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Declare a Climate Emergency

- And commit to:
  - Rapid decarbonisation
  - Citizens’ climate emergency panel
  - Costed action plan
  - Transparent divestment
  - Requirements for council, CCOs and contractors
  - Uphold commitments made in Te Tiriti o Waitangi
ASB Tennis Arena

Presentation to the Environment & Community Committee

March 2019
About Tennis Auckland

- Tennis Auckland is a registered Charity and the Regional Sports Organisation charged with leading all aspects of tennis in the Auckland region.
- The ASB Classic has grown into a major annual event that Auckland can be proud of.
- Although it is a commercial enterprise the ASB Classic acts as our annual fundraising event. The financial surplus from the tournaments is invested into community initiatives and public tennis facilities across Auckland.
- The tennis community is more inclusive than many people think. Research from Sport NZ & Gemba shows that tennis is a game for all ages and our participants are evenly split between males and females. It also tells us that tennis is popular within the Asian and sub-continent communities.
The Redevelopment Project

- The ATP and WTA require Tennis Auckland to host the ASB Classic at a venue that can hold 3500 spectators
- The current capacity of the ASB Tennis Arena is 2881 - This means Tennis Auckland must apply for dispensation from the WTA and ATP annually
- The tournaments are under threat from wealthier hosts with significant central and state government backing such as Doha, Brisbane & Shenzhen
- Whilst the roof remains part of the project plan, increasing capacity to 3500 is the immediate priority
- Tennis Auckland is taking steps that will allow for potential multi-purpose use in the future
Staging

- Stage 1A – The West Stand
- Stage 1B – The South Stand
- Stage 2 – The North & East Stands
- Stage 3 – Construction of the Roof

Tennis Auckland is committed to Stage 1, and intends to undertake this build in two parts over 2019 and 2020.

Tennis Auckland are budgeting to invest $1.175m of our own money into Stage 1A.
Project Outcomes

1. Retain the tournaments by achieving the 3500 capacity required by our Tour Licenses
2. Provide a world class experience to spectators and players by replacing aging infrastructure
3. Ensure Tennis Auckland operates a sustainable business model
4. Invest any financial surplus from the tournaments into community tennis
Community Benefits

The financial surplus provided by the ASB Classic supports:

- Development programmes to 9500 primary school aged children
- Services to 8400 members across 52 clubs
- Club competitions for 1264 inter-club teams
- Performance pathways for over 100 promising young players
- 3 public tennis facilities in Glen Innes (Scarbro Tennis Centre), Manukau (Manukau Tennis Centre) and Mount Eden (Nicholson Park)
Economic Benefits

The 2019 ASB Classic delivered over $11.95m in GDP, made up of:

- Operating costs spent with local suppliers
- Food and beverage spend during the tournaments
- Visitation impact

In 2019 Tennis Auckland received $175,000 from ATEED towards running the ASB Classic
Showcasing Auckland – 2018

- WTA and ATP reports tell us that the total global television audience for the two weeks was 94.5m
- The same WTA and ATP reports tell us that total broadcast hours across the two weeks was 1730 hours
- The gross advertising value of the Men’s 2018 ASB Classic was $60.2m
- The Women’s 2018 ASB Classic generated 13,664 social media mentions and 13,747 online articles across the world
Showcasing Auckland - 2019

The full analytics from the 2019 ASB Classic are yet to be released by the ATP and WTA. However to date we know that:

- The combined social media reach of the four most high profile women at the 2019 ASB Classic was 19.5m
- The cumulative online audience (digital articles & social media) of the 2019 ASB Classic was 76 million people, which carried a PR value of $4.4m
- Following a new broadcasting deal between the WTA and the Tennis Channel, 33 million people in the America's alone watched the women’s first round match between Venus Williams & Victoria Azarenka live
Next Steps

Following the decision by the Environment & Community Committee:

- Tennis Auckland has a confirmed tender in place for Stage 1A
- Subject to today’s decision we hope to sign a contract and begin construction in March 2019
- This allows us to finalise our planning for the 2020 ASB Classic
- The new West Stand is due to be completed in November 2019
- Final fundraising will continue throughout 2019 for the South Stand
- The targeted start date on the South Stand is January 2020
Thank you for your time and consideration.
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Item 5.3
• **HEALTHY WATERS** – RICHARD SMEDLEY, FLOOD PLANNING TEAM MANAGER & JAYESH SOLANKI, OPERATIONS WEST TEAM MANAGER

