

Summary of local board individual submissions on the Remuneration Authority's consultation document "Local Government Review"

Albert-Eden Local Board

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

- a) *Strongly supports the continuation of the current regime where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, specifically, the Remuneration Authority.*
- b) *Does not agree with the Remuneration Authority's proposed factors of population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights as the primary way to determine local authority remuneration.*
- c) *Considers that the roles and responsibilities of local board members have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- d) *Considers that the other factors of population, projected population change, operational expenditure, asset size and social deprivation should be used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate, and should be of secondary importance to the base factors of local board member roles and responsibilities.*
- e) *Strongly disagrees with the Remuneration Authority's proposed approach to establish a remuneration pool allocated to local authorities to decide on their own remuneration.*
- f) *Strongly disagrees with the Remuneration Authority's proposed approach that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council by either the governing body and/or local boards.*
- g) *Considers that the current approach whereby the Remuneration Authority determines remuneration for local board chairs by taking into account roles and capabilities required should continue.*
- h) *Considers that the local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- i) *Considers that the Remuneration Authority should recognise the role of deputy chair of local board as a position and should increase the rate of remuneration to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.*
- j) *Supports the introduction information included in the tabled document as it provides important context on the unique Auckland Council shared governance model and roles and responsibilities of local board members.*
- k) *Supports the reasons included in the tabled document around certainty, independence, transparency and adequacy of information as important factors when deciding on local board member remuneration.*

- l) *Supports the role and capabilities descriptions included in the tabled document and requests that the Remuneration Authority sufficiently understand the roles and responsibilities unique to Auckland Council to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determinations.*
- m) *Requests that the General Manager Democracy Services:*
- i. *Review Auckland Council's interpretation and implementation of Section 12 - Communications allowance of the Local Government Members (2017/18) (Local Authorities) Determination 2017, relating to the provision of computer, laptop or tablet, mobile telephone, internet, printer and associated consumables*
 - ii. *Amend current practice to ensure elected members have access to an Auckland Council provided computer, laptop or tablet, mobile telephone, internet, printer and associated consumables*
 - iii. *Amend current practice to ensure elected members are reimbursed for use of members own computer, laptop or tablet, mobile telephone, internet, when used for council business and these items are not provided by Auckland Council.*

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- *The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*

- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then:*
 - *We believe the remuneration pool should be allocated to each individual local board for its determination, rather than to the governing body;*
 - *Each additional position of responsibility, above the base local board role, should have a formal role description; and*
 - *Each local board should be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all of its positions.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- *The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.*

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- *The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role*

Franklin Local Board

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- *The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then:*
 - *We believe the remuneration pool should be allocated to each individual local board for its determination, rather than to the governing body;*
 - *Each additional position of responsibility, above the base local board role, should have a formal role description; and*
 - *Each local board should be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all of its positions.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- *The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.*

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- *The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.*

Gt Barrier Local Board

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

- a) *support in principle the draft submission developed by officers on the Remuneration Authority's Consultation Document "Local Government Review" and confirm the Chair will engage further with other boards prior to the submission being lodged by 15 December 2017.*

Henderson-Massey Local Board

Comments will be finalised at its meeting on 21 November 2017.

Hibiscus & Bays Local Board

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- *The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then:*
 - *We believe the remuneration pool should be allocated to each individual local board for its determination, rather than to the governing body;*
 - *Each additional position of responsibility, above the base local board role, should have a formal role description; and*
 - *Each local board should be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all of its positions.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- *The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.*

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- *The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.*

Howick Local Board

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- *The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- *The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.*

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- *The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.*

Kaipataki Local Board

Customised the combined submission. Its responses to the questions asked by the Authority are:

Council sizing

KLB notes the suggested criteria around council sizing. It does not believe that these criteria are totally relevant for Auckland's local boards. KLB supports the use of population and operational expenditure as factors.

Asset size is only partially relevant to local board decision-making. The distribution of assets within the Auckland region reflects the preferences and priorities of the 8 legacy councils and is not spread equitably over the 21 local boards. There are long term facility network plans to address the gaps in current provision and better match the network to where residents live. While the Governing Body is responsible for the decision to fund a new facility, the majority of the subsequent decision-making falls to the local board.

It is unclear from the discussion paper what relevance social deprivation has to the complexity of governance decision making. The issues faced will be similar across councils and local boards; deprivation is only relevant as a proxy for how it might impact on the rates take.

KLB does not support using number of guest nights as a factor in council sizing. In the Auckland region guest nights are disproportionately spread across the region. An inner metropolitan board area such as Kaipātiki has few accommodation providers, whilst the Waitemata local board, which covers the central business district, has many accommodation providers.

As the consultation document notes there is incomplete information available on guest nights. KLB believes that many visitors to Auckland will be staying with friends and family resident in the region and the numbers of such visitors is also unknown. All visitors will treat the Auckland region as one place and the demands they place on local infrastructure and services will bear only a very limited relationship to where they stay.

