

[Index](#)

TW1B_4_OTHER : Option 2: Opt out I think the Council should opt out of the Government's Three Waters Reform Programme. Please tell us why you chose this option (select as many options as you wish) - Other

Firstly, I'm concerned about the proposed Māori/Iwi involvement in the Three Waters management which gives them right of veto over any decisions made by the rest of management. They have disproportionate power and are not democratically appointed. Secondly, buying the infrastructure assets at significantly less than value, then charging users for the loans etc. for that purchase is double charging. Thirdly, lumping Northland in with Auckland is sure to result in Northland with less population being treated badly compared to the much larger infrastructure issues that Auckland faces. Northlanders are likely to end up subsidizing Auckland.

Given the government's current stance of bullying and coercing people into injecting toxins into their bodies I do not have faith in the government to keep our water supplies safe.

Auckland has more people in the big city than Northland put together. This would make priority for the city instead of the rest of Northland.

We share our roading budget with Auckland now and we have appalling roads while Auckland gets 5 years budget to pay for a tunnel. Auckland currently pays less rates than I do for more services. They need to pay for what they use. User pays is a good concept. If Auckland is short of a resource let them manage it better. Decentralised use makes better use of resources.

My experience of the water reforms in the UK is that it started well but declined over time in management and maintaining a high standard, especially when private management was introduced. This was when the loss of focus from quality and public health to profit occurred, making the service morph to a commodity not an essential service for the community. I can see no difference of this happening in NZ with a higher management overhead and the long term possibility of the service being contracted out to the highest bidder as has been done in some countries. Despite any high ideals that will be given out as reassurance and good intentions I have no confidence that this will not result in a high cost to the users in the future and will be political football and a big disappointment to the customers in times come.

I'm on a private waterboard as well as a septic.

I think run by a central government would perform poorly.

Yet another asset grab by the government.

Lacking accurate facts and details.

Don't want Māori controlling rainfall, sea bed, rivers etc.

I want to know that my water rates stay in our community not given away to lazy people.

The government controls and don't have the confidence in them to do this fairly. We are becoming more and more socialists.

It is our sovereign right to manage and choose our use of waters. I support and trust our council over the government.

Previous governments have recognized that their type of programmes are far better to be handled by local councils, not centralized governments.

Auckland is a giant consumer of water, we need all our water to supply the green revolution.

It is the stupidest idea ever.

This is part of a diverse racist approach which will ultimately destroy the NZ way of life.

History has proved it won't work. Look how Rodney and Franklin residents have been disadvantaged by being by pulled into Auckland City. Amalgamation will not create efficiencies or reduce costs to households.

Should stay owned by the ratepayer and managed by the local council.

A racist separatist government structure whereby 15% of the population have 50% of the say, very un New Zealand like.

In zone A the Far North will be forgotten while the same area as Auckland.

Government never does anything efficiently and they have already sold all the important public assets to greedy corporates.

I have no confidence in this type of governing, this is not democratic and as citizens we won't have any say in the future. The Iwi should only have their percentage of representation.
The process for electing the board is not democratic. No local say. Opportunity for other groups to benefit from what is normally a public resource.
As a ratepayer I don't believe that our assets should be given over to the Iwis and also be controlled by government and be connected to Auckland, Whangārei etc. We should be independent to our area.
I do support NZ wide water standards for streams, waste grey water, toilet flush water and storm water. Water quality needs monitoring and testing across a range of sites. Our aquifers need to be conserved. Streams and waterways need wider vegetated margins to help improve run off quality. Slopes greater than 18 require native vegetation cover.
Total distrust in any promise made by this government, housing, child poverty, health, finance a few examples. How could you possibly trust them with NZ Water?
You say the infrastructure is worth 306.5 yet government only wants to pay 35m for 3 assets that we as ratepayers have paid for. Also concerned as to what the make up of ownership will be.
I am worried about higher powers taking away our human rights.
We shouldn't have to pay for water that falls from the sky, just so we can drink and shower and clean. The government is greedy.
We should not have to pay for water that falls from the sky to drink, and clean ourselves.
Handing over 50% control to Māori will have far reaching consequences.
We want water freedom on our own land. Why should we rebuy an asset that we already own?
I believe centralisation of these services makes it harder to hold people to account for failures and issues. It becomes no one's fault so there's no real incentive to get it right.
Pay private company which I can't see working. Our water comes from the lake. Te Kao water and rainwater in tanks and waste water is disposed of be self. I can't see any advantage in 3 waters. Our water bill has written across the bottom "Not fit for humans, farm use only". I can't see our water being improved by 3
Don't want to be linked in with Auckland City.
Water located on private land should be able to be managed privately by the landowner and not subject to overreaching policy and legislation and cost.
We manage our water requirements effectively. We do not need to pay many times more for someone else to do what we do for free parts.
In any other field of endeavour or business the government scheme would be considered sharp practice at best and an out and out scam at worst.
Concerned about these assets being given to Māori. This is discrimination. Racist against all other groups living in NZ.
Not prepared to hand our assets over to Māori to be managed from a distance and used as an income for non users. Similar to our Hydro power stations.
Create a monopoly (super utility), prices will escalate, essential resources that I have paid for will be mismanaged and I will pay through a national uniform annual charge. I will lose my democratic right to choose the type and quality of essential water/wastewater supply. I will lose my democratic voice and experience thank you.
I suspect Central Government aims to use Local Government assets to solve its longstanding difficulty in resolving Iwi claims to freshwater.
Very, very concerned of the gov't handing over part control to ethnic groups.
Leave it as is.
Facilities are owned by councils and are valuable assets.
Jacinda back off!
We need to be able to run our systems locally. Paper shufflers in Auckland will not run our systems well. Imagine trying to contact someone in Auckland about a water leak.
It is a plan to divide New Zealanders.
The racism of only consulting with some residents and not all residents of Northland in the proposed

