

Kia ora koutou

Ka tu au i raro i te maru o Mahuika, o Uenukukopako, o Rangiteaorere, o Rangiwahakekeau me Tutakangahau hoki. Ko a ratou maa oku tupuna, aa, ko Mary Tukiwaho toku ingoa.

He mihi atu au ki nga tane e noho ana i te tepu ra i a au. I whakarongo atu koutou i nga wiki e toru, ki nga kaikorero maha i kororerero ana i a ratou whakaaro, a ratou wawata, a ratou moemoea, a ratou raru e pa ana ki te TANK Plan.

He mihi mahana, mihi aroha atu ano au ki te whanau me nga tangata katoa kua tae mai ki nga korero katoa hei tautoko, hei awhi ki nga kaikorero ka tu i te wahi ka tu au inaianei. He mihi, he mihi, aa kia tau.

Has the table read and understood my submission? Do I need to clarify anything written within my submission? Soooo where to start? That's one of the loaded questions that I have for myself, with the other one being: "What do I have to say that would support all the speakers that opposed the TANK plan and add meaningful value to my speech as well as theirs?"

Let's start with a recap: Over the last two sittings you have heard a range of speeches from mana tangata and what they need to have changed within TANK Plan through to organisations and what they want to come out of the TANK plan.

If we are being honest, open minded and transparent some of those speeches were of immense value to the TANK plan and on point as to what is needed to be changed and implemented, some were far-fetched and added very little value whatsoever, and others were monotoned, dry and put Mary to sleep a quarter way through their speech. Not because they didn't have anything of value to add but because I lost interest in what they were trying to say. So where to from my summarising? What are my points and added value for the Proposed Plan Change 9 aka the TANK Plan 9?

Let's discuss tokenism, management, solutions, and implementation, all of which are referred or implied to in my submission. Just before I start could I ask a question in reference to the s42A? On page 19, sections 85 & 86 the Hawkes Bay Regional Planning Committee (RPC) is about a co-governance group made up of Regional Councillors and Post Settlement Governance Entity representatives for management of natural resources, correct?

I would like it to be noted that as tangata whenua and I will not be the only one to disagree with NKII as well as HTST speaking on our behalf, and that is I **do not** give my personal mandate and the mandate of Runanga marae to the representatives of the Post Settlement Governance Entities to speak on our behalf unless there is a representative from Te Taiwhenua o Heretaunga speaking on behalf of nga marae of Heretaunga.

Why is this? I have numerous reasons, but my main reason is that both NKII and HTST do not consult with the people first before they make decisions on our behalf. Te Taiwhenua in particular Te Manaaki Taiao / Runanganui board do. They also guide us to improve our marae outlook and improvements, our people's presence be it spiritual, mental or physical, and

increase our knowledge for issues such as COVID 19, TANK, building consents and potential waahi tapu within those building consents, health, and safety issues especially around work-related areas and so much more. If there is a recommendation needed for a representative/s from TTOH, I nominate Morrie Black and Marei Apatu.

My next point for management is again with the s42A page 33, paragraph 169 – “yearly reporting” could I suggest changing the timeframe to “a random 6 monthly reporting” as seasons change as does the water, land and soil, also some people use the timing of the yearly visits to cover up their unlawful acts. So random 6 monthly visits would be beneficial for the HBRC, the people and the environment.

Well that took care of the management part within my korero, I think. I'll be interested to know the outcome of the inclusion of TTOH to this management committee and whether HBRC are just doing this out of tokenism or if they are really, really going to listen to the people, I meant TTOH.

I guess this brings me to my next subject “tokenism”, thanks to Ngaio for the word. Let's take the advert from HBRC's take on water and that would be “Water is a taonga”. Loosely translated taonga means gift. Within the world I grew up in taonga means so, so much more than the English's translation and it is hard to put into words that would do it justice.

Let me dumb it down for those who weren't as privilege as I was growing up: let's use me as the example: Ko oku tupuna ko au, ko au ko oku tupuna meaning my tupuna or ancestors are me as I am my ancestors. How is that possible? I am my tupuna not only through DNA, but their experiences passed down to me through my name, my whakapapa, the land they strived and fought to keep for me, the stories, songs, and proverbs of them etc. Through these things they live through me within me from those things that I know of them. It's like “ko te awa ko au, ko au ko te awa” – the river is me as I am the river. Meaning that without the water within the awa I cannot live, without the kai from the awa I cannot provide for myself or my whanau. Marama??? Understand my point on tokenism? You cannot use Maori words within a document without knowing the whole – as in wholistic - of that particular Maori word. It's just tokenism or what I call ticking the brown box. I commend the s42A for integrating matauranga Maori into the changes if only they could be set into practise not just as the words for Maori to appease the Treaty of Waitangi role by using words such as mauri, awa, puna etc.

My take on solutions is kind of tunnel visionary, similar to what I see, I do only. It would be what I know to the best of my knowledge, what I believe in whole heartedly and what I fully understand. Which means what exactly in regard to TANK and in particular the Appendix 11? I do not hold a doctorate or even a certificate in water hydrology so who am I to give you my understanding of water quantities? Let's just say that the Ngaruroro water levels are the shallowest that I have ever seen them – going from meters to centimetre's in the space of 20 odd years. The once beautiful and full river of Bridge Pa is no longer, Runanga Lake once full of tuna, freshwater crayfish and mussels is slowly residing and no longer has freshwater mussels or crayfish. It barely has tuna, shall I continue?

Solution One: to increase the water level at Omaha bridge – close off all man made re-diverted streams that take water out of the Ngaruroro from Omaha back to Owhaoko. This would allow for water levels to increase and for the aquifer and springs to replenish themselves.

Solution Two: re-instate the old natural waterways once the Ngaruroro river has risen to the level that it should be.

Solution Three: Re-educate the farmers, and growers on how to reuse wastewater, get HBRC to invest in better watering solutions to help those organisations and the wider urban public to become more water savvy because they are draining ALL waterways.

I think giving four or was it five solutions is more than enough food for thought, now for the implementation of said solutions. This would be a time frame implementation so if we are giving random 6 monthly reports so too should be the implementation of the solutions. The implementation of ALL solutions, whether voiced by me or by other submitters, should see a solid outcome within a 6-month period not 3 years later like 2024 as stated in s42A. Only because this would be really, really beneficial to not only HBRC but to the people of Heretaunga as a whole.

I think that's the longest I have spoken in a very long time, so without further ado. Please do not hold it against me if I do not sing a Waiata because I cannot sing to save myself.

Hoei ano tena koutou, tena koutou, tena tatou katoa.

Ka huri...