Wanaka.	
609	<b>Janice Pont, Dunedin</b> The quality of water in our lakes and rivers should be the priority to keep our clean, green image real for everyone.	
640	<b>Alison Lindsay, Dunedin</b> Overall concern is for water flow and quality throughout Otago. The degradation caused by farming and seemingly uncontrolled dairying spreading into the Maniototo and Central Otago horrifies them.	Otago water plan seeks to maintain good water and improve that quality where it is degraded. To this end, farmers are free to implement their own methods to manage the quality of farm runoff to achieve defined results.
641	<b>Penelope Sell, Dunedin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned for our freshwater ways, from small streams to large rivers. Would like to see an education fund for farmers to investigate more environmentally positive ways of farming e.g. away from dairy cows towards something good like hemp production, which will bring in a profit and clean up rivers rather than pollute them.</li> <li>Against any increase in cow numbers. Totally against more irrigation. Agricultural chemicals and fertilisers need to be significantly limited if not banned, as they make land and people sick over the long term.</li> </ul>	
648	<b>Lynne Stewart, Clyde</b> ORC must work towards safe swimming rivers so they don't leave us sick if we imbibe water from them. Our rivers must be of a water quality to support eels and fish living in them and no dirty dairy runoff.	
690	<b>Simon Wilkinson</b> More needs to be done to ensure clean and swimmable rivers with much stronger protection against pollution from farms and other industry. Water is our future, lets make sure it is clean.	
708	<b>AL &amp; HE McKillop, Dunedin</b> Strongly support programmes to maintain water resources in good condition. Deterioration must be halted.	

721	<p><b>Public Health South, Andrew Shand</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports planning and reporting on the quality of water in the Shag and Catlins Rivers 'estuaries. Also support monitoring in the Kaikorai and Tokomairiro estuaries.</li> <li>• Appreciate the ongoing effort council is making to monitor cyanobacteria in recreational waters and reporting to key agencies.</li> <li>• Support ORC on plans to introduce a recreational water monitoring programme across Otago. Understand this will be contingent upon all the TA's buying into the process including information on public health risks of bathing areas.</li> </ul>	
722	<p><b>Victoria Bonham, Alexandra</b></p> <p>Waters in critical decline due to pollution. Do not have luxury of 3 years making assessments. Water quality should have been fully monitored and tested before now. Regulation and management needs to be put in place now. Zero tolerance for cattle grazing waterways, good practice standards essential, restrictions on new and existing dairy operations. Fines for anyone not complying.</p>	
724	<p><b>Fish &amp; Game, Nigel Paragreen</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports on going minimum flow setting processes. Imperative processes are adequately resourced with 2021 deadline approaching. Supports accelerated process, as would like to see smooth transition from deemed permits to RMA consents.</li> <li>• Focus on encouraging catchment management groups by water users is encouraging. Group management is most effective approach.</li> <li>• Some catchment management groups have been encouraged to undertake deemed permit transitions through RMA processes alone, rather than being supported by a minimum flow plan change. Support adequate funding being set aside for ORC to engage with these groups.</li> <li>• Supports use of the Water Management Reserve.</li> </ul>	
735	<p><b>Michael Rawlinson</b></p> <p>There is a real need to replant unstable banks of the Waikouaiti River between the flow gauge downstream of the water tower to 1km upstream of the confluence on the North Branch. Excessive willow removal was undertaken around 2008 which ruined much trout habitat. Kumeti willows are a good option.</p>	
737	<p><b>Queenstown Lakes District Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORC has developed a whole prudent approach to finances that does not effectively use the capital it has on its balance sheet, nor utilise debt funding. Not promoting a reduction or cap on regional rates, but ask the ORC to see how best it can add value to the urgent programmes in the QLD.</li> <li>• ORC to recognise unprecedented growth, and more effectively partner the QLDC to find critical solutions. ORC may wish to revisit the stated intention of having general rates at a sustainable level, so ORC will not have to draw down on special payments by 2019.</li> </ul>	

