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1 Welcome

Chairperson IM Fordham will open the meeting held by Skype for Business and welcome everyone in attendance. Member J Cleave will lead a karakia.

2 Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

3 Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 25 February 2020, as a true and correct record.

5 Leave of Absence

At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

6 Acknowledgements

At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

7 Petitions

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

8 Deputations

Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

At the close of the agenda no requests for deputations had been received.
9 Public Forum

A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public forum had been received.

10 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

"An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

"Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To recommend an amendment to the local board’s standing orders in order to provide for attendance of non-members at local board meetings via audio or audio-visual link.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. This report updates the local board on the temporary arrangements for local board meetings enabled by the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 and provides options for implementing similar arrangements for non-members.

3. The COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 temporarily amends the existing legislative restrictions for local government on remote attendance for elected members and minimum quorum at local board meetings. This now enables meetings to proceed by audio-visual link, changes how meetings can be open to the public and how members of the public receive the agenda and minutes.

4. The current local board standing orders do not provide for non-members, specifically members of the public and Māori, to give input via audio or audio-visual link.

5. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) requires that a person other than a member of the local board may participate by means of audio link or audio-visual link if the standing orders of the local authority permit this and if the chair is satisfied that all conditions and requirements in the standing orders are met. (Clause 25A(2), Schedule 7, LGA). Local board standing orders do not currently allow for this.

6. Auckland Council will be using Skype for Business for local board meetings. Attendance by members and non-members (if approved) will be facilitated by phone (audio only) or Skype video (audio-visual) via Skype for Business app.

7. An amendment to Standing Orders to enable electronic attendance can either be reversed at a future date or maintained to support that attendance in the future, where it is available.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) note the temporary amendments pursuant to the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 which allows members to attend meetings by audio-visual link, as of right and despite anything to the contrary in standing orders and to be counted for the purposes of quorum.

b) amend its standing orders by including a new Standing Order 3.3.10 that reads as follows:

   Attendance of non-members by electronic link

   A person other than a member of the local board may participate in a meeting of the local board by means of audio link or audio-visual link if the person is otherwise approved to participate in accordance with Standing Orders Sections 6 and 7.

c) amend its Standing Order 7.8.5 to provide discretion to the chair of the meeting to decline Public Forum requests via audio or audio-visual link.
Horopaki
Context

COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020


9. The amendments to the LGA and LGOIMA enable local authorities to have meetings by audio-visual link (given the restrictions regarding physical distancing and Alert Level 4) and support the effective operation of those meetings by removing conditions associated with the right to attend meetings by audio or audio-visual link.

10. These amendments only apply while the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice 2020 is in force and will be repealed when that notice expires or is revoked.

Amendments to LGA

11. The amendments to the LGA modify Clause 25A, Schedule 7 so that a member of a local authority has the right to attend any meeting by audio or audio-visual link, regardless of what is provided for in the local authority’s standing orders. It also modifies clause 25A so that a member attending by audio link or audio-visual link is counted for the purposes of quorum.

Amendments to LGOIMA

12. The amendments to LGOIMA include modifying s 47 so that the requirement for meetings of local authorities to be ‘open to the public’ may be met during Alert Level 4 and other restrictions on physical distancing. The amendment redefines ‘open to the public’ to mean that the local authority:

   a) if it is reasonably practicable, enables access to the meeting by broadcasting live the audio or video of the meeting (for example, by broadcasting it on an Internet site); and
   
   b) does 1 or both of the following as soon as practicable after the meeting ends:

      i. makes an audio or a video recording of the meeting available on its Internet site
      ii. makes a written summary of the business of the meeting available on its Internet site.

13. This amendment does not anticipate public involvement as part of the meeting itself but ensures the public can access or view meeting proceedings online (either live or after the meeting) or through reviewing the summary.

14. Other amendments to LGOIMA include:

   • Modifying s 46A so that agendas and reports for the meetings may be made available on the local authority’s internet site instead of at offices and other physical locations.
   
   • Modifying s 51 so that minutes of meetings may be made available on the local authority’s internet site instead of at offices and other physical locations.
   
   • The changes made by the COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 now supersede some of the provisions in the local board standing orders and the restrictions on physical distancing and from Alert Level 4 now limit the opportunity for public input.

Local Board Standing Orders

15. The LGA requires local authorities to adopt a set of standing orders for the conduct of its meetings and those of its committees (Clause 27, Sch 7). Each local board has adopted its standing orders which have been developed from a template.
16. As a result of the statutory amendments listed in this report, the following standing orders have been temporarily superseded:
   - 3.3.2 Member’s status – quorum and vote
   - 3.3.3 Conditions for attending by electronic link
   - 3.3.4 Request to attend by electronic link
   - 7.3.1 Information to be available to the public
   - 7.3.2 Availability of agendas and reports
   - 8.2.1 Inspection of minute books

17. There are additional provisions in standing orders that may require further consideration if the local board wishes to enable these to continue during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period. These relate to input and participation by Māori and the public.

18. Clause 25A(2), Schedule 7 of the LGA requires that a person other than a member of the local authority may participate by audio link or audio-visual link if the standing orders of the local authority permit this and if the chair is satisfied that all conditions and requirements in the standing orders are met.

19. The current standing orders do not currently provide for non-members, if required and approved to do so, to give input by means of audio link or audio-visual link.

20. Other participants at local board meetings include Governing Body members and staff. The LGA and the recent amendment provide the right for any member of a local authority or committee to attend any meeting of a local authority by audio-visual link (unless lawfully excluded). This can be interpreted broadly to extend to meetings where the elected member may not be a decision-maker or be participating in the decision at all. As such, Governing Body members participation may be by audio or audio-visual link and the process for providing them with speaking rights remains under standing orders.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

21. In performing their role, local boards are required to act in accordance with the principles contained in s 14(1) of the LGA including the requirement for the council to conduct its business in an open, transparent and democratically accountable manner and make itself aware of and have regard to the views of all of its communities.

22. While the LGA does not specifically require public input to be provided for at local board meetings, the standing orders approved by the local board reflect the principles in s 14 LGA by providing for public attendance and enabling public input at meetings.

23. In order to continue to provide this opportunity as well as facilitate input by Māori and the public, the standing orders require amending.

Standing Orders Section 6 Māori Input

24. Speaking rights for Māori organisations or their nominees are granted under standing orders for the purpose of enabling Māori input, if any, to any item on the agenda of a meeting.

25. To ensure this right can be exercised during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period, provision needs to be made enabling any input to be given by audio or audio-visual link.

Standing Orders 7.7 Deputations and 7.8 Public Forum

26. The provisions for public input in standing orders are one of the ways that local boards give effect to the requirements of the LGA (s 78 and s 79).

27. The LGA provides that in the course of its decision-making, a local authority must consider the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by or have an interest in the
matter. The LGA does not specify how those views are to be obtained or what form that consideration should take. It does not require a public forum at meetings.

28. However, the LGA gives local authorities discretion as to how to comply with s 78 and what to consider. Through their standing orders, local boards and the Governing Body have chosen to enable public input through deputations and public forum at their meetings as one way to obtain community views, among other things.

29. To ensure this opportunity can continue to be made available during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period, provision must be made in standing orders to receive this by audio or audio-visual link.

Proposed amendment

30. This report recommends that input from non-members continue to be enabled during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period. This requires an amendment to the standing orders.

31. An amendment to standing orders requires a 75% majority vote.

32. A similar amendment has been made by the Governing Body to their standing orders. It is desirable to ensure consistency across the governance arms of Auckland Council. The Governing Body resolutions are as follows:

   **Resolution GB/2020/33 (n)** That the Governing Body amend standing orders by inserting a new Standing Order 3.3.10 as follows:

   Attendance of non-members by electronic link A person other than a member of the Governing Body, or the relevant committee, may participate in a meeting of the Governing Body or committee by means of audio link or audio-visual link in emergencies if the person is otherwise approved to participate under these standing orders (such as under Standing Order 6.2 “Local board input” or 7.7 “Public input”.)

   **Resolution GB/2020/33 (p)** That the Governing Body agree to change Auckland Council’s Standing Orders to provide full discretion to the chair of the Emergency Committee to decline public input requests

33. The local board’s standing orders currently gives discretion to the chair to decline deputations but not public forum requests. Giving discretion to the chair to manage requests for public forum during this time can ensure the requirements of the LGA regarding the provision of the technology requirements, can be supported.

Technology options available

34. Where attendance by audio or audio-visual link is permitted, the LGA requires that the chair of the meeting ensures:

   • that the technology for the audio link or audio-visual link is available and of suitable quality
   • that the procedure for use of the technology will ensure that participants can hear and be heard by each other.

35. The chair’s discretion will need to be exercised where the technology and quality cannot be guaranteed.

36. The audio and audio-visual link options available for non-member input are provided by Auckland Council through Skype for Business:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio link only</td>
<td>No ability to see presentations being shared or to see and be seen by local board members attending the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Skype for Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 11

#### Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meeting via phone.</td>
<td>meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Only technical equipment required is a landline or mobile telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual link</td>
<td>Allows non-member to see both presentations being shared and to see and be seen by the local board members attending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and audio attend Skype for Business meeting</td>
<td>• Requires a mobile phone or a computer device with an internet connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. If enabled under standing orders, non-members who wish to give input would need to contact the local board with a request to attend. If approved by the chair, information on how to join the meeting using audio and audio-visual link options above will be sent out to the attendee by staff.

#### Summary of meeting

38. Where it is not reasonably practicable for the public to attend the meeting through a broadcast and/or peruse a recording after it has happened, a summary of the meeting will need to be provided by staff.

39. A summary in this context would be different from the content of agendas, reports and minutes which are all separately required to be publicly available. It should contain the thrust or key points of the discussion or debate at the meeting keeping in mind that its purpose is to provide an alternative to an audio or video recording of the meeting, in a situation where the public is not able to attend and hear this discussion themselves.

40. The ordinary definition of a summary is a brief statement or account of the main points of something. While the appropriate level of detail is likely to vary depending on what is being discussed at meetings, a summary is not expected to include verbatim notes.

#### Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

**Climate impact statement**

41. This decision is procedural in nature and any climate impacts will be negligible. The decision is unlikely to result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

**Council group impacts and views**

42. Staff attendance at meetings, while not specifically provided for, is a necessary part of local board meetings and as such is expected to take place using audio-visual link.

#### Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe

**Local impacts and local board views**

43. This report seeks to amend the local boards standing orders to enable public input and Māori input at meetings.

#### Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

**Māori impact statement**

44. This report seeks a decision that will ensure Māori input can continue to be given during the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period.

45. This will ensure Māori are not prevented from giving input at a meeting on any matter that may be of interest to them.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

46. The decision to amend standing orders is of a procedural nature and is not considered to have financial implications on Auckland Council.

47. The scaling up of technology to ensure compliance with COVID-19 Response (Urgent Management Measures) Act 2020 is being done at a cost to the council. The costs are not known at this stage and will be factored into operational budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

48. The objective of the recent legislative changes is to reduce public health risks and ensure compliance with social distancing measures and other restrictions in New Zealand’s COVID-19 alert levels response plan.

49. While this is not specifically required by legislation, permitting public input by audio or audio-visual link, if practicable, can ensure the local board can receive and consider views of its constituents on decisions that they are making.

50. There is a risk that the audio-visual option would only be taken up by a small number of constituents as this would only be available to those who have the technical devices and internet access. The software that will be used for meetings is Skype for Business which is free to download and use. However, the internet access costs or availability of technology/devices can be a limiting factor for some constituents. Constituents who do not have internet access can participate, if approved, by phone.

51. The report is seeking discretion for the local board chair to decline public forum requests. This delegation should be exercised with caution so as to not undermine the intention of standing orders (which currently provided some limited grounds to decline public input). There will be instances where it is reasonable to decline (noting these examples are not intended to be exhaustive), such as:
   - where the technology cannot be provided or quality cannot be assured
   - a need to manage time allocations for the agenda
   - the matter is neither urgent nor the subject of a decision to be made at the meeting
   - the request is offensive, repetitious or vexatious.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

52. If approved, the amendments to standing orders can, if the local board chooses, continue beyond the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period. Enabling these changes gives maximum flexibility for attendance of non-members at future meetings, including those with underlying health issues or compromised immune systems that may need to take extra precaution even after the Epidemic Preparedness (COVID-19) Notice period has ended.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Claris Cemetery project

File No.: CP2020/03450

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To update the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board on the Claris Cemetery project and seek funding to complete the project.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The local board selected Crossroads Reserve on Whangaparapara Road as the preferred location for the next cemetery on the island.

3. A resource consent and change of land designation have been granted for the site.

4. Several options for construction have been investigated and the optimum solution is proposed that replaces the existing sandy material with fill material that is suitable for burials.

5. The current actual expenditure for the project is $122,271, plus an outstanding commitment of $5,546.

6. The estimated cost to complete the construction and associated works is $285,000. This is based on:
   - slightly raised finished ground levels to minimise cut and fill
   - removal of all existing sand and then filling with suitable soil to accommodate 21 coffin burial plots, 48 ash internments and 17 eco-burial plots
   - access to free clean fill
   - substantial landscaping
   - no shelter structure and no temporary shoring.

7. Staff seek approval from the local board to allocate funding to complete the design and construction of the cemetery as described above.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) approve discretionary capex funding of $285,00 to complete the design and construction of the proposed cemetery at Claris, which comprises $277,000 from Local Improvements Projects (LIPs) funds and $8,000 from Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capex funds, both in the 2019/2020 financial year.

Horopaki
Context

8. For many years now Aotea / Great Barrier Island residents have asked for cemeteries to be developed in the north and centre of the island so people can be remembered where they or their loved ones had lived. The former Auckland City Council started investigating possible sites for a new cemetery back in the 1990's. As part of Auckland Council, the Aotea / Great
Barrier Local Board has responded to these requests and spent considerable time and resources over the last eight years to advance this request.

9. In July 2015 the local board obtained authority for cemetery development on the island and in December that year approved the investigation of sites in the Okiwi and Claris areas that might be suitable for cemeteries.

10. The Aotea Great Barrier Local Board Plan 2017 declared an outcome of providing cemeteries in the north, centre and south of the island. The plan states, ‘The Governing Body has delegated authority to us to manage and plan for new cemeteries, allowing us to find a potential site at Claris’.

11. A specific project to establish a new cemetery was initiated in the 2016/2017 financial year.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**Demand for Cemetery Services at Aotea / Great Barrier**

12. At the 2018 Census there were 936 usual residents in the Aotea / Great Barrier area, essentially unchanged since the 2013. This includes 192 people (20.5 per cent) who identified as being Māori.

13. Over the next 30 years, the total population is expected to increase by 120 people, or four people per year. There is a large influx of visitors during summer, however they are unlikely to use the cemetery facilities on the island. In the past, people from the isthmus have expressed an interest in being buried on the island, however this has not translated to a significant number of additional burials. Therefore, the long-term demand for cemetery facilities is not expected to be governed by changes in the total population or demand outside of Aotea / Great Barrier.

14. Between 2011 and 2019, Statistics NZ data shows a reasonably consistent rate of six deaths per year in the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board area. However, this data needs to be treated with caution as it has been randomly rounded to three to protect confidentiality.

15. Predicting the demand for services at the proposed Claris cemetery, based on the forecast number of deaths is problematic because of:

- alternative options for cemetery services, which are discussed below
- the age distribution of the residents and other factors affecting the likelihood of death such as gender, genetics, access to health care, exercise and lifestyle
- the trend towards cremations, that is currently not available on the island
- the uptake of proposed ecoburials, that is currently not available at the existing primary cemetery at Gooseberry Flat
- the cost of services
- the personal preferences of residents.

16. Alternative burial options for cemetery services include:

- the Gooseberry Flat cemetery carries out the majority of burials in the Aotea / Great Barrier area. It is in the south of the island and has limited capacity
- Whangaparapara cemetery is rarely used as it has sea access only and difficult topography. This may be a preference for residents who have family members buried at the cemetery
- Motairehe Marae and Kawa Marae urupa are only available to people associated with the respective marae
- private burial arrangements are rare but have occurred on large farm blocks
• currently residents from Aotea / Great Barrier move to the isthmus for aged care and other facilities. However, the number of these residents that do not return to the island is unknown. As high-tech medical technology is expected to continue to advance, this may attract further residents to move permanently to the isthmus for technology that is not available on the island.

17. The primary cemetery at Gooseberry Flat covers 3,532 square meters, however it is largely unusable space due to native bush and steep topography. The remaining capacity of the site is estimated at 44 plots, including 14 that have been reserved. Simplistically, if the current usage continues at a rate of two plots per year, this suggests that the cemetery will reach full capacity in 22 years.

18. The 2018 Census showed that 24.5 per cent of residents in Aotea / Great Barrier were 65 or older, compared to 12.0 per cent for the rest of Auckland. A different set of data (produced by Statistics NZ in February 2017) indicates that the number of residents aged 65 or older is expected increase from 280 in 2018 to 340 in 2038 i.e. a 21 per cent increase over 20 years.

19. Two alternative sites have been investigated in the north of the island. However, they are not well located to serve the large number of residents in the centre and south of the island. Investigations have recently been postponed.

20. In the absence of any alternative cemetery services, the current demand for burial services at Gooseberry Flat is a reasonable indicator of future demand. Taking into account the expected 21 per cent increase in residents aged 65 or older, the cemetery at Gooseberry Flat is likely to reach full capacity in approximately 20 years from now.

21. If the proposed cemetery at Claris is developed, over the next 10 years the current demand for plots at Gooseberry Flat of two burials per year is expected to gradually transfer to the cemetery proposed at Claris.

22. The perception associated with the site will have a bearing on the usage. The proposed site is currently a poorly utilised sandy area. The sandy conditions and low-quality vegetation may have poor connotations for residents. This needs to be overcome by good quality landscaping and maintenance that is respectful of the deceased and cemetery visitors.

Preferred Site

23. Aotea / Great Barrier Island residents have a strong sense of community spirit and have expressed a desire to have cemeteries in the centre and north of the island that serve the local communities.

24. After the formal establishment of the project, various locations in the north and centre of the island were investigated for a new cemetery. In February 2017 the local board selected Crossroads Reserve on Whangaparapara Road opposite the sports club for further detailed investigation, which subsequently became the preferred location for the next cemetery on the island.

25. The proposed cemetery is centrally located. It is close to residents at Claris, Okupu, Whangaparapara and Port Fitzroy. While the Gooseberry Flat cemetery still has spare capacity, it could continue to serve the residents at Tryphena, Schooner Bay and Cape Barrier. Medlands is equidistant by road to both sites. Attachment A shows the location of the cemeteries and population distribution.

