

Introduction

Name:

Privacy of natural persons

Email:

Privacy of natural persons

Business name or organisation (if applicable):

Position title (if applicable):

Is this an individual submission or on behalf of a group or organisation?

Privacy of natural persons

Please indicate which group you most identify with or are involved in?

Privacy of natural persons

Please specify the group that you most identify with

Please indicate which type of group your submission represents

Please specify the group or organisation that your submission is on behalf of.

Vision

Do you agree or disagree with the overall vision for the minerals and petroleum sector in New Zealand?

Disagree

Why?

Past behaviour of Solid Energy was corruption and Regulation as they stand don't protect our current environment. Southland the Capital of Pollution has been subsidised and allowed to pollute for decades as the Dairy Industry. Regulations by Govt and local Regional Council don't protect people in it's current form.

What is your vision for the minerals and petroleum sector in New Zealand?

Green Technologies for renewable energy - cobalt and lithium Megan talks about expanding. Petroleum sector isn't required to expand from Taranaki as electric vehicles are direction of the future. Cameron Bagrie stated September 2019 that renewables were the future. Kaiwera wind farm is at a stand still and Southland is already the Capital of Pollution with dirty polluting industries subsidised like Tiwai especially. Aluminium could be used in the housing sector but is exported.

How can New Zealand sustainably derive value from its petroleum and minerals resources?

No value in petroleum growth apart from offshore and Taranaki. Fertiliser and liquid fuels is 1980s thinking and impacts are widely recognised with Fracking which I've viewed in Chinchilla and Condemine to name a few areas visited in rural Australia. Reading Table 6 - Potential Renewable Energy Available to New Zealand to 2015 graph we have so much more potential with renewables, when we exhaust them possible which isn't realistic. We can't provide adequate care and pension costs now with poor policy protecting those born here. The 1990s govt failed to protect the future on a local and central government level.

Objectives for the minerals and petroleum sector

Objective for a sector that: “Responsibly delivers value for New Zealand (a) Supporting a productive, sustainable and inclusive economy (b) Supporting New Zealand's transition to a carbon neutral economy”.

Strongly disagree

Why?

Observation in many countries the petroleum sector doesn't act responsible. Whether Helen Clark makes head way with the corruption and environmental impact of petroleum sector we'd have to be privy to the information. A balance of industries is important than just measuring GDP which has been the former baseline of wealth but incorporating the four capitals (page 22) is an improvement. Inclusive economy sounds beneficial but reading more on OECD do question is validity especially being driven by wealthiest network in the world advocating it. Power prices are incredibly high now and doesn't equate to all the natural energy like wood people consume on top of that. Opportunities you discuss but Kiwi's working hours for well being need to reduce which isn't a common place for these industries. Rural sector provides more volunteer hours from observation than urban for our communities sport and service. Export industries don't benefit substantially to our communities welfare. Danika, Tiwai etc all start projects initially and these collapse for invalid reasons. Similar to NZ supermarket big business does very little for community, no xmas acknowledgement no major gains in local community but jobs and most under 20 yrs of age. Infrastructure in the power industry isn't benefiting the majority but the minority. NZ royalties the lowest around and no transparency just like the RUC we aren't privy to where this tax is being spent. On Govt Ms Gentler produced graph to say finally the rural sector were getting more money spent on their roads. Talk of GST being given back to provincial areas but not privy to detail if a win or loose for Southland with the biggest roading network. Looking at tax rate we are subsidising the wealthy over \$75k by 50% with the rates being greater from \$48k to \$70k. You mention these industries earn \$150k that will not happen in the market industry in the South Island. Yes perhaps Iwi should get more of a share in funds from royalties but does it need to be at the expense of current. Royalties in NZ are lower so additional added to make it a fair playing ground. Benefits under coalition have seen a cpi increase but not sure if that's a system implemented for the future or one off. All the export industries in Southland continuously have relied directorship increases that produce performance. Retainers and then commission caps is the real world. Perhaps there needs another tax for those earning above a mean that contributes percentage. Currently these dirty corrupts use there funds to reward favours and policy driving disconnect with the public as export dollars having less impact on local communities. SBS Bank policy is about building a mutual trust partnership and ethical behaviour that approaches members to lead the future.

Objective for a sector that: “Is productive and innovative”.

Strongly disagree

Why?

Green technologies yes. Methane capturing is innovative and productive but Petroleum industry is a dying industry with a fragile social licence. Getting the most value would be using locally, competition does encourage better behaviour occasionally, high value is key alongside carbon responsibility.

Objective for a sector that: “Is effectively regulated”.

Strongly disagree

Why?