• THE GLEN ESK VALLEY HAS A 1,000HA CATCHMENT WITH STEEP SLOPES (6.5%), WHICH LEAD TO RAPID RISE OF STREAM LEVELS DURING HEAVY RAINS. THE FIRST RAINFALL EVENT HAD A 1.5 YEAR RETURN PERIOD (20% CHANCE OR REOCCURRING EACH YEAR), WITH 40MM OF RAIN FALLING IN 30-40MINS. THE SECOND EVENT HAD 1-1.5 YEAR RETURN PERIOD (60% CHANCE OF REOCCURRING EACH YEAR), WITH 80MM OF RAIN FALLING IN 4HR PERIOD. A DRAFT REPORT ON THE GLENESK CATCHMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED AND WILL BE PEER REVIEWED OVER NEXT WEEK. THE FLOW RATES FOR THE TWO EVENTS WERE HIGH COMPARED TO THE AVAILABLE CAPACITY OF THE STREAM. 35 TO 45 M3/S COMPARED TO 13 TO 30 M3/S CAPACITY.

• THEREFORE FLOODING IS PREDICTED TO BE A FREQUENT EVENT FOR THIS AREA.
Hi Stephen

As discussed on Monday (and apologies for the delay getting you formal instructions and a LEX), we would like to seek your advice on the powers Council has where there is a significant flood risk.

In Pina around Glenesk Road, there is a significant flooding risk. Many of the properties on Glenesk Road have habitable floor areas that flood. Flooding can occur rapidly with little or no warning and the depth and velocity is a real safety concern.

Structural works to address flooding are not practicable and likely would not get resource consent.

There are a couple of immediate issues:
- What powers do councils have require residents to leave their homes during a flood event due to the danger and risk to life?
- What powers do councils have to require residents to leave a house when there is no flood event because of the risk and danger if there was a flood event.
- If a council were to require a resident to leave temporarily or permanently under any legislation, is the council required to compensate the residents
- Can Council compulsorily acquire land where there is a significant flood risk.

Legislation that comes to mind that may have powers include:
- RMA
- Building Act
- Local Government Acts
- Civil Defence Act
- Public Works Act

There may be other legislation that contains statutory powers relevant to the questions above. I note that you previously provided advice in respect of whether buildings could be considered insanitary by reason of their location in respect of flooding.

At this stage, a high level analysis of potential powers is required. More detailed advice may be requested later in the context of the risk posed in this specific location and a flooding assessment that is currently being prepared by our Healthy Waters team. I also mentioned the ability to put planning constraints in place to address the flooding risk and possibly enable managed retreat from a location, however, I think we will look at that in subsequent advice as that would be a longer term action.
2 The context for these questions arises from Glensk Road in Piha, where there is a significant flooding risk to private properties. We understand that flooding can occur rapidly, with little or no warning, and the depth and velocity of the flood waters is a real safety concern, as habitable floor areas flood in many of the properties on Glensk Road. You have advised that structural works to address flooding are not practicable, and would not likely obtain resource consent.
We note that this advice is focused on statutory powers, and the Council could also choose to negotiate with the owners on a voluntary basis to acquire the properties if it wished.
11. Options to mitigate the risk from flash flooding have been identified in this report for further consideration by Auckland Council and consultation with residents. No recommendations or decisions have been made by Auckland Council at this time. Staff will need to consider these and any other options further, having regard to Council’s role and other factors after consultation with residents.
together with the required action of removing, relocating or raising the affected habitable floor. For sites substantially covered by high flood hazards with access required across fast moving water the recommended action is generally “remove from or relocate away from” the site under this option.

