

ADDENDUM 1: SUMMARY TABLE OF SUBMISSIONS

RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION – APP.037197.01.01 – PROPOSED

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|
| 9.10.17 | Air Zone Ltd | Attention: K Martin Air Zone Ltd PO Box 893 Whangarei 0140 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The dredging proposal has sound benefits to the ongoing sustained operation of Refining NZ and local businesses. The proposal will also improve environmental performance through fewer ships visiting the harbour. Many businesses in the Whangarei district are heavily reliant on Refining NZ directly providing work for a large number of staff. Local businesses purchase goods and services from other local businesses not working directly on site. The extent of this flow-on effect should not be underestimated. Refining NZ has comprehensively assessed the effects associated with the Proposal and consulted widely on it. The adverse environmental effects of the Proposal are considered minor and acceptable. Refining NZ has been a responsible corporate citizen especially in enhancing and safeguarding our foreshore, water quality from run off into the harbour and respecting what is an important seafood source for families. | Grant consent. |
| 11.10.17 | BP Oil New Zealand Limited | Attention: M Bone BP Oil New Zealand Limited PO Box 99873 Newmarket Auckland 1149 | Support | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will deliver improved safe tanker passage for existing operations as well as allowing for larger Suezmax vessels, with no net increase for potential oil pollution to the surrounding environment from tanker activities. There are various environmental impacts to the proposal but these will be mitigated to an acceptable level. The overall benefits of the proposal - safer ship access and improved long-term competitiveness of Refining NZ - outweigh any residual impacts of the proposal after the mitigations identified. | Grant consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 9.10.17 | Bream Bay Coastal Care Trust | Attention: R Hembry Bream Bay Coastal Care Trust 5 Beck Place Ruakaka 0116 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Cultural Effects Assessment Report commissioned by Refining New Zealand has not been included in its Resource Consent Application, representing a slap in the face for tangata whenua. Concerned about the effects on the ecology of the proposed dredge site and the greater Bream Bay marine environment. There are a number of historical kaimoana (shellfish) beds located within the vicinity of the proposed dredging, all of which are filter feeding species and therefore at risk during the dredging activity. The disruption to all birdlife in the vicinity of the dredging site including land based birds relocated to the Bream Head Reserve. Witnessing the magnificent marine animals such as orca, humpback, sperm, pilot whales, dolphin frequent the Whangarei Harbour and the greater Bream Bay marine environment is an ongoing privilege and one that should be protected for future generations. The potential for lighting pollution to disrupt the circadian rhythm of the local residents, bird and marine life if the dredging takes place nightly for the duration of the proposed consent. Should there be an oil spill associated with the larger Suezmax tankers, the effects on all life, land- and marine-based, could be devastating. Potential adverse effects of the proposed project on the two marine reserves within Whangarei Harbour. There is a need for the global community to change from the use of fossil fuels to a low carbon economy (to reduce climate change). Given that the Refinery plant is some 50 years old, the sites closure will be sooner rather than later. | Refuse consent |
| 9.10.17 | Bream Head Conservation Trust | Attention: R Gates Bream Head Conservation Trust C/- Mallet Angelo Quinn 5 Hunt St Whangarei 0110 | Support (conditional) | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental enhancement and mitigation measures proposed are not sufficiently extensive to manage the full environmental and social implications of the proposal over the consent period sought. An interim management authority should be established for maintaining harbour health within the affected coastal marine area and beyond and be funded by RNZ. The precedent conditions set by Environment Court decisions on the consents for the Northport construction should be followed. | Grant consent. (with conditions) |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|---|--|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|
| 5.10.17 | Chamber of Commerce and Industry Northland Inc. | Attention: T Collins Chamber of Commerce and Industry Northland Inc. PO Box 1703 Whangarei 0140 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northland's economic development and growth requires the right infrastructure, a skilled workforce, and the opportunity at a regional level for businesses to grow both their capability and capacity. Refining NZ and this Proposal have an important role to play in providing these elements. • Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. • Refining NZ has comprehensively assessed the effects associated with the Proposal such that interested parties have sufficient information to understand potential effects on the environment and on themselves. • The adverse environmental effects of the Proposal will be minor and acceptable. • There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. - potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the local economy. - enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour - downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. • There are a range of environmental initiatives which will result in overall positive outcomes for certain sensitive species and habitats. | Grant consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Coastal Oil Logistics Limited | Attention: J Kelly Coastal Oil Logistics Limited Level 10 The Bayleys Building Lambton Quay Wellington 6143 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed dredging will deliver enhanced navigational and marine safety aspects for vessels utilising Refining NZ's facilities. • The Proposal is expected to result in a reduction in the overall number of vessel movements required to transport crude cargoes to the refinery. • Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. • Any adverse environmental effects of the Proposal will be limited. • There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. - potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the local economy. - enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour - downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. | Grant consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|
