

Date:

Tuesday, 3 May 2022

Annual Budget 2022-2023 Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

WRITTEN FEEDBACK Vol. 1 (11-9499)

Sub #	Organisation name	Local Board	Volume
11		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
229		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
954		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
1045		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
1150		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
1187		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
1543		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
1949		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
3007		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
3010		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
3029		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
3265		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
3346		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
3718		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
3839		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
4397		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
4520		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
4540		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
4567		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
4672		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
4862		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
4966		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
5034		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
5167		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
5354		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
5543		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
5791		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
5810		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
5921		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
6323		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
6672		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
6817		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
7017		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
7978		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
7994		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
8153		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
8871		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
9090		Aotea/Great Barrier	1
9499		Aotea/Great Barrier	1





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? I don't know

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 I don't know or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with I don't know between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties I don't know

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part I don't know of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Support

Marine protection initiatives	Other
Water resilience initiatives	Support
Environmental protection initiatives	Support
Advocating for a bespoke public transport service	Support

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Do not support (prefer PAYT system)

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Support

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives Water resilience initiatives Environmental protection initiatives Advocating for a bespoke public transport service Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: There is no alternative

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support

Tell us why: Must maintain increases in the face of inflation

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why: Important to minimise the effect on the disadvantaged

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why: More opportunity to support better sorting for recycling and food scraps collection

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Support

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives Water resilience initiatives Environmental protection initiatives Advocating for a bespoke public transport service Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information

Have your say



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Other

Tell us why: Hard to support when unknown at this point which things you are planning to spend money on, and which you are phasing out. In the past the council hasn't made good decisions on the 'priority' or 'key' options.

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Other

Tell us why: Only a few years ago you spent a lot of money to set up the current refuse collection system. To now completely change that is a waste of money and certainly not a priority.

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 I don't know
or more units)Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with
between two and nine unitsI don't know

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties I don't know

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part Do not support of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

- Community well-being initiatives
- Marine protection initiatives
- Water resilience initiatives
- Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: As we are all independently providing and monitoring our drinking water, I do NOT want interference, and I would be very irate if you started charging me fees for water I collect and maintain with no help from council. I didn't receive any assistance when I had to replace a water tank recently so don't be surprised if any fees imposed would go unpaid until the new tank was paid off.

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Communities should be consulted on what the 'key' or 'priority' issues are.

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: the immediate cost to residents pales in comparison to the cost of the alternative

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Other

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? Tell us why:



6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Do not support

Tell us why: If you want people to use the bus. Subsidize the bus rates. Stop wasting money on cycle lanes that few will use.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.



What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Do not support

Tell us why: How about you stop increasing rates for once? The average aucklander is struggling more with inflation than your "budget pressure"

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? I don't know

Tell us why: Tldr - need a summary

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why: Sick of bin tags ...

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 I don't know or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with Support between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part Do not support of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Support

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Support

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives Water resilience initiatives Environmental protection initiatives Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information

Have your say



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: It's a no brainer, but I would like to see a review of baseline spend especially in the Auckland Transport and Water portfolios to reassess the planned maintenance and investment and divert some of this funding to climate risk mitigation actions. There really is no need for curb renewal in, for example, Herne Bay, when whole suburbs are being flood affected by rain events every year.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023



• considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support

Tell us why: Please take care with the sale of assets. Once they are gone they are gone and they can't be used for the benefit of the people that own them. Consultation on each asset sale will be needed.

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Other

Tell us why: It depends. Compared with the size of the AT and Watercare budgets, and the potential to improve efficiency in those organisations, why take on this political hot potato for relatively low financial yield? I would prefer to see a full review of AT's budget with a climate and emissions reduction lens on it, which also seeks savings, than an unhelpful squabble about community services likely to be the target of this process. A 1% decrease in AT spend would get you to your target and more. Do you really believe AT is as efficient as it can be right now? Watercare also.

In addition, there are some services which are underinvested in - such as biodiversity protection and in particular fresh water and marine biodiversity monitoring and protection. Auckland Council has a huge responsibility here for wetlands and the coastal zone, yet there is not even a team of people in the whole organisation currently doing this work. Most other councils have larger teams than Auckland working on this. These are the responsibilities of a regional authority under the RMA but these budgets do no adequately recognise the crisis in marine and freshwater biodiversity inside the coastal zone. If you are going to prioritise services, you need to make room for expansion or introduction of services - for example to address the biodiversity crisis and climate responsiveness and resilience.

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Do not support (prefer PAYT system)

Tell us why: What is the purpose of this policy? Is it waste reduction or revenue generation. There is a danger that unintended consequences and slow behaviour change will lead to a big increase in illegal dumping. I would prefer Council looked to other options to reduce waste and in particular to reduce and divert waste to landfill. For example reduce the waste produced by the building sector, and to increase investment in sorting and reusing waste, alongside nationwide packaging reduction initiatives with the support of central government. I can't see how this change gets us to zero waste faster. The compost part of the proposal is worthy of investment however. Why bundle it in with the PAYT change - the baby could be thrown out with the bathwater. You are also shifting costs from ratepaying landlords to renters at a time when renters don't need extra costs. Again, can't see the "why" in this change.

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.



What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
	0
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: The Aotea Local Board is an absolute hero for environmental protection and restoration in the Auckland region and on Aotea. Without them, DOC and Auckland Council as a whole would not be investing what they are in the island. That they are funding community members and mana whenua members to do this work is absolutely essential to protecting the taonga that Aotea is for the region and Aotearoa. I particularly support the food security initiative and paid coordinator. I think that will lead to an unpicking of the generation of waste on the island, more on-island food production, and to a review of the policies around access to kaimoana (essential) and what is needed to support an on-island dairy and abbatoir. These ideas are not new, and they have local support, it is just that they are difficult and need paid people to develop and manage over time.

My whanau also support the Ahu Moana focus. Iwi and the community want control and restoration to begin and this will be resisted by MPI if the proposals (as they will) require a halt to the taking of some species and no take except for local use until stocks recover. It would be good to see the board work with Councillor Pippa Coom to ask Auckland Council to support this mahi and use its power under legislation to ban activities which are harming biodiversity (such as trawling, set nets etc) inside the coastal marine zone. Appropriate use of funding would be to share funding of paid positions to get Ahu Moana over the line with MPI and DOC (who should be paying for it anyway under the implementation of Sea Change).

On the environmental side, projects and trusts which are nationally recognised would not survive without this Board's timely support. Please keep it up. That the local board sees these issues and puts the hand up to facilitate and lead them is exactly what is required.

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

• Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).

- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

I fully support Local Boards having decision making over local community services. It's about time.



I support appropriate funding and planning for the Tupuna Maunga Authority.

Re the Environmental Section of this proposal, why is there no funding for protection of the coastal marine zone and for meaningful Freshwater protection? Biodiversity in these two domains is in crisis. See above comments. The relative investment in these areas is tiny compared to other budgets. Auckland Council is not fulfilling its responsibility to maintain indigenous biodiversity with current services, compliance and regulatory support. Where is the investment for these areas going to come from and when? The largest freshwater catchment in the region currently has a landfill planned for it, which the Council did not oppose until pushed. In the coastal marine zone, the Hauraki Gulf Forum's data showed 2 years ago the acute need for regulation to reduce the take of species such as crayfish, scallops, other shellfish and a reduction in harmful fishing methods. Auckland lives by the water. When are council's budgets going to reflect the prioritisation of more than just water infrastructure and marine transport?

Important privacy information



3007



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Do not support

Tell us why: Same as covid, the "science" isn't settled. Climate change is bullshit. Sure, reduce pollution, but stop lying with the unscientific data.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.



What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Other

Tell us why: Get rid of all the extra chair polishers you've hired in the last few years and cut all council salaries by at least 10%.

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Other

Tell us why: As above, cut your staff numbers and cut the salaries of those that are actually needed. They are ludicrously high.

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? I don't know

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	l don't know
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	l don't know
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	l don't know

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: We already look after the marine environment. Just stop commercial fishing and taking of crayfish.

We already have our water sorted.

There is too much focus on "native". It's becoming a ridiculous obsession by some "wannabe" environmentalists with their snouts in the trough.

We don't need public transport services.

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Stick to the basics. Stop the insane funding of those who are only interested in using issues to get ratepayers money. Collect rubbish, fix roads. Recycle. Stop the crap from getting here in the first place and we won't need to worry about how to "deal" with it.

Important privacy information



3010



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: We need to make changes to protect our environment

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Other



Tell us why: For many people on the Barrier who are paying exhorbitant prices for everything especially food and fuel it is going to hit them hard

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why: If you have to reduce no choice

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Do not support (prefer PAYT system)

Tell us why: We are good at recycling, composting etc. let's pay only for what we can't recycle, compost etc

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 Do not support or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with I don't know between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties I don't know

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part I don't know of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?



Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: I don't think we need public transport initiatives. All we need is good transport to and from the island

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information



3029



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: It's high time. There's no public transport ON Aotea yet and transport TO Aotea is still fully carbonated ;-). In the busiest areas, between Tryphena and Medlands and Tryphena and Okupu, there are no tracks that can easily be used by walkers and bikers for transport. Also, EV charging points at ferry terminal would likely promote more EV rental initiatives.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023



• considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Other

Tell us why: Partially support. I think capital spending should not be halted, especially where public transport systems are concerned.

Trimming down/efficiency savings sound good. Many 'control' systems seem too labour intensive and too hard for council staff to comprehend let alone enforce.

