Helena Strange,
Clerk of the Committee
Auckland Governance Legislation Committee

12 February 2010

Submission on the Local Government (Auckland Law Reform) Bill by the Auckland District Council of Social Services

We wish to be heard orally in support of this submission please, preferably in Central Auckland. Please contact Angela Maynard at the above phone / fax 09-4459996 or email: a.maynard@xtra.co.nz to arrange.

The Auckland District Council of Social Services (ADCOSS)

ADCOSS is an umbrella organisation covering the Auckland isthmus area. Membership is made up of representatives from voluntary agencies, community groups, statutory bodies and interested individuals. This submission was drafted by our Submissions sub-committee and contains ideas approved by our 14 member Executive this month.

Our functions include disseminating information on social policy issues, social legislation and on policy changes, to our members and to other social and community service providers. We do this by running workshops, seminars and training sessions. We also frequently make submissions to Parliamentary Committees and to public bodies such as yourselves.

We have an Executive, made up of members elected at our AGM and co-opted throughout the year. This meets monthly to discuss current issues and programmes, and it is to this meeting that representatives from our sub-committees report. We currently have sub-committees on: housing issues, producing submissions, children, older adults, volunteering, publications and disabilities.

We are affiliated to the New Zealand Council of Social Services, based in Wellington, which works closely with Central Government, the New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services, the New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations and ANGOA in the social policy field.

1. General Points:

1.1 **Local Board Powers.** Government spokespeople regularly told us this third Bill would clarify the important roles the new Local Boards would fulfill but it does not even clarify the principles and criteria set down in the second Act for deciding on these roles. The Bill gives no specific powers at all to the local boards except to recommend local targeted rates, fees and bylaws. It should give the Boards a list of minimum local specific powers either for six

years or indefinitely so candidates can make an informed choice as to whether they have the skills, interests and time commitment that is a good fit for the boards' roles. There should be a similarly specified partial list of roles for the Auckland Council. Other roles would be allocated initially by the Transition Agency and then negotiated between the Council and the Boards. The Bill should be amended to specify as a criteria for such decisions that the local community aspects of services are determined by the Boards despite their generally having regional implications. Potential board candidates regular approach us for advice as to what skills, knowledge, networks and time commitment will be required and what their remuneration will be. These need to be settled quickly and, unless it is amended and strengthened, the Bill will fail to do this.

1.2 **Local Board's Name.** The Boards need to be renamed local councils or community councils and their members councillors because the proposed boards will be bigger, relate to more people and be more powerful than most District Councils in NZ. This will lead to no more confusion than currently applies between the Auckland regional Council and the Auckland City Council.

1.3 **Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs).** The Bill seeks to establish three CCOs: for Water (after 2012): Transport and the Waterfront and gives the Minister of Local Government the power to establish others by Order in Council. Government and Auckland Transition Agency announcements herald at least 7 CCOs, the above three together with: Economic Development, Tourism and Events; Property; Investments and Major Regional Facilities of which only Investments has the clear single commercial focus for which a CCO is clearly appropriate. We are opposed to Parliament and Government establishing particular CCOS, when this should be a democratic decision by the new Auckland Council when established. We believe most of these proposed CCOs mix a range of commercial and competing non-commercial foci and should be part of the Council's staffing and Committee structure instead. For instance economic development needs a long-term strategic focus and not one concentrating on just one of local government's well-beings, while planning for events requires a short-term one-off focus linked equally to the social and cultural wellbeings and even to environmental wellbeing as much as to economic well-being. The major regional facilities each have their own established, effective and distinctive cultures and identities and strong working relationships with their Councils, key stakeholders and audiences that probably would not suit an arm's length business-oriented lowest common denominator governance conglomerate. Managing properties is often about maximizing financial return but it is also often about protecting heritage or urban design or maximizing community use.