| 11.10.17 | Cribb E | E Cribb 16 Aratiatia Place Tikipunga Whangarei 0112 | Oppose | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whakapapa • Kaitiakitanga • Mauri • Wairua • Whanaungatanga • Te Ao Huri • Tuku iho • Maramataka • Rahui | Refuse consent |
| 10.10.17 | Culham Engineering Company Ltd | Attention: R Kirwan Culham Engineering Company Ltd PO Box 660 Whangarei 0140 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed will have a range of positive effects for Whangarei and Northland. • Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. • Refining NZ has comprehensively assessed the effects associated with the Proposal such that interested parties have sufficient information to understand potential effects on the environment and on themselves. • Any adverse environmental effects of the Proposal will be minor and acceptable. • There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. - potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the local economy. - downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. • Enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour. • Reduction in the overall number of vessel movements required to transport crude cargoes to the refinery. • There are a range of environmental initiatives which will result in overall positive outcomes for certain sensitive species and habitats. | Grant consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------|---|---|
| 11.10.17 | Director General of Conservation | Attention: G Silver Department of Conservation Private Bag 3072 Hamilton 3240 | Oppose (conditional) | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed dredging within the mouth is in close proximity to the Whangarei Harbour Marine Reserve at Motukaroro Island, Mair Bank and other sensitive ecosystems such as rocky reefs. • The area is a known feeding and breeding habitat for birds, marine mammals and other wildlife. • To be effective and enforceable, mitigation and enhancement measures and monitoring must be imposed as conditions of the consents with sufficient detail, including targets to properly manage the adverse effects. • The monitoring proposed does not include adequate monitoring of potential adverse effects on the marine reserve, or require any adaptive management, if adverse effects are detected. • May be concerned if the size and number of vessels increases significantly as a result of the deepening and realignment of the harbour approaches. • Support the concept of the harbour enhancement programme, subject to appropriate predator control to address adverse effects. • Without appropriate conditions to address the adverse effects of the proposed activity the application does not promote the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, does not meet the requirements of Part 2 of the Act and is not consistent with the relevant planning documents. | Refuse consent (unless subject to specified conditions) |
| 11.10.17 | Fisheries Inshore New Zealand (FINZ) | O Wilson PO Box 297 Wellington 6140 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the extent of the proposed dredging and dumping processes, concerned that the proposal will adversely affect local inshore fisheries and the associated marine life. • The maps provided are not of sufficient detail to accurately demonstrate the impact and extent of the spatial and temporal overlap of the proposal with local fisheries, including at 3 Mile Reef. • The data used to assess the impacts of the proposal on commercial fisheries is not up to date. • The proposal does not clearly explain the rationale for dumping of spoil at the proposed disposal sites or for the proposed proportion of spoil volume at each site. • The proposal does not adequately address the impacts of the disposal sites and there is inadequate consideration for suitable alternatives. • Disposal site 1.2 is located adjacent to important scallop beds and overlaps with longline activity. Disposal site 3.2 overlaps with one of the main trawling areas in Bream Bay. Further consideration is required of the impact of the use of these disposal sites on this fishing activity, including potential displacement of fishing effort. • The proposal does not adequately consider possible alternative locations or methods for spoil disposal, particularly land based options. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|--|--|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|
| 10.10.17 | Forsyth B | B Forsyth PO Box 10234 Te Rapa Hamilton 3241 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed will have a range of positive effects for Whangarei and Northland. Sustainability for one of Northland's major employers. Better opportunity for growth for RNZ and its suppliers. Less impact on the environment long term with less ships. Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. Refining NZ has comprehensively assessed the effects associated with the proposal such that interested parties have sufficient information to understand potential effects on the environment and on themselves. Any adverse environmental effects of the Proposal will be minor and acceptable. There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the local economy. downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. Enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour. There are a range of environmental initiatives which will result in overall positive outcomes for certain sensitive species and habitats. | Grant consent. |