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why: Climate Action has become a must do. Focus attention on Public Transport, which embodies the most important change we can make in our climate action. And on Transport in general, ensure EV charging is in place, subsidised by central government and that most people can easily get around on foot and by push- and ebikes throughout Auckland.

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why: Waste cutting behaviour must remain incentivised.

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Support

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: Can we make Carbon reduction the main priority please? Public transport on island, does not have to be bespoke. Check what islanders and visitors want. Transport TO the island, incentivise transport providers to take action, availability of E-charging in all main centres, support of E-businesses and options for locals to use tracks for transport, not just for recreational purposes.

Planning for tourism, the islands main economy, is another main priority and needs to be added to the top of the above list. It's not even there?!!!

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Could there be a consideration to limit the size of Local Boards, and increase the input local experts/stakeholders can have on decision making through working groups?

Important privacy information







Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Do not support

Tell us why: i live on island with no public transport and only go to auckland once a year so am not interested in paying for something i don't use

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.



What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Do not support

Tell us why: i do not support the rates increase due to the cost of living is high enough and impacting on my living costs eg fuel food

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why: yes you do need to look closely at what and where you are spending rate payers money

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Other

Tell us why: we should have a choice which system suites our household

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 I don't know or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with I don't know between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties I don't know

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part I don't know of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: not sure how you can set up a public transport services that would actually work

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

the cost of living on the island is high enough without putting up rates or adding any other costs to our properties. we also live in a very low income area

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Do not support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support



3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Do not support
Tell us why:	

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives



Marine protection initiatives Water resilience initiatives Environmental protection initiatives Advocating for a bespoke public transport service Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? I don't know

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Do not support
Tell us why:	

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why:

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: Because not doing these things would be distastrous!

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? I don't know



3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? I don't know

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? I don't know

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 I don't know or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with I don't know between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties I don't know

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part I don't know of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Do not support

Tell us why: Bus lanes are not needed. Public transport is unreliable and so it is unused by the majority of Aucklanders.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Do not support



Tell us why: This is going to hinder the people of Auckland. The government has wasted money and so we shouldn't have to foot the issues of the government.

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? I don't know

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? I don't know

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 I don't know or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with I don't know between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties I don't know

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part I don't know of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Howick Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support all priorities

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information



4520



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: To protect my future generations, kids and grandkids to make sure their life is not endangered

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Other



3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Other

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Other

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10Otheror more units)Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties withOtherbetween two and nine unitsOtherOther

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties Other

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part Other of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information

Have your say # 4540



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: Climate action is important. Climate change is an issue that should be a priority. No need to prioritise short term low economic value, when helping our environment will better us in the long run

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.



What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures?

Tell us why:

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system?

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information



4567



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Do not support

Tell us why: If private business cannot drive these initiatives why should rate payers be asked to pay even more, where others do not. High earners pay little or NO tax or rates because they offset so much, these are the same people who will have their hands out for grants and more offsets. If the 2 largest carbon emitters in the world are not going to be held to account then we are wasting our time. Councils should get on with rubbish, roads and their core business, back off where they don't belong.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services



- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Do not support

Tell us why: It's easy - tighten your belts. There is so much being wasted unnecessarily and unproductively. It's time for the fat cats to go on a diet. Cut back on junkets and stop decorating the icing on the cake when it doesn't change the flavour. We hand out grants with wild abandonment yearly, sometimes to the same people who were unable to make last years projects work, it's time to get value for money. Prove that you need the money and will use it for the good of the city not just to benefit yourself and your direct families. Less travel, way less travel for councillors and council employees, most things can be dealt with on the internet now so use it.

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Do not support

Tell us why: Stop being so damned WOKE. The climate is NOT a council issue - stop wasting our money

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? I don't know

Tell us why: What I do know is you have to stop changing what you do so often, everytime you change something it cost money but adds nothing, other than more fat cat useless jobs.

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: People who have been on the island for many years are resilient and resourceful if the new comers don't get with the programme then maybe they have moved to the wrong place.

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: This is vital funding for Auckland Council to begin addressing the climate emergency. As a rate-payer I would dearly love to see it happen.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.



What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support

Tell us why:

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system?

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information

Have your say # 4862



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: Low carbon transport is essential as part of the climate crisis response. Getting people out of cars is integral to this

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.



What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support

Tell us why:

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Do not support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 Do not support or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with Do not support between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties Do not support

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part Other of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 - have we got it right?



Tell us why:

Manurewa Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support all priorities

Tell us why: I support all priorities

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information



4966





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: We must do all that we can to fight against the climate crisis

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? I don't know

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? I don't know

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? I don't know

Tell us why: I think that PAYT system will lead people to think more about their waste, however, I have not seen any data to confirm nor deny this

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 I don't know or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with I don't know between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties I don't know

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part I don't know of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?



Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: I value our local board's prioritisation of our environment, wellbeing and resilience over profit-driven motives such as increasing tourism, etc

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- · Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information



5034



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal?

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures?



3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system?

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Do not support

Tell us why: New Zealand is already costly enough for residents and other country's in the world need to do a lot more as well or its too little too late

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Do not support

Tell us why: It never works in a residents favor

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Do not support

Tell us why: Cause it will be what the government wants not us.. We dont want electric cars and some live far away from any public transport.

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? I don't know

Tell us why: Why do I feel like it will be a lot of money going into the new sizes of bins? Just stick to one thing and leave it stop changing everything. Maybe just make bags less expensive for everyone or better yet put our public bins back so people stop littering more

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Do not support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Do not support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Do not support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Do not support

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: I support all except transport because a lot of people o er here would need transport to get that local transport... But meh maybe they will find someway around it

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

· Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).

- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: It has become a matter of survival

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support



3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 Support or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives Water resilience initiatives Environmental protection initiatives Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: Our world needs to heal, and we have to do this by helping the most vulnerable ecosystems, lifeforms and individuals first.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures?

Tell us why:

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system?

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: It's necessary to make sacrifices now to try to avoid even more costly disruption in the future. We can't rely on the actions of central government to deliver what's needed and so need to act locally as well.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.



What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? I don't know

Tell us why: There's insufficient detail to have an informed opinion. While I'm in favour of making the savings needed I want to see the detail.

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why: Pay as you go should provide some encouragement for households to reduce the amount of waste they produce.

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	l don't know

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information



5810



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: We cannot save the people unless we save the world

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support



Tell us why: We have deferred relevant action for too long

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why: Money needs to be well spent, cheapest is dearest

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why: Equitable

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10	l don't know
or more units)	

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with I don't know between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties I don't know

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part Support of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? Tell us why:



Howick Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

Tell us why: Waste is a big problem

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Improve public transport, waste collection And improve public spaces

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: I view tackling climate change and Aucklands transport issues as two of my top priorities.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures?



3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system?

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: not only will it support the environment which is crucial but also considerably add to peoples quality of life. climate action has to be the number one focus to enable our children to live in a liveable world

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.



What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures?

Tell us why:

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system?

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information



6672



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: More needs to be done in Tāmaki Makaurau Auckland on climate action

We are living in a climate emergency

Paying a little now means we'll hopefully pay less in the future

Not everyone has equitable access to public transport

This is a good first step to tackle climate change

In 2019, Auckland Council declared a climate emergency. The Auckland Climate Action Targeted Rate must be passed to show that this declaration is more than just an empty gesture/words.

Reducing transport emissions will go a long way

I want to know my kids are safe when they cycle and walk

Climate justice has to be a major focus because

More frequent bus routes will make it easier for me to get around all of the city

I want more options to get out of my car

Decarbonising the ferry fleet is a really important step toward reaching climate goals



Council should have dedicated funding for tangata whenua-led initiatives

We cannot delay this package so it should not be pushed off to 2024

More buses need to be decarbonised and quickly

Front-load the fund so more gains can happen before 2030

More funding needs to go to the parts of the city that have low canopy cover and fewer green spaces

Take more incentives away from the use of private vehicles

Create more mara kai and plant even more native trees, and provide initiatives to build community

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures?

Tell us why:

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system?

Tell us why:



Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information







Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support



3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? I don't know

Tell us why:

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 I don't know or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with I don't know between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties I don't know

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part I don't know of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives Water resilience initiatives Environmental protection initiatives Advocating for a bespoke public transport service Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- · Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information



7017



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: Important for Aotea/Great Barrier Island as well, where there is a need for some form of public transport from Tryphena wharf to the north of the island. In Auckland itself, it is no longer safe to ride a bike to school in many areas, as I did in the 1950s, so I fully support more funding for public transport, cycling and safe walking initiatives. The excessive use of private cars and old diesel buses also adds to the health costs of vehicle emissions, which a number of studies in New Zealand have assessed as leading to at least as many premature deaths as road accidents. See for example: Hales S, Atkinson J, Metcalfe J, Kuschel G, Woodward, A.

Long term exposure to air pollution, mortality and morbidity in New Zealand: Cohort study. Sci Total Environ 2021;801:149660.

Also: Horrocks, J, Wilson, N. Diesel Matters. NZMedJ 2021; 134: 119-133.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:



- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures?

Tell us why:

3. Prioritising operating spending

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why: Works well in Lower Hutt (introduced in 2021)

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:



5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information

Diesel matters: accelerating the light diesel vehicle endgame in Aotearoa New Zealand

ABSTRACT

Air pollution from diesel-powered vehicles is likely to be contributing substantial harm to health in Aotearoa New Zealand, as well as making it harder for this country to meet its international climate change commitments. There are a lack of controls and outdated standards applied to diesel vehicles in New Zealand, and there is scope to extend the monitoring of emissions. A comprehensive list of interventions that would assist with the phase-out of light diesel vehicles and reducing their emissions during the transition has been compiled. This list includes regulatory interventions such as bringing forward the year in which the Climate Change Commission proposes to ban imports of internal combustion light vehicles (ie, from 2035 to 2025). Also detailed are fiscal measures (incentives and disincentives) and improvements to information for consumers at point-of-sale.

