

Three Waters Survey Results

Contents

Project Overview.....	3
Awareness of Proposal.....	4
Response to Statements.....	4
Ranking of Statements.....	6
Feedback on priorities.....	8
Feedback on change the Government is proposing.....	8
Location.....	9
Age.....	9
Gender.....	10
Rate Payers.....	10
Households.....	11
Verbatim comments.....	12

Project Overview

Central Government is proposing a reform to the Three Waters services currently administered from Council and moving these services to four entities.

The Three Waters review started in 2017 final time frame has not been set for decision-making. If the reform is passed new entities would be expected to start in 2024.

Rangitikei District Council is included in 'Entity B' involving 22 councils including our neighbours Whanganui and Ruapehu, as well as others in Waikato, Tauranga, Bay of Plenty and Taranaki.

The proposed structure would see the 22 councils represented by six elected members and six iwi representatives in a Regional Representative Group.

The Regional Representative Group would appoint an independent selection panel, which would appoint the water entity's board members. The board members would independently govern the entity.


The survey undertaken by Council on Governments proposed Three Waters reform proposal saw 269 responses. The Survey was advertised in the District Monitor, a letter was sent to all households who receive the District Monitor, Council website and Facebook page. The Mayor and Chief Executive held a Facebook live session where they provided information and took questions from viewers. The Survey was also advertised in Council buildings.

The Survey focused on gathering feedback from the community on their thoughts about the proposed Three Waters reform. The findings of the survey have been analysed and commented at the total level.

Overall the majority of responses are opposed to the transfer of ownership to an entity and would prefer that Council retain its Three Waters. A number of concerns were raised about the reform and the way in which the process has been undertaken.

Awareness of Proposal


Q1 Before receiving this survey, were you aware that the Government is proposing to change the way drinking water, wastewater and stormwater (the 'three waters') are provided across the country?



When canvassing the community on whether they were aware of the Governments proposed reform for Three Waters the majority of respondents (92%) were aware. The majority of respondents aware of the reform resided in Marton (46%).

Response to Statements

Q2 'Three waters' is how we commonly refer to our drinking water, wastewater and stormwater services. Thinking about how we deliver drinking water, wastewater and stormwater services, do you agree or disagree with the following statements?



Statement one	All areas of New Zealand should have access to safe drinking water.
Statement two	We should have safe drinking water
Statement three	We should all have the same standard of three waters service, even if we have to share costs across other councils
Statement four	Our water infrastructure should be improved, or it should be maintained to at least the same standard as it is now
Statement five	Three water services should be managed and operated as efficiently as possible
Statement six	Water rates should only be spent and invested locally
Statement seven	Households should pay for their water based on how much they actually use
Statement eight	Three waters should be managed and operated locally by people who understand our area
Statement nine	The three waters infrastructure assets should remain in local ownership (Assets mean things like pipes, water pump stations, water treatment plants)
Statement ten	We should have a strong (representative) democratic say in the way three waters services are provided in our area

For all statements, except statement three, respondents agreed. A low response of agreeance with statement 3 indicates respondents do not want to share costs with other territorial authorities.

30% of those who were rate payers agreed it should be a shared cost with other councils for the same standard with 39% of those who are rate payers disagreeing that the cost should be shared.


While the majority of respondents to statement seven, were in agreeance that *Households should pay for their water based on how much they actually use*, 25% did not agree that it should be on a user pays basis.

43% of those who indicated as rate payers agreed with 'households should pay on a user basis', versus 23% who did not agree who were also rate payers.

Ranking of Statements

Q3 Please rank these statements. Rank them in order of most important to least important. Drag and drop the statements into your preferred order

Answered: 255 Skipped: 14



Statement one	All areas of New Zealand should have access to safe drinking water.
Statement two	We should have safe drinking water
Statement three	We should all have the same standard of three waters service, even if we have to share costs across other councils
Statement four	Our water infrastructure should be improved, or it should be maintained to at least the same standard as it is now
Statement five	Three water services should be managed and operated as efficiently as possible
Statement six	Water rates should only be spent and invested locally
Statement seven	Households should pay for their water based on how much they actually use
Statement eight	Three waters should be managed and operated locally by people who understand our area
Statement nine	The three waters infrastructure assets should remain in local ownership (Assets mean things like pipes, water pump stations, water treatment plants)
Statement ten	We should have a strong (representative) democratic say in the way three waters services are provided in our area

When ranking statements, the most important was statement one (34%) and statement two (24%).

When ranking statements, the least important was statement three (34%) and statement seven (20%).

Feedback on priorities

Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your priorities

When asked to provide commentary 174 responses were received.

Summary of comments

- Council should retain assets
 - Respondents like the way three waters is currently administered by Council
- Not wanting to be grouped with other councils with fear of local communities being left behind
- Most commentary relating to water supply as opposed to stormwater and wastewater
- Dissatisfaction with government's proposal
- Consultation has been poor at a local and central level
- Dissatisfaction with current water
- Māori and iwi should not have as much input
- Rural and residential three waters should be treated separately
- There is some support for the proposed reform

Feedback on change the Government is proposing

Do you have any other comments about the change that the Government is proposing to how we manage the three waters?

When asked to provide commentary 205 responses were received.

Summary of comments

- Opposed to government ownership of Three Waters
- Council should continue to have ownership of Three Waters
- Concerns for the administration of Three Waters
- Concern of validity of information
- Concerns of cost savings
- Process of the proposed reform has been rushed
- Māori and iwi should not have as much input. Representation of Māori and iwi should be representative of population
- Consultation has been poor at a local and central level
- Concerns of metropolitan areas being prioritised, and smaller areas left behind
- Concerns with entity system
- There is some support for the proposed reform


Location

Where do you live?

There were 265 responses to this question. Most respondents identified as residing in Marton (51%).

Q8 Where do you live?

Answered: 265 Skipped: 4




Age

How old are you?

The majority of respondents were 65+ (37%).

Q6 How old are you?

Answered: 267 Skipped: 2




Gender

Which of the following do you identify with?

There were slightly more male respondents than females.

Q7 Which of the following do you identify with?




Rate Payers

Do you pay rates to the Rangitikei District Council?

The majority of the respondents (87%) paid rates to the Rangitikei District Council.

Q9 Do you pay rates to the Rangitikei District Council?




Households

Which of the following best describes your household?

Couples was the most common make-up of households.

Q10 Which of the following best describes your household?

Answered: 266 Skipped: 3



Verbatim comments

Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your priorities?