I believe the 3-waters initiative may be part of an agenda to expand central control of what are now locally-controlled services. Water quality issues should be addressed by having nationwide safety standards. If a local body cannot achieve standards adherence then take appropriate action on a case-by-case basis.
Extremely poor process to date, complete lack of consultation, undemocratic processes in breach of requirements for councils to consult on major asset purchase/sales, undervaluing asset base paid for by locals for locals, no accountability to tax payer or rate payer, disproportionate control seated to iwi that is not representative of majority of constituents, appalling public propaganda campaign from central govt is insulting at best, outright unbalanced misrepresentation in reality.
The outcome is also extremely racist.
Ownership should be the majority of New Zealand and not Iwi based.
I didn't select option two above, as the words three waters needs to be omitted but I definitely believe that our assets should be kept OWNED and OPERATED by the FNDC ratepayers. It's an asset grab by this government and their track record on all their undertakings to date is dismal and they are not being open or honest on their real intent. Their advert treats us as little children and quite frankly is insulting.
The government is proposing to take control of the services we have paid for and pay the council peanuts for it. It is theft on a grand scale.
This socialist programme to give 50% of the infrastructure to be under the control of 16% of the population is RACE based there does not comply with the Race relations Act or other laws of NEW ZEALAND.
This type of change has seldom ever produced. The efficiencies claimed apart from allowing a minority to control what the rest of us pay for what we have already paid!
I see this as an asset grab and the Gov't are not been transparent.
This is 'Race' Generated, and will bring division in our community and country.
I believe this is a total asset stripping of local council, offering 10% of actual worth to take all assets and then be controlled by Auckland.
I do not want the substantial asset that the local ratepayers have built over many years to be handed over to another entity and the value of the asses be lost to the people who have invested in it.
Obviously something needs to be improved ASAP, but the proposed structure does not appear appealing or feasible. Gov't must support Councils in respect of expertise and funding to build and maintain their vital infrastructures. The existing system of Councils working independently under supervision of Regional Councils is not effective: rather Regional Councils should pool expertise with Councils to achieve more reliable results. Councils might not be able to fund most qualified top level experts - so they should be shared. Furthermore, the aim to connect all households to reticulated water & wastewater is not feasible in our rural areas: stand-alone system with rainwater tanks & filters and small waste water treatment plants would be cheaper and more efficient. Tanks should be mandatory. Affordable Electro-Coagulation systems are able to clean septic tank effluents to 100% clean irrigation water. Council staff must stop rejecting new proposed methods based on their unfamiliarity with them: Gov't should make experts available to advise Council staff about new techniques.
Under the Three Water proposal by this current government, our local assets which have been paid for by the local ratepayers for generations, are being given away. It is a pure asset grab, giving veto rights to a selected few from a 16% minority of our population. This is NOT democratic. These race based laws should have NO legal status in NZ and should have nothing to do with our water. Rain water comes from the sky, belongs to us all. NO-ONE should have veto rights!!! Plus the Scottish example upon which these so-called reforms are based on, have NO relevance to the Far North or to NZ as a whole, as we live in a unique country with very diverse conditions in each region.
The government will take over locally owned assets paid for by ratepayers over the years and then increase our water rates and charges to pay for other cities/towns water infrastructure. It's a centralised asset grab by Wellington and should be stopped.
Central gov't seldom delivers good results with anything they 'manage'.
The model just doesn't work. Look at Watercare in Auckland - they are still imposing water restrictions (due to leaks they haven't fixed), after a winter of heavy rain. Utter incompetence and no accountability.

