

All Submissions that Selected Option C

C - Sell up to 49% to an investment partner

Submitter ID	pg
45	218
997	219
1587.....	220
1974.....	221
1914.....	222
2791.....	223
3427	224
No commentary.....	224

Option Chosen

C - Sell up to 49% to an investment partner

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Murray Sargison Submitter #45 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Understand the need to do this and the option of selling 49% to the right partner could also bring some further expertise to the table.compared to 49% held by mix of public.</p>
<p>Junette Sanderson Submitter #196 To be heard? No</p>	<p>To control who actually has the ownership. Floating the shareholding on the open market would not be controllable.</p>
<p>Peter Ball Submitter #214 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The arrangement with Tauranga seems to be working well, however I would not like to see more than 40% sold. We must have surety that the proportion sold must not exceed the agreed amount in the future should the Port be looking for more finance, and arrangements must be in place to enable and attract smaller local shareholders rather than only have the shares available to overseas companies with endless finance available. The shares sold must be to entities that have the future of the port at heart and are just not looking to make a "quick buck".</p>
<p>Nick Riddell Submitter #262 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Don't sell all at once.</p>
<p>Adrian Smith Submitter #324 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Easily most reasonable commercial approach. It has to be done for future growth. One Proviso: All Hawkes Bay residents (rate payers) must have first opportunity to purchase shares. Nothing to stop Port buying back shares later.</p>
<p>Kevin Holmes Submitter #342 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Why would you buy shares as they did in the port of Tauranga in 2014 they were \$15.45 per share now 4 yrs later only worth \$5.10 per share a good loss in your investment of 66%</p>
<p>Victoria Gordon Submitter #398 To be heard? No</p>	<p>For all the reasons that you have said on the Summary of Consultation document. I think it is the best option out of all four.</p>
<p>Matt Mannington Submitter #512 To be heard? No</p>	<p>It hasn't been made clear enough why 49% is the magic number. The reason I understand is that 49% clears enough debt for the port to move forward un encumbered. Why can't it retain some debt. If it is growing and adding more services with a stable 10 year plan it is quite normal for a business to carry a percentage of debt to equity. Why not a 25% sell down and retain the same debt ratio?</p>
<p>Mark Annand Submitter #519 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I believe that developing and owning large community assets through debt funding alone is a dated concept and that some equity funding is needed. However the options provided are somewhat lacking in imagination. Under options B. & C. I would like to see provision for an investment trust or similar vehicle to provide opportunities for residents and ratepayers to subscribe capital and thereby help to maximise continuity of community ownership.</p>
<p>John Lucas Submitter #521 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Retains ownership and provides necessary capital for future expansion plans particularly the additional pier to accommodate larger vessels and cruise ships. The Cruise dollars are an invaluable input to our Regional economy.</p>
<p>Chris King Submitter #670 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Don't pay too high salaries as this takes everyone down</p>
<p>Mr W R McKee Submitter #745 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Do not wish to invest in harbour. If I did I'd buy shares in the Tauranga harbour</p>