Drinking Water should be "pleasant" to drink and clear (no discolouration) for anyone.
We need to maintain control of our assets. Our community are the only ones who understand the complexity of our environment, culture and needs
Don't use the issue that happened at Havelock North as an excuse for regulating the rest of NZ's water. Leave the responsibility of safe drinking water to each council.
Our systems are already badly maintained this needs sorting first
N/A
Keep it local
This is a poor attempt by RDC at consultation one weeks notice , limited information, a days notice of a Facebook question and answer session which would be held at 2,30 on a Friday afternoon is inadequate it's your way or the highway only 6 councils out of 67 . have said they are keen for this 3 waters scheme should listen to your people Mr Watson
We should stay in control of our hard earned assets - centralising management will cost more and lose local relevance..we should monitor and manage the assets and costs ourselves. We put them in they are OURS..eg Huinterville Rural Water Scheme...hands off Big Brother.
Difficult to rate as they are all what most people/areas want as first priorities.
I would like to have a better quality water supply that doesn't smell or taste foul and I support the governments proposed changes
local council appears unable to consistently provide good quality and clear water - have not invested enough in infrastructure over the years and have instead built not fit for purpose community centres and the huge over run on this is arrogantly passed over as "learnings" !
Keeping it local is important.
No thanks
Rural areas should not be treated the same as urban or city areas
The water infrastructure that we have paid for through our rates over years should stay in local ownership and control
The infrastructure owned by our district should remain owned, and managed by our district. I think if the Central Govt wants to help with quality water it can legislate what that quality must be and then councils need to adhere to that level.
I am completely and utterly opposed to a 3 Waters Council that is elected or comprised of members elected according to their race. I refer of course to the 50% of seats that must be filled by Maori and the other 50% that must be filled by Maori and/or "other" persons.

<p>If this is what Governments wants, why then, is our Parliament not elected on a 50% of seats to Maori only? What is so bad with the elected being elected on merit, rather than on their race?</p> <p>That said, I'm a great supporter of input from mana whenua into 3 Waters on a cultural basis and I do think this is very important and needs to be provided for, just not provided for on the basis of race-based elections.</p>
<p>An alternative model has not been presented. Not happy to be divorced from Manawatu and put into an area as far north as Coromandel.</p>
<p>I wish to have a say in how three water services are delivered through local representatives who I have the ability to speak to and vote in or out of office. I want the assets paid for by this community over many many years to remain in our ownership with the ability to have an influence over how they are maintained and improved. I do not believe a small part of the population should have as much say as the majority of the population. I strongly believe that a large bureaucratic organisation will do a worse job of managing three waters than the status quo and will cost far more in the long term.</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>Ownership and control of water resources should not be segregated by race, especially where the percentage ownership is disproportionate to degree of ownership.</p>
<p>The three waters should stay with the councils, as the public have a better direct link with them.</p>
<p>I dont want to see us be grouped with areas out of our district.</p>
<p>There is a lot of leading questions in this survey all pointing to what the government wants. I am totally against the rangitikei selling control of our local assets</p>
<p>When central government takes over local governance the rural areas become the poor relations and receive the left overs after the cities needs are catered for. Rural areas must be in control of their destiny and not trust in the so called "goodwill" of central government.</p>
<p>Keep local control for as long as possible .We have no idea of other areas financial situation in regard to their own water care services and do not want to subsidise them.</p>
<p>I think the council is being railroaded. The government hasn't given us their solutions, just expensive propaganda. The larges cities will take all the money and resources</p>
<p>Three Waters has been raised so as to fulfil New Zealand's 'racist' Government's He Puapua plan and they are trying to push it whilst they have the majority power in parliament. The speed at which it is being pushed through parliament will end in a total balls up which this government is renown for.</p>
<p>What constitutes an area? Do I think drinking water should be plumbed to the top of Mt ruapehu? No I do not</p>
<p>Leave all decisions to local authorities crazy to try and manage such a large area with a vast range of capital investment and local assets . Private water and supply for stock shouldn't be included.</p>

Having safe drinking water shouldn't be a question it should be expected and is expected no matter how it is delivered. It is important for our Council to be the ones to deliver and monitor the waters in the Rangitikei and have the power to make the decisions we need in our area.
no
In the past Bulls rate payers have paid for water both by rates and water meters to ensure that we had a supply suitable for the needs of our community. We need to maintain our control not have it spent on the better good of other areas. This is the wedge that will remove our ability to control our own future development.
I would like to be able to drink from the tap and not have the water taste like dirt. Also, the filtered tap located on Wellington Street should have filters changed regularly
Adding extra layers of bureaucracy never reduces costs
As we move into a bigger area of control we will loose our identity and be unable to demand our say as there will be other players involved this will inevitably blow out costs maybe not initially but eventually. The Maori king has stated that Maori own all the water and snow that falls so our bills if this goes ahead will skyrocket and while Maori lore has a part to play it is not a defining quality that we must adhere to - only that we must listen to
The government should not be railroading new zealanders. All new zealanders should have the opportunity for consultation on the proposals
Why is there no mention of the natural waterways but all the government ads show clean waterways and swimmable rivers. Where does that all fit
Essential everyone has the opportunity to have their opinion heard and an absolute rejection of Maori taking ownership and control. It is beyond belief they might even imagine such a possibility could exist
Don't let this present government nationalise our assets.
dont let the government have anything to do with our local assets
The 3 waters proposal is undemocratic. It will also mean we, the taxpayers, who have already paid for the current infrastructure, will be paying for it all over again. This is the most ridiculous proposal and should be widely and honestly explained to all by the current Government . Some hope ! No transparency from this government.
Has to stay the way it is
no
Historically cenralisation of the provision of services has not been as successful as well funded local providers(e.g. pest control, roading etc) The make up of the entity could prove rather unwieldy and diverse--Rangitikei will be a small"player". Could this be the first step to privatisation ?
Some of the above questions are loaded and ambiguous in their interpretation. We want to see our council in charge of our assets and water as they know this area.
No

Why is Scotts ferry not on the list below.....we always get ignored.....really annoying
The central Labour/Maori govt needs to but out of this water grab, they have and are being communistic in their approach, verging on dictatorial having already set up a water authority prior to going the public with this issue and have also hinted that regardless of the consultation they will force the bill through parliament. This issue should be taken to a referendum at the next election.
If Rangitikei Council are happy and efficient and cost effective to operate our local 3 waters, they should continue the procedure, (I do not have the financial details of costs of operating the 3 water system) but if the economics of running the 3 water system are efficient, than continue the 3 waters.
three-waters-reform is not necessary nor wanted
All councils need to stop charging people for water with rural properties that provide their own water via water tanks and septic sewage systems. It's grossly unfair.
Stick to present system and no national interference
no
Maori should have the same say in all things New Zealand as everybody else. No race should usurp others. That is Aparthied. Pure n simply. The TOW did NOT give maori rights over New Zealanders, but only the right to their OWN pathways.
My priorities are don't lose what we own, don't giveaway our assets.
I have concerns that once the merging of the areas takes place, there will be priority given to the larger towns and cities within those because that's where the greater population live, and there will situations where the whole country is expected to pay for Auckland to bring their system up to standard (for example). I believe that all households should pay for the water they use to encourage better and less wasteful use of this resource, which would then hopefully flow on to less waste water needing treating. While I can see the sense of the Three Waters Project as a long term plan for ensuring water management country wide, it is difficult to relinquish control and our voice in the management of our system. I'd like to see robust controls put in place that no privatisation would occur further down the track, and that all communities are viewed equally - not our large cities taking the lion's share of resources as often happens.
Maintaining and upgrading expertise must be sourced as locally as possible. Trade agreements should not e allowed to prevent local contract procurements,
no
No changes should be made to control of water assets without public debate.
Why change things now.Water usage is already included in our rates. Nobody owns water. But I have no objection to pay a fee for maintenance. But no more costs.

