

Index
TW1A_4_OTHER : Option 1: Opt In I think the Council should opt in to the Government's Three Waters Reform Programme. Please tell us why you chose this option (select as many options as you wish) - Other
I wouldn't trust FNDC to boil an egg.
Instead of Northland getting the end of government expenditure perhaps we will get some fairness of distribution of finances.
Guard against privatisation.
Possibly be more aware and consistent with iwi/hapu sensitivities.
This is also a Treaty of Waitangi issue - water is a taouga. Iwi need to be involved in future water decisions.
Concerned about our ability to manage flooding and drought in our district and the finance for the infrastructure.
Would hope to see a reduction in cost and an improvement in quality.
Having dealt with FNDC re water supply, management, attitude to, and efficiency of services, I wouldn't trust FNDC to boil an egg, let alone manage the key element to life on this planet (or any other).
New entities will hopefully avoid water bans during summer.
Council provide a substandard service.
I would prefer more than four designated areas. So much of the Far North is challenged when it comes to providing these services as a small number of ratepayers support a huge influx of tourists that challenge our present infrastructure. The population is too small to fund what will be required in the future. We need more visionary decisions.
FNDC is chronically short of funds and forced towards small-think. We need to be able play with the big kids or risk falling further behind in our development.
We are a small population spread across a vast geographical area and there is no way we, as ratepayers, will be able to meet the future cost of upgrading our water systems to comply with the new standards as well as build a resilient infrastructure that can cope with future climate change.
It makes sense to consolidate funding to ensure equitable access to a high standard of service. How can FND with its tiny ratepayer numbers and large area, ever hope to afford the high maintenance and development costs?
Current system is NOT working. Anywhere.
Greater resilience in the face of unexpected challenges. The standard of performance in both storm and waste water is poor in our area, and there is no reticulated potable water.
Economic and social equity for the people i.e. the water users, and maybe water supplied on a fair and equitable basis.
There is no option to provide comments and suggest you add this function to the survey - I am concerned the representation of ratepayer equity is not accurate. It implies central government is buying 305M of assets for 35M. However I understand the public own these assets, and they will remain in public ownership. Governance of these assets is all that is changing, and the 35M is to counter the impact that loss of assets will have on councils' borrowing capacity. This is misrepresented in your information currently and I think should be clarified to avoid misleading the public. I'd also like to understand how much debt is currently associated with these assets. And also how much has been borrowed against these assets, and has it all been reinvested in 3 waters infrastructure? My understanding is investment in 3 waters infrastructure has been insufficient and that the assets are used to leverage investment in other unrelated infrastructure - i.e. footpaths - when this money should have all been reinvested into 3 waters infrastructure.
Local councils lack the expertise to decide on issues like chlorination and fluoridation.
Sharing the cost across the country will reduce the burden on Far North ratepayers while ensuring the same level of service is enjoyed by all.

The existing physical assets are not a financial asset and should more appropriately be referred to as a liability. Ratepayers are better off not having the obligation to comply with the cost of meeting the required standards, both existing and future. The government has bigger pockets (of our money) to deal with the issues!! There is limited benefit for ratepayers to maintain total control.
I don't support individual nazirs privately selling off our water.
The FNDC and the NRC have been useless in providing these services and are corrupt in their dealings on these matters.
The current system hasn't served us well.
Capital costs of essential infrastructure in the long term should be the responsibility of central government and shared amongst all taxpayers. Drinking water and stormwater and sewerage waste, particularly in climate change environment, is NZ's responsibility. Maintenance costs to be paid through rates if they are
Water safety and quality in NZ has not been looked after by current councils properly.
Three Waters is, IMHO, the perfect opportunity to 'trial' a 50/50 aka 'Partnership' Co-Governance model in a system complex enough to self-regulate to an adequate [or better] extent. With everything from Individual 'Private' Property through Marae, Papakainga, Settlement, Marae & Community, Locale, Town, City & Super-Region to 'Govern', the Entities (I hope we find great names for them) are like a form of Provincialized* Fundamental Human Right Supply Organization. Natural (personal, local office) Feedback Loops within & across levels & locales can [must] be augmented by Best-Practice organisational ones using all formats - call centre, website, social media etc. 3Wai provides an interim measure and style of governance effectively protecting or ring-fencing water during the upcoming Settlement of WAI262. Flora & Fauna - to which water must surely be central. Conservative Councils in need of reform themselves are not the best protectors of the resource physically, culturally, socially, economically and spiritually. Simple as that. SNA gate proved that to me beyond doubt. 3WAI may serve to help heal the terrible 'rift' or 'schism' in Aotearoa NZ's social fabric caused long ago by Provincial Government 1841-1877 by giving hapu-iwi Māori something more approaching the 'influence' they would have had back then. I don't think Te Karauna should specify the 'Representation' model they use, only the number of votes (if that?). Let hapu-iwi decide this themselves. 16 representatives may share the available payment and the available 6 or however many votes. Strive 'marae-like' for Consensus. Likewise Te Karauna should [MUST] consider trialling Citizens Assemblies and other unorthodox, egalitarian governance/jurisprudence models as part of Taiwi 3WAI Representation. Councils & Regional Councils might strive to have representatives each too, provided the influence of Vested Interests can be minimized in favour of verifiable, evidence-based, ethical Public or Common GOOD? Until Local Government is reformed 3WAI Hinonga must unfortunately be 'Appointed'. A Te Tai Tokerau Water Trust situation MUST be avoided at all cost. Geographically the combination of Te Tai Tokerau me Tamaki makau-rau is ultimately better. Northland's water must be 'governed & administered' to the North of Tahanga: Dome Valley which drains into the Kaipara but is now part of Auckland 'geopolitically' [and stupidly]. 3WAI might even be able to prevent the Landfill there? Governance of Fundamental Elements (and much else IMHO) must be Globalocal across the spacial & wellbeing spectrum. I personally hope that one day there will be *SOME* agreed Global governance & administration of water, just as there is Individual at the Private Property in the Soil* level now. "To speak here of property as one speaks of property in an article of use is to renounce thought" -
Even though I provide my own water I think the government should provide high quality drinking water and treat wastewater properly. The government is in a better position to fund and manage major infrastructure projects.
Mechanisms to protect and promote Māori rights and interests.
The FNDC has proved inept at managing the water infrastructure in Kaitia this has been especially obvious over the recent droughts. The water infrastructure and wastewater disposal is below par.
Small towns with a high summer influx of visitors can't afford the sewage schemes needed. It makes sense for a broader populations base or the government to fund them. It's also about expertise we don't want the kind of blowout that Mangawhai had, again a small resource poor council trying to do big, complex projects doesn't make sense.