26. The proposed cemetery covers approximately 600m² of the total 13,481m² of reserve, which allows for considerable future expansion if required.

27. The proposed site is located across the road from the Claris Sports and Social Club which could be used for after-funeral receptions, by private arrangement.

Change to Reserve Classification and Resource Consent

28. A proposed change to the reserve classification of Crossroads Reserve was publicly notified in March 2019 to reclassify the land under the Reserves Act and then subsequently approved.
29. A resource consent to develop a cemetery was granted in September 2019, including three burial options:
   • 21 coffin burial plots
   • 17 eco-burial plots
   • 48 ash internments.

30. The resource consent will lapse in September 2024 unless the consent is given effect to, or the council extends the period after which the consent lapses.

**Earthworks and Soil Fill**

31. A significant constraint for the project has been the difficulties associated with the sandy soil conditions that are not well suited for excavating graves. Several options have been investigated to mitigate this issue, including a trial of temporary shoring for grave burials. The trial concluded that temporary shoring is not a good option for this site.

32. Phasing the construction over several years has also been investigated. This is not considered to be economical due to the modest size of the site, availability of fill and disruption caused by ongoing construction.

33. It is proposed to remove the existing sandy material on site and replace it with material that is stable and suitable for burials. The depth of cut material will vary depending on the intended final use, such as landscaping, grave plots or ecoburials.

34. On Aotea / Great Barrier Island, the maximum quantity of fill coming from a donor site is generally 500 cubic meters. As the quantity of fill required is estimated to be approximately 800 cubic meters, two donor sites are intended to be used. It is expected that suitable hardfill will be available free of charge from existing stockpiled material. The landfill adjacent to Claris Airfield is proposed as one donor site. Another site has yet to be confirmed, however this is likely to be either from the stockpiles at Okiwi Airfield or surplus overburden material at Blackwell Quarry.

35. The excavated sandy fill will be taken to an approved fill site, that has yet to be confirmed.

**Cost of Establishing the Cemetery**

36. Following an initial cost estimate by a quantity surveyor, discussions with a contractors and specialists have taken place to get a more realistic estimate of the cost of construction and to identify opportunities to reduce costs. As a result, the cost estimated to complete the works has reduced significantly. The revised estimate below allows for 21 traditional coffin burials, 17 eco burials and 48 ash internments. The estimate is also based on raised finished ground levels to minimise cut and fill, with cut depths of approximately 1.8m for traditional coffin burials. This is a departure from the resource consent, which can be rectified with a minor amendment that is expected to be preferable for Regulatory Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil plant</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civils - cut, fill, sediment control</td>
<td>$77,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access road - including drainage</td>
<td>$31,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial area - octagonal ash plots, basic fencing</td>
<td>$10,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping - mulch, native vegetation, planting</td>
<td>$35,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety notices</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage for wayfinding, info, safety notices</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor site costs</td>
<td>$25,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees, council, consenting, 15% contingency</td>
<td>$85,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. A shelter structure was originally proposed within the cemetery to provide shade, rain cover and collect rainwater. A very basic shelter has been designed that provides functional amenity but lacks aesthetic appeal. This feature has been removed from the proposal at this stage to save time and cost, as well as avoiding potential risks associated with consenting, conflicts with Māori traditions and unsuitable quality.

38. At a later stage a shelter could be added, with water facilities in an appropriate location and designed to a higher specification.

**Impact on the Environment**

39. A comprehensive assessment of environmental affects has been completed with supporting documentation from specialists commensurate with the scale and nature of the proposal. This assessment concludes that any adverse effects on the environment will be minor and will be adequately avoided, mitigated or remedied through appropriate design and management.

**Costs and Affordability**

40. The current actual expenditure for the project is $122,271, plus an outstanding commitment of $5,546.

41. The local board has enough discretionary funds to complete the construction of the cemetery, estimated at $285,000.

42. Fees and charges to the public for the proposed cemetery facilities are set each year at the discretion of the local board. This is likely to be influenced by the current fees and charges at Gooseberry Flat cemetery, with typical costs:
   - body burial fees (aka digging fees) for an adult at single depth at $1,100.00 plus GST
   - ash burial fees at $311.30 plus GST
   - exclusive right to bury a body in the lawn area (aka plot fees) is currently not charged as the land was originally donated.

43. In addition to the cemetery fees, the public will have costs such as a funeral director, casket or shroud, flowers, celebrant, venue and memorial.

44. The ongoing costs of maintaining the site is mainly for mowing the lawn, as well as costs for garden and general maintenance. This is expected to be similar to Gooseberry Flat at $3,000 (excluding GST) per year. Burial costs are also expected to be similar at $3,000 (excluding GST) for each grave that is dug.

45. For instance, if there are two body burials per year, the net cost to Council would be $6,800 per year.

**Timeframe**

46. If budget were approved, design and specification could be finalised within approximately two months. The next step would be to proceed to invited tenders. The start of construction depends on the availability of contractor resources. Ideally, construction would take place over summer to help ensure the required soil compaction.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

47. The main effect of this proposal on the climate will be from transpiration of the trees and grass, and the evaporation from the soil.

48. The works include the removal of seven mature pine trees and scrub. This will initially be replaced by grassed lawn and planted landscaped areas. In addition, as part of the eco burial process, approximately 17 commemorative trees will be planted, which will mature over time. Eventually the additional vegetation will benefit the climate by reducing temperatures at the site and removing air pollutants such as dust, ozone and carbon dioxide (a greenhouse gas).
49. Earthworks include the replacement of sandy material with organic soil that will better retain moisture, support vegetation growth and release moisture into the air. Although this will have a positive effect on the climate at the site, this will be offset by the reallocation of the sandy material to another location on the island that is yet to be determined.

50. Overall, the impact on the climate from the proposed works is expected to be a minor improvement.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

51. The Manager Cemetery Services has visited the proposed site and has expressed concerns about the sandy ground conditions that are not well suited to digging graves due to the poor stability of the material. As part of the construction of the site, the sandy material will be replaced by suitable fill material to achieve the required soil stability.

52. The proposed cemetery is not expected to impact on the Cemetery Services team as it is proposed to be managed by local staff, in the same manner as Gooseberry Flat.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe Local impacts and local board views

53. There are essentially two options for this project: to progress the development of the proposed cemetery immediately or defer the development for some years.

54. The primary considerations for the local board are balancing the wishes of residents for a new cemetery versus the costs of the proposed cemetery.

55. For many years Aotea Great Barrier residents have asked for cemeteries to be developed in the north and centre of the island so people can be remembered where they or their loved ones had lived. This is expressed in the 2017 Local Board Plan and has been progressed by obtaining a resource consent and change of land designation. Funds are currently available to complete the construction of the cemetery and there is a risk that funds will not be available in future.

56. The main cemetery at Gooseberry Flat is expected to reach full capacity in approximately 20 years from now. This is based on the low number of current burials which varies from year to year. Many factors will impact on the future demand at the proposed site, including the perceptions of locals about the proposed site. There is an option to delay the construction for several years, to land bank the site until the demand for cemetery services is more certain. The site is now designated as a cemetery and an extension to the resource consent could be requested prior to September 2024.

57. Delaying construction would increase the actual cost of construction, however this would be offset by savings from avoiding debt, depreciation and maintenance. For example, a superficial assessment of delaying the construction for 10 years is:

58. Costs:
   
   Additional cost of construction (4.0% p.a.\(^1\)) $114,000
   Loss of benefits. This is subjective and influenced by alternative funeral services
   Total costs = $114,000 plus the value of the benefits

59. Savings from avoided costs:
   
   Debt financing (4.3% p.a.\(^2\)) $122,550
   Depreciation (access road 3%, fencing 7%, signage 7%\(^3\)) $36,584
   Ground maintenance ($3,000 p.a. increasing by 2.5% p.a.\(^4\)) $37,500
   Total savings = $196,634

---

\(^1\) Rate recommended by a Principal Quantity Surveyor, Auckland Council. Assumed straight line.
\(^2\) Rate recommended by Group Planning Financial Manager, Auckland Council. Assumed simple interest.
\(^3\) Rates from Inland Revenue Department, NZ. Assumed straight line.
\(^4\) NZ Labour Costs from Rate Trading Economics. Assumed average from 2019
60. For this example, capital appreciation of land is ignored as the land designation and ownership will continue in future. The land will appreciate if developed or not. Similarly, cemetery digging costs are ignored because they would likely still be incurred at the Gooseberry Flat cemetery.

61. From a purely financial perspective, this example suggests net savings from delaying the project, however this is based on many long-term variables. The overriding issue is the value of the subjective intangible benefits gained from developing a new cemetery.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

62. Ngāti Rehua affiliates to Ngāti Wai. Aotea, also known as Great Barrier Island, is the ancestral land of Ngāti Rehua Ngātiwai ki Aotea.

63. There are two marae located in the north of Aotea; Kawa and Motairehe that have their own burial facilities.

64. On 31 October 2017, representatives of Ngāti Rehua Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust met with members of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board and project representatives to discuss the proposed cemetery development. This meeting contributed to council’s commitment to Māori. The following issues that are particularly relevant to Māori were discussed:

- the whenua’s history, including the battles in the area and the subsequent lifting of the tapu
- grave orientation, detailed how the faces of the buried (the graves orientation) should face east so they receive the morning sun
- the spreading of ashes on the ground is not accepted cultural practice
- the requirements of ashes or burial plots not to interfere with kai sources e.g. water
- if the idea of the eco burials is supported, selected trees should not be kai trees
- a depth of two meters is required which limits the suitable areas. Importing fill will expand the area where burials can be undertaken
- the use of fill to extend the burial area up Whangaparapara Road is supported
- “Council Style” burial plots are not wanted. Breaking up burial plots into smaller groupings of approximately 10 graves each was suggested
- no concrete berms
- side by side burials were not supported
- an Archaeologist should visit the site and undertake an investigation of any known archaeology.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

65. Community Facilities requests approval from the local board to allocate discretionary capex funding of $285,00 to complete the design and construction of the cemetery as described above.

66. The $285,000 discretionary capex requested is to be funded as FY2019/2020 $277,000 Local Improvements Projects (LIPs) and FY2019/2020 $8,000 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capex. The LIPs funding of $277,000 is the remaining capex funding that has been carried forward from FY2018/2019. This LIPs capex funding is unable to be carried forward to following financial year unallocated as per the financial guidelines; it must be formally allocated to a project prior to 30 June 2020.
67. If the board decides not to go ahead with the Claris cemetery project, the budget spent to date cannot be capitalised. This would mean the spend to date of $127,817 will have to come out of the local board’s 2019/2020 LDI opex budget. This would also mean, the local board would be reinstated with $127,817 of LIPS budget which would make total LIPS budget $404,817 and, as mentioned above, this budget will have to be allocated to a capital project before 30 June 2020.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

68. The major risks and mitigations associated with this initiative are:

- there is a risk that the public do not support the use of the newly constructed cemetery. For many years now Aotea / Great Barrier Island residents have expressed a desire for new cemeteries in the centre and north of the island, which supports the need for a new cemetery. Council opted to publicly notify the resource consent; however, no formal feedback was received. The proposed cemetery is well located in the centre of the island serving a large nearby population. Demand for the proposed cemetery will also be impacted by the eventual closure of the existing cemetery at Gooseberry Flat. Good quality landscaping is proposed to help establish a respectful cemetery ambience and support public perception.

- there is a risk that suitable fill may not be available on the island when required. The material at the envisaged landfill sites need to be tested by a geologist or engineer to ensure that it is suitable. Arrangements can then be made to retain appropriate quantities of material for this project.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

69. Community Facilities seeks approval from the local board to support the allocation of discretionary capex funding of $285,000 to complete the design and construction of the cemetery as described above.

70. The $285,000 discretionary capex requested is to be funded as FY2019/2020 $277,000 Local Improvements Projects (LIPs) and FY2019/2020 $8,000 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capex. The LIPs funding of $277,000 is the remaining capex funding that has been carried forward from FY2018/2019. This LIPs capex funding is unable to be carried forward to following financial year unallocated as per the financial guidelines; it must be formally allocated to a project prior to 30 June 2020.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01</td>
<td>Great Barrier Island population map</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michael Cairns. Project Delivery Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Rod Sheridan - General Manager Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A: Population and Location Map

Each box shows the population of the area from the 2018 Census.
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

File No.: CP2020/05175

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for local financial matters for the local board agreement 2020/2021, which need to be considered by the Governing Body in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 process.
2. To seek feedback on the proposed regional topics in the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. Our Annual Budget contains 21 local board agreements which are the responsibility of local boards to agree with the governing body. These agreements set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures.
4. Auckland Council publicly consulted from 21 February to 22 March 2020 to seek community views on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 and local board priorities to be included in the local board agreements (Consultation part 1).
5. Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council’s financial position, which will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. The council is now considering what those impacts are likely to be, and plan to ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council’s proposed ‘emergency budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19 (Consultation part 2).
6. Local boards are required to receive the feedback on the proposals in consultation part 1, which are not affected by the changes being considered by the council and therefore will not be subject to further consultation and make decisions on them. This must be done before consultation part 2 can get underway, so the scope of consultation part 2 is clear.
7. This report seeks decisions on local financial matters for the local board agreement.
8. The council received feedback in person at community engagement events and through written forms, including online and hard copy forms, emails and letters.
9. This report summarises consultation feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021, including on local board priorities for 2020/2021.

Feedback on Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board priorities for 2020/2021
10. The local board consulted on the following priorities:
   - sustainability priorities including Ecological Footprint, potable water, food security and ethical investment
   - environmental priorities including Ecology Vision, marine protection, and marine biosecurity
   - culture and community priorities including mana whenua aspirations, support for community groups and tourism
   - infrastructure priorities including housing and connectivity
11. Two submissions were received on Aotea / Great Barrier local board priorities for 2020/2021 (attachment A). Both submissions were supportive of the local board’s proposed priorities.
Feedback on regional proposals in the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 from the Aotea / Great Barrier local board area

12. This report seeks local board views on the proposed regional Annual Budget topics including:
   - the changes to rates and fees, key proposals:
     - waste management targeted rate
     - refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
     - Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate
   - the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021
   - other budget information.

13. Local board views on these regional matters will be considered by the Governing Body (or relevant committee) before making final decisions on the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

14. Out of the 4,765 submissions received on the regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021, two submissions were from people living in the Aotea / Great Barrier local board area.

15. Both submitters supported the waste management targeted rate and refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City.

16. One submitter supported the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.

17. Auckland Council also consulted on the Council-Controlled Organisations (CCO) Review at the same time. The feedback received on this will be presented at a later date.

Ngā tūtohunga Recommendations

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Aotea / Great Barrier local board area.

c) provide feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021.

Horopaki Context

18. Local board agreements form part of the Auckland Council’s Annual Budget and set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures.

19. Auckland Council publicly consulted from 21 February to 22 March 2020 to seek community views on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 and local board priorities to be included in the local board agreements. This is now referred to as consultation part 1.

20. Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council’s financial position, which will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. Work to date on the proposed Annual Budget will need to be adjusted to consider the new financial realities facing Auckland.

21. The financial report presented to the Emergency Committee during April 2020 indicated potential reductions in cash revenue of $350-650m for financial year 2020/2021, depending on the length and extent of the disruption caused by COVID-19. The Emergency Committee
requested staff provide further information to the Governing Body on the impacts of the various scenarios modelled against a rates increase of between 0 per cent and 3.5 per cent. They also resolved that further public consultation on the Annual Budget would include considering whether to adopt a 2.5 per cent rather than 3.5 per cent general rates increase for the 2020/2021 financial year, among a suite of other measures aimed at offering support to all ratepayers, including businesses, facing hardship due to the impacts of COVID-19.

22. The council is planning to ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council’s proposed ‘emergency budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19. It is anticipated this will be carried out from late May until mid-June 2020. This will be in addition to the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation we have already carried out from February to March 2020. This is referred to as consultation part 2.

23. Consultation part 2 is unlikely to revisit any of the specific proposals in consultation part 1. Therefore, the local boards and the Governing Body are required to receive the feedback on these proposals and make decisions on them. This must be done before consultation part 2 can get underway so it is clear what decisions have already been made, and what decisions will be made after consultation part 2.

24. Further, some of the proposed changes to fees and charges required a Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) and the requirements for this were met in consultation part 1. It is important to complete this statutory process, especially where consultation part 2 will not be relevant to the decisions on these fees and charges.

25. This report includes analysis of the consultation feedback on the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board priorities for 2020/2021, and on the regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Aotea / Great Barrier local board area.

Local financial matters for the local board agreement

26. This report allows the local board to agree its input and recommend other local financial matters to the Governing Body in May 2020. This is to allow time for the Governing Body to consider these items in the Annual Budget process.

Local board input on regional plans

27. Local boards have a statutory responsibility for identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the context of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of Auckland Council. This report provides an opportunity for the local board to provide input on the proposed Annual Budget.

28. Local Board Plans reflect community priorities and preferences and are key documents that guide both the development of local board agreements and input into regional plans.

Council-controlled organisation (CCO) review

29. An independent panel was appointed by Auckland Council to examine three areas: (1) the CCO model, roles and responsibilities, (2) the accountability of CCOs, and (3) CCO culture. Local boards had the opportunity to provide input into this in March 2020.

30. Auckland Council also consulted on the review of CCOs during the same period as the Annual Budget, from 21 February to 22 March 2020.

31. After receiving feedback, the panel will report on key issues, community and stakeholder feedback to the council in May 2020.

32. The panel will provide a final report and recommendations to the council in July 2020.

Types of feedback

33. Overall Auckland Council received feedback from 4,765 people in the consultation period. This feedback was received through:

- Written feedback – 3,972 hard copy and online forms, emails and letters
- In person – through 58 Have Your Say events and community events.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Feedback received on Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board priorities for 2020/2021

34. The Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board consulted on the following priorities:

- sustainability priorities including Ecological Footprint, potable water, food security and ethical investment
- environmental priorities including Ecology Vision, marine protection, and marine biosecurity
- culture and community priorities including mana whenua aspirations, support for community groups and tourism
- infrastructure priorities including housing and connectivity

35. Key themes across all feedback received (through written and in person channels) were:

- Environment (including biosecurity and planting trees)
- Planning (including infrastructure and subdivision)
- Marine protection and biosecurity
- Roading
- Waste
- Connectivity
- Potable water

Feedback received

36. Two submissions were received on Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board priorities for 2020/2021. Both submissions were supportive of the local board’s proposed priorities.

37. The Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board held one Have Your Say event. There were two attendees.

Overview of feedback received on the Annual Budget from Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board area

38. The proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 sets out our priorities and how we’re going to pay for them. The regional consultation on the proposed Annual Budget focused on changes to rates and fees, the key proposals were:

- waste management targeted rate
- refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
- Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.