1.4 **Auckland Transport.** The Transport Body should not be established by legislation but by the Auckland Council. In this Bill Auckland Transport is given unnecessary and inappropriate powers to appoint its own chair and deputy chair and to make bylaws, all of which should be retained by the Auckland Council. The Auckland Transport System that they are responsible for is defined in the Bill in a way that includes street furniture, street trees, berms, footpaths and local safety and urban design features that should be defined instead as being the role of the Local boards. Local boards must be given a statutory right to be consulted by Auckland Transport about its Statement of Intent and its decision-making about regional and, particularly, locally significant matters. Auckland Transport should be required to develop and consult on a 10-year plan, like all other CCOs. Auckland Transport, Watercare, and potentially other CCOs are unnecessarily largely exempted from the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act that would otherwise enable their decision-making to be transparent if it was made by internal business units and Council Committees. Any proposed asset sales by CCOs of over $2m should require approval by the Auckland Council after a special consultative procedure

1.5 **Decision-making around Establishing CCOs.** Decisions on whether to establish these CCOs and others or not should be democratic, transparent, and consultative decisions by the new Auckland Council rather than have their existence and incredibly detailed roles and operational mechanisms determined by the Government. If Cabinet retains a power to establish CCOs any such CCO must be required to have a single well-defined commercial purpose and focus. All CCO directors should be appointed by an electoral college of the existing councils and boards and not appointed by Rodney Hide. If this is not changed the Auckland Council must have the power immediately to review and replace where appropriate the members of these CCO Boards without compensation. The new Council should decide whether, who and how many elected councillors and local board members are appointed to each particular CCO, instead of the Bill's proposed ban on any elected members ever serving on any of them (apart from Auckland Transport).

1.6 **Auckland Services Performance Auditor.** As recommended by the Royal Commission there should be a statutory Auckland Services Performance Auditor for Watercare and for any other CCOs acting as a monopoly service provider. Earning the confidence of its users will be crucial for Watercare and a Performance Auditor is crucial for this to happen. The overworked office of the Auditor- General cannot give this role sufficient attention, lacks the power to intervene on monopolistic activities and is not necessarily attuned to Auckland's needs and views.

1.7 **Social and Community Service Agencies and Social Policy.** The Bill is clearly lacking, and should be amended to apply to the Auckland Council a clear mandate and responsibility adequately to fund, sustain, engage and collaborate with effective regional and sub-regional social and community service and networking organisations such as Citizens' Advice Bureaux, Councils of Social Services and Refugee and Migrant Services. Just as the Auckland regional Amenities Act, which is rightly updated and perpetuated through this Bill, guarantees the continuity, sustainability and good governance of crucial Auckland regional amenities, so should the key effective social and community services also have their future effectiveness secured. The Bill should also make it clear that the local boards have an equal mandate and responsibility to fund, sustain, engage and collaborate with effective local agencies and service providers. There is still nothing at all in legislation about how Aucklanders can determine and be involved in social policy issues through the Auckland Council, Local Boards, or other democratically elected and accountable agencies, and this issue is still being consulted on. There are widespread fears that the Government is preparing the ground for a 10% or greater cut in social services spending but they seem intent on making these decisions exclusively within the Cabinet by Budget time rather than taking Auckland's diverse and challenging needs and views into account.

1.8 **Maori Engagement.** The generally negative Maori responses to the proposed advisory board demonstrate the clear need to provide in addition for two Maori Councillors on the Auckland Council elected from Maori Roll wards. It is absolutely vital that Maori have confidence in, and fully engage with, the new Auckland governance structure. It is important to specify and have appropriate real decision-making powers for Maori Councillors and the Maori board rather than their being merely advisory and such delegated powers, or ability to delegate appropriate powers to Maori representatives, should be added to the Bill. Maori must have a structure that they have confidence in and can engage with authentically and share in exercising real mana. Those Maori appointed to Council Committees and other appropriate decision-making bodies must have a vote in order to have a voice beyond the tokenistic. Their role should be defined as being clearly broader than just natural and physical resources issues.

1.9 **Stronger Protections against Privatisation are needed.** There are inadequate protections against the privatisation of key services and assets, which are only protected against sale until mid-2012 in the case of strategic assets generally, no longer specifically protected at all in the case of Council's shareholding in the Ports of Auckland nor of the Auckland Centennial Park in the Waitakere Ranges and only until 2015 in the case of Watercare. While the Government is seeking to circumscribe the autonomy

and independent decision-making of the new Auckland governance bodies in these 186 pages of detailed legislation, public assets cherished by Aucklanders as their family silver will cease to have sufficient protection.

1.10 **Ability to Borrow in Foreign Currency.** There should be a provision for the Auckland Council, and probably for other NZ Councils, to be able to borrow in foreign currency. The new Auckland Council in particular, and therefore the rates burden on its business and residential ratepayers will face higher effective interest charges in New Zealand's limited financial markets unless this change is made. It is unwise that small Auckland businesses can borrow in overseas currency while this huge new enterprise is still prohibited from so doing.

