

**From:** Environment Canterbury  
**Sent:** Monday, 28 March 2022 1:26 pm  
**To:** Have your Say  
**Subject:** Submission on draft Annual Plan 2022/23

Anonymous User just submitted 'Draft Annual Plan 2022/23 submission' with the responses below.

**First name**

Lindon

---

**Last name**

Boyce

---

**Email address**

---

**Suburb**

St Albans, Christchurch

---

**Phone number**

---

**Are you submitting on behalf of an organisation?**

No, I'm submitting as an individual

---

**Which age category are you in?**

40-64 years old

---

**Do you wish to speak to your submission at a Council hearing?**

No

---

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

I don't have a preference

---

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

I dont Agree to or with ANY of these changes

---

**Any other comments on bus fares?**

In 2008 ECAN - Public Transport Operations transported 17.5M Passengers ("Counts" not individuals) that Cost the Tax / Rate Payer (mostly in subsidies) \$41.9Million (23,000 individual passengers) In 2020 ECAN - Public Transport operations transported 10.4M Passenger That cost the Tax / Rate Payer, (mostly in Subsidies) \$84.4Million Dollars- a 41% REDUCTION in passengers Transported from 2008 for a 104% INCREASE In COST to Operate this service via Rates and Tax's (Inflation adjusted 72%) Taking into account increases in actual operational costs Driver's wages Diesel RUC and R&M of 15% would indicate that ECAN now transport half the amount of Passengers for twice the Cost...Inflation adjusted! Based on information received by LOGIMA and provided by ECAN Reports the average number of passengers transported each bus journey is less than 5 (FIVE) In 2008 ECAN demanded \$109MILLION in Rates /Fees from Canterbury Residents In 2020 ECAN demanded \$275 MILLION in Rates / Fees from Canterbury Residents Now in 2022 ECAN are demanding a 24% / \$66MILLION INCREASE in Rate demands to provide less than half the service given These proposed changes solve absolutely nothing other than to increase costs to the Rate Payer with absolutely no improvement in service to the public more likely to our detriment

---

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

No

---

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

Better Management of Current income.

---

**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?**

These are already funded by the NZTA NLTF from fuel TAX and RUC All assets should be covered under existing Insurance policies

---

**Any other comments on flood protection in Ashburton?**

There is no explanation of "Benefits received" or what the proposed increase in costs actually are. This is a leading question

---

**Would you support a levy to accelerate action in response to climate change?**

No

---

**Any other comments on future funding for responding to climate change?**

ECAN have failed "How" this "Levy" (TAX) would be of "benefit" how much this would cost and what the actual result of this would be.

---

**Where did you hear about the consultation?**

Environment Canterbury website

---