39. The submissions received from the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board area on these key issues is summarised below, along with an overview of any other areas of feedback on regional proposals with a local impact.

Waste management targeted rate

40. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to increase the waste management targeted rate. Both Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board submitters responded in support of this proposal.

Question 1: Waste management targeted rate
The cost of responsibly dealing with our kerbside recycling (paper, cardboard and plastics) has increased due to international market conditions.

To pay for this we propose to charge only those who use the service by increasing the targeted rate by $19.97 a year or $0.38 a week (the total cost changing from $121.06 to $141.03 incl. GST).

If we do not do this, we would have to fund the shortfall by increasing general rates for all ratepayers, including those who don’t get a kerbside collection service.

Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

41. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to increase the refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City targeted rate. Both Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board submitters responded in support of this proposal.

Question 2: Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. In other parts of the city, residents pay for their collection via Pay As You Throw. The targeted rate for the Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas no longer meets the cost of collection.

To cover this extra cost we propose increasing the targeted rate in these areas by $14.23 a year or $0.27 a week for a 120 litre bin (the total cost changing from $129.93 to $144.16 incl. GST), and an additional $6.68 a year or $0.13 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191 to $211.91 incl. GST).

If we do not do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those living outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau cities.

Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

42. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to increase the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate. One Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board submitter responded in support of this proposal.

Question 3: Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal of this service in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area said they wanted to keep the service. The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43.

Our proposal, for those in the Waitākere Ranges local board area who want the service, is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $260 and $320 a year (incl. GST). This increase would apply from July 2021.

If we do not do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitākere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service.

Feedback on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021

43. No feedback was received from the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board area on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

44. The decisions recommended in this report are procedural in nature.
45. Some of the proposed projects these would fund may have climate impacts. The climate impacts of any projects Auckland Council chooses to progress with as a result of this, will be assessed as part of the relevant reporting requirements.

46. Some of the proposed projects these would fund will be specifically designed to mitigate climate impact, build resilience to climate impacts, and restore the natural environment.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

47. The Annual Budget is an Auckland Council Group document and will include budgets at a consolidated group level. Consultation items and updates to budgets to reflect decisions and new information may include items from across the group.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

48. Local board decisions and feedback are being sought in this report. Local boards have a statutory role in providing local board feedback on regional plans.

49. Local boards play an important role in the development of the Annual Budget. Local board agreements form part of the Annual Budget. Local board nominees have also attended Finance and Performance Committee workshops on the Annual Budget.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

50. Many local board decisions are of importance to and impact on Māori. Local board agreements and the Annual Budget are important tools that enable and can demonstrate council’s responsiveness to Māori.

51. Local board plans, which were developed in 2017 through engagement with the community including Māori, form the basis of local priorities. There is a need to continue to build relationships between local boards and iwi, and the wider Māori community.

52. The analysis included submissions made by mana whenua and the wider Māori community who have interests in the rohe / local board area.

53. Ongoing conversations between local boards and Māori will assist to understand each other’s priorities and issues. This in turn can influence and encourage Māori participation in council’s decision-making processes.

54. Some of the proposed projects these would fund may have impacts on Māori. The impacts on Māori of any projects Auckland Council chooses to progress with as a result of this, will be assessed as part of the relevant reporting requirements.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

55. This report is seeking local board decisions on financial matters in local board agreements that need to then be considered by the Governing Body.

56. Local boards are also providing input to regional plans. There is information in the consultation material for each plan with the financial implications of different options.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

57. Local boards are required to make recommendations on these local financial matters for the Annual Budget by 15 May 2020, to enable the Governing Body to make decisions on them when considering the Annual Budget in May.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

58. Local boards will approve their local board agreements and corresponding work programmes.

59. Recommendations and feedback from local boards will be provided to the relevant governing body committees for consideration during decision making at the Governing Body meeting.

60. The dates of these meetings are yet to be determined as the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown are taken into account.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board Annual Budget FY2020/21 submissions</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Jacqui Fyers - Senior Local Board Advisor Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

The cost of responsibly dealing with our kerbside recycling (paper, cardboard and plastics) has increased due to international market conditions. **To pay for this we propose to charge only those who use the service by increasing the targeted rate by $29 a year (or $0.38 a week) to $141.03 (incl. GST).**

If we do not do this, we would have to fund the shortfall by increasing general rates for all ratepayers, including those who don’t get a kerbside collection service.

**What do you think of our proposal?**

Support
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

To cover this extra cost we propose increasing the targeted rate in these areas by:

- $14.23 a year or $0.27 a week for a 120 litre bin (the total cost changing from $129.93 to $144.16 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don't do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $260 and $320 a year (incl. GST). This increase would apply from July 2021.

If we don't do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitākere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Aotea/Great Barrier

I support most of the priorities
The environment needs to be the top priority in all areas of council function

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#457</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The environment and protecting and enhancing what we have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

The cost of responsibly dealing with our kerbside recycling (paper, cardboard and plastics) has increased due to international market conditions. To pay for this we propose to charge only those who use the service by increasing the targeted rate by $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) to $141.03 (incl. GST).

If we do not do this, we would have to fund the shortfall by increasing general rates for all ratepayers, including those who don’t get a kerbside collection service.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support
Don’t use the service so good it is a targeted rate not charged when I don’t use it on Great Barrier Island property

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

To cover this extra cost we propose increasing the targeted rate in these areas by:

- $14.23 a year or $0.27 a week for a 120 litre bin (the total cost changing from $129.93 to $144.16 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidize residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitakere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $250 and $320 a year (incl. GST). This increase would apply from July 2021.

If we don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities

Aotea/Great Barrier

I support all of the priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Local board feedback for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions

File No.: CP2020/04261

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To recommend that the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board delegate authority to the local board chair to submit the local board’s formal views for inclusion in Auckland Council submissions to Central Government and other councils, where this feedback is due before a local board meeting.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Central Government (and other councils) seek feedback through public consultation on bills, inquiries and other key matters. The consultation timeframes vary between four and eight weeks.

3. The Governing Body is responsible for making official submissions to Central Government on most matters except for submissions to government on legislation where it specifically relates to a local board area. Where the Governing Body decides to make an official submission on a Central Government matter, staff work to develop a draft submission for consideration by the Governing Body and will call for local board input so it can be incorporated. The Auckland Council submission needs to be approved within the consultation timeframes set by Central Government.

4. Local board input is required to be approved by the local board. Where local boards are unable to make these decisions at a local board meeting due to the constrained timeframes, another mechanism is required. In situations where local boards prefer not to use the urgent decision process, local boards sometimes provide informal feedback that is endorsed at the next business meeting. This is not considered best practice because the local board input can be challenged or changed at ratification or approval stage, which leads to reputational risk for the council.

5. In situations where timeframes don’t allow reporting to formal business meetings, staff recommend that the local board either uses the urgent decision process or delegates authority to the chair to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions. Both options provide an efficient way to ensure that local board formal input is obtained when external parties set submission deadlines that don’t allow formal input to be obtained from a local board business meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) delegate authority to the chair to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils.

b) note that the local board can continue to use its urgent decision process to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils, if the chair chooses not to exercise the delegation sought in recommendation (a).

c) note that this delegation will only be exercised where the timeframes do not allow for
local board input to be considered and approved at a local board meeting.

d) note all local input approved and submitted for inclusion in an Auckland Council submission is to be included on the next local board meeting agenda for the public record.

Horopaki

Context

6. Government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils seek feedback on issues using both formal and informal consultation opportunities. Auckland Council has an ongoing opportunity to provide advocacy on public policy matters and this is often done by making a public submission. Submissions can be provided on other council’s plans, on policy and legislative reviews or on an agency’s proposed strategy.

7. Council submissions are the formal responses to the public consultation opportunities that are open to everyone, including all Aucklanders.

8. Under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 the Governing Body must consider any views and preferences expressed by a local board, where a Governing Body decision affects or may affect the responsibilities or operation of the local board or the well-being of communities within its local board area.

9. Under the current allocation of decision-making responsibility, the Governing Body is allocated decision-making responsibility for “submissions to government on legislation including official submissions of Auckland Council incorporating local board views”. Local boards are allocated decision-making for “submissions to government on legislation where it specifically relates to that local board area only”.

10. Central Government agencies set the deadlines for submissions which are generally between four to eight weeks. These timeframes do not usually allow for formal reporting to local boards to input into the council submission. In situations where local boards prefer not to use the urgent decision process, local boards can sometimes provide informal feedback that is endorsed at the next business meeting. This is not considered best practice because the local board input can be challenged or changed at ratification or approval stage, which leads to reputational risk for council.

11. Providing a delegation for Central Government submissions provides local boards with another option to give formal local views within prescribed timeframes.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

12. There are five options available to local boards to approve their formal views and input on submissions to Central Government. Where this input is sought within a time constrained process and is due before a meeting of the local board, only four of these options will be available.

Table 1: Options for mechanisms through which the local boards can approve their formal views on Auckland Council submissions to Central Government and other councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Local board input approved at a business meeting</td>
<td>• Decision is made and adopted in a public meeting (transparency of decision making). • All local board members have the opportunity to make the formal decision.</td>
<td>• Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines often don’t align with external agency deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Local board input approved at an extraordinary meeting of the local board | • Provides a mechanism for local boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules.  
• Decision is made and adopted in a public meeting (transparency of decision making).  
• All local board members have the opportunity to make the formal decision. | • Extraordinary meeting needs to be called by a resolution (requires anticipation by the local board) or requisition in writing delivered to the Chief Executive. The process usually requires a minimum of three clear working days.  
• There are additional costs incurred to run an unscheduled meeting.  
• It may be difficult to schedule a time when enough local board members can attend to achieve a quorum. |
| 3. Local board input approved using urgent decision mechanism (staff recommend this option) | • It provides a mechanism for local boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules.  
• Local board input can be submitted once the Chair, Deputy Chair and Relationship Manager have received the report providing the local board views and input.  
• The urgent decision needs the sign-off from two local board members (i.e. the Chair and Deputy Chair), rather than just one. | • The decision is not made in a public meeting. It may be perceived as non-transparent decision-making because it is not made by the full local board.  
• Chair and deputy may not have time to properly consult and ascertain view of the full local board. |
| 4. Local board input approved by the chair who has been delegated authority from the local board (staff recommend this option where local boards choose not to use the urgent decision process) | • It provides a mechanism for local boards to provide their formal views where submission deadlines do not align with local board meeting schedules and local boards don’t want to use the urgent decision process.  
• Local board input can be submitted as soon as possible after the local board views and input have been collated and discussed by the local board members. | • Decision is not made in a public meeting. It may be perceived as non-transparent decision-making because it is not made by the full local board.  
• The chair who has the delegated authority may not have time to properly consult and ascertain views of the full local board. |
| 5. Local board input submitted and ratified at a later date | • Local board informal input can be submitted as soon as possible after the local board views and input have been collated and discussed by the local board members. | • Local board input submitted is considered to be the informal views of the local board until they are approved.  
• Local board input can be challenged or changed at ratification or approval stage.  
• Decision to ratify informal views, even if made in a public meeting, is unable to |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be changed in the council submission (can be perceived as non-transparent decision-making).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion of informal views in the Auckland Council submission will be at the discretion of the Governing Body. These may be included with caveats noting the views have not been ratified by the local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If the local board changes its views, there is a reputational risk for the council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Options one, two and three are already available to local boards and can be utilised as required and appropriate. Option one should always be used where timeframes allow reporting. Option four requires a delegation in order for a local board to utilise this mechanism and should be used only when timeframes don’t allow reporting to a business meeting.

14. Local boards who wish to utilise option four are requested to delegate to the chair as this fits within the leadership role of the chair and they are more likely to be available because the chair is a full-time role. The role of this delegated member will be to attest that the approved and submitted input constitutes the views of the local board. The input should then be published with the agenda of the next formal business meeting of the local board to provide transparency. The delegate may choose not to exercise their delegation if the matter is of a sensitive nature and is something that the full board should consider at a business meeting.

15. Each local board will be in charge of its own process for considering and developing their local board input that will be approved by the delegated member. This can include discussions at workshops, developing ideas in a small working group or allocating it to an individual member to draft.

16. Where local boards do not wish to delegate the views to the chair, the recommended option is to use the urgent decision mechanism (where deadlines don’t align with local board reporting timeframes). The mechanism requires a staff report and the decision to be executed by three people (the Chair, Deputy Chair and the Relationship Manager). Local board input can be submitted within one to two days after the local board views and input have been collated and discussed by the local board members.

17. Option five is not considered best practice and local boards are strongly discouraged from using this.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

*Climate impact statement*

18. This decision is procedural in nature and any climate impacts will be negligible. The decision is unlikely to result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

*Council group impacts and views*

19. This report proposes a delegation to ensure that staff can undertake the preparation of submissions in a timely manner, while receiving formal local board input on matters that are of local board importance.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
20. This report seeks to establish a specific delegation for the local board chair.
21. Any local board member who is delegated responsibilities should ensure that they represent
the wider local board views and preferences on each matter before them.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
22. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have a positive or negative impact
for Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
23. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have financial implications on
Auckland Council.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
24. If local boards choose to delegate to provide their formal views on Auckland Council
submissions, there is a risk that this mechanism is perceived as non-transparent decision-
making because it is not made by the full local board. This can be mitigated by publishing
the submitted local board input on the next agenda.
25. There is also a risk that the chair who has the delegated authority may not have time to
properly consult and ascertain views of the full local board. This can be mitigated by
encouraging the local board to collectively discuss and agree their input before it is
submitted by the member who has been delegated authority.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
26. On those occasions where it is required, the delegation will be used to approve and submit
the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from
government departments, parliament, select committees and other councils.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Carol Stewart - Senior Policy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason – General Manager, Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local board representative on the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group

File No.: CP2020/03648

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To appoint a representative from the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board to the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group was established in late 2017 to provide oversight and guidance to council group staff on progressing shared objectives with the Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan, which seeks to improve outcomes in Tikapa Moana / the Hauraki Gulf.

3. Recognising the potential to further integrate council group activities to improve outcomes for the Hauraki Gulf, the Environment and Community Committee agreed at their September 2019 meeting to extend the work of this political reference group. It was also agreed that the group will be renamed to the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group. An updated Terms of Reference for the group is attached (Attachment A).

4. It is important to continue to have local representation from local boards on the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group.

5. Following further discussions with the Chair of the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group, who has delegation as per the Group’s Terms of Reference to approve membership changes, he has advised that separate representation from Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards will be provided for in this Political Reference Group.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) appoint a member to be a representative to the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Terms of Reference for the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

Author: Jacqui Fyers - Senior Local Board Advisor Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

Authorisers: Louise Mason – General Manager, Local Board Services
Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards
Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group

Terms of Reference

FINAL (September 2019)

Purpose

1. To provide oversight and guidance to, and encourage integration of, Auckland Council group activities and initiatives that advance Hauraki Gulf outcomes.

2. To, where possible, integrate the activities of the Auckland Council group with the those of other agencies in the Hauraki Gulf and the Hauraki Gulf Forum.

Background

The SeaChange – Tai Timu Tai Pari Marine Spatial Plan was completed by an independent working group of stakeholders in December 2016. The Sea Change plan’s broad vision is to ensure that the mauri of the Hauraki Gulf is strong, and it is vibrant with life, productive, and supports healthy and prosperous communities.

The Planning Committee acknowledged the shared vision and intent of the Sea Change plan and Auckland Council’s goals in May 2017. At the direction of the Planning Committee, the Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group was established, with a preparatory meeting in August 2017.

A work programme of council group activities to progress shared objectives with the Sea Change plan was approved by the Environment and Community Committee in September 2017. At the same time, the purpose of the Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group was approved, being to provide oversight and guidance to council departments and council-controlled organisations in delivering this agreed work programme, and to integrate with other agencies in the Hauraki Gulf and the Hauraki Gulf Forum where possible.

The Auckland Council Sea Change Political Reference Group has made the following observations since its formation:

a) Hauraki Gulf aspirations are being progressed through various initiatives, and the Sea Change plan is one reference point amongst a broad range of strategies, plans and activities.

---

1 The Auckland Council group includes Auckland Council and its council controlled organisations, particularly Watercare, Auckland Transport, Puruuki Development Auckland, and Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development.
b) Some council group activities with a significant impact on Hauraki Gulf aspirations have not been considered to date, as they were not directly referenced in the Sea Change plan.

c) Since the Sea Change plan was released in December 2016, and the council group work programme was agreed in September 2017, various substantial strategies, plans, activities and programmes have been initiated or completed that have a significant impact on Hauraki Gulf outcomes. Examples include the America’s Cup 36 programme, the Auckland Plan 2050, and the Auckland Unitary Plan.

d) There is the potential to enable greater synergies and collective buy-in through embracing a wider range of strategies, plans, activities and initiatives.

e) There is the potential to effect greater system change, and therefore more holistic approaches to Hauraki Gulf outcomes, through integrating a wider range of council group functions in the oversight role of the political reference group.

For these reasons, the purpose and membership of the political reference group has been broadened, resulting in this updated (September 2019) Terms of Reference and membership below.

Membership

The Chair of the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group is the Chair of the Environment and Community Committee (or the Deputy Chair in their absence).

Membership, outlined in Table 1 below, reflects the desire to include inter-related responsibilities and membership from the Environment and Community, Planning, Finance and Performance, and Regulatory Committees. Additionally, membership includes Local Board representatives – one from the Hauraki Gulf Islands and three from the adjoining mainland (geographic distributed preference to representatives from Franklin, Hibiscus and Bays, and Rodney local boards). Independent Maori Statutory Board representation is also included.

Members may be replaced as required, while retaining the relative mix of representatives from differing backgrounds and interests. The Environment and Community Committee have agreed to delegate to the Chair of that committee the ability to agree to any such changes, particularly following the outcome of the September 2019 local body elections.
Table 1: Membership on the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Environment and Community Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair, Environment and Community Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or Deputy Chair, Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or Deputy Chair, Finance and Performance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair or Deputy Chair, Regulatory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor or Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands local board member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland local board members (3) adjoining Hauraki Gulf coast (Franklin, Rodney, Hibiscus &amp; Bays)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Maori Statutory Board member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings and sharing of information

Meetings are proposed to be called as required, with an expectation of at least two meetings to be held in the 2020 calendar year. Members will be provided information for their consideration prior to any such meeting.

Quorum

Four members, with at least one being the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Environment and Community Committee shall form a quorum.