The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 section 19 requires that local boards have a funding policy. The factors required to be considered in developing the funding policy may provide a useful proxy for a future determination for Auckland's local boards. Section 19(4) sets out the factors that must be considered in setting the funding policy. Section 19(5) sets out the factors relevant for funding the administrative support allocated to each local board. Under the current funding policy¹ funds for locally delivered initiatives a number of factors are used to generate a funding pool. This is then allocated are allocated on a formula based on; population 90 per cent, deprivation 5 per cent and land area 5 per cent.

Local boards are also responsible for decisions relating to their Local Board Transport Capital Fund. This fund is held by Auckland Transport (which delivers the majority of the

¹ Auckland Council Local Boards Funding Policy <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Documents/local-boards-funding-policy.pdf>

projects funded). This fund is currently \$10 million per triennium and is allocated on the basis of population for 19 of the 21 local boards. Waiheke and Great Barrier local boards receive respectively 2 and 1 per cent of the fund.

The factors required to be considered when these policies are prepared provide the basis for an alternate approach to 'sizing' for Auckland's local boards.

Weighting

KLB notes that the Remuneration Authority is yet to complete its weighting analysis. As noted previously KLB believes that assets are only partially relevant to local board governance responsibilities.

Both the local board funding policy and local board transport capital fund provide parameters upon which the Authority could base its local board weighting decisions.

Mayor / chair remuneration

KLB supports the approach suggested for mayor / chair remuneration. It has equal applicability for local board chairs.

Additionally KLB believes that the Remuneration Authority should also consider and make a determination on the salary to be paid to local board deputy chairs. The deputy chair is required to assume the chair when s/he is unable to chair a meeting, the deputy chair also shares some of the leadership / civic representation role carried by the chair. This requires a time commitment greater than that of other board members and should be reflected in the determination.

Governance / representation pool

KLB does not support the consultation document's suggestion of a governance pool. This opposition is based on two foundations:

- KLB views it as inappropriate that local board members decide their own remuneration. Removing remuneration from the political sphere de-politicises the decisions.
- It may also run contrary to the views expressed during the Auckland governance reforms:

"While we recognise that we cannot set the remuneration levels of local board members, we urge the Remuneration Authority to give serious consideration to this issue. We consider that the remuneration provided to local board members must be sufficient to attract good quality candidates and reflect adequately what the job involves".²

² Local Government (Auckland Law Reform) Bill as reported from the Auckland Governance Legislation Committee https://www.parliament.nz/resource/en-NZ/49DBSCH_SCR4748_1/98434c12ee3f55f60f491a8c3a572eaf3ab4552d

- *The current prescriptive determination provides certainty and removes any potential internal conflict between board members over remuneration rates.*
- *KLB strongly objects to any suggestion that the remuneration be decided by the Governing Body. The select committee considering the bills establishing the Auckland Council stated:*

*“Our amendments seek to ensure that decision-making by the two tiers of the Auckland Council would be allocated according to clear principles, and that the governing body of the Council and the local boards would sit alongside each other and have distinct roles, rather than operate in a hierarchical relationship”.*³

- *Requiring the Governing Body to determine local board members remuneration would create a hierarchical system and be contrary to the views of the select committee.*

A local government pay scale

KLB supports the Authority’s views on a possible local government scale. Both members of the House of Representatives and local authority members have ‘constituency’ and governance roles. They differ in both the absolute and relative size of those roles. A member of the House of Representatives also spends far more time away from home working in Wellington.

Timetable for future determinations

KLB notes the Authority’s proposed timetable for the first determination incorporating the changes currently being consulted on.

KLB supports the determination being released in the election year as this gives some clarity to prospective candidates as to the remuneration they may receive.

KLB believes it would be unfortunate if the current ‘pool’ proposal went ahead with individual elected members remuneration determined after the election. This creates considerable uncertainty for potential candidates. It may mean that some candidates may chose not to stand as their personal financial situation is such that they need certainty over remuneration if they are to give up their current employment (or go part time) to take up their local board duties.

Manurewa Local Board

1. *The board supports the draft local board submission, in particular the submissions calling for:*
 - retention of the current regime, with remuneration determined by the Remuneration Authority*
 - a base level of remuneration being allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair)*

³ Local Government (Auckland Council) Bill as reported from the Auckland Governance Legislation Committee https://www.parliament.nz/resource/en-NZ/49DBSCH_SCR4490_1/5e9b59a2def7999cf53374f62842aa8fd4227272

- iii. *Local board chair role to be recognised as full time and paid accordingly*
- iv. *increased remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload.*

2. *The board does not support:*

- i. *a base level of remuneration to be allocated for each local board role (member, chair and deputy chair) with other factors, such as population operational expenditure asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local board, where appropriate.*

The board does agree that the roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the case level of local board remuneration across all local boards.

Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board

1. *The board supports the draft local board submission calling for retention of the current regime, with remuneration continuing to be determined by Remuneration Authority.*
2. *The board supports the draft local board submission calling for local board chair, deputy roles to be given formal role descriptions.*
3. *The board supports the draft local board submission calling for the local board chair role to be recognised as full time and paid accordingly.*
4. *The board supports the draft local board submission calling for increased remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload.*
5. *The board does not support the draft local board submission suggesting a base level salary for local board members, chairs and deputies, with additional remuneration based on factors such as population, opex, assets, social deprivation and guest nights. The board prefers the current basis for setting local board remuneration.*
6. *The board opposes setting of elected members' remuneration within Auckland Council, because of the political risk that this will bring.*

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- *The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- *The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.*

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- *The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.*

Orakei Local Board

Context

The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 established Auckland Council's unique shared governance model. This model is not replicated anywhere else in New Zealand.

Section 7 of the Act states that the decision-making responsibilities of the Auckland Council are shared between the governing body and the local boards. Section 12 states that a local board is not a local authority, a community board, or a committee of the governing body.

Auckland Council's 21 local boards and 149 local board members, have a significant and wide-ranging governance role. Each local board is an independent governance entity with decision-making responsibility for local activities, issues and facilities, as well as providing the local input into regional policies, plans and decisions. They have responsibility for significant operating and capital budgets and are fully accountable for the decisions they make.

Setting Remuneration

The Orakei Local Board:

- a) does not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration.*
- b) does not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority. The Board believes this approach would negatively impact on local boards and as a result, the communities we serve.*
- c) considers that the Remuneration Authority should continue its current practice of transparently and independently setting the rates of remuneration for local board members, chairs, and deputy chairs.*
- d) considers that if the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then:
 - i. the remuneration pool should be allocated to each individual local board for its determination, rather than to the governing body;*
 - ii. each additional position of responsibility, above the base local board role, should have a formal role description; and*
 - iii. each local board should be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all of its positions.**

Members Remuneration

The Orakei Local Board:

- a) considers that the roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- b) considers that a base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*
- c) does not agree that there is any rationale to change the current approach to remuneration of local board chairs and as such, the remuneration for local board chairs should continue to be set by the Remuneration Authority.*
- d) considers that the remuneration for local board chairs should continue to reflect the fulltime commitment required of this role, noting that the specific requirements of the role and workload are unique to Auckland and its governance structure and are not comparable to roles in other local authorities.*
- e) considers that if the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the*

Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.

- f) *requests that the Remuneration Authority increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role, and notes that for the Orakei Local Board its portfolio system ensures the workload is shared between its members and encourages collaboration with and accountability to its residents and ratepayers.*

Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board

1. *The board supports the draft local board submission, in particular the submissions calling for:*
 - *retention of the current regime, with remuneration determined by Remuneration Authority*
 - *a base level of remuneration being allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair)*
 - *population, opex, assets, social deprivation and guest nights, used to consider additional remuneration to relevant local boards*
 - *LB Chair role to be recognised as full time and paid accordingly*
 - *increased remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload.*
2. *The board believes that it is undesirable for local boards to set their own remuneration and potentially unworkable to require a minimum 75% majority vote for this.*
3. *The board makes an additional suggestion, that if the Remuneration Authority involvement is to be discontinued, then Auckland Council should set up a similar independent body to fix remuneration for Auckland elected members. The “Auckland Remuneration Authority” would have the same remit and independence from council as the current Remuneration Authority.*

Puketāpapa Local Board

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then:*
 - *We believe the remuneration pool should be allocated to each individual local board for its determination, rather than to the governing body;*
 - *Each additional position of responsibility, above the base local board role, should have a formal role description; and*

- *Each local board should be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all of its positions.*

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- *The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- *The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.*

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- *The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.*

Papakura Local Board

Background

The Papakura Local Board is one of 21 local boards that sits within Auckland Council. It provides independent governance and decision making responsibility for the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of current and future communities in the Papakura area.

Local board members have the experience and knowledge of the Auckland Council's governance model which therefore enables them to advise on the remuneration proposals put forward by the Remuneration Authority.

Feedback

The Papakura Local Board provides the following feedback points in relation to the Remuneration Authority - Local Government review 2017.

No	Heading	Detail	Papakura Local Board feedback
1.	Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration	The role and responsibilities of local board members, chair and deputy chair are primarily driven by statutory and allocated roles and responsibilities. There is a base level of work and activities that all local boards are required	i) The board agrees that the roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in