1.11 **Pasifika and Ethnic Boards.** There is a wise provision for Pasifika and Ethnic Advisory Boards. However, to win the confidence of the Councillors they are advising they need ultimately to be appointed by the council rather than just by the Mayor as is proposed. The Bill should be amended to ensure that existing Pasifika advisory bodies need to be consulted about the nature and membership of the Pacific People's Advisory panel. Existing ethnic councils and major ethnic groups need to be consulted about the membership and role of the Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel. Their existence and operation should be reviewed in 2013 rather than requiring their abolition, and if abolished they need effective and representative bodies to succeed them. There should also be provision for a Youth Council or Councils and for a Central Business District Advisory Board or Committee.

1.12 **Fair Protection of Existing Staff.** The jobs and all the employment terms and conditions of staff employed by Councils and current CCOs at the end of October, or transferred to the new Council or CCOs before then, should be fully protected for at least the first 6 months of the new Council and CCOs or until the end of April 2011, whichever is the later.

2. Clause by Clause Analysis and Recommendations:

2.1 Clause 11 proposed section 13(1)(cc) and Clause 24 Section 35L should have the Ethnic and Pasifika panels appointed through and by the Council, not by the Mayor alone.

2.2 Clause 11 proposed section 13(1)(g)(ivb) should be deleted so that the new Council can decide whether and how it wants a waterfront development agency as a CCO.

2.3 Clause 12 Section 14 (3) (c) re the electoral officer should refer to the Mt Wellington and Otara Licensing Trusts also.

2.4 Clause 15 section 18A(1)(c) should delete “being the capital value of the land” so the Council can decide its own rating system e.g. the annual rental value, or land value as options in setting rates.

2.5 Clause 17 Section 19(1A)(a). This should require the allocation of decision-making responsibilities for the boards and the Council to be done in consultation with existing Auckland local authorities and community boards. The bill should also specify some specific roles for each of the Council and also for the boards, and also elaborate on the criteria in the second Act that the ATA must use in making this allocation e.g. that the local aspects of regional services must be determined by the Boards.

2.6 Clause 18 Section 19B should preferably be deleted so the new Council decides entirely on any waterfront development agency. Alternatively it should be amended to have the new Council, not the ATA, establish the Waterfront Development Agency and clarify that it is only for a section of the Waitemata waterfront contiguous with the CBD and for Westhaven and not for Devonport, Hobsonville or Onehunga for example.

2.7 Clause 24 Section 35C should be amended to make it clear that the chief executive offers employment, transfers and any changes in employment conditions rather than determines them and that remuneration or terms and conditions of a transferring employee cannot be reduced until 1 May 2011. Section 35F should be amended to require the existing Auckland Councils to be consulted about any proposals under this section to terminate particular existing council-controlled organisations.

2.8 Clause 24 Section 35G. This currently gives the Cabinet and the Minister of local government the power to establish more and new Council Controlled Organisations and set out their objectives, governance, structure, and operation. These proposed sections should be deleted as decisions should instead be made by the new Auckland Council or, if they are urgently required, by Auckland’s current Councils collectively.

2.9 Clause 24 Sections 35H and 35I. We are strongly opposed to these proposals. In no circumstances should the Minister appoint the initial directors of any CCOs including Auckland Transport. The first preference is for these to await appointment by the new Auckland Council; the second preference would be for appointments to be made by an Electoral College of the existing Councils and a community board representative, and third preference by the Auckland Transition Agency on the recommendation of the Electoral College above. There should also be specific powers provided for the Auckland Council to review all CCO director appointments at any time in

its first or second year and to be able to replace any without compensation.

2.10 Clause 24 Section 35L. There should be a statutory obligation to consult the existing Pasifika Boards of the local authorities and the community boards as well and for the appointments to be made by the Auckland Council not the Mayor alone to ensure all Councillors respect their advice.

2.11 Clause 29 Section 3(d). The purpose of arrangements concerning Maori should be amended to “decide and advise on” issues for Maori not merely to promote them. The legislation or the Auckland Council should delegate some specific roles and decisions to them.

2.12 Clause 35 section 11(5) needs to be amended to provide, as in the current Act, that these electors must at least specifically apply every 3 years to go on the special and publicly accessible roll for this purpose and only have one vote for each particular authority. Better still, in line with the principle of one person one vote, people should only be entitled to enrol and vote at the place they regard as their home, as is the case for Parliament. The fact that someone owns property in a particular board area does not generally give them a greater interest in an area than others do who regularly rent a property there for their holidays nor those who regularly work, worship or play sport in that board area but who quite rightly do not thereby earn a vote there.

