

ATTACHMENT

UNDER SEPARATE COVER COPY OF SUBMISSIONS

Extraordinary Council Meeting

8 July 2025

Table of Contents

4.1	Local Water Done Well Water Services Delivery Model
	Attachment 10 Copy of Submissions Received

Name	В
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None will cost ratepayer more
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Name	Leslie Wrightson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	
No	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Page 4

Name	K Scriven	
Individual or	Individual	
Organisation		
Support or Oppose	Oppose	
Collaboration		
between Councils		
Rural Supply	No	
Ward	Oamaru	
Benefits		
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs	
Comments		
No		

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Damien McNamara
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

If we partner with any other councils for a joint venture, it should be with the councils who share our current water supplies, being the Waitaki River, then if anything changes further on under a new government where mana whenua need to have input, you are already partnered with the same council that are connected with their associated runanga with water supplies in their takiwa.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Linda Wison
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Better infrastructure
Concerns	Lack of transparency

Comments

It is concerning to learn that 30% to 50% of the district's allocated water is being lost due to leakage, an issue that remains unaddressed. Prioritizing the resolution of this problem is essential to minimizing future costs.

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Alex Lee
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
	Improved asset management
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Increased local costs in inadvertently or purposely subsidising other territory
	authorities
Comments	

I see no reason why options 2 and 3 prevent multiple councils working together for bulk procurement of capital works and asset management of existing and future water services.

This then allows cost savings and continued ownership of current assets

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Jason Lilley
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Changes in water quality
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Frances Mcmillan
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I don't see the benefits
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
	I see this as cost saving for council and the individual in the short term- however long
	term I feel we will see the creep in costs to households.
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Christine
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	If your description of options is correct, there could be benefits as stated above, are there guarantees of these benefits? Will there be regular auditing as councilors change through elective processes?
Concerns	Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Top heavy administration system increasing overall costs to comsumer

Comments

Setting up a company to manage water assets will cost more.

Endanger of creating a top heavy hierarchical management system that will cost more in regulation s and rules.

If this option 1 $\,$ goes ahead does the 30 $\,$ % of money already paying for water ,get relocated back to consumers?

I feel like you as council have already chosen your option, Will this submission be considered or is this just lip service?

I thought the three waters plan (labour govt) was never agreed upon, why do you refer to it in this document?

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Aude Graf
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None of these benefits are guaranteed. There is no proof that our water quality will improve. There is no proof that any of this will happen. It all depends on who is part of the regional entity and how it is managed. And looking at some of the other councils who are considered to join this regional entity and how they have acted in the past, I am really concerned that the costs will outweight the benefits for our region.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency Risk that other councils' needs will be prioritised over the WTC's needs, particularly when looking at the councils who would be part of the regional entity.
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Julie Marr
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	Amalgamation of infrastructure cost should benefit councils with lower revenue
Concerns	Inability of multiple business units working together, to reach a consensus
Comments	
I have lived in cities where each property has metered water and as a household with low water usage I feel	
this is the fairest system	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Kelly Gore-Symes
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Fabian Vinbrux
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I remain unconvinced of the long-term benefits of collaboration with other councils concerning our water infrastructure.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Austen McMillan
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Opposed primarily due to the loss of direct council control over the management of water assets and the delivery of related services.
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Joel Jacob
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
	Too big a commitment with 3 other entities who may/ may not share the same
	interests as Waitaki.

Comments

CCOs have proven to work out better within Waitaki District.

Whitestone Contracting and Omarama airfields for example. Having such organisation under the Council gives the District a good oversight on assets. Water assets for the size of Waitaki should be held under CCOs as the lack of expertise can be bridged by hiring a few experts and allowing them to train and upskill current employees in the Water Infrastructure division.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	James
Individual or	Group of Individuals
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	We need to keep Waitaki in Otago & not collaborate with any region in Canterbury.
Comments	
Water infrastructure	needs to stay in the Otago region

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Jay McMillan
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I oppose the move toward council collaboration under the preferred Water Done Well model and the shift away from local water control.
	Centralising water services reduces community accountability, increases complexity, and distances decision-making from those directly affected.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments	

The preferred WDC approach risks higher costs and diminished transparency, while removing local oversight of essential infrastructure. Water is a core local service and should remain under the control of local councils to ensure responsiveness and public trust.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Elaine Monks
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	No benefit. We lose a valuable asset which has cost ratepayers a lot of money to set up. I cant understand why Council would want to give that away to another joint identity
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Jeff and Lyn Armstrong
Individual or	Group of Individuals
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Councils will not be working together since an independent entity will be able to override any local council/resident inputs with no culpability.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

Waitaki water services already cover a huge area. Therefore it would be financially unwise to extend the scope of our water services to include the extra area if we amalgamated with other districts water management, especially when administered by an independent regional company.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Norm Robertson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Name	Denvir Collins
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Subsidising and prioritising other councils to remedy their issues.
Comments	

I think you're being disingenuous by having a ranking system for the options. I want the current system run properly, not other systems to avoid councils responsibility. Get back to your core responsibilities and stop wasting money.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Page 23

Name	Bev Robertson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	ken lawson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	there could be advantages in "sharing technology" or "co-operating" in particular situations. sharing and cooperating does not require the building of another bureaucracy especially wth limited accountability.
	given hindsight, who would vote for establishing regional councils today????
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency building another bureaucracywhich will be difficult to reverse in the futureand will not be accountable at the ballot box.
Comments we do NOT want an a	uckland type structure with water meters and separate bureaucracy . ask any

aucklander if they like it !!

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Page 25 Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Name	Chris birchall
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

We have the mighty Waitaki river on our door step, unlike other council's, we do t have the initial supply issues, and as much as we have aging infrastructure, we have already done a lot of work with our water treatment plants, why would we want to give control of that to someone else, if another region is in worse shape, they will get looked after first, no thanks, waitaki water for Waitaki people, as for less borrowing Mayberry the council should manage their funds better, that is after all their job..

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Trisha Ashby
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I don't see any benefits
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
No	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jan Omnet
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I do not see any benefits from joining forces with these three troubled Councils
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

Look at other troubled water entitles - Wellington, Auckland etc. We do not need this!! The WDC is in a strong position to go it alone due to the hard work put in by councillors, both past and present, to get us to where we are today. Don't throw it away!!

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Peter Richardson
Individual or	Group of Individuals
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	NONE - KEEP THINGS AS THEY ARE RIGHT NOW - IT IS WORKING WELL, AND OUR
	WATER COSTS ARE INCORPORATED IN OUR RATES & TAXES ANYWAY - NO CHANGE
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Keep our water mana	gement exactly as it is right now - why break something that is working properly

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Shirley Newman
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I don't believe the waitaki would benefit from combining with other councils as the quality of water and maintenance would likely drop
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Sharon Richardson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	no benefits, it was not broken before, so why try to 'fix' it?
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	,
all these proposed changes will cost the earth to implement and aren't anywhere near to being urgently needed.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Murray Elliott
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Don't need the sugge	sted meaningful role with Ngai Tahu

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Cp;in Richard Wolverson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Katherine Henry
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Nil. Mike Sweeney's arguments seem sound to me. How can WDC claim cost savings in contradiction to the report it has commissioned?
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency Would enable WDC to borrow yet more money for other projects.
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Kayleigh Cropp
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

Keep it in house. I think putting the existing three waters infrastructure into a separate company will not solve problems. There is a massive resource here for water (the Waitaki) don't take three waters out of councils control. It's part of living here and paying rates and should stay that way, just start charging for water usage (and monitor dairy farms water run off better)

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Philip Robb
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

This survey is corrupted as I cannot freely choose my honest result.

This is a massive infrastructure decision which should be put to the ratepayers for a vote. Obviously if the Waitaki District Council is considering this merger then They are not the ones who should be deciding the outcome.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jocelyn Marsh
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs

Comments

we pay rates for our water to our council who are directly accountable to us the ratepayers. I do not have confidence that an independent provider looking after a number of regions would look after our best interests.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jack Dobbs
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	This survey seems constructed to ignore the fact that council is trying to divest itself
	completely of water services to an entity that has no checks and balances afforded to
	ratepayers. Leave it as it is.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Control by and for fhe farming lobby
Comments	
KEEP IT AS IT IS	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Name	David Hancock
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Page 39

Name	Rae Martin
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	NONE
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
	No accountant local level
Comments	

Our Waitaki Water needs to stay under local council control, with well run simple systems in place. Giving away our water debt, along with all control and rates increasing horrificly is not acceptable to ratepayers at all.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	V A Quartly
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None, it will work like the electricity companies, higher costs to the consumer with more office staff.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

I thought the National Government was going to pay for 3 waters monies spent and if they hadn't lied we wouldn't be doing all this. Citizens are now wary of the Council and Government as they seem to do as they please and the people pick up the bill.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Page 41

Name	Sharon Solomon
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I see no benefits
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

I firmly believe that we should keep our water services in house. That we way control our own services. If combined we could get lost in the mix and even become the lowest priority.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Craig Gibson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Neil Booth
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	none
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>
No more adding debt	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	John Palethorpe
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	None
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Alan Quartly
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	None.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	

Limit spending to infrastructure, no convention centre or observatory centre. Pay chief executives less and consultants as they are showing they don't know what they are doing.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	M Korten
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

Examples from other councils and regional organisations such as Wellington Water recently show it is unsustainable financially to create a new entity for water control. Costs will be too high as new organisations cost more, besides having no historic involvement nor responsibility for each District/Region. The local borrowing capacity is still available according to consultants' reports so WDC will have the funds to continue its water services through in-house expertise.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	steffan christensen
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	One Council learns what works in another Council for effective water services and
	infrastructure.
Concerns	Loss of local control

Comments

The Council should seriously consider how farmers and agricultural purpose users, commercial, and resident payers pay for water. Those with a commercial use should pay more since it is built into their cost of goods and expense structures and they will make a business case to use less water or pass on costs. Those that are residential users rarely are the largest users. Also, all new developments should have horizonal infrastructure include a larger share of the cost of this new infrastructure. Those existing residential users can be considered for Council tax offsets where they install low flow or reduced water usage strategies like capturing rain-water for watering gardens, low flow shower heads, toilets, etc. The Kapiti Council for example gives 5 year tax credit offsets for the installation of water storage units on houses.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	James McPhee
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Previous council(s) went down the wrong path re our water. This current strategy is a continuation.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Rodie Macrae
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	No benefit for the Waitaki residents. Have seen similar systems happen before. With Waitaki being the smaller minnow, we will be the ones paying the money and missing out
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	
Make your choice wis	ely.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Becky Martin
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Tokarahi
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Heather
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Windsor
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Better infrastructure
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Anne Phillips-Vira
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability Hopefully more environmental respect for the water that we currently have at our fingertips would be the result of joining with other councils in the region. I feel like a lot of Waitaki residents are blissfully unaware of how very lucky we are to have such easy access to water. Having lived in the Pacific Islands for 35 years I know about the expense of having to pay for water to a private company where there is little to no transparency. Each household being connected to a water meter makes one very, very aware of just how much water one family uses and also immediately informs a household if there is a problem ie) leaking pipe or theft of water as the cost per month increases exponentially. I have also lived on one of the outer islands of Vanuatu where every community relies soley on rainwater tanks for their everyday water supply. Taps exist only on the rainwater tanks - there are none in the houses. When there is a drought people wash their clothes and swim in the sea to keep clean. Frankly, I feel like many Waitakians don't know how lucky they are when it comes to water. I feel like people need to be more responsible with water use, pay for what they use and think more about environmental impact, the future of water supply for their children and its conservation in the Waitaki and wider Otago region. I hope that a joint scheme with the councils in the Otago/Southland area would allow for this to happen and ensure that there is transparency and accountability in that process.
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

Comments

My focus would be on improving upon deteriorating infrastructure, paying for the water that we use (to help increase awareness of the cost of using vast amounts of water without consequence) while hopefully enabling each consumer / company to get their fair share. I realise that farmers, and probably mostly, dairy farmers use a lot of water in their operations, but they (like everyone else) need to use water carefully and responsibly. I wonder just how many farmers do consider the value of their water as I often notice farm irrigation water spraying onto the road on my way up to Duntroon. I thought that this practice was illegal maybe some more compliance would be useful in these cases. Also with regard to run off of effluent into waterways, I think perhaps that more testing needs to be carried to hold people responsible for damage to waterways as a consequence of pollutants. It is difficult to know if it's ok to swim in places where we used to swim or drink water straight from a stream. I think that the impact of the dairy industry on Waitaki waterways is of concern. Also, there MUST be transparency and reporting to the public about what is going on when working together with other councils.

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Neil Watt
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Loss of local control
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Alastair Macdonald
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	
I have read Mr Sweeneys report and believe it and not the council	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Trevor Tunnicliffe
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Large water quantity consumers and waste water producers do not get cheaper cost just because they can negotiate. High users should pay the same cost as single house users as the water they use cost the same. Having worked for a large user who received cheap water and waste water, there was no incentive for the saving and the domestic user subsidized them.
Comments	
Everyone pays the sa	me for the same services

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Clare Pascoe
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Duntroon
Ward	Other
Benefits	Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Increased costs

Comments

Where a property has an extremely efficient and environmentally friendly waste water system (natural flow Wormerator) installed as part of a new build, at considerable expense) we hope that this won't have to be disconnected if and when piped wastewater is brought to Duntroon. Currently there is no piped wastewater or guttering for storm water. Surely a rural village doesn't require an urban type of infrastructure incurring the same cost for less infrastructure?

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Hazel Agnew
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Mervyn Wilson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	<u>I</u>

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Alan Sandri
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	No real benefits, maybe a broader selection of ideas ?
Concerns	Loss of local control

Comments

I do not want seperate councils controlling water in the Waitaki District. We should be able to make our own decisions without being hamstrung (out voted) by people who have nothing to do with Waitaki.