Submitter	Commentary
Suzanne Meiklejohn Submitter #997 To be heard? No	If the Port gives such a good financial return perhaps "Maori Compensation Money" could be encouraged to invest instead of their investment monies going over-seas. Also ACC money that they have; to be invested detoured to being invested in NZ projects. - I am against OVERSEAS investment Two or Three solid NZ funds up to 49% - eg BNZ and ANZ etc banks with profits going overseas! Also I think numbers of Cruise Ships should be limited. Pollution + extraction of water.
R Hamilton Submitter #1008 To be heard? No	Prefer other options not yet explored.
Iris de Winter Submitter #1018 To be heard? No	'C' means control maintained and funding for expansion provided. An investment partner should bring skills in to assist with growth.
Bruce&Mary Ryan Submitter #1050 To be heard? No	C Selling a minority stake to an investment partner
Pauline Lane Submitter #1123 To be heard? No	In order keep ownership within New Zealand the investment partner should be the NZ Government. Let's ensure that port of Napier stays under the control of democratically elected local and national Governments.
Bruce Carrad Submitter #1197 To be heard? No	By selling 30%, not 49% to Staff and Locals to pay off current debt then raise loans to build new wharf.
John Waihape Submitter #1269 To be heard? No	I dontd want to pay more rates
Kathleen King Submitter #1343 To be heard? No	Would very much prefer to share any shares sold to remain at 40% (leaving 60% of shares with HBRC) and would think it would be better that it be in two 20% parcels - perhaps 20% from The Governments Regional Development Fund, and the other 20% from the NZ Superannuation Fund. You can only sell the "family silver" once and frankly I think it is unwise to sell it at all.
jeff slack Submitter #1360 To be heard? No	More money available in the private sector. Better Executive skills to be found in the private sector. Guaranteed to make a profit and be proactive. The community will benefit with a share. Better to own 20% of a success than 100% of potential.
Tom Rutter Submitter #1396 To be heard? No	USE UNISON PROFITS + EQUITY TO FUND PORT DEVELOPMENT.
Roger Tonge Mary Ellwood Submitter #1487 To be heard? No	I would like to see a Hawkes Bay Investor purchase Shares in the Port, and then it would be kept in Hawkes Bay.
Tony Mildenhall Submitter #1515 To be heard? No	OPTION FOR ME: TO RETAIN OWNERSHIP WITHIN NEW ZEALAND MAY BE: :UNISON NETWORKS :NZ SUPER FUNDS NOT TO BE FLOATED ON THE N.Z.X. OR WE WILL LOSE CONTROL TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS
Norman Emsley Submitter #1550 To be heard? No	We still retain ownership and final say for the future without bearing the full brunt of the cost on the rate payer.
Murray Howarth Submitter #1585 To be heard? No	An appropriate investment partner may be able to complement the ports business and improves its management and governance. Also I think that the portion sold should only be what is necessary to fund the current debt allowing the expansion to proceed with Bank debt as required. ie I do not have confidence to trust the HBRC with management of a " future investment fund ".

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Graham England Submitter #1587 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I find the procedure with regards to the port options leave a lot to be desired. I don't believe the council at this stage should have declared their preferred option, to me this indicates the decision has already been made, asking for preference and submissions is only to appease the rate payers. The council should have set out the options they are considering, and ask for rate payers to make submissions, then put out what they believe to be the best option and the reasons why. I would propose the viability of setting up a consortium of only Hawkes Bay business, Iwi and Trusts, if found to be viable be given the opportunity of 40% shares of the Port. These Shares can only be resold back to the Regional Council. While it reduces some income to the HBRC, the benefit of any future dividends should still be retained in Hawkes Bay.</p>
<p>Guenter F Dietz Submitter #1609 To be heard? No</p>	<p>MY WIFE CHIEKO HAS AGREED WITH MYSELF THAT <<C>> WOULD BE THE BEST AND MOST REALISTIC OPTION. G A Dietz</p>
<p>Denise Mildenhall Submitter #1631 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option C. Not to overseas majority owed. share company. To N.Z. majority held share company e.g. N.Z. Superfunds/Unison network, ACC.</p>
<p>Kerry Corbett Submitter #1648 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Option C to me is the best of the options but needs to be amended to a a maximum of 40%-42.5%. Perhaps a kiwi saver fund ie Booster. "Leasing of port" (opt.D) would only end up in having the port infrastructure deteriorate as a lessee would not spend capitol on major works. As for "full ownership"(opt A) I get the feeling that the port is not operating at it's full potential with poor relationships with businesses with a vested interest. As for "public Shares"(opt B) I feel it would be too messy and cumbersome and only lead to poor performance.</p>
<p>Margaret Markham Submitter #1729 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Sell enough to clear the PONL balance sheet and no more.</p>
<p>P.J. Rutter Submitter #1773 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Investigate all avenues of local funding for investment partners- especially UNISON. NO share sale to foreigners Try not destroying the wharf you have now would help! Stop dropping 2x 40Tx 40' containers on it</p>
<p>Janice Cram Submitter #1805 To be heard? No</p>	<p>- Rate payers pay for enough already - Never certain NZX might crash like 1929 - My land was leasehold but now I own it and feel good about that - Wonder who the investment partner is? Good luck & best wishes Janice Cram</p>
<p>Stefan Yuile Submitter #1855 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Hawkes Bay rate payers should get first option on shares</p>
<p>Kathryn Young Submitter #1901 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I do not think it is the role of a public sector organization to operate a commercial enterprise but understand the emotional need of the public to retain majority ownership</p>
<p>Bob McCaw Submitter #1903 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I trust elected officials to make the right decision on behalf of the port's future, and I feel that since the Port of Tauranga has used this model to fund their successful port expansion, its a path that can be followed with confidence.</p>
<p>steve Markham Submitter #1904 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The management running the port at present is totally out of touch with what the contractors need that bring in the containers etc. The local dairy is open longer hours than the port. You can't hope to expand the port by opening 7am -5pm and closed at weekend. If a professional port management team from an already established port were to invest maybe then things could move forward. At present If more than 14 trucks turn up the place is overwhelmed</p>
<p>lynda stewart Submitter #1910 To be heard? No</p>	<p>more employment in the area</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Wade Riley Submitter #1974 To be heard? No</p>	<p>History tells us that private not public run businesses, and the Port is a business, are always more profitable!</p>
<p>Brian Bulford Submitter #2151 To be heard? No</p>	<p>LIMITING MINORITY STAKE TO 45%. I SEE MERIT IN APPROACHING UNISON POWER TRUST WITH A VIEW TO SETTING UP A SIMILAR SITUATION AS HAS BEEN DONE WITH POWER DISTRIBUTION. THIS WOULD GIVE LOCAL RESIDENCE A REAL INTEREST IN THE ONGOING SUCCESS OF THE PORT. HAVE JUST READ TIM CLAUDATOS LETTER SAYS IT ALL</p>
<p>Mr P W Goeldner Submitter #2165 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Parnters NZ Govt via ACC or Super fund etc. & major exporters</p>
<p>Susan Rogerson Submitter #2182 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Why is there debt on the port if it is so profitable? Should you not start with no debt</p>
<p>No Name No Name Submitter #2206 To be heard? No</p>	<p>A block share rate of 25% or 33% to a consortium of Hawkes Bay primary producers or look at Iwi or Hapu entities as well.</p>
<p>A R Wallis Submitter #2304 To be heard? No</p>	<p>By adopting a minority stake it will keep the port for the existing shareholder a 49% or 50 year lease will cause damage to my investment</p>
<p>Malcolm Craig Submitter #2603 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Having a private partner will take some of risks off the ratepayer, provide a source of finance and hopefully will provide enhanced business acumen and a more entrepreneurial spirit. History has proven that private sector capitalism, despite all its faults, is a much better system than the command economy. This statement is made by a former public servant of 40 years duration.</p>
<p>Gordon Preston Submitter #1692 To be heard? Yes</p> <p>The New Zealand Government is already investing \$1Billion/year in the regions and to ensure Napier Port stays under the control of local and national democratic government the only other partner being considered should be the NZ Government. \$32-35 million per year (average) is just over 3% of their annual budget (normal banking can iron out peaks and troughs) which is an investment of only \$8/year for every man, woman & child in the country! NZ Rail and Air NZ buybacks and bale outs need not be repeated!!!! This development should be funded by the Govt's regional dev fund so that all NZers via the Govt are part owners of the Port. The "State" needs to declare "We control everything and are ultimately responsible for everything" on behalf of the citizens of our country. Added Information from 2nd submission: I recommend that the Port Authority as a leading and absolutely essential player in the Hawkes Bay economy leans heavily as it can on the Government to become an equity partner (30-60%) in future Port development, so that the ownership of the Port remains completely in unadulterated public ownership. Stuart Nash needs to be completely on board with this concept and government bureacrats and advisers should be given no wiggle room to sidestep this opportunity to avoid future NZ Railways type fiascoes (via Fay Rich White privatization etc). Any talk of Kiwi Saver type investments can be arranged with the Government being the middleman (Board type situation) rather than just hoping/trusting the free market/stockmarket facility will give good longterm ongoing returns. The Government must record this an investment which will give it a good ongoing return. Compounding value (based on 5%/annum interest).</p> <p style="background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px;">0-\$300m / 5yrs - \$383m / 10yrs - \$489m / 15yrs - \$630m / 20yrs - \$797m / 25yrs - \$1017m / 30yrs - \$1299m / 35yrs - \$1658m and after 40 years \$2.116 Billion!!</p>	