Absolutely not- light pollution, aquifer contamination, protection of soils (1cm takes 50-100yrs to build), Solid Energy 2012 stated at a meeting the intended to sell our soil in Southland and export it. Rehabilitation was a wingit system also was relayed by Solid Energy staff. The Biological activity in soils which is crucial for many needs protection as soil can solve many issues treated right and protected by regulation and legal restrictions. If Tiwai was effectively regulated more individuals would sleep soundly in Southland. As Nigel Latta states past behaviour predicts future behaviour and no news of dirty polluters sharing the load. There isn't any regulation yet to safeguard the four capitals in the petroleum sector or minerals. It's just token regulation. Industry compliance is a joke those tasked with compliance have a conflict of interest or mates on the boards so little to no accurate monitoring. Derrick technology by Land & Water Science maybe able to give us in the near future more live monitoring.

Are there any other objectives for the minerals and petroleum sector that you would like us to consider in the strategy?

Regulation overhaul on monitoring - Particulate measurements below 2.5mcg as found in lungs, Live monitoring, Petroleum & fracking industry transparent with the ingredients, Soil biological activity baseline measure before and after requirements to meet not waiting 25 years for the soil to mitigate toxins. Soil protection. Contamination of aquifers and water bodies monitored in real time.

Guiding principles

Principle: The environment, ecosystems, and biodiversity are respected now and in the long term.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Page 24 - principles 1-6 doesn't provide for transparency. No independent body that can monitor as conflict of interest a concern. No. 9. Fair, transparent, reasonable and proportionate sounds reasonable but no confidence in this as no independence.

Principle: Māori cultural interests are understood and respected.

Strongly agree

Why?

Tangata Whenua is important to me and a component to Aotearoa and growing momentum as indigenous cultures are deprived of resources.

Principle: Support the transition to a carbon neutral economy by 2050.

Agree

Why?

Yes with renewable green technology not the Petroleum Industry. An island in the south pacific surrounded by wind and water it should be fairly easy. The impacts are far less detrimental to others.

Principle: The impact on people, communities and regions are managed in a just and inclusive way.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Read up on OECD inclusive economy and seems from me a principle that's warm and fuzzy in nature rather than realistic outcomes. It said usually the trickle down economy was objective but in today's society it wasn't working. From observation from Solid Energy, BHP etc they buy social licence by sponsoring every major event in a district

Principle: Support a circular economy by meeting resource needs through resource efficiency, recycling and reuse.

Why?

Four capitals is an original concept but who will monitor the progress and when is this evidence provided.

Principle: Actions taken within the mineral and petroleum sector should align with the strategic direction of other related sectors and Government strategies.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Currently the consenting process just for minimal activity is diabolical so don't have confidence as working with Govt parties for a year in relation to farming and staff in MPI move around and no form of consistency or knowledge formed in these departments.

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following principles for the Crown?

Principle: The Crown honours its duty towards Māori as a Treaty partner, adheres to the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and its duty to meet settlement commitments.

Agree

Why?

I'm challenged with this as Fresh water policy talks and MFE has missed a Hui gathering for Ngai Tahu and members have said that Labour's relationship is more turbulent with group which I'd love to see amended.

Principle: The Crown receives a fair financial return for its minerals and petroleum.

Agree

Why?

Currently it's not in proportion but are you trying to make attractive due to cost of exporting as that's incredibly unfair to our citizens and not a level playing field.

Principle: The Crown regulates in a way that is fair, transparent, reasonable and proportionate.

Strongly disagree

Why?

On the Parliamentary Services on TV Channel I didn't see this submission process which usually has the current ones on this last week. No evidence of this, Tiwai, Danika, Dairy shows that a reactive society exists and that activism has its place to assist in driving regulation sadly. We must also consider corridors/buffers to DoC as they are vital to biodiversity health and co-exist.

Principle: The Crown honours the rights of current permit holders to continue production or exploration activities under existing permits.

Strongly disagree

Why?

Doesn't make sense. The mining industry have been lobbying Govt for too long and perhaps under royalties the cost of those permits be returned to government. We have a vision and must confuse matters for our goal for Green Growth only with renewable and earth minerals such as cobalt and lithium, lime, aggregate which are the biggest resources required. Why head down the sunset industry just clear signals as are a bold country with principles and values that resonate with us. Formally had Thompson & Clark trespassing on our ToW landmark property, spying, listening devices, following our actions. Amentity values to the district is important having seeing a death notice one lady returned from the UK so she could see the Hokonui ranges. People should be notified they are in a permitted area just like the risk factors to a property are on the valuation information that wasn't also notified. People have a right to fairness and another party shouldn't have an advantage.

Principle: The Crown makes policy decisions based on the best evidence, and accounting for the foreseeable need for minerals and petroleum, both now and for future generations.

Disagree

Why?

My observation you don't have balanced material, conflict of interest with pro fossil fuel lobbies. We are just starting to get more software programs on mapping aquifers, linear landscape etc but no evidence of monitoring being the best in the world. We need to be proactive and we don't have all the tools and regulation required and trust in agencies. As Winston said before the election National and Labour are the same but with the Coalition a heart for the community wellbeing has immense traction.