750	<p><b>Guardians of Lake Hawea</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approach to water management quality for Lake Hawea (and the other 2 deepwater lakes) is grossly inadequate. Provides no confidence that ORC will manage the lake and its catchments water quality. Serious concerns that this can be achieved by 6A alone.</li> <li>• The current and proposed monitoring of the health of Lake Hawea do not provide an adequate evidence base to inform an assessment.</li> <li>• The deep Otago lakes are complex biophysical systems. Water coming down the Hunter River carries nutrients including nitrates. Dense cold water presumably sinks to the bottom of the lake. Climate change underscores the urgency of obtaining baseline measurement. Nitrate laden bottom water could rise to higher levels. More detailed sampling and monitoring required to understand such processes.</li> <li>• Concerned with approved sale of the Hunter Valley Station lease. One condition of sale is to improve productivity. Presumably this includes increasing stock numbers, and application of nutrients to pasture. ORC needs to assess whether the plans will impact on the quality of Lake Hawea catchments.</li> <li>• Been advised that water quality monitoring involves a single open water site and two “inshore” sampling locations in each lake. Understand there is only one open water sample for Lake Hawea and no “inshore” sampling. The single site cannot be representative of the whole lake, so not an adequate basis to form evidence based understanding of the quality of the water.</li> <li>• Consideration also needs to be given to ecosystem functioning. Recommend: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ORC initiate development of a Lake Hawea and catchment management plan with community and stakeholders.</li> <li>○ Water quality be monitored to international best practice.</li> <li>○ Ecosystem health indicators be adopted and monitored.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The monitoring of water quality of Lake Hawea is being reviewed as part of the SOE monitoring review that is underway.</p>
766	<p><b>Barbara Blatt, Wanaka</b></p> <p>Successful management of water quality and health is facilitated with community engagement, working alongside regulators and scientists. The Upper Clutha community has indicated strongly a wish to be proactive and develop and implement a collaborative water management plan. ORC should be a key lead in this. Urge ORC to support the development of a community led plan.</p>	
792	<p><b>Dunedin City Council</b></p> <p>Ask that the ORC identify the Middlemarch groundwater system and include it in a Groundwater Protection Zone in the Water Plan and manage activities to ensure water quality is suitable as a potable water supply for Middlemarch.</p>	<p>Note this request and schedule for study prior to plan change process.</p>
794	<p><b>Otago Water Resource Users Group, Alexandra</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask for additional performance target: “Work with water users to undertake water security and economic impact analysis”.</li> <li>• This is fundamental to any robust minimum flow setting work, but is not mentioned anywhere.</li> <li>• Currently a lack of information about the impacts of proposed minimum flow options in the Manuheirkia catchment. It is crucial for informed democratic planning, and for Council to assess the</li> </ul>	

	<p>issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If council wishes to reduce risk of appeals on minimum flow plan changes, will be essential to provide adequate resourcing for high quality water security analysis and economic and social impact assessments, and invite water users to participate in the process. Water users should be involved in setting the terms of reference for this work, to ensure outputs are sound and meaningful to those most affected by the proposed changes.</li> <li>• Consultation document states we are proposing to accelerate our minimum flow setting programme to get all flows needed to inform replacing permits by 2019. When council set the existing minimum flow for the Manuherikia and elsewhere, it was with the stated intention of providing certainty for users, so they could transition to the new regime prior to 2021. Therefore surprising that council is now proposing to significantly alter these flows.</li> <li>• Submit that minimum flows already set and determined by the Environment Court should not be changed. To revise at the 11th hour is an unnecessary use of ratepayers money and completely undermines the certainty these flows were designed to provide. To include following statement in the annual plan: “Council has already set some minimum flows in the Water Plan to provide for the orderly transition to the expiry of deemed permits in 2021. Some of these were determined by the Environment Court. Council will not expend resources on changing these minimum flows.”</li> </ul>	
813	<p><b>Gerard Dodd, Alexandra</b>  Key to water quality is managing land use, not the river flows.  Ridiculous to allow dairy farming in Central Otago. This is what is killing our rivers.</p>	