Nahuta needs to keep her hands off councils throughout New Zealand. Local councils may not be perfect, but at least they are local and know the area and the people and know what is going on. A centralised system does not give any local protection. Note the mess of the Auckland super city - so-called.
I fear that our rates will be spent fixing other councils mistake and mismanagement of rates in fixing, maintaining and upgrading infrastructure. And in the process our 3 waters services will be severely impacted.
That sewage discharges under high rainfall situations is avoided and that all beaches always remain safe. It is not acceptable that sewage can under any circumstances discharge into the sea or other waterways. Our level of treatment and ability to cope with emergencies must be high. Zero tolerance I would say. The infrastructure must match the urban development. The lifetime of the system must be accounted for already and without crisis-causing compromise in replacement in future decades. Prior planning and correct thinking beforehand is paramount.
That infrastructure is managed and maintained to cope with the demands of the future. If we are building more homes then the infrastructure has to surpass this demand. Do it once and do it well.
Rangitikei water infrastructure must stay in the ownership of the people of the Rangitikei
no
The government scheme must be cancelled .its a Scam.
three waters lacks credibility if the cost of three waters is not paid for by the rate payers it will mean an extra burden on the tax payers
No
We do not believe that the current proposed geographic area adequetly represents our needs or aspirations as the control is most likely to be based around Hamilton/Tauranga which is too far removed from the Rangitikei
Requires more consultation .
No
Councils will not have the funds to move into what they consider is their priorities for the district when Three Waters has been initiated
As ratepayers who have invested in our water systems for several generations we should retain the ownership of these assets . They should not be “ bought “ by government and therefore as ratepayers we will be paying for these asserts twice !!!!
keep it in council hands
water should be FREE for all!! its a basic human right to have access to free, clean drinking, bathing and washing water.
Don't want central government dictating on assets we have already paid for after buying them for a pitance

Keep control of our three waters in our region and don't let cost be the only motive for giving over control to a centralised model. Our people working in our region know what we face for the future of our infrastructure and we need to have faith that our council can meet our needs rather than someone sitting in an office in another city.
These are local assets and should remain in the control of local councils
Maori should have a say only in the same proportion as their population.
We live on a rural property with its own water supply and sewerage system. Seems to me, our household should be paying much less for "three waters" as we don't actually use any of these services (we seldom even shop in Marton anymore).
yes for sure - in my email to Councillor Gill Duncan
Rural people living of rain water tanks or other natural means of acquiring water (spring or borehole etc) should not be regulated, charged or prescribed or in any way interfered with how they collect or use water.
Don't let iwi anywhere near our water or trying to gain ownership of anything to do with our water.
Efficient timely response to all water problems. A structured approach to capital and maintenance investment
Simply the way it is now is the way it should stay
Feel Entity 2 is too big, could be broken down in smaller units, so management requirements are meet more readily.
RDC do not have the expertise, capability nor capacity to manage our 3 waters. Its time for RDC to stand aside and not pretend any longer that they are able to manage fiscally and physically our 3 waters.
Remain local with democratic control locally
Firstly that the Three Waters Proposal must be rejected outright and the current system retained at all costs as this undemocratic Three Waters is theft of assets built and paid for by citizens over decades. The fact that we have no say in the people who will run these Water Bodies is totally unacceptable in a modern democracy such as New Zealand. Leave it as it is where we can elect people to run these Council owned assets for the benefit of citizens of Rangitikei and not other areas of the North Island who have different needs and problems.
One week to respond to such an important issue is not enough time. There has not been enough consultation with ratepayers because of Lockdown restrictions.
That the Council MUST retain the water infrastructures and as some one who lives in RURAL Rang. we don't have any of the services we provide our own so sure don't want to help pay for other areas. NO NO NO keep the 3 waters within all Councils.
Not interested in governments plan of four entities, how our three waters are used, maintained and controlled is a local decision. Has local Iwi been consulted?

driveway from road to gate, why should I pay to have it concreted when you the council took away the concrete that was there when you's up graded the footpath?
no
The water in marton is undrinkable something needs to be done long term even filters are a temporary solution
the water quality in Bulls is shockingly inferior to other areas. there is community concern for health and safety.
This nonsense should be thrown out decisively, not only because of the priorities above but also to stop this government acting undemocratically and without transparency.
Some money from rates should be being put away now to slowly i pipes improve the water pipes in Marton and slowly improve areas in the poorer areas first not new areas
Yes - if one authority prevails, councils need to approve the structure. We need to manage as Wellington Regional water board or the like - we don't want to create another vastly ineffeicient Watercare
No to state control!
These changes should not cost more to ratepayers who are not on town services.
make sure every one controls the water not just the maoris
Protection against Privatisation
As a rural farm with 3 houses which are all on rain water tanks etc I am concerned about broadbrush cost which we have no need or wish to be part of. I cannot find where this is covered in information I have been sent.
No
What does 'safe'mean in the context of this survey? Will not cause illness? Or is treated and added to for social health outcomes? I would have ranked palatability high on priorities, but it was not an option
The control must stay in the hands of the rate payers
No
no
I believe sewer, stormwater, and potable drinking water should be a retained asset and owned by the local council
With Rangitikei being significantly rural the costs to provide drinking water, wastewater treatment to every ratepayer would be horrendous and not necessary. I am also not sure how the new Three Waters is to be funded-rates, taxes, increase in GST?????
Nope