2.13 Clause 36 proposed section 11A should be amended to make Local Boards to be local authorities and their members local authority members for most purposes and not just for the purposes of sections 43 to 47 of the Local Government Act.

2.14 Clause 37 Section 13A. This should be amended to include in possible reorganisation proposals also the subdivisions of a local board and their boundaries, the division of a local board into 2 or more boards or for new boards to be created out of 2 or more boards. The Auckland Council should be able to comment to a local board and to the Local Government Commission on proposals for boundary and other changes to boards put forward by boards or by local residents but not be able to act as a filtering, determining or vetoing body for Local Government Commission decisions.

2.15 Clause 45 Section 37. In the proposed (1)(b) it is vital to amend the definition of the Auckland Transport System to take out of the definition things that should be done instead of Auckland Transport by the Council or, preferably, by local boards e.g. footpaths, berms, those parts of road reserves not used as road, street vegetation, street furniture, artworks,

urban design features, and utilities buried in or otherwise utilizing road reserve space.

2.16 Clause 45, Section 39. “Energy efficient, people friendly, efficient and appropriate land use, contributing to good urban design and minimally polluting” should be added to the objectives of Auckland Transport. It should also be obliged legislatively to contribute to the economic, environmental, cultural and social wellbeing of Auckland

2.17 Clause 45, Section 42(1)(i), delete the power for Auckland Transport to make bylaws. These should ultimately be made by the Auckland Council as many like street trading and billboards have non-transport objectives and also the ultimate accountability must remain with the Council. If not, the Bill should require the same special consultative procedure for making bylaws and other significant policies as is required for local authorities.

2.18 Clause 45 Section 42(1)(j). The reference to tolling schemes should be deleted, as road tolling is an unfair and inefficient road funding mechanism and should only be exercised by a Council not a CCO.

2.19 Clause 45 Section 43(1) should be deleted. The Auckland Council should retain the ultimate authority to resume powers initially conferred on Auckland Transport

2.20 Clause 45 Section 44(a). The requirement to exhibit responsibility should have “cultural” added to the other three wellbeings.

2.21 Clause 45, Section 45 should be amended to provide that the majority of members are Auckland Councillors and also not limit the number of voting members.

2.22 Clause 45, Section 47(2). This must be amended so that all of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act must apply to all aspects of Auckland Transport and to all the other CCOs. LGOIMA already exempts commercial secrecy and personal privacy and that is the only exemption required. Residents, ratepayers, elected representatives and transport operators and users need to know when the Transport Authority is having a meeting considering matters that affect them so that they can make their views known either directly or indirectly, whichever is appropriate.

2.23 Clause 45. In proposed Part 5, sections 49-65 re water and wastewater services, the proposed section 51 re bylaws should be undertaken entirely by the Auckland Council for democratic accountability and transparency.

In Section 61, this should be amended water organisations should pay the same capital value-based rates as every other ratepayer.

2.24 Clause 45, in the proposed Part 6 re spatial planning the same specific requirement that it be sustainable as is in the Local Government Act and RMA should be added. Economic, social, cultural and environmental objectives should also be added because environmental guardianship, sustainable planned activities and equitable social outcomes are equally important.
Powers to delegate appropriate functions under the RMA and the spatial plan to the Maori board and to the local boards should be added.
Powers with respect to the co-ordination of utilities like broadband, electric power, gas and telcos need to be added.
Subsection (3)(h) should add references to “historic heritage, recreational activities and open space” and these should be protected, as are ecological areas in 3i.
Subsection (6) – requiring the special consultative procedure requirement- is supported.
In subsection (7)(b) the Act should require the plan and amendments to be made available on Waiheke and Great Barrier.
A timetable for reviewing and updating these spatial plans should be added.

2.25 Clause 45 Part 7 sections 67-74 the proposed Maori Board. Section 69(d) and (e) need to add that the Maori Board also has a role to advise all the CCOs and the local boards as well as the Auckland Council.
In Section 70(1) need to add “built and cultural” resources to the natural and physical resources referred to, because built structures and cultural resources and expression are equally as important to Maori as natural and physical resources. The one or two Maori Board appointees to a limited number of appropriate Council Committees should specifically in the legislation have both speaking and voting rights if they are to be seen and experienced as more than a token. In Section 71 the Maori Board should have some appropriate powers delegated to it, particularly some RMA and cultural powers.

