

[Index](#)

TW1C : Option 3: Don't know or undecided I don't have a view on this or don't have enough information to make a decision. - Comments

I like the idea of opting into the Government's Three Waters Reform Programme for simplification, standardization and cost savings. I am not happy with what I call 'scare tactics' of the exorbitant cost to households if we don't opt-in. When I see something of this nature, red flags go up. I am also concerned about the layers being put in place when locals want input and/or answers to issues.

It is not something I have thought about as we are on tank water.

My concerns will be that grouped with Auckland, the Far North will be left short in the funding allocation and action. As yet I would like to see more information.

I have my own water supply, waste water disposal, soak hole, and septic tank system.

I don't have enough information about this, but do not understand how this will affect me.

Not knowing how they came to a costing future, it is difficult to say whether a good idea or not.

I have no opinion either way as I receive neither water nor wastewater services of course there should be the same level of service to all residents in new Zealand.

I live rural and handle my own drinking water etc., I have no idea of what happens in town.

My personal view is the government to clean water ways and hopefully in the near future will have clean waters and air for future generations to live healthy lives.

I live on bore water and rain water, nice water.

No information about those who have no water, stormwater or wastewater service currently.

The government is still releasing information.

I am not happy with the idea that we will be joining Auckland in this zone. I would need to know that the Far North will have a voice in what happens in the Far North. We are a long way from Auckland and if representation is population based then Auckland will hold all the cards. We need representation based on land area or we will always be at the tail end of the available funding whatever our needs.

I need more information.

Concerned that this is another entity that could become privatised.

FNDC & NRC both need to think outside the box when considering any new by-laws everything is so restrictive nowadays because of the consent processes, most people are aware of the environment so they act accordingly, but they end up paying the cost of actions of irrespirable parties when these people should have to pay the costs of cleaning up their crimes.

We have neither of the 3 waters options. What happens to our rates?

Very little information is available to the general public as far as I am aware. I want to know the nuts and bolts of the proposal. Will we in the north be paying to keep sewage off Auckland's beaches? Will all services be rated for the area receiving the benefit etc.

Difficult to be clear which option could benefit ratepayers. Presently FNDC are not transparent or fair in dealing with infrastructure, especially wastewater. Therefore 3 waters or local council? Hobsons choice.

I don't know enough about it. The reports are very long and difficult to decipher. It seems, according to the government's reports, that opting in will be financially beneficial for ratepayers, but I do not trust the government's information on this.

I have my own water tank and septic system. I'm not on town supply so it doesn't worry me.

Who is running the scheme, what is the makeup of the entity.

Need to know more about the mechanisms to protect iwi interests.

I would like to have more information so will await whatever November brings.

I believe the council is correct in delaying the decision pending further information from the government. The government statistics do not seem to be carefully modelled currently, with too many questionable assumptions.

The question cannot be yes or no because the proposal is wrong. Water control should be taken from Local Councils because too many of them have demonstrated their inadequacy. But: we don't need another bureaucratic empire to run this: existing Regional Councils already have some of the statutory responsibilities and the expertise to manage water governance; They also have the advantage of local representation.

I consider that the gov't option of only 4 bodies responsible for all of N.Z. is unlikely to yield the savings claimed. Worldwide the history of both government and private sector amalgamations shows that the economies and savings of scale do not arise and in fact are seldom analysed by the amalgamated body presumably to avoid embarrassment. I do agree however that these 4 bodies would be able to employ greater expertise but would also doubtless spawn an expensive highly paid bureaucracy. I would be concerned about Northland being swallowed by Auckland and its 1.7 Million population. However I equally consider that the status quo with about 72 local bodies providing the three waters has failed badly. The Far North does not have the skills or expertise and our dispersed population has long been lacking 3 waters infrastructure. The rating base is small and the funding available has not generally been used on out of sight three waters infrastructure nor the depreciation used appropriately. In my view a larger number of regional entities, say a dozen or so, could provide the reforms necessary. In our case FNDC amalgamating with Whangarei, Kaipara and NRC. The population base would be relatively small, about 200,000, but should enable a basis for skill, expertise and planning. I recognise that Whangarei might be resistant to absorbing the large sewerage debt of Kaipara in an amalgamated entity. Another reason for the failure of local bodies to manage three waters, apart from lack of competence and a possible misuse of depreciation, is the lack of funding resources. I consider that if central government transferred some taxation revenue to say a dozen regional entities a much less draconian solution to the 3 waters problem nationally than to 4 gigantic entities could succeed.