Submitter	Commentary
<p>Brett Chapman Submitter #2649 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The port would benefit from the expertise of a single partner and the investment required would be shared between HBRC and the new partner. Qube Holdings in Australia being a very good example to look at. Listing on the NZX is no guarantee that the necessary funds will be realised and recent IPO's have not been as successful as expected. I also note that the Port of Tauranga's financial projections and expected returns for the future are of concern which also implies that there are better investment opportunities for investors. The "Have your Say" document does not provide a balanced view in regard to the options being considered and is somewhat predetermined in describing the preferred option.</p>
<p>Lance SIMON Submitter #1914 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>My submission is that I do not really like any of the four options. I feel there should have been more options. I am also very concerned that so many HBRC ratepayers did not receive their submission documents in the mail, myself being one of those. If you can send out rate demands on time to everyone there is no excuse, not even blaming some organisation you used to send those documents out. Not one member of my extended family received those documents. I hope you did not pay the organisation you used to carry out this task. You will never know how this has effected the number of submissions you received. If you use option B, which is the HBRC preferred option, and I feel quite confident this is what you will do no matter what, there are some things I would like you to consider.</p> <p>1) I guess it does not matter to the HBRC where the money comes from if the Option B is taken up, but it does matter a great deal to HBRC ratepayers, who have a genuine fear that outside interests, with no connection with HB, will be having a great deal of influence over the port as their only interest will be making profits for themselves.</p> <p>2) If option B is taken up, other organisations which are owned by the people of HB, like Unison, could be offered the shares, with some sort of caveat that if Unison were sold to outsiders those shares went back to the HBRC/Napier Port.</p> <p>3) If option B is taken up, my preference would be divide the money required for the port development by the number of properties in HB paying HBRC rates and offer the shares to all HBRC ratepayers, on an equal basis. Obviously not all HBRC ratepayers would wish to take up the share offer. Those that did could then be offered more shares, but limiting the amount of shares per person to the amount of shares needed to reach the required amount of money required. This could be done say 3 times. By doing this HB residents could have a say in regards the operation of the port and profits would go back to HB residents. If still not enough HBRC ratepayers took up the offers, then the rest of the shares could be offered to the NZ general public or companies owned by NZers. If large organisations, be it local or especially outside of HB, end up having the bulk of the shares on offer, there is a real danger of HB residents losing control of the Napier Port as those type of organisations will be driven by self interest. I wish at this stage to speak at a hearing of submissions. Regards LR Simon 14/11/2018</p>
<p>Johan Cusack Submitter #2670 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Use money from Unison!! Both owned by ratepayers.</p>
<p>Paul Harris Submitter #3505 To be heard? Yes</p>	<p>The port although busy needs to be operated with a future focus and would benefit from some outside influences to achieve the operating efficiencies I need going forward as an exporter. Recent larger projects by the port have shown a poor return to region ratepayers. Thus I favour a third party investor. I wish to be heard in support of this submission.</p>
<p>Stewart Palmer Hyslop Submitter #2723 To be heard? No</p>	<p>I would suggest the Kiwisaver Fund/Scheme. Something that is NZ owned. Solely NZ owned. Definitely NOT option B where the 49% ownership would be the rest of the world. If there is a way to keep it in Hawkes Bay I would prefer that above all, but the rate increase could be tough on a considerable number of residents.</p>
<p>Denise & Andy Wheeler Submitter #2745 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Do not sell to overseas investors Do not sell to banks unless wholly NZ owned Sell to the likes of Unison. In effect the people of HB are still owning & investing in the port.</p>
<p>Gavin Crawley Submitter #2760 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Float on NZX is OK - but is there a way of ensuring binge Hocks are not purchased by overseas investors or Investor Key preference:- Ideal scenario is NZ super fund or Similar NZ group as partners with buy back provisions for NZ companies only (ie the province's major exporters). G Crawley</p>