2.26 Clause 45 Part 8 Miscellaneous. In section 75(1)(b)(ii) this should be amended so that a substantive CCO need only have $2 Million in assets to be defined as a substantive CCO.
In section 75(2)(c)(iii) add “technological, and public opinion” factors.
Delete 75(3) so Auckland transport is not exempt from the otherwise generally applying substantive CCO requirement to prepare a 10-year plan.

2.27 Clause 45, delete section 76 as it should be up to the Council to decide whether particular Councillors would be the best directors of a substantive CCO and not the Parliament or Government.

2.28 Sections 77-79 do give an appropriate Board - Council dispute resolution role to the Local Government Commission so that the Council and the Board concerned are treated equally and independently of them. This provision is therefore supported.

2.29 Clause 45 Section 83. The first review of representation arrangements should be permitted during the Council's first term as there are likely to be some boundaries that prove unsuitable and be required no later than 2015. For completeness an (h)(iii) should be added to include whether additional local boards should be created merged or reshaped, boundaries changed or the number of board members overall or from a subdivision or subdivisions changed.

2.30 Clause 49. A specific amendment is required to save section 28 of the Local Government (Auckland) Amendment Act, which sets out a comprehensive consultative process should the sale of Auckland Regional Holding's shareholding in Ports of Auckland be considered. Aucklanders very clearly want this asset retained in perpetuity.

2.30 Clause 51(1)(b) add "or until a successor programme is approved by the Auckland Council" and to 51(2) add "or until a new strategy is adopted".

2.31 Clause 53(4)(c)(iii) add with respect to current Council employees "any less favourable terms and conditions may not come into force until at least 6 month after an employee is transferred to the Auckland Council or one of its CCOs or until 1 May 2011, whichever is the later".

2.32 Clause 59 postponing consideration of any, which are likely often to be better, reorganisation proposals and Clause 60 requiring first past the post for at least the next two elections, should be deleted. Aucklanders should decide those matters under normal legal and public consultation procedures.

2.33 Clause 61(5) should be amended to have the remuneration of board members determined by the Remuneration Authority as it does now for Community Boards and not by the Auckland Council.

2.34 Clause 62. This provides a moratorium on the sale of strategic assets. This should be retained unchanged but its sunset clause extended from July 2012 to July 2015, so none are rushed into.

2.35 Clauses 65-74 re Watercare Services. The requirements in these proposed clauses should remain as statutory requirements permanently. None should expire as is proposed in June 2012 in Sections 65, 66, 67- re the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act, and 69 nor in 2015 as is proposed for sections 71- keeping prices to a minimum, or section 73 – preventing privatisation. In clause 69 the views of local boards must also be required to be taken into account in the SOI. In Clause 72 the ban on Councillors being on the Watercare Board should be deleted- that should be a decision of the Council.

2.36 Clause 75. This clause re the Airport Shares should refer to a greater than 20% shareholding rather than 22.8%, as the shareholding is slightly less than 22.8% and varies over time.

2.37 Bylaws. Clause 92 Amend this clause so Transport Bylaws are made by the Auckland Council, not Auckland Transport.

2.38 Clause 100 Standing Orders. These Standing Orders of the new Auckland Council should not be imposed by the Minister but preferably by a joint committee of the Auckland Councils or failing that by the ARC.

2.39 Clause 101. There is a typo in that in subsection (4)(b) it should refer to a local board, not community board.

2.40 Clause 105, subsection 12. We submit that the southeastern corner of the current Auckland Region containing water supplies and regional parks should be restored to Auckland. If this is not agreed to, a reference to the Hauraki District should be added.

2.41 Clause 111 re Pacific and Ethnic Councils. In subsection (1) delete "mayor of" so the Council is responsible for the appointments.
In (2)(a)(i) and in (3)(a)(i) add and "any proposed budgets, fees and rates" as this financial influence and advice is a key one for them to exercise. In (2)(b) and (3)(b) add "and CCOs." as their powers will be great in their impacts on Pasifika and Ethnic populations.
In (4) amend (b) to replace "disestablished" with "reviewed" and add (4)(c) "if disestablished these must be replaced with a democratic, authentic, appropriate and effective successor."