		<p>to undertake regardless of budget or population size.</p> <p>Namely the preparation of local board plans, local board agreements, inputting into numerous regional policies and plans as well as the responsibilities of local activities, managing issues, providing facilities and services.</p>	<p>determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.</p>
2.	Local board member remuneration	<p>Currently, candidates know the remuneration they will receive if successful and can plan accordingly. This certainty is also relevant to local board members considering a role as chair or deputy chair of a local board. The proposed remuneration pool will create uncertainty, as the actual level of remuneration for specific local board roles will not be set until after the local government election. This could cause financial hardship for candidates whom have reduced their hours of work elsewhere to take up a role as a local board member.</p>	<p>i) The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue. The process should be depoliticised and remain with the Remuneration Authority determining the amounts.</p> <p>ii) If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.</p>
3.	Local board chair remuneration	<p>The local board chair has a leadership role, with broad oversight of all local board activities and also takes on many additional tasks. The role of the local board chair requires a full-time commitment. The specific requirements of the role and workload are unique to Auckland and its governance structure, and are not comparable to roles in other local authorities.</p>	<p>i) The Local board chair's role should be treated as a full time role and remunerated accordingly.</p> <p>ii) The remuneration for local board chairs should continue to be set by the Remuneration Authority.</p>

4.	Local board deputy chair remuneration	Local board deputy chairs have a major role, which extends beyond that of a local board member. A role and capability description has been developed which demonstrates the additional workload expectations of a deputy chair, Currently the deputy chair does not receive additional remuneration.	i) The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.
5.	Adequacy of information	Significant work has been undertaken over the last two years to define the roles and capabilities required of its elected members. Board members are confident that the requirement of these roles are now well defined and that there is sufficient clarity on board member, chair and deputy chair roles for the Remuneration Authority to continue with its current practice of setting the rates of remuneration.	i) The local board does not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. ii) The board does not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (either by the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority. iii) We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination iv) The decisions relating to remuneration need to sit with the Remuneration Authority. v) The Remuneration Authority needs to take into consideration the structure of Auckland Council governance structure. vi) The board does not agree to bulk funding as the job is the same no matter how big the population base. The larger boards have larger number of members to share the workload

Rodney Local Board

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- *The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then:*
 - *We believe the remuneration pool should be allocated to each individual local board for its determination, rather than to the governing body;*
 - *Each additional position of responsibility, above the base local board role, should have a formal role description; and*
 - *Each local board should be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all of its positions.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- *The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.*

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- *The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.*

Upper Harbour Local Board

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- *The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then:*
 - *We believe the remuneration pool should be allocated to each individual local board for its determination, rather than to the governing body;*
 - *Each additional position of responsibility, above the base local board role, should have a formal role description; and*
 - *Each local board should be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all of its positions.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- *The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.*

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- *The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.*

Waitakere Ranges Local Board

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- *The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.*
- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*
- *Assets go beyond built infrastructure, significant role of managing environmental ecological assets and responding to ecological needs.*
- *Guest nights focus predominantly on urban centres, much of Auckland's attractions and management issues arise from visitors in general.*
- *Do not support using guest nights as a proxy for tourism activity in an area. As the Waitakere Ranges have few places to stay this will not adequately measure local tourism activity or the effects on the local environment and matters that need to be governed and managed.*
- *Local board members by their role are very accessible to members of public and face increased pressure of local demands and expectation of a timely action and a response.*

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then:*
 - *We believe the remuneration pool should be allocated to each individual local board for its determination, rather than via the Governing Body to assist with consistency and equity in distribution;*
 - *~~Each additional position of responsibility, above the base local board role, should have a formal role description; and~~*
 - *The Governing Body should be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all of its positions.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should ~~continue to~~ be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*

- The ~~current~~ future approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue look to establish closer parity between local board Chairs with Ward Councillors remuneration noting that they are different roles however they both have significant responsibilities.
- Furthermore, it is noted in a current situation a local board chair receives around 75% of the base councillor salary, and only 60% when compared to a governing body Committee Chair.
- It is also noted that all Ward Councillors have a shared base flat rate and this should be a goal for Local Board Chairs remuneration.
- If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.

Local board member

- Local board members should be paid the same rate across the region noting that the population base is already reflected in the number of local board members in each board.

Waitemata Local Board

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- receive the Remuneration Authority's Consultation Document Local Government Review*
- rejects the Remuneration Authority's proposal that local authorities decide their own remuneration*
- recommends that the Remuneration Authority continue its current practice of transparently and independently setting the rates of remuneration*
- notwithstanding b) should the Remuneration Authority proceed, endorses the tabled Remuneration Authority Consultation Document: Local Government Review Local Board Submission as the alternative Waitematā Local Board feedback with the amendment that any remuneration vote should be by way of a true majority of members as a super majority may be unworkable*

Whau Local Board (to be formally approved on 22 November)

Used the combined submission. For reference, its specific submissions are:

Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

- The roles and responsibilities of local boards have the most significant influence on the workload of local board members (including chairs and deputy chairs) and should be the

primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards.