The relationship between air pollution and health, including premature death, is well-recognised. The Global Burden of Disease (GBD) study estimated in 2020 that in the previous year there were 6.7 million premature deaths globally from air pollution (ambient particulate matter and ambient ozone pollution). This number comprised 11% of all female deaths and 12% of all male deaths.¹ Another study has produced an even higher figure: 8.7 million premature deaths annually from fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) produced by the burning of fossil fuels.²

In this viewpoint, we have concentrated on the impact on air pollution of New Zealand's light diesel vehicles, which have made up a growing proportion of the diesel fleet since the year 2000. This category covers vehicles that have a gross mass of under 3,500 kilograms. It includes passenger cars and vans, but recent growth in the number of light diesel vehicles has been concentrated in the commercial fleet, which contains utility vehicles (utes), goods vans, motor caravans, lighter trucks and buses. Since 2000, the proportion of light commercial vehicles powered by diesel has increased from 44% to 74%.³ The popularity of diesels has created a potentially powerful lobby for the continued use of this fuel and poses a challenge to the proposals by the Climate Change Commission (CCC) for a rapid decarbonisation of the transport sector and a shift to electric vehicles. According to the CCC's 2021 draft timetable, no further internal combustion light vehicles would be imported after 2035.⁴

In order to clarify the steps that would need to be taken to achieve the CCC's transport goals, we assessed how much is known about the local ambient concentrations of the most harmful components of diesel emissions, nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and $PM_{2.5}$: that is, how they are being monitored and how well-informed about their emissions are the purchasers of diesel vehicles. A reduction in these pollutants would comprise an important health co-benefit to any initiatives to control carbon emissions from diesel. We also examine some of the actions that could accelerate the removal of light diesels from the vehicle fleet.

Since 2013 there has been a trend away from petrol cars towards large dieselpowered sports utility vehicles (SUVs) and





utes.³ Modern versions of the latter have incorporated the tray into the bodywork, if and twin cab models can often be seen in the country's towns and cities, where they are used as family vehicles.⁵ Because New Zealand's popular utes fall under a commercial designation, owners who claim that they use their vehicle for business can enjoy tax advantages such as depreciation of the asset, exemption from fringe benefit tax, rebates of goods and services tax (GST) and the ability to offset running expenses against income. These attractive incentives go some

way to explaining why Ford proudly labels its Ford Ranger utility vehicles as "NZ's Favourite Workmate,"⁶ a reasonable claim as the Ranger has been the country's highest-selling new vehicle since 2015, with 7975 new Rangers registered in 2020.⁷ All these models of the Ranger in New Zealand run on diesel.

At a time when sales of light diesel vehicles are falling in other countries and there are restrictions on their use in many European cities,^{8,9} New Zealanders continue to have a love affair with diesel. Most SUVs imported into the country are available in diesel versions, including the Kia Sportage, the fifth-highest selling new car in 2020. The popular Toyota Hiace range of vans and camper vans also includes diesel options. In 2019 diesel vehicles accounted for 19.8% of the fuel use in New Zealand's light fleet.³

Health impacts of diesel emissions

Diesel vehicles are heavy producers of NO_x and PM₂₅. The main source of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) from on-road emissions in New Zealand comes from diesels, which contributed 70% of the 47,800 tonnes of NO, produced by vehicles in 2015.10 Diesel emissions contain far more NO_x than emissions from petrol engines because diesels operate at a higher pressure and can also operate at a higher temperature under some driving conditions-factors that during combustion favour the creation of NO_x from the nitrogen and oxygen in the air/fuel mix. NO₂ itself is, in turn, produced when emissions of NO_x react with other chemicals in the air. PM_{2.5} resulting from the use of vehicles can be formed by mechanical abrasion from traffic (eg, from wear on tyres), but its

contribution from traffic is mainly found in the form of soot as a result of incomplete combustion.^{11,12}

Both NO_x and PM_{2.5} are associated with a variety of harms to health.¹⁰ NO₂ irritates the respiratory tract and can lead to long-term cardiovascular damage, and diesel engine exhaust has been identified as a cause of lung cancer.¹³ The increased mortality within populations that are exposed to particulate pollution, even at low levels, is long-established.¹⁴ A study of the impact of both ozone and PM_{2.5} pollution on mortality among the 61 million Medicare beneficiaries in the US found that even at levels below those set by national air quality standards for PM_{2.5}, these pollutants were linked to a greater all-cause risk of death.¹⁵

New Zealand-based research has also linked air pollution exposure to increased mortality risks, with stronger associations for Māori.¹⁶

The most recent estimates for the year 2016 were for approximately 4,000 premature deaths from $PM_{2.5}$ and NO_2 combined for New Zealand (more specifically: approximately 2,000 deaths from for $PM_{2.5}$ from all sources and approximately 2,000 from NO_2 from road traffic).¹⁷ Such estimates do not even include the health loss from disability (eg, from chronic respiratory disease and cardiovascular disease). Furthermore, a large study in London has linked typical diesel exhaust pollutants with more severe symptoms of mental illness in vulnerable individuals.¹⁸

The limited controls on New Zealand's light diesel vehicles

Diesels can be significant contributors to climate change through their emissions of carbon dioxide (CO_2). Although they have lower fuel consumption than petrol vehicles, each litre of diesel accounts for more CO_2 emissions than a litre of petrol.¹⁹ Together with the sheer size of many diesel SUVs and utes in New Zealand, this means that the larger models in these classes can emit more than 200 grams of CO_2 per kilometre. This contrasts with the emissions of the country's highest-selling smaller car, the Toyota Corolla, the petrol versions of which are claimed to produce less than 140g/km.⁸





New Zealand consumers are not well-informed about the fact that diesel vehicles also produce NO_x and $PM_{2.5}$. A cursory chat with salespeople at car yards makes this clear, and the manufacturers' figures for NO_x emissions from diesels are not displayed at the point-of-sale, unlike the CO_2 data for models sold locally. CO_2 figures are published at the point-of-sale, on the motor distributors' websites and by the New Zealand Government website Rightcar (though Rightcar does provide an opaque and poorly characterised composite rating for pollutants other than CO_2).

Apart from this lack of information, the control of emissions from New Zealand's light diesel fleet is held back by the country's weak and outdated emission standards for new vehicles and newly imported used vehicles. Since November 2016, importers of light vehicles have had to meet the emission standards set by EURO 5 or its equivalents, like Australian Design Rule (ADR) 79/04, JAPAN 09 and US 2007.20 EURO 5, however, was superseded as long ago as September 2014 by the new requirements set by EURO 6. EURO 6 sets a limit for NO_v emissions of 0.08g/km, a 67% reduction on the EURO 5 limit. In order to meet the more stringent limits and tests that must be met by EURO 6 vehicles, the particulate filters on the exhaust systems of EURO 5 models must be supplemented by other devices. These may include a NO_x trap that uses a catalyst to reduce NO_x to nitrogen. Another process, selective catalytic reduction (SCR), uses an additive, AD Blue, which contains urea. This is injected into the exhaust and reduces NO_v to nitrogen and water.²¹ As one might expect, these devices need expert maintenance. Even the particulate filters on EURO 5 models need regeneration through occasional periods of high-speed driving. Beside these innovations, the later versions of EURO 6 assess emissions by tests that also reflect real-world driving conditions, rather than just the laboratory results that supported earlier standards.

The protective value of the EURO 5 standard currently used in New Zealand for new and used additions to the light vehicle fleet is doubtful, as NO_x emissions are likely to be far higher than the official limit. A study conducted for the German Environment Agency (Umweltbundesamt) found that if temperature changes were taken into account and measurements were also taken under real-world driving conditions, EURO 5 diesel vehicles could exceed the limit for NO_x of 0.18g/km by over 400%.²² The health implications of this gap between testing under laboratory conditions and real-world driving conditions was illustrated by a study of the effect of diesel emissions in 11 major markets. It estimated that, because of their role as ozone and PM₂₅ precursors, excess NO_v emissions were linked in 2015 to approximately 38,000 premature deaths worldwide. These "excess" emissions were those observed during on-road driving over and above those recorded by testing under laboratory conditions.23

In May 2021, the Ministry of Transport canvassed motor industry opinion over its suggestion that stricter emissions requirements for imported used diesel vehicles could come into force after January 2022 and new vehicles a year later. The immediate response from the Vehicle Industry Association was that 90–95% of used imported models would be banned as a result²⁴—an indicator of the degree to which New Zealand has become a haven for polluting vehicles.

EURO 6 does set more demanding standards for NO_x , but there are questions about how many new diesels can actually meet these standards when in use. Results for different passenger brands vary widely and only 10% of EURO 6 cars tested by the International Council on Clean Transportation passed the NO_x standard on the road.²⁵ Official figures from vehicle manufacturers also need to be treated with scepticism, quite apart from any deliberate falsification of test bed results, as seen in the "Dieselgate" scandal with Volkswagen in 2015.²⁶

As outdated as EURO 5 may be, it does set limits for emissions besides CO_2 including limits for NO_x and PM. The limit for PM is a measure based on the total mass of particles in exhaust emissions. The majority of particles are very small (less than $PM_{2.5}$), but a relatively few larger particles contribute most of the mass.

One unintended benefit of New Zealand's tardy adoption of newer emission rules may be the opportunity to set in place measures to stop motorists from tampering with the various technologies used to reduce diesel



emissions. As well as exhaust system filters and exhaust gas recirculation, these include engine software and on-vehicle diagnostic systems to monitor emissions. The potential for tampering has been recognised by New Zealand industry groups such as the Motor Industry Association, and in 2016 the Ministry of Transport began work on how legislation and associated operational actions could prohibit this practice. The New Zealand Transport Agency's 2021 requirements for urban buses explicitly prohibit these practices in the case of buses.²⁷ The seriousness of tampering is demonstrated by the fact that over the previous decade in the US, at least 550,000 owners of diesel pickup trucks (utes) have disabled or modified these control devices. The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimates that the polluting impact of this tampering has resulted in emissions equivalent to those produced by an additional nine million (compliant) pickup trucks.²⁸ The blatant use of this practice has been seen by prosecutions in which offenders have been found to have used defeat devices on diesels with names such as Deviant Race Parts, Alligator **Diesel Performance and Adrenaline Perfor**mance. Some modified vehicles can also "roll coal", a kind of "exhaust-belch" of sooty exhaust that can be released on demand. Rolling coal is used as a political challenge to protesters about liberal causes, as well as drivers of eco-friendly cars, such as Prius owners.²⁹

In New Zealand, more old vehicles are kept in use than in countries with a comparable degree of motorisation, such as Canada, the US and Australia. In 2018 the average age at exit for all light vehicles bought new was 18.9 years, and for used imports the figure was 20 years.³ This feature of the country's vehicle fleet means that it includes relics from a time when standards for fine particle emissions were far laxer than the current requirement for new imports. For the heavier diesel fleet, buses are among the more visible examples of the local tendency to keep older vehicles in service, even when there are strong efforts by local and regional authorities to phase them out. In Wellington, for example, 79% of the fleet is now EURO 5 or above, including 10 electric vehicles.³⁰ The remaining ancient buses can be identified

easily enough by the black exhaust that emerges from their tailpipes as they travel through central city streets like Lambton Quay. Similar buses continue to enjoy second careers as school buses or be used on contract. This can be seen in old Volvo buses operated in these roles by Mana Coach Services.

They met EURO 3 emission standards when they entered the passenger transport fleet, but these are criteria that date back to the year 2000. EURO 3 included an allowable PM level in exhaust five times higher than applies to later EURO 5 imports. During operation, this will be an underestimate, in view of the age of these buses and the fact that emissions tests for vehicles earlier than EURO 6 were not conducted under realworld driving conditions.

Given the above issues, further development of high-quality monitoring of diesel emissions in New Zealand is important. In the Appendix we discuss the current arrangements and scope for further improvements.

Accelerating the light diesel vehicle endgame and reducing harmful emissions

In Table 1 we outline potential interventions to accelerate the light diesel vehicle endgame and to reduce air pollution during this transition. Some of these interventions apply to all vehicle use but have particular relevance for diesels (the first part of the table), and some of these would have health co-benefits via other pathways (eg, increased physical activity from infrastructure to support walking and cycling). Some of these steps have been considered by the CCC³¹ and the Ministry of Transport,³² but others do not appear to be under substantive discussion (eg, scrappage schemes). We discuss such schemes and other precautionary actions in the text below.

Extensions to the Clean Car Discount

The Clean Car Discount, or feebate scheme, was proposed by the Labour government in 2019³³ and is now a key part





of the transport strategy of the CCC. It has two main features. The first is a Clean Car Standard, which sets goals for importers of average grams of CO₂ emitted per kilometre among the vehicles they bring into the country each year. The second is a combination of charges at the time of purchase for vehicles that are heavy emitters of CO₂ and discounts for less polluting vehicles (Clean Car Discount).³⁴ The aim is to encourage motorists to move towards smaller cars and hybrid or electric vehicles (EVs). The Clean Car Discount for new imports of new and used EVs and plug-in electric hybrid vehicles has already applied from 1 July 2021, with the maximum discount at \$8,250 for new EVs.

The next stage of this scheme is a first step towards controlling the dominant position of large diesels in the light vehicle fleet. From 1 January 2022, large diesels will attract charges at the time of purchase. Detailed charges are still to be finalised (at the time of writing), but in the 2019 version, a buyer of a new Ford Ranger would pay an additional \$2,175, whereas a buyer of a small car, such as the Toyota Corolla, would receive a discount of \$600 because of the vehicle's much lower CO₂ emissions. The proposed charges for a large diesel-powered ute like the Ford Ranger are controversial enough to have led to a rush to buy such vehicles before the scheme comes into effect, yet these charges are minimal by comparison with proposals in other jurisdictions for charges that could be as much as 20 times higher.35

A serious limitation in this scheme is that it applies only to vehicles that are newly imported. In the case of diesels, it does not take into account the numbers of large diesel vehicles already in the country and their longevity.³ It is also based on CO₂ emissions and overlooks the variety of other hazardous emissions produced by diesels. In order to more rapidly reduce carbon emissions and other hazardous outputs, it would be better to make an annual charge at the time of registration for all larger light vehicles, including diesels, not just new imports. This charge could be differentiated by the size and type of vehicle, as in the feebate scheme proposals, but at a lower overall rate. That would overcome the disincentive to buy a new vehicle, an

unintended consequence that could ensure only older and more polluting diesels are being used during the transition to a low-carbon vehicle fleet. At the same time, it would signal to all diesel owners that large diesels are a costly transport option. Additional charges based on the NO_x and PM emissions from diesels could help to differentiate them from similar models that run on petrol.

The Clean Car Standard is sometimes described as a fuel efficiency standard, as in the 2021 Ministry of Transport's Green Paper on pathways to net zero for transport emissions by 2050.32 Carbon emissions are closely related to fuel usage, and the merit of this standard is that it applies to all fuel types and prioritises carbon. As a performance measure, however, the use of the phrase "fuel efficiency" needs to be distinguished from actual fuel economy standards, which have been set in all of the 24 OECD countries apart from Australia, Russia and New Zealand.³⁶ This further evidence of a longstanding lack of pressure to improve the fuel economy of the New Zealand vehicle fleet explains why it is one of the most fuelhungry in the OECD.³⁶

In its submission to the first report of the CCC, the Motor Industry Association made a strong case that the CCC's focus on a rapid shift to EVs overlooked the fact that the current supply chain for vehicles is closely linked to Australia, and that the small size of the local market means that New Zealand has little prospect of influencing what global manufacturers should build for us, especially as production is geared towards left-hand-drive vehicles.³⁷ The CCC's views about the future of EVs may not go as far as entering the "realm of fantasy," as the Motor Industry Association argued, but supply issues for new EVs and the durability of the current fleet of diesels indicate that incentives for getting older diesels off the road will also be very important. The accelerated retirement of these polluting vehicles will not be achieved simply by the introduction of the Clean Car Discount scheme in its current form.

Vehicle scrappage schemes

New Zealand can learn from the example of other countries about how to plan for the scrappage of older and polluting vehicles. In the US, for example, there are detailed





protocols for replacing old school buses. In some cases there are rebates for this or for retrofits.³⁸ The limited scrappage trials run in New Zealand in 2007 and 2009 are mainly of interest now for the degree to which the participants were ill-informed before the trial about their options for getting rid of old vehicles.³⁹

Fiscal incentives to scrap older vehicles could speed up their withdrawal from use, as well as being an equitable solution for lower-income families who may find it difficult to replace their vehicles. These could be funded by the income generated by the type of feebate scheme described above, or from Emissions Trading Scheme revenue. Actual disposal of old vehicles should be part of a nationwide scrappage scheme, as in Ireland. In the United Kingdom, distributors of particular brands of vehicles are also beginning to offer scrappage incentives for older vehicles instead of traditional trade-ins,⁴⁰ such as Hyundai with its Scrappage and Emission Reduction Scheme. New Zealand distributors could be encouraged to support such schemes.

Studies of gross emitting vehicles in the light vehicle fleet (defined as the 3% of the fleet that produce the most emissions) may in future provide a guide to which vehicles can be singled out for scrappage. These studies are discussed further in the Appendix.

Shifting perceptions and informing the public about the hazards of diesel

Light diesel vehicles have enjoyed years of heavy promotion based very much on a psychological aura of dominance and outright aggression. The most extreme example of the macho image of utes is the availability from several online suppliers of "truck nuts," a popular accessory for pickup trucks in the US. These are outsize and brightly coloured imitation testicles that can be hung from a vehicle's tow bar.

Vehicle size itself has also been emphasised as a positive feature of diesel vehicles, illustrated by the slogan in an advertisement for the 2019 Ford Ranger Raptor: "You're Going to Need a Bigger Garage."⁴¹ Other attributes of these vehicles have names that associate them with predatory beasts: aspects such as "a muscular presence," appeals to urbanites that convey the vehicle's capacity to ride over "annoying" speed bumps, and the vehicle's "look"—"these look ready to scale mountains" was a description of the Ford Everest bi-turbo diesel.⁸

Marketing like this is at odds with a transition to a low-emissions economy. The CCC recognises that "significant changes to behaviour" will be required to realise its goals.⁴² In the face of such advertising, behavioural change becomes more difficult. In similar fashion, the Motor Industry Association emphasises the importance of incentives if demand is to be shifted from popular models such as SUVs and utes, automatics and vehicles that are suitable for towing.