**Table 6 – Building Options Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential Action</th>
<th>Risk Issues to be addressed</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-4 Glenesk</td>
<td>Ensure any building consent applications consider flood risks.</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Unsafe for any future habitable buildings with the flood hazard area.</td>
<td>Safety hazard avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road (vacant Lot)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 Glenesk</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Habitable floor at risk for E3% AEP.</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 Glenesk</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Private footbridge (accessway) inundated with unsafe depths and velocities of flowing water.</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Glenesk</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Habitable floor at risk for E3% AEP.</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Glenesk</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Private footbridge (accessway) inundated with unsafe depths and velocities of flowing water.</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Glenesk</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Habitable floor at risk for E3% AEP.</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Glenesk</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Habitable floor at risk for E3% AEP.</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Glenesk</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Habitable floor at risk for E3% AEP.</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-32 Glenesk</td>
<td>Ensure any building consent applications</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Unsafe for any</td>
<td>Safety hazard avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road (vacant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**20 AUGUST 2018**

**RECOMMENDATION TABLES FROM GLENESK FLOODING REPORT**

---
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**Item 5.3**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road/Location</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 Glenesk Road</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Habitable floor at risk for 63% AEP&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Glenesk Road</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Habitable floor at risk for 63% AEP&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Seaview Road</td>
<td>Remove residential building. Access the risk of access to NZ surfing adventures buildings</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Habitable floor at risk for 63% AEP&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed, Access to NZ Surfing building resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art gallery building (on Council Land)</td>
<td>Remove or relocate building off the site</td>
<td>Site inundated with unsafe flood waters. Habitable floor at risk for 63% AEP&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Safety hazard removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Seaview Road</td>
<td>Fire service to provide a risk assessment for the firehouse</td>
<td>Land inundated with unsafe depths and velocity. Access for fire service personnel and vehicles at high risk</td>
<td>Subject to risk assessment. Potentially move the building to a safer location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 Sea View Road</td>
<td>Prevent any buildings or camping activity within the flood plain area</td>
<td>Portion of land inundated with unsafe flood waters. Potential access issues to be resolved by any building consent application</td>
<td>Risk of any new development managed to safe level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sea View Road</td>
<td>No action. But floor to be surveyed</td>
<td>Site partially within flood plain area for 100 year ARI storm event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Beach Valley Road</td>
<td>No action. But floor to be surveyed</td>
<td>Site partially within flood plain area for 100 year ARI storm event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Glenesk Road</td>
<td>Remove ground level floor from habitation</td>
<td>Habitable floor at risk. Vehicles may be subject to flooding</td>
<td>Site still inundated. Access restricted during flood events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Glenesk Road</td>
<td>Check if any ground floor habitation living as this will be at risk</td>
<td>Garage flooding. Site inundated. Vehicles may be subject to flooding</td>
<td>Site still inundated. Access restricted during flood events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-103</td>
<td>Warning signs and</td>
<td>Access to properties and escape</td>
<td>Site still inundated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INVITATION
Should we continue to grow there when the risks are really high?” he says. “It’s a wonderful piece of new engineering thinking but at the same time you wouldn’t have to do it if building was done in a different place.”

Hulse points to Piha as another place where the council is already being confronted with the fallout from climate change. Several low-lying houses in the town are at risk of flood inundation. In March, her committee will receive a report on its options when it comes to those properties.

“The report will be coming to us and saying things like, ‘Do we buy some houses? Do we have managed retreat?’ That will be the first time we have to start making decisions like that.”

It’s unlikely to be the last. Climate change is going to make many other
Executive Summary

Scope

Under the 2010 amendment to the Local Government Act 2002, Auckland Council is responsible for the following two activities:

- Stormwater Management
- Flood Protection and Control

Stormwater management refers to a system that collects and conveys rainwater runoff from private property, public reserves and roads.

Flood protection and control works are physical structures that are owned by local authorities and are designed to protect urban and rural areas from flooding from rivers, and includes ancillary works such as channel realignment or gravel removal.
6.3.1.1 Streams

Restoring streams to a more natural state is a key objective of the council (Mayoral report on the LTP 2013). Project Twin Streams in Waitakere is an excellent example of the significance of stream restoration projects where the council worked with the community to achieve enhanced environmental, social, cultural and economic outcomes.
2005 Floods – Stephen Town was CEO of Tauranga
– now Auckland CEO (Experience!!)
There was a significant weather event in the BOP in 2005.
In Otumoetai, Tauranga, several properties slipped off their
foundations as a relic slip gave way. The solution here was
‘retreat.’ Council purchased the properties at market value
and retired the land. Subsequently, Council spent some
$150m on flood protection works across the city. This was a
bit ad hoc, Council didn’t have a clear policy at the time.