All three. It should stay local.
I object strongly to the anti democratic stance taken by the present Government.
This is a badly thought out plan by people who have no idea what they are proposing.
The Auckland experiment is a disaster. Bigger does not bring savings.
No confiscation without compensation.
This is not a central government function. Leave this with local government.
Given history' with super city and electricity fiasco it will probably cost everyone a lot more and is not guaranteed.
It is New Zealand NOT Aotearoa and will always be.
I don't think an Auckland based entity will have the environmental concerns that we need.
Bigger is no assurance of better, I do not believe that the reform of Auckland has improved overall services. 3W would mean a loss of investment and no fair recompense for our assets. Distant Wellington based services will inevitable lose real understanding of our realities. I am wary of huge bureaucracies and high paid people creating assured futures for themselves. The suggestion that 3W will be able to manage climate change is preposterous.
This is another government instituted amalgamation idea, none of which have EVER produced economic or administrative benefit to communities. All its designed to do is to give 17% of our population the rights to control assets belonging to ALL of us, based on racial claims that have no foundation in reality, and terribly divisive. One people. One vote. One legal system. All else is doomed to produce uncontrollable racial divide.
Don't trust the government's plan, there is a lot more behind this proposal which we are not being told.
How can someone In Auckland or outside the area understand local needs and at what cost. User pay and pay for your own services needed.
I am concerned about the way the governing bodies would be made up. I am concerned that the area would be far too large to manage effectively, I am concerned the whole concept has another agenda and that the democratic freedoms are in jeopardy. I sincerely hope council will say no to accepting the Gov't proposal.
I have own water supply, i.e. catchment to tanks. Gov't can keep their hands off.
This would lead to forced amalgamations of Councils due to a reduced asset and cashflow base.
The services are owned by the ratepayers who finance the council and therefore they should stay under their control. They cannot be given away to anyone else.
Also my parents and my husband and I paid a lot of rates over the past 70 years why would we just give control to the government.
We are on tank water which we manage well ourselves. Don't want to change that. I think that too much funding would go to Auckland and Wellington.
All three of the choices above are correct and in addition it is a racist policy with regard to IWI controlling 50% of the board.
If it's not broken it doesn't need fixing. A lot of Far North folks are on tank and septic, not sure how 3 waters will affect that and what we pay. Why hand over our asset to some gov't dept. Will that really save money? and what about the service issues, is there a potential for loss of jobs?
The government is trying to centralise everything which is owned by local councils to force upon us their way of thinking and remove democracy!
I would tick option 3. I also reside in the Rodney district that voted to not join the Auckland super city. It was widely disbelieved that amalgamating the various Auckland councils would return the savings the government (who were pushing the amalgamation) promised. From day one rates rose, and have continued skyward. This will be no different. The government is involved.
We will be lumped in with Auckland's water problems potential nightmare.
It could easily be privatised. Auckland would control the money.
It is not fairly represented for the whole community.
Still concerned about potential for privatisation in the future.
Proposed governance is not democratic.

I believe the governments 3 water reform programme will increase taxes & be a further invasion to our rights as iwi are given more entitlements & rights, even over private property.
I used to live in Auckland, and the thought that a central authority that includes Watercare would have any influence over management of Far North water infrastructure is quite frankly horrifying. They have demonstrated their incompetence and inability to plan or act for the benefit of their customers, repeatedly.
I've seen this before. Despite all the promises that the new water authorities would not be sold off, they were and we discovered that our water company in southern England was owned by a South Australian company. More privatisation by stealth orchestrated by others.
I am totally against what feels like a takeover of my Country, New Zealand, by one very small group of people who live amongst us.
The council currently own the water assets and have paid for them - the gov't is proposing to purchase them at less than full value from the council and then levy us to maintain them - i.e. we sell an asset we own for less than full value to someone else _ which no sensible business or person would do so why should council be forced to do so and then are required to pay to maintain the asset that the gov't now owns. The assets should be left with the council who then has the full value of the asset and the rates take to put up as security to borrow (if required) to continue to upgrade the asset and at least then there is certainty ay money borrowed will be used for that purpose. Also those making the decisions around water in the north will be answerable to their specific voters.
One size does not fit all, local management allows local decisions. Proposed Board structure is not democratic in any way. 3 waters assets have been funded by ratepayers for years, this proposal will allow government to take those assets, refinance using them as security then ask users to pay again. The water available, while improvements can be made is of an acceptable standard without millions more spent. This government appears intent on sneaking these reforms through without proper consultation, this is
Not only is the proposal bad in principle half of our stolen assets then get handed to iwi. This cannot be right.
I am concerned that this will eventually lead to Māori entities charging royalties or fees to non-Māori New Zealanders for the use of water.
50% Māori ownership is a not reflective of NZ, giving a huge amount of power to a minority group. Would create further separatism which seems to be a goal of this current government.
I don't trust the current Government.
Water will eventually under this system be privatised as has happened overseas.
Three Waters sets the system up for privatisation. Any government can change legislation.
It is wrong to take assets paid for by generations of Northland ratepayers.
Future ownership issues.
It will turn out to be an absolute disaster and should be thrown into the waste paper basket.
This is yet another step down the path towards totalitarian rule, and I speak as one who knows from personal experience. It is divisive, racist and damaging to both the economy and democracy.
Hidden agenda and ultimate ownership as it needs to be owned by the people, all the people and the council has a good investment and would not be treated fairly with the Gov't plan.
It belongs to the New Zealand people not based on skin colour.
We have never seen a business plan for the amalgamation. I feel the whole idea is "Ripe" for future sale. Ownership by the FNDC will go and therefore we shall loose borrowing collateral. We do not need another disaster like was formed by the amalgamation of Auckland into a Super City. I'm sure people in the Far North do not wish to pay for Auckland's water woes. The FNDC is a wonderful organisation and should be left
We need improvements to happen on water but we do not like the proposed co-governance structure. Also, my understanding is that the proposed entity will be a law unto itself and could be "jobs for the boys" leading to secret agendas by individuals abusing the rights of ratepayers. Who will the Board be answerable
Ownership should stay with local councils.
The compensation to the FNDC for assets paid for by ratepayers is nothing short of theft. The proposed governance of 50% Māori - 50% Other is undemocratic. This government hasn't delivered on any project and will not deliver on this one either.