That our water be clean and free of any dirt from dam storage
It would be great to upgrade our water quality. However if the water management is taken over by someone else then we will be the last to be looked at and I would be worried our water quality would become worse due to neglect. I also would be concerned about the amount of fluoride or other chemicals being put into our water because our community fits into this bigger picture which wouldn't take into account of what that individual towns needs are. I also am concerned that our little town won't even be a priority at all because it is out of the way compared to other towns. Also trying to express our concerns about water problems will become even worse due to talking to someone who isn't even part of the community thus they won't care and will be hard to contact.
How are they going to calculate how much water a household uses, water meters? It will only be a matter of time and water rates will go up with the new 3 water exercise. Kick that idea into touch.
Stop the reform.
No
Vote Against Three Waters. We already have clean & safe drinking water & adequate waste water systems
No except that there should be robust Public Meeting debate around all aspects of this proposal, it is we the public of New Zealand who are being and long term will be affected by these changes especially if there is not an in-depth consultation process prior to any decisions being made. Why is the Government wanting to rush thru these proposals so quickly without in depth public consultation? There are far too many questions that the Rangitikei District Council (who represent us, the rate payers) should be asking the Government before any of this, 'Three Waters Reform' is even considered let alone goes ahead. Especially while there are these continual lockdowns for Covid, which understandably are distracting the public from these serious issues. I am sure I'm not the only person who upon reading this proposal has a multitude of questions that I would like answers for. Thank you
As I dont agree with the three waters proposal I find this survey to be impossible to answer how I would like to. We have never had any problem in Taihape and the council do a Stirling job with our water.
No.
I am strongly opposed to this reform bill. I would highly prefer that we continue local management and ownership of our local assets. I am concerned that the balance of cost and access to service will actually not be equal, considering the large size of the proposed 'entity'. Also the vague description of the proposed 'enitivity' is rather worrying.
I believe that our council is doing the best they can and that if we give up our water services we are not going to gain anything from it, in fact we could see our services degraded. Look at the debacle caused by the sale of NZ Rail in 1993.
all tap water needs to improved and safe for drinking.

Keep our assets local. Do not sell off to the government at the discount rate and then let iwi take it all over.
That they aren't sold off
I don't agree with charging residents any more than you already charge. Where is the money coming from when we are already stretched beyond capacity. You need to spend the money received from rates more wisely
As we pay water rates to our council, if anything goes wrong, we can expect quick fix it up from our council, which has workers in our area
All water whether it is drinking water,waste water or storm water should remain under Rangitikei Council control as it is now
It all comes down to cost and efficiency of delivery What is the councils view on these issues We as rate payers have to be guided by that
The reasons for these reforms are political.If entity boards are established, they must be governed by the best board members available and NOT on the basis of ethnicity. Iwi have no more right to sit on these boards than any other qualified person.
no
By incorporating 3 waters into one large area, in emergency scenarios (earthquakes floods etc), where large amounts of infrastructure is damaged; assessing and fixing the infrastructure would be extremely difficult and likely result in smaller communities being left without infrastructure for longer. (see what happened in Christchurch during the earthquakes and how long it took for rural communities to have infrastructures reviewed and assessed.)
It's time for New Zealander's to wake up to the reality of the water situation in our country and to improve it
Nothing wrong with the way it is now
Ratepayers should be receiving the full benefit of their payments. I don't agree with the 3 Waters Proposal as The demands of Various geographical locations of asking different even within each of the four allocated read regions. Where is a high risk that some areas more than others within those regions will be favoured for upgrade etc in terms of money being spent, where others will go without and deteriorate. That is not fair on the investment already made in those areas. I believe the current system we have now is much more suited to the individual geographical locations where the locals have the best knowledge on how to manage and maintain their assets and needs of the community/area they are responsible for.
Totally opposed to the The Three Waters Reform as it would see loss of local control over assets ratepayers have paid for, result in a disproportionate influence of Maori and increase the possibility of the assets being on-sold to commercial entities with resulting greater charges for users.
We should not join the three water proposal. Your ranking system, is not appropriate as many points are equal, and shouldn't be put in an order of highest to lowest.

Keep strictly in local control. This totalitarian, communist Government wants to steal everything and make us serfs in our own country and another Government in the future would sell off the water to private interests as has been done with other assets (Electricity, Railways, Post and Telegraph and State Housing)
Māori should not have a 50% representation to move in this direction needs the consensus of the people of NZ this is occurring by stealth and if it occurs will divide this nation
Open racism being promoted by the Government is bad enough, having unelected representation on any board or committee is a very dangerous thing. It would appear that central Government want to do this and it is not right, or democratic.
Keep assets that have been paid for by ratepayers under control and management of our locally elected and employed council.
Water assets need to stay in local council ownership
N/A
I am not confident in our current local government to improve our 3 waters.
Local is important
A set of standards can achieve the same results. Central control has been well and truly proven to be a bad idea (look at what's happened with the electricity system)
There has NEVER been a successful amalgamation of services that have been to the benefit of locals. Too much money gets wasted by large amalgamations rather than being spent for the local area it is supposed to service.
We pay enough for our water now and don't need any additional costs with this government's proposal
The water in Marton is often disgusting, worst I have ever seen anywhere in no. it may be 'safe' but it is not drinkable. The local council does not seem to be capable of fixing this. Makes me think the assets are bad so hand it over let others with more skill fix it.
I believe that safe water that is provided to national standards is key.
I am against the three waters reform. Water should be owned by the local government and should be paid for by our rates.
You shouldn't have to pay for things you don't get. I live rurally, and pay for water and sewage services i don't receive. It's disgusting
Yes. A better quality of drinking tap water. That's not full of chemicals
Under NO circumstances should the council have anything to do with three waters, this is theft by central government. If we want tank water for our houses and not council water, then it's our choice. The standard of water must be set locally never by central government. Iwi should have no priority over anyone else to sit around the decision making table, that is a despicable lack of democracy should any group be given special treatment.

The 3 waters assets should be held by Council, and run by council, as they have been and still are being paid for by our ratepayers.
All it sounds like to me is another bill,,, will rates go down due to someone else doing the water?? No of course not.. Where do You think people get all the money for rates hikes and new bills?? I'd rather use rain water and septic tank if it's only ever going to be someone with their hand out for more and more money that people just don't have
Do not go with 3 waters....Rangitikei District Council provides an efficient system as at present, ratepayers will be at the mercy of the "entity" otherwise with no recourse....
no
Strongly disagree with yet another government entity taking over a regional issue.
Many of my priorities are 1 but the survey does not allow for this.
Do not allow more and more subdivisions before KNOWING the existing infrastructure can support it. Anticipating more rate payments and projecting these to cover upgrades is counter productive.
Absolutely NO to any proposal that give casting votes to a minority of ANY portion of our population. In spite of current attempts, surely democracy is still our fundamental right?
The business performance by the Rangitikei District Council is appalling. At the very end of engagement period (August and September 2021) the Mayor finally delivers a letter to households in his communities. 2 weeks before the end of the engagement period there is a proposed Facebook live session engagement, held at a time when a lot of people well be working and cannot take part . This is simply not good enough, and carries on the poor performance by the Council on their Long Term Plan consultations.
Will this affect those of us who do not use the water or waste system
Keep it local!
Why did the minister (Mahuta) state that councils were NOT to consult with the community??? This absolutely stinks of a corruption at a ministerial level.
Water needs to be improved not maintain the same as our water maybe safe to drink but still taste, smells awful & causes stomach upsets that we have to buy it in. Maintaining would not improve our water.
Nationwide management is the long term complete solution
Rangitikei District Council to refuse to join 3 Waters.... Nothing wrong with our present operation.
Cost- It should be fair, and remain low as Water is free in NZ
The rates collected need to be spent on maintenance and upgrades of infrastructure rather than on bureaucratic nonsense and silly projects that pander to minority groups. Spend money on the must haves.