The Motor Industry Association points out that importers place orders for the models consumers want.³⁷ The impact of these consumer choices is exacerbated by the way manufacturers provide model versions to New Zealand that are less efficient than those supplied to countries that have regulated fuel efficiency standards.⁴³

Another example of the need for better information for consumers is the controversy over the 2021 Clean Car Discount.44 This reflects debates in Australia at the time of their 2019 General Election, when the governing Liberal Party claimed that the Opposition's call for a move towards electric vehicles and new emission standards would damage "tradies," kill the economy and represent an attack on fourwheel drive vehicles that would spell "the end of the weekend."45,46 New Zealand's National Party used similar tactics later that year to attack an earlier version of the feebate scheme, but was forced by the Advertising Standards Authority to withdraw an advertisement that exaggerated the costs.⁴⁷ It is no surprise, therefore, that some of the more negative reactions to the current Clean Car Discount are not new. They indicate that there is a need for a vigorous strategy to alert consumers to the advantages of the scheme. This could include material about the need to move away from the country's most polluting vehicles, diesels.





Specific actions to shift public perceptions could have the following features:

- Mandatory information at the point-of-sale about the NO_x and PM emissions of diesel vehicles, in line with the information that is currently provided about CO₂ emissions and fuel economy.
- Mandated clear labelling of vehicles themselves to indicate their emission status, as required in Europe. In Britain, for example, the EURO standard to which a new car has been certified has been noted on the vehicle's registration certificate since September 2018.
- Explanatory information about steps to reduce the number of diesel-fuelled vehicles, to avoid misconceptions among groups such as farmers and tradespeople that their work vehicles will be unfairly targeted during the transition away from fossil fuels.
- A ban on all New Zealand marketing for older diesel vehicles that cannot meet the latest European emission standards. This would include almost all light diesels in the current vehicle fleet. Promotion about vehicles could be permitted only at the point-

of-sale and could be limited to vehicle specifications.

• Government information material about the health risks of diesel emissions, in order to inform not only the motoring public, but organisations such as the Automobile Association, the Motor Industry Association, and motoring publications.

Conclusions

Air pollution from diesel-powered vehicles is likely to be contributing substantial harm to health in New Zealand, as well as making it harder for this country to meet its international climate change commitments. There are a lack of controls and outdated standards applied to diesel vehicles in New Zealand, and there is scope to extend the monitoring of emissions. A comprehensive list of interventions that would assist with the phase-out of light diesel vehicles and reducing their emissions during the transition has been compiled. This list includes regulatory interventions such as bringing forward the year in which the Climate Change Commission proposes to ban imports of internal combustion light vehicles (ie, from 2035 to 2025). Also detailed are fiscal measures (incentives and disincentives) and improvements to information for consumers at point-of-sale.





Potential actors	Potential intervention/s
Impacting specifically on lig	cht diesel vehicles
Central government	Bringing forward the CCC's proposed end date (2035) ³¹ on the permitted importation of internal combustion light vehicles (eg, to 2025, the year that Norway will <i>end the sale of all</i> fossil fuel-powered cars ⁴⁸).
Central government, local government, and vehicle distributors themselves	Vehicle scrappage schemes for light diesel vehicles. See text above for further details.
Central government	A ban on all New Zealand-based marketing for older light diesel vehicles that cannot meet the latest European emission standards. See text above for further details on how diesels are currently market- ed and other steps to counter the momentum this gives to providers of these vehicles.
Central government	Mandatory information at the point-of-sale about the NO _x and PM emissions from light diesel vehi- cles.
Central government	Mandated clear labelling of light diesel vehicles themselves to indicate their emission status.
Central government	Explanatory information about steps to reduce the number of diesel-fuelled vehicles, to avoid mis- conceptions among groups such as farmers and tradespeople. See text above for further details.
Central government (Ministry of Health)	Informational material about the health risks of diesel emissions (especially at the time that related laws or regulations are introduced).
Central government, operationalised by workers doing WOF inspections	Requirements for pollution mitigation devices (to reduce NO _x and PM) on new light diesel vehicles from a specific date. Mandatory checking of such devices at warrant of fitness (WOF) inspections could follow (with appropriate fines for non-compliance).
Police	Tighter enforcement around obviously polluting diesel vehicles—at present drivers can avoid penalty if they claim that smoky emissions are unavoidable because the design of the vehicle's equipment is original and it would entail disproportionate effort or expense to remedy its faults. ⁴⁹
Potentially impacting on all	vehicles but including light diesel vehicles
Central government	Increasing fuel prices, ³² or increasing the price of carbon via further reform of the Emissions Trading Scheme. But preferable to these may be a more effective carbon tax, ⁵⁰ with per capita annual pay-outs to all citizens (as "climate dividends"). ⁵¹ The latter could actually ensure that low-income households are better off. ⁵¹
Central and local govern- ment	Financial and regulatory support for the CCC's recommendations around: public transport, changes to urban form to support walking and cycling and remote working. ³¹
Central government	Adoption of the latest Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount, but in the latter's case with the addition of an annual charge at the time of registration (also based on vehicle type and size). See text above for further details.
Central government (to empower local govern- ment), then local govern- ment to act	Establish low-emission zones in major city centres where only EURO 6 standard vehicles are permit- ted (eg, as per some European citiesº).
Central government (to empower local govern- ment), then local govern- ment to act	Introduce transport pricing, with congestion charging and distance pricing considered in a Ministry of Transport Green Paper. ³² These can be potentially combined with subsidies (free public transport) and funding support for the uptake of low pollution transport modes (walking and cycling).
Central government and local government	Minimum parking prices nationally within inner-city areas and enhanced enforcement. Parking on roads that are popular cycle routes could also be prohibited.

Table 1: Framework of options for accelerating the light diesel vehicle endgame and reducing air pollution during the transition





Appendix

Monitoring of diesel emissions in New Zealand

Monitoring of emissions is critical, as it establishes where public exposure to them is likely to be at its highest and what trends in exposure are emerging.

Monitoring of NO₂ An indicator of the volume of diesel emissions in New Zealand is the data provided by a nationwide network of passive monitors managed by Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA). These monitors record levels of NO₂ in selected cities, with a focus on monthly averages.52 Because the monitoring sites are alongside the kerbside of roads, they record the immediate impacts of traffic—NO, levels drop quickly according to their distance from the monitors. The NZTA results are also supplemented by data collected from sources such as the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC). They are based upon the assumption that NO₂ is useful as an indicator pollutant, a proxy for other traffic-related emissions, in accordance with a guideline from the World Health Organization (WHO). The fact that these data also provide a rough estimate of the impact of diesel on emissions is a handy side benefit, as diesel vehicles are the principal contributors to traffic-related NO_x emissions.¹⁰ Passive sampling of this kind is useful for observing trends, but may provide higher values than continuous sampling, which is the method required to assess pollutants in accordance with New Zealand Environmental Standards for Air Quality (NESAQ). New Zealand's only standards for NO₂ exposure are for one-hour and 24-hour periods, whereas the results for annual exposure collected by passive sampling have to be assessed against a non-binding WHO guideline.¹⁰

An analysis by the NZTA of concentration levels of NO₂ recorded at roadside monitoring sites in the three largest cities over the years 2011–2019 shows a trend towards a reduction in mean and median levels of annual exposure over this period. This has been most marked over the last of these three years, a result attributed to improvements in vehicle design. However, three of the four sites that in 2016 exceeded the

WHO annual guideline of >40 micrograms per cubic metre (µg/m³) continued to do so through 2017–2019. Two of these sites were in Auckland and one in Hamilton.⁵²

Local "hot spots" appear to be the areas most of concern for NO₂ concentrations. Rather than locations where people live, they are more likely to be places where there is stop-start driving, heavy traffic at rush hour and buildings that, due to their height, create a canyon effect, as on Lambton Quay in Wellington and Queen Street in Auckland. Poor air quality along Wellington's "Golden Mile" between Courtenay Place and Lambton Quay has been attributed to the combination of these physical features and the presence of a small number of old dirty diesels that have a disproportionate impact.⁵³ As well as places such as this, there are other urban sites in New Zealand where concentrations of NO₂ may not actually breach the WHO guideline for annual exposure, but that still approach or exceed the range that has been identified by the NZTA as a medium level of pollution (30-39.9 µg/m³).⁵²

More monitoring of similar hot spots would be desirable, especially with the trend for intensification of housing in the central parts of cities and the accompanying conversion of some office blocks for this purpose. For pedestrians and people waiting at bus stations in the centre of cities, especially those with respiratory conditions like asthma, exposure to pollutants at peak traffic times may be more significant than measures of annual concentrations. In central Wellington, however, one-hour exposures to NO₂ are within New Zealand's National Environmental Standards, which permit levels to exceed an average of 200 $\mu g/m^3$ no more than nine times per year. Acceptable limits today may, of course, be altered in the future. A recent multi-city and multi-country study of data from 398 cities and 27 countries or regions has found that exposure to NO₂ was associated with increased risks for mortality and morbidity even when levels were below regulatory guidelines. The authors suggest that considerable health benefits could follow from a strengthening of WHO limits the next time they are reviewed.54



Contributions of particular classes of vehicle to emissions of NO_x

The contribution of various types of vehicles to urban air pollution in New Zealand was explored by Bluett and various co-workers in a number of studies between 2003 and 2015. By using a remote sensory device (RSD), they were able to differentiate between the emissions of vehicles according to parameters such as age, type and whether they were diesel- or petrol-powered. The importance of the actual number of dieselpowered vehicles was illustrated by the 2015 study, which found that NO_v emissions from the more recent light-duty diesel vehicles had not improved significantly with new technology and, in fact, the negative pressure from a recent increase in the number of diesel light-duty vehicles was one factor leading to a plateau effect (stabilisation) in the volume of NO_x emissions at this time, after a period of decline.55