Think for a minute about the Otago Regional Council and how their rates and personnel have exploded over the last five years. We have no control over what they do.

To have Gary Kircher talk about a CCO being compared to Network Waitaki is ambiguous. How can Network Waitaki donate thousands of our user dollars to an Events Centre if they are "not for profit"?

I hope the Council has not made their decision already -as I suspect they have - and all of this is not a complete waste of our time.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	lan perry
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	None
Concerns	Increased costs
Comments	
Keep the water in house	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Cathy Watt
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u>1</u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jeremy Blampied
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments Need to focus on running the council as a business as efficiently as possible. Need a Dodge dept to reduce spending.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	christine Brien
Individual or	Organisation
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I dont see any benefits
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments the souncil people to be managing its manage better to deliver what we are catually naving far instead of the	

the council needs to be managing its money better to deliver what we are actually paying for instead of too
many staff doing too little.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	colin wolverson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Peter Walker
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Heidi Thomson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

I do not believe the assets that the population in Waitaki have paid for over the generations should be given to other Councils and non-elected representatives. Why would we GIVE our assets to a distant Business that must work with other Councils, AND gives us a very minor voice of 25% interest.

Would you personally give your house, property or business over to another company when you lose 75% ownership and CONTROL over your property?

The water you are talking about BELONGS to every single ratepayer in Waitaki.

I also see this as an easy way for the existing Council to dump their 'irresponsible' and expensive decisions which have created this large debt. This new Regional Company will not et us forget our debt completely, I am sure there will be other costs incurred by Waitaki ratepayers.

Get the Council back to basics, and make savings - no stadiums yet, until finances are more under control.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Warrick Johnston
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	None. Centralisation never works. Ask Russia or North Korea
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
	Centralisation corruption. It always happens. Also the impact of Council associated
	lwi nonsense and other WOKE agendas.

Comments

This entire issue of the rising cost of providing water needs to be shown and balanced with all other Council expenditure. There are vanity or needless projects happening all the time that could easily offset the rising cost of water infrastructure.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Vicki Jayne
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments I find this feedback form very weighted toward a specific outcome that the Council obviously prefers ie the	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

"water done well" option. Isn't "consultation" meant to be an unbiased process?

Name	Richard
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	eden maher
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Elias Maher
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	No benefit.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Chris Yarnton
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
No.	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Danny webb
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Rate payers money that has been spent on pet projects rather than fixing services
Concerns	Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	We want to know the billing structure

Comments

We want the billing structure not the reports and projections that means next to nothing because it's just all guess work.

We have the right too know how much iwi will control and the cost to home owners.

A guarantee that it won't,t be subject to co-goverment...

That the money amount that goes to the water board is the same as what comes off our rates.

That it doesn't mean the the council see.s the decrease in rate,s the right to put them back up...

WHAT happens if someone stops paying there water bill.

Will we get a water meter and a line charge.

Saying it will be similar to network waitaki is misleading because we are charged by a power company. WE WANT THE BILLING STRUCTURE...

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Steve Burge
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

No three waters.

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Everything to stay as they are.

Don't trust the council and there ideas

Council wastes to much of the ratepayers money.

Contractors get paid way to much.

Council needs there own staff to do the jobs properly like they did years ago with clerk of works.

Take on apprentices, teach truck drivers, etc Won't be a shortage then and save money.

The cost of new pipeing is mental.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Page 75

Name	GRAEME ISBISTER
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments	

Not interested in joining Central Otago and the like. They have potential infrastructure problems and future development costs down there due to population increases.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Stuart
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Daniel Maher
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jennifer Herbst
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I don't agree with it.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality
Comments	I
No	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Carl
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	There are none.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	ful we are not amalgamated into a larger entity and lose say and control. Keep it local.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	D carey
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Not transparent on cost, no local control, combining with other councils with a lack of performance in there areas, no idea of chargeable cost for metered water
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Katrina mclennan moffat
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Duntroon
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Theresa Brosnahan
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	None at all, with the Councils proposed.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Given that the other Council's included in the proposal have serious issues with their
	water and wastewater management, in many case's due to the Council allowing for
	large residential and business development, I have serious concerns about how this
	would effect our district. Mainly with the increases to rates and water costs. Had it
	been Waimate or Timaru I would have been more in favour.

Comments

I am extremely disappointed with the WDC response to the meeting held in our local hall, regarding a Wastewater proposal for Hampden.

I am still waiting on the outcome from a discussion within Council, as discussed and agreed at this meeting. Hampden residents, the numerous businesses, primary school and other relevant areas reliant on Septic tanks deserve better. I was informed by a local at our recycling center that the WDC had decided not to proceed.

A little bit of communication would have gone a long way. After all, Mayor Kircher and Martin Pacey assured the 100 or so, residents that attended the meeting that we would be advised of the result.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Linton Winder
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	If this is the best option then it clearly is beneficial
Concerns	I have no concerns if this is the best option

Comments

A few years ago I campaigned against the proposal to develop Forrester Heights. This was a simple proposal, which could be easily understood by anyone, and where the opinion of a member of the community was perfectly valid - whether for or against.

The Water Done Well project is at the other end of the scale; unless a given community member has a genuine and deep understanding of the issues around water treatment, distribution, treatment and infrastructure maintenance then just their "opinion" is not helpful. This is because technical knowledge is a pre-requisite for making the correct decision.

So I urge the council to base their decision not on this consultation, but on the technical information provided to them by experts in the field. This consultation is not a tool for making the correct intergenerational and long term decision that will impact future communities. The issues are far too complex. So please make a decision which you genuinely believe to be correct, regardless of the feedback received. I also urge the council to discount those shrill voices that discount options on the basis of their own prejudice. Having worked as a pollution specialist for the UK's Environment Agency for over five years, I have some understanding of the complexity, cost and difficulties of water resource management.

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Sandra Winder
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Being unable to act upon scientific advice due to financial constraints

Comments

This is a massive decision that will affect future generations and the environment both financially and health wise for years to come. Climatic changes are yet to be fully understood.

I do not believe lay people have enough knowledge to make anything but a gut reaction to this decision. I believe only the council, after considerable input and advice from experts, can make the best decision. Please do not be swayed by vociferous members of our community.

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Raewyn Reader
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	No benefit at all
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Amanda Ironside
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Carol Greenhalgh
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments I moved to Oamaru frin.	rom Lawrence and I know what a shambles the Clutha Councils water infrastructure is

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	John Dustin
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None at all. Why is this survey so blatantly biased for the one choice that is being forced down our throats? Who thinks this will be cheaper in the end? Did no one learn from the Wellington water fiasco when they did this several years ago? Rather than save money, it allowed costs to run rampant and several fat cats to get even richer. Please read your history books!
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Yes but it is a well kno	own fact that nobody at Council listens so I may as well save my breath.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	John Dustin
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None at all.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	It will end in a debacle and cost us extra money.
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jude Ansbacher
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
	Unelected people running it
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Malcolm Garland
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	No benefit, It will cost ratepayers more
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
I want the Council to	listen to the ratepayers. There is only one option, which is to keep it in-house

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jan goldsmith
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Lack of accountability of a CCO

Comments

As Council brought forward projects from LTP in anticipation of Three Waters, and unfunded the depreciation accounts, there should be little urgent work required. Furthermore a CCO lacks accountability, a costly bureaucracy to both set up and run yearly appears unnecessary burden for Ratepayers already struggling under huge increases.

Ring-fencing money in house for water projects that cannot be loaned internally or externally, whilst retaining the knowledge currently held as stated is the preferred option.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Amanda Ironside
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Shane Melton
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Peter Johnson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
	The corporate body ownership model of several properties on one piece of land leads
	to lots of problems if all the owners don't agree on maintenance etc.
	What happens if councils have different opinions on what is needed about water?
	One candidate for mayor has already stated he woud change the preferred option to in
	house ownership if elected. Could he do this?
	I am fortunate enough to afford the increased charges. What happens to families that
	can't, many are stretched to breaking point already.
Comments	
No thanks	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Mark Paton
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Janet Calder
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None. I think set up costs would be higher, than anything we already have. Let's keep it
	local so we have control not only of our water but also our costs
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Keep it local. Keep co	osts in control. Have more transparency

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Nic Ruddenklau
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Phyllis Wong
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Cherie Thurston
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Thanks for all the info	ormation that has gone out about this subject

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Frans Schlack
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
	When those Councils/Districts are adjoined.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
	Districts that are not geographically/physically connected or adjoined will not be able
	to work together effectively as those that are. When Districts are adjoined they can, in
	the future, look at improving their water infrastructure to suit and support each other.
	Districts that are 'apart', as is now under WDC's Option 1, will never have that
	opportunity.

Comments

Having a CCO with the southern districts robs Waitaki of any future development of that CCO beyond an administrative center controlled by the southern districts making decisions, as a voting block, that will benefit their own southern region. A CCO even with just McKenzie District has advantages to both McKenzie and Waitaki District and that successful CCO might very well lead to Waimati and Timaru joining it. Joining the southern districts in a CCO will forever prohibit this.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Vernon Hayes
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Increased costs
Comments	<u>L</u>

The face book information hour was great as well as the discussion between the 4 mayors - well done, it really helped me to make an informed decision

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	David Bousfield
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I see no benefits what so ever
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Why should we take on other towns bad management	

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Sarah Langley
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Jenny Nyika
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
no	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Name	Jan Campbell
Individual or	Organisation
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Other
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Page 107

Name	Chris rutherford
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Setup and running co	sts of option 1 liable to run a muck

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Karl Savage
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I dont see any apart from possible financial sharing f operating admininistration jobs . The funds at hand will be used in the most needed areas of repairs or upgrading
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Shaun Davison
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I think keep it local
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	I
I don't trust in joining.	
Keep it local and in ho	ouse.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	William Main
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Andrew Langley
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Hayley Roache
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	I don't believe there are any benefits
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Why take on other councils infrastructure just concentrate on our own	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Mr William Daniel Alasdair
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure
	There is surely added strategic value of the partnership, particularly with the TMWW
	grouping (Option 4)
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency

Comments

I strongly urge that the TMWW grouping - Option 4 - will create a strong hub around the Waitaki basin area - from which our water mostly derives, and also creates the possibility for a more strategic alliance and cooperation with the TMWW councils in social housing, tourism promotion, public transport and other service delivery areas. In addition, this will create a much stronger lobby to gain better terms and conditions from the electricity generators, for the benefit of all the citizens of TMWW. I would be hopeful that this alliance and cooperation could grow into a new regional council, let's call it 'Aoraki.' This would be much to the benefit of all TMWW communities, to have greater control of their own destinies, rather than being small fish within the present two larger regional councils. TMWW has already agreed on individual pricing, rather than harmonized. In contrast, the SWDW grouping is much more diverse and spread out over such a large area, has less population and relates to a completely different river system, so that the potential 'community of interest' value is not quite as strong.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Let's Talk Waitaki

Submission to Waitaki District Council: re Southern Water Done Well

Name: Mr William Daniel IV Alasdair

Individual submission

P.O. Box 6317, Marion Square, Wellington 6011

e-address: alasdairiv@hotmail.com

This paper is supplementary to the submission that I sent yesterday (27 May 2025) via on-line submission form - to expand upon the brief comments in the on-line submission.

Oamaru was my birthplace and my first 4 years were spent in the lower Waitaki valley. I have visited Waitaki numerous times since, most lately in December 2024. I have other family links to the wider area: an uncle farmed at Dunback; a number of relations & family friends were involved in design/engineering and construction of some of the Waitaki hydro-power projects; my grandparents had a small farm at St Andrews, and were later at Waimate until their departure; and Grand-dad spent so many wonderful times fishing in the Waitaki lakes.

Therefore, I write as a 'connected person,' a well-wisher and an enthusiast for Waitaki's continued success. I presently live in the North Island and work in policy analysis and general administration.

Preferred Option:

I prefer Option 4: a joint-CCO with the TMWW grouping.

My reasons are as follows:

- *Cooperation with other adjoining districts is essential* for Waitaki to take advantage of the benefits of efficiency of scale, and to share the burdens;
- The SWDW grouping (Central/Clutha/Gore) is too widely spread out there may be some efficiency gains with a joint CCO, but there is almost zero potential for aggregation of services/supply systems in aligning with these districts:
- The other major cities and districts in Otago & Southland Dunedin, Queenstown-Lakes, Invercargill, and Southland should be taking the neighbourly responsibility of closer cooperation with Central, Clutha and Gore to provide efficiencies of scale and direct cooperation on water services. It shouldn't be up to Waitaki to 'take up the tab' for these larger rural districts, two of which do not directly adjoin Waitaki;

- Let's keep things within the main river systems, as obvious geographical 'communities of interest.' In a large part, Waitaki District's water supply derives from the Waitaki river system/drainage basin. Waitaki is not directly connected with the Clutha, Taieri or Mataura river systems/drainage areas. There is no viable potential for closer cooperation between Waitaki and these river basins it's quite impractical. Even Waihemo/Shag River doesn't connect into the Taieri or Clutha basins;
- Obversely, there are potential benefits to be gained, in particular, from closer cooperation with Mackenzie and Waimate, which already have existing water supply cooperation with Timaru district. Thus, these four TMWW districts form a natural and logical hub around the Waitaki basin;
- Timaru is a larger city, which seems to be very well set up, well resourced, and well operated thus Waitaki can gain some side benefits from this alliance and Timaru is obviously interested in this partnership;
- It has been indicated that TMWW grouping would agree to individual/nonharmonization basis for water services pricing, which would facilitate more security around pricing for consumers in Waitaki, as well as maintaining a sense of 'fairness;'
- On this basis, a good argument could be made that Waimate should be encouraged to cooperate with her neighbours, rather than choosing a standalone option;
- The formation of a TMWW grouping around the Waitaki basin as a hub could in the future potentially lead on to further cooperation with these councils in other service delivery areas, such as social housing, tourism promotion, business development, public transport to gain mutual benefits/cost efficiencies for all;
- In this context, let's also put forward the long-term vision of a new regional council, incorporating these four TMWW districts. Let's call it the 'Aoraki region.' The long-term benefits that may accrue from this could include specifically for Waitaki to overcome the present handicap that results from being split between two existing regional council areas;
- It would also be hoped that TMWW (and eventually the Aoraki region) could be in a stronger position *together* to negotiate better terms and conditions relating to the utilization of hydro-electric generation capacities in the wider Waitaki River basin.

