

[Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** [Redacted]  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** [Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** [Redacted]  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

The bounds of the topic are so broad as to cause me to think industry players have been obfuscating with detail.

As I understand it 80% of NZ's domestic and commercial needs are already met by renewable resources. If the Manapouri generation is added then it seems to me NZ is already self sufficient.

Why I wonder are we putting so much time and effort and money into a study around the remaining 20%. It seems disproportionate.

I am sure industry players via submissions and huge data will be attempting to distract the Commission from the obvious that is all of them have been gouging consumers (and domestic consumers in particular) since 1990. Hydro power should be among the least expensive source of electricity. Witness the price of supply to the Smelter in Southland.

It is sensible for the lines companies to remain standing alone. The cost of running a supply efficiently anywhere in NZ can be readily established within broad parameters. Parameters which which can be adjusted from time to time to allow for natural disasters such as earthquakes and improvements in technology (making supply cheaper and more secure) .

Speaking specifically about the Eastