

# INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT OF WATER SERVICES WORKSHOP

Wednesday, 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2001

## **Attendance:**

<b>Teri Puketapu</b>	<i>Te Runanganui</i>	<b>Matiu Rei</b>	<i>Ngati Toa</i>
<b>Tim Davin</b>	<i>Porirua City Council</i>	<b>Dave Benham</b>	<i>Wellington Regional Council</i>
<b>Stuart Duncan</b>	<i>Hutt City Council</i>	<b>Stephen Garlick</b>	<i>Hutt City Council</i>
<b>Andrew McKenzie</b>	<i>Wellington City Council</i>	<b>Holden Hohaia</b>	<i>Wellington City Council</i>
<b>Paul Rogers</b>	<i>Wellington City Council</i>	<b>Anna Ross</b>	<i>Wellington City Council</i>

## **Apologies**

**Liz Mellish**                      *Tenths Trust*

		<b>ACTION</b>
1	<p><b>Welcome &amp; Introduction</b></p> <p>Stuart Duncan welcomed the group and gave a brief overview of the resolutions of the Hutt City and the Wellington City Council's on Water Integration. Stuart highlighted that both Councils had resolved to work together to develop revised options to achieve integration of water services. This will involve building on the work to date including the outcomes of the public consultation process. The involvement of the other Councils in the Wellington area in this process would be welcomed.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Workshop Objectives</b></p> <p>The following workshop objectives were reviewed and agreed by the group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To review initiatives to date to integrate water services in the Wellington area</li> <li>▪ To set out a process for progressing the integrated management of water services</li> <li>▪ To agree a project objective</li> <li>▪ To consider criteria</li> <li>▪ To set out options</li> <li>▪ To agree next steps</li> </ul>	

3. **Iwi Perspective**

Teri Puketapu addressed the workshop on behalf of Te Runanganui o Taranaki Whanui ki te Upoko o Te Ika a Maui. Issues that were of particular importance to the Runanganui were:

- Iwi involvement at governance level in the provision of water services
- Consideration of Treaty Principles in any proposals for change.
- Avoidance of cross subsidies between the Cities (eg expenditure for renewing new pipelines). Ring fencing of particular costs such as and sewage plants (Hutt City & Clearwater).
- Savings/efficiencies must be achieved by integrated management.
- Iwi involvement “on the way through” the process of developing any proposal for change. Replicate the level of involvement in the Hutt Valley Drainage Project.
- Minimise the mixing and diverting of water flows within the realms of legislation.

Matiu Rei addressed the workshop on behalf of Ngati Toa Rangatira. Issues that were of particular importance to the Ngati Toa were:

- That any integrated management arrangement must not be vulnerable to be captured by interest groups (eg the anti fluoridation lobby)
- That a seamless service is provided from the community perspective (ie persons contacting their Council with water services issues should not be referred onwards to a separate service provider).
- Contracting out activities is acceptable in principle as long as control and responsibility is maintained by the Councils.
- The criteria for evaluating an option must be acceptable to all parties.
- WRC could be an existing “vehicle” that could be used to achieve integrated management of water services.
- Public access to water services and the water service providers must not be compromised.
- Community perceptions of what is being proposed are all important not sufficient to

	<p>have solution Councils believe is acceptable – need to ensure community fully understand what is proposed).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public Health and hygiene will continue to be an issue eg fluoridation.</li> <li>▪ Iwi involvement “on the way through” the process of developing any proposal for change but not at the very detailed level.</li> </ul> <p>The Wellington Tenth Trust was unable to attend and had sent their apologies.</p>	
4	<p><b>Background to Water Integration</b></p> <p>Stephen Garlick gave a synopsis of the past Water Integration projects.</p> <p>Since 1987 there have been five projects, which without exception have indicated that there is scope for significant efficiencies in the way water services are provided.</p> <p>In June 2001 the Wellington Regional Council resolved not to proceed with the Wellington Regional Council/Wellington City Council/Hutt City Council integrated trust proposal. This proposal could not proceed further as it was based on participation by all three Councils.</p> <p>Wellington City Council and Hutt City Council subsequently resolved to work together to develop revised options to achieve integration of water services which would as far as practical address the concerns expressed during the consultation process on the integrated trust proposal. This will involve building on the work to date including the outcomes of the public consultation process. The involvement of the other Councils in the Wellington area in this process would be welcomed.</p> <p>The Trust proposal and past proposals have taught us that there is support in principle for Integrated management of water services. Through Council resolutions, consultation with the public and Iwi, there is a number of stakes in the ground that give us a base to work from – we don’t need to square one.</p>	
5	<p><b>Proposed Process</b></p> <p>Andrew McKenzie advised that the WCC and HCC intend to adopt a co-operative process for developing a proposal to achieve the integrated management of water</p>	