WDA At Wellington, 28 May 2025

Name	Mike Adams
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
	Shared resources where currently borders stop this. Staffing benefits (knowledge and
	support)
Concerns	Central Otago makes sense, as does South Canterbury (Waimate, Mckenzie &
	Timaru),
	Clutha and Gore doesn't make sense, theyre miles away and much smaller districts
	with known large issues.
Comments	-
My preferred option v	vould be South Canterbury and Central Otago. Ditch gore and clutha, they don't make
sense.	

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Summer Nyman
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control That the waitaki ratepayers would be subsiding other councils who have not done well and be paying for their water infrastructure so it's up to par with our own. That waitaki council would have little influence on future decisions regarding our water supply. A regional company is of no benefit to the waitaki rate payer or community and to go ahead with option one would be a final decision and not something we could get out of. As ratepayers and protectors of our whenua we should be keeping all decisions and water in house.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Daniel Moffat
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Duntroon
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	See attached.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	See attached.
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Katrina Hazelhurst
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
	See attachment

Comments

Water Submission – Supporting Option 3: An In-House Business Unit $\,$

Retaining Local Expertise

I support Option 3. This option ensures that Waitaki retains its local contractors, water engineers, and operational staff. Employing personnel within our district fosters a workforce with a vested interest in delivering high-quality services, leveraging local knowledge for efficient water management. In emergency situations, having staff based in the area is crucial, particularly when adverse conditions (such as impassable roads) make assistance from other districts impractical.

Prioritizing Waitaki's Infrastructure & Ensuring Value for Money

A joint water entity would need to manage competing infrastructure demands from multiple regions, resulting in prioritization of projects that serve larger populations or those required to avoid regulatory fines. Waitaki's long-term plan outlines a lower level of capital investment compared to neighbouring districts such as Central Otago, raising concerns that essential local projects may be deprioritized in favour of larger-scale works elsewhere.

Value for money is not solely determined by expenditure but by the quality of service delivered in return. Waitaki risks receiving diminished infrastructure investment under a combined model, as project prioritization will ultimately be subject to regulatory requirements set by Taumata Arowai. A joint entity cannot guarantee equitable investment in Waitaki, potentially leaving the district's water infrastructure underfunded while addressing issues in other regions first.

Maintaining Local Autonomy

An in-house business unit preserves direct local governance, ensuring that Waitaki retains control over its water infrastructure and service delivery. Centralizing water management into a larger entity would reduce local representation and accountability, limiting Waitaki's ability to influence decisions that impact ratepayers.

Financial Risks

Transitioning water management from individual councils to a joint water entity presents greater overall financial risks compared to maintaining water services in-house. These risks include significant upfront costs associated with staffing, establishing a new corporate structure, advertising, securing premises, and legal fees.

Examples from New Zealand demonstrate that amalgamation has not consistently resulted in lower costs. The Auckland Super City amalgamation and the formation of Wellington Water are cases where projected savings did not materialize, leading to higher costs for ratepayers.

Given these financial and governance concerns, retaining in-house control of water services may offer greater financial stability and better local oversight.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

118

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Name	Sandra Marlow
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Lyn McErlane
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	
Clean water, No meters, No fluoride, cheapest	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Terry McErlane
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None keep our srevices in house.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	
No water meters or toxic chemicals put in our water. Check latest data from USA.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	John Thorn
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Maria Dickie
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Kauru Hill
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	I don't see any benefits
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency

Comments

I think keeping the water local is the most cost effective for users and rate payers. I have seen in the past when extra layers of bureaucracy are added in and it leads to higher cost and delays in resolutions of issues. We need to make sure we prioritise our waters over vanity projects and have a plan to replace infrastructure in a planned way. Look for cost effective ways to look after the rural water schemes and not try to put the same system as we have for towns. We need to take into consideration that around 95% of rural water is for stock or is used in washing down etc, and not used for human consumption. Also remembering that water is stored in on farm tanks, so water treated at source has many opportunities to deteriorate before it is consumed. Using a Network Waitaki type of model may also work. The inference that joining with others could bring a bigger buying power and could lead to savings is not proven councils need to become better at negotiating a good deal. Joining with other councils will lead to more bureaucracy and less feet on the ground getting the work done and increased costs with workers potentially having to travel more and an increase in costs. Councillors need to listen to their rate payers.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Bruce McCulloch
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None, although there may be arguable cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control

Comments

I am very keen to see our Council retain control of our water in house if at all possible or if necessary as a local CCO. I believe this will retain local skills, control local debt, and make Waitaki water a priority. I think this will override any arguable cost savings.

Over the years Waitaki has prided itself in doing its own thing - from the 1880 26 mile open water race complete with inbuilt filtering of fresh water mussels to the innovatine rural water schemes, to the more recent chlorination and filtering. We can continue to locally provide our own water, arbiet more controlled by the government.

As a aside, I was very disappointed in your consultation document which was very biased and more of an indoctrination document!

Thankyou for considering my submission.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Steve Dundass
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	1

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Gordon Clark
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Ken Mitchell
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	I think there are benefits from working together with neighbours and/or the parts of areas where we share the water resources, core or primary infrastructure and have a shared local operational presence. I also note there are more synergies available by working other local utility providers eg. shared technology, comms, scada, GIS, AMS, control rooms, 24/7 fault services, contractor resources, resilience capacity.
Concerns	Loss of focus on local quality and performance issues. sub-optimal asset management with conflicting strategies and variance in asset management system maturity. Don't saddle us with a bunch of dogs.

Comments

Option 1 is simply the wrong choice of strategic partners. There is too much diversity in current group. Selection appears based on maintaining fiefdoms and avoiding the obvious question of why so many councils exist. Better assessment of the optimal strategic partnering is required.

Option 4 doesn't exclude breaking council franchises with different companies managing different areas. For example, McKenzie having a shareholding in the Waitaki CCO and a Timaru CCO.

A JV with Network Waitaki should be on the table. They have 20years head start on this particular form of regulatory form. They went from benchmarking 3rd to the bottom to 7th (and highest rural) line company in two years simply by adopting best practice asset management. Small can out compete the bigger players and deliver faster.

The analysis and projection of costs demonstrates a lack of shift from the existing "cost plus the Govt. made us do it" mindset in local authorities. Costs in all options are shown to ramping up. Best performance (high service/quality at low cost) through mature asset management practice will deliver a lower steady state expenditure. No expenditure spikes, no loss of service from failing assets, no failures to deliver for growth. Can be done, is being done, nothing special about councils.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	phil mcnamara
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments copy what's happened with network waitaki, and you wont go wrong	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Bob Matheson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	no shown savigs
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Alison Brewster
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Lack of transparency
Comments	
NA	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Karen
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Kauru Hill
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency

Comments

I am 100 % for an in house business unit.

• water delivery needs to stay with the local council through a set up of a dedicated internal water service unit. (Which will be compliant with required government regulations). Simple but effective!

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Richard Scott
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Kauru Hill
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	None,too many pigs in the trough
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

Needs to be controlled by locals, with local knowledge,

Who do this sort of work every day, not a couple of one sided councilors with big egos thinking they can decide for the people when they haven't got the experience in this sort of work. Regarding buying power, if you put out for tender, wanting a large omount of products priced , there are plenty of businesses around nz that will give a competitive price, as every council will all be doing the same thing, so going with any other council is just blind stupidity.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Pat Wala
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	None, I dont trust Councils as far as I can throw them
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	
I hope Council take ir	nto account peoples preferences and not just pretend to.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Catherine Manning
Individual or	Group of Individuals
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	No benefit at all
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

This council does not represent the people of Waitaki. It is shameful the way you have pushed this option even this document has Southern Water Done Well on it when it should have said it was a survey on future water services to the Waitaki District. A council of bullies indeed.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Louise Skene
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Wayne
Individual or	Group of Individuals
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Robyn Francis
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

My preferred option is the in house model due to more community control over assets, infrastructure and decisions.

I am opposed to the CCO model with Clutha, Gore and Central Otago because where there is intense propaganda like there has been there is always something to weary of.

The bias towards the preferred option has been relentless leading to people being confused and lacking of information about the other 3 options.

It seems that the preferred option is based on the money available to borrow. Debt is all I heard in relation to joining a CCO. 500% borrowing capabilty for goodness sake!

Having an unelected board of directors overseeing 4 councils when the council has managed up til now seems like a knee jerk reaction to me when the pressure is put on by the government.

We have been told there will be no jostling to get work done and we won't be responsible for the other councils debt well I don't believe it.

I preferred the in-house option.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	David Rush
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control
	increased bureaucracy and costs
Comments	
keep it in House nice	and simple

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Alex Familton
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	<u> </u>
Please see comments attached.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Judy Piner
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	Improved water quality, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency

Comments

- 1. Water Meters Essential for each household
- To ensure, as far as possible, fair payment for water used. Also used for monitoring leakage and as a means to encourage care and responsible water usage.
- 2. Make readily and easily accessed information about harvesting rainwater and recycling greywater where appropriate. Especially using water butts, where to buy new and suggestions about repurposing plastic tanks and drums etc. Ideas on constructing simple systems cost effectively, using harvested water wisely, drip irrigation systems etc.

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	G Bartrum
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
No ex officers or employees of the current WDC to be employed in the new entity.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Simon Berry
Individual or	Organisation
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Why is there no option for non-benefit of working with other councils
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Rate increases are out of control, where are the operation cost reductions from the "Transformation"	
investment?	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Hendrikus van Lier
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None just creates another tier of bureaucracy thus increasing additional costs to
	ratepayers.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

What is wrong with the present system and why would we want to give away control of our assets. Is the present administration unable to manage the different sectors that makeup the the services provided in the Waitaki District boundary? Sounds like we need a replacement manager to get on and do the job properly instead of looking at ways to remove some of the responsibilities that goes with the job. Toughen up!

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Page 145

Name	Ken Hinton
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

anelle Bilcliffe
dividual
ppose
0
amaru
o benefit at all
oss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
o say in what happens to water, if more councils are added to the collective then
/aitaki's say at the table reduces. Current scenario has Waitaki at 25% voting rights,
dd four more councils and Waitaki has 12.5% say
0 0 0 0 0

Comments

Council should retain water services in house and if borrowing celings are the concern then efforts must be made to cut non essential services and ongoing costs for Galleries, Event Centres, repairs to buildings which show no return and unnecessary projects.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Gareth Bilcliffe
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
	Increased debt to unmanageable levels for water users.
Comments	
	o live within their means and incur debt only for essential services and reduce the

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jan Fleming
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Keep our water withir	ı our own council

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	V Fleming
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	I don't, local councils should look after local infrastructure
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Ray Henderson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Why was any money:	spent on this sham of a 'consultation'?

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Keri Sime
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	H Barrell
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Nil
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	
NA	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	S Barrell
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Nil
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	
NA	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Retired ratepayer Hampden
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	I do not see any benefits
Concerns	Loss of local control, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments Clean affordable is a basic human right and what we pay our rates for. NOT to be incorporated with other	
rating areas.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Graeme Francis
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	I don't see any benefit's from councils working together especially when Waitaki has already spent a significant amount of money bringing our water up to standard.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency

Comments

It appears to me one of the main drivers of joining with other councils is to be able to borrow more. I see this as a distinct negative as we are further encumbering future generations with debt they can't afford. While there could be some advantages of joining with other councils the lack of control and the fact we are ahead of other councils in water quality far outweighs any possible advantage.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	chris thorn
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

- 1 We need to keep control of the water in our area
- $2\ \ \text{We have seen too many instances of cock-ups and cost overruns when Council\,run\,things}\ .$
- A trust along the lines of Waitaki Power would address the problems and keep things open, transparent and in the district

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Anne Thompson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>
Why are options already suggested for the last part? Are council using their own preferred options to influence this poll? If so it needs re doing as a neutral poll.	

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Linda Gould
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Increased costs
Comments	
Very concerned about cost	

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	SFW Morrison
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Nil advantage
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	<u> </u>

Commonto
I have never seen a combination council delivery of services work Better for the WDC to own and operate
their own services.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Ewan Rusbatch
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I do not see any advantage
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

I am worried that any joining with other Councils will result in Waitaki ratepayers ending up for other local upgrades eg Queenstown wastewater

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Ralph Brewster
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	There is none
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Na	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	M Thorn
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

Why are there only four alternatives the council should have another look at their options. The favoured ones seem to be more about enabling the council to borrow more money than an intensive study on how best to provide water to the ratepayers at a reasonable cost

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

requirement for "fair representation" of all options.

160-6260326

Name	Michael Sweeney
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
See attached letter to	Auditor-General requesting audit of consultation document because it violates legal

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Ian Anderson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Tokarahi
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Fleur Martin
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Better infrastructure
Concerns	Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Elsa du Toit
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Poor coordination and unfair focus of different objectives.
Comments	

Comments

If you have a larger group innovation e.g biogas to electricity and or solar panels covering settling ponds could be investigated to offset some of the costs, reduce emissions and increase renewable energy as part of the project cost benefit analysis.