Do you have any other comments about the change that the Government is proposing to how we manage the three waters?

<p>If RDC (or others) have not been provided with adequate information to answer resident's questions - I wonder how do Government expect anyone to provide input? I am suspicious as to the overall plan when this action appears to be happening in such a rush. It feels very like a smoke and mirrors exercise. I wonder if the "incentives" do not result in an "opt in" outcome, will in the near future, it become a situation when Government say - you were given an offer, you refused, so we will make it happen and there will be no "compensation", potentially possibly, there will be "financial (or other) consequences" for opting out. Call me suspicious, but that is how I feel. . .</p>
<p>This is a terrible idea, we have no time to make an informed decision and as a person who owns assets I would never make an important decision about those assets without properly thinking it over. Also if our system works as it seems to why connect to regions we're it doesn't work and we are one of the smaller areas which may allow us to be bullied.</p>
<p>Don't support this!!!!</p>
<p>Local councils for their local communities. They are doing OK. Government should stay out of it.</p>
<p>I do not agree with the three water's proposal.</p>
<p>The regulating of all water schemes to be controlled by Central Government is control by stealth. Minority groups to be given major control with veto voting rights is not democracy. Neither is the way these 4 areas have been made up. An area that includes South Island and North Island as one of the 4 areas makes no sense. Also to be combined with areas north of Ruapehu makes no sense at all. There will be many disadvantaged people that will loose their perfectly safe privately supplied community water schemes because of these unnecessary regulations. There has been little time for this to be reviewed which I would like to see our council vote against this proposal. That is if councils get any say at all. After watching this Bill on the parliament channel I have grave concerns for the future of NZ.</p>
<p>I do not like what is being pushed onto us</p>
<p>Needs to stay in local ownership</p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p>Its stupid.</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>Tell them to keep your greedy hands off our assets</p>
<p>Totally Disagree with it</p>
<p>Seems to be a lot of airy fairyness in the current proposal of central government. A top heavy and multifaceted creation covering large areas never works. Will only create 'bunfights' for allocation</p>

of resource schemes and works programmes, expense budgeting headaches and waste. Perhaps as well not the right people 'jockeying for representative positions.
Get people who know what they are doing working for the common good of our country
sooner the better
Very different local issues won't be solved by centralization.
I do not believe the costs savings that are proposed. I do not think the efficiencies that are talked about are real as NZ does not have the number of contractors available to make these savings. Any external contractors brought in will mean a loss of local jobs or costings being forced down to a level where it is not sustainable for locals.
Not on board, would rather it stayed with our local Council
This has been rushed through and the media have not presented true reporting and explanations to the general public.
Yes - they could divide up the money allocated for this for each council to help them do this work.
<p>The central govt seems to have made up its mind to put this change through before it has thought the facts out. The adverts on TV make it sound like our waters are bad and poorly run which is totally incorrect. It appears to me the central govt is about to run rough shod of local councils with no real consultation with the residents who own and manage the water schemes. It is not democracy in action at all. There is a greater agenda here than just improving the three types of water systems and this needs to be investigated. Refuse to join this fanciful form of govt and only consider the matter when a well thought out plan has be put forward. This reeks of the same problems as the Intensive Winter Grazing legislation rushed through that were poorly thought out plans put in place and then had to be backtracked and replaced with a better plan. Please don't let this happen.</p> <p>I think if a change of water management is put in place it should be a region matter. I. E. Use the Horizons Regional Council area for our water, Waikato for theirs and Auckland for theirs etc. The current govt proposal is unworkable, open for management that will reduce local ability to have a say likely to be run by a group with an interest in rather than expertise in the systems and possibly set it up for privatisation in the future no matter how much the proposers doth say! I'm sorry but I feel that this is a very rushed poor piece of work put through possibly by someone with ulterior motives</p>
The change is being ram-rodged through and LGNZ has assured Government it will not oppose the changes, so what's the actual point of this survey then?
<p>The Councils will be "owners" without financial ownership and no shareholding. Strange business model!!</p> <p>Three new tiers are to be introduced, costs will escalate.</p>
Cost - Concerned that three waters will be a separate rate & therefore cost to each household that will keep increasing annually (like Horizons that separated off from our general rates). Also concerned about the loss of our assets and ability to hold them to account.
I object to the three waters reform and see it as a move by government to enhance governance through management while achieving more political autonomy over the nations waters

See above. Also I am very suspicious that it looks like we are not to be given any say in this. If it looks and smells like pillage of locally owned assets it probably is. I am convinced it will be more expensive for local residents in the long term.
Yes three very important points: 1. Different catchments have very different needs 2. Centralisation will not help resource focus or efficiency for Rangitikei 3. 50% control to one race will long term be very divisive in the community, it is not the Kiwi way of equality
This should all be managed and operated locally. When will people learn that centralising anything does not work . The governments proposal is a total con .
There is too much risk of loss of local control for the minority areas
Rangitikei District Council should opt out of this nonsense.
no
How can an added level of bureaucracy improve economic efficiency? Why are the proposed changes being advertised extensively on multimedia at no little expense? Is this paramount to the public paying for government propaganda?
Id hate to see the small areas be left out by the big guns and perhaps forgotten about
Totally against it. This will turn out a disaster that will cost locals
very short sighted
This legislation has been conceived in haste with little or no consultation. Why, what is the hidden agenda?
Very short consulting time for such a massive change. What else does Chairman Ardern have in her hidden agenda
Reject the governments request that we buy into the Three Waters Scheme.
It's bad enough with local government in charge, imagine the ████ show if central government got hold of it! For free by the way.
Can't understand when local authorities have invested so much and now looking to run as larger entities.
I don't agree with the Three Water Reform at all as I'm really worried that our voice will be lost in the representation they are proposing - 6 representatives and 6 iwi representatives. I have read all the information available to us and believe we are not being given all the information needed to make the right decision if in fact we are allowed to decide and it's not just mandated. I do not believe what the Government is proposing is right or even fair. I would much rather the Government provided some kind of water funding for areas like ours that have a small ratepayer base. Also the elephant in the room is the role of iwi and to what extent that role will impact the reform.
I support three waters