Tenure

The scope, currency and need for the Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Political Reference Group should be reviewed by the Environment and Community Committee prior to December 2020.
Urgent decision request of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board regarding COVID-19 crisis funding assistance for Aotea Family Support Group

File No.: CP2020/05120

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To enable the local board to formalise by resolution the decision made under the urgent decision-making process regarding COVID-19 crisis funding assistance for Aotea Family Support Group.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Ministry of Social Development has formally recognised the Aotea Family Support Group (AFSG) as Aotea / Great Barrier Island’s essential social service provider during the COVID-19 crisis. The sorts of crisis services currently being provided by AFSG include food, fuel, petrol, home heating and counselling.

3. The AFSG sent an email to the local board to emphasise higher need on welfare services on the island as a result of COVID-19 and request extra crisis funding to meet these demands.

4. AFSG is requesting $5,000 to top up of their crisis fund. The assessment criteria for use of this fund allow for essential food, health and other emergency expenses that cannot be funded from other sources of assistance.

5. The Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board has a remaining budget of $5,600 in its Community Response Fund budget for the current financial year. Hence, an urgent-decision making process was undertaken in response to AFSG’s request. A copy of the memo is appended as Attachment A.

6. Under Auckland Council’s Guidance on payment of grants and other funding during COVID-19 Alert, grants to NGOs providing welfare services that are critical within the community throughout alert period are permitted. Auckland Council’s Community Empowerment Unit supported this request.

7. This report seeks to formalise the decision made through urgent decision-making process of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) ratify the approved urgent decision (Attachment A of the report) dated 22 April 2020 regarding COVID-19 crisis funding assistance for Aotea Family Support Group.
**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Urgent decision-making memo for AFSG crisis funding</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Guia Nonoy - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

7 April 2020

To: Janine Geddes – Acting Relationship Manager Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke
   cc: Izzy Fordham – Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board
        Luke Coles – Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board
From: Jacqui Fyers – Senior Local Board Advisor, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

Subject: Urgent decision request of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board regarding Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework

Purpose
The purpose of this memo is to initially seek the local board relationship manager’s authorisation to commence the urgent decision-making process and if granted, seek formal approval from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) to use the process to make an urgent decision.

The urgent decision being sought needs to be authorised by the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) by signing this memo. The decision required, and the supporting memo, are attached to this memo (Attachment A).

Both memos will be reported as an information item at the next Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board’s business meeting, if the urgent decision-making process proceeds.

Reason for the urgency
The Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework – proposed changes report was submitted to the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board 24 March 2020 business meeting (Attachment A).

The purpose of the report was to outline key amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework and to obtain the local board’s views prior to presentation at the Environment and Climate Change Committee in May 2020.

The local board’s 24 March 2020 business meeting was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown. The next local board business meeting is scheduled for 12 May 2020.

The reason for the urgency is that the local board needs to submit its feedback by 17 April 2020.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:
   a) adopt the feedback on the changes to the draft Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework.
Background

1. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved to develop an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region (ENV/2018/11).

2. To meet this requirement, Auckland Council led the development of Te Taruke-a-Tawhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, (‘ACAF’) with extensive collaboration and engagement with mana whenua, public, private and voluntary sectors.

3. In June 2019, the Environment and Community Committee approved a consultation draft of ACAF and associated materials.

4. In February 2020, a memo was circulated to all local boards to share key findings from the public consultation on the draft ACAF.

5. In March 2020, a report was submitted to the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board outlining key structural changes proposed for the framework and requesting their feedback on the proposed changes prior to presentation at the Environment and Climate Change Committee in May 2020.

Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Signed by Janine Geddes
Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board Date: 08/04/2020

Approval to use the urgent decision-making process

Izzy Fordham
Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board Date: 08/04/2020

Luke Coles
Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board Date: 08/04/2020
Aotea / Great Local Board Resolution/s

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) support the overall intent of a Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework and the proposed changes outlined in the report.

b) strongly support reducing our emissions to reach net zero emissions by 2050. We need to be more assertive in our stance to reach this target and should set clear goals at frequent intervals to reach this target. Therefore, we advocate for two additional goals of 12.5% reduction by mid-2022 and 25% reduction by 2025.

c) support the preparing for climate change pillar but would suggest bolder action than a ‘precautionary’ approach for the region and a change to the tone of the wording as Auckland is in a climate change emergency and it’s imperative that we act fast and act now.

Izzy Fordham
Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board Date: 08/04/2020

Luke Coles
Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board Date: 08/04/2020
Ratification of Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback on the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review
File No.: CP2020/04875

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To enable the local board to formalise by resolution the feedback provided to inform the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs) Review.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Governing Body approved the Terms of Reference for an Independent Panel to undertake a review of substantive CCOs at its meeting on 26 November 2019 [GB/2019/127].

3. The review covers Auckland Transport, Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development, Panuku Development Auckland, Regional Facilities Auckland and Watercare. The overall objectives are to examine:
   - whether CCOs are an effective and efficient model for delivering services to the council and Aucklanders, and
   - whether the CCO decision-making model provides sufficient political oversight, public transparency and accountability.

4. The review asks the Independent Panel to examine three areas: the CCO model and its accompanying roles and responsibilities; the accountability of CCOs; and CCO culture.

5. The Independent Panel is seeking the views of local boards on these areas.

6. A report was scheduled on the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board’s 24 March business meeting agenda to provide feedback on the Council-Controlled Organisations Review to the Independent Panel. This meeting was cancelled in response to the government’s call to prevent the spread of the COVID-19 virus.

7. This report seeks to formalise the feedback (Attachment A) provided by urgent decision – making process of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) ratify Attachment A as the board’s feedback provided on 17 April 2020 for inclusion in the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations review.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback on the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations (CCOs) Review</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Guia Nonoy - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

16 April 2020

To: Janine Geddes – Acting Relationship Manager Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke

cc: Izzy Fordham – Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board
Luke Coles – Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

From: Jacqui Fyers – Senior Local Board Advisor, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

Subject: Urgent decision request of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board regarding Council-Controlled Organisations (CCO) Review to the Independent Panel

Purpose
The purpose of this memo is to initially seek the local board relationship manager’s authorisation to commence the urgent decision-making process and if granted, seek formal approval from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) to use the process to make an urgent decision.

The urgent decision being sought needs to be authorised by the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) by signing this memo. The decision required, and the supporting report, are attached to this memo (Attachment A).

Both memos will be reported as an information item at the next Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board’s business meeting, if the urgent decision-making process proceeds.

Reason for the urgency
The Local Board feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review report was submitted to the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board 24 March 2020 business meeting (Attachment A).

The purpose of the report was to provide an opportunity for local boards to provide formal feedback on the Council-Controlled Organisations (CCO) Review to the Independent Panel.

The local board’s 24 March 2020 business meeting was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown. The next local board business meeting is scheduled for 12 May 2020.

The reason for the urgency is that the local board needs to submit its feedback by 17 April 2020.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) adopt the attached feedback (Attachment B) on the Council-Controlled Organisations (CCO) Review to the Independent Panel.

Background

1. On 26 November 2019, the Governing Body approved the Terms of Reference for an Independent Panel to undertake a review of substantive CCOs [GB/2019/127]. The Independent Panel was appointed by the Governing Body on 12 December 2019.
2. The review covers Auckland Transport, Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development, Panuku Development Auckland, Regional Facilities Auckland and Watercare with the objectives to examine:
   - whether CCOs are an effective and efficient model for delivering services to the council and Aucklanders, and
   - whether the CCO decision-making model provides sufficient political oversight, public transparency and accountability.

3. The Independent Panel will examine three areas: the CCO model and its accompanying roles and responsibilities; the accountability of CCOs; and CCO culture.

4. In March 2020, a report was submitted to the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board providing an opportunity for local boards to provide formal feedback on the CCO review. The Independent Panel is due to report on key issues, community and stakeholder feedback in May and to provide a final report, with recommendations, in July 2020.

**Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process**

[Signature]

Signed by Janine Geddes  
Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board  
Date: 17/04/2020

**Approval to use the urgent decision-making process**

[Signature]

Izzy Fordham  
Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board  
Date: 17/04/2020

[Signature]

Luke Coles  
Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board  
Date: 17/04/2020
Aotea / Great Local Board Resolution/s
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) adopt the attached feedback (Attachment B) on the Council-Controlled Organisations (CCO) Review to the Independent Panel.

Izzy Fordham  
Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board  
Date: 17/04/2020

Luke Coles  
Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board  
Date: 17/04/2020
Local Board feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review

File No.: CP2020/03194

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for local boards to provide formal feedback on the Council-Controlled Organisations (CCO) Review to the Independent Panel.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Governing Body approved the Terms of Reference for an Independent Panel to undertake a review of substantive CCOs at its meeting on 26 November 2019 [GB/2019/127].
3. The review covers Auckland Transport, Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development, Panuku Development Auckland, Regional Facilities Auckland and Watercare. The overall objectives are to examine:
   - whether CCOs are an effective and efficient model for delivering services to the council and Aucklanders, and
   - whether the CCO decision-making model provides sufficient political oversight, public transparency and accountability.
4. The review asks the Independent Panel to examine three areas: the CCO model and its accompanying roles and responsibilities; the accountability of CCOs; and CCO culture.
5. The Independent Panel is seeking the views of local boards on these areas.
6. Local boards are advised that their views are requested by the Independent Panel by 3 April 2020.

Ngā tūtuhunga
Recommendation/s
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:
   a) provide formal feedback on the Council-Controlled Organisations Review to the Independent Panel.

Horopaki
Context
7. The Governing Body approved the CCO review Terms of Reference on 26 November 2019 [GB/2019/127]. The Independent Panel was appointed by the Governing Body on 12 December 2019 and is comprised of Miriam Dean, Doug Martin and Leigh Auton. Miriam Dean has been appointed panel chair [GB/2019/149].
8. Briefings on the CCO Review were provided to local board chairs in December 2019 by staff and in February 2020 by panel member Leigh Auton. The panel wrote to local board chairs in February asking for advice on what constitutes good engagement between CCOs and local boards.
9. Monthly updates on the review are reported to the CCO Oversight Committee and circulated to all local boards.
10. The Independent Panel is seeking comprehensive engagement to obtain a range of views about the issues forming the subject of the review (Attachment A). Community engagement on the review is occurring alongside the Annual Budget 2020/2021 in February/March 2020. An engagement document has been developed and a summary document has been translated into five languages and a New Zealand Sign Language video. A webpage¹ provides information on the review, including stakeholder updates, relevant documents (including the Terms of Reference) and a contact for further information.

11. All feedback on the CCO Review will be provided to the Independent Panel. The Panel will report on the key issues and community and stakeholder feedback in May and will provide a final report and recommendations in July 2020.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

12. To identify the scope of their work, the Independent Panel has distilled the essence of the review terms into a list of issues, that forms the basis of the engagement and eventual report. The list and prompts, at Attachment A, provide a structure for local boards to give feedback.

13. The three key areas of focus set out in the list of issues are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Area of Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCO model, roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>The essential question here is whether the CCO model delivers council services with the maximum of operational efficiency, transparency and accountability, or whether there are better ways to deliver such services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO accountability</td>
<td>Here the key question is whether the council’s current approach to holding CCOs to account on behalf of Aucklanders could be improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO culture</td>
<td>The central issue here is whether CCOs need to improve how they consult, engage with and respond to the wider community and council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

14. Local boards have an opportunity to consider suggestions that might improve climate change outcomes/mitigation in their feedback on the CCO Review.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

15. The Independent Panel is engaging across the council group on the review, including:

- the chair of the independent panel wrote introducing the panel and the review objectives to all CCO chairs and chief executives, councillors, local board chairs, chief executive of IMSB and the co-chairs of the Mana Whenua Kaitaki Forum on 20 December 2019
- the panel met briefly with the CCO chief executives and chairs on 28 January 2020 to discuss the proposed review process and CCO engagement. Each CCO was asked to provide the panel with key stakeholders/customers
- individual meetings have taken place with CCO chief executives and board chairs over February and March 2020, and the panel is meeting with CCO stakeholders.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

16. Local board formal feedback on the CCO Review, including issues experienced with CCOs, good practice and options for improvement, is sought by the Independent Panel by 3 April 2020.
17. Material on the CCO Review was available at Have your Say local board events for the Annual Budget.
18. Following the conclusion of the Independent Panel’s review, as part of the development of the next 10-year budget, local boards will have the opportunity to provide formal views on any proposals for change to the CCO model.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

19. Staff presented to the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum on 19 December 2019. The panel met with one of the Forum co-chairs and mana whenua are invited to provide feedback to the panel. Mana whenua have also been invited to a hui with panel members on 18 March 2020.
20. The panel has met with the Independent Māori Statutory Board.
21. Panel members spoke on Radio Waatea to promote Māori interest and feedback on the CCO review. Material on the CCO review is being provided at matawaka events for the Annual Budget and matawaka organisations have been briefed on the review during the public engagement period.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial Implications

22. There are no financial implications from this report.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

23. There are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

24. The Independent Panel is due to report on key issues, community and stakeholder feedback in May and to provide a final report, with recommendations, in July 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review list of issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Claire Gomas - Principal Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Alastair Cameron - Manager - CCO Governance &amp; External Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Board feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review
Attachment A

Item 17

| Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager: Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards |
Auckland CCO Review
Independent Panel

CCO REVIEW

Independent review of council-controlled organisations: list of issues:

This list is intended as a guide to the high-level issues on which the review will focus. The issues in this list may be subject to revision during the course of this review.

Objectives

The review’s overall objectives are to examine:

- whether CCOs are an effective and efficient model for delivering services to the council and Aucklanders
- whether the CCO decision-making model provides sufficient political oversight, public transparency and accountability.

The terms of reference require us to examine the following three issues:

CCO model, roles and responsibilities

The essential question here is whether the CCO model delivers council services with the maximum of operational efficiency, transparency and accountability, or whether there are better ways to deliver such services. In particular:

- Are there any problems, real or perceived, with the current model, including the risk of duplication with in-house council activities?
- Is the purpose of each CCO clear and current, and is the council giving each adequate direction?
- Are the roles and responsibilities of CCOs and the council towards one another clearly defined and well understood?
- Are there viable alternatives and what are their advantages and disadvantages?

CCO accountability

Here the key question is whether the council has adequate mechanisms to hold CCOs to account and is using them appropriately, and whether improvements, including new mechanisms (such as those provided for through the Local Government Act 2002 Amendment act 2019), are needed. In particular:

- Do current accountability mechanisms, monitor CCOs’ performance effectively and ensure CCOs respond appropriately to the concerns of the council, local boards and the public?
Auckland CCO Review
Independent Panel

- Do CCOs understand the need to act in a way that reflects their accountability to the community, as well as the council’s accountability to the community for CCO performance?
- Are there adequate mechanisms to ensure CCO board members and senior management meet the legislative requirements towards Māori, and that CCOs have developed sufficient capability to achieve this?
- Do CCOs have adequate guidance about when to act in their best commercial interests and when to act in the best interests of the public?
- Are council policies that are applicable to all CCOs (group policies) adequate, or should they be extended to other areas, such as remuneration?
- Is the process for appointing CCO board members, including the skills criteria used in the selection process, appropriate?

CCO culture

The central issue here is whether CCOs need to improve how they consult, engage with and respond to the community and council. In particular:

- Are the working relationships between the various levels of council (political, executive and staff) and CCOs (and between CCOs themselves) based on mutual trust, respect and confidence?
- Do recruitment processes and job descriptions sufficiently address the need for CCO chief executives and senior managers to respond to council directions and work effectively with senior council managers?
- Do CCO boards, executives and staff demonstrate accountability to Aucklanders, including by consulting sufficiently with Aucklanders and responding sufficiently to their concerns, or could their performance be improved?
- Are CCOs giving adequate public acknowledgement (such as through branding) to council-funded activities?
- Do CCOs give the council quality advice?

The full terms of reference can be found at

20 December 2019
Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback on the Council-controlled Organisation (CCO) Review

Background

- Aotea / Great Barrier Island lies 90km east of Auckland City in the Hauraki Gulf and is Auckland Council’s most remote and isolated area.
- Over 60 per cent of the island is Department of Conservation (DoC) estate; 43 per cent of which is the Aotea Conservation Park.
- The island has a permanent population of 936 residents; 20.5% identified as Māori and the median age for the island is 52.9 years (2018 Census).
- The island has approximately 1000 part-time residents and hosts seasonal tourists and boaties.
- There are three primary schools, one Te Kura correspondence hub and no secondary school.
- The island is one of the lowest socio-economic areas in the Auckland region with a median income of $21,200 (2018 census).
- The island has no reticulated power nor water. Households are off-the-grid powered by generators, solar and wind and collect water by bore, stream-take or rainwater.
- Transport and freight to and from the island is by either plane, a 35-minute flight one way, or by ferry a four-and-a-half-hour trip one way. There is no on-island public transport.
- Telecommunications can be a challenge on the island with many black spots.

Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback

1. The Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board area is unique. We are a rural remote island community and our needs are very different to those on the mainland. As such we have a very different relationship with the CCO organisations as a lot of their ‘core’ business relates to the urban mainland.

2. Our community is best served by adaptable, agile and efficient council service models. The CCO model is not always responsive to local difference as they operate at a regional level. There needs to be an ability to recognise Aotea / Great Barrier’s points of difference for ease of operations for the community and CCO staff. There is also a loss of efficiencies which could be streamlined through alignment with council such as technology platforms, procurement and purchasing systems, and human resource processes.

3. We would seek better transparency and more local board oversight for local projects/programmes to achieve better accountability from CCOs. Also, relationship liaisons that are senior enough to have the ability to provide quality advice, co-ordinate action within different parts of the organisations and exercise proper accountability.

4. The CCO culture exposes a disconnect with the rest of council, entities and the community. There is little evidence of collaboration on projects, little alignment on strategies and policies and very little internal communication.
Feedback by Council-controlled Organisation:

Auckland Transport (AT)

5. Our work programme/relationship with Auckland Transport (AT) is very different to any other board area. We have no public transport, shared roads for pedestrians and cyclists, and no traffic lights. We have two airfields and wharves which provide vital links to the mainland for freight and travel. The mainland links of the domestic terminal at Mangere and Wynyard Quarter are also essential for us. Roading is one of the highest economic providers for the island.

6. AT has a dogmatic approach to its operations and processes. Due to our local differences to the rest of the region we don’t tend to fit the ‘normal’ system or meet the priority measures. Our local projects and requests are often de-prioritised and ignored. This can be due to the fact there is no ability for AT staff to progress things that are different to the mainland. AT as an organisation needs to be more agile and be more local solutions focussed.

7. AT operates on a complaint-driven culture. We would like to see it operate proactively. As local board members we find ourselves escalating complaint requests from the community and spend more time focussing on operational concerns rather than governance concerns.