- *A base level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, such as population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights, being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.*

Local board member remuneration

- *We do not agree with the principle of local authorities deciding their own remuneration. As such, we do not agree that local board remuneration should be decided by Auckland Council (by either the governing body and/or local boards) through a remuneration pool allocated by the Remuneration Authority.*
- *We believe that the current regime, where remuneration is transparently determined by an independent authority, is preferable and should continue, and that there is sufficient clarity on roles to enable the Remuneration Authority to make its determination.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then:*
 - *We believe the remuneration pool should be allocated to each individual local board for its determination, rather than to the governing body;*
 - *Each additional position of responsibility, above the base local board role, should have a formal role description; and*
 - *Each local board should be required to gain a 75% majority vote to determine the allocation of remuneration across all of its positions.*

Local board chair remuneration

- *The local board chair role should continue to be treated as fulltime and remunerated accordingly.*
- *The current approach to determining the remuneration for local board chairs should continue.*
- *If however, the Remuneration Authority decides to allocate a remuneration pool to Auckland Council, then the remuneration for local board chairs should be set by the Remuneration Authority, taking into account the role and capabilities required of a local board chair.*

Local board deputy chair remuneration

- *The Remuneration Authority should increase the rate of remuneration for local board deputy chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.*

Waiheke Local Board

Executive summary

The Waiheke Local Board has separately endorsed the collective submission of the Local Boards of Auckland Council which:

- opposes Council's setting remuneration levels on the basis that it will provide uncertainty, make it a political issue, potentially cause unnecessary conflict and tension between elected members (and particularly with the governing body if it is the decision-making body).
- requests that the Remuneration Authority continues to set remuneration on the basis that this is transparent and independent.
- requests that the Remuneration Authority increase remuneration for Deputy Local Board chairs to reflect the additional responsibilities and workload expected of this role.

Additionally, the Waiheke Local board submits that:

1. There should be greater equity of base level remuneration of local board members and chairs than the current status quo, particularly:
 - a. equity of remuneration for the same work
 - b. equitable remuneration for members of smaller boards which cover the same obligations of larger boards but with fewer people to enact relationships and advocacy within the Auckland governance and operational frameworks, and in some cases more representative obligations because of their remoteness/differences compared to urban and rural boards.
 - c. equitable remuneration to attract a larger more diverse pool of potential aspirants to public office regardless of location.
 - d. equitable remuneration on the grounds that every board catchment has its own complexities and these should not be assumed to equate with population size.
2. There should be one other factor other than those proposed by the Remuneration Authority (namely population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights) that is considered when setting remuneration for local board members. That is:
 - a. visitor/guest numbers rather than exclusively guest nights where these are clearly able to be quantified.

1. **Equity of Base Level Remuneration**

a. Performing the same role

The Auckland Local Boards' submission makes the case that:

"The workload and responsibilities of each local board, and as a result, local board members, chairs and deputy chairs, are primarily driven by statutory and allocated roles and responsibilities. There is a base level of work and activities that all local boards are required to undertake, regardless of budget or population size" ... "As such, we submit that the roles and responsibilities of local boards should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards. A base

level of remuneration should be allocated for each local board role (member, chair, and deputy chair), with other factors, ..., being used to provide additional remuneration to particular local boards, where appropriate.”

The following table indicates the current disparities in gross remuneration between the Hauraki Island Local Boards and their counterparts in the greater Auckland isthmus:

	Chair	Member
Highest (Howick)	95,400	43,450
Lowest (Papakura)	74,500	41,200
Waiheke	59,400	24,950
Great Barrier	53,400	23,350

Given that the hours of committed work do not vary in terms of Council's expectations of members across the local boards (full-time for the chair, and 20 – 25 hours per member), and that in practice for some Waiheke Island members the hours are under-represented, then the issue of equity does need to be squarely reconsidered at this time of review. The current disparity is illustrated below:

Local Board area	Chair	\$ Hourly rate	Member	\$ Hourly rate
Highest (Howick)	95,400	46	43,450	33
Lowest (Papakura)	74,500	36	41,200	32
Waiheke	59,400	29	24,950	19
Great Barrier	53,400	26	23,350	18

Table note: in the case of chairs the rate is calculated on a 40-hour week and for members 25 hrs.

Given the clear accord among local boards which are party to the Local Boards' submission to the Remuneration Authority that *“the roles and the responsibilities of local boards should be the primary factor in determining the base level of local board remuneration across all local boards”* then it is apparent that the Hauraki Gulf local boards are being significantly under-remunerated relative to their urban and rural counterparts.

The Waiheke Local Board cannot represent the Great Barrier Board's average hours in this submission but we can assert that the Council's upper expectation of 25 hours per member are being met on average and are certainly exceeded by some members of the Waiheke Local Board.

By and large all local board members across the region attend the same trainings, cluster meetings, attendances at other council meetings, workshops and CCO briefings. We read the same materials and are consulted on governing body issues to the same extent, including reviewing comprehensive briefings on by-laws, major statutory planning documents, policies and procedural changes and so on. All local boards are required to prepare local board plans and local board agreements. However, in the case of the Hauraki Island board members each hour of such work is remunerated at a greatly discounted rate to our colleagues from other urban and rural boards, and well below an acceptable level for the detailed and often complex matters that are base level work for all local board members.