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Richard Dukes
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments no thanks	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	ronald john paul
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	nome
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	1
As the mayor said its	a sham decide first then ask for submissions

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Lee Brehaut
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability I would expect all of the above to be the result of this combined CCO, however, I am not yet totally convinced it is the best way to go. The people running the CCO will change in the future. What safe guards can be put in place to ensure continuation of what is being suggested with the CCO model - unless any changes mean improvements across all the four districts.
Concerns	Lack of transparency How work is allocated between the 4 councils. The cost of having specialist expertise on the Board. How the Board is elected. individual agendas influencing Board decisions. Are we rescuing Clutha to some extent with the huge variation of population against size of their asset?

Comments

The wording of each of these definitions is very leading. Not helpful.

I watched the clip of the four Mayors and found it helpful, but it did not bring me to an easy, clear decision as to my preference. However, having run submission rounds for a Canterbury council, I can well appreciate the amount of time and effort you all (staff and Council) have put into this extremely important, complicated and far reaching decision. I trust you have done your best for us all and thank you for your effort.

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	G Phillips
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability Knowledge sharing and nationwide consistency e.g. standard materials and performance specifications (which are particularly helpful to cross-boundary contractors).
Concerns	Loss of local control, Changes in water quality

Comments

The boundaries of the districts in option 2 are much closer and can physically support each other through technical specialist availability and much reduced travel times to attend to faults and/or investigations. Looking ahead, a Waitaki water treatment plant (using Waitaki river water) can be constructed supplying river water (downhill) to Kurow, Duntroon, Lower Waitaki, Waitaki rural schemes, Waimate and Oamaru. This option has an economy of scale and, if required, can pump water to Otematata and developing sub-divisions in that area.

Thinking more broadly, a water treatment plant further west in the valley could supply water downhill from the Omarama area and also pump it into the MacKenzie district and Waimate via Kurow bridge. Not possible with the southern option 1.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru,
	Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Catriona McIvor
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	

Comments

I have owned property in Moreton Bay Qld where Unity Water has provided water services to Moreton Bay, Sunshine Coast and Noosa local Government areas since 2010. The services have been good, although the cost savings from economies of scale have not been as high as projected. It may be worth noting also, that mandatory on-site sewerage treatment plants for sections larger than 2000 square metres such as the Taylex Wastewater Treatment System (I'm not sure what the New Zealand version of these is) have gone a considerable way to keeping wastewater costs down for those living on larger semi-rural sections and may be worth considering for new development in the Waitaki and surrounding district.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Malcolm Garland
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	In the long term, there will be no benefits. We can do it better by keeping it in-house
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Please do not take the	e decisions away from the rate payers of Waitaki

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	D N Barltrop
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Windsor
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Absolutely no benefit. With no local control, absolutely madness. Substantially
	increased costs, contrally to mayoral propoganda.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	1
Yes. Council resign so	o as we can have clear sensible people voted in who will listen to the ratepayers who
elected them.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	M Hunt
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Paige Wills
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Tokarahi
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	I have major concerns about this option and especially that it is being decided before
	local body elections.
Concerns	Loss of local control

Comments

Submission to Waitaki District Council: Pause Southern Water Done Well CCO Decision Until After Local Elections

To the Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to strongly urge the Waitaki District Council to pause any decision on forming the proposed Southern Water Done Well Council-Controlled Organisation (CCO) until after the October 2025 local elections.

Water is one of the most critical assets under local control, and the proposed CCO represents a permanent shift in how that control is exercised — and by whom. While there may be merit in regional collaboration, this proposal risks replicating many of the same issues that led to widespread rejection of the former Three Waters model: distance from decision-makers, reduced democratic accountability, and the erosion of local voice.

Under the proposed joint CCO, residents of Waitaki could find themselves governed by executives based across multiple districts, answerable not to our community but to a broader, less responsive entity. Local ratepayers will shoulder the consequences of any failure — yet may be told their elected councillors have little influence over the outcomes.

Given the scale and permanence of this decision, it is essential that voters have a say before control of their water services is transferred. Councils are currently consulting on the formation of a legally binding entity, with real consequences for representation, governance, and community autonomy. Rushing to lock this in months before an election — without a direct electoral mandate — undermines democratic principles. No one disputes that water services must improve. But local control doesn't just mean local ownership on paper — it means decisions made by people who are accountable to us. That accountability must be preserved.

We therefore call on the Waitaki District Council to:

Defer any decision on the formation of a CCO until after the October elections, allowing incoming councillors and mayors to seek an electoral mandate for their water reform stance;

Clearly outline to the public the risks as well as the purported benefits of joining a joint CCO, including loss of direct control, cost-sharing implications, and long-term governance changes;

Uphold democratic accountability by ensuring that decisions of this magnitude are made with — not before — public endorsement.

Water belongs to the people, not to an unelected board. Let voters decide who they trust to manage it. Sincerely,

Paige Wills

Wills Farm Holdings Ltd

0211819215

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

174

Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Carolyn Thelning
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

I believe we need to keep control of our water locally. I also wish to keep it within our council rather than have it separated out and easier to sell off in the future. This will also keep our locally elected representatives responsible for the care of our waters and we are able to hold them to account through the election process. Also, if there is a problem it is organised and fixed by locals who know the area and the needs.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Page 178

Name	Yvonne Webb
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Do not see any benefits for our local water supply.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

I believe we should have the control and accountability for the infrastructure of our water and sewerage at a local level. Namely the Waitaki District Council.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Page 179

Name	Stuart Webb
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I do not see any benefit for our local water supply.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

Our current Council and those that have gone before have achieved a very satisfactory water supply to our region. There have been significant upgrades to our infrastructure, in both water and sewerage over many decades, which places us in a very good position to continue to control our own water and sewerage at a local level. We need to have accountability for these services at a local level.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	John Chetwin
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
	Risks of poor business performance; investment priority dominated by Gore and
	Clutha basket cases an Central Otago growth; lack of integration with local planning
	and building consents
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Peter Beauchamp
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	MNL
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	The premise of sustainability is straight out of the Agenda 2030 playbook, it is all fabricated propaganda - these soft words hide the reality that Central & Local government are centralizing our water to gain control, that will not create better or safer supply to residence, it will simply cost more in rates, The water is already poisoned with the know neurotoxin Hydroflusilicic Acid, made from waste of superphosphate Fertilizer, NZ Govt & WDC state this is safe - Its NOT, many Countries globally have banded this substance, hey smoking was promoted as safe - 20-30yrs later look at the illness, Giving away control is the last thing we need, we need a Local Accountable Council.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency Ability for Newly formed entities to extend borrowing under the premise of the need for upgraded infrastructure, wages to unelected officials, the probability that Maori will play a major part in controlling what we do with our water on our properties, both residential & rural. The lack of accountability, even at present WDC are not reading the room & are hell bent on their elected agenda to give local control of a service & system that is paid for over many years by the rate payers of this town & will continue to do as so. Current spending/borrowing has ballooned under the current CEO & Mayor without any sign of abating.

Comments

Yes, the last question was manipulative, in that we could not select multiples of a number that highlighted our preference to the options listed - this is exactly the language & misleading manipulation that WDC are currently running with their Preferred Option Propaganda in all online & newsprint media, It is evident our Local Councils have been hijacked by unelected CEO's & Central NZ Govt, New Zealand is the land of the FREE, elected or not - these officials DO NOT have our best interests at Heart & are clearly following a doctrine from larger Un-elected corporations, via central Govt, these corporations are again unaccountable to the local community, once they have control & water infrastructure is given away we are at the mercy of bureaucrats dictating what ever they choose - we do not live in a Socialist Country.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Raewyn Pilgrim
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	At this point it is hard to say what the benefits would be, these would only be known if this council did choose to join others
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	1
Not at this timetha	ank you

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Hamish Kay
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Laurette Robinson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency

Comments

I strongly support Option 3. In-House business unit.

Reasons for choosing Option 3

I have serious concerns regarding Mayor Gary Kircher's evangelical -like, rigorous support of CCO with Central Otago, Clutha and Gore.

Fait Accompli?

Why would Waitaki District which has invested \$55 million for upgrading water take on other councils' debt? It is common knowledge Gore has reached its debt limit, Clutha has incurred 3 infringement notices for its wastewater 22/23, Central Otago faces huge investment because of potential rapid growth.

It is astounding Waitaki District would even consider joining up with these troubled districts.

I recommend Waitaki District contact Dunedin, Invercargill, Ashburton for advice and guidance. These entities chose to go In-House.

Unfortunately, the qualities of sound judgment, commonsense, respect of ratepayers are absent within Waitaki District personnel.

Remember, you are meant to be serving Waitaki ratepayers

Local Body elections are 5 months away. All Councillors should be required to state their preference a.s.a.p. Thank you.

Laurette Robinson

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Donald Urquhart
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	
Am concerned at the	potential for loss of control and cost increases going forward

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Stephen Black
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None, I believe it should be kept in the district and the WDC owns 100% of Whitestone
	Contracting who could manage and deliver the Waitaki water services
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency

Comments

I believe that with the Council and the ratepayers owning 100% of Whitestone Contracting they should keep the services within the Waitaki District and utilize and develop this company to keep control of our infrastructure and services. This would also generate local employment opportunities and revenue back to the community. This model is the same as Network Waitaki

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Peter Reid
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	In theory sounds good but in practise they never work
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	John Munro
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I don't see any benefit for decisions being made without Waitaki ratepayers input.
	More unproductive bureaucracy to inevitably increase costs.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
	Remote decisions being made about local affairs by disinterested individuals.
Comments	
Water is the least of our problems when we have c	
Council borrowing and spending on the "nice to have" items like half million dollar toilets, speed bumps at	
compulsory stops, unnecessary cones on minor roadworks etc, etc, etc	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Graeme Anderson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I see no benefits from collaboration with outside council who do not know or care about our local circumstances
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	1

The council must retain controll of our assets otherwise we run the risk of ending up with another fiasco.like delta lines conzrail the list goes on where profits are put ahead of basic maintenance

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Belinda Smith
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	<u> </u>
No	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Nick Le Bas
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	This is a rhetorical question, you haven't any information that supports the above claims. The Morrison Lowe report shows cost savings but there are no facts to go with the report to support what they are saying. Simply say the other options are more expensive without facts means nothing. You need to spend \$400 million over the term, but it looks like the numbers have been play with to make it fit the picture you are displaying.
Concerns	It hasn't been explained well how this will look and operate, other than there isn't any hamonisation around costs and I assume debt. I get the sharing of back-office function and professional services but unsure how this CCO will provide and improved service to the people of Waitaki.

Comments

Generally speaking, the issue is that everyone has undervalued water and their assets for too long. This is from the public to the elected members of council. The prize has always been to keep rates to a point where everyone is mostly happy, well the day has come that we need to face those poor decision and accept that we have to pay for those pass mistakes.

Winding back the \$400 million to \$190 million over the next 9 years is again showing that council do not understand the problem and just delaying what has to happen to make it someone else's problem (CCO). The sooner that these decisions are remove from council and put in the hands of experts in their field the better.

My last point is that who has worked out what happens when people claim hardship and can't afford \$200 per month. I assume your model is based on a 100% collect of water rates?

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Natalie Evans, Oamaru business owner, Oamaru rate payer, Chartered Accountant
Individual or Organisation	Individual
Support or Oppose Collaboration between Councils	Oppose
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency Impact on WDC revenue, degradation of WDC and staff and Whitestone Contracting Ltd and other local contractors, complexity in prioritisation of services between the various areas, lack of detail and agreement between the 4 Councils in terms of management set up and delivery, added cost with another CEO etc etc and Board of Directors, difficulty in ensuring efficiency, disagreements within the JV are inevitable, power inbalance etc etc.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Brian Harrison
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Loss of local knowledge & control of our systems - we will be a low priority
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

I have concerns about increased Council borrowings if the water debt is removed. Loss of accountability / responsibility for our assets which are in good condition. SWDW is another layer of bureaucracy (without local representation at significant costs) that is not needed - if we dont comply with the standard then we will make the necessary living adjustments to improve our plants. Then there are the discussions to give lwi a meaningful role - how democratic is that? Transparency is not evident.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Isaac Cooper
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jason
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Windsor
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Nothing, when there not local
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Natalie Callaghan
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Windsor
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Jane and Blair Smith
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure
Concerns	Loss of local control

Comments

As ratepayers, our preference would be either to keep it in-house for the time being as it is prudent to see where the local government /RMA/Water reforms land over the next 18-24 months, but longer term it would make sense (in regards to cost efficiencies and scale) to amalgamate with the closest most comparable area - ie South Canterbury, rather than other areas of Otago that are geographically and dynamically vastly different to Waitaki. If a unitary authority move was to take place, then the assumption is that this would more likely merge Waitaki in with the catchment that shares the Waitaki River, ie Canterbury - hence the move to merge water services closer to this boundary would make more sense. The risk however is a merge with E-Can is a move to less localised control and having to pay for the more concerning water quality issues that north of the Waitaki have.

In short, Waitaki should hedge it bets - keep local short term until the vast changes are bedded in (The new RMA/Water Services/ Unitary Authority discussions) and then if an amalgamated move is deemed necessary for financial and long term security, look closely at the North option rather than the South. However this would also be dependent on the cost and security (governance) of both options.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Philip Martin
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Loss of local control

Comments

I generally support the idea of Joint CCOs. To do this well and get the best outcome however, will require some strong and inspiring governance from our Council. And whether we get that will depend on the upcoming elections. I hope that Waitaki is equipped in the future to govern this effectively.