Principle: The Crown proactively engages and consults with relevant stakeholders and decisions are communicated in a clear and transparent way.

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Stakeholders have the advantage and the necessary funds while a community has to struggle with impacts beyond. The dust monitors on the boundaries of say New Vale and former Solid Energy are just a joke. Children are represented well as they are the most vulnerable to heavy metals, particulate. Animals aren't monitored and milk produce in Australia was refused due to heavy metals from mining. Petroleum industry use massive water resources and pollute water ways. Government needs to give peace of mind with monitoring in the Taranaki province before it proceeds expanding policy for dirty polluters.

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following principles for Industry?

Principle: Pursue continuous improvements in health and safety.

Agree

Why?

Not achieved.

Principle: Strive to implement industry best practice in operations.

Strongly agree

Why?

Giving them two weeks notice before due is ridiculous and corrupt.

Principle: Seek innovative ways to improve the resource efficiency of extraction operations; and minimise the negative impacts of these operations.

Agree

Why?

Soil no protection for the health of this micro-organisms vital to a healthy system

Principle: Engage with stakeholders and implement management systems to understand and manage impacts, and realise opportunities for redress where needed.

Agree

Why?

Knowledge is power, people need to see large scale developments and get a balanced view to assist in the regulation they may need and policy to address.

Are there any other principles you would like us to consider in the strategy?

Two weeks is insufficient for Iwi and they don't have the man power so clearly have a disadvantage.

Action areas intro

Action Area: Modernising the Crown Minerals Act

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Haven't all the information, most importantly land access concerns many, further information in the future. Please provide all submitters with information. Friends wanted assistance with a Regional Council relating to dairy unit operation that neighboured them and they weren't helpful in assistance so who does one use or trust those in situations if you can't trust your Regional Council - Environment Southland, Ombudsman or a politician maybe next.

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Action Area: Securing affordable resources to meet our minerals and energy needs

Neither agree nor disagree

Why?

Yes but management of Green Growth and earth minerals only as there is no need for liquid fuels etc as they are the least credible individuals globally.

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Onslow renewable energy makes sense, out of the way capturing the run off from the headwaters.

Action Area: Improving Treaty partnership

Agree

Why?

It's obliged to by the treaty agreement

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Action Area: Improving stakeholder and community engagement

Strongly agree

Why?

We've been a victim of Solid Energy being a neighbour, there was plenty of mind games and mistruths with the entire community as they were benefiting from sponsorship and owned our entire town. No body bar the activists gave a balanced view.

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Up front of the negative impacts. Complaints taken seriously. Monitoring a priority and appropriate policy to protect. Our youth are more interested now what is righteous than money and understand a balance view more than the ageing population. Fair debate platforms are needed just like local governance elections. The process is one eyed as Stakeholders should be those impacted also not just Chamber of Commerce with their one eyed view.

Action Area: Improving industry compliance

Strongly agree

Why?

Real time monitoring, track and trace of material especially of waste, rules are made like H Truck road compliance but it's not monitored either. As we've seen at Pike River if activity was live for compliance to check accuracy of events then we'd all feel safer and comfortable for those working in the industry.

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Technology - you've given them lots of help to find resources but not in protecting our communities beyond their boundaries.

Action Area: Research and investment in better mining and resource use

Strongly agree

Why?

Technology on measuring the impacts as unbalanced and in favour of the operator.

What future actions would you like us to consider under this Action Area?

Are there any other action areas you would like us to consider as part of advancing this Strategy?

Other

Are there any other comments you would like to make about the “Minerals and Petroleum Strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand: 2019-2029”?

Green Growth need to be balanced with our other industries and impact on these needs baselines and monitoring. Technologies in favour of identifying the resources which has been paid by ratepayers and voters but little benefit to them. Still waiting on aquifer mapping of Southland contributed to, lidear and runoff mitigation. Appropriate IAS for this transition as auditing needs transparency and no black box systems also. Population growth needs to benefit existing citizens and currently - pensions, ACC, etc are in favour of our visitors.

If you wish to, attach a document to this submission.

Use and release of information

We intend to upload submissions to our website at www.mbie.govt.nz. Can we include your submission on the website?

Yes

Can we include your name?

No

Can we include your email address?

No

Can we include your business name or organisation?

No

Can we include your position title?

No

Can we include the group you most identify with (if submitting as an individual)?

No

Can we include the group your submission represents (if submitting on behalf of a group or organisation)?

If there are any other parts to your submission that you do not want public on the website please note them below:

OIA publishing warning

If there is information in your submission that you wish to remain confidential, please note them below:

Allan & Robina Rickard Johnston

stayingore@gmail.com (we've been victims with Thompson & Clarke so don't wish to targeted)

Please replace with - Matamata Otaupiri Murihuku