A recent and more comprehensive RSD study of the contribution to pollution of the gross emitters in the light vehicle fleet has helped to clarify the relevance of variables such as the age of these vehicles, which emission standard applies to them, their mileage, their fuel type and how long they are likely to stay in operation.⁵⁶ When the contribution of these gross emitters is contrasted with the median emissions of typical emitting vehicles in the rest of the fleet, it is estimated that their removal would result in a net reduction per year of 37,500 tonnes of carbon monoxide (CO), 2,500 tonnes of hydrocarbons (HC), 4,600 tonnes of nitrogen oxide (NO), 520 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide (NO2,) and 53 tonnes of particulate matter (PM). This work could, in future, provide guidelines for which older vehicles should be selected for scrappage, which is an area in which more monitoring would be desirable.⁵⁶

Vehicle emissions prediction model

A broad assessment of the annual quantities of different categories of pollutants is provided in New Zealand by the vehicle emissions prediction model (VEPM) developed by the Auckland Council and the NZTA.⁵⁷ This can provide annual national emissions estimates in terms of tonnes per kilometre travelled. These are for a variety of pollutants—CO, volatile organic compounds (VOC), NO_x, CO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Emission factors are derived from a European model (COPERT). This model is used to identify trends in the country's emissions inventory, based on specifications of vehicles in the local fleet. Updates of the model since 2008 have moved beyond averaged speed estimates and fleet characteristics. Among the refinements are adjustments for changes in European emissions standards, the introduction of data on various vehicle types, including hybrids, alignment with Japanese emissions criteria and subtle aspects such as changes in road gradients.

This tool promises to be a useful source of estimates about emissions. In one example from research on the practicality of the model, real-world emissions from a small number of petrol and diesel vehicles were measured using a portable emissions monitoring system. The real-world emissions of most pollutants were up to eight times higher than those predicted by the VEPM, but the real-world NO_x results were comparable to those from Australia and Europe for similar vehicles.⁵⁸

Monitoring of fine particle pollution

New Zealand currently has no national standards for PM_{2.5} exposure. Work is now being done on developing standards for PM₂₅, which would align with WHO guidelines. The proposed standards would become the main regulatory tool for managing exposure to ambient particulate matter.⁵⁹ This will be a major step forward, as the absence of such standards is hard to justify, especially in the light of the vast literature about $PM_{2.5}$ in other countries and its impact on health. In the US, for example, standards for PM_{2.5} exposure were first promulgated in 1997.60 The availability of such data in the US facilitates the assessment of health and monetary benefits as the result of decreases in diesel exhaust emissions.61

At present, information about $PM_{2.5}$ depends on whether local authorities collect such data. Otherwise, findings must be inferred from the results of monitoring larger $PM_{1.0}$ particles. The most comprehensive dataset comes from Auckland, where monitoring of $PM_{2.5}$ has been focused on four particular sites—Queen Street, Khyber Pass, Takapuna and Penrose.⁶² The



results for the years 2006–2013 demonstrate the seasonal nature of $PM_{2.5}$ exposure, particularly from biomass burning, as well as the variety of sources of these particles, which include sea spray. The Auckland data also enable the respective contributions from diesel and petrol emissions to be determined. At the Queen Street site, for example, diesel emissions accounted for 39% of total $PM_{2.5}$ and the contribution from petrol vehicles was 3%. The site-specific nature of such data is illustrated by the detail in the Auckland findings: ship emissions accounted for 5% of $PM_{2.5}$ at the Queen Street site near the port, whereas the comparative PM_{2.5} contribution of diesel to petrol was lower at Takapuna than in the central city. The Auckland study has also been able to demonstrate long-term trends in PM_{2.5}, exposure, with a significant decline over the period 2006–2013. More recent data from the Takapuna site and another Auckland site show that this trend has continued and is traffic related.¹⁰ The proposal to give a greater role to nationwide monitoring of PM_{2.5} offers the opportunity to conduct further monitoring of the type carried out in Auckland and thus arrive at a better understanding of the role of diesel emissions in New Zealand.



Competing interests: Nil.

Author information:

John Horrocks: Independent Researcher, Hutt City. Nick Wilson: Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington.

Corresponding author:

Prof Nick Wilson, Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington nick.wilson@otago.ac.nz

URL:

www.nzma.org.nz/journal-articles/diesel-matters-accelerating-the-light-diesel-vehicle-end-game-in-aotearoa-new-zealand

REFERENCES

- 1. Global Burden of Disease Risk Factors Collaborators. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet 2020;396:1223-49.
- 2. Vohra K, Vodonos A, Schwartz J, Marais EA, Sulprizio MP, Mickley LJ. Global mortality from outdoor fine particle pollution generated by fossil fuel combustion: Results from GEOS-Chem. *Environ Res* 2021;195:110754.
- 3. Ministry of Transport Te Manatū Waka. Annual Fleet Statistics. Wellington: Ministry of Transport, 2019. Available from: https:// www.transport.govt.nz/ assets/Uploads/Report/ AnnualFleetStatistics.pdf
- 4. He Pou a Rangi: Climate Change Commission. 2021 Draft Advice for Consultation, p.108. Our advice and evidence. Wellington: He Pou a Rangi: Climate Change Commission, 2021. Available from: https:// www.climatecommission. govt.nz/get-involved/ our-advice-and-evidence/.
- Radio New Zealand. Alistair Woodward: The rise of the urban light truck. Radio New Zealand 2021;(19 June). Available from: https://www.rnz.co.nz/ national/programmes/ saturday/audio/2018800439/

alistair-woodward-the-riseof-the-urban-light-truck.

- Ford New Zealand. NZ's Favourite Workmate. (Accessed 6 March, 2021). Available from: https://www.ford.co.nz/ commercial/ranger/
- Motor Industry Association. Vehicle Sales (Accessed 3 March, 2021). Available from: https://www.mia.org. nz/Sales-Data/Vehicle-Sales
- Horrocks J, Wilson N. "Beasts"-New Zealand's utility vehicles: their climate change emissions and macho marketing. N Z Med J 2019;132:90-99.
- 9. European Union. Urban Access Regulations in Europe. (Accessed 12 March, 2021). Available from: https://urbanaccessregulations.eu/.
- 10. Ministry for the Environment and Statistics NZ. Our Air 2018. Ministry for the Environment and Statistics NZ, 2018. Available from: https:// environment.govt.nz/ publications/our-air-2018/.
- 11. International Council on Clean Transportation. Vehicle NOx emissions: The basics (10 October 2017). Available from: https:// theicct.org/cards/stack/vehicle-nox-emissions-basics
- 12. Mitchell T. Traffic-related air quality monitoring in the Wellington Region 2016/17. Greater Welling-

ton Regional Council, 2017. http://www.gwrc.govt.nz/ assets/council-publications/ Traffic-related-air-quality-indicator-201617.pdf

- 13. International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). IARC: Diesel engine exhaust carcinogenic. Press release No. 213. (12 June 2012). Available from: https:// www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/ pr213_E.pdf.
- 14. Dockery DW, Pope CA, 3rd, Xu X, Spengler JD, Ware JH, Fay ME, Ferris BG, Jr., Speizer FE. An association between air pollution and mortality in six U.S. cities. *N Engl J Med* 1993;329:1753-9.
- 15. Di Q, Wang Y, Zanobetti A, Wang Y, Koutrakis P, Choirat C, Dominici F, Schwartz JD. Air pollution and mortality in the Medicare population. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:2513-22.
- 16. Hales S, Blakely T, Woodward A. Air pollution and mortality in New Zealand: cohort study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2012;66:468-73.
- 17. Hales S, Atkinson J, Metcalfe J, Kuschel G, Woodward A. Long term exposure to air pollution, mortality and morbidity in New Zealand: Cohort study. *Sci Total Environ* 2021;801:149660.
- 18. Newbury J, Stewart R, Fisher H, Beevers S, Dajnak





D, Broadbent M, Pritchard M, Shiode N, Heslin M, Hammoud R, Hotopf M, Hatch S, Mudway I, Bakolis I. Association between air pollution exposure and mental health service use among individuals with first presentations of psychotic and mood disorders: retrospective cohort study *Br J Psychiatry* 2021;doi: 10.1192/bjp.2021.119.

- New Zealand Government. Rightcar. (Accessed 12 March, 2021). Available from: https://rightcar.govt. nz/carbon-emissions.
- 20. New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi. Exhaust: Table 11-2-5 Approved exhaust emission standards for new diesel-powered vehicles. Available from: https:// vehicleinspection.nzta. govt.nz/virms/entry-certification/i-and-c/exhaust/ exhaust-emissions#up.
- 21. UK Automobile Association. Euro Emissions Standards: Limits to improve air quality and health (updated 11 December 2017). Available from: https://www. theaa.com/driving-advice/ fuels-environment/ euro-emissions-standards
- 22. German Environment Agency. Nitrogen pollution from diesel-fuelled cars even higher than suspected. (Press release 25 April 2017). Umweltbundesamt. Available from: https://www. umweltbundesamt.de/en/ press/pressinformation/ nitrogen-pollution-fromdiesel-fuelled-cars-even.
- 23. Anenberg SC, Miller J, Minjares R, Du L, Henze DK, Lacey F, Malley CS, Emberson L, Franco V, Klimont Z, Heyes C. Impacts and mitigation of excess diesel-related NOx emissions in 11

major vehicle markets. *Nature* 2017;545:467-71.