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Rachel Blackler
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	

Comments

Given timaru's water has just been voted best tasting, this further reason to investigate this option further. Option 4 seems most sensible as all from same 'catchment', close proximity to each other will mean better economy and continuity in all aspects ie management, infrastructure, maintenance etc.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Michael Lilley
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	No benefits at all. The other councils suggested for Waitaki have huge water quality
	and infrastructure problems.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	1
A more open discuss	ion would have been to invite Waimate and Invercargill councils to a open discussion on
why they have gone Ir	nhouse with their water.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Kate Lilley
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I do not see any benefit to the ratepayers of the Waitaki District in joining with other councils to deliver water and waste water services. We will have yet another administration heavy organisation that will cost us very dearly with the loss of autonomy over our services
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

I have found the councils communication with ratepayers on social media to be arrogant and condescending on this issue. To consistently referring people back to the council website instead of answering the questions asked has appeared to be nothing short of bullying

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Nicole
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	NONE!!
	The Government & Local Government are hell bent on gaining full control of the water
	to make it centralised all under the guise of "sustainability". This will NOT create
	better of safer supply, it WILL however create more costs for the water payer. The
	water is already unsafe thanks to the industrial chemical and neurotoxin
	Hydrofluorosilicic Acid being added against the communities wishes, it is a poison that
	many many other countries have banned!!
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
	Joining councils will create way more red tape and bureaucracy, more wages will go to
	more unelected staff, the Debt levels will go through the roof so the water bill will be
	astronomical! We will completely loose control of our water, what goes in it, and even
	though you say it can't legally be privatised, the law will end up being changed so that
	is can be sold off.

Comments

YES

Waitaki DC have been extremely manipulative with this whole water "consultation", forcing your preferred option down our throats while pretending that it is the best and most cost effective option. What a load of propaganda.

WE (The rate payer) pay the bills, therefore, WE (the rate payer) should get the say, because WE the RATEPAYER pay your wages, therefore you work for US!

WDC, Kircher & the CEO have already made it very clear that if the community want something different than the councils preferred option it will be bad luck for the rate payer as the decision has already been made to go with the "Preferred Option".

The only thing the WDC is good at is ignoring the voices of the community - PROVE ME WRONG! I would like to know who is benefiting from the councils preferred option? It is certainly not going to be the ratepayer, that's for sure!

DO NOT GIVE OUR WATER AWAY - KEEP IT INHOUSE!

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Richard Cruice
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	This will allow our council staff to continue spending like drunken sailors. It will allow the bureaucracy to escape accountability. It will allow departments to grow their budgets, staff count and the perceived importance/egos of staff. None of this benefits the district of the ratepayer, these are direct benefits to individual employees at the expense of the ratepayers and the district.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency I am as strongly opposed as possible. I do not trust the aggressive promotion of this by council staff and elected members. I do not trust the modeling that is used to justify this decision. I do not wish to be involved in the large levels of debt involved. The Mayor has repeatedly stated that access to higher levels of debt as part of the the justification for this idea. EVERY single ratepayer who does not work for council that I have spoken to is strongly opposed. There appears to be an agenda to promote this as a solution, thereby avoiding the need to cut back wasteful spending at council to allow headroom for water spending. I do not trust fundamental aspects of the modeling that have not been transparently made available such as the time frames for debt under the different options. It is far too easily with such modeling to build a narrative that fits the decision that officials want to justify. Such as choosing debt repayment timeframes that present this option as cheaper by focusing on single billing cycles rather than focusing on the long term where additional interest means higher costs over the long term as principal is repaid more slowly.

Comments

This has been an absolute BULLSHIT process.

I have no faith in our elected officials to make a decision based on the best interests of the district.

There has been aggressive attacks on ratepayers who challenge the assertions made by council.

There is an election coming up which a candidate is proposing to scuttle this agenda if its pushed through and he is elected. Much better to delay the decision making and allow the ratepayers to decide the direction at the ballot box rather than push this through under an unpopular outgoing mayor with no accountability.

The areas we are being pushed to align with are not natural partners if we went down the partnership route. But the more natural partners have already expressed a common sense decision to go it alone.

Biggering like this never runs as promised by the bureaucrats misleading the people. Just look at the abstract failure of Network Waitaki's past attempt.

The absolute failure of the polytechnic merger.

There have been claims by the Mayor that the feedback received through this consultation may well be simply ignored. The justification for this being that only a fraction of ratepayers will submit and an attempt to invalidate the submissions made. I remind the elected officials that the most recent 2022 election was based on a 45% voter turnout. So if you want to assume that minority participation invalidates ratepayers who did participate, then your positions are built on the same minority support. Perhaps you should all step down if you do not believe that those of us who got off our ass and participated in democracy are the basis of democratic decision making.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

203

Page 205

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Thomas Amoy Nyika
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	There is no benefit at all - only increased water charge (cost) to consumers.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	This is a replication of the proposed Three Waters scheme rejected at the last general
	election. It is an attempt to hide the cosat of debts the Councils incurred and pass the
	costs to us in water services.

Comments

Under the Three Waters plan proposed by the previous Labour Government, Councils would have passed their debts incurred for the improvement of their water schemes to the Government as part of assets transfer. So Councils borrowed a lot of money, some not for water. If Waitaki borrowied \$55 million the other Councils proposed to form the CCH had borrowed far more. Therefore the proposed CCO Three Waters would be debt laden from the start. If it costs \$13.8 million to set this thing up and \$6.5 million per annum to run it then the debt level would be even greater. So this scheme would not be affordable or high quality as our mayor seems to push forward. We, especially in Oamaru, have developed our drinking water over many years from the 1970s and 1980s when the quality was low to the present acceptable quality. And it had cost us a lot of money in rates to reach this level.

In 1990's when Duncan Taylor was Mayor, we had to pay \$2000 for every house hold and for every business to help pay for the wastewater treatment plant being built in North Oamaru near College Street. I understand that every future section would pay \$1000 if not connected to the water system, and \$2000 if connected. That means all houses build since had paid the \$2000 required. So we have real ownership of the waste water treatment plant. We don't want to pay artificially high charges for the waters because of the high debt incurred by those Councils.

Mayor Kircher talked about trustees for the proposed CCO for water services. They may be people he probably has in mind or may be people he has already lobbied. But he failed to mention Chairman, CEO
Managers, office workers, field workers etc. Soon we will have another juggernaut called CCO going out of control. CCO has no government sanctions. They hold us water users captive and regularly harass us with high water charges.

Soon they will want a centralised bright new office as HQ also borrowed for. It is important to note that the Mayors who did the borrowing in the first place are either no longer in office or not standing for office in the coming elections, except for Gore! They are the ones pushing this thing forwards.

Let us not allow this to happen. Let us keep our water services in house. They only require maintenance through the rate charges as usual. The Mayor cannot compare Network Waitaki with a CCO, Network Waitaki was the result of Government electricity reforms of the early 1990s. It could have been sold and the proceeds apportioned to power users. We chose to keep in house. It paid dividends to power users from its profits as rebates on power charges, however in recent years the money has been diverted to something dear to the mayor. Nevertheless we hope Network Waitaki will resume proper dividend payments in future.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

205

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Name	Katheryn Margaret Cruickshank
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

I have been away for a period and was dismayed to read in the ODT 04.05.25 that the Waitaki District Council has a preferred option of 'working' with 3 other district Councils - Gore, Clutha and Central Otago. The WDC has been prudently and diligently working through the directives set down by the previous Labour Government. Our rates bills have increased markedly over the last few years. How much more will they rise if a whole new organisation is set up - directors, officers, offices, stationary etc, each with considerable cost. Then factor in the costs of meetings, regularly travelling the considerable distances between the 4 councils (I do understand there are costs to set up the process in-house).

Amalgamation is not the answer, especially when you look at Wellington Water along with Auckland Ci8ty. An in-house organisation should be able to minimise costs. The article talks about modelling, a term which to me conjurs up vast quantities of numbers and tables, most of which become meaningless when faced with practical reality. Of course plans and structures are required, but with an 'in house' organisation 'forearmed is forwarned;, sorry 'forewarned is forearmed'..! Mistakes can be minimused. I do not want to be paying for the other three Councils past, current and future problems. I believe our Council has taken careful steps to be in an excellent state for our water to remain as in Option 3, in the possession of Waitaki District Council.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Leslie McAuley
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	None of the above
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs

Comments

- 1. In-house model allows the council to continue integrating water service delivery, while providing flexibility to adapt.
- 2. Water to remain managed in local control.
- 3. Committing to improvements needed to ensure water services are reliable, sustainable and future proofed.
- 4. Ratepayers value transparency and accountability.
- 5. Places a control on debt borrowing.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Joanna Anderson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency Loss of majority control in decision making - collaboration with other areas results in 100% control to <25% control, held to the decisions of other areas and what decisions work best for their community rather than focusing solely on our community. The cost saving offered does not mitigate loss of control and/or potential liability for other areas in terms of their water schemes.
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Lisa Howard-Sullivan
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency Loss of majority control in decision making - collaboration with other areas results in 100% control to <25% control, held to the decisions of other areas and what decisions work best for their community rather than focusing solely on our community. The cost saving offered does not mitigate loss of control and/or potential liability for other areas in terms of their water schemes.
Comments	
Please see attached	document for detailed responses to each individual question.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Graeme Blackler
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	1
Can not understand t	he logic of teaming up with Gore etc when they are so far away .

Can not understand the logic of teaming up with Gore etc when they are so far away .

Timaru area has been spending a lot on water infrastructure hence the best water in NZ award

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Howard Nigel Selwood
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	That Councils will receieve fair budgets/expensive from overall funding. A pity Mackenzie is not part of SWDW
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Simon B Laming
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Poor performance councils would be able to hide inneficiencies
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Collaboration in a means of councils avoiding having to face their own problems
	directly.

Comments

An internally controlled system would obviously be the best in theory. Most efficient, with the least overheads and shared administration costs. However, our council has shown itself to be so inept in its own processes that a CCO is probably the acceptable option, ASSUMING an efficient organisation is maintained. This is still a worry, , if you look at the lacklustre performance of current CCO's like Whitestone Roading.

Surely this challenge is the time for councils to reset. They are our pipes, it is our water, this is our responsibility. What is the use of further layers of joint administration? Councils love the idea of getting critical mass, and pressuring central government for help. This is "fools thought". One way or another, we all have to pay, whether by our rates or by our taxation. We need to make the choice to fix our own problems with our own money, and get the work done. As a KPI, what percentage of ratepayers dollars actually get spent on implementation, vs planning and compliance (and more planning!)? FULL CREDIT TO WAIMATE DISTRICT FOR THEIR GUTSY DECISION.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Barbara Liffiton
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

While I am on a town supply (Goodwood) this a rural restricted scheme and my waste and storm water are managed onsite. I do have some knowledge of Corriedale Water Management Ltd (CWML) and am impressed with how they are able to provide potable water within the funding they receive through our rates via WDC. I would like to think that any new way of managing our 4 waters is done utilising the knowledge and expertise CWML have in providing potable water that is cost effective, while at the same time they proactively maintain the infrastructure. Like we have seen in health services, I would hate to see much of our money go towards administration rather than actual delivery of service. CWML provide a cost effective service very well which isn't top heavy and we can learn from them.

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Erwin Matheeuwsen
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None of the above!!!!!
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	"Councils working together" is misinformation. A CCO is a commercial company that
	will try to maximise income while minimise costs. This means higher water charges
	than necessary. Four councils working together, where three councils are in severe
	debt and under-investment positions regarding their water facilities, is in no way
	beneficial to WDC.

Comments

Yes, the way Mayor Kircher has misinformed the Waitaki public about this issue in public is a disgrace to himself, his function as the Waitaki mayor and shows nothing but contempt for the Waitaki ratepayers and their intellectual capacities.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	David Wigley
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Unity. it is essential that councilors from each district collaborate and create the vision. "Importantly, we need a vision of the future. From experience, the accuracy of the vision matters less than you might suppose," to quote Richard Hamming science and engineering tutor USA

Comments

Comments:

Infometrics' C.E. Brad Olsen (ODT 5thJune) said "One of the most compelling advantages of SWDW's preferred model was the leap in bargaining power it delivered referring to SWDW's four partner councils — Waitaki, Gore, Central Otago and Clutha district councils....they collectively moved into the fourth-largest position, representing 6.6% of the South Island's population..That shift in scale is transformative," said Mr Olsen.

These four councils represent a population of 84,000. My view is that even greater advantage would be gained by including the additional 63,200 customers of our northern neighbours (Timaru 49,500 plus Waimate 8,200 plus Mackenzie 5,500). Servicing a total population of 147,000.

This expanded, regional group offers a reduction in management costs and yet greater purchasing power. Furthermore, it comes closer to the government's target of 300,000

Whilst council says the door is being left open for enlargement in the future - the time for action is now. Otherwise much of the establishment costs (\$13.8M) will be duplicated. Look at the problems in Health relating back to the multitude of data management systems, still unresolved... LWDW staff will, quite rightly, be resisting yet further change.

In other words the long-term decision must be made before any structural changes get underway. Do it once, do it right.

The future role of AI may be an unknown but we can be certain that both quality and security will be critical. Criteria that may best be achieved by restricting the data boundary to our specific region.

The entire region of Central and North Otago plus South Canterbury is geographically unique, within NZ and internationally. Therefore I propose this region as the boundary of the database/ AI service and therefore of the LWDW.

Council has not pursued Option 4 for reasons given. Having read LWDW proposals issued by Timaru and Waimate I conclude that the latter's preference of going it alone, an internal water service for their 8,200 people, is not going to cross the line with the government.

Of Waimate councilors standing for elections this year, the cost of rates is their main concern, as reported in the Timaru press. ... the election may change council thinking.

Personalities must not be allowed to dictate what is the best long term solution. That decision has to be evidence based.

Waitaki Council needs to state the case to government for the LWDW group servicing a population of 147,000 as the best option to start with and for the long term

Those are my views.

Thank you to those compiling the information.