| 10.10.17 | Hansen Drainage and Earthworks Limited | Attention: K Hansen 62 Pyle Road East RD 1 Ruakaka 0171 | Support | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic benefit to Whangarei and Northland. Long term sustainability of the refinery. Ongoing and future employment for local families. | Grant consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Hicks M B | M B Hicks PO Box 225 Ruakaka 0151 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Damage to the marine environment; the seabed and its biota, marine mammals and seabirds. Increased risk of accidents from larger vessels manoeuvring in the restricted space of the harbour entrance. Failure to take into account climate change in the declining days of the oil industry. Failure to present the CIA from Patuharakeke Trust and to comply with related provisions of the RMA e.g. s6(e). | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Kawiti A R | A R Kawiti PO Box 250 Whangarei 0140 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proper respect and consideration has not been given to tangata whenua hapu, Te Whakaputanga o Nga Hapu, Te Tiriti O Waitangi or the findings of the Waitangi Tribunal with regard to our Tino Rangatiratanga. Kaitiakitanga is not properly included (in the proposal) involving ongoing monitoring by tangata whenua.. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|----------------|---|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|
| 11.10.17 | Kawiti M P | M P Kawiti 117 Corks Road Tikipunga Whangarei 0112 | Oppose | Yes | Te Whakaputanga 1835 and Te Tiriti O Waitangi 1840 gives our hapu the right of usucapion (acquisition of a right to property by uninterrupted and undisputed possession) to the Whangarei Harbour. We accept no other authority. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Kawiti T R B | T Kawiti C/- Kawiti Caves Caves Road Waiomio | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural, economic and environmental issues are not addressed adequately by the application. • Consultation with hapu has been inadequate. • Bigger cargo loads mean bigger disasters in the event of oil spill or accident. • No longer have access to kaimonana – pipi and cockles – through pollution and cannot fish from same historical places due to commercial activities, including the refinery. • Dredging up marine species would likely kill them and adversely affect our kaimoana, the environment, and our cultural capacity to manaaki (support, care for) our whanau and hapu. | Refuse consent. |
| 3.10.17 | Kepa C | C Kepa 337 Takahiwai Road RD 1 Ruakaka 0171 | Oppose | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RNZ has failed to keep Whangarei Harbour healthy and clean since the 1960s. • RNZ has taken no notice of the wishes of Nga Hapu katoa and shown no respect for their beliefs and customs. • RNZ has rejected the cultural effects assessment of the proposal prepared by Juliane Chetham, Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board. • RNZ has put the reputation of Te Tai Tokerau as a region and New Zealand as a nation at risk internationally. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|----------------|--|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|
| 15.9.17 | Kepa M | M Kepa 337 Takahiwai Road RD 1 Ruakaka 0171 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued loss of te reo Maori me nga tikanga and matauranga Maori by excavation, exploitation, destruction and degradation of the whenua to make more money for RNZ. Continued loss of whenua as a result of population growth, migration, industrialization and urbanisation. Continued loss of spirit and beauty. Continued loss of mauri [health and hygiene] of the whole of Whangarei te rerenga paraoa through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the risk of marine pest species recolonizing the excavated areas; - the oil spill risk from ships and super tankers; - the iron sand erosion (perhaps related is the change in the shape of Marsden and Mair banks); and - the potential turbidity-muddy or opaque liquid in the sea with a suspension of particles; Continued contaminated sea water means continued loss of seafood to feed the whanau, hapu, and manuhiri to express the whakapapa, rangatiratanga and mana of the tribes during ceremonial ritual. RNZ just doesn't care enough about our culture and belief in taniwha, Tangaroa, Papatuanuku, and Ranginui. Continued absence of collective enhancement by the tribes as a result of heavy industrialization. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Kingi W | W Kingi Pataua North Road RD 5 Whangarei 0175 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Maori Worldview versus the Western World view including in relation to concepts of Kaitiakitanga and manaakitanga. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Lawson D R | D R Lawson 332a Western Hills Drive Whangarei 0110 | Oppose | Yes | The dumping of dredging spoil into the ocean. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Mahanga P | P Mahanga 896 Taiharuru Road RD 1 Onerahi Whangarei 0112 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of proper consultation. Cultural impacts upon our people, whanau and hapu. Environmental effects. Customary rights to water. Timeframes for capital and maintenance dredging. Te reo and tikanga should feature in all aspects of the application and proposal relating to Maori and Maori interests. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|