Auckland Supercity have MAJOR ISSUES with their water supply and I don't think it is a good solution for us to be bundled in with them.
Māori will have control over water. Outrageous. This is all about giving them water control, nothing else.
All the above and I am seriously concerned about 50% of the asset being given to iwi. This is not democratic and will divide our country further.
Our rates have purchased these assets and we control them locally, they must stay that way.
I support the ability to at least have a say with our Local Government whereas this reform programme will take away a person's right to have a say as the Government is proving time and again the only time we have a say in matters regarding our well being currently is at an election every three years apart from that they ignore and disregard the opinion and right of the individual to have a say. It is wrong and undemocratic. Please FNDC reject this proposal opt out and further more take the stance of the Timaru District Council and distance yourself from the Local Government Body that supposedly represents Local Government and is pushing this atrocious proposal.
If funding and affordability is the concern to the government on behalf of the ratepayers in the future, why not provide the Councils with sufficient funding to enable future planning and modelling, access to required funding, and support in delivering it. A technical pool of people may be more effective than wholesale changes. The proposed option will require very effective linkages between the central body and the people on the ground. I'm not so sure this works on such vast geographical areas when local issues are not known or simply not considered important.
Including Iwi, will only slow down any development and applications for all applicants. The processes are slow enough already.
The government is taking our services which we already own and selling them back to us.
With such a small and geographically spread population, compared to the people controlling our supply - the decisions will be made based on what's best for the majority of the population which will be mostly in Auckland and the higher densely populated areas, and not be as concerned for the lower voter numbers in the Far North.
3 waters scheme gives disproportionate control of water supply to iwi.
Labour cannot provide any service efficiently. They can promise etc but not deliver.
Proposed governance.
I don't feel comfortable with the government taking control over water, it leans towards communist governance.
I have absolutely no problem with the way FNDC has operated our water. Kelly did a fabulous job last summer with the drought. By centralizing this I am confident we would not be so well looked after. Please opt out.
This is a very dangerous path that is ideologically and not practically based.
We do well ourselves. I get fresh water from my roof. I take my own water bottle full of my water. I can't have chlorinated or fluorinated water. I'm on thyroxin daily without my thyroid now due to cancer.
Far North has special issues that 'outsiders' will not be aware of a will end up doing all sorts of investigations of aspects Far North Council already is aware of. There will be a lot of people on the new 2 Waters organisation and this will be costly, top level over-paid and not accountable.
I would like there to be a public meeting where the Council can inform us of their views on the proposal.
I do not like how this has been forced on us by this Government.
Abandoning democracy and handing local assets to the government for thirty pieces of silver is a trojan horse for the colonised who think they are in a partnership with the Crown.
Central gov't should fund local council's in order for them to provide what their areas need but enforce a minimum standard.
Locally managed efficient water system for locals, develop, build and managed by locals who know the conditions, what we need and what suits us best!
Gov't not to be trusted as bigger issue in play.