Thank you to all councilors and staff, and to Mayor Kircher for your Viewpoint in the Oamaru Mail, David Wigley

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru,
	Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Bruce Albiston
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Overall resources/personnel sharing MIGHT provide benefits: entirely dependent on structural relationships without a corporate cost burden!
Concerns	Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

None of the 4 options are ideal nor demonstrably preferable: the constraints of the consultation process is precluding other positive options: a) options 4 + 1 may be shown to be achievable; b) option 2 could be modelled on the sucsessful Waitaki Power or Whitsteone Construction Ltd- both having been predicted to fail on similar arguments to those advanced in this exercise; The constraint of Government demands for a September agreed model are being used as a stick for wrong reasons and an unacceptable outcome: still would be entirely better process to submit a notional solution to DIA on basis that they assist all parties to solutions.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	P A de Reus
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I see no advantage at all to rate payers and or renters. Unless it is an informal combined purchase of items or formal job sharing of part time experts to other councils
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u>, </u>
I do not think that the	council option is viable due to the increased cost.
I also do not like the t	ick box rating system used as I would have only used one box the in house option.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Douglas Carson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Windsor
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Changes in water quality
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Ross Palethorpe
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Wendy Halvorsen
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	I don't see benefits working with councils where the water quality is not at the same
	standard as ours
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	We have already spent substantial money on our water and I don't see combining with
	other councils that are not even our neighbours being beneficial to Waitaki Ratepayers
Comments	
I do not agree with co	mbining with other councils that are not even local!

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	John Halvorsen
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	It will increase costs for all. We will lose our control of our assets.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	
I am opposed to merging with councils that are not our neighbours.	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	David Stone
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Lake Ohau Alpine Village has a perfectly adequate potable water supply. We do not
	need to be shanghaid into what will prove to be a costly joint scheme with another
	layer of bureacracy and no better water. Forget. Instead fit water meters to all uses
	throughout Waikati and chase the cheats and the wasters.

Comments

Yes. As stated above = meter all users residential, commercial, industrial, all agriculture, horticulture etc. and even Council itself. Then charge appropriate but not rapaciously.

We do not need an Auckland style Watercare. BTW water charge is increasing by 7.5% from 1 July! Waitaki should not have to subsidies other District with outdated infrastructure and different users / needs, and as a ratepayer I certainly don't want too.

Quality water is the issue not combining with other Councils. Are they 'wasters', well managed, good sources of water and more? Is it proposed to pump water around? What a waste of power! Whose silly idea was this?

Some will raise the issue of privatisation. Perhaps not but this would be one step towards that happening in the future. Think the UK situation - learn from other Councillors.

Waitaki has plenty of water so long as ECan doesn't continue to over-allocate to farmers etc.

Frankly, the proposal is a cop-out by Council so it can blame another organisation for water failures by it in the past (and future?) = what a muck up was the Lake Ohau Village proposal of about 6 years ago.

Waitaki, do your job and continue to provide quality potable water to all citizens but make all consumers pay a fair price.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Keith Marshall
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None under the current government anointed approaches.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
	1. Potentially reduced priority for local water service vs the other Councils involved.
	2. Additional bureaucracy arising from the additional complexity and interactions.
	3. Less efficient decision-making.

Comments

- 1. Unless Waitaki retains an absolute veto over the combined annual work program of the CCO (whether it comprises four or more/less councils), then in effect the asset will have been gifted to a third party with no controls over maintaining the asset value.
- 2. Unless Waitaki retains a veto over ALL director appointments, then it runs the risk that the board could be dominated by other parties.
- 3. ALL joint ventures succeed or fail based on the controls established at the time of company formation. There are no details of the potential CCO articles of association, nor of its operating constraints. Without those details it is not possible to form a view as to whether the proposed CCO is likely to be successful. Thus, in the absence of that legal detail, it is improper by the current council to take a decision to proceed.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Sonia Callaghan
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Barbara Allen
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Better infrastructure
Concerns	Lack of transparency
Comments Stop think about wha	t your doingwataki needs to join with who are close, budding up with Gore is just to

far away...

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Page 228 Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Name	Bryce Burnett
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Kauru Hill
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	More people to run and administer the proposed system and costing more to the rate payer
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

The model of Whitestone contracting and Network Waitaki are good examples of what could be achieved under a CCO.

The Rural water schemes should be left out of a CCO and run as their own such as Corriedale water. These schemes are looking after water only, and doing this very efficiently, they are also complying with the water authority and doing this very sucessfully.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Martine Conlan
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Nikki OBrien
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Bookie
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	The fact the other Otago councils seem to have done such a poor job in their regions - doesn't inspire confidence in their ability to set up a good CCO. On the other hand, Waimate seems to be a pretty well-run council (in case they decide to team up).
Comments	,
	enging topic and I'm left with a lingering unease that Council might not have been us. I hope that's not actually the case.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	David Duff
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None at all.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

The WDC has gone to exceptional lengths with propaganda to promote their preferred option.

At the Oamaru information evening the speakers reasons for their option 1 were excuses and they were overly defensive to questions from the public.

One reason given for option1 was better purchasing prices - rubbish, all you have to do is communicate with other councils and order at the same time from the preferred supplier. Local businesses do this too.

The cost projections do not prove much as no one knows what prices will be in 5, 10, 15 years time.

The other councils have water problems so why should we get tied in with them. They will push the overheads up and Waitaki will be penalised.

We have to choose option 3 to ensure we look after Waitaki and not get messed around by someone in a corporate office miles away with no care for our community, only his budget.

A business owner knows that it is more cost effective and efficient to do everything "in house". Once you subcontract work out you loose control of the job.

The WDC keeps repeating the maximum they can borrow with their option 1 - I do not believe we have to borrow to the maximum. We should borrow what the ratepayers can afford. The WDC don't understand the rate payers have limited incomes and the compounding rate increases are not affordable. The WDC statement that "Rates will go down" doesn't fool me. I will end up with 2 bills to pay and it will cost me more.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Oscar Smit
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings
Concerns	I don't have concerns about Councils working together in principle, however the particular Councils being promoted as partners in a CCO are not a natural fit. Working with Mackenzie, Waimate, and Timaru makes much more sense geographically, and Waitaki would not be the one doing the heavy subsidising.

Comments

Your consultation document leaves a lot to be desired.

The discussion about rural water supplies ("the fourth water") on p11 does not go anywhere and is barely discussed anywhere else in the document. Why is it included? The only real difference for those supplies is the possible method of water treatment; all other aspects such as better asset management, meeting the requirements of the Water Services Act et cetera are the same as they are for township supplies. And why are Duntroon and Lower Waitaki included in this list? The Duntroon supply is fully restricted, however almost all water goes to residential properties. There are only a handful of connections to farms. It is fully managed by WDC, and it is a very compact supply. Treatment already includes filtration, UV, and chlorination at the water treatment plant. The Lower Waitaki water supply inclusion is somewhat more appropriate, but that supply also has a centralised treatment plant (UV and chlorination), and is directly managed by WDC.

On the response form you have a tick-box for "Stoneburn" and one for "Stoneburn and Bushy Creek". There is no "Stoneburn and Bushy Creek" supply. Stoneburn and Bushy Creek are two separate water supplies separated by approximately 60km as the crow flies. I wonder if the creator of the consultation document could point to either Stoneburn or Bushy Creek on a map?

On p31 you state that the current average annual cost for water supply for a home is \$1,406.45 including GST in the current rating year. This is not correct. The water rate for any individual dwelling on an on-demand supply or receiving 1x unit from any restricted supply or zone (e.g. small townships and lifestyle blocks) is well below \$1,406.45 including GST. The highest rate for a domestic on-demand connection or 1x restricted unit is \$1,182 including GST for the Duntroon supply. The Waihemo water rate is the only other one that exceeds \$1,000 (it is \$1,075) for a single domestic connection or 1x restricted unit. I suspect that whomever was collecting the data simply summed up the number of connected properties and then divided this by the total water rates paid by those properties. The problem with this is that you capture all non-residential properties too, including farms, motels, commercial, and industrial properties, all of which will pay far more for water than an ordinary domestic connection or 1x restricted unit. It's the only way I can think that you've ended up with an average figure that (far) exceeds all the individual water rates for a domestic property anywhere in the district. Perhaps you should have a look on the WDC website. What you are presenting is the average water rate per connected property (including farms, motels et cetera), not per home/dwelling. A filter by District Plan Zone to exclude all properties not zoned Residential, Rural Residential, or Township would have yielded a very different (i.e. correct) answer. There's something similar happening for the average sewer rate currently paid "per home".

On p37 the Timeline shows step 7 as "Establishment of proposed Jointly owned (sic) CCO Water Services Organisation". This sounds very presumptuous, possibly predetermined. Did you mean "Establishment of preferred Water Services Organisation"?

One last thing - most of your Facebook posts include pictures of lakes, river, dams etc. Lovely pictures, showcasing the beauty of our district. But nothing to do with the treatment plans, pipes, pumps, reservoirs et cetera that all this is about. Does the creator of those posts know what all this is about?

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Ian Elliott
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Tokarahi
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	No concerns
Comments	
Councils must work t	ogether, to go it alone is unsustainable

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	Wayne Todd, Lawyer.
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	I oppose the proposed joint venture. I believe that this initiative poses significant risks
	and challenges that could adversely affect our community.
	1. Loss of Local Control
	One of the most concerning aspects of joint ventures is the potential loss of local
	control over essential services. When decision-making power is centralized in a joint
	venture, local governments may find it increasingly difficult to address the unique
	needs and priorities of their constituents. Our community thrives on local engagemen
	and responsiveness, which can be compromised under a joint venture structure.
	2. Increased Costs
	Contrary to the claims of cost savings often associated with joint ventures, evidence
	suggests that these arrangements can lead to increased expenses. Administrative
	overhead, duplication of services, and inefficiencies can quickly outweigh any
	anticipated financial benefits. Our community deserves transparent budgeting and
	accountability, not a system that obscures financial realities.
	3. Lack of Transparency and Accountability Joint ventures often operate with less
	transparency than traditional local governance. This lack of openness can breed
	distrust among community members and hinder effective oversight. Ratepayers
	should have the right to access information and hold decision-makers accountable fo
	their actions. A joint venture may create barriers that prevent this essential
	engagement.
	4. Inequitable Service Distribution
	The complexities of managing services across multiple jurisdictions can lead to
	inequitable service distribution. Each Council may have differing priorities and needs,
	resulting in conflicts over resource allocation. This can leave some areas underserved
	and diminish the quality of services that residents rely on.
	5. Negative Impact on Local Economies
	Local contractors and businesses may suffer as a result of joint ventures, particularly
	if larger, non-local entities are favoured in service delivery. This could undermine our
	local economy and stifle opportunities for growth and development within our
	community.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

235

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10

Mrs J de Reus	
Individual	
Oppose	
No	
Oamaru	
I, strongly, do not support a joint council-controlled organisation	
Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency	
I did not want to rank the other 3 choices: this muddies the water and is not necessary. The mayor's statement the he will decide what is best for the Waitaki district is opinionated.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Belinda Brown
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I remain unconvinced that it will be done materially better or cheaper
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Stranded overheads not being netted off potential savings and by working together and
	leaving a residual council we will be creating the catalyst for amalgamation of councils

Comments

This consultation process has appeared very biased right from the beginning. It failed to analyse the other alternatives properly. The preferred option doesn't look far enough into the future and consider the flow on effects for local government in general. The future of councils as we know balancing on this decision is understated and the fear created around breaching of debt headroom seems overstated based off the 30 year projection released by council themselves.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Patsy Johnston
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	
I don't want to take or	n any other Councils debt, and we lose control over our own water supply

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Barry Johnston
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None lose control
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	
To keep ownership of	our own water and be in control for spending

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Catherine Harvey
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Inability of councils to work together in a way that benefits all users fairly.
Comments	

Trust the best long term choice will be made with consideration given to the feedback from those that foot the bill and depend on a continued supply of adequate water from the Waitaki and other North Otago river catchments.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Paul Bryant
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	No benefit, keep in house
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Christine Quested
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Awamoko
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Lesley Jackson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	I see no benefits that are worth losing local control for.
Concerns	Loss of local control
Concerns	Loss of local control

Comments

Option 1 moves us further away from our voices as rate-payers being heard due to more layers of bureaucracy being buffered against us. Option 1 is just another way to creep towards central govt control (as was 3-waters) Im not in favour of central government control - including the issue of fluoridation of water supplies (banned in western European and some other developed countries)

Question 12. Q3 is a loaded question which I chose not to answer.

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	S Lawrence
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	<u>I</u>
I Am a oamaru rate pa	ayer
Loss of local control with option one	
Dogy finaancial with option one	

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Judy Piner
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	Improved water quality, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency

Comments

Water meters: Essential for each household to ensure as far as possible, fair payment for water used. Also, as a means to monitor leakage

As a means to encourage care of responsible water usage.

Make readily and easily accessed, information about harvesting rainwater & recycling grey water where appropriate. Especially using water butts - where to buy new and suggestions about repurposing plastic tanks and drums etc - Ideas on constructing simple systems cost effectively - Using harvested water wisely (drip irrigation systems etc)

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Leov Lealand
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	Better infrastructure
	Maybe better infrastructure but considering the neglect Palmerston suffers - I don't
	expect more - We likely will get a lot less.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	I'm concerned that the 'Ltd Companies" being set up in local govt can be sold to
	private equity companies to be asset stripped at our expense - NZ Rail

Comments

Comments made against option 1 - BUT protected from sale to P Equity

Comments made against Option 2 - But protected from sale!!

My opinion as a company direction is that the "Business units" formed or being created are going to be a quick & dirty way to put our natural assets up for sale to private equity or other interestes - Likely from other countries.

NZ Rail is a prime example of how selling a public asset to foreign companies benefits NZ - It does not. I see nothing in all this discussion that protects NZ rate payers from losing complete control of our water resources to the highest bidder. Please show me protections in the legislation that prevent this! I bet there aren't any.

Once sold off we will be at the mercy of the owners and there won't be a better way and cheaper way - Just the way that makes the most \$\$ for whoever owns the "business unit".