| 10.10.17 | Maintenir Ltd | Attention: L Faithfull Maintenir Ltd PO Box 660 Whangarei 0140 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed will have a range of positive effects for Whangarei and Northland. Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. Refining NZ has comprehensively assessed the effects associated with the proposal such that interested parties have sufficient information to understand potential effects on the environment and on themselves. Any adverse environmental effects of the Proposal will be minor and acceptable. There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the local economy. downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. Enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour. There are a range of environmental initiatives which will result in overall positive outcomes for certain sensitive species and habitats. | Grant consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Marsden Maritime Holdings Ltd | Marsden Maritime Holdings Ltd PO Box 196 Whangarei 0151 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refining NZ is critical infrastructure that needs to be supported for the benefit of the Northland region as well as at a national level. | Grant consent. |
| 10.10.17 | McKay Ltd | Attention: L Faithfull McKay Ltd PO Box 843 Whangarei 0140 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed will have a range of positive effects for Whangarei and Northland. Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the local economy. downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. Enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour. Reduction in the overall number of vessel movements required to transport crude cargoes to the refinery. There are a range of environmental initiatives which will result in overall positive outcomes for certain sensitive species and habitats. | Grant consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|
| 11.10.17 | Moanaroa T | T Moanaroa PO Box 1747 Whangarei 0140 | Oppose | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not convinced that tohora (whales and other sea mammals) will be safe with the increased shipping traffic. • Do not want a repeat of the 'Rena' incident outside of Tauranga Harbour where wreckage was allowed to remain. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited | Attention: C Taylor Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited PO Box 1709 Shortland Street Auckland 1140 | Support | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed will have a range of positive effects for Whangarei and Northland. • Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. • There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. - potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the local economy. - downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. • Enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour. • Reduction in the overall number of vessel movements required to transport crude cargoes to the refinery. | Grant consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|----------------|---|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|
| 11.10.17 | Modrich M J | M J Modrich 21A Ata-Mahina Way Ruakaka 0116 | Oppose | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cultural effects assessment has not been included with the application, and therefore unable to assess whether cultural values have been appropriately addressed. • The potential adverse effects of the works on tsunami risk to the coastline have not been given adequate consideration. • The applicant has not adequately consulted with recreational fishermen or investigated the extent of the impacts the proposal will have on recreational fishing, • Habitat destruction will be a significant adverse effect and does not meet the aims of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement, or of the NRC for this part of the CMA. Also, no mitigation is proposed. • The potential adverse effects on kayakers have not been specifically considered. • The potential adverse effects of vessel wakes on recreational activities during construction do not appear to have been considered. • No adequate reason is given for the applicant stating it does not intend to undertake shore profile monitoring. • The recreational boating figures appear based on 2010/11 data and it is likely that boating activity has significantly increased since then. Therefore, the adverse effects will be amplified compared to those stated in the proposal. • The maps showing scallop beds and fishing spots are likely to indicate only a handful of recreationally important areas which might be affected by dredging operations. • The economic effects stated appear to have no consideration of the likelihood of road transport being predominantly electrified within the project lifetime. Therefore, the economic justification for causing adverse effects is not correct. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|----------------------|---|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|
| 11.10.17 | Ngātiwai Trust Board | Attention: K MacDonald Ngatiwai Trust Board PO Box 1132 Whangarei 0140 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The non-inclusion of the Cultural Effects Assessment report among the documents accompanying the application hinders the proper consideration of the matters in RMA s7(a) and 8. The proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is not consistent with many provisions in the Ngatiwai Iwi Environmental Policy document. will adversely affect Ngatiwai's position as kaitiaki. undermines Ngatiwai's Treaty right to exercise rangatiratanga in its rohe moana. adversely affects the value of its future Treaty settlement with the Crown. undermines the anticipated recognition of its customary interests under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011. Potential oil spills from larger tankers will adversely impact Ngatiwai's commercial and customary fisheries. These issues are not directly traversed in the application. There has been no comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of mitigation measures put in place for previous dredging consents issued. Therefore, decision makers cannot be reassured that similar mitigation measures will be effective in this case. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Norris M | R M Norris 36 Otaika Valley Road Whangarei 0170 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Cultural (Effects Assessment) with the application. Cultural and Spiritual Values to Maori cannot be protected with this application. Our Toanga is on the verge of extinction and no plans have been identified with this application to help repair the damage. The loss of our kaimoana has not been addressed and should be before Refining NZ destroys any more parts of our Harbour. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|