BAY OF PLENTY TIMES
Council CEO resigns
12 Jul, 2010 11:54am
“Mr Crosby singled out Mr Town’s leadership of the council
organisation and the extremely high regard and respect the staff had
for him.
As an example, he cited the way Mr Town managed and supported
staff during the 2005 floods, both during the days of crisis, and in the
months of recovery that followed.”
The ‘safety to person’s’ approach
This approach provides for a reduction in risk to persons up to and including a 100 year flood, where the property in question has a recorded history of flooding of more than once in the last 10 years.

At - risk properties are those where a depth x velocity threshold of >0.4m/s is exceeded within 8m of a building with a habitable floor for residential and rural residential zoned private property, and >0.6m/s for non-residential and non-rural residential zoned private property.

**The model predicts velocities between 1.5 and 2.2m/s along Glenesk Road and surrounding properties.**

**Summary**
As a result of flooding we got some high quality evidence as to the worst affected areas in the city.
The problem was too big so we had to prioritise; we created a policy and funded its implementation.

**Council ‘owned’ the problem.** We purchased properties and created overland flow paths; most of these were pre 1989. One was a property that turned up through the flood modelling but was built as recent as 2015!
Safe Communities Accreditation

- June 2016 resolution: “Auckland to become an accredited Safe Community, and write to the Safe Communities Foundation New Zealand (SCFNZ) to initiate the accreditation process” (REG/2016/33).

- Internationally recognised model (World Health Organisation recommended approach) - platform for collaboration to deliver evidence-based safety and injury prevention strategies at a local and regional level.

- Auckland is the largest local government authority in Australasia to seek SCA : 20 + local authorities and 50% of NZ’s population is already accredited (eg Wellington & Christchurch, Melbourne also has this status).
SCFNZ - “a safe community”:

- is a place that is attractive to live, work and visit; a liveable community, where people can go about their daily activities in an environment that without fear, risk of harm or injury.
- increases community well-being by creating an infrastructure in local communities to increase action by building local partnerships and collaborative relationships.
- is about wellbeing, building strong, cohesive, vibrant, participatory communities.
- Safe Communities is the only national network that brings key stakeholders together with a primary focus on community safety, violence and injury prevention.
Safe Communities Accreditation

- Application prepared by organisations with a community safety and injury prevention focus. Together formed the “Safety Collective, Tāmaki Makaurau, Auckland” (led by Council, chaired by Cr Collins).

- Application to be submitted March 2019, following approval by ECC, accreditation expected June 2019.

- Linkages to Auckland Plan outcomes:
  - Belonging and Participation
    - Focus 1: Create **safe opportunities** for people to meet, connect, participate in and enjoy community and civic life
    - Focus 6: Focus investment to **reduce disparities** and serve communities of greatest needs
  - Transport and Access
    - Direction 3: **Maximize safety** and environmental protection
    - Focus 6: **Move to a safe network, free from death and serious injury**
The approach:

- identifies safety and injury prevention priorities.

- shares information and strategies.

- looks at appropriate local interventions particularly with a focus on prevention through early recognition of issues.

- By sharing information and effective strategies, communities and organisations involved in managing safety and injury prevention across the region have greater access to support and resources.
The Challenge and Opportunity

Muriwai beach tragedy: Couple loved outdoor activities - daughter

Auckland's rampant road toll out of sync with the rest of New Zealand

Drinking culture leads to emergency department - study

New Zealand's drinking culture has come under fire following a new study which shows a link between alcohol consumption and trips to the emergency department.
Regional Pest Management Plan: operative plan adoption

Environment and Community Committee
March 2019
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Overview of presentation

- Process to date
- Re-cap on proposed plan
- Discussion of main changes based on consultation and Long-term Plan 2019-2029 budget decision
- Summary of decisions sought today
## Project timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Pest Management Plan review stage</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial engagement with elected members, mana whenua and stakeholders</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation on discussion document</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee adopts proposed plan for consultation</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation on proposed plan, aligned to LTP consultation</td>
<td>Feb-March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget envelope decided through Long-term Plan 2018-2028</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public submissions analysed</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected member and mana whenua engagement</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff amendments to plan in response to submissions</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council adopts new operative plan</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key new elements in proposed plan

- Stronger controls on people moving pests to islands
- Additional rules for Aotea
- Mammal eradications on Waiheke and Kawau
- Shift in pest plant enforcement to focus on buffers around ecologically significant parkland
- New freshwater pest management
- Increased scale of possum control
- Clarified cat management approach
- Banned new pest species
Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

The proposed Regional Pest Management Plan (RPMP) produced by Auckland Council staff (after consultation via their 2015 discussion document), is technically very sound.

In fact, I think it’s an exciting strategy document that will put Auckland firmly back in place as biosecurity and biodiversity leaders.

- Associate Professor Margaret Stanley, University of Auckland in Newsroom, March 2018
Attachment A

Consultation feedback on proposed plan

- Over 1,300 submissions.
- Strong support on most elements.
- Attachment B summarises submission themes and staff responses.
- Corresponding changes shown in Attachment A.
Scale of amended plan

Funding for the amended plan is 80% of the full proposed plan, and still:

- overall 189% increase in investment compared with legacy Regional Pest Management Strategy
- rural possum control will almost double
- several entirely new programmes e.g. island eradications, freshwater
Pest plant management on and around parks

Targeted rate funds substantial increase on historic levels of protection for significant parkland:

- on-park protection increases from 33% to 94% of significant parkland
- new 500m buffer around 36% of ecologically significant parkland
Gorse rule change

- Re-instmted rural boundary rule for gorse
- Rule restricted to land being used for commercial primary production, 10m from boundary
New species additions

Addition of phase-in periods to assist smooth transition for affected industries
Cat management

Everyone agrees council should support responsible pet ownership, this is retained in amended plan

Amendments to proposed approach:
- Changed name to ‘unowned cat’
- Allowed for other forms of ID (e.g. named, addressed collar)
- Restricted cat trapping to threatened species sites in rural areas
- Restricted ban on feeding of cat colonies to parks with threatened species
Summary of recommendations

- Confirm that the process has complied with a sequence of Biosecurity Act requirements (*Recommendations a, b and d*).

- Determine that council will be the management agency implementing the plan (*Recommendation c*).

- Adopt the operative plan and incorporated material (*Recommendations e and f*).

- Adopt the agenda and attachments as a ‘decisions report’ (*Recommendation g*).

- Determine the contributions of general and targeted rates for funding the plan (*Recommendation h*).
Submission on process heat technical paper

The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) and the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority’s (EECA) technical paper “Process heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions.”

March 2019
What is process heat?

- Process heat is thermal energy, in the form of steam, hot water and direct heat systems
- Examples of areas where process heat is used: evaporation, drying, product heat, sterilization, chemical reactions
Process heat in a national and local context

Auckland

- Contributes to 1.36 million tonnes of CO2
- 54.7% is supplied through natural gas
- Key users are the primary metal and metal product manufacturing sectors

New Zealand

- Contributes to 8.5 million tonnes of CO2
- 56% is supplied by burning of fossil fuels
- Key users are the wood, pulp and paper manufacturing

Auckland Council

To Kaupapa a Tāmaki Makaurau
Relevance to Auckland’s current commitments

- Auckland is currently developing its Climate Action Plan (ACAP) which will set a path to rapidly reduce greenhouse gas emissions to keep within 1.5 degrees of warming while ensuring Auckland is prepared for the impacts of climate change.
- Process heat is a significant contributor to Auckland’s emissions (20%) and is an important area to transition.
- Good opportunity for Central Government and Auckland Council to coordinate responses to lowering process heat emissions.
Submission key points (process heat)

- Energy efficiency provides between 1 to 5% reduction in energy use and emissions
- Low to medium temperature (20-200°C) could transition to renewable sources
- High temperature range (200-400°C) is not technically or economically feasible to transition to renewable resources at this time
- The New Zealand supply of natural gas is predicted to drop steeply after 2022 and natural gas should be prioritised for industries that require high temperature process heat
Recommendation

- Retrospectively endorse the Auckland Council officer submission on process heat to MBIE's and EECA's technical document, “Process Heat in New Zealand: Opportunities and barriers to lowering emissions”.