

## Proposed Change 1 to the Wellington RPS – Hearing Stream 2: Integrated Management

### Speaking notes of Miles Rowe for submitters – S157 Fuel Companies, and S134 Powerco

Tena Koutou katoa

Ko Miles Rowe taku ingoa

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

I prepared a joint statement of evidence for the Fuel Companies and Powerco. The Fuel Companies comprise of bp Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand, and Z Energy. Their assets and interests in the Wellington region include bulk fuel storage terminals and retail fuel services. Powerco's assets and interests in the region are electricity and gas distribution networks.

My evidence relates to proposed Objective A and proposed Policy IM.2. In preparing this brief summary of my evidence, I confirm that I have also read the rebuttal evidence of Mr Wyeth for the Wellington Regional Council (dated 7 July 2023).

#### Proposed Objective A

In my evidence I accept that the term 'physical resource' encompasses all infrastructure, and therefore, it not necessary for the Objective to specifically reference regionally significant infrastructure. However, I support the submissions of Meridian and Wellington Water, that the resilience of communities is a critical resource management issue that is intertwined with other elements of Objective A.

The rebuttal evidence of Mr Wyeth recommends further changes to Objective A, including to clause (h) regarding a specific recognition of regionally significant infrastructure and its role in improving the resilience of communities to climate change.

This recommended change to Objective A addresses the matters raised in my evidence.

#### Proposed Policy IM.2

The submissions of the Fuel Companies and Powerco is that Policy IM.2 contains ambiguous language, is unable to be applied on a consistent basis, and it is unclear how it would be applied to resource consent applications.

In my evidence I noted that the section 42A recommended changes to the Policy are an improvement over the notified version, but I am not convinced that it is the most appropriate way to achieve the RPS objective. My primary position stated in the evidence is that, Policy IM.2 should be deleted, but if it is to be retained, then it should not apply to consenting

processes, and clause (a) should be amended to remove reference to “*addressing barriers*” on the basis that it is not clearly defined.

Further, if Policy IM.2 is retained, then I support the section 42A recommendation to reframe clause (c) to “*a low-emissions and climate resilient region*” and I agree the deletion of clause (d) in the notified version as being ambiguous and unnecessary.

The rebuttal evidence of Mr Wyeth is that Policy IM.2 will not be effective or efficient to achieve the RPS objectives and recommends that it be deleted.

The deletion of Policy IM.2 addresses the matters raised in my evidence.

Ngā mihi nui

Miles Rowe