Refuse it.
Keep our water managed locally.
Dont do it
I think that this is to big a jump for New Zealand to aspire to if some regions have questionable water ,sewerage, and storm water then the government and others should instead identify/prioritize these areas and invest in them first.
Consultation, taking time to work out all the issues before any final decisions are made
I can't understand how they suggest there is going to be thousands more jobs, yet it is all going to be cheaper. They cant risk our sovereignty by selling out the debt to another country.
I do not support the proposed change taking management of infrastructure away from district Councils. Amalgamation of bulk district planning, management, maintenance would not promote fairly to a rural community needs against an urban communities requirements. The sector our district is in includes townships that require greater infrastructure requiements than small communities. Urbanization is not All N.Z'ERS end goal!! Decline project 👍
We are all New Zealander's. Nothing, particularly management and ownership should be based on race. basis
Ownership and control should remain with local bodies/councils
It is just socialism, not environmental or economic reasons behind it.
I cannot understand why the the proposed new entity is to be 50% owned by Maori. This is an absolutely undemocratic decision.
three waters is a dead duck. we have no affiliation with these other councils. only wanganui and manawatu.
I am against this proposal to have a 50/50 share of the water that is used in the way we use it and in this 3 waters proposal. Why should maori who only represent about 15% of the population have a 50 / 50 say in it;s use. It is an unfair representation as of the rights of all New Zealander's, we should and MUST have a referendum on this before it becomes a power grab of the water in this country, because that is how it will end up. maori who only represent a tiny proportion of the population should not be given a 50 / 50 share of anything. That goes for any race who is a minority.
no
No to Maori ownership and Rangitikei will miss out on services and bigger centers will benifit.
Yes they are pushing ahead without any consultation with locals. They are wanting to take community assets that don't belong to them. At the same time they are not telling us how they are going to improve our services or make it cheaper.
Smaller entities with more community consultation as opposed to consultation with Councils

The Three Waters plan by government gives them too much control. A spread across many regions with different problems can cause procrastination in decision making, incurring of expensive costs to different councils by consultants and reports. New businesses starting in areas could be waiting for many months to get permits for three water requirements to start up which is going to be interpreted by a board sometimes with little local knowledge. Contrary to what the government says that all assets will remain with the Councils and no dividends will be paid, this type of reform can lead to easy takeovers in later years by governments changing the rules, which they have a track record for doing. Do we want to see the Three Waters reform used in future, for example in Treaty of Waitangi negotiations and settlements, when the water has been on earth since before man and belongs to no one.

Should be left as it is

Who do you mean by - "We", NZ as a whole, the RDC, the Maroi party? that's an ambiguous question, same as the 1st 2 questions - loaded. The central Govt needs to back off from their "one size fits all" water reform which is long on rhetoric and short on detailed plans, other than their kindergarten advertising which seems based on emotion and not fact to the point of being condescending to the nations intelligence.

Yes. I do not want the Rangitikei council to give ownership of the 3 waters services to the 4 large publicly owned entities, esp to the mana whenua, as they are influencing the labor party and government with propaganda of taking ownership of all New Zealand natural resources in a slow and stealthy operation.

this system is racially biased

It needs to be a National system and not a local one to keep everyone honest

Racially biased setup

no

As a RDC ratepayer I want the RDC to retain control of our water assets and delivery! I DO NOT want the RDC to join the Govts proposed scheme!

Creating massive entities, and then controlling them from afar, is a recipe for disaster, proven so many times.

It puts too much control into beurocrat's hands, and all too often, they make political decisions and not considered decisions for local people's needs.

Locals should control their own destinies, it is what makes an area attractive to others, and brings money to regions. Do a bad job, people leave and the local economy suffers, as it should, until the right people are back in charge.

I left Wellington for this reason.

The catchment area is too large with districts that are different to the makeup of our district and will use water differently.

As the proposed 4 entities would be allowed to borrow at about 3 times the rate allowed to individual councils by the LGFA, they are more than likely to give contracts to big foreign corporations. This would have catastrophic effects on social cohesion in our regions. so much for the 'well-being' rhetoric !!! -

<p>Government intention has been spoken to allow Maori (who are 16% of the population) 50% control of 3 Waters. Why are we talking as if the population should be divided along race lines and what could that mean so far as water policies are concerned?</p> <p>Central control of utilities such as electricity, railways and communications was broken up because management was bloated and inefficient. Why are we reversing this direction?</p>
no
I do not think the change the government is proposing is fair or equitable. Control of the 3 waters should remain in the hands of local councils.
The Councils should retain ownership of all water assets. The 3 Waters project is undemocratic and the government is not successful at management of anything.
Yes. As I stated earlier we already pay for metered water also charged in our rates. So with this new proposal we will be paying x three times for water.
We are opposed to sharing ownership of water with Maori as we are with any transfer of management of water to Maori. Water must be under the control of our locally elected [which of course could include Maori] representatives and owned locally.
Rangitikei cannot manage its drinking or storm water n therefore needs help
Cancel the proposal
Only to reiterate the above - central government needs to stay away from centralisation/control of vital services to our Rangitikei region. They are not to be trusted.
Councils have a legal responsibility to their rate payers to manage the services and infrastructure in an efficient and financially sensible / sound manner. I think we need more information on how the 3 entities will manage this ensuring the ratepayers / residents of each council district will no be left out in the cold so to speak.
No
Having the govt propose how we manage something does scare me in light of some past decisions that the Labour Govt has been involved in. However any work done by local Govt to fix issues some local issues has fallen on deaf ears so basically I'm 50/50 on this job.
Three waters is the perogative of the people. The government must heed the will of the people and allow us to decide.
Will not improve on the current system and is certain to cost more with increased bureaucracy
These are centrally bureaucratic ,inefficient and undemocratic proposals with an racially divisive management plans.
Giving Iwi 50% control and not able to be outvoted is Wrong
It's the communist way more and more central control
Keep our MARTON water under RDC not government