Make-up of the board of the new entity does not stack up. Why would the Maori group of 16% get 50% of the new board (where they have not made any contribution in the form of assets).
I support Council opting out until more is known. Key matters for me are the money (will we be subsidised or will we be doing the subsidising), and will we (all New Zealanders) retain ownership and control of the assets (and do they take the debt with the infrastructure?)
This is just a further measure for central government to control our lives and steal our current infrastructure built by ourselves and our forefathers for the benefit of corporate thieves, and as we catch our own water and reticulate it we should not be charged for it and have it contaminated with toxic chemicals.
The Council must protect the assets of the ratepayers.
I have not seen any positive argument or benefit as to why 50% of controlling rights are to be vested to one ethnic group.
Gov't not committed to open and transparent discussion in spite of PM saying this will be an open and transparent Govt for all NZers.
There has to be a better way than creating another government department. Maybe print a bit more money and give to the councils to improve what they already have. This government seems to know how to print money without working out how the country will pay for it.
Like thousands of New Zealanders we own a rural property and invested providing our own water and wastewater systems. I am concerned the proposal won't take us into account and we will be levied fees for services we don't use. I am also concerned that the proposed governance of the 3 WRP suggests that 'the board' will be dominated by Iwi who will have the final say.
Any three waters coloration needs to be set up to cover costs not make profits/price gouge; and expertise and workers should be in-house, not contracted in. There also needs to be requirement for three waters to be provided in an ecologically sound way.
If I wanted to live in a country with no democratic rights I would move to China.
These assets have been paid for by local government rates and should therefore remain in local ownership and control. Northland will not get a fair deal being lumped in with Auckland.
This is tantamount to theft from the ratepayers who have contributed to the costs of infrastructure over years in the payment of their rates. FNDC are doing a very good job in a difficult, sparsely populated area in some cases, and they know how to keep costs down to the minimum which is unlikely with a new entity with no option to question expenditure. The Government has made the claim that the assets will remain in Council ownership, this is simply not true. Once the assets have been passed to new water entities, control will be passed over to an unelected board, and lost to local ratepayers for ever.
This entire idea is being driven by government against the will of Kiwis, without any real need in the majority of councils.
Puna Wai are taonga cared for managed and protected by whanau hapu a gift from our tuupuna he tangatawhenua for our mokopuna tamariki mai ra ano, gov't again will take our natural resource and allow it to be sold and bottled.
Fundamentally wrong in our democratic society.
We believe we DON'T WANT any more USELESS GOV'T Depts. Thanks BONETTI Family.
I collect my own water and I don't want any interference with this.
The proposed governance arrangements violate democratic principles.
It is a case of if it isn't broke don't try and fix it. This is nothing more than government forcing control.
Sick of gov't thinking they can do better when history has proven its better in local hands. Bigger isn't always better. Gov't will just increase the cost. We all pay anyway as we fund the govt. Water quality is not an issue in no.
The legislation is yet another example of the many racial based bureaucratic blunders that are dividing this New Zealand's people. Big is not beautiful. As our elected representatives please think long and hard before joining this lunatic idea.
I don't want the water to be controlled by a single racial group.

<p>We already own them as ratepayers, under Three Waters we will be having to pay for them all over again. Not acceptable.</p>
<p>The reforms are adding another layer of bureaucracy which equates to more cost. I believe that as a district the Far North will miss out on benefits as new infrastructure will go to the areas of greatest benefit which will be densely populated areas but we will still be paying for no benefit.</p>
<p>Why change something that is not broken? What happens if you have nothing to do with any of the three waters, are you going to pay for it?</p>
<p>A local ownership model with ratepayers and Hapu represented is my preference. Central Government's role should be to enable this.</p>
<p>Not happy a large share is being 'given' to the Iwi who can't run a marae let alone a major water facility!</p>
<p>The recent investment of te tai tokerau water trust in Northland the unproven water bore on monument hill has been an investment for Northland controlled by Northland not Wellington.</p>
<p>I believe the current government has introduced a range of policies and legislation in an undemocratic manner and have no faith that this change will be any different.</p>
<p>Stop trying to CONTROL everything.</p>
<p>Central gov't will be taking assets owned and paid for by ratepayers.</p>
<p>Should be 100% managed by Council or Government, not local iwi. They do not own the water and in many cases do not even pay rates I believe. Correct me if I am wrong, besides we are on tank water and septic tank only 3.5k from the newly constructed sewerage works. No hint of being connected to something we have all paid for indirectly over many years.</p>
<p>Why should non-ratepayers get 50% say in assets confiscated from generations of ratepayers!!</p>
<p>Too much has been invested in the present water system (storm, drinking and waste water) by ratepayers and council to have it taken over by others. It will happen if we let it.</p>
<p>I feel not one group of people should own the waters if it's 50/50 that how it should be, majority consensus.</p>
<p>Auckland is constantly low in water - so what guarantee of secure supply for us in Northland which is a warmer and drier area.</p>
<p>We have already paid for the services in our rates and own them so why give them away.</p>
<p>This 3 water proposal is only heading one way-central control by state gov't - we, in the regions, will be ignored, under provided for as is occurring now with our roads etc. This is an outright, blatant grab of assets, at a massive fire sale price (called bribery and coercion) for state control of people, places and freedoms. It should be vehemently opposed every step of the way.</p>
<p>This is part of the government's plan to move control to the unelected Māori tribal elite.</p>
<p>I want our water services to be operated and managed locally.</p>
<p>Having read many reports, both the governments, and those from independent sources I do not believe the proposed reforms will deliver efficiently. I strongly object to a central government controlled, bureaucratic entity taking charge of infrastructure that has been paid for by ratepayers and I strongly object to the divisive plans for setting up Boards of 50% Māori and 50% of all other New Zealanders to oversee and manage NZ's Three Waters. The reports have shown, over and over, the costings do not stack up and that it will be citizens and ratepayers who shoulder the financial burden, this in times of great uncertainty. Central government should not take control of assets paid for by the ratepayers of their local community. The proposal is flawed, undemocratic and divisive.</p>
<p>Decentralised services and control is more focused on actual local issues and needs.</p>
<p>I believe that these services and decisions be run by ALL New Zealand rate payers and not by the minority.</p>
<p>I am a retired contractor so have understanding of the problems involved.</p>
<p>We should not be included in the Auckland region.</p>
<p>This government needs to be stopped from stealing ratepayers property and trying to re-distribute the ownership to Māori interests and IWI just to please it's Māori caucus.</p>
<p>It's theft of our capital structure.</p>
<p>Want less central government involvement in my life.</p>
<p>There will be extra expenses for ratepayers paying a water royalty to Māori tribes, Iwi and Māori Elite.</p>