Submitter	Commentary
<p>K S Chalmers Submitter #2791 To be heard? No</p>	<p>No No No B Option C - the investment partner should be Mr Jones with all his tax payers money which he says is for regional investment. Ratepayers could probably manage a small increase in rates. We should retain ownership.</p>
<p>Sean P Colgan Submitter #2812 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Governments cannot adequately manage business assets. Get a major Port partner that knows how to run a Port.</p>
<p>Juliet Watt Submitter #3036 To be heard? No</p>	<p>The Regional Council needs to invest more in our infrastructure/ environment impacts especially the quality of water, basic needs. If we retain Public interest, we still are empowered to make decisions about our Port and selling 49% to a new investment partner will open doors and free up capital, allowing long term growth from tourist revenue and exported/ imported products. It makes sense to portion out the responsibility. Increasing rates would only lead to more Public health and welfare debt, long term.</p>
<p>Darriel Evans Submitter #3043 To be heard? No</p>	<p>Although preference is for complete ownership, many ratepayers may not easily be able to service such an increase in rates for A, so C seems the most stable way to move forward to finance a new wharf.</p>
<p>George Rowlands Submitter #3245 To be heard? No</p>	<p>a N Z investment preferred EG Infratil, NZ Superfund, Unison etc.</p>
<p>Barrie Ridler Submitter #3370 To be heard? No</p> <p>HBRC / HBRC Napier Port Expansion. Submission.22/11/2018</p> <p>Sell or lease to an investment partner. As no opportunity has been allowed to retain the current port as an option but increase productivity, or more importantly, profitability (the two are not always synonymous) the Option of enhancing efficiencies through more efficient use of the resources has not been allowed nor seemingly, discussed. This would be to identify constraint points (such as loading inefficiencies due to swells, tide and depth) through more systems based analysis. Reason: Risk in developing regional ports. Although an occupancy rate of 70% may impress compared to 50% for other ports, that data conveys little about actual efficiency. 100% occupancy occurs if no ships are actually loaded or unloaded. There have been comments from Shipping Company executives that NZ will be serviced by larger container vessels to 4 ports only. Napier is not one of them.</p> <p>The intention to develop the port to take larger ships is already in question. Tauranga is one of the four ports that will accept the larger vessels and Napier is best suited to improving its efficiency as a “hub” for taking produce to Tauranga with other cargo on smaller ships (such as logs) to final destinations. Continual (and deeper) maintenance of the channel and port depths will add to running costs and any extension of the “breakwater” will require more ratepayer money in terms of trying to limit the erosion of the Westshore beachfront and removing sand build-up from the port breakwater buffer. Already the No. 5 wharf can only have limited use. Cranes have difficulty with the larger vessels due to weight limits (removal of covers takes time and adds to inefficiencies). The larger cranes can lift more but efficiency is reduced with swells moving the ships. The type of crane that is likely for the new extension wharf can be used and will improve efficiencies, but swell will have similar impacts in terms of movement when precise container lifting is required.</p> <p>The issue of swells and the very small tolerance already for larger ships entering the harbour will merely be exacerbated with the new wharf position. Shipping companies will not tolerate delays because Pilots deem it unsafe to berth such ships. No doubt, larger more powerful tugs (higher on-going marginal costs) will be needed but the swell issues may be the determinant as to maintaining the strict schedules shipping companies demand now. This was a recurring theme in a number of reports on the future of shipping in New Zealand. So risk of not meeting the proposed increase in larger ships is high. It is because of this that a proposal to sell or lease the port to an investor who is prepared to front up with ALL the developmental AND additional running costs of the expansion in return for the additional revenue generated by that investment would seem the best avenue, but not one that ratepayers have been provided with.</p> <p>If no investor is prepared to undertake such a development, it is confirmation that the port expansion proposal suffers from the same Greenspan “irrational exuberance” regarding costs, income and outcome as the RWSS. The fact that Fonterra can change ports (after Taranaki spent over \$20 million upgrading to take Fonterra exports which went to Wellington, then Napier then back to Wellington) as conditions and contract charges vary shows that ratepayer money is again being put at risk by those with “no skin in the game” (Taleb) i.e. the ratepayers are there to backstop the investors. It is costly to compete with those who have very high natural advantages when you do</p>	