| 9.10.17 | North Tugz Limited | North Tugz Limited PO Box 26 Ruakaka 0151 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed will have a range of positive effects for Whangarei and Northland. Enhanced navigational and marine safety aspects of the proposal and the ability to deliver an even greater and beneficial marine service to Refining NZ. Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. Refining NZ has comprehensively assessed the effects associated with the proposal such that interested parties have sufficient information to understand potential effects on the environment and on themselves. Any adverse environmental effects of the Proposal will be minor and acceptable. There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the local economy. downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. Enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour. Reduction in the overall number of vessel movements required to transport crude cargoes to the refinery. | Grant consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Northland Conservation Board | Northland Conservation Board PO Box 842 Whangarei 0140 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative effects the proposed work could have on the surrounding marine and land environments. Supports motion by tangata whenua of Whangarei Terenga Paraoa to oppose the proposal. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Northland Inc. | Attention: V Cooper Northland Inc. PO Box 1762 Whangarei 0140 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refining NZ continuity of operation is very significant for both the Northland and New Zealand economies. The current use of Suzemax vessels that are only partially loaded into the harbour in order to meet current channel constraints is both uneconomic and unsustainable in the long term. The studies to support the proposal are of a high standard. There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. potential benefit in cost savings and operational efficiencies from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the regional economy. downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. | Grant consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------|--|--|
| 6.10.17 | Northland Regional Harbourmaster | J Lyle Regional Harbourmaster Private Bag 9021 Whangarei Mail Centre Whangarei 0140 | Neutral | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A management plan is required when dredging is undertaken to ensure safe and free access by other vessels. Once dredging has been completed, an implementation plan for deeper draft tankers in relation to the dynamic under keel clearance program will be required. | Grant consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Northland Scallop Enhancement Co. Ltd | T Hollings Northland Scallop Enhancement Co. Ltd PO Box 104106 Lincoln North Auckland 0654 | Oppose | Heard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that the proposal for deepening and associated discharges and dredge-dumping will adversely affect nearby scallop beds, particularly at disposal area 1.2, and also related marine life and fisheries. The application does not adequately consider nor weight the importance of fisheries. More work is required to adequately address the impact on local inshore fisheries. The proposal does not adequately consider possible alternative locations or methods. Neither does it adequately explain the rationale for dumping of spoil at the current sites and the proportion of spoil volume at each site. Proposal is contrary to Part II of the RMA including the promotion of sustainable management. | Refuse consent (unless subject to specified conditions). |
| 11.10.17 | Northport Ltd | J Moore Northport Ltd PO Box 44 Ruakaka 0151 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The studies to support the proposal are of a very high standard including for hydrodynamics, disposal options, and navigation and safety aspects. Refining NZ is critical infrastructure that needs to be supported for the benefit of the Northland region as well as at a national level. Reduction in the overall number of vessel movements required to transport crude cargoes to the refinery. | Grant consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board | Attention: J Pitman Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board PO Box 557 Whangarei 0140 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deeply disappointed that the cultural effects assessment (CEA) is not included as part of the application notification material and that reliance has instead been placed on a peer review of the CEA. Decision makers cannot appropriately assess the proposal without the opportunity to review the CEA. Not convinced by technical reports that indicate changes to the wave climate, tidal currents, tidal flux and harbour hydrodynamics will all be minor. Previous experience with computer modelling shows actual results can differ from those predicted. Predicted 7-minute tide phase adjustment as a result of channel dredging is not minor as it represents a fundamental change to the mauri of the harbour. Where there are disputes over the cultural value and tikanga of a group in a particular area, weight should be given to the tikanga of those who are from the area. Technical advice that the proposed deepening within the channel will not significantly change the sedimentary outcomes on Mair Bank does not take into account recent rapid declines in the pipi population. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|---|---------------|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project could undermine Kaitiaki efforts to care for and restore the pipi population on Mair Bank, including through potential sediment settlement over shellfish beds. • Exclusion of Patuharakeke from accessing their known mahinga kai (e.g. Mair Bank) during and after dredging needs to be taken into account in decision making on the application. • The AEE states that the final selection of the dredging methodology will be made by the company commissioned for each dredging campaign. Given that the different dredge types generate different plumes and different potential effects, this approach is inappropriate. • Further clarification is needed of the operational measure to avoid or mitigate sediment plume impacts on taonga species. • The imposition of required navigation safety operational measures for use of the channel appears to be outside the scope of the RMA consent process or may constitute some type of 3rd party approval. Certainty is needed that these measures will be implemented. • No evidence that a decrease in shipping traffic will actually occur or that Suezmax tankers will be continue to be preferred over the proposed consent term. • Oil spill risk will always remain a concern for tāngata whenua and is considered a low probability but high impact potential effect that is unable to be mitigated. • Effects of noise on taonga species such as marine mammals, and in terms of amenity values. • The potential adverse effects of the project, including regular maintenance dredging, on benthic communities will be significant not minor or moderate. • Important fish species, including migrating eels, will be disturbed by dredging activity and will avoid the area. This could potentially impact on the use of the maramataka (traditional Maori calendar) for customary kaimoana harvesting. • The probability of impacts on larger ecosystems (not just the subject site) that tuna (eels) interact with have not been considered. • Spoil disposal may cause scallop mortality and/or reduction in population recruitment through physical smothering or habitat change. • Significant adverse effects on manu (bird) species including little penguin and grey-faced petrels, are likely owing to turbidity, lighting and noise effects during dredging operations, which will compound existing pressures on local populations, e.g. predation by stoats. • Disagree that Whangarei Harbour and Bream Bay are not significant habitats for marine mammals. | |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|--|---|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on marine mammals cannot be fully or accurately assessed without certainty around the capital dredging period or the frequency of subsequent maintenance dredging. • Reject the AEE assessment of cultural effects as this is based on the peer review of the CEA and not the CEA itself. • Technical reports do not reflect how the proposal will affect Patuharakeketanga as well as the other hapu around the harbour. • The economic benefits are not significant enough to warrant substantial modification of Whangarei Te Rerenga Paraoa especially if the refinery is viewed as a sunset industry. • Economies of scale are based on the assumption that the status quo will continue for the next 35 years. • Product consumers and the local economy will not directly benefit from the cost-savings expected from the project. • A decline of the application would not be fatal to the refinery as it could convert to becoming an importer of finished product. • The importance of a healthy ecosystem and associated ability to sustainably harvest kaimoana for food cannot be quantified in the type of economic model used. • The arguments around the economic inefficiency of retaining the entrance as is do not factor in the ecosystem services provided by the existing natural environment and are incongruous with the Maori world view. • The potential for ongoing degradation of the mauri of Whangarei Te Rerenga Paraoa and Bream Bay is not outweighed by the economic benefits. • The application does not fit with the country's broader aspirations in relation to climate change. • The proposal is considered inconsistent with RMA Part II, the NZCPS, the operative Regional Coastal Plan and the proposed Regional Plan. • The applicability of the peer review of the CEA is challenged as only mana whenua can determine what effects the proposal will have on their values and culture. • Multiple points and conclusions made within the peer review are contested. | |
| 11.10.17 | Pehiaweri Resource Management Group - Ngati Hau Resource Management Unit | C/- N Wakefield 87 Pakehaua Road RD 4 Hikurangi 0184 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application puts the harbour and its cultural values at risk by proposing an activity with unknown and irreversible effects on the wider ecosystem surrounding and connected to the harbour's entrance including migrating species, shellfish, oceanic mammals, and sea birds, all of which are specific taonga to tangata whenua of the Whangarei Harbour. • The conclusions and recommendations of the Cultural Effects Assessment prepared for this application by J Chetham are supported. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|--|---|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|