<p>Why is Northland within the Auckland city? Auckland has if not more people in Auckland than Northland put together.</p>
<p>The proposed Government Reforms constitute central planning and lumbering bureaucracy. It is proven everyday how large centralised bodies are unresponsive to local needs and largely inefficient, unaccountable and expensive.</p>
<p>I am concerned that we will lose local control over a local resource. I am worried that people outside our area will not manage the resource carefully.</p>
<p>All Māori reference and water royalties to Māori must be abolished to keep ratepayer costs down.</p>
<p>The Māori control element is deeply concerning.</p>
<p>We need more convincing detail about the government's proposals and an understanding of how the Government calculated the so called benefits of their proposals. I do not see why race should be any part of the proposals. We need a colour blind society. Without any or governance based on privilege given on basis of ethnicity.</p>
<p>Te Tai Tokerau survives on the margins. This one signals the extermination. Least we forget.</p>
<p>Water should be owned by all New Zealanders.</p>
<p>Without water there is no life anywhere, do not give our long paid for water supplies over to gov't that will turn it over to elite Māori control. It's theft, by stealth, we will all end up paying the elite for right to use our basic life necessity water without it no life can exist, it's nothing more than a royalty system for the high ranking, don't trust this bloody evil plan, their plan cannot be allowed to proceed.</p>
<p>The set up costs would be better spent in the areas that require extra support e.g. Havelock 2006 incident there should be a fund to assist when things go wrong. I believe our plans are going to help provide Northland with good drinking water. I would like to see an option to have tanks in urban setting for droughts which are going to be an ongoing issue.</p>
<p>Very important to have local alignment and responsibility on how the region develops and responds.</p>
<p>Possible hidden Government agendas.</p>
<p>The governance regime is convoluted and is race based, and ratepayers don't have a say in who is on the governance boards. The ratepayers are left out of the democratic process of appointing the board based on their expertise in water management. I am concerned that the board will not have the expertise if based their race and iwi affiliations.</p>
<p>In God I trust. Everyone else has to earn it. I trust John Carter as I have met him personally and know his back ground. Trust is very important in a functioning society. I don't trust big institutions as they less accountable and can be influenced by global institutions like the UN and the World Economic Forum.</p>
<p>I don't like the fact that other entities will have control over our water issues. That control must stay with our local community.</p>
<p>It sounds like a good idea overall however allowing one "entity" to manage Auckland North is bad news for Far North. Funds will inevitably be prioritized to Auckland as per status quo. Pricing will be modelled on Auckland supply vs demand & operation costs. I know the dirty word here is Privatisation but I think privatisation in a correctly managed open market (which is the government's job and judging by the power costs here being 36% higher than national average they aren't working too hard there) would work far better than what is proposed now. This scheme sounds to me to be a way of making Auckland more affordable and getting the north to foot the bill. Therefore I am against it.</p>
<p>If it was about improving the situation the gov't. would make borrowing easier for councils and would facilitate quality engineering assistance. Water is an engineering problem not a Treaty problem.</p>
<p>This is a major step towards privatising the assets that ratepayers paid for and own. When the assts go into private (probably overseas) ownership we will be just customers having no control over a vital service.</p>
<p>This government cannot run the country let alone anything else will be better like it is.</p>
<p>Our size compared to that of Auckland area wise means we will be the small and poor relation. Decisions we see as appropriate for an urban/strongly rural area will not be compatible with a city based "cousin". We need to make our own decisions.</p>