2.42 Page 107 Schedule 2 Provisions relating to planning document Clause 2 (2)(a) add "and projects" after "activities" because local boards will have a number of local projects and events.

2.43 Page 113 Schedule 3 Matters in relation to election signs Clauses 4-8. It is important these are consistent across the region but these proposals are too detailed and inappropriate to be decided by legislation rather than by seeking agreement between the existing Councils. If they are proceeded with as drafted they far too prescriptive and impose unfair and unnecessary costs on candidates and their supporters. In clause 4(2) it is unreasonable and could constitute censorship of political expression for a landlord to be allowed to ban their tenant putting up a sign for a candidate they support.
In Clause 6 sub-section (1)(d) change to approximately 45 degrees for the angle of the bracing, if this requirement is needed at all, all words after "securely Braced" could be deleted. In Clause 6 (1)(g) Delete, as reminder to vote signs or ribbons are surely okay provided they are safe. In Clause 6(3) change from a one sign limit to one of no more than 2 signs to allow those at approximately right angles facing each way for stability and for visibility. Clause 7(1)(b) delete "damaged, is vandalised or" as unnecessary – they only need to be taken down if actually unsafe. Clause 7(2) after sign add "for the purposes of subsection 1" i.e. candidates only should be required to pay if they have breached the requirements or the sign has to come down because it is unsafe and they should always be offered the option of taking down and storing the sign themselves. In Clause 8(1) after "candidate" add "or group of candidates"- which will be the more common situation for signs.

2.44 Page 119 Schedule 6. (4)(b) is supported which ensures continuing employees cannot have their wages or salary cut until 30 April 2011. Their terms and conditions should also be protected until 30 April 2011 and this provision added to the Bill.

2.45 Page 121 Schedule 2 Clause 1(2). Directors' terms should be for a maximum of 3 years with a right of reappointment which is stated in sub clause (3), in order to correspond with the Council term.

2.46 Page 126 Schedule 2 Clause 14(2)(d) the reference to a trustee should be amended to a beneficial trustee, because being a professional or voluntary trustee is irrelevant if there is no financial interest and many lawyers and accountants act as trustees for hundreds of organisations without thereby having an interest.

2.47 Page 130 Schedule 2 Clause 23. Subsection (b) should only occur when that method of electronic rather than face to face communication is agreed to by all directors as satisfactory for that particular meeting.

2.48 Page 137 Maori Board Schedule 3 Clauses 1 and 6. The Board should have 4 taura here representatives so urban Maori and external iwi have a reasonable voice. In clauses 9 and 10, these decisions should be made by

the selection body and not by the Board. In Clause 17 the Maori Board's remuneration, because of its independence, responsibilities and mana should be determined by the Remuneration Authority, not the Auckland Council.
.
2.49 Page 152 Schedule 3 Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act. The retention of, and the proposed amendments to, this Act are supported.

2.50. Page 155 Schedule 3 Land Transport Management Act, proposed section 17. (1)(a) should be amended to require these to be agreed to by the Auckland Council.

2.51 Page 163 Schedule 3 Part 1 Local Electoral Act. The mayoral campaign spending limit must be reduced greatly. We recommend it be changed to $100,000 plus 5 cents per elector, not plus 50 cents each elector. Mayoral candidates need to compete in terms of their personal qualities, ability to generate genuinely newsworthy statements and policies; and motivate voluntary workers: not in terms of the personal wealth of themselves and their supporters.

2.52 Page 163 Schedule 3 Local Government Amendment Act 1992. Section 77 must not be repealed but simply amended to change the ownership of the Auckland Centennial Park from the Auckland Regional Council to the Auckland Council. This valuable regional asset must be specifically protected in Auckland Council and Auckland public ownership.

2.53 Page 164 Schedule 3 Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act. Part 2 of schedule 1 must have inserted in it Auckland Transport, the Auckland Waterfront Agency, Watercare and any other Auckland Council CCOs that may be established in future.

2.54 Pages 170 and 171 Schedule 3 Part 2 referring to the Auckland Regional Amenities Funding Act. The amended provisions contained in the Bill aimed at ensuring that these regional amenities are sustained financially and in terms of good governance in the long-term should specifically be supported. We support the removal of the artificial funding cap. We doubt that there should be a continuing reference to the Franklin District in the Act. We also support the amended provisions for MOTA T and the Auckland War Memorial Museum.

Yours sincerely

Angela Maynard
Administrator
Auckland District Council of Social Services