Leave control locally
Do not agree with proposed changes
i am totally against this it should stay in control of our council they have the local know all and if there are problems we can go to our local council and ask to fix it
This is the start of privatisation of our most valuable natural resource. I don't believe any government can be trusted in future years to retain it as a national resource for the people of NZ even though supposed restrictions are going to be put in place to prevent this from happening. We already give away huge amounts of our water going offshore and I believe if we go down this route of government controlled water, we will see more and more going offshore.
No
We feel that control will be taken away from us to a faceless entity who will be more concerned with satisfying the major centres and not have any thought to the more rural areas. What is going to happen to our investment which has been substantial are we therefore going to have to subsidise the failure of larger centres to invest in their water facilities???
Too hasty
No
I am looking forwards to a change in infrastructure to focussing on the future health and wellness of our country in the very long term
It is the most ludicrous legislation ever proposed . We do not want or need our water assets to be centralised
Dont sell it ,you survey seems bias to three waters
I'm concerned that smaller areas will suffer when piled within a larger area. keep it local is best.
Don't want a one size fits all
Bad idea. We need to keep control of our three waters locally in our own region in partnership with our neighbouring regions if required.
See it as an illegal confiscation of local assets, concocted behind closed doors in a time when people are distracted by Covid. Corrupt.
Don't trust anything the Government says. This could be the thin edge of a wedge to totally control our lives.
as above
Not supporting the government initiative
Just keep Maori's away from taking over our water
The survey is very obviously biased in that the obvious answer to all questions is "strongly agree". How will rating be structured? how will the new organisation be staffed? Couldn't the cost of setting this organisation up be better spent distributing funding to existing local authorities?

Wouldn't it better to allow local authorities to raise loans for local upgrading of facilities.? This survey is blatantly biased.

I am totally opposed to the 3 waters proposal. Leave local government to do their job.

1.Does this mean there will be another level of bureaucracy and offices needed?
2. If so, where will they be situated and how will that give effective representation over a larger and very diverse area?
3. Who will actually do the work?
4. How will this new entity be funded? Are central government picking up the tab out of general rates or will rate payers we hit with a further separate charge?
5. If this reform comes into place, will we see an immediate reduction in our District Council rates ?
6. How will this reform impact on Regional councils handling of river systems?
7. What thought, if any, has the government put into managing the myriad of rural water and irrigation schemes, many of which are privately managed and funded. Erewhon and Omatane water schemes are two that come to mind.
8. What safeguards will be put in place to stop this becoming a top heavy administrative monster? Hospital boards are a good example here, where too much is spent on administration and their vehicles and not enough on the nurses , who do the work.
There are a myriad of such questions but these are the first ones that come to my mind.

Believe 50% of any infrastructure needed is to be met by govt. according to report. Are Levies being charged across the board (country) or each Entity?

Central control of these services will see decisions made by people who have no understanding of local conditions, and no real concern for consequences as they are not personally effected. Smaller less populated areas like Rangitikei will end up paying for the denser populated areas and be left behind in the quality of these services.
This should not be forced on this country without a reasonable consultation period. This smacks of a government deciding the people who it represents are idiots. I don't believe that this proposal will benefit NZ at all and is being pushed through without reasonable consultation because there is something to hide or a hidden agenda.
How are the benefits calculated. Monetary numbers plucked out of thin air?
I believe that this proposal will have absolutely no benefits to our local area and will degrade our current services more that they are now.

The government are correct to take 3 waters out of local councils jurisdiction.

Very bad idea and economic benefits outlined are fantasy

We believe this move is to change Local Government as we know it.

It is an outrage to take over community owned water assets and give them to unelected bodies, part governed by selected racial groupings that want to take over and govern NZ for this minority race, i.e. Maori, all of whom have small amounts of Maori heritage.
Leave the system of local government, water services alone and retain the current local council democratic electoral process.

The close association with MDC makes sense. Local knowledge could be lost with this new entity.

Am bitterly disappointed at the direction our government is taking us regards race. your statement that three waters will remain in public ownership, while correct, fails to mention that 18% of the population will be gifted 50% of a multi million dollar asset, plus have a right of veto
why would they listen to what I have to say?
Don't gift our assets to any publicly owned body. Just look what's happened to electricity. Giving Maori the power of veto as an absolute joke.
If we have clean non dirt tasting water coming into our homes that will make a huge difference to the community
Just stop them. The current system is working and does not need to be fixed or changed to suit politicians
Glad it's happening as Marton water tastes terrible
The motives are sound but I think this solution is an over-reaction to a problem, thus unnecessary and a very inefficient solution
This is just another form of socialist state control. Money will go from the regions to the cities as it is with the roads. And our water quality and infrastructure will downgrade accordingly. We need our local councils overseeing our infrastructure not some far removed politician who doesn't give a hoot about the regions. Having lived in a few regions across the country I would like to say that our local Mayor and council do an amazing job at looking after this region and I for one would like to see it remain that way in all respects.
No
costs are a factor another lot of collar and tie buggars to run it all on big salaries
No
Concerned that they are having such trouble performing currently why they are taking on another huge reform? Why not give regional support to councils unable to perform for legitimate reasons such as growth in population tourism etc?
I fundamentally disagree with the involvement of Maori for no reason other than an accident of birth
I am concerned that centralizing 3 waters will remove local knowledge and care for the systems, and result in one-size-fits-all policies being introduced, which will increase cost, without necessarily improving the outcome. Or worsen current infrastructure and products
This has to stop before this Govt takes more control of our assets and lives.
I like the concept of the taxpayer sharing some of the burden to carry out necessary upgrades to the country's infrastructure. I answered don't know to the network being managed locally. To my mind emergency response, maintenance and managing construction contracts have to be carried out using local staff. I'm not sure that high level asset management, policy making, programming etc can't be done centrally so as to ensure equal standards amongst similar population centres around Aotearoa (in other words the doers need to continue to be based at council depots, even

if they are technically employed by one of the four entities, while the thinkers can be subsumed/streamlined into the entity headquarters)
<p>The 3 Waters plan will result in freshwater, stormwater and wastewater assets and infrastructure paid for by generations of RDC ratepayers being transferred to new regional water agencies 50:50 co-governed by iwi. Although local authorities, on behalf of the ratepayers, will provide all of the assets, they will be given only 50 percent of the control. The other 50 percent will be given to local iwi.</p> <p>The letter to residents and ratepayers does not clearly explain this, saying only "mana whenua having a joint oversight role". The 3 waters are virtually being handed over to, and will be under the control of, iwi. This is unfair and the details of how iwi control will work needs to be explained to ratepayers in more detail.</p>
I believe that each council should have ownership and have the governing say on how each of its local territorial authority manage the three waters
Comments as above.
What guarantees do we have that, if a national 3 waters scheme is introduced, the 3 water system won't be privatised.
That the local Council still has its say on water treatment
I think the government needs to listen to their people and act like a democracy not communist forcing their ways onto us. Definitely keep the rights of water in our local councils. Do not give it to someone who won't even care about little communities.
As long as the infrastructure stays with the local council as it was paid for by local rates.
Small regions will be bumped down the priority list - focus will undoubtedly remain heavily on bigger centres.
No
4 large entities aren't enough- Rangitikei's needs aren't the same as Tauranga's
Public Consultation is essential. Anything else is not constitutional.
Leave things as they are. If something is working there is no need to fix it.
No.
I'm in favor of privatisation of our water programmes before this new bill is shoved through.
Leave it alone. It will become a monopoly.
There is nothing wrong with how the RDC is currently providing water. Certainly don't want to go into a big pool and have to fight for funding. And as for iwi having the final say.....
N/a