Like the DHB's money will be sucked up by a lot of middle management plus we won't have a strong democratic voice to government. Look how much the Far North gets overlooked now. Maybe we team up with WDC and Auckland on our own backs. We rely on Auckland for business. Why don't we link up with our neighbours and rub off on their success.
The whole proposal is democratically unsound. Taking control from elected members and putting control of a "nod-nod, wink-wink group of individuals under the friendship act!" This sort of thing harks back to the communist control Stalanist era in Russia. We need to put a complete stop on this in any form.
I have seen enough in the last several governments to believe that this gov't. is self serving and has no intention of keeping promises or telling the whole truth.
I don't want the Māori's Taking control of our waters already owned by all New Zealanders.
I think that the needs of the city of Auckland are so great that they should be kept separate.
Simply it's best to set tax rates according to its community needs and not surrender its revenue control to implement maintenance, expansion and upgrading.
We as the community, that have paid rates for these assets. We use them, our expectations from the governance body is locally driven. They should not be controlled or owned by a national body, as this would inhibit us to services and therefore add more hurdles, ultimately leading us to more cost, therefore more taxes. I also believe the way in which these assets are being undemocratically stripped and given to a race based group is prejudice!
I think the way the changes have been proposed are divisive for both the district and New Zealand as a
On tank water and septic tank.
Very concerned that one group of people/race will eventually claim the water!
I am not going to pay to collect my rainwater nor will I pay to have it inspected and then dosed with what I consider to be toxins to human gut flora therefore my health. It is against my freedoms to drink and collect water as I see fit. Not as the government wants to do trying to cover it's backside because some places had contaminated their own local supply.
Government is not representing the people on anything at all our water is our water. Keep it safe from Government!!!! They are criminals and have stolen the election votes with the voting machines being skewed in the Globalists favour 100% Fact.
If the government recommends this then it's bad news for the ratepayer. Only ratepayers should have a say as we are the ones that pay the bill. This will cost us a lot of money and to bundle us in with Auckland NO THANKS.
Another Government bureaucracy will be created with layers of expensive salary tiers and inefficiencies, with decisions made regarding the FNDC catchment by people with little knowledge of, and empathy for the residents of the Far North. We, my Partner and I, are vehemently opposed.
Worried about centralisation means we have less input as ratepayers.
Centralized gov't entities have been incapable of dealing & managing properly the vast micro detail involved in operating these types of operations. A large incompetent bureaucracy only outcome.
It will be theft of our asset (water)!!
Why reform something for no reasonable reason? Leave it alone. We the people should vote on it. Water belongs to no one.
The board members are not democratically elected and therefore have no responsibility to the ratepayers. Also the representation of the board members does not reflect the demographics of the region that they control (Māori are 16% of the population but they have 50% of the board seats - this cannot be justified).
If we have to join we must be Far North only Auckland should be separate.
Bigger isn't always better. The labour gov't. is full of liars and con artists who are detached from reality. There is no way that a big corporate will ever be more efficient than a small easily controlled dedicated team with lots of local knowledge, which is what you have now.
Tell Ardern to keep her grubby paws off.
I don't believe that 50%of the asset should be controlled by 15% of the population and also if we are lumped in with Auckland we will get nothing like the roading.