Palmerston could be an awesome town but poor decisions - re selling of public buildings, unnecessarily poor drainage, to the nearby river and infrastructure neglect mean that it is under performing in an era where new people lie us want to see it go ahead and succeed.

How is any of this new water plan going to help Palmerston specifically? Unclear.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Laurie Cain
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

I don't believe that the council is pushing the best option. We already have see what happened with network waitaki in it's joint operation that didn't work.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Hilary Plunket
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	I am required to answer this question before I can move on but potentially i can see
	real benefits
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
	I am concerned that such a model may lead eventually to the sale of the company as
	has happened in the United Kingdom with the result that water quality and delivery is
	dramatically degraded in pursuit of dividends for shareholders

Comments

I am a Christchurch resident but an Oamaru ratepayer. I am concerned that the council's preferred option has the potential to add layers of bureaucracy eg. forming a company with a chief executive and a board and all the attendant costs that go with that before any real work to upgrade the water systems has even begun. My concern about the significant increase of costs is matched by my concern that once a company is formed the possibilty of the sale of that company will lead to the degrading of the systems in the pursuit of profits to pay shareholder dividends.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Russell Quinn
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
	More bureaucracy and more debt
Comments	
None	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Ian Hurst
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Lower Waitaki
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs

Comments

I thank Councilors, advisors, and consultants, for the detailed information that has been presented before our community regarding the complex and vitally important matter re: the future for our water services. I recognize and appreciate that there has been extensive work gone into the "Preferred CCO Option", and that the decision for the future may be well advanced.

However, I need to record my views on this matter, because I am seriously concerned about the proposed option choice.

I support the "In House" option.

It is critically important that we get the decision regarding ownership and management structures right for the future growth, development and affordability of our region.

After 7 decades of living within the Waitaki district, I view our most valued regional asset is the access to, reliability of, and quality of our water, for its multiple uses.

We presently have a delivery system to our urban boundary, that is of international standard in both consistency, governance and cost effectiveness, independently run by the Lower Waitaki Irrigation Company.

I fully understand that the delivery of high-quality potable water is only part of the Southern Water Done Well proposal, and we are required to consider the future of wastewater and storm water management.

It is my firm belief, that responsibility for the future of managing each of these divisions, should fall into the hands of our local community elected officials.

- # As a community, I consider we have an inherent responsibility to manage our infrastructures, in a manner that leads by example, taking full responsibility for its implementation and execution to a high standard of excellence.
- # We should not be delegating this responsibility to a minority, part owned, CCO, that includes parties who have different and much more complex infrastructure requirements to that of our region.
- # We have decades of experience and intellectual knowledge inhouse, that have taken responsibly for the day-to-day management
- of our existing schemes, and this should not be underestimated or undervalued.

The challenge, complexity, and cost of transferring this intellectual knowledge to a new, centralized, off-site operation, should be viewed with great caution.

- # History shows us that we have and can managed these schemes, on our own, within our ability to afford same.
- # It has been presented that getting increased levels of future debt and operational costs off the WDC financials for reporting purposes, is attractive.

I would encourage caution.

The reality is, any proportion of debt sitting inside a proposed CCO will sit against each shareholding Council, as a contingent liability, or an auditors note on the Balance Sheet. It remains debt.

The establishment of a new bureaucratic body, isolated from our community, of which we are a minority shareholder, and hoping that it will cater for the specific daily demands required buy our residents is concerning.

The Waitaki District has a chance to stand tall, and say that as a community, we are going to take responsibility for our supply, distribution, and disposal of all water related issues and lead by example. This is a critical infrastructure management opportunity that surely is one of the reasons we have Councils representing our people, to do just that, in an affordable and accessible manner.

I appreciate the opportunity to express my views.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Lindsay Eagle
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

I am a Christchurch resident and an Oamaru ratepayer. I think that the council's preferred option will create an additional layer of overpaid executives, with limited direct accountability. The potential for disastrous privatisation, where profit rules above service, is all too evident.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Hamish Carswell
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	None.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

I would like to see complete transparency for Waitaki District Rate Payers on this issue. It is an absolute must that rate payers have speaking rights to their submission. There needs to be total accountability for decisions made on this matter by council. There is no logical or sound reason why the Waitaki District Council should want to align with Clutha District, Gore District and Southland Districts particularly when Mr Kircher and Mr Cadogan were asked recently by The Southland District Mayor, Rob Scott to show and convince him of the benefits of amalgamation and were unable to do so. It would also be totally irresponsible to align with the Gore and Clutha districts that have such excessive debt levels.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Glenys Robinson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs

Comments

Please take note of what the community tells you about this. By stating your preferred option you appear to have already made the decision, which is not at all the way democracy is supposed to work. In my opinion, the logical joint venture would be with Waimate as we share the massive resource of the Waitaki River.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Yanic (Yannick) Servole
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	This question is rude. It assumes I agree with councils working together. I don't.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

My address might be in Lyttelton but I have been a rate payer in Oamaru for over 10 years.

I believe in protecting our local social assets from the likely chance that future councils will seek to sell assets like water into private ownership.

I oppose the setting up of a council owned business to manage water. It is a step in the direction of selling our assets.

Once a product like water is in private ownership there is no control over quality, quantity, availability, and cost to the end user.

Thank you.

Y Servole

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Wayne Murphy
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	There are no demonstrable benefits
Concerns	Multiple reasons
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Lisa Mathieson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure, Enhanced sustainability
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Kerry
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Cost savings, Better infrastructure
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Wayne Simpson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Improved water quality, Cost savings
Concerns	Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Kate Murcott
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Kauru Hill
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	I am yet to understand how costs will be saved other than remuneration of those required to run a standalone business being split between multiple councils.
Concerns	Loss of local control That our elected councillors will have no ability to represent us due to the leadership sitting separate to our local council. We are a rural water scheme that is well managed by local people, if we join with other areas that are unfamiliar with our systems and area then this adds cost and delays in issues we may face. Concern regarding the ability for increased lending under a separate organisation, while this MAY speed up infrastructure upgrades it is still debt that our district is required to pay back.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	A E Denham
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Stoneburn
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Nic Ruddenklau
Individual or	Organisation
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Charlie
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Stoneburn and Bushy Creek
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	StanRandle
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	As a consequence of a restructuring of the core services delivery the current role of the Council and its structure is revisited as is the election of Councillors and even the Role of a Mayor .
Concerns	My concern is that the cost benefit analysis which strongly advices that the Rate
	Payers select the water done well proposal is via a group of Councils working together is based on very tenuous assumptions . The assumptions stated:
	1. An increase in scale of Rate Payers select the Numbers from 1%/2% of Sth Island population to 6% presumingly gaining superior contracting negotiating power; accessing superior quality skilled staff; and superior funding access. Then supposedly compounding that if "More the Merrier Councils occurred" even greater superior negotiating power/even greater superior skilled staff/ even greater superior funding and outstanding leverage would be achieved. Mr Olson Chief executive of Infometrics not only a 20% saving on 'Stand Alone" predicted costing but even greater gains beyond his initial 20% savings predictions. Translating the above super gains into dollars Morrison-Low predict savings of \$44 Million over 10 years while Mr Olson predicts \$82 Million. So the first consideration is: If these experts are confident that their economic savings over the 10 year upgrade construction period are accurate to +/- the nearest \$1 million then there must be a strong case to integrate the other two essential services of Roading and Waste Management thereby meeting the core services that Councils were created in
	the first place. Further considering the special case for "Storm Water" being such a relatively trivial matter for Central Otago lying in the Rain Shadow of the Southern Alps then the Proposed 'Three Waters' could be reclassified down to 'Two Waters'. With the Super Duper gains as described by the Experts —-Morrison-Low;—Olson of Info-metrics—-Andrew Strahan SWDW Project Leader then a unique opportunity exists to create and reestablish a super efficient Organisation focused on the core services that the Rate Paying Public are funding. Extraneous services desired by the Rate Payers can be completely renegotiated

Comments

It would be very helpful if the "Experts" particularly Mr Olson would also complete the Southern Water Done Well rank list by presenting his costing for each and indicating the basis of his predicted savings that results in a \$82 M saving

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

264

Name	Bart Geypen
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	None
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
Let's hope the counci	l listens to the ratepayers for once

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Nivonne Schultz
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs

Comments

The Council's preferred model is a slippery slope towards less local control in decision-making that impacts our community.

This is the main reason I oppose it.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	G.A.MINTY
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	Do not see any benefits to ratepayers.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency

Comments

The Morrison Low model predicts water charges that are very close in pricing across the options you have given us. Therefore ,the in-House Business model is my preferred choice as it gives the WDC authority on behalf of the ratepayers and will also save the WDC millions of dollars in setup costs. Regards

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	John Schultz
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Alison MacTavish
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
	See uploaded submission
Comments	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation

Name	John (Jock) Webster
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	I don't see why the above improvements could not be made with local control.
Concerns	Loss of local control

Comments

Waitaki Water Submission.

I have lived and worked in this region for over 50 years.

I was chairman of North Otago Irrigation Company from 1992 till 2007 and executive chairman during the construction of stage 1.

I fully understand the critical nature of local input.

I cannot understand why the WDC is so keen to become part of a group of other councils to manage water within our region.

These other areas have little in common with our region.

Big is not always beautiful.

You don't need to be big to get better pricing -just smarter.

There has been countrywide opposition to the introduction of "three waters" and it has been discarded. I believe that the mini three waters being proposed by the council should be given the same treatment - be

discarded. John Webster.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Annah Evington
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	I have not seen any substantiated evidence of cost savings benefits so far. The 'consultation document' seems to consist of estimates and arbitrary projections, none of which have been backed up with any actual transparency around calculations used for these estimations. No-one knows with any confidence whether it would cost customers more or less by establishing this regional company. But the consultation document pretends that it does. In the December, 2024 report, MorrisonLow, the WDC's own consultant, observed (p. 2) that a WDC in-house unit alone would have lower water charges (collected through rates) than the average charges that would be levied by a regional company. The difference is substantial— about \$1000 per year per customer by 2038. MorrisonLow noted in this report (and again in March 2025) that "price harmonisation," or setting water charges the same throughout the regional company, is a likely objective for a regional company. It would seem that this forecast didn't make WDC happy, so MorrisonLow produced a new report in March, 2025 which assumed that different water charges would be levied for each district. However, MorrisonLow felt it necessary to state: "we consider that it is likely that a Southern WSE will, over time, seek to move towards a pricing model where there is a consistent price for the same level of service received." (p. 29) This was accompanied by a chart that showed WDC in-house charging about \$500 per year less than the regional company by 2030. (p. 30). So the claim in the consultation document of "much higher water bills" for in-house is contradicted by WDC's own consultant. The possibility that the regional company would actually be the more costly option is concealed from the readers of the consultation document. But a close reading of MorrisonLow's March report reveals that the projection of the regional company charges is based on the arbitrary assumption that its operation would be 12% more
	efficient than in-house operation (p. 50).
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

I absolutely object to being forced to 'rank your preferred options for the future delivery of water services and maintaining and renewing infrastructure' in this previous section. Having to give a ranking for anything other than the in-house option infers that i would favour these when i reject these options.

I do not believe that WDC has been transparent in this process and i believe that the set-up costs for a CCO are costs that have not been fully explored or explained to ratepayers.

We cannot continue to borrow beyond our means and the notion of transferring the water infrastructure costs to a separate entity that we will not have control over, without knowing even what the set-up costs are, or without being able to have a say in future borrowings and spending, being made, is cavalier to say the least.

Asking us to accept that the transfer of responsibility for water infrastructure borrowing will allow WDC to increase it's level of borrowing, is worrying. A determined and ongoing lack of transparency has been a notable practice with this council for some years.

A multi-sports event stadium that, under cover of darkness, became a netball stadium without viable facilities for other large events but requires a substantial increase in ratepayer funding support and we pay enormous annual operating costs anyone?

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Katrina Ramsay
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u> </u>

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Tony Ramsay
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Changes in water quality, Lack of transparency
Comments	<u>I</u>

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Sven Thelning
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Maybe lower costs as best as the modelling can predict given significant assumptions,
	but could this be negated by high debt servicing, 8-12% (FFO) surplus requirement,
	and expiration of harmonisation in ten years or so?
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	It appears there will be stranded overheads at council - what is the intention to
	mitigate this?
	Unclear modelled benefit differential - the South Cant'y proposal hasn't been as well
	researched but it appears to be at least as good, and possibly better but limited time
	has been given as a reason not to put equal effort into developing this option. Why not
	put equal effort into researching this option?
	One reason given for amalgamation of water services is attracting and retaining
	specialist people. Has any consideration been given to developing these skills locally
	to retain/attract these quality jobs in the stand alone CCO/business unit models?
	Perhaps they could be hired out to other councils as needed?
	With the 500% debt ceiling for the CCA there will be a higher debt loading on
	ratepayers once they are also customers when combined with the existing council
	debt ceiling. The end cost of the entire work schedule once accrued interest costs are
	included risks losing customers. Sourcing more rain water, surface water and bore
	water will be more attractive to rural customers. Has any potential loss of revenue
	through the effects of supply and demand been considered?

Comments

Should other council services be amalgamated under the same model?

Has consideration been given to the quality of the asset database? There are known discrepancies between the map of the services vs the actual location. Often the discrepancies are institutional knowledge held by individuals. What is the risk of losing individuals during the restructure/re-establishment?

Has council reviewed asset management, depreciation and condition of other services to proactively assess if other services may also be forced to amalgamate with other councils, or submit plans?