As the Local Boards' collective submission puts this: *"These are significant governance roles requiring considerable commitment and as a result, limit the capacity to undertake additional employment. The manner in which local board members are remunerated is therefore, an important issue."*

The Waiheke and Great Barrier member rates are in fact below the minimum living wage rates being adopted by Auckland council for its lowest paid employees. Further, the extensive time taken to travel to and from the city to fulfill various obligations (3 hours return door-to-door on average) precludes Waiheke members working another 20 hours in other part-time work, particularly in light of the multiple ad hoc scheduled demands that are made on their time by Council officers and because of member obligations. A 1 ½ hour briefing in council city venues takes on average 4 ½ hours for Waiheke members to attend. It is noted that there are counterparts in local boards in urban catchments who are able to work not only part-time but full-time in some cases.

2. Equitable remuneration for members of smaller boards

Local boards cover the same responsibilities across the region regardless of their size and are involved in all of the same settings, other than those which are local in character.

- i. Local boards generally share among themselves the board's responsibilities in key advocacy areas and for attendances/responsibilities across the membership. In the case of a board of 5 members those members must therefore cover and share the same responsibilities as their larger board counterparts which vary in size from 6 to 9 members, a variance in allocated work responsibilities of between 20% and 80% more per member than their counterparts.
- ii. Because of the very different lived experience of the Hauraki Gulf Islands relative to the rest of Auckland, local board members, particularly the chairs, are asked to represent the Hauraki Gulf local boards on some council forums, an attendance obligation that exceeds those of their urban counterparts. i.e. Hauraki Gulf Forum, Governance Framework Review, Procurement.

a. Remuneration and diversity of elected members

The Remuneration Authority has recognized roles, responsibilities and workloads when setting the remuneration of elected members of Auckland Council. These balance expectations of public service with some market recognition, therefore encouraging more diversity in age, ethnicity and background experience in aspiring candidates for civic responsibilities.

That same principle hasn't been applied to the roles of elected Local Board members for the Hauraki Gulf Local Boards. The remuneration at below living wage levels, coupled with the travel times for council business in the city is a significant disincentive to diversity, and actively discourages a broader pool of potential candidates from participating in the electoral process. This is a distinct disadvantage to the broader representative principles that underpin our democracy.

b. Local Board complexities

There should be greater equity of remuneration across the local boards because every board catchment has its own complexities and these should not be assumed to be solely or even directly related to population size. These can be one-offs or long-standing or permanent characteristics.

Waiheke as an example of complexity

By way of example only (*not as a negative comparison with other local boards' own complexities which the Waiheke Local Board fully acknowledges and respects*) the following are some characteristics that significantly impact Waiheke's Local Board deliberations and responsibilities over and above 'normal' in other settings:

i. Vulnerability to natural disasters, and building infrastructure

- a. Waiheke Island incurred the worst flood damage of the region to its business district and residential properties in the March & April 2017 Auckland storm events because of its vulnerability to the elements.

Our relative isolation from the mainland has meant local board members not only playing key roles in civil defence on the day, but in general: getting civil defence reorganized and in line with both new protocols, being the interface between those affected locally and Council's Healthy Waters department and Auckland Transport where there have been major difficulties getting reasonable redress for residents' issues. Additionally, members have initiated, led and attended multiple public meetings, chaired and attended infrastructure working parties and attended to a large number of disaffected complainants.

- b. The flood damage itself reflects the highly inadequate quality of roading and stormwater infrastructure compared to the city and most rural counterparts. These are a constant and time-consuming source of deliberations and advocacy of local board members with Council and Auckland Transport.

ii. Land mass, ecological significance and marine responsibilities

It behoves Waiheke Local Board members to be familiar with all of the Council reserve assets across 9,324 hectares and to actively work to ensure that these are protected, maintained and enhanced for the sake of the ecology of the island in its own right and for the use and enjoyment of current and future generations as well as visitors. In Waiheke's case this amounts to approximately 135 parks and reserves owned or managed by Council which are governed by the local board on behalf of Council. These comprise extensive esplanade reserves within its 128 km of coastline, large tracts of wetlands, bush and open space recreational reserves.

In the Waiheke Local Board's case it also has responsibility for the islands of Rangitoto, Motutapu, Motokorea, Motuihe, Ponui, Rakino, and a number of smaller islands. Whilst some islands are managed by DOC, in the case of Waiheke and Rakino Islands and

some others DOC owns only a small number of the reserve assets and these are mainly maintained by Council on behalf of DOC but governed by the Local Board.

In practice having such extensive reserve assets requires significant on-going effort for all local board members:

- a. Reviewing and responding in detail to multiple resource consent applications that propose infringements.
- b. Along with council officers working with multiple community volunteer groups, Trusts and contractors involved in pest management (both plant and animal), considering applications for funding, advocating for council funding, and being involved in facilitating group co-ordination efforts to get best effect from limited funding options. By way of explanation Waiheke has a number of predators that threaten our native wildlife including rats (prolific), weasels, stoats and ferrets (very difficult and expensive eradicating across more than nine thousand hectares). Waiheke is also one of the weediest islands in the world. Pest plants choke out native species and destroy natural habitats for our birdlife and other wildlife critical to the local ecology.

