

Submission on Port Taranaki Proposed Development and Draft Business Plan

Friends of Golden Bay Inc. (FoGB) have a long history of involvement with the aquaculture industry, specifically pertinent the allocation of the Aquaculture Management Areas (AMAs) in Golden Bay.

Our membership is involved with sustainable development and environmental concerns in New Zealand and particularly Golden Bay.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan, however wish to point out that it is rushed, has not given the community the respect of being involved in the planning, nor enough time to make good informed comment. We find ourselves in the position of reacting to a proposal, which ideally should have had us all creating a proposal for this valuable and special area. And as a community in order to truly benefit from it's beauty, care for its environmental values and create a place where we all feel ownership and pride. We hope it is not too late to do this.

To this end FoGB would like the following considered:

Community Access: Stacey Faire in her report "Port Taranaki - Summary of Stakeholder Feedback" which we note was a very limited interpretation of who exactly the stakeholders are here, and even more limited time (less than 1 week), pointed out ideas from the community from her brief research time here. These do not seem to be well reflected in this Plan.

Apart from many carparks and a small confined area for seats/trees there appears to be no consideration given to anything other than commercial aquaculture and fishing space and an altered area for recreational boats to tie up. Others, Golden Bay residents and visitors, need to be considered who want another experience here at this beautiful site. Restaurants, fish and mussel sales, research facilities, children's fishing wharf, safe access for small boat launching are some of the many ideas compatible with such an important area to Golden Bay.

Wildlife: Taranaki is home to a significant population of Little Blue Penguins as pointed out by DoC. There exists here an opportunity to enhance this population and to provide a wildlife experience for locals and tourists, alongside education and research possibilities. FoGB support the Golden Bay Penguin Trust's aims for this project as outlined by Prof. John Cockrem. "It is assumed dredgingd will be disposed of on land" some more certainty is needed here. Dredging will need to be when penguins are not vulnerable as they need clear water.

Other wildlife of note here are the rays which cruise the area, and are visually

admirable, as well as fishing opportunities for people, and marine educational possibilities.

Bio security at this site and in our enclosed Bay will need huge input.

Education: Golden Bay HS has an aquaculture academy, this would provide a great opportunity for research here alongside other marine studies, as well as embracing the research and tourism values of the Little Blue Penguins as outlined by Prof Cockrem.

Tourism: Tarakohe is a gem for Golden Bay with its attractive surroundings, wildlife encounter possibilities, seafood supply and easy access. Mohua encounters are listed as income earners yet no information is given regarding this, or how this will occur. There will be other competing tourism operators hoping to use this area in the future.

Traffic issues: Traffic, both on sea and land will be a significant problem for the residents of Pohara and those travelling the roadway, especially bikers and walkers. Significant road upgrading will be necessary. This needs to be considered in the eventual costs, this is not considered in this proposal - "no expansion beyond the current physical footprint". The huge increase in trucking the future predicted aquaculture will entail must be considered. Who will be liable for this. It has been noted in the Stantec report "there is no readily available land for road corridor improvements".

Economics: There seems to be a lot expected here of the ratepayers of Golden Bay. Risk and costwise. Costs are given as \$35mil, \$28mil, then added that they could be higher. Applying for "most of the funding from PGF". How Much is that? Where is the rest coming from?

Most of us presume overcosts are inevitable given most projects recently of this scale. Council acknowledges that costs will be "a significant challenge for Council to fund" even with the PGF grant. Will this lead eventually to the selling of this port out of Council, ie local, control to remedy the inevitable debt? The PGF is providing funding for the business case. "we plan to seek further funding from the PGF for resource consenting and construction, ownership and future operation" How do we know if this will be provided and to what extent? Will PGF give you a blank cheque?

The assumed growth from 6293 ton to 27222 ton by 2024, and 29535 ton by 2029 when it breaks to a profit, seems a risky scenario. If the port development takes a year or two, how is a nearly 5 fold increase to happen by 2024? Let alone the enormous jump to assume the industry will increase by that much. It may be able to given the most ideal circumstances, but will it? Who will wear the consequences if it doesn't? We fear the outcome of this will be to sell the port to private owners. This whole case is predicated on

growth, what if it doesn't happen? And why does growth need to be so single focussed?

Most importantly is why the mussel industry, some of whom are very big and wealthy players, are asking the community to risk such debt. Again it begs the question as to whether the "industry" would rather see the port in such debt it needs to be on sold.

Precautionary approach: With profits not forecast until 2029, this does not allow for a downturn in the aquaculture industry. See <https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/farming/113699131/food-poisoning-warning-as-coromandel-mussel-growing-area-closed> ,where the industry has closed due to *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* poisoning. Also at the time of writing this submission 24.7.19 TDC website has a warning not to collect shellfish in Tasman Bay. Climate change is happening now, and the marine aquaculture industry is suffering the effects of this, note the salmon farming problems in Marlborough Sounds, if not the above mussel industry problems.

We note future consultation should this proposal be approved will be on resource consent issues. These are reactionary and devisive, leaving no scope for different plans or ideas. Those who can afford experts will hold sway, and locals left standing.

Climate change effects on the road and trucking are not considered. Insurance will not be available, already the case now with the storm damage to the port arms. CO2 production from trucking produce to various sites over the hill will encounter emmissions trading at some time.

Local Issues: There will be effects on local residents. These may include noise , lights, traffic (note a suggestion trucks will move at night), smell from storage.

The current water supply to the port is compromised by the soil washing off the hills and filling the dam. This consent also expires 2026. The Pohara supply is not adequate during summer to supply the port's needs, hence a water supply will need to be considered. This seems a fairly basic requirement but not given any certainty.

Future resilience: Climate change is a reality, already the road is affected by this past the band rotunda. Golden Bay needs to be looking beyond trucking over the hill, this area could provide an alternative route via barging for weather or other events isolating us.

In conclusion, this Plan appears to be captured by, but not to be paid for, by the aquaculture industry. Golden Bay residents have already fought long and

hard to retain the port in local ownership in the past. Is this another attempt to pass ownership on?

We again state that this wonderful asset owned by our community deserves more time, input, thoughtfulness and respect. It is not a thoughtful way for our Council to operate by asking residents to submit to a proposal that is already a proposal, and not a joint project. We have an opportunity here to do better for this place and the rarepayers.

We would like to be heard in support of this submission.

Heather Wallace Sec for FoGB Inc.

Box 274 Takaka.