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Alan Gibson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	The above all Hyperthetical
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
Comments	
This survey has a mischievous loading implication . Confusing rather than intuitive.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Lindsay and Sue Smith
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency
Comments	
No to Joint Councils	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	James White
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Reduced local control; operational complexity due to varied infrastructure and geography; potential for cross-subsidisation creep despite assurances otherwise. Internationally, smaller, community-owned utilities (e.g. in Denmark*, Germany) often outperform large regionalised models in customer satisfaction and leakage reduction. The preferred SWDW model distances decision-making from local ratepayers. Over time, pressures from partner councils may lead to pricing harmonisation or decisions that do not align with Waitaki-specific needs. Waitaki's infrastructure differs significantly from that of Gore or Central Otago (e.g. pipe sizes, treatment systems, rural schemes). A regionally aggregated entity must reconcile these variances at cost, potentially eroding efficiency claims. Though the SWDW model allows higher borrowing, it also exposes Waitaki to shared liabilities. While the Southern Water Done Well joint CCO presents theoretical cost savings, these are contingent on assumptions that do not adequately account for: the bespoke needs of the Waitaki network, the risks of reduced local control, and the historical underestimation of regional integration costs.

Comments

Option 5: Network Waitaki

A fifth option is the use of Network Waitaki, a successful, community-owned utility operator based in Oamaru, to deliver three waters services solely for the Waitaki District. This would form a new water services CCO managed by Network Waitaki Trust, which already provides trusted, customer-facing electricity distribution and services.

Rationale:

Local Governance: Network Waitaki is a community trust, democratically governed, with a strong reputation for responsiveness and reliability.

Existing Capacity: It has asset management, digital systems (SCADA, metering), supply chain logistics, customer service infrastructure, and a workforce capable of adapting to three waters.

Cost Efficiency: Retains local spend, eliminates regional subsidy risks, and avoids costs of cross-district coordination.

Scalability: Could subcontract technical services where needed (e.g. treatment plant management) while retaining local operational control.

WDC should undertake a formal feasibility study into enabling Network Waitaki to operate water services for the Waitaki District—either as a standalone provider (preferred) or as the delivery model underpinning Option 2.

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled
	Organisation
Second Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

278

Name	Helen & John Beckingsale
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	•

First Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury – Timaru,
	Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Second Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water

Name	Kirsty Williamson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control
Comments	
Not at this stage	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Dugald MacTavish
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	Only as separte entities for technical sharing, coodination and perhaps cost savings but that is not the most important thing. The most sustainable water system option is a self-organizating local council as water systems need to be considered in the context of all the other local government responsibilities.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Lack of transparency I think that there are areas where Councils can and should work together - like sharing experts for economy and sharing purcurment - but that does not require the formation of a separate combined entity. And while this current water law prevents privatization and Councils retain a level of direction, governments can change laws in an instant and as CCOs are one step removed from Councils they are much easier to privatize hence forth. Reasons for opposing privatization are given at the end of this submission

Comments

Forcing the submitter to declare a second, third and forth preference when they may not prevents the submitter expressing what they may wish. To that extent its not a true reflection of individual opinion and, particularly if an STV method of analysis is used, preferences expressed on options do not accurately represent public opinion.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Lindsay Currie
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

Note 1

'Modelling' has mostly proven disastrous at best in recent times. When questioned about the inner details of the WDC's 'preferred' option, no one in your team can provide any detailed responses. Only repeating the prepared information.

Your presentations and projections are actually flawed in many respects. Presenting a jumble of graphs is meaningless to most.

You have no real ability in answering viable questions in a cohesive, understandable manner, often preferring to publicly shut down very good questions as 'misinformation'.

The Mayors performance and his attitude towards the public is disgraceful.

The Council has made public assurances that at no point can the Local Water Asset be sold because there is 'legislation in place to prevent the sale of these assets'.

Reality - legislation can change overnight! This whole government endorsed and pushed water issue, possibly has only been legislated in recent years. Legislation comes and goes at the behest of government, politicians and BIG BUSINESS interest on a regular basis.

As the elected council, your first priority is to the local ratepayers and population. NOT central government. Pushing your 'preferred option' is only an extension of government agenda. Can you not 'think outside the square'?

I can only assume by the urgency apparent, that the WDC Mayor and Councillors (no doubt some will have stood up against this) have somehow succumbed to some form of indoctrination - and don't know it! Or, does your CEO actually have absolute control over the Mayor & Councillors?

You have virtually become in recent times a de facto 'government administrator'.

Shameful - we are supposed to be living in a democracy. You are servants of the Waitaki Community - NOT wellington.

Note 2

Benefits - I can see no benefit to the people of Waitaki in regards to our water..

You have made mention of 'shared resources' and 'better purchasing power'. Why isn't that done already? Councils don't have to be 'joined at the hip' to share information.

The lack of proper business acumen shown by the WDC in the recent past is very disturbing.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	W.M. White
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	None of the above are guaranteed.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency

Comments

I want an inhouse business unit because it offers local control, and the best longterm solution to NOT allowing our water assets to be SOLD.

The councils preferred option is based on modelling where the figures could be wildly inaccurate, and the setup and bureaucracy costs are mind boggling.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	P.B. Plunket
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	Potentially none of the above are guaranteed with S.W.D.W
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Set-up costs and bureaucratic costs especially with the second layer of governorship.

Comments

The first comment to make is that there probably needs to be, and there possibly is, some acceptance across the community that water delivery, waste water removal and treatment, and stormwater removal, together are going to require rates increases and some other sorts of funding. Charging for water via water metering, with some allowances, some form of charging for waste water, and the same for stormwater, perhaps based on the hard surface areas of individual properties.

All through the document "Southern Water Done Well" are statements where the opposite may be equally true.

The Mayor states on page 6 "We simply don't have all of the expertise or resources to manage future requirements on our own". We managed in the past. A large upgrade on the Reservoir Road Water Treatment Plant was completed sometime in the 2010's and before that the major major upgrade to the wastewater system that changed our disposal system from direct to the sea only semi-treated to a land-based treated system. That at the time was a major project and was funded as I recall by several options of which one was to pay three instalments over three years.

On page 16 for instance, in support of Option 1 (your preferred option), it is stated, "We could improve water infrastructure faster and more efficiently by developing a smart funding strategy and accelerating investment." However there isn't actually a requirement for this to happen in reality, slowing the work down and planning it over a longer period of time would ease the financial burden on ratepayers.

On Page 18 under the heading Ownership it is stated that "Legislation prevents assets from being privatised." There is always the possibility that legislation can be changed at some point in the future. Any water C.C.O would be a prime target for privatisation as utility companies are attractive to investors because of their steady income stream.

There are other statements in this document where the opposite could equally be true but I don't have the time or energy to document them because A) It looks very much like the council has already made it's decision and regardless of public opinion there will be no change. B) I think there is a likelihood that this submission won't even actually be read and if by chance it is it won't be by anyone with any responsibility for decision making.

There is however one statement that is irrefutably correct on Page 19 where the downsides of the preferred Option 1 are discussed. The statement "Establishing a jointly owned C.C.O to serve multiple locations will be complex and expensive." estimates are around \$13.8 million for a jointly owned C.C.O as an estimate this figure could change with a good likelihood that it could be larger rather than less. Any sum like this, even shared around the councils, is a large figure and this is before a sod is turned in the ground. I appreciate Option 3 has additional financial costs, particularly due to regulatory obligations, but, in part, the systems within council exist to support an in-house business unit. For example we already have a C.E.O. who oversees the water department that exists and this must be in his/her existing job description. In the section "Money Matters" on page 31 there is section headed "Whats the cheapest option?" The cheapest option involving anything is often not the best option and occasionally turns out not to be the cheapest option in the long term. My rates to the year 30 June 2025 are \$3524.87. With the recently struck increase of 9.74%, then the projected rise of 6.5%, then a decrease of 16.11%, projected my rates should be about \$3457. If you add the figures from Morrison Low modelling to that figure, Option 1 gives a total cost of \$5665 whereas the Option 3 figure is \$5726 which is a difference of 1.07%. An insignificant increase compared to the risk to the ratepayer of the C.C.O. options.

In our Southern District, the Dunedin, Invercargill, and Waimate District Councils have chosen to stay with the in-house models of business units. I am aware that there are also other councils throughout the country that have chosen to keep their water services in-house.

The Waitaki District Councils consultants Morrison Low in their report favour a jointly owned C.C.O. and this finding has been recently supported by Brad Olsen from Infometrics.

The above three mentioned councils however must have taken independent advice to reach their decisions which seems to suggest that you could get advice to support any of the options depending on which consultant you used. Which is the best option. The relative heavyweights, Dunedin and Invercargill City Councils and the potential minnow Waimate .D.C have chosen in house business units. Which option is the best.

I think the Council would be acting in the best interest of the ratepayers by choosing Option 3.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Third Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Margaret Currie
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	Note 2
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	Note 1

Comments

Note 1

Well, we have been implored by the Mayor and Councillors to attend the recent Oamaru 'Water Done Well' meeting 'with an open mind'.

As that meeting progressed it was very obvious that the Mayor especially wanted us to only have an open mind on the WDC's 'preferred option'.

He went out of his way to rant a virtually non-understandable patter, supported by the which is pretty much the same being spouted elsewhere. He has learnt his lines well.

Gary did not hesitate to reply some questioners with a not very nice diatribe — like 'how dare you ask such questions'. Almost an aggressive attitude. What then hell has got into the Mayor when he does this? I can only surmise the Mayor has real pressures pushing him from somewhere?

Jim Hopkins — Jim is what I class as a respected councillor, very experienced. However, as his presentation (the usual graphs and practised dialogue) in progress, when he went to give us the detail of the next section on the screen, he pointed out he 'didn't know enough about that' (or something similar), and decided not to proceed. And these councillors are expected to vote and make the decision for the people?

I would question, what the councillors have been doing over the last months if they don't know about all aspects of the 'Option One'?

How do you expect us the public to get a proper grasp of the often vague aspects? There's a lot of 'modelling' and 'predictions'. Chrystal ball stuff at best.

'Modelling' has mostly proven disastrous at best in recent times. When questioned about the inner details of the WDC's 'preferred' option, no one in your team can provide any detailed responses. Only repeating the prepared information.

A presentation of graphs have become meaningless to most people. Actual detail is thin on the ground. Shutting viable questions down as 'misinformation' is disgraceful. The Mayors performance and his attitude towards the public is disgraceful.

The Council has made public assurances that at no point can the Local Water Asset be sold because there is 'legislation in place to prevent the sale of these assets'.

Reality — legislation can change overnight Cr Jim Hopkins!

As the elected council, your first priority is to the local ratepayers and population. NOT central government. Pushing your 'preferred option' is only an extension of government agenda.

You have virtually become in recent times a de facto 'government administrator'.

Shameful — we are supposed to be living in a democracy. You are servants of the Waitaki Community — NOT wellington. Not the UN Agenda. (and NO, I am not a conspiracy theorist, our own government is party to the UN 2030 Agenda)

Note 2

Benefits — I can see no benefits to the people of Waitaki.

The only benefits are perhaps only quite a few higher salaried jobs and the never ending junkets councils are addicted to.

You have made mention of 'shared resources' and 'better purchasing power'. Why isn't that done already? The lack of proper business acumen shown by the WDC in the past is disturbing.

The huge projected borrowing is the worst outcome possible for the future. Certainly not a 'benefit'. I am appalled at the ease the Mayor and council wants to borrow more funds.

The WDC as a whole needs the input of real life business folk to sort out the inefficiencies and financial wastage of the entire organisation. Get out of dream world and into the real world.

Your current CEO seems quite incapable of this.

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Lisa Howard-Sullivan
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	See attached document.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	See attached document.
Comments	
Please see attached document for detailed responses to each individual question.	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern
	Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South Canterbury –
	Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils

Name	Janice Maree Wheeler
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	Higher Costs for 3 Waters and NO BENEFITS! from JCCO.
Concerns	Loss of local control, Increased costs, Lack of transparency
	See attachment
Comments	
See attachment	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Andy McKeown
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Yes
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No benefits	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Bruce McNab
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Didn't answer
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Unsure
Ward	Didn't answer
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No benefits with these Councils, may be different with stronger Councils	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Elizabeth Jenny Morrow
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Yes
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Evelyn Zena Webb
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
None	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Gregory James Wilson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No benefits	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Health New Zealand
Individual or	Organisation
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Didn't answer
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Other
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
Didn't answer	

First Choice	
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10 Page 297

Name	Federated Farmers
Individual or	Organisation
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Didn't answer
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Didn't answer
Ward	Didn't answer
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
Didn't answer	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Howard Nigel Selwood
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Support
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No benefits	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10 Page 299

Name	Irene Lawton-Sharpe
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Jane Metcalfe
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	Yes
Ward	Ahuriri
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No benefits	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	John and Julie Morrow
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
no	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Kelvin Taylor
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Didn't answer
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Corriedale
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
Didn't answer	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Laurette Robinson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Didn't answer
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
Didn't answer	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	Option 4: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with South
	Canterbury – Timaru, Mackenzie and Waimate district councils
Fourth Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done
	Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils

Name	Mel Watson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
Didn't answer	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Neville Bartrum
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No benefits	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Debbie Brunton
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No advantage working with other Councils	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Duncan Taylor
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Jennifer Hopkinson
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No benefits	

First Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Robert Rayner Fox
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Neutral
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No	

First Choice	Option 1: A Jointly owned Council Controlled Organisation with Southern Water Done Well – Gore, Clutha and Central Otago district councils
Second Choice	Option 2: A Stand-alone Council Controlled Organisation
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Susan and Larry Maxwell
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Oamaru
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Name	Vanessa Barsby
Individual or	Individual
Organisation	
Support or Oppose	Oppose
Collaboration	
between Councils	
Rural Supply	No
Ward	Waihemo
Benefits	
Concerns	
Comments	
No	

First Choice	Option 3: In-house business unit to deliver water
Second Choice	
Third Choice	
Fourth Choice	

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10 Page 313

Item 4.1 - Attachment 10 Page 314