From:	Environment Canterbury					
Sent:	Saturday, 19 March 2022 11:38 am					
o: Have your Say						
Subject: Submission on draft Annual Plan 2022/23						
Anonymous User ju	ust submitted 'Draft Annual Plan 2022/23 submission' with the responses below.					
First name						
Andrew						
Last name						
Scott						
Email address						
Are you submitting	g on behalf of an organisation?					
No, I'm submitting	as an individual					
Which age categor	y are you in?					
40-64 years old						
Do you wish to spe	eak to your submission at a Council hearing?					
No						

Which bus fare structure option would you like to see trialled?

Option 2: \$2 flat fare for adults and \$1.20 for children across bus zones 1, 2 and 3

Tell us more about why you support the selected bus fare option.

While a small number of households would benefit from option 1, there would be an increase for many other households who would benefit. We are a family with two young children who cannot travel independently on the bus. Their child care and school cannot be accessed by bus. The increase in cost is unreasonable to many families. Option 1 may also have a negative effect of shifting young people from using active modes of transport (bike & scooters) onto buses which may increase not decrease the emissions. It is disappointing that a document which shows the assumptions used for the modelling was not included as part of the consultation so that people can review the validity of the assumptions. The adults in our household currently use the buses on semi regular basis but the biggest challenge is the unreliable nature of the arrival times of the buses during peak hours to pick up young children. More should be done to clear bus lanes and remove some unnecessary on street parking. I support option 2 as it seems to offer best value for money for most people and is a fairer system to most taxpayers. I think that with the increase in fuel price and reduced bus fee it could push significant numbers of people to use the bus (and reduce emissions). The biggest reductions to emissions will still be from encouraging people to walk or ride so Ecan needs to work with ccc to encourage that.

Any other comments on bus fares?

Lower price may encourage people to use the price but bus reliability will still be the key. I do not want empty buses to be running around so they still have to be matched to demand

Is borrowing and repaying through general rates the right approach for this regionally significant event?

Don't know

How else might we pay for our share of this work?

It's not clear what the nature of the required repairs is or is they are necessary or beneficial. I have tried to view the map but this didn't have any more details. Are some of them access routes for small numbers of properties? Ecan should have some money saved up for these sorts of events from small general levies particularly if these events will become more frequent. People living closer to flooding should pay more. Thought should be given to see if flooding can be reduced by e.g. regaining land close to rivers that have become farms.

How do you think recovery from flooding of this scale – events that impact state highways, bridges, rail and power for example – should be funded in the future?					
As above. Levies that are proportional to the risk from the flooding.					
Which option for distribution of rates in Ashburton River rating district do you support?					
I don't have a preference					
Would you support a levy to accelerate action in response to climate change?					
Yes					
What current or future projects or activities would you like to see funded by such a levy?					
I do not support funding for food and water security unless the benefits from this are for local community and not export. I strongly support measures to make walking and cycling safer and for buse to have lower emissions and to be available to those who cannot walk/ride. I also support planting of trees and increasing biodiversity. Given that farming is a huge source of greenhouse gas emissions we should also focus on this but farmers should pay levies to drive research in this area.					
Any other comments on future funding for responding to climate change?					
It should be clear what the levy can be used for.					
Where did you hear about the consultation?					
Social media (Facebook, Instagram) Postcard					