8. We would like to see more transparency from AT. The organisation does good work but it largely goes unseen.

9. Relationships are key to building trust and engagement. We have a good working relationship with our AT relationship manager who navigates the organisation for the local board and our operational and technical staff. Due to Aotea’s differences it’s important that staff understand the way the island operates and there is always concern about the longevity and tenure of AT staff.

10. We would advocate for our AT relationship liaisons to be senior enough to have the ability to provide quality advice, co-ordinate action within different parts of AT and exercise proper accountability.

11. We would like to see better collaboration between AT and other organisations and council departments particularly Parks, Community Facilities and Environmental Services. Many of our local projects cross departments, e.g. culvert remediation for fish migration, signage, tree planting, paper roads. We find it extremely difficult to get traction on these projects when AT’s strategies don’t align or when they refuse to engage. Another example is the island quarry where we had some issues over the quality of the aggregate which is used for roading. Panuku manages the quarry contract and AT the roading contract. It has taken us over three years to resolve these issues and Panuku and AT have actively not engaged nor collaborated during that time.

12. There is a disconnect with how AT responds to local board concerns and a lack of accountability. We have raised our roading quality concerns for over three years and there has been denial, ‘passing the buck’, and avoidance regarding these concerns. We request more accountability, more oversight and more assurance that our concerns are being addressed and managed.

13. We would like to see better local procurement practices for local efficiencies and better engagement. The island roading contract is coming up for renewal. We raised with AT our concerns around procurement on the island and initiatives in our local board plan for local economic improvements which align to council procurement practices. We were assured we could be involved in discussions around the process for procurement. AT proceeded with their procurement process with no local board engagement and decided on a Sole Supplier contract that excluded our local contractors tendering for.

14. We would like to see better strategy and policy alignments between AT and Auckland council. We’ve noticed that AT makes empty gestures towards the environment, and there never seems
to be budget nor genuine desire for considering the environmental context of their work. For example, culvert remediation for fish migration or future planning for coastal roads due to climate change impacts.

15. AT is known as having a culture of dominance where they don’t listen or engage with the community. We would recommend AT engages more with community groups and establishes relationships. Our Manager, Parking Facilities & Airfields, engages with our community groups and local businesses regularly in relation to wharf and airfield upgrades and as a result the community have more ownership in those spaces. We have more negative feedback in roading where engagement does not take place.

Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku)

16. Panuku manages one site on the island which is the quarry contract. We also engage with Panuku over Wynyard Quarter as our essential ferry service Sealink operates its berthing from there.

17. We had concerns about the quality of the quarry aggregate which is used for roading. Panuku was slow to address our concerns but did accept accountability and seek to address and mitigate. The operating agreement is due for renewal and they have discussed ways to mitigate our concerns through this process and keep us in the loop.

18. We would like to see better collaboration between Panuku and other organisations in particular AT.

19. We have a good working relationship with our Panuku relationship manager who engages with us as required. Due to Aotea’s differences it’s important that staff understand the way the island operates and there is always concern about the longevity and tenure of staff.

Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED)

20. ATEED has had decreased interaction with the island over recent years. ATEED no longer supports local tourism through visitor information centres and is more focussed on regional economic programmes than local economic projects.

21. There has been a ‘loss’ to the ‘local’ of Local Economic Development being removed from Auckland Council and being taken up by ATEED as many programmes are regional and not tailored to our local economic needs. Many of the local board’s local economic projects are supported by other council departments and not ATEED.

22. ATEED’s strategic approach and policies can sometimes appear to be in direct contrast with other council entities like Parks and AT with concepts around promotion, events and leverage. There needs to be more collaboration, engagement and cohesion with other council entities.

Regional Facilities Auckland and Watercare Services

23. Regional Facilities Auckland and Watercare Services has no presence on the island and therefore we will not submit any feedback on these CCOs.
Ratification of Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback on proposed amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework

File No.: CP2020/04819

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To enable the local board to formalise by resolution the feedback provided on proposed amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework.

Whakarāpopototangata matua
Executive summary
2. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved to develop an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region (ENV/2018/11).
3. To meet this requirement, Auckland Council led the development of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework (ACAF), with extensive collaboration and engagement with mana whenua, public, private and voluntary sectors.
4. Local board engagement and insights were sought throughout development of the framework, including meetings and cluster workshops.
5. In June 2019, the Environment and Community Committee approved a consultation draft of ACAF and associated materials.
6. In February 2020, a memorandum was circulated to share key findings from the public consultation and proposed amendments to the draft ACAF to address the feedback received through the consultation.
7. A report on the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board’s 24 March business meeting agenda sought formal feedback from the local board on the amendments. This meeting was cancelled in response to the government’s call to prevent the spread of the COVID-19 virus.
8. This report seeks to formalise the feedback (Attachment A) provided through urgent decision-making process of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) ratify Attachment A as the board’s feedback provided on the proposed amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework submitted on 8 April 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Aotea / Great Barrier feedback on proposed amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ngā kaihaina Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Guia Nonoy - Democracy Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Janine Geddes - Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke Local Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

To: Janine Geddes – Acting Relationship Manager Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke
cc: Izzy Fordham – Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board
    Luke Coles – Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board
From: Jacqui Fyers – Senior Local Board Advisor, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

Subject: Urgent decision request of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board regarding Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework

Purpose
The purpose of this memo is to initially seek the local board relationship manager’s authorisation to commence the urgent decision-making process and if granted, seek formal approval from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) to use the process to make an urgent decision.

The urgent decision being sought needs to be authorised by the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) by signing this memo. The decision required, and the supporting memo, are attached to this memo (Attachment A).

Both memos will be reported as an information item at the next Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board’s business meeting, if the urgent decision-making process proceeds.

Reason for the urgency
The Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework – proposed changes report was submitted to the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board 24 March 2020 business meeting (Attachment A).

The purpose of the report was to outline key amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework and to obtain the local board’s views prior to presentation at the Environment and Climate Change Committee in May 2020.

The local board’s 24 March 2020 business meeting was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown. The next local board business meeting is scheduled for 12 May 2020.

The reason for the urgency is that the local board needs to submit its feedback by 17 April 2020.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) adopt the feedback on the changes to the draft Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework.
Background

1. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved to develop an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region (ENV/2018/11).

2. To meet this requirement, Auckland Council led the development of Te Tāruke-a-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, (“ACAF”) with extensive collaboration and engagement with mana whenua, public, private and voluntary sectors.

3. In June 2019, the Environment and Community Committee approved a consultation draft of ACAF and associated materials.

4. In February 2020, a memo was circulated to all local boards to share key findings from the public consultation on the draft ACAF.

5. In March 2020, a report was submitted to the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board outlining key structural changes proposed for the framework and requesting their feedback on the proposed changes prior to presentation at the Environment and Climate Change Committee in May 2020.

Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Signed by Janine Geddes
Acting Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board Date: 08/04/2020

Approval to use the urgent decision-making process

Izzy Fordham
Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board Date: 08/04/2020

Luke Coles
Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board Date: 08/04/2020
**Aotea / Great Local Board Resolution/s**

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) support the overall intent of a Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework and the proposed changes outlined in the report.

b) strongly support reducing our emissions to reach net zero emissions by 2050. We need to be more assertive in our stance to reach this target and should set clear goals at frequent intervals to reach this target. Therefore, we advocate for two additional goals of 12.5% reduction by mid-2022 and 25% reduction by 2025.

c) support the preparing for climate change pillar but would suggest bolder action than a ‘precautionary’ approach for the region and a change to the tone of the wording as Auckland is in a climate change emergency and it’s imperative that we act fast and act now.

Izzy Fordham  
Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board  
Date: 08/04/2020

Luke Coles  
Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board  
Date: 08/04/2020
Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework - Proposed changes

File No.: CP2020/03204

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. The purpose of this report is to outline key amendments to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework and to obtain the local board’s views.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved to develop an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region (ENV/2018/11).
3. To meet this requirement, Auckland Council led the development of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, (ACAF) with extensive collaboration and engagement with mana whenua, public, private and voluntary sectors.
4. In June 2019, the Environment and Community Committee approved a consultation draft of ACAF and associated materials.
5. In February 2020, a memorandum was circulated to share key findings from the public consultation (Attachments A and B).
6. To address the feedback from the consultation, this report outlines key structural changes proposed for the framework including:
   - introducing three pillars representing the core drivers to which all actions will align (i.e., a place-based approach; emissions reduction; preparing for climate change).
   - moving from eleven key moves to eight priorities to streamline actions and address feedback.
7. It is also proposed that the title of the document is changed from Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan to reflect feedback and the greater focus on the impact of actions against our climate goals and roles in delivery. In addition, this provides certainty for roles and responsibilities with regards to implementation.
8. The proposed changes meet the requirements of a climate action plan as defined by C40 Cities.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) provide feedback on the changes to the draft Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework including:
   - introducing three pillars representing the core drivers for climate action (i.e., a place-based approach; emissions reduction; preparing for climate change)
   - moving from eleven key moves to eight priorities
   - changing the title from Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework to Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan.
Horopaki

Context

9. In February 2018, the Environment and Community Committee resolved to develop an integrated climate action plan for the Auckland region, addressing both emissions reduction (i.e. mitigation) and preparing for the impacts of a changing climate (i.e. adaptation) (ENV/2018/11).

10. To meet this requirement, Auckland Council led the development of Te Tāruke-ā-Tawhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework, (“ACAF”) with extensive collaboration and engagement with mana whenua, public, private and voluntary sectors, reaching hundreds of Aucklanders.

11. Local board engagement and insights were sought throughout development of the framework, including meetings and cluster workshops. A summary of feedback from local boards is available in Attachments C and D.

12. In June 2019, the Environment and Community Committee approved the consultation draft of ACAF and associated materials.

13. In February 2020, a memo was circulated to all local boards to share key findings from the public consultation on the draft ACAF (Attachment A and B).

14. This report provides an overview of key proposed changes to the draft ACAF to address the feedback received through the consultation. Local Board views will be reflected in the final version, which will be reported to the Environment and Climate Change Committee in May 2020.

15. More detailed changes reported in the consultation summary are not repeated here but will be reflected in text changes in the final version.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

16. The proposed changes to ACAF have been informed by consultation feedback received on the draft document. Some key themes that arose include:

- **Urgency and scale of action** needs to be better articulated
- **Lack of clarity on how key moves work together** and how they address our climate goals. In addition it was felt that there are too many.
- **Need to be clearer about roles and responsibilities** with a request for more information on who is responsible for actions at each level.
- **Need for partnership working across sectors** and with central government and mana whenua in particular.
- **Greater focus on equity** across feedback points.
- **Need for a strong Māori voice** with widespread support for working with Māori, using mātauranga Māori and Māori practices in designing and implementing climate action.
- **Need for a system shift** and scale of change required, and to better articulate this with Aucklanders.
- **Need for communication and behaviour change** and a request for campaigns to raise awareness across the region and enable action at an individual level.
- **Need for a significant shift in transport (of all key moves)** with the identified actions supported but a need for these to be delivered at pace and scale.

17. To address this feedback a number of key structural changes are proposed.

18. The first of these is establish three core drivers for action – our ‘pillars’ (Attachment E). These provide greater clarity on the goals of the framework and all actions will align to how they deliver against these goals.
Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board
24 March 2020

- **A Tāmaki response:** This pillar reflects the uniqueness of Auckland and our place-based response to climate change. It is informed by learning from Māori principles and practice, provides a greater focus on equity and a better definition of roles and responsibilities and collective action across governance and sectors.

- **Reducing our emissions:** This pillar reflects the need to provide greater clarity on our emissions target and the need to halve emissions by 2030 and reach net zero emissions by 2050. It improves alignment with the actions and how we will deliver and prioritise emissions reductions.

- **Preparing for climate change:** This pillar enables a greater focus on how we will approach climate change adaptation and take a precautionary approach for the region and also provides greater alignment with the actions.

19. The second structural change is that the eleven key moves are streamlined into eight priorities (Attachment F). This proposed change is to address feedback on where areas are more foundational and therefore should be embedded throughout all priority areas, or where there is confusion and overlap.

- It is proposed that Key Move 3: Make development and infrastructure climate compatible and Key Move 4: Transform existing buildings and places are combined into a single built environment priority area.

- It is proposed that Key Move 1: *Lay the foundation* is embedded into our three pillars in recognition of the cross-cutting nature of the actions.

- Similarly, **Key Move 9: Rangatahi (Youth & Inter-generational equity)** is embedded into pillar 1 to reflect the need to consider actions across the framework.

20. Actions contained within Key Moves 1 and 9 will still be maintained and reflected in the updated document.

21. Actions contained within Key Moves 1-11 will be carried through into Priorities 1-8 (Figure 2) and updated to:
   - clarify any ambiguities that were raised in consultation
   - remove repetition or overlapping actions
   - make additions in response to consultation feedback
   - strengthen alignment to delivery of the three pillars.

22. Overall, the intent of the actions between the Key Moves 1-11 and Priority areas 1-8, remain the same. **Attachment G** briefly summarises how the actions have changed from the consultation document to the updated priority areas.

23. It is also proposed that the title of the document is changed from *Te Tāruke-a-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework* to *Te Tāruke-a-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan* to reflect feedback and the greater focus on the impact of actions against our climate goals and roles in delivery. In addition, this provides certainty for roles and responsibilities with regards to implementation.

24. The proposed changes meet the requirements of a climate action plan as defined by C40 Cities.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

25. The changes identified in this report have been made to reflect feedback received and updated emissions modelling. As such, they will further deliver and strengthen climate action already identified.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views**

26. Regular meetings and workshops took place across the council group for development of the framework.
27. In addition, a working group was established from the outset to provide expertise from across the council group, central government and district health boards.

28. This group has continued to provide input post-consultation and has reviewed and provided input into the proposed changes.

29. In addition, the team has been working closely across the Council group in the development of costed actions for consideration in the Long-term Plan. This process is running concurrently with the finalisation of the plan.

Ngā whakaaweke ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

30. The framework will have implications for all local boards.

31. In June 2018, the Chief Sustainability Office attended workshops of 19 of the 21 local boards and obtained formal email feedback from the other two local boards to identify their main priorities related to climate change. This was followed up in September 2018 at cluster workshops to assess and test a series of ‘must haves’, which were the precursors to the actions included in the draft framework.

32. Priorities included:
   • coastal erosion and inundation concerns
   • affordable and accessible transport
   • long-term infrastructure development to consider climate impacts
   • better stormwater management
   • climate-related education and awareness
   • building community resilience
   • for Auckland Council to lead by example.

33. This report seeks Local Board formal views on proposed changes to the draft Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework outlined in this report. These views will be reflected in the final version.

34. Local boards will be key in taking climate action at a local level. Support will be provided for local board planning and alignment with outcomes.

35. The Chief Sustainability Office and Quality Advice Unit will implement a programme of work for the whole council family to provide guidance and training on how to embed climate action in Local Board plans and what to expect in climate impact statements.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

36. Climate change impacts and associated policy and action will have significant impacts for Māori communities.

37. A Tāmaki and climate change subject matter expert rōpū (group) was established in March 2019 which has been supporting and advising mana whenua and council on climate change issues for Māori and providing direct advice and narrative for the draft framework.

38. A rangatahi Māori and Pasifika rōpū has also been working in partnership with council on this kaupapa to develop rangatahi-focused actions for the framework.

39. A joint mana whenua and Māori expert task group is finalising a Tāmaki and climate change position paper, Te ora ō Tāmaki, which will be used as the bridging document to weave key anchor points into the climate action framework.

40. Anchor points include:
   • weaving the narrative into the framework, specifically the following sections: Climate change and Māori, Impacts on Māori and Developing the Plan with Māori
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

41. Actions within the framework will result in budgetary implications for organisations across the region; identifying and unlocking appropriate funding and financing streams in the future will be critical.

42. Taking climate action will require a range of finance and/or funding mechanisms. For instance, green bonds have been a useful tool for financing council-owned assets such as electric trains but investment in clean tech may require crowd-sourcing, grants or venture capital.

43. To support this, a climate finance work package is underway to identify partnerships and broader funding mechanisms across actions such as bonds, grants, equity instruments and public/private partnerships.

44. The final framework and specific Auckland Council actions being developed will need to inform on-going Long-term Plan discussions to support delivery and avoid costs associated with inaction, such as increased maintenance costs and infrastructure failures through to missed opportunities to Auckland’s economy in delivering the transition.

45. Not all actions within council’s remit will require additional budget. Some actions can result in long-term cost avoidance – for example electrifying fleets can reduce fuel and maintenance costs. Some actions could require existing funds to be redirected if priorities change.

46. Also, not all actions will require funding, for example those related to advocacy to central government or expert input into actions led by other organisations.

47. The costs associated with different council-specific actions will consider funding sources as described above.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

48. No high or extreme risks have been identified with the proposed approach.

49. Moderate risks exist, including:

- preparing for the implications of climate change may not comply with current rules and regulations
- potential strategic risk with non-alignment with New Zealand Government direction and policy
- potential governance risk in shared leadership and ownership of the framework across sectors.

50. A risk mitigation plan has been developed to address the above, including targeted engagement approaches, a legal review of the final framework, on-going partnership with central government and establishment of clear governance structures for the implementation of the framework.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

51. Workshops will be held in April 2020 with the Environment and Climate Change Committee and Independent Māori Statutory Board to discuss updated framework text, and the final text will be presented to the Environment and Climate Change Committee for approval in May 2020.

52. The draft digital plan layout will be workshopped with the Environment and Climate Change Committee in June 2020 and finalised in July 2020.
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To retrospectively adopt the formal feedback submitted by the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board on the following:
   - Inter-regional marine pest pathway management proposal
   - Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity
   - Review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 and related legislation
   - Justice Committee’s inquiry into the 2019 local elections and liquor licensing trust and recent energy trust elections

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board provided formal feedback on four government consultations in February and March 2020.

3. Informal public consultation on potential approaches for inter-regional marine pest pathway management was undertaken between 18 March and 24 May 2019 in four regions: Northland, Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty. The consultation results showed a preference among submitters for consistent rules for boat hull fouling across the four regions, and a preference for boat owners to maintain a clean hull at all times.

4. Auckland Council staff are currently progressing with an options analysis to identify a preferred option for marine pest pathway management and are collating further supporting evidence through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity working group. The board submitted its formal feedback on Monday 2 March 2020 (Attachment A).


6. The Ministry for Health is reviewing New Zealand’s legislation relating to death, burial, cremation and funerals in New Zealand for the purpose of updating relevant legislation so that it is modernised, fit-for-purpose, reflects general trends in society and is compatible with other legislative documents.

7. The affected legislation includes the Burial and Cremation Act 1964, Cremation Regulations 1973 and the Health (Burial) Regulations 1946. Formal local board feedback on this review was submitted on 28 February 2020 and appended to the Auckland Council submission (Attachment C).