Large sums of money and constant effort is required to prevent these pest plants gaining purchase in new habitats and/or dominating in existing habitats.

- c. The Hauraki Gulf itself adds additional environmental/ecological responsibilities for the Waiheke Local Board as residents and ratepayers have mandated the Local Board by way of independent professional survey to advocate for the marine environment. Aside from investing in research to progress the establishment of marine reserves around the island the Local Board has also been an active member of the Hauraki Gulf Forum, set up by central government to establish pathways back to a healthy self-sustaining Hauraki Gulf marine environment.

iii. Community engagement levels

When considering the Local Boards of the Hauraki Gulf population size has clearly been a key factor in the Remuneration Authority's previous considerations of scale of Local Board Member remuneration. However, there are verifiable means by which to assess the impacts of community engagement which in highly engaged communities has a multiplier effect on local members' workload as there are raised expectations of local board members and indeed significantly more interaction between members and residents/ratepayers at a formal, informal and casual level on a per capita basis.

This is further augmented by the local media presence which effects Waiheke Island's board members' participation in local affairs, Two weekly newspapers and a local radio station track every local board issue and give those major profile. Most local members have some media contact most weeks over and above formal channels.

There are numerous examples of the Waiheke community's historical bias for political involvement and action. That same drive is reflected in the workloads of local board members who are constantly responding to pressures from within the community to align with a multitude of agendas and initiatives, and to explain/defend/communicate its actions and its decisions.

This is the nature of the Waiheke community – deeply committed, articulate, intelligent, dedicated to Waiheke and to its environment, its people and their community, its economy and to its quintessential character. It is widely recognised as the most politically active community in the country – yet it's political representatives are the

least remunerated relative to their local board peers for leading/moderating their community's political processes, the interface with the Council's governing body and also with the CCOs in ways that deliver value both locally and centrally.

The attached **Appendix 1** verifies, using Council's own research data, levels of community engagement in Waiheke and Great Barrier Local Board matters relative to the rest of Auckland and provides additional supporting information.

iv. Waiheke Local Board Governance Pilot

The Waiheke Local Board welcomes the Auckland Council's Governing Body decision to use Waiheke Island as a pilot for some further devolved governance responsibilities. Whilst this is intended to facilitate some decision-making to progress local issues the reporting of progress and issues to both the governing body, other local boards and to officers will also carry new responsibilities for feedback and insights via interviews, surveys, presentations and updates in a number of contexts.

2. Factors to be used in sizing local board member remuneration

The Remuneration Authority is proposing a mix of population, operational expenditure, asset size, social deprivation and number of guest nights to be used when sizing local authorities for the purposes of determining remuneration.

The Auckland combined Local Boards' submission makes a strong case for levelling the playing field via equity of base level remuneration for local board members, chairs and deputy chairs, and for topping that up where significant other factors significantly impact the responsibilities of local board members.

Visitor numbers

The Waiheke Local Board would like the Remuneration Authority to consider visitor numbers equivalent to the measure of guest nights when determining factors of complexity.

Waiheke Island is rated as one of the world's top destinations by several influential travel advisory agencies e.g. *Conde Nast*, *Lonely Planet*, *Travel + Leisure*, and Auckland is dependent on the on-going success and indeed growth of that tourism trade. Waiheke's visitor numbers exceed 1,200,000 per annum (source: ATEED Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development), whilst the permanent resident population is approximately 9,400, and in summer approximately 35,000 as ratepayers include large numbers of holiday home owners who are resident over summer months particularly.

In Waiheke's case visitor numbers do not directly translate to bed nights as the vast majority of Waiheke's visitors are day trippers who arrive by passenger or vehicle ferries.

Waiheke's main points of difference are its character, its beaches, its vineyards, its multitude of bush and coastal walking tracks, and its heavy event schedule. It is the Local Board's role to navigate all the issues such large visitor numbers cause and/or present directly or indirectly. These include but are not limited to:

- i. Advocating for and or governing/funding the development of tourism infrastructure (toilets, fresh water supply, rubbish collection, pathway maintenance and upgrades,

transport, signage, safer roads and walkways, park maintenance in high profile coastal reserves).

- ii. Advocating and liaising with Auckland Transport (AT, a Council CCO) to facilitate mass visitor movement in conjunction with 1200+ commuters and competing demands on local parking and public transport.
- iii. Consenting and/or governing via community funding a full events calendar.
- iv. Protecting and maintaining, and in some cases regenerating the natural environment that attracts visitors, including separately advocating or providing for Kauri dieback provision to protect our untouched Kauri from disease brought in by foot.
- v. Liaising with residents en masse and responding individually over tourism issues and negative impacts, including problem solving when rifts are caused between people and groups with opposing agendas.
- vi. Working with council, CCOs and tourism operators when tourism ventures threaten the quintessential and desirable character of the island (e.g. jet ski tours, double-decker buses).
- vii. Working with retailers and other small businesses whose trade is negatively impacted by off-shore tourism operators.
- viii. Liaising with and working with tourism, wine and hospitality associations.
- ix. Detailed weekly resource consent application reviews for multiple visitor and/or hospitality related facilities including working with council officers and the community over controversial helicopter landing consents.
- x. Working through planning documents and policies, and advocating for the same at multiple political and officer levels to protect the island from the undue effects of tourism, whilst also promoting and enhancing the local economic value of tourism.
- xi. Working with AT and local interests to progress new infrastructure to grow low-impact tourism (e.g. new cycleway, mountain bike and walking developments).