Submitter	Commentary
	<p>not, whether that be ports, businesses or farms. Without a natural advantage, costs are ongoing and the risk increases in the commercially driven world of transport.</p> <p>Napier Port should look at current constraints and try to minimise those. It should accept that this is another option (but not as media grabbing) for increasing the profit and lessen risks to ratepayers. More throughput is not always the path towards more profit as the fully accounted marginal costs too often (compared to the first rose-tinted GM analysis of expansionary exuberance) outweigh the fully analysed marginal return.</p> <p>The additional costs of trying to move more produce through a port that is disadvantaged compared to its competitors will be a continual (and losing) battle. When physical, climatic and environmental issues are part of that overall systems complex, there are any number of what have been termed “known unknowns” that will occur. None will be on the upside of any vested interest’s calculations.</p>
<p>Raymond Abbott Submitter #3427 To be heard? No</p>	Because it states minimal impact on the ratepayers
<p>Ian Inglis Submitter #3547 To be heard? No</p>	Sell a minority stake to be limited to fully NZ owned entities only.
<p>Nick Chapman Submitter #3565 To be heard? No</p>	We insist this is the best option and minority take holdings should first be offered HB Maori Post Settlement Entities - not HB power company as this excludes Wairoa residents.
<p>M de Vries Submitter #3577 To be heard? No</p>	Please do not sell it to the Chinese, as they are only out for themselves and have no regard for future generations or the environment.

The following submitters selected “Option C” however added no commentary or reason for their choice.

	Sub ID	To be heard
David Tennent	183.....	No
Anne Pedersen	251.....	No
Ian Condon.....	471.....	No
Teena Moody	594.....	No
Alasdair MacLeod	731.....	No
Stephanie Parnell	961.....	No
Wendy Keogh	1143.....	No
Marie Bell	1237.....	No
Kim Salamonson	1378.....	No
Mrs M E Goeldner	1442.....	No
R Taggart	1563.....	No
William Rees	1656.....	No
Dan Sankey	1989.....	No
Mrs R Rae Maney	2145.....	No
Jennifer Matheson	2155.....	No
Derek Burns	2274.....	No
Genevra Susan Avery	2320.....	No
Rachel Tearangi Gillies	2408.....	No
Claire Mole	2423.....	No
P J Lawrence	2659.....	No
Janet Francis on behalf of Francis Family Trust	2784.....	No
Peter & Lesley Fletcher	2796.....	No
Taylor Beresford Bryan	2944.....	No
Joyce Elizabeth Brownlie	2945.....	No
Ken Bowskill	2994.....	No
Robyn Price	3514.....	No