| 11.10.17 | Pyle B H | B H Pyle 129 Pyle Road East RD 1 Ruakaka 0171 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential environmental and cultural effects have been either played down or ignored. Considering the need to reduce rather our use of fossil fuels to limit global climate warming, the Application for operations to allow much bigger supertankers to get to the refinery should be declined. Bringing in larger tankers will significantly increase the risk of destruction of marine and estuarine biota including kaimoana in Whangarei Harbour, Bream Bay and adjacent coastal areas e.g. through oil spills and bilge water leaks. The proposed 24/7 dredging and other activities are proposed will disturb marine life in the area and may also annoy coastal residents. The Cultural Effects Assessment presented to NZ Refining by seven hapu with interests in and around Whangarei Harbour should have been included with the Application. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Rewarewa D Māori Incorporation | Attention: N Wakefield Rewarewa D Māori Incorporation PO Box 6022 Otaika Whangarei 0147 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application puts the harbour and its cultural values at risk by proposing an activity with unknown and irreversible effects on the wider ecosystem surrounding and connected to the harbour's entrance including migrating species, shellfish, oceanic mammals, and sea birds, all of which are specific taonga to tangata whenua of the Whangarei Harbour. The conclusions and recommendations of the Cultural Effects Assessment prepared for this application by J Chetham are supported. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Ringa Atawhai Trust and Whangarei Maori Executive Committee of Tai Tokerau Maori Council | Attention: M Norris Ringa Atawhai Trust 10 Porowini Avenue Whangarei | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hapū of Whangarei Terenga Paraoa have never been provided with adequate access to traditional areas of customary use within the Marsden Point Refinery site once development happened. The Crown and their agents have an obligation to protect the Hapū of Whangarei Terenga Paraoa from the environmental impact of the Marsden Point Oil Refinery on their lands, estuaries, fisheries and other resources. The Cultural (Effects Assessment) has not been published by RNZ for Tangata whenua to reference for a submission. RNZ has admitted the proposal will have an effect on the environment. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|---|---|----------------|------------------|---|--|
| 11.10.17 | Ruakaka Parish Residents and Ratepayers Assoc. Inc. | Ruakaka Parish Residents and Ratepayers Assoc. Inc. PO Box 151 Ruakaka 0151 | Neutral | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment around pipi shells armouring Mair Bank geomorphology ignores the recent almost complete die-back of the population. This could have long-term consequences that need to be considered. • Discussion of the dredge plume takes no account of the counter current that runs between Home Point and Frenchman Island during ebb tides. • Question the need for two leading lights on Calliope Bank. • Aspect of effects on recreational fishing is skimmed over and does not take into account the economic benefit of this activity to Ruakaka community. • Dredging off Home Point will affect one of the most popular fishing spots in Whangarei Harbour with recovery anticipated to take at least two years. | Grant consent (subject to conditions). |
| 11.10.17 | Tana H | H Tana Ngunguru Ford Road RD 3 Whangarei 0173 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against the dredging proposal • Illegal aliens on board • Dumping scallops on mussel beds Smugglers Bay | Refuse consent. |
| 12.10.17 | Te Pouwhenua o Tiakiriri Kukupa Trust | Dr B Pittman 2A Church Street Hikurangi 0114 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued assault upon and loss of unique, collective spiritual and cultural values of Te Parawhau inherent in the land, waterways, harbour and oceans. • These essential taonga, including harbours and oceans, have been under incessant attack and we must ensure that no new threat is allowed to pose any risk (of) things becoming even worse. • The ongoing reliance on, perpetuation of and preference for fossil fuels merely allows an ongoing denial of the alternatives by vested interests. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Tonks A | A Tonks 21 Northcroft Drive RD 6 Whangarei 0176 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sediment load and deposition in Whangarei Harbour is the critical issue for the harbour's water quality. • The impacts on sedimentation rate and their effects within the Harbour and in Bream Bay appear understated as the dredge plume will not be confined to main channel as stated in the AEE. • Limiting dredging to ebb tide times may mitigate effects. • Contribution toward lowering land-based sediment loss should be considered as a mitigation option. • Increase in sediment load within Bream Bay will contribute to an increase in deposition within the harbour. The bay will also likely be adversely affected. • Discussion within the AEE is largely based around the proportion of (silt/clay involved) and does not take into account the scale of the operation, particularly the capital dredging. • Disposal of spoil to land or out to sea should be preferred. • Proposed monitoring of turbidity at 3 Mile Reef is inadequate. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------|---|----------------|
| 11.10.17 | United Civil Construction Ltd | Attention: A J Campbell United Civil Construction Ltd 19B Rewarewa Road Whangarei 0147 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of a sustainable and successful Refining NZ to the local and regional economy. • Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. • Refining NZ has comprehensively assessed the effects associated with the proposal such that interested parties have sufficient information to understand potential effects on the environment and on themselves. • Any adverse environmental effects of the Proposal will be minor and acceptable. • There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. - potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the local economy. - downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. • Enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour. • Reduction in the overall number of vessel movements required to transport crude cargoes to the refinery. • There are a range of environmental initiatives which will result in overall positive outcomes for certain sensitive species and habitats. | Grant consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|---|---|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|