- 24. Autotalk. Ministry admits admissions approach was incorrect. Autotalk 2021;(16 June). Available from: https://autotalk. co.nz/news/ministry-admits-emissions-approach-was-incorrect
- 25. Baldino C, Tietge U, Muncrief R, Bernard Y, Mock P. Road Tested. Comparative Overview of Real-World Versus Type Approval of NOx and CO2 Emissions from Diesel Cars in Europe. International Council for Clean Transportation. White Paper (September 2017). https:// theicct.org/sites/default/ files/publications/ICCT_ RoadTested_201709.pdf.
- 26. Hotton R. Volkswagen. The scandal explained. BBC News (10 December 2015). https://www.bbc.com/ news/business-34324772
- 27. Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency. Requirements for urban buses in New Zealand for consistent urban bus quality (updated March 2021). Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency. Available from: https://nzta.govt.nz/ assets/resources/requirements-for-urban-buses/ docs/requirements-for-urban-buses-2021.pdf.
- 28. US Environmental Protection Agency. Tampered Diesel Pickup Trucks: A Review of Aggregated Evidence from EPA Civil Enforcement Investigations. US Environmental Protection Agency (September 2020). Available from: https://int.nyt.com/data/ documenttools/epa-ontampered-diesel-pickups-11-20/6d70536b06182ad2/ full.pdf.
- 29. Bernton H. Washington state diesel truck shop accused of tampering with

hundreds of pickups to thwart emission controls. Seattle Times 2021;(13 May). https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/ environment/washingtonstate-diesel-truck-shopaccused-of-tampering-withhundreds-of-pickups-tothwart-emission-controls/.

- 30. Greater Wellington Regional Council. Improved quality of public transport. p.1. Greater Wellington Regional Council, 2021. Available from: http://www. gw.govt.nz/improved-quality-of-public-transport/
- He Pou a Rangi Climate Change Commission. 2021 Draft Advice for Consultation. NZ Government, 2021. Available from: https://ccc-production-media.s3.ap-southeast-2. amazonaws.com/public/ evidence/advice-report-DRAFT-1ST-FEB/ADVICE/ CCC-ADVICE-TO-GOVT-31-JAN-2021-pdf.pdf.
- 32. Ministry of Transport. Hīkina te Kohupara – Kia mauri ora ai te iwi Transport Emissions: Pathways to Net Zero by 2050 (Green Paper). Wellington, Ministry of Transport, 2021. Available from: https:// www.transport.govt.nz/ assets/Uploads/Discussion/ DiscussiondocumentHikinateKohuparaKiamaurioraaiteiwiTransportEmissionsPathwaystoNetZeroby2050.pdf. 2021.
- 33. Ministry of Transport. Moving the light vehicle fleet to low-emissions: discussion paper on a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount (9 July, 2019). Available from: https://www.transport. govt.nz/assets/Import/ Uploads/Our-Work/ Documents/11de862c28/ LEV-consultation-document-final.pdf.
- 34. Waka Kotahi New Zealand



Transport Agency. Clean Car Programme Overview (June 2021). Available from: https://www. nzta.govt.nz/vehicles/ clean-car-programme/ overview/.

- 35. Satherley D. Gas guzzling fees could be twenty times higher – Green MP Julie Anne Genter. Newshub 2021;(19 June). https:// www.newshub.co.nz/home/ politics/2021/06/gaz-guzzling-vehicle-fees-could-be-20-times-higher-green-mpjulie-anne-genter.html.
- 36. Ministry of Transport. Moving the light vehicle fleet to low emissions: discussion paper on a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount. Ministry of Transport, 2019. Available from: https://www.transport. govt.nz/assets/Uploads/ Discussion/LEV-consultation-document-final.pdf.
- 37. Motor Industry Association. Submission to Climate Change Commission 2021 draft advice for consultation (28 March 2021). Lower Hutt: Motor Industry Association, 2021. Available from: https://www.mia. org.nz/Portals/0/MIA%20 submission%20on%20 Climate%20action%20 for%20Aotearoa%20 New%20Zealand%20-%20 28%20March%202021. pdf?ver=MuERbULBFJCgwBqxgU3R_g%3D%3D.
- US Environmental Protection Agency. Making School Buses Cleaner (Updated 6 August 2020). Available from: https:// www.epa.gov/dera/makingschool-buses-cleaner
- 39. Ministry of Transport. A vehicle scrappage trial for Wellington and Christchurch: May 2009. Ministry of Transport. Available from: https://www. transport.govt.nz/assets/ Uploads/Report/Scrap-

page-Report-FINAL.pdf

- 40. Custard B. Scrappage schemes the complete guide. Car Buyer 2021;(3 February). https://www. carbuyer.co.uk/tips-andadvice/156243/2021scrappage-schemesthe-complete-guide.
- 41. Ford New Zealand. You're Going to Need a Bigger Garage. New Zealand Autocar (2018, December), p2.
- 42. He Pou a Rangi-the Climate Change Commission. Chapter 17: The direction of policy for Aotearoa. Climate Change Commission, 2021. Available from: https://ccc-production-media.s3.ap-southeast-2. amazonaws.com/public/ evidence/advice-report-DRAFT-1ST-FEB/ Evidence-CH-17-directionof-policy-for-Aotearoa-21-Jan-2021.pdf.
- 43. New Zealand Productivity Commission. Low-emissions economy: Final report. NZ Productivity Commission, 2018. Available from: https://www. productivity.govt.nz/assets/ Documents/4e01d69a83/ Productivity-Commission_Low-emissions-economy_Final-Report.pdf.
- 44. Trevett C. The 'feebate'– Govt can confirm rebates for buyers of electric cars, but petrol car buyers will cop it. NZ Herald. 2021;(13 June). https:// www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/ the-feebate-govt-confirmsrebates-for-buyers-ofelectric-cars-but-petrolcar-buyers-will-cop-it/ TEJ3V5CF72YFTT5NPQTOW-J3AAE/.
- 45. Molloy S. Bill Shorten is killing off the ute, according to critics. News. com.au. 2019;(10 April). https://www.news.com.au/ national/federal-election/ bill-shorten-is-killing-offthe-ute-according-to-critics/

news-story/e637de638a169d-03114036e9f488702d.

- 46. Crabb A. The secret life of utes: How Australia's 'blokey' car has a grip on politicians. ABC News 2019;(10 April). https://www.abc.net. au/news/2019-04-09/ utes-electric-cars-and-politics/10983298.
- 47. Cooke H. 'Shameful' delay on Nats' misleading ad. New Zealand Herald 2020; (12 February), p. 17.
- 48. Reuters Staff. Fossil fuelbased vehicle bans across the world. Reuters 2020;(18 November). https://www. reuters.com/article/ climate-change-britainfactbox-idINKBN27Y19F.
- New Zealand Government. Land Transport (Road Use) Rule 2004. Emission or smoke vapour from motor vehicles. 7.5 (3). NZ Government. (Reprint 1 May 2021). Available from: https://www.legislation. govt.nz/regulation/ public/2004/0427/latest/ whole.html#DLM303623.
- 50. Green J. Does carbon pricing reduce emissions? A review of ex-post analyses. *Environ Res Lett* 2021;16:043004.
- 51. Carattini S, Kallbekken S, Orlov A. How to win public support for a global carbon tax. *Nature* 2019;565:289-91.
- 52. Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Authority. Ambient Air Quality (Nitrogen Dioxide) Monitoring Programme. Annual Report 2007-2019. Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Authority, 2020. Available from: https://www.nzta. govt.nz/assets/resources/ air-quality-monitoring/no2-monitoring-network-site-metadata-report-2007-2019.pdf.
- 53. Radio New Zealand/ Stuff. Diesel vehicles are





keeping Wellington from world-beating air quality – NIWA (29 December 2019). Radio New Zealand/ Stuff. https://www.stuff. co.nz/dominion-post/news/ wellington/118509781/ diesel-vehicles-keeping-wellington-from-worldbeating-air-quality--niwa.

- 54. Meng X, Liu C, Chen R, Sera F, Vicedo-Cabrera AM, Milojevic A, Guo Y, Tong S, Coelho M, Saldiva PHN, Lavigne E, Correa PM, Ortega NV, Osorio S, Garcia, Kysely J, Urban A, Orru H, Maasikmets M, Jaakkola JJK, Ryti N, Huber V, Schneider A, Katsouyanni K, Analitis A, Hashizume M, Honda Y, Ng CFS, Nunes B, Teixeira JP, Holobaca IH, Fratianni S, Kim H, Tobias A, Iniguez C, Forsberg B, Astrom C, Ragettli MS, Guo YL, Pan SC, Li S, Bell ML, Zanobetti A, Schwartz J, Wu T, Gasparrini A, Kan H. Short term associations of ambient nitrogen dioxide with daily total, cardiovascular, and respiratory mortality: multilocation analysis in 398 cities. BMJ 2021;372:n534.
- Bluett J, Aguiar M, Smit R. Understanding trends in roadside air quality. NZ Transport Agency Research Report 596. 2016. https://nzta.govt.nz/

assets/resources/research/ reports/596/596.pdf

- 56. Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency. Assessing the Impact of Gross Emitting Vehicles. 2021. Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd. p.33. Available from: https://www.nzta. govt.nz/assets/Highways-Information-Portal/ Technical-disciplines/ Air-and-climate/Monitoring/Remote-sensing/ assessing-the-impact-ofgross-emitting-vehiclespdp-202007.pdf.
- 57. Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency. Vehicle Emissions Prediction Model. Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency, 2021. Available from: https://www.nzta. govt.nz/roads-and-rail/ highways-information-portal/technical-disciplines/ air-quality-climate/ planning-and-assessment/ vehicle-emissions-prediction-model/.
- 58. Kuschel G, Metcalfe J. NZTA Research Report 658. Testing New Zealand vehicles to measure real world fuel use and exhaust emissions. NZ Transport Agency, 2019. https://www. nzta.govt.nz/resources/ research/reports/658/.
- 59. Ministry for the Environment. Proposed

amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality: particulate matter and mercury emissionsconsultation document. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment, 2020. Available from: https:// environment.govt.nz/ assets/Publications/ Files/proposed-amendments-to-the-national-environmental-standards-for-air-guality-consultation-document_0.pdf.