<p>This Government has already proved how incompetent they are by their racist separation policies in general without consultation to the voting public.</p>
<p>Basic quality principles of plan, do, review, learn tend to be entirely absent in these sort of proposals. Previous amalgamations have not delivered for locals so there is a poor track record. Small local government is best to encourage local enterprise. Large conglomerations typically only contract out to large multinational corporations, damaging the local economy. Amalgamations do not allow splitting off once started. For example is there a single example of any local authority amalgamation that has ever been reversed? This looks like a power grab at the expense of democracy.</p>
<p>If the gov't takes over the management who carries the current debt??</p>
<p>I don't like the separatism in giving 50% to iwi.</p>
<p>Infrastructure has been built up by FNDC ratepayers + loans etc. so it is unacceptable that these assets are taken over by Central Government and control is handed into uncertain ownership and into huge organisations that have little or no knowledge of what is required by the local communities. Far better to provide cheap loans to local councils to upgrade 3 waters infrastructure.</p>
<p>Auckland has very aged water caring infrastructure and basically needs someone else to help pay for the work required to keep them up to standard. This is a government ploy to get Far North ratepayers to help pay for Auckland's needed upgrades. In fact the same with other areas of NZ. This is the same as what they did when forcing amalgamation of the former Auckland cities. Majority of cities opted out of amalgamation and were ignored and amalgamation took place. NO SAVINGS EVENTUATED. IT WAS LIES. Also this could be their way of setting usd all up to privatisation, for future well offs.</p>
<p>We live in a rural area which supplies our own safe drinking water, wastewater and stormwater at no cost to the FNDC or the government. How will anyone protect us more efficiently or regulate rural people without unnecessary expense imposed on us? Rural people in our situation will be expected to subsidise urban people. This is unjust, unfair and unnecessary.</p>
<p>I am concerned that being in the same group as NZ's largest city that we will be considered as of least importance in managing future problems.</p>
<p>That's a lot of research you have done, however let everyone that wants to have their own water tanks this will help immediately. The best water, is off your own roof if it is clean. Also it is way too expensive what you are proposing. That money has to come from somewhere and it isn't coming from me. I get virtually nothing for what I pay in rates already. I have my own rain water and my own wastewater system. There was a rumour that people with tank water will have to pay, is this so?? I saw mention of Māori in the text. Do Māori pay rates on Māori land like we do for ours?? No they don't. If they did maybe things would be better for us all. Do they get the benefits as well?? Don't ask everybody else that isn't Māori to subsidise Māori. I'm not racist and have some very good working Māori friends. Enough about that bit. You haven't made things perfectly clear, who is looking at taking over, who is going to pay and who isn't. Where is the money coming from, is it fair, someone who is on town supply for water and sewage is completely different than someone with tanks and there own septic system. You need to condense it, be realistic and put it in front of us as it would be in real terms. BE TRANSPARENT.</p>
<p>All of the above & don't want any extra cost to the ratepayer, as traces are extremely high now, for law abiding ratepayers that pay.</p>
<p>The government cannot organize anything efficiently and as a taxpayer in a rural area I/we are not even considered in their thoughts.</p>
<p>It is unacceptable that the governance of three waters would be given to predominantly one minority ethnic group.</p>
<p>Giving iwi 50 percent.</p>
<p>If you consider gov't forced amalgamations of councils/power reforms/snaps there has NEVER been a plus for the consumer/ratepayer. Fight this with all your might also there is no cross party agreement on this contentious issue. It is theft of community assets IMO.</p>

<p>Creating a bureaucratic heavy system out of touch with locals and our issues. Fears it will be sold off to....????? It's being raced through along with many other things, including the SNAs etc without true consultation. All part of the 2030 UN agenda, and not a NZ agenda approved by the people of NZ.</p>
<p>I believe Three Waters service providers should be independent entities operating on a commercial basis with a private-public equity structure (e.g. Air New Zealand) and that amalgamation decisions between adjoining providers should be made by those providers based on their mutual economic benefit, not imposed by central government.</p>
<p>It will just create one more primarily self-serving bureaucracy that, instead of serving the water interests of the residents and ratepayers, will simply consume even more public funds simply to promote and sustain itself.</p>
<p>I see that what is proposed by the Government will just add a lot more overheads and mismanagement. In no way should there be an Ethnically Biased Management of these Resources, as is currently proposed.</p>
<p>We believe local council is there to protect the assets of the ratepayers. It would be a crime to give these away. The council should plan all the future requirements for infrastructure, the government should fund the work accordingly and the council should oversee the implementation. Please protect our assets.</p>
<p>Will the proposed reforms affect the land drainage systems which in some areas are contiguous with each other. The Gov't. financial picture of the future cost is stupidly simplistic.</p>
<p>I want FNDC to retain our water services. Quite simply - take a look at how government operate all manner of things in this country. Do you really want them to POORLY manage our water services too? Furthermore, this Labour orchestrated "promotion of iwi / Māori rights" is to promote separatism which I STRONGLY oppose, as a New Zealander of Māori descent myself. We are all kiwis, Māori don't need special treatment or special input over any other ethnicity in this country.</p>
<p>Iwi must not have any say over water rights as this may be used for their own grievance agenda against colonisation.</p>
<p>I am on septic, catch my own house hold water and look after my own storm-water, so already pay.</p>
<p>It's a take over of water rights by and for Māori. Separatist and undemocratic.</p>
<p>Costs to ratepayers will increase and accountability will be less. If you get a large entity to oversee what happens in Northland is making it streamlined but we need to make each council aware of their duty to water users. Gov't should set out the highest of standards to Councils with monthly checks to see records, check equipment, aquifers etc. Councils to be fined if this is not up to date and correct. We can not be delivering contaminated water to users in this day and age of 2021. Come on Councils get your act together. Government should be helping with cheap loans to get aquifers and water systems up to scratch. Clean Water, clean Air clean food! We need people on the ground checking what is going on. Encourage self storage for gardens etc with proper plastic tanks able to be fitted next to a house. A lot of wasted water suitable for car washing watering the garden etc.</p>