8. In December 2019, the Justice Committee notified its inquiry into the 2019 local elections. Submissions close on 29 February 2020. The board submitted its formal feedback on the Justice Committee’s inquiry into the 2019 local elections and liquor licensing trust and recent energy trust elections on Wednesday 19 February 2020 through the urgent decision process (Attachment D).
Te tūtohunga
Recommendations
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) adopt the input submitted on the inter-regional marine pest pathway management (Attachment A of the report).

b) adopt the submitted feedback on Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (Attachment B of the report).


d) adopt the submitted feedback on the Justice Committee’s inquiry into the 2019 local elections and liquor licensing trust and recent energy trust (Attachment D of the report).
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Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board input on the inter-regional marine pest pathway management

Background

- Aotea Great Barrier Island lies 90km east of Auckland City in the Hauraki Gulf and is Auckland Council’s most remote and isolated area.
- Over 60 per cent of the island is Department of Conservation (DoC) estate; 43 per cent of which is the Aotea Conservation Park.
- The island has a permanent population of 936 residents (2018 Census)
- Aotea is a popular destination for recreational boaters and tourists in the summer season with the most popular areas being Whangaparapara and Port Fitzroy harbour.
- In the last few years a number of invasive international pest species have been identified in the waters around our island including Sabella spallanzanii (Mediterranean fanworm) and Charybdis japonica (Asian Paddle Crab).
- There is currently no local enforcement for marine biosecurity nor hull cleaning facility. A feasibility study for an on-island hull cleaning facility has recently been completed.

Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback

1. We fully support an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan
2. We fully support the overall biosecurity goal and objectives that are set out in the Sea Change, Tai Timu Tai Pari (Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan) to identify, manage and mitigate threats to the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park from pests and diseases through prevention, early warning and detection, eradication, and control measures.
3. Aotea / Great Barrier Island has much to protect and a lack of local oversight and education makes us extremely vulnerable, as we know, from the recent increase in new pest species discoveries.
4. We identify the need for an island-based presence to support marine biosecurity monitoring and surveillance efforts to be able to detect and respond quickly to new introduced species.
5. Aotea / Great Barrier Island will need protection, new infrastructure and compliance capability on-island urgently.
6. We request that a hull cleaning facility be further investigated for the island alongside implementation of an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan for local and emergency use.
7. It is known that Aotea is often a gateway or steppingstone for visitors travelling to other regions, including Northland, Coromandel and Bay of Plenty, so there are potential wider biosecurity and economic benefits in providing an on-island hull cleaning facility.
8. We have serious biosecurity concerns from the dumping of marine and related waste in our waters.
9. The rules currently allow boats to move into deeper waters to remove foul and this is unacceptable as it increases the risk of invasive species and biodiversity threats.
10. This unacceptable activity also threatens our fishing stocks, ecosystems and habitats and adversely impacts on the matauranga, mauri, wairua and general well-being of our marine environment.
11. We request that all hull-cleaning be performed at licenced areas and not on beaches and deep waters.
12. Considering the real threat to our marine environment, with the geographical distance from the mainland, it is important that an on-island hull cleaning facility be established together with a management/monitoring/surveillance facility.
Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback on proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity

Background

- Aotea / Great Barrier Island lies 90km east of Auckland City in the Hauraki Gulf and is Auckland Council’s most remote and isolated area.
- Over 60 per cent of the island is Department of Conservation (DoC) estate; 43 per cent of which is the Aotea Conservation Park.
- The island has a permanent population of 936 residents (2018 Census)
- Aotea Great Barrier Local Board Plan 2017 has an outcome where ‘Our environment is protected and enhanced’
- ‘Aotea Great Barrier Island: A world of its own, where people and place are woven in a tapestry of ecological richness’ - Aotea Great Barrier Island Ecology Vision statement 2016
- The island is free of possums and mustelids.
- Aotea is home to many of New Zealand’s endemic species including Chevron skink, Hochstetters frog, Black petrel, Paua slug and smaller banded Dotterel.

Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback

1. Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board supports the overall intent of a National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity to protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity to reach levels of biodiversity abundance.

2. We acknowledge the reference to the Treaty of Waitangi, however the Treaty principle of partnership should be explicitly mentioned - particularly as the policy is ‘Indigenous’ Biodiversity as opposed to non-indigenous/introduced.

3. There is no mention of the Wai 262 Claim or recommendations (Flora and Fauna claim) – some consideration/inclusion should be noted.

4. There is also no reference to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (parts 3, 24, 25, 26, 27).

The New Zealand Law Commission is currently undertaking review of the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 to determine whether the legislation is in its current form meets public expectations. This short note firstly provides some context before offering some quick points relevant to the Aotea community.

Background:
Aotea is an island community with an average population of 1000 in a context where 60% of the land is administered by Te Papa Atawhai. The remoteness of Aotea has historically resulted in residents undertaking the action of burial on or near traditional homesteads and some families gifting land for burials adjacent to existing burial sites. The number of burials each year is relatively low with three last year. In view of this unique character of Aotea we have the following comments on the Burial and Cremation Act review.

Legislative provision:
1. To support eco burials.
2. To enable burials on private land as long as necessary consents have been obtained.
3. To support opportunities to establish crematoriums – as there are no crematoriums on Aotea.
4. To support the re-interment by iwi of their kōiwi when required
5. That recognizes a tikanga process in the event a burial dispute arises where two or more iwi are involved deferring to the Maori Land Court if required.
6. To reflect a consent application process to scatter ashes – this is important due to the pristine nature of the Aotea environment
7. That recognizes the importance of tikanga Maori processes
Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback on the Justice Committee’s inquiry into the 2019 local elections and liquor licensing trust and recent energy trust elections

Context

- Aotea Great Barrier Island lies 30km east of Auckland City in the Hauraki Gulf and is Auckland Council’s most remote and isolated area.
- Over 60% of the island is Department of Conservation (DoC) estate; 43% per cent of which is the Aotea Conservation Park.
- The island has a permanent population of 936 residents (2018 Census).
- Almost half (44% per cent) of households were one-person households; this is a high proportion when compared with the regional average of 19 per cent.
- There is no public transport and transport to and from the mainland is by either plane, a 35-minute flight one way, or by ferry a four-and-a-half-hour trip one way.
- The island has no reticulated power nor water.

Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback

Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board supports Auckland Council’s submission on the Justice Committee’s inquiry into the 2019 local elections and liquor licensing trust and recent energy trust elections.

The local board would like to note the following feedback:

1. We support the ‘Localism’ approach. We believe that elections are more effective when the local communications, local people and local ‘character’ are used. While we are supportive of investigations into an Electoral Commission to conduct the process of local elections, we would not want this aspect of localism to be lost.
2. Connectivity can be a challenge on the island with many black spots. We request that digital platforms for elections and communications remain as one method among a range of methods including print.
3. We support simplification of the voting documents to make voting easier including the same electoral system.
4. We support aligning the Local Electoral Act 2001 with the Local Government Act 2002 regarding the disclosure of candidates having serious criminal convictions.
Local Ward Area Councillor's Update

File No.: CP2020/03285

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide an opportunity for the local ward area councillor to update the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board on Governing Body issues and other points of interest to the local board.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. Standing Orders 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 provides provision in the local board meeting for local ward area councillors to update their local board counterparts on regional matters of interest to the local board.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) receive the written report update from the Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor, Pippa Coom.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Pippa Coom Councillor Report – Waitematā and Gulf Ward

General update

- My Councillor report, covering the period from 31 January until 29 February 2020, is prepared for the Waitematā, Waiheke and Aotea Great Barrier Local Boards’ March business meeting agendas.
- The purpose of my report is to share key information with the local boards including governing body activities, attendance at events, conferences and meetings, regional consultations, media activities and ward issues I have been following up on. I also declare all gifts in my report regardless of value.

Governing Body and Committee meetings*

The minutes for all meetings are available on the Auckland Council website here.

Planning Committee on 4 February 2020

- Approved Auckland Council’s submission on the Land Transport (Rail) legislation bill
- Approved approach to the Auckland Council’s submission on the Urban Development Bill

Governing Body on 12 and 27 February 2020

- Adopted the Draft Tūpuna Maunga Operational Plan 2020/2021
- Adopted the consultation material and supporting documentation for Annual Budget 2020/2021
- Adopted the amendments to the Revenue and Financing Policy
- Approved the draft submission to the Justice Committee’s inquiry into the 2019 Local Elections and Liquor Licensing Trust Elections, and Recent Energy Trust Elections
- Approved the submission on funding options for Fire and Emergency New Zealand

CCO Oversight Committee on 18 February

- Received the updated report on the CCO Review work programme and requested the report be circulated to local boards

Auckland Domain Committee on 25 February

- Requested staff explore costs and possible funding to implement recommendations in the master plan
- Requested staff investigate options to meet the shortfall for the Accessible Improvement Programme (aiming to improve walking and cycling in the Domain)

*Note: This is not intended to be a complete summary of all governing body and committee meetings. Refer https://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/ for full details
Hauraki Gulf Forum

- The Hauraki Gulf Forum is a statutory body, which promotes and facilitates integrated management and the protection and enhancement of the Hauraki Gulf, under the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000.
- Hauraki Gulf Forum members are representatives of the Ministers of Conservation, Fisheries and Māori Development, elected representatives of Auckland Council (7 in total including representatives from Waiheke Local Board and Aotea Great Barrier), Waikato Regional Council, Thames-Coromandel, Hauraki, Waikato and Matamata-Piako District Councils and 6 representatives of the tangata whenua of the Hauraki Gulf and its islands appointed by the Minister of Conservation.
- At the first Hauraki Gulf Forum meeting of the term on 17 February the historic decision was made to adopt a co-governance model with co-chairs (one elected by all forum members and one co-chair recommended by the tangata whenua representatives). I was delighted to be elected one of the co-chairs.
- The ‘State of our Gulf 2020’ report released on 27 February by the Hauraki Gulf Forum puts a spotlight on the ongoing environmental degradation facing the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park. (Attachment 1: Media Release from the Hauraki Gulf Forum: The Hauraki Gulf is hurting and needs our help)

Events and other meetings

- Attended a range of meetings with the Environment and Climate Change Committee Chair in my role as Deputy Chair
- I attend a weekly chairs’ catch up with the Mayor and a fortnightly Mayor and Councillors catch up (photo right of the first Mayor and Councillors catch up of the year held on 3 February)
- I have a fortnightly meeting for transport updates relating to ward issues
- Attended the LGNZ National Council meeting on 10 February and the Metro Sector meeting (as alternate to the Mayor) on 14 February
- Attended the Waiheke Local Board business meeting on 18 February to give my Councillor’s update
- Met with the Chair of the Environment and Climate Change committee to finalise the Council’s submission on the Reducing waste: A more effective landfill levy paper
- On Friday 21 February I hosted a Councillor “clinic” on Waiheke with booked appointment times including meeting Cycle Action Waiheke (photo below), caught up with the Waiheke Community Art Gallery Director, enjoyed a delicious Kai Conscious
Cafe lunch, got taken on a site visit to the WWII lookout and historic buildings, popped by the Whitaker’s music museum (gate crashed MP Nikki Kaye’s meeting!) and wrapped up the day meeting local board chair Cath Handley.

- The Auckland City Centre Advisory Board meeting on 26 February confirmed Heart of the City’s CEO Viv Beck as chair.
- Met with the CCO Review panel on 28 February.
- Throughout the month I meet constituents on request and request a range of meetings to follow up on issues raised with me.

I also attended the following events:

- Official Opening on 4 February of Te Ipu Kōreko o Maungawhau and Whau Cate on Maungawhau / Mount Eden hosted by the Tōpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority (photo right with Councillors Bartley, Filipaina and Casey and members of the Authority)
- Waitangi Day ki Ōkahu 2020 festival hosted by Ngāti Whāitu Orēkei
- Farewell reception for Stephen Jacobi from New Zealand China Council at the Northern Club on 10 February
- Scales to Tails dinner hosted by Peter Gordon at the invite of The Sugar Club and Ora King
- Whales Tales Auckland 2021 launch at the Auckland Art Gallery on 11 February
- Wynyard Quarter Celebration hosted by Willis Bond & Co on 12 February
- Opening by the PM on 13 February of Te Whare Hīnātore, City Mission’s new transitional housing programme, assisting wāhine experiencing homelessness
- Sod turning for the portal where the boring machine will launch to build
the City Rail Link tunnels connecting Mt Eden Station to the new Aotea Station (photo above with Minister of Transport Phil Twyford, the Mayor and elected representatives)

- Opening night of Roger Hall’s play Winding Up at the invitation of Auckland Theatre Company on 13 February
- Sod turning for the start of the Tamaki Drive cycleway on 16 February (photo right the Mayor and Minister of Transport Phil Twyford with the spades)
- Waitemata Local Board’s Myers Park Medley festival on 16 February
- Opening of the Auckland Fringe Festival 2020 on 17 February at Caluzzi Cabaret
- Launch by the Mayor of City Hop’s EV vehicles at the Crowne Plaza on 20 February
- Auckland Museum Medals on 26 February
- Media briefing for the release of the State of the Gulf report by the Minister of Conservation Eugenie Sage MP and two of the authors. The report is a major piece of work led by the former Hauraki Gulf Chair John Meeuwsen and Deputy Chair Moana Tamaariki-Pohe.
- Participated on the panel of the Auckland Conversations “Gift of the Gulf” at the RNZYC on 27 February (photo right)
- A walk of the Waitemata Local Board boundary on 29 February with Living Streets Aotea’s Andy Smith, continuing the tradition of starting the new term with Beating the Bounds - a walk of the boundary to ensure neighbouring local boards haven’t “encroached” over the last three years and to check out projects along the way. I walked with local board members until the point on Newton Road (photo right) where my ward boundary diverges and then walking the shared Ōrākei boundary with Cr Desley Simpson to Tamaki Drive
- Ponsonby Road Street Festival on 29 February
• Opening Covert Theatre at the invitation of The Yes and Trust (photo below with Mayor Phil Goff, Sir Bob Harvey, Covert Theatre Trustee Mike Hutchinson and founder Wade Jackson).

Regional grants

• The Regional Event Fund and the Regional Community Development Grants were allocated at the Parks, Arts, Community and Events committee on 13 February.

Regional consultation topics

• The Annual Budget 2020/21 consultation started on 21 February and will continue until 22 March. Have Your Say events are being held across the region.
• The independent panel appointed to review how well Auckland Council’s CCOs are working is hosting drop-in sessions across the region so Aucklanders can provide their feedback into the review. Consultation on the review closes on 22 March.
• The engagement and consultation documents are available at akhaveyoursay.nz.

Significant issues and ward issues (as at 29 February)

Leys Institute Library Building

In response to a planned “save the Leys Institute building” protest on 26 February I provided this update:

I appreciate the considerable concerns regarding the sudden closure of the much-loved Leys Institute buildings and the desire to see the restoration happen as fast as possible and library services resumed.

I am not able to attend the protest but want to provide a reassurance that I am not aware of any part of council that considers demolition to be a viable or desirable option for a class A scheduled building (even if it were possible under the Leys bequest).
The report on the options will be going to the local board in June. I am absolutely committed to the restoration of the building and the return of library services (temporary services are due to open in mid-March at 14 Jervois Road). My role is to work with the local board to ensure the project secures what is likely to be a considerable budge, from the governing body (Councillors and Mayor).

On-going water issues during the dry weather

- The lack of rainfall over summer has been particularly hard for Aucklanders on tank water. Updates have been provided regularly on the support available during the dry weather.
- Watercare is monitoring water levels and reports that, with nearly 65 per cent storage in its dams, the municipal water supply is stable. It is running a campaign to remind customers to be waterwise during dry periods when demand is high.
- An advice brochure for tank owners is being distributed via council’s community networks and is available to download from OurAuckland.

COVID-19 (novel coronavirus)

The Mayor has been in regular contact with the Director General of Health and is providing regular updates. Since the first case arrived in New Zealand the main message is that Aucklanders should be prepared but should not panic – they should take sensible measures and contact health officials if they are worried.

- There is no reason for people to change the way they go about their daily lives
- The first case is being well managed, and the patient is in a stable condition
- Ministry of Health and the airport are moving to meet everyone coming off flights to give people information on what to do should they feel unwell

Together we’re powerful - containment starts with you. Our greatest enemy right now is not the virus itself - it’s fear, rumors & stigma. And our greatest assets are facts, reason and solidarity.

Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, World Health Organisation
Transport

Together with the Local Board transport portfolio lead Graeme Gunthorp I have been following up on a number of transport issues that I would like to see Auckland Transport resolve including:

- Car transporters unloading illegally on Great North Road
- Enforcement of car parking on berms and on footpaths. I dispute AT's position on this issue and do not agree that signage is required before AT can take enforcement action.
- Eastbound bus lanes on Customs Street that are needed as a result of the ongoing closure of Lower Albert Street.

The positive resolution by Auckland Transport of issues I have raised on behalf of constituents includes:

- confirmation that traffic calming on Clifton Road is going ahead as part of the Herne Bay walking and cycling project
- the installation of new safety barriers on the Western Springs Shared path (photo right)

Media

- I was quoted in the Hauraki Gulf Forum media release: The Hauraki Gulf is hurting and needs our help
- My regular Ponsonby News column was published in the March edition
- I wrote an OpEd for the NZ Herald about the positive side of seeing so many orange road cones in Auckland. Humble orange cone means the future is coming

Disclosures

There are no gift disclosures this month. Invitations to events are all noted above.

Recommendation

That this report be received.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Media Release from the Hauraki Gulf Forum: The Hauraki Gulf is hurting and needs our help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ponsonby News March column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Our Auckland version of the NZ Herald Op Ed published on 26 February: Humble orange cone means the future is coming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 1

The Hauraki Gulf is hurting and needs our help

Published: 27 February 2020

Tāiko / Black petrel on Aotea / Great Barrier Island. Photo credit Shaun Lee

Hauraki Gulf Forum
Tikapa Moana
Te Moananui-ā-Toi

The ‘State of our Gulf 2020’ report released today by the Hauraki Gulf Forum puts a spotlight on the ongoing environmental degradation facing the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park at a time when the eyes of the world will soon be on the Gulf for the 36th America’s Cup.

Hauraki Gulf Forum Member Ms Moana Tamaariki-Pohe, Deputy Chairperson of the Forum during the report’s production, says that the Gulf continues to need our help.

“At the same time, the tide may be starting to turn,” says newly elected Forum Co-Chairperson Pippa Coom.

