

## Make Submission

<b>Consultee</b>	Mr Trevor George (77084)
<b>Email Address</b>	trevorg985@gmail.com
<b>Address</b>	5 Karnak Crescent Russley Christchurch 8042
<b>Event Name</b>	Long-Term Plan 2018-28 Consultation
<b>Submission by</b>	Mr Trevor George (77084)
<b>Submission ID</b>	2018-28 LTP -595
<b>Response Date</b>	16/03/18 8:27 PM
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Freshwater Management ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Freshwater Management Support/Oppose

See page 6 of the Consultation Document.

**Please select one of the following:** I generally agree with the activity proposed for Freshwater Management.

### Freshwater Management Comments

#### Please provide any comments.

Two submissions here.

Firstly that ECAN makes it clear to farmers (of all types of business structure) that the results of Farm Environmental Plan (FEP) audits will be reported on at a named individual level if need be. The current wording on page 54 of the FEP auditor's manual currently states that this will not be happen and that such collected data from an individual farm audit will be used for the purpose of supplying aggregated (anonymous) catchment data for reporting. The rationale for my submission is that some farmers have been issued several years running with abatement notices yet continue to non comply. Farmers who do comply have nothing to fear and indeed are carrying those who don't. It will also bring peer pressure to bear on non-compliers, assist in Official Information Act requests and generally enhance the cleaning up of a defiled public good - fresh water. The submission, if acted on, will also assist in informing purchasers, both local and foreign, of the veracity of green friendly product claims made by producers of Canterbury agricultural products. To claim that such information is commercially sensitive does not help consumer confidence in agricultural products produced in Canterbury.

Second submission

That farms falling under an ISO accredited umbrella such as that held by Synlait will be individually environmentally audited more than once (currently only one FEP audit required). Rationale. If Synlait slips in its accreditation requirements, years may go by with continued freshwater degradation before a response is made that benefits freshwater. Therefore there is potential drift in obtaining timely, quality data. Independent (ECAN) monitoring should continue for farms under this type of accreditation.

## Make Submission

<b>Consultee</b>	Mr Trevor George (77084)
<b>Email Address</b>	trevorg985@gmail.com
<b>Address</b>	5 Karnak Crescent Russley Christchurch 8042
<b>Event Name</b>	Long-Term Plan 2018-28 Consultation
<b>Submission by</b>	Mr Trevor George (77084)
<b>Submission ID</b>	2018-28 LTP -596
<b>Response Date</b>	16/03/18 8:54 PM
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Public Transport Options ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Public Transport Options

Public Transport is one of the programmes in the Transport and Urban Development portfolio. For the first year of the Long-Term Plan 2018-28 we are proposing changes to the Public Transport programme as outlined in the **Consultation Document**.(on page 14)

To make comment on the Public Transport proposed changes please complete the selection panel below.

To make comment on the the whole Transport and Urban Development portfolio, please use the tab on the left.

**Please review the options in the Consultation Document and indicate which option you support:** Option 4 – none of the above. (Please provide comment/ideas for an alternative solution)

### Public Transport Comments

#### Please provide any comments.

That ECAN rewrite Christchurch urban area contracts to allow tenders for totally flexible (no fixed routes or times) public transport provision. Tenders should be accepted from organisations such as UBER and others. I envisage that this could at least be trialled in some sectors of the city. It would entail a designated minibus (buses) continually looping through a sector picking up passengers via an app with real time information for both driver and passengers and taking passengers towards a generally common destination. For example buses could be continually looping from New Brighton to the CBD. This service would probably still need a subsidy, but hopefully not as large as the current subsidy. It does make the assumption of both owning and being able to operate a Smartphone. I

currently see so many large buses subsidised so heavily by ratepayers with so few passengers in this city.