Well attended to infrastructure costs on water have always and will always require the central treasury. Small local business operations will inevitably fail to meet the standards expected. Exceptions like Whangarei only prove the above. This is progress. The long term benefits will be.

This will enable Māori to participate fully as partners with government in the management of the three waters, in line with Te Tiriti o Waitangi, whereas in under local government control the 'tyranny of the majority' will always dominate, especially in the climate of popularism which seems to be a fundamental feature of most local government entities. The nature of our country's waters is that they are inter-connected, as are our peoples/communities, and the best management will be at this larger scale which will encourage holistic perspectives to be exercised, away from the limitations of local government which too often is parochial and self-serving. This is increasingly important in today's and tomorrow's world where the quality and availability of water are critical issues, within a backdrop of climate change. Local government is not well equipped to wisely and equitably manage these big issues which fundamentally affect environmental health and human well-being.

More expertise and less waste of financial resources. Also likely to be more performance accountability. Long term financial benefits likely for the ratepayer.

Remove decision making from elected officials.

They might fix my wastewater problem that the council has ignored year after year.

Better maintenance of infrastructure through innovation and transparency.

As NZ Herald economist Brian Fallow states; The status quo is not an option. The 67 councils (far too many), need to reflect on what counts as an asset. If something is going to cost you money & more & more each year, then it is in reality a liability & there has been a legacy of chronic under in Three Waters infrastructure by many councils. The FNDC's performance in delivering a new water supply for Kaitiaa has been nothing short of diabolical over the past 11 years, with millions of ratepayers funds wasted & the current Sweetwater bores & pipeline project projected to cost \$14 or \$16 million plus, it probably could have been cheaper to supply piped champagne. They have never been forthcoming as to why they could not access the original Sweetwater Bores as Mayor Carter personally told me was the case in 2017. The 2019 drought should have been well prepared for & for the Mayor to call it unprecedented event was nonsense as we all knew it would come as droughts have in the region previously, so again a huge wastage of ratepayers funds on the emergency water supplies as well as gov't. funds due to pure incompetence of the FNDC. And then there's the other water. The non-compliance of the Taipa Treatment Plant for 11 years being one issue & poor performance of other plants in the region. We have 67 district councils & while some apparently are & have performed much better than others, many have underperformed, & while I have some concerns re centralisation, surely there needs to be a standard that applies to all. I point to the dogmatic approach that the FNDC takes with wastewater systems by insisting that people I know have been forced to install a very expensive system, that requires a power source, & I am told by 2 such persons that their plans have failed on occasion, when other councils allow perfectly suitable composting systems in areas that are non-threatening to waterways. I know of household who have septic tanks that have never been inspected, nor have the owners ever had any notification from the FNDC to do so, & others that overflow directly into a waterway, plus a number of long drops close to the sea & streams. I ask where is the consistency? Further I have concerns that the council will use this survey as a means of opting out of the Three Waters proposals, given that I suspect that most taking part (a very small percentage of the total number of ratepayers), & the FNDC can thereby say: The majority of responders were against opting in, so we will opt out. Another good reason why the FNDC shouldn't have responsibility for the 3 waters. They have far more information in front of them than us lowly ratepayers do. Surely they can do what they are there for & make a decision based on factual evidence.

Takes the issue out of individual politicking by local Councillors AND Māori values concerning water e.g. not discharging sewage out to sea - may actually be taken into account!

The experts required to run water services are not available in their 100s. Much better to have 10s across the country and not having each council competing for few trained staff. If the councils had cooperated earlier, then central government would not have needed to get involved.