“The restoration of Gulf islands is proving to be a spectacular success and has enabled the reintroduction of native species such as the wētāpunga and kōkako. Efforts to re-establish shellfish beds are also gathering pace, and, frankly, more of us than ever before are rolling up our sleeves and getting our butts wet to help restore and protect our big blue backyard.”
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Compared with when the Marine Park was established in 2000

There is some good news:

- Slower ship speeds have helped prevent ship strikes of Bryde’s whales. Pest eradication on the motu / islands of the Gulf, and native revegetation efforts, have been spectacularly successful – allowing the return of native species like the wētāpunga, tuatara and many endangered birds like the kōkako, takahē and kiwi. Many more people from all walks of life are now playing an active role in restoring and protecting the Gulf. And much more is now known about the unique environment of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park, thanks in part to State of our Gulf Reports by the Hauraki Gulf Forum – this 2020 edition is the sixth such report.

However, environmental degradation continues:

- Crayfish / kōura are now hard to find in heavily fished areas of the Gulf. Sediment, nutrients, chemicals and plastics continue to wash into the water, though efforts to improve water quality are gathering pace. Both seabirds and shorebirds have seen sharp rises in the number of species classified as threatened. Cockles / tuangi numbers have declined in every area where gathering is allowed year-round. The number of marine pests has more than doubled, with the arrival of invasive species like the Mediterranean fanworm. Kina barrens are replacing once lush kelp forests. And urban and coastal sprawl has expanded, driven by higher than expected population growth, meaning wild places are harder to find.

Kōura / Crayfish at Tawharanui Marine Reserve. Photo credit - Shaun Lee
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There is also mixed news on the fishing front:

- Total commercial fishing catch in the Gulf has increased compared with 20 years ago, while total recreational catch has fallen. Fish stocks, overall, remain low though some are now rebuilding such as snapper / tāmure and tarakihi.

What is the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park?

The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park New Zealand’s first marine park.

It’s a big park, stretching from Te Arai in the north to Waihi in the south.

At 1.2 million hectares, or 20 times the size of Lake Taupō, it includes the Waitematā Harbour, Gulf Islands, Firth of Thames and the east coast of the Coromandel Peninsula.

The Park was established by special legislation in February 2000. This year marks its 20th anniversary.

It is the seabird capital of the world and a whale superhighway.

What is the Hauraki Gulf Forum?

The Hauraki Gulf Forum is a statutory body charged with the promotion and facilitation of integrated management and the protection and enhancement of the Hauraki Gulf.

The Forum has representation on behalf of the tangata whenua of the Hauraki Gulf and its islands, the Ministers of Conservation, Fisheries and Māori Development, and elected representatives from Auckland Council (including Aotea Great Barrier Island and Waiheke Island Local Boards), Waikato Regional Council, and the Waikato, Hauraki, Thames-Coromandel and Matamata-Piako District Councils.

The Forum is required to present triennial reports regarding the state of the environment of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park.

The 2020 State of our Gulf report is available at gulfjournal.org.nz and haurakiguflforum.org.nz
Pippa Coom: Councillor for Waitemata & Gulf

It would not have gone unnoticed that there are a huge number of projects underway, not just Downtown but also locally.

The $37.8m St Marys Bay area water quality improvement separation project championed by the Herne Bay Residents and St Marys Bay Associations kicked off before Christmas. Storm water improvements are popping up in part to the additional targeted rate funding. An example of the new approach to designing places to linger in rather than car-dominated thoroughfares, is the Daily Street enhancement that has recently fully re-opened.

The cycling improvements in Herne Bay are part of a wider cycling network that will connect to Westmere and Pt Chev and eventually over the Auckland Harbour Bridge. In early February, the New Zealand Transport Agency announced that what has been known as “Skypaths” is now one section in the newly named ‘Northern Pathway’, all the way to Albany. The Government is investing $360 million in the first section as part of the $6.8 billion NZ Upgrade Programme, and construction is expected to start next year.

Auckland is playing catch-up after decades of under-investment, poor planning and short-sighted decision making. Auckland Council is making progress on essential work like improving the ferry infrastructure, putting an end to poni going into the harbour and ensuring the Quay Street seawall doesn’t collapse. We are going to see a lot more people friendly, safe and vibrant environments as the city changes and grows.

The Quay Street enhancement is now halfway to completion and will be fully opened in time for America’s Cup. It is going to be a stunning street with wide footpaths, rain gardens, heaps more trees and connected to two new public spaces. The new Ferry Basin open space will also be complete by December 2020 once the seawall is rebuilt, was named Te Whauanga by the Waitemata Local Board last term. An example of the new approach to designing places to linger in rather than car-dominated thoroughfares, is the Daily Street enhancement that has recently fully re-opened.

All this construction work is being undertaken in partnership with Council’s CCOs including Auckland Transport, Panuku and Watercare. CCOs are independent council-owned organisations that are overseen by their own board of directors, chief executive and staff. A review is currently underway of the CCOs a decade since they were first established. An independent panel led by Miriam Dearn is investigating how well the CCOs are working. You can give your feedback about the CCOs until 22 March. This consultation is underway at the same time as the Annual Budget and Local Board priorities 2020/21 Have You Say process. Details on council’s website. (PIPPA COOM) [10]

Contact Pippa Coom via pippa.coom@aucklandcity.govt.nz
Orange road cones show Auckland is getting stuff done

Published: 28 February 2020

Councillor Pippa Coom

Quietly, over the last six years, Willis Bond & Co has been building a new neighbourhood of award-winning apartments at Wynyard Quarter. Private investment has followed the public spend to create people-orientated spaces designed for modern urban living. This "placemaking" includes wide footpaths, new plazas and parks, rain gardens, activated event spaces and lush ngahere.

I was fortunate to attend a recent celebration hosted by their Managing Director Mark McGuiness to welcome the new residents and thank those involved in the development. Inevitably, the conversation turned to Auckland’s prolific orange road cones.

Orange cones have become a convenient focus of rage for some commentators in Auckland.

In Mark’s view, the cones are a positive symbol that the city is getting stuff done. They show that progress is underway, and the city is improving after decades of under-investment, poor planning and short-sighted decision making. I think of it as Auckland moving from a town with a cowboy mentality focused on short-term gains, to Tāmaki Makaurau, a truly international city with a uniquely indigenous point of difference.

We’re working to stop poo from entering our harbour and we’re getting on with essential work like improving our ferry infrastructure and ensuring the Quay Street sea wall doesn’t collapse. We’re delivering new public spaces and creating the right conditions for new residential, retail and office investment. I don’t think it makes sense for any of this construction to be slowed down or stopped.
ATTACHMENT 3

When the cones are removed from Quay Street a stunning street will be revealed; one that will never go back to a four-lane road. Just as other international cities have embraced their waterfront, Quay Street, together with a new downtown square, will be our welcome mat for a plethora of international events happening in 2021. Slow speed, pedestrian-focused environments will become the new normal in our city centre.

It is time for Aucklanders to move on from the myths that “public transport is rubbish” and “no one uses cyclelanes”. All the evidence (that could fill a separate column) points to the opposite conclusion.

We are no different to people in other international cities. We embrace the most convenient, reliable and affordable transport option. We jump on bikes when we feel safe. We shop, relax, linger and spend in inviting places where people – not cars – are king. Wynyard Quarter was the “guinea pig” for perfecting placemaking in Auckland, but this best practice approach is now spreading benefits across the city.

It is also time to drop “CBD” and instead refer to it as the city centre as it has a growing residential population, with more than 33,000 people already calling it home.

Our city centre generates a fifth of Auckland’s GDP and over 130,000 people work there. Our biggest infrastructure project, City Rail Link, will double the number of people who live within 30 minutes of the city centre when it opens in 2024.

Along with our construction partners, we have to do more as a council to share the vision of what is happening in the city centre so Aucklanders can see the wider benefits. We need to ensure traffic management is exemplary, projects are coordinated and efficiently managed, and that businesses and residents are looked after through the construction. We must help all those who need to travel into the city regardless of transport mode.

Collectively as Aucklanders, we’ve got to put the orange cone “chaos” into perspective. When I recently missed an early morning flight it wasn’t cycleway construction that delayed me getting to the airport. It was the traffic I created, other traffic on the road, and a minor crash. These types of delays are so commonplace Aucklanders consider this a “normal” inconvenience.
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I agree with Mark that we shouldn’t turn orange road cones into the enemy. When the first stage of Wynyard Quarter opened in August 2011, Aucklanders were amazed at the welcoming transformation and flocked to the waterfront. As parts of Downtown are completed and pedestrians are welcomed back, I have no doubt that we’ll get the same reaction.

Delivering people-friendly, safe and vibrant environments continues not just in Downtown but across the city. We can all feel proud at the stuff that is getting done. The future is in progress

First published in the NZ Herald
Pippa Coom Councillor Report – Waitematā and Gulf Ward

This is an extraordinary Councillor report covering the period from 13 March 2020 until 28 April. It is prepared for the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board business meeting to be held on 12 May.

The purpose of my report is to provide an update on the key governing body decisions as the Covid-19 crisis escalated and during the lockdown as well as my focus during this time as Councillor.

Auckland Council response to the Covid-19 crisis

Following the WHO declaration of an official pandemic on 11 March the first indication of the seriousness of the situation was the need to cancel the Pasifika Festival on 13 March due to concerns about the risk of the virus spreading into the Pacific Islands. As more cases were confirmed Auckland Council closed pools, libraries, galleries and other community facilities on 20 March. The next day the Government introduced a four-level alert system to help combat Covid-19. The Prime Minister announced New Zealand would go to Alert Level 4 at 23.59 on 25 March 2020. A state of emergency was declared putting the country into lockdown for a minimum of four weeks. People were told to stay home to save lives and only go out for essential work, supplies and local recreation.

It is an unprecedented situation that is evolving every day as we get to grips with the new “normal”. First and foremost, Council is taking the advice of the Ministry of Health, which is leading New Zealand’s Covid-19 response.

Essential Council services continue, including storm water infrastructure repair and maintenance and water treatment, animal welfare management, biosecurity and hazard monitoring. Auckland’s kerbside rubbish and recycling are considered essential services and will continue as usual. Unfortunately, there is currently no market for recycled paper so temporarily it will be going to landfill (paper and cardboard can still go out in the recycling bin). The inorganic collection has been postponed.

Over 300 Council facilities have closed including recreation centres, pools, community centres. Parks and reserves remain open for local recreation but playgrounds and recreational facilities in parks are closed. Most public toilets are closed although some remain open for essential workers and rough sleepers.

Auckland Libraries e-lending services like audiobooks, video streaming services and learning databases like Lynda.com continue to be available for free and have been extended. Library fines for overdue books have been suspended and gym memberships are on hold.

Road maintenance undertaken by Auckland Transport is considered an essential service so continues during the lockdown. However, this is being limited to only that maintenance required to keep the network safe and operational during this period.
Council staff have been deployed to help Aucklanders experiencing hardship as a result of the lockdown. Deliveries of essential supplies including food and toiletries began on 1 April via an 0800 22 22 96 phone number provided for those needing assistance with accessing essential supplies (the service also covers Aotea Great Barrier and Waiheke islands). Photo right of re-deployed council workers preparing welfare parcels.

Auckland Council and homeless agencies have been working together to ensure there is accommodation, food and essential support available for rough sleepers.

The Our Auckland website was transformed quickly to provide a one stop shop for all Auckland Council related Covid-19 information. Just before the Easter break a further plea was made to boaties to not visit the islands against level 4 lockdown rules. While New Zealand Police and other agencies have reminded boaties to stay off the water during the lockdown, unfortunately some continued to create issues by visiting Aotea Great Barrier.

Local board chairs supported by local board members have been on the front line dealing directly with a range of challenging issues in their communities especially at the outset of the lockdown. I have been in regular communication with chairs in my ward and available to follow up on issues as requested.

An emergency management fund established on 24 March was accessed quickly to guarantee one flight per day to Aotea Great Barrier to ensure essential services, products and workers continue to be available to all residents (Attachment 1). A service for essential supplies was also put in place for Rakino Island.

Work is underway to identify potential cuts to expenditure required due to the substantial reduction in non-rates revenue caused by the recession. Steps have already been taken to reduce spending on external contracts and contract staff in non-essential services, as part of plans to manage the financial impact of Covid-19 (Refer Attachment 2 regarding the Annual Budget 20/21).

On 17 April the chief executives of council and its five council-controlled organisations announced they will take a pay cut of 20 per cent for the next six months. In addition, board chairs, directors and senior executives have volunteered a range of reductions.

Regular Covid-19 briefings for councillors have been held since 18 March. At the time of writing New Zealand has moved into Alert Level 3. Facilities remain closed but a number of roles have re-commenced and construction projects have resumed with more restrictive practices in place. Planning for the post Covid-19 recovery is underway.
Governing Body meetings

The minutes for all meetings are available on the Auckland Council website here.

On 19 March the Finance and Performance Committee meeting received the Auckland Council Group and Auckland Council quarterly performance report for the period ended 31 December 2019; a Financial update on current status due to Covid-19 as an extraordinary item, and a presentation from the Eden Park Trust Board noting the uncertainty of future financial projections due to Covid-19. (this was the last meeting with all members in attendance at the Town Hall prior to lockdown)

On 24 March, an extraordinary meeting of the Governing Body met to discuss Governing Body decision-making continuity during the Covid-19 response period. It was agreed unanimously that members could attend any meetings of the Governing Body or its committees by audio or audiovisual link, and be counted as present, during the Covid-19 response period.

A temporary Emergency Committee of the whole of Governing Body was established with a quorum of 2, with others participating via audio link, which meets weekly and includes 2 members of IMSB. All functions and powers of the Governing Body have been delegated to this committee other than those in Audit and Risk.

We also agreed to establish a Covid-19 contingency fund of $22.5 million for any urgent expenditure required to respond to the pandemic or its impacts.

Following this meeting Governing Body members had to quickly adapt to skewing into meetings, and although there have been a few teething issues, in general the process is working well to maintain good governance.

On 26 March Governing Body met and endorsed the proposed membership for the Heritage Advisory Panel and the updated terms of reference. 3 items were deferred, being Referred from the Audit and Risk Committee - Health, Safety and Wellbeing Update - emerging risks and issues, Summary of Governing Body information memoranda and briefings (including the Forward Work Programme) - 26 March 2020 and Review of remuneration of independent members of the Audit and Risk Committee which included a report in the confidential section.

On 2 April the Emergency Committee met with all members attending via electronic link. The meeting considered 2 items of extraordinary business. The meeting delegated all emergency powers and roles to the Group Controller and ratified all decisions made by the controller since declaration of a state of emergency. We were also provided with a report on activities undertaken by council to support the wider community in response to Covid-19. A verbal update was provided on the Summary of Infrastructure criteria for “shovel ready” projects announced by Government. Reappointment of board members to City Rail Link Ltd and Haumaru Housing was considered in the confidential section.

On 9 April the Emergency Committee received a written and verbal briefing from Ian Maxwell, Director Executive Programmes and Kate Crawford, Group Controller, Auckland Emergency Management. We unanimously approved Auckland Council’s list of ‘shovel-ready’ infrastructure projects and programmes to be submitted to Crown Infrastructure Partners Ltd and delegated the final prioritisation of 20 projects to the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, IMSB Chair and four Councillors. (the final list of 73 ‘shovel-ready’ projects submitted to GIP was announced on 14 April)
We also discussed the Healthy Waters southern and regional maintenance contracts in the confidential section.

On 14 April an Extraordinary Audit and Risk Committee met via electronic link. Members were briefed on the Covid-19 pandemic and Auckland Emergency Management status and received two confidential updates on the approach to risk management and assurance activities, and the approach to identify and manager financial risks.

On 16 April the Emergency Committee received a verbal briefing from Ian Maxwell, Director Executive Programmes and Mace Ward, Group Controller, Auckland Emergency Management. Representatives from the Taxpayers Union and the Auckland Ratepayers Alliance presented in public forum. Cr Darby introduced an extraordinary item regarding Auckland International Airport share purchase plan. Members agreed 18-5 to seek a report looking at improving the council’s oversight of the airport company, including whether as the biggest shareholder, it should seek to appoint a director.

Auckland Council’s submission on the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package was approved.

The confidential part of the meeting covered council’s Financial position and Annual Budget 2020/2021 Update. Councillors were unanimous that the council needs to take decisive steps to reduce the pressure on residents and businesses facing economic hardship, while ensuring we can protect and maintain the essential services Aucklanders rely on. It was agreed that another round of consultation including the option of limiting any rates rise to 2.5%. (Our Auckland Attachment 3)

On 23 April the Emergency Committee approved the levy for funding Auckland’s regional amenities for the next financial year, appointed Phil Wilson as the Group Recovery Manager for Covid-19 and received its regular Auckland Emergency Management update. Watercare Chief Executive Raven Jaduram also provided an update on Auckland’s water shortage situation and the requirements for stage one water restrictions.

Other meetings and events

As NZ moved to Alert level 2, I stopped attending events and meetings in person from 20 March. In the days prior to that I attended the Waitetū Local Board monthly business meeting and CCO Oversight Committee workshop with Auckland Transport on 17 March, The CCO update on Covid-19; Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee workshop on the proposed Burial and Cremation Act 1984 submission and the Planning Committee Briefing; Supporting Growth Alliance – on transport network proposals in greenfield areas on 18 March.

On 17 March I also spoke at the EV’s and Beyond Conference held on Waitakere in relation to Auckland’s commitment to the Climate Change Emergency.

I was interviewed by BM on 19 March and 20 April for an item called “City Counselling” covering council’s response to the Covid-19 crisis, the Annual Budget, tactical urbanism and the Auckland Climate Action Plan work underway.

LGNZ’s National Council meeting in Wellington on 20 March was held via Zoom. It was agreed to postpone the annual conference until 2021 and the AGM until November.
The weekly meeting with the Mayor for Chairs and Deputies of the committees of the whole has continued via Skype. A fortnightly Auckland Transport catch up on ward issues has also continued during the lockdown.

A virtual ANZAC day service was observed with neighbours joining from their bubble for Stand at Dawn.

**Emergency Budget 20/21**

Planning is underway for the upcoming Emergency Budget, with workshops for elected representatives to discuss where significant financial savings can be made. In response to a “rates freeze” campaign and many emails from constituents seeking a zero rates rise I have provided the following information:

The draft 2020-21 annual budget that was consulted on prior to the lockdown proposed a 3.5% rates increase. We now need a new “emergency” budget that responds to these extraordinary times. We are in incredibly challenging times dealing with the Covid-19 crisis and there is no doubt the economic downturn is going to continue hitting hard across our businesses and communities.