| 12.10.17 | Whānau of Henare Maki and Tuihau Elizabeth Pirihi | D Milner 26 McKinnon Crescent Waiouru Military Camp Waiouru 4826 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot support the degradation of the Mauri of Te Rērenga Paraoa through the proposed activities. The non-inclusion of the (CEA) with technical AEE documents is unacceptable and affects the ability to completely assess of the application, including by the public and community. The CEA IS necessary to help other hapu and iwi to be the voice for our atua, special places, and taonga in their submissions. The peer review of the CEA challenges the mana of tangata whenua, mana whenua, mana moana of the representatives involved in the group that created the CEA. Further dialogue is required to address identified cultural concerns. Uncertainty about the actual sediment (stabilisation) period after capital dredging, which will directly influence maintenance dredging requirements. Spoil disposal at the two defined sites has the potential for disruption of habitat and therefore a potential for growth of foreign (marine pest) species. Potential of disposal to impact on the scallop fishery (in Bream Bay) with flow-on effects for scallop recruitment and spat distribution within the harbour and associated customary and recreational scallop harvesting. Mapped scallop distribution in AEE does not include known beds north of proposed dredge areas and within harbour. Use of dredged spoil for land use (reclamation) is similar to mining and needs further investigation. There is a need for more robust and comprehensive research and monitoring initiatives prior to any consent being given, to eliminate some of the uncertainty that is apparent in the application. | Refuse consent. |
| 12.10.17 | Whangarei Harbour Marine Reserve Advisory Committee | Dr B Pittman 2A Church Street Hikurangi 0114 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about potential impacts on the Marine Reserves within Whangarei Harbour, especially in relation to that at Motukaroro given its proximity to Marsden Point. Concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - potential pollution and contamination - effects of changes in hydrology and water quality - species movements from proposed dredging and dumping sites. Existing written, photographic and anecdotal archives held by WHMAC could be used for monitoring of any impacts from the activities proposed. | Refuse consent. |
| 11.10.17 | Whatitiri Resource Management Unit | M Ruka Whatitiri Resource Management Unit PO Box 98 Whangarei 0140 | Oppose | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuation of putting Whangarei Harbour and it's cultural values at risk by proposing an activity with unknown and irreversible effects on the ecosystem surrounding and connected to the harbour entrance, including shellfish, marine mammals, and sea birds which are specific taonga to tangata whenua of the harbour. Support the conclusions and recommendations of the Cultural Effects Assessment prepared for this application, authored by J Chetham. | Refuse consent. |

| Date Received | Submitter Name | Name and Address | Oppose/Support | Wish to be Heard | Issues of Concern | Relief Sought |
|---------------|----------------------|---|----------------|------------------|--|----------------|
| 10.10.17 | WorleyParsons NZ Ltd | Attention: R Nutting WorleyParsons NZ Ltd 25 Gill Street New Plymouth 4310 | Support | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed will have a range of positive effects for Whangarei and Northland. Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. Refining NZ has comprehensively assessed the effects associated with the proposal such that interested parties have sufficient information to understand potential effects on the environment and on themselves. Any adverse environmental effects of the Proposal will be minor and acceptable. There are significant positive economic benefits including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retaining RNZ as a major employer in the region. potential benefit in cost savings from the use of bigger vessels which will assist the refinery to remain competitive internationally and continue to contribute to the regional economy. downstream spending as a result of the continued operation of the refinery, and the jobs it creates. Enhancement of navigation safety for all commercial vessels accessing Whangarei Harbour. Reduction in the overall number of vessel movements required to transport crude cargoes to the refinery. <p>There are a range of environmental initiatives which will result in overall positive outcomes for certain sensitive species and habitats.</p> | Grant consent. |
| 10.11.17 | Z Energy Limited | Attention: D Binnie 3 Queens Wharf Wellington Central Wellington 6011 | Support | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact of the proposal will be positive because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the ability to fully load Suezmax ships means fewer ships would need to visit the refinery to deliver the same amount of crude oil. fewer, larger ships will reduce the cost of transporting crude oil to the refinery, thereby reducing the overall cost of each barrel of crude and increasing its competitiveness with imported finished product. fewer shipments reduces the amount of bunker fuel used to transport each barrel of (crude) oil, which is likely to lower the overall carbon footprint of the fuel supply chain. Refining NZ has consulted widely with regards to the Application. Refining NZ has comprehensively assessed the effects associated with the proposal such that interested parties have sufficient information to understand potential effects on the environment and on themselves. | Grant consent. |