	<p>services in the Wellington Metropolitan area, involving Iwi and the participating Councils.</p> <p>The proposed process is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree Project Objectives.</li> <li>2. Agree Criteria.</li> <li>3. Agree Options – Structural / Legal considerations.</li> <li>4. High Level Evaluation – Structural Options.</li> <li>5. Detailed Evaluation – Shortlist options evaluated against Legal options.</li> <li>6. Preferred Option reached – this option is refined in detail.</li> </ol> <p>Wellington City and Hutt City Councils have requested the officer's report back on the preferred proposal in February 2002.</p>	
6	<p><b>Project Objectives</b></p> <p>Paul Rogers outlined the draft project objective which is:</p> <p><i>“To jointly develop a revised proposal to achieve greater co-operation and integration in the management of water services in the Wellington area, which meets criteria defined by the participating Councils and addresses the issues raised during the public consultation process and by Iwi on the integrated water services trust proposal.”</i></p> <p>The workshop group felt the draft objective didn't fully represent the intent of the Councils and the project. It was agreed that this objective would be revised to better highlight the cooperative approach and common goal to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the water services in the Wellington Area for benefit of the end users of water services.</p>	<p><b>HCC / WCC</b> to develop new draft objective and circulate to workshop participants for comment by 30 August 2001</p>
7	<p><b>Criteria for Integrated Water Services Management</b></p> <p>The “Stakes in the Ground” (aka indicative criteria list) were discussed.</p> <p>Matiu Rei pointed out that they were very similar to the criteria for the integrated trust proposal which had not gained acceptance and stressed that while the criteria might be</p>	<p><b>Project Group</b> to revise criteria list to include recommended items reflected in the corresponding</p>

	<p>acceptable perceptions about how they were reflected in any proposal were all important.</p> <p>Dave Benham commented that as the “stakes in the ground” reflected previous resolutions of the WRC and/or the outcome of the consultation on the trust proposal, he would be surprised if WRC had any significant difficulty with these.</p> <p>Tim Davin indicated that PCC may have difficulty with the “Holistic approach – water supply/wastewater/stormwater” criteria but that the other “stakes in the ground” would probably be acceptable to Porirua City Council.</p> <p>Teri Puketapu had earlier identified “Lack of cross subsidisation between the cities” as an additional criteria.</p> <p>Matiu Rei identified “ensuring any integrated management arrangement was not be vulnerable to capture by interest groups (eg the anti fluoridation lobby)” and “That a seamless service is provided from the community perspective (ie persons contacting their Council with water services issues should not be referred onwards to a separate service provider)” as additional criteria. There was general acceptance of the suggested additional criteria of “implementability”, “efficiency” and “reversibility” although Tim Davin considered that “efficiency” and “reversibility” were captured in other criteria.</p>	<p>comments.</p> <p><b>Anna</b> to add “Three services holistic approach” to the agenda of the next ‘expanded’ project meeting</p>
<p>8</p>	<p><b>Integrated Options</b></p> <p>Stephen Garlick walked the workshop group through the nine options that have been developed over the duration of the last four years</p> <p>In summary the following comments were recorded:</p> <p><i>Structural Options</i></p> <p>It was agreed that the descriptions of the options needed to be reviewed and in some cases amended to ensure that there is a common understanding of what each option represents. Matiu Rei pointed out that essential services such as water are fundamentally different from other commodities and suggested that the word “retail” be removed from the descriptions, as it is a term that the community do not associate with water services.</p> <p><i>Legal Options</i></p>	<p><b>WCC / HCC</b> develop matrix with options and criteria for evaluation.</p>

	<p>Tim Davin suggested that the term “legal arrangements” should be replaced with the term “governance options”. The point was made that what the list represented were possible options for the legal form of any entity and that governance options were an additional and separate issue that needed to be considered. Tim Davin suggested that “joint committee” be added to the list of options.</p>	
<p>9</p>	<p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <p>It was agreed that criteria and options would be considered further at the next meeting.</p> <p>HCC and WCC proposed that in order to be in a position to meet the February target of reporting back to Hutt City Council and Wellington City Council that weekly meetings should be held. Naturally the Iwi and the Wellington Councils are invited to attend.</p> <p>In addition it was proposed that all material be circulated to Te Runanganui o Taranaki Whanui ki te Upoko o Te Ika a Maui, Ngati Toa Rangatira and the Wellington Tenth Trust and that regular briefings be held (at significant milestones or approximately monthly depending on progress) if they preferred not to partake in the weekly meeting.</p> <p>Matiu Rei advised he would like to attend the project meeting on a fortnightly basis.</p> <p>Dave Benham said he would need to consult with his Council regarding his / WRC involvement in the project.</p> <p>Tim Davin confirmed he would “be involved in the project meetings but on a fortnightly basis in the interim.</p> <p>Next meeting date would be confirmed in the meeting schedule.</p>	<p><b>HCC / WCC</b> to liaise with Tenth Trust and Te Runanganui to confirm their attendance at project / briefing meetings</p> <p><b>HCC / WCC</b> to circulate meeting schedule by 30 August 2001</p>