There are clearly issues with water infrastructure & this will be expensive. If we don't want to create huge debt going on into the future we have to face this issue. I'm a bit bemused that the options for more sustainable models doesn't appear to be on the table. I'd prefer council to investigate & expand use of worm farm sewerage systems, composting toilets, water tanks in residential sections. Education is also required to teach people to be connected to where their water comes from & goes no mindless usage will address our very imminent issues. It appears central gov't. feels that bigger is better in this issue & I'd feel better if I could see clearly that gov't. has a broad & future embracing plan.

The specifics of how the reform will affect the day-to-day lives and costs of ratepayers who supply their own water via tanks and deal with wastewater via their own septic tanks have not been outlined. Ratepayers in this position are all too painfully aware that FNDC intends cranking up rating fees.

A difficult decision to make when there is really not much information yet about how it would actually work. I feel there needs to be more detail provided by the government before I decide if I think this is a good idea or not.

I would like to know if the Council considers the 3 waters infrastructure an asset or a liability. Facts to back up their position would be helpful.

I do not have enough information on the ownership and control / management structure of the proposed new entity. I need more information and I ask that the time to answer be extended to after further information has been provided.

Option 1 and 2 are both extremes and undesirable as they stand. They pit Government / Corporation against Council / community involvement. We need a clear list of reasonably costed goals put forward by councils in discussion with their ratepayers. These should then be discussed briefly with government. Next step 1, the present situation results from neglect by Council and Government caused by the public being strongly allergic to rates and taxes with some minor excuses based on bureaucratic inefficiencies but mainly on public selfishness. Step 2 the cost of the neglect needs to be shared by Council rates and Government Taxes to reach agreed goals. My preference would then be for Council run services with a lot more information and responsibility to their ratepayers.

I am forced to use the Don't know option due to lack of full information and the wish to comment. Much of what has been supplied by both sides is questionable. For example FNDC valuation of \$300M is depreciated replacement cost, not what was spent. Further it ignores associated debt which must transfer with the assets as there will be no future income to fund repayment. Given the Minister's stated intention to legislate, FNDC should Opt In to get the \$35M carrot otherwise this will be lost. Obviously once 3 Waters assets have gone, roading is already dictated by government funding so the next logical step would be further round of "local" government amalgamation or massive downsizing of the present empire. I have little doubt that is behind the campaign to opt out when FNDC staff report the proposal is financially advantageous to the ratepayers. If personal preference is to Opt out, the solution is to ensure change of government given National has stated it will reverse 3 Waters. Hopefully after \$35m carrot has been used!

I need information on how we will be affected if we live in a rural district and manage our own water (tank), storm water and have a septic tank. Each 5 years the council requires us to empty and clean our septic tank at our cost. How is that managed under 3 waters? If our water tanks, our pump or anything else associated with it gives way that is our cost. How does this work under 3 waters? We don't want to be paying a lot extra through our rates and still having to manage our 3 waters?

Have a serious concern over an entity based in Auckland being as responsive or as efficient in that response to on the ground issues and emergencies, compared to a local controlled entity.

There is not enough information on this issue for example who is going to bear the cost of the THREE WATERS our rates are already high enough without further costs. There has been no detail on how this scheme is going to be funded. Do we not get charged for the service or do we still pay with additional funds being billed to the rate payer by the government?