At the Emergency Committee meeting on 16 April Councillors were unanimous that the council needs to take decisive steps to reduce the pressure on residents and businesses facing economic hardship, while ensuring we can protect and maintain the essential services Aucklanders rely on. There will be another round of consultation including the option of limiting any rise to 2.5%. For the average ratepayer, a 2.5% increase would be equivalent to an extra $1.35 per week, while a 3.5% increase would be $1.83 per week.

The final details of the Emergency Budget 20/21 including rates will not be voted on until July.

In considering the options it is clear that cutting rates will end up costing ratepayers more and will slow down Auckland’s recovery. It is important to note:

- There is going to be a substantial reduction in non-rates revenue caused by the recession, some projects and services will need to be cut or postponed to reduce expenditure. Development Contributions and fees make up 53% of council’s income. Potential reductions in cash revenue of $350-650m for 20/21 depending on the length of disruption caused by Covid-19
- The credit rating agencies have allocated Auckland Council an AA/Aa2 rating. This enables council to borrow for capital projects at attractive interest rates, for longer time periods, and means there is no shortage of those wishing to invest. Our financial policy is to limit our debt to revenue ratio to 270%, although internally we manage to a 265% ratio to give ourselves a buffer. Lowering income could potentially put this at risk. The outcome would be higher interest rates, reduced funding abilities and shorter timelines for debt renewals. All these add up to very real costs which would be to the detriment of ratepayers, both now and well into the future. A 1% increase in rates equals $17 million in additional income. 3.5% equates to $59 million net. A 1% increase in interest rates equates to around $100 million of additional interest costs.
A single notch credit rating downgrade would cost council approximately $15 million every year in additional interest costs.

- Even at a 3.5% rates rise there will be substantial cuts to the infrastructure projects, maintenance and services provided by the Council. This work is already underway with many temp or contracted staff having been given notice.
- At the same time, council has already driven savings of $270 million in operational expenses. $62 million of additional savings are budgeted for this year. All opportunities to cut spending still need to be reviewed from across the council group.
- The CEO and senior executives have voluntarily agreed to pay cuts.
- The Emergency Committee agreed to consult on targeted measures including suspending the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate and the broadening of council’s rates postponement policy. We also announced more help to ratepayers and business who may be struggling to pay their rates in the financial year to 30 June.

I believe we have taken a principled based approach with a strong commitment to financial prudence and sustainability. An austerity budget based on a zero rates rise will hit our most vulnerable communities hardest and limit council’s ability to play a key role in working with Government to promote economic recovery. I think targeted assistance to ratepayers suffering financial stress is preferable.

Consultation on the Emergency Budget 20/21 is due to start by the end of May for three weeks. The consultation material will provide a clear explanation of what each ratemaking option will mean for council services and infrastructure. Please take the time to review the information and provide feedback.

Other matters

I worked with Cr Richard Hills, Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Committee to seek the inclusion of a climate lens and other Auckland focused criteria to the prioritisation process for the “shovel ready” programme considered at the Emergency Committee meeting on 9 April (Attachment 3). I also submitted a spreadsheet of shovel ready projects for consideration which included local board projects in my ward.

The work of the Environment and Climate Change Committee has continued with briefings and catch-ups via skype. The Covid-19 crisis has had an impact on the timeline for Auckland’s Climate Action Plan but the current aim is to bring the final plan to a committee meeting in July.

I have been working with the Executive Officer and Tangata Whenua co-chair of the Hauraki Gulf Forum to create a draft work plan for consultation with forum members ahead of the Forum meeting planned for 25 May. We also wrote to the Infrastructure Industry Reference Group, Crown Infrastructure Partners regarding the shovel-ready projects and the Hauraki Gulf, Tikapa Moana, Te Moananui-a-Toi (Attachment 4).
I provided feedback on Auckland Council’s submission on the Accessible Streets Regulatory package that went to the Emergency Committee meeting on 16 April.

I am working with Cr Darby on progressing council and Auckland Transport’s response to NZTA’s *Innovating Streets for People* funding supporting trials and pilots to create more people friendly spaces (photo right showing the use of “tactical urbanism” to create a cycle lane) as well as the roll out of an emergency measures to create additional space for walking and cycling during Alert Level 3.

I think leadership on a pay cut is important when there is no doubt the economic downturn is going to hit hard across our businesses and communities. It is about acknowledging the pain and showing solidarity with those on the frontline of the crisis. As the current legislation doesn’t allow for any Councillor pay cut to go back into the Council’s budget I will be donating an amount to charity in line with the pay cuts announced by the Mayor, other councillors and the executive leadership. However, as I don’t believe any pressure should be put on low paid members or workers to take a cut I will keep my donations private.

I continue to be contacted by members of the public seeking reassurance and answers to a wide range of issues.

**Recommendation**

That this report be received.
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>goods to Great Barrier Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Our Auckland: Councillors agree rates support for Aucklanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Letter to John Dunshea regarding Auckland Council ‘shovel ready’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infrastructure projects from the Environment and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Chair and Deputy Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Attachment 1

Auckland Council guarantees freight of essential goods to Great Barrier Island

Our Auckland Published: 27 March 2020

Auckland Council has guaranteed the delivery of essential goods and services to Aotea / Great Barrier Island to ensure residents have access to critical medical supplies, medical testing material, fresh food and essential service workers.

Mayor Phil Goff said, “Great Barrier is highly dependent on small aircraft flights and less frequent ferries to access essential products and services. With Alert Level 4 isolation rules restricting almost all travel, commercial operators are unable to provide the services they normally would, putting pressure on supply chains servicing the island.

“To ensure the wellbeing of our Great Barrier Island residents, arrangements were needed quickly to ensure transport services could be maintained at a basic level sufficient to provide the essentials.

“Auckland Council, through its Auckland Emergency Management function, will guarantee one flight per day to ensure essential services, products and workers continue to be available to all Great Barrier residents.”

The flights will be operated by Barrier Air and will enable the delivery of 1.2 tonnes of goods to be delivered every day. The first delivery has already been completed.

Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor Pippa Coom said the news would provide real comfort to Aotea/Great Barrier Island residents.

“These are extraordinary times and stressful for everyone, but for remote communities there are additional pressures.
“That’s why the council took urgent steps to confirm this arrangement because it deals quickly with what was a unique and critical concern for the Great Barrier community.

“I’m really pleased that we can reduce some of the stress on Great Barrier Islanders by guaranteeing the delivery of essentials like medical care and food supplies.”

Great Barrier Local Board Chair Izzy Fordham says, "The community of Aotea Great Barrier Island is eternally grateful to Auckland Council for granting them funds out of council’s new $22.5 million contingency fun.

"The grant will enable Barrier Air to continue to provide vital service to the island. They hold the contract to carry the island’s medical needs bringing in medical supplies, PPE, medical and nursing staff along with pharmaceuticals. On departure they carry all laboratory specimens and COVID-19 swabs.

They are also contracted to bring all mail to and from the island. These services are crucial to the island’s wellbeing and we thank Mayor Phil Goff, councillors and staff for their support during this difficult time.”
Attachment 2

Councillors agree rates support for Aucklanders

Our Auckland. Published: 17 April 2020

After a marathon 10-hour meeting of Auckland Council’s Emergency Committee, Councillors yesterday agreed on the key priorities needed to guide the regional response to COVID-19 and its impact on the economy.

“Councillors were unanimous yesterday that the council needs to take decisive steps to reduce the pressure on residents and businesses facing economic hardship, while ensuring we can protect and maintain the essential services Aucklanders rely on,” said Mayor Phil Goff.

“With a substantial reduction in non-rates revenue caused by the recession, some projects and services will need to be cut or postponed to reduce expenditure. Already many temp or contracted staff have been given notice.

“But Aucklanders will want us to continue to provide core services that the city needs, and which make our city a great place to live. Aucklanders will also want us to partner with the government to invest in the construction of vital infrastructure that the city needs, and which will contribute a stimulus to growth and jobs to assist our recovery.

“Auckland Council will consult with the public on a rate increase of 2.5 or 3.5 per cent. For the average ratepayer, a 2.5 per cent increase would be equivalent to an extra $1.35 per week, while a 3.5 per cent increase would be $1.63 per week.

“The Emergency Committee looked at all options for rate increases and the impact different levels of rate increase, including a zero per cent increase, would have on the ability of the council to provide services for Aucklanders and to invest in infrastructure for jobs.

“There will be a new round of consultation with Aucklanders providing a clear explanation of what each rating option would mean for council services and infrastructure and we will be
providing robust information as part of the consultation document to ensure that picture is very clear,” he said.

The Emergency Committee has agreed a suite of measures to immediately offer some support to all ratepayers, including businesses, facing hardship due to the crisis:

- Waiving the APTR payment from 1 April to 30 June (2020) for all accommodation and tourism businesses
- Offering all ratepayers experiencing financial hardship the opportunity to defer payment of their fourth quarter rates instalments.
- As part of the public consultation, Aucklanders will be asked if they support options including:
  - A recommendation brought by the Mayor for both a 2.5 per cent and 3.5 per cent rate rise to be considered, with information included outlining the potential impact of both those options.
  - A broadening of the council’s rates postponement policy to include businesses experiencing financial hardship.
  - Suspension of the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate, and the expenditure that it would fund, until 31 March 2021.

Mayor Phil Goff said, “The measures we agreed yesterday add to the strong financial support programmes already announced by central government. These changes will help to reduce the financial strain many Aucklanders are under as a result of the COVID-19 induced recession.

“Businesses in the accommodation and tourism industries are under particular pressure, so we are waiving the fourth quarter instalment of the APTR to provide some relief. All businesses and residents facing financial hardship will be able to request deferring their fourth quarter rates payments until the due date of the first rates instalment for the next rating year (31 August 2020) without penalties.

“Our priority is to look at what we can do in the area of rates to support those Aucklanders under real strain; acting to protect and maintain the key services Aucklanders rely on; ensuring we play our role in partnering with the government on the projects needed to kickstart economic recovery and employment, and taking a long-term view of the budget to ensure we can meet the short-medium term financial challenges posed by COVID-19 while continuing to invest in our region’s future.”

The Emergency Committee also requested staff to undertake further analysis of the impact of different rates increases between 0 and 3.5 per cent would have on council services and business activity in Auckland. This analysis will help inform the public consultation process.

Finance and Performance Committee Chair, Councillor Desley Simpson said, “I believe that it is really important for Aucklanders to understand what services they might lose if we went for an even lower rates rise which is why this will be clearly outlined in the consultation document.

“We need to ensure our residential and business ratepayers are supported if they need assistance but at the same time keep key council services funded and operational. We know that not all ratepayers will be in a position to pay their rates during this financial hardship and that will impact on our income.”

"This is an emergency budget for extraordinary times."

Download the COVID-19 Financial Update here.
Attachment 3

Councillors’ Office

Via email: john.dunshea@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

John Dunshea

GM Development Programme Office

Auckland Council

6 April 2020

Dear John,

Re: Auckland Council ‘shovel ready’ infrastructure projects

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on Auckland Council’s final “shovel ready” programme and projects. We note the Government’s criteria is limited to infrastructure projects with a value of more than $10m to have an immediate stimulatory effect on the construction industry and economy.

For Tamaki Makaurau, the assessment of “shovel ready” projects must be aligned with an overarching strategic approach that enables government spending to best secure our economy toward Auckland 2050.

Any assessment must deliver on Auckland Council’s commitment to the agreed target of halving Auckland’s emissions by 2030 and a precautionary approach to planning for change; as supported unanimously at the Environment and Climate Change Committee on 12 March 2020.

Only by applying a strategic approach with a climate lens we will secure a post COVID-19 future that supports a sustainable, environment-friendly economy that is good for jobs, provides for sustainable growth, community resilience and equity across Auckland and puts us in the best position for post pandemic recovery. This must include a focus on already vulnerable communities such as youth, Māori, and Pasifika. Investment and high level jobs, as well as focus on a geographic spread.

We support consideration of the existing work programme. Projects should be prioritised to deliver on council’s strategic objects and put us on a pathway to reduce emissions. This exercise should not allow for projects to be resurrected that are no longer fit for purpose and only provide short term benefits. It is important to note the approach we recommend delivers on the criteria set by government, creates jobs, supports the economy, and locks in longer term benefits for the environment and for all Aucklanders.

We therefore request that an “Auckland Council criteria” is developed and applied before any project is submitted. Such criteria must ensure:

a) Alignment with existing Auckland Council plans and strategies
b) The project is climate positive and contributes toward the pathway of reducing emissions by 50% by 2030
c) The future needs of the community are taken into account; local employment opportunities, climate mitigation and adaptation, transport choice, healthy housing, and community wellbeing.
d) Equity of outcomes. We need to create secure, quality jobs, employment opportunities, career paths, and industries that will be sustainable in a rapidly changing future. We also need to keep the
Councillors' Office

needs of Māori, Pasifika, and young people front of mind in creating high value jobs geographically across the region.

e) Any spend is targeted toward projects where expenditure and profits will be retained within Auckland and the wider New Zealand economy.

f) Local board and community support for the project.

We urge Chief Sustainability Office input throughout the selection process and that consideration is given to their work intersecting Sustainable Development Goals with the Auckland Plan.

We appendix a list of the key categories and projects consistent with this proposed Auckland Council criteria. We will also individually each submit a list of projects in the format requested.

We request that in submitting projects to Crown Infrastructure Partners Limited, additional Council feedback is provided to government raising concerns regarding:

• The concept of ‘shovel ready’ as applied to post COVID-19 city building when all existing projects were developed and costed under very different circumstances. There may also need to be new approaches taken to the delivery of projects to reflect cost constraints for example considering the opportunity to install cycle lanes cheaply quickly, and cost effectively using temporary infrastructure.

• Government’s role in ensuring projects selected are truly transformational and kick start a climate positive, environment-friendly economy.

• The lack of diversity in the Infrastructure Industry Reference Group, tasked with preparing a report to Ministers on infrastructure projects/programmes that are ready for construction. We would at least like to see women and Māori at the decision-making table.

We appreciate the time pressures to this process but if we get the Auckland Council criteria right we will be best placed to leverage the opportunity provided by the government’s shovel ready programme to create jobs as part of a future-focused, sustainable economy.

Kind regards,

Richard Hills

Chair | Environment and Climate Change Committee

Pippa Coom

Deputy Chair

Councillor | North Shore

Councillor | Waitāmatatū and Gulf

135 Albert Street | Private Bag 92300, Auckland 1142 | aucklandcouncil.govt.nz | Ph 09 301 0101

Local Ward Area Councillor’s Update
Appendix One: Key categories and projects consistent with the proposed Auckland Council criteria submitted by Richard Hills, Environment and Climate Change Committee Chair and North Shore Ward Councillor; and Pippa Coom, Environment and Climate Change Committee Deputy Chair and Waitematā and Gulf Ward Councillor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport initiatives that will lead to mode shift and the decarbonisation of the transport fleet</th>
<th>Rapid transport projects including Northwestern busway, second and third stages of the Eastern busway to Botany, Northern busway extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed up construction of cycleways, including Pt Chev to Westmere; New Lynn to Avondale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Harbour Bridge Shared Path and enabling work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus fleet electrification and charging infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerated safety programme including Safe Schools upgrades, and projects such as Cook St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pukekohe electrification, third main, and other rail upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Waters – stormwater infrastructure and programmes</td>
<td>Kaipara Moana Remediation project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerate Healthy Waters water quality work programme, including St Mary’s Bay Pipeline, Hurstmere Road, Northcote Greenway, and new brownfields developments (such as Unitex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td>Accelerate urban and rural ngahere programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste projects in line with sustainability goals</td>
<td>Kauri dieback tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Including Materials Recovery Facility, Deconstruction hub, Community Recycling Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated delivery of the planned low carbon, resilient precinct in city centre</td>
<td>Ensure city centre work continues including CRL, Quay St, Downtown public space, City Centre Masterplan; Access for Everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building infrastructure to allow intensive residential and commercial precincts around the new City Rail Link stations at Mt Eden, Karangahape Rd and Aotea Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other projects</td>
<td>Projects that reduce Council group’s operational emissions in line with a 50% reduction by 2030 target, including Project Gigawatt, replacing boilers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery of renewable energy generation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion and acceleration of the retrofit programme to transition to low-carbon, resilient, healthy buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku transformations for housing and transport including Northcote and Manukau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities wharf and jetty renewals including Northcote Wharf to keep the public transport connection loop open with Northern Pathway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mark Binns
Chair, Infrastructure Industry Reference Group
Crown Infrastructure Partners

Re: Shovel-Ready Projects and the Hauraki Gulf, Tikapa Moana, Te Moananui-a-Toi

14 April 2020

Tēnā koe Mark,

Thank you for your letter dated 25 March calling for ‘shovel-ready’ projects.

As the statutory body mandated to advocate for the nationally significant Hauraki Gulf Marine Park, the Hauraki Gulf Forum urges you to give priority to infrastructure investments that protect and enhance our natural environment’s life-supporting capacity - now and into the future. Investments that deliver both employment and environmental outcomes will be truly transformative.

Specifically, we strongly support the following projects:

1. From our members:\n
   - Projects which improve water quality, including three-water separation and other infrastructure that lessens outflows of sewerage, stormwater, sediment, nutrients, heavy metals, plastics and other pollutants into the Gulf.

   - Projects which improve marine environments and ecosystems, including catchment management, and restoration of coastal, island and marine areas.

   - Kaupapa that enhances the kaitiakitanga of mana whenua who uphold and have customary associations and interests in the Gulf.

   - Projects which contribute to a safer and cleaner Hauraki Gulf Marine Park, including support and back-end infrastructure.

2. From external parties:

   - Projects which improve water quality, marine environments and ecosystems, including:

---

\* Representatives of Auckland Council (including the Aotea Great Barrier and Whangārei local boards), Waikato Regional Council, Hauraki District Council, Waikato District Council, Matamata Piako District Council, Thames Coromandel District Council, the Ministers of Māori Development, Conservation and Fisheries, and Tangata Whenua of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands and catchments.
Conservation Restoration – Partnering to plant Aotearoa by the Sustainable Business Network.
Building and launching electric and hydrogen-ready hybrid ferries by EV Maritime, Vector and Fullers360.

As we are reminded at present:

Hei tiaki i te whenua
Hei tiaki i te moana
Hei tiaki i nga mokopuna
He kaitiaki tātou

Look after the land
Look after the sea
Look after our future
We are guardians

Should you require any further information, please contact the Forum’s Executive Officer (Alex Rogers, 021 191 8527, eo@haurakiguflforum.org.nz).

Wishing you and your team all the best for the unenviable task ahead.

Nā māua noa, nā

Nicola Macdonald  
Co-Chair – Tangata Whenua

Pippa Coom  
Co-Chair