- 60. Esworthy R. CRS Report for Congress. Updated January 10 2005. Particulate Matter Air Quality Standards: Background and Current Developments. https://www. everycrsreport.com/files/20050110_ RL31531_22b3ea88131ddb-75d084677154c8125abee568e0.pdf.
- 61. US Environmental Protection Agency. Diesel Emissions Quantifier (version 8.4; 21 December 2020). Available from: https://cfpub. epa.gov/quantifier
- 62. GNS Science. Source apportionment and trend analysis of air particulate matter in the Auckland Region. July 2017. Technical Report TR2017/001. Prepared for Auckland Council by GNS Science.





7978



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why: This would be a brilliant move towards reducing emissions and supporting people on low incomes.

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support



We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? I don't know

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why:

This is the system I am under at the monent and it works well. Is fair and reasonablyy efficient.

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	l don't know

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information

Have your say # 7994



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures?

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change?

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Other

Tell us why: Intuitively pay as you throw makes sense to me and I would support it but we we know that the small cost to dispose is little disincentive to most over convenience and so the benefits of a PAYT system are likely to be exceeded by the costs associated with operating it. The idea still has merit though in terms of perception and providing opportunity to incentivise changes to reduce waste in the future. I would support provisions to reward those who go above and beyond with waste minimisation and who make application for consideration. I also support allowing for Local Board/Community wide initiatives that will have a significant impact on reducing waste within or from their communities to be considered for a unique, non standardised waste management solution for their area eg introducing food waste collection and reducing kerbside refuse collection to fortnightly.

I support the three different sized bins to incentivise reducing waste to landfill but note that it appears that per litre, it costs more to use a 80litre bin than a 240 litre bin. I would also support an even smaller size again as there are community members who generate very little waste. These bins on the kerbside may create interest and enthusiasm by neighbours to reduce their waste and significant price differential may support this. I acknowledge that the size of the bin used may be more a reflection on the size of the household than the success in reducing waste per resident but still consider that the price per litre could be at least equal for each bin to fully support waste minimisation efforts.

Support Kerbside collection of food waste

Question **B**

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10	l don't know
or more units)	

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with I don't know between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

I don't know



Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part I don't know of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why: Focus on supporting resilient, regenerative practices- in farming, park development and care, transport services and community living on Aotea.

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support



We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? I don't know

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Do not support (prefer PAYT system)

Tell us why: Submission regarding proposed charges for waste on multiply owned properties who are unable to be part of the Aotea kerbside waste collection. Wairahi Bay Station Ltd (PT Paish Aotea, Wairahi Bay Great Barrier Island 0991) is a multiply owned property. Our aims and aspirations (as recorded in our Management Plan) are to manage and develop the land in a manner consistent with conservation values in order to provide and maintain a clean, healthy and rewarding place in which we and our families may live. All the shareholders have great concern for the conservation and protection of the natural environment. In our development and management of the property every attempt is made to protect the natural treasures of the land from destruction and pollution.Our Management Plan has a section on rubbish disposal which states that: "...every effort shall be made to dispose of rubbish in a responsible manner such as reuse, recycling, and composting of green waste. ..."

As a resident of Wairahi Bay I support incentivising minimising waste and don't believe that uniform charges adequately do this. If all households are charged the same amount then households who make a big effort to minimise waste are not rewarded and households producing a lot of waste are not incentivised to do better in reducing their waste. We manage waste by not creating it in the first place:- we have large gardens and orchards, grow our own meat, do baking and preserving etc, are conscious shoppers with regard to packaging, and compost all our green waste. Any waste that is created needs to be transported by boat and land to the main part of the island and then to Claris Landfill for disposal. While a drop off facility is provided near Port Fitzroy Wharf, this is not suitable for use by Wairahi residents because our access is very tide and weather dependent. Because of this we already pay significantly for the small amount of rubbish created.

We understand the need to pay for services but believe that \$53.80 per household is too much in our isolated location and in light of the initiatives we have in place in to minimise and manage our own waste. We believe there are others in a similar situation to us and think there should be an opportunity to assess rates charges for such properties (multiply owned usually) based on evidence of initiatives to reduce and manage our own waste in a responsible and environmentally resilient way. Myself and other Wairahi residents have voluntarily shared our personal household initiatives towards waste reduction with the wider Aotea Community in a bid to promote waste minimisation and contribute to waste reduction initiatives within the wider community.

Yours sincerely,

Sue Reusser, one of Wairahi Bay Station residents.

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 Do not support or more units)

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives

Water resilience initiatives

Environmental protection initiatives

Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

• Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).

• Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).

· Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information



8871



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Do not support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support



We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	Support
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Do not support
Tell us why:	

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives Water resilience initiatives Environmental protection initiatives Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information

Have your say # 9090



Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Do not support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support



We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Do not support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Do not support (prefer PAYT system)

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10	Do not support
or more units)	

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with Do not support between two and nine units

Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties Support

Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part Support of a property

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives Water resilience initiatives Environmental protection initiatives Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information

9499





Annual budget 2022/2023

Note: this version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Aotea/Great Barrier

Your feedback

1. Climate action targeted rate

To meet our climate ambitions, we must reduce transport emissions in Auckland by 64 per cent by 2030. To address the climate emergency and contribute to this climate goal, we are proposing spending an additional \$1.045 billion (including government funding and other sources) over the next 10 years on a series of targeted actions to reduce emissions and support adaptation. This includes:

- improving transport choice for over one million Aucklanders who will be living within 500 meters of new or improved bus services
- moving to low-emission ferry services
- increasing provision for walking and cycling, and
- increasing tree canopy cover in communities that need it most.

We propose introducing a climate action targeted rate (separate from general rates) to pay for \$574 million of this over the next 10 years. We estimate the targeted rate to be about \$1.12 per week (about \$58 a year) for the median value residential property.

What do you think of this proposal? Support

Tell us why:

2. Managing on-going budget pressures

Due to on-going impacts of COVID-19 on our revenue, and growing inflationary pressure, we are forecasting a budget shortfall of \$85 million for 2022/2023 compared to what was budgeted for in the 10-year Budget 2021-2031. Some of the budget pressures would be ongoing.

We plan to use a range of levers to manage next year's, and on-going, budget pressures, including:

- using the Government's Better Off support package funding
- changing the timing of some capital spending
- implementing cost reductions in the form of efficiency savings and potential reduction in some services
- keeping the previously agreed general rates increase of 3.5 per cent for 2022/2023
- considering the sale or long-term lease of additional non-strategic assets as required.

What do you think of our proposal to manage on-going budget pressures? Support

We need to prioritise operating spending to help manage on-going budget pressures. We have proposed a set of criteria to be used when making decisions about cost reductions, including those that could reduce, stop or change some services.

What do you think about how we propose to choose which services to reduce, stop or change? Support

Tell us why:

4. Standardising waste management

Question A

Over the next three years we are moving to standardise waste services and charges across Auckland. Currently, some of Auckland pays for rubbish collections on their rates bill, and other parts of Auckland buy bin tags or bags to get their rubbish collected.

We are proposing a move to a region-wide rates funded refuse collection service with a choice of three bin sizes to accommodate different household needs, as this is the most cost-effective, equitable and climate friendly option to achieve waste minimisation outcomes.

This proposal is instead of the current Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan approach to move to a region-wide pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) system (e.g. tags and bags).

What do you think about our proposal to move from a planned region-wide PAYT system to a region-wide ratesfunded rubbish collection system? Support (prefer rates-funded system)

Tell us why:

Question B

In addition to how we fund region-wide kerbside rubbish collection, we are also proposing to standardise waste management services and charges across Auckland.

This includes standardising which properties can opt out of council waste services and charges.

What do you think about these proposals?

Standardise the opt-out rules for residential multi-unit developments (10 or more units)	Support
Standardise the opt-out rules for residential and lifestyle properties with between two and nine units	l don't know
Standardise the opt-out rules for non-residential properties	l don't know
Apply a minimum base charge to every separately used or inhabited part of a property	Support
Tell us why	

Tell us why:

5. Local Boards

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board

Tell us your thoughts on our proposed priorities for the local board area in 2022/2023 – have we got it right? I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed?

Community well-being initiatives

Marine protection initiatives Water resilience initiatives Environmental protection initiatives Advocating for a bespoke public transport service

Tell us why:

6. What is important to you?

Do you have feedback on any other issues, including:

- Local board decision-making over local community services (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan 2022/2023 (page 53 in the consultation document).
- Changes to fees and charges (page 53 in the consultation document).

Or is there anything further you would like to give feedback on?

Important privacy information