Summary

The Waiheke Local Board submits that the variances originally built into the remuneration scales for Auckland's local boards have been proven in hindsight to be inequitable. The Waiheke Local Board seeks redress of that situation through the Remuneration Authority, and is grateful for the opportunity to submit its views along with information that is designed to support that review. Our position is that is that the remuneration for Auckland Local Board members should be equitable.

APPENDIX 1 is attached.

APPENDIX 1

Levels of political and general engagement with Local Boards and local body politics in Hauraki Gulf board catchments.

As stated earlier there are verifiable means by which to assess the impacts of community engagement which in highly engaged communities has a multiplier effect on local members' workload as there are raised expectations of local board members and indeed significantly more interaction between members and residents/ratepayers at a formal, informal and casual level on a per capita basis.

Auckland Council's 2016 consumer survey provides insight

- i. Of 21 Local Board areas only 6 Local Boards had 50% or more name recognition by their own residents (2016). 8 had less than 40% recognition. By comparison Waiheke and Great Barrier had 75% and 90% respectively.
- ii. With respect to knowledge of the local board and co-related engagement levels the total surveyed population scored only 17% engagement, whilst Waiheke residents scored the highest engagement levels at 52%, and Great Barrier 38%. See table below:

Local Board	Member \$	Awareness Recognition	Engagement Knowledge of LB
Highest (Howick)	43,450	48%	<i>tbc</i>
Lowest (Papakura)	41,200	41%	9%
Waiheke	24,950	75%	52%
Great Barrier	23,350	90%	38%
21 Local Boards		42%	17%

Other engagement indicators are:

- election participation,
- the involvement of local community members in the creation of local board plans, and
- community based organised political activity

Election participation

In the 2016 local body elections there was 42% participation of eligible voters nationwide but only 38.5% in Auckland.

However, Waiheke's and Great Barrier's participation rates were among the highest in the country with 59% and 69% voter participation respectively.

Local Board planning

In 2017 public meetings on Waiheke in all stages of the creation and finalisation of the 3-year local board plan attracted a great deal of interest.

The draft Waiheke Local Board Plan was subsequently reviewed and received 267 responses,

more submissions than 8 other of the 20* Local Boards, all of those with populations of 48,000 to 108,000 relative to Waiheke's 8,337 (**Census 2013**)

(*note those 8 exclude Great Barrier because its population is significantly smaller than

Waiheke's)

Local Board	Population (census 2013)	No. of LBP submissions received	Percentage of population
Albert/Eden	94,695	1327	1.4%
Devonport/Takapuna	55,470	633	1.1%
Franklin	65,320	192	0.2%
Great Barrier*	939	35	3.7%
Henderson/Massey	107,685	241	0.2%
Hibiscus and Bays	89,832	762	0.8%
Howick	127,125	413	0.3%
Kaipatiki	82,494	307	0.3%
Mangere-Otahuhu	70,959	215	0.3%
Manurewa	82,242	263	0.3%
Maungakiekie-Tamaki	70,002	291	0.4%
Orakei	79,536	275	0.3%
Otara/Papatoetoe	75,663	198	0.2%
Papakura	45,633	383	0.8%
Puketapapa	52,938	149	0.2%
Rodney	54,879	1592	2.9%
Upper Harbour	53,670	391	0.7%
Waiheke	8,337	267	3.2%
Waitakere Ranges	48,399	249	0.5%
Waitemata	77,136	164	0.2%
Whau	72,594	283	

Community based political activity

There are numerous examples of the degree to which the Waiheke community, with whom the local board works very closely, involves itself in direct political action.

Historic examples are:

- i. the Community Board of the day declaring Waiheke Nuclear free;
- ii. later GE free;
- iii. the community galvanising to prevent the development of a marina in Matiatia Bay – and succeeding in the Environment Court.

more recently

- iii. the court proceedings to reinstate the RUB removed in the Unitary Plan finalisation process, and
- iv. the public petitions and protests to remove Fullers Double-decker coach buses from Waiheke's small roads, and
- v. the involved membership of the consumer group Our Waiheke that has successfully sought a full review of Waiheke's local body governance framework from the Local Body Commission, a review that is currently underway.

What all of these indicators point to is the significant amount of engagement required at a local level by Local Board members to fulfill their roles and responsibilities effectively with the residents and ratepayers, and also with Council officers and those of CCOs, as well as within the wider democratic process.