i believe central govt should not be making decisions and set boundaries for local councils and i feel the boundaries they have set will disadvantage Rangitikei on favour of other councils in entity B
Keep it local, the Government loves to aquire and then sell assets do not let this happen with our water
we need to look after our own area only.
It is the start of a slippery slop that in time we will lose control of
See above
Yes.In Rangitikei we already have efficient effective water systems. Local control will be lost. Assets will be nationalised. Ratepayers will have little or no say on future cost increases. We will be subsidising other areas. Co-governance is undemocratic in the extreme! Havelock North enquiry did NOT recommend nationalisation as implied in the newsletter.Average annual household costs projections are misleading in the absence of more detailed calculations, including 30 years of inflation. Where will the costs of the four entities be borne and how much?
Keep central govt out of grabbing local assets
By incorporating 3 waters into one large area, in emergency scenarios (earthquakes floods etc), where large amounts of infrastructure is damaged; assessing and fixing the infrastructure would be extremely difficult and likely result in smaller communities being left without infrastructure for longer. (see what happened in Christchurch during the earthquakes and how long it took for rural communities to have infrastructures reviewed and assessed.)
I'm in favour of the government proposal
Strongly disagree with the proposed change.
Don't do it
I believe it should be managed locally as it is now. Local council have the best knowledge of the state of their system currently, what has been spent on it, what needs to be spent on it and the needs of the community. I believe them are qualified to spend the money where it is needed then a large entity.
Totally opposed, don't trust any of the promises/assurances by the Labour Govt. Labour have a hidden agenda of allowing one sector (Maori) too much influence that is undemocratic and race based.
They are taking control of our assets & will we be paying for them again even though we already own them. This survey makes no mention of how many rural water schemes are going to be effected, thought new regulations. SAY NO. I'm very disappointed in your coverage of the three water policy, even this communication doesn't effectively tell people what the government is proposing. I have gained a lot better information from other councils.

<p>Yes Instead of poisoning our drinking water with chlorine it should be treated with UV which is far more efficient and not damaging to peoples health. I believe some councils use UV for sewage treatment which is sensible also as it kills all harmful bacteria and viruses.</p>
<p>This is all happening far too quickly for councils to make correct decisions. Councils must look after their rate payers interests not agree to policy that may or may not benefit the country as a whole. For instance climate change will not challenge the Rangitikei as it may challenge coastal towns. Do not agree to another rushed agenda filled and badly thought out policy from a socialist government that has no interest in areas like the Rangitikei when compared to South Auckland!!</p>
<p>Under the current proposals, smaller District Councils will have little or no effective input into the active management of local infrastructure. They will be dictated to by yet another layer of bureaucracy hindering progress and adding unnecessary costs.</p>
<p>The Government has its hands full now, learn from history. The retail electrical supply is a fine example of Government getting involved in local matters.</p>
<p>Socialist behaviour</p>
<p>It should be equal between all areas of NZ. The quality of our water must be improved</p>
<p>We effectively contract out our 3 waters upkeep/improvements to Manawatu Council. I believe it is time for a change.</p>
<p>they are rushing them through, which never ends well</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>As always, the smaller regions/rural towns will lose! The government should leave water management to the LOCAL entities. I have absolutely no desire to pay for Auckland or another regions water issues. Tell the government to show us ANY time an amalgamation has been cost effective or beneficial to local areas. All you need to do is look at the history of amalgamating Taihape Borough Council to what it is now. Nothing gets spent here, and the one large ticket item that we are getting, NOBODY IN TAIHAPE WANTS. But does the council listen? NO. So why would we expect a larger body to take any notice of what we want.</p>
<p>Dont do it</p>
<p>Don't let it happen</p>
<p>Good let's give it a go</p>
<p>There has been under investment for years. How long has water locally been a hot topic? Took many decades to be looked at. A comprehensive approach driven by experts is required.</p>
<p>I think communities should be given more debate so as to make it more fair.</p>
<p>Don't want it</p>
<p>NO NO NO to central government Leave it local. Why are we answering all the ridiculous questions above when you didn't ask "do you want 3 waters" yes or no! Some advice- keep to the point with your survey.</p>

Our water rates should not be used for someone else's water, ours needs improving. I feel that small places like Marton will be last on the list for improvements and upgrades
As far as I know we have been paying rates so water is kept to a good standard,, now we are told it's not so why is no body sacked for failures?
No
how is changing an existing service to householders going to improve the old outdated infrastructure that now runs through streets and roads. are we not talking billions \$. Marton is a good example of such services requiring new infrastructure that rate payers can not afford hence the patchup?
Consumers will be at the end of another 0800 number leading nowhere. Keep it local, leave it alone!
The comment is Don't Do It. Look at electricity and health.
DHBs recent poor performance has proven that going big together DOES NOT work for the benefit of the smaller areas. Allowing government or Maori only bodies total control has already proven counter productive.
It appears NZ is being railroaded without sufficient consultation and time restraint
It would appear that Maori are being given unjustified voice
Another "pipe dream"? More houses (let's buy some motels!!). Burn less coal? look at the last 12 months!! Grrrr.
Yes, the proposal as I read it has the potential to reduce costs to ratepayers. Of my current rates bill 45% of it relates to water charges. That potentially tells me my council rates bill will reduce by 45%, but I will pay reduced water costs elsewhere. Why, in the Mayor's letter to households has he not included some cost benefit comments. Instead all we have received in the communication is some emotional words on losing control of what council regard is a local resource.
Do not change from the current position
As the councils over the entire life of Marton can't seem to get it improved maybe the government can but as long as there are safeguards so that it is sold off to private run companies & we end up like Spain, Germany etc that have had to buy back their water at great cost to rate payers.
Timeframe appears rushed. Governance structure looks complicated.
I wholeheartedly support it
Rangitikei water is often low quality. The water quality in Rangitikei needs to improve, not only stay the same. I don't think Rangitikei has safe drinking water currently when compared to other councils.
No

How are they going to pay for this? Our economy is [REDACTED] at present thanks to Covid. People can not afford 3-5k a year for water- waste and use

Terrible reform. No council should agree to this.

This is a to bigger proposal for Council's to decide without full public consultation and a referendum. Central Government is being very underhand and manipulative forcing this on Council's in the way they have. It is a blatant asset grab!!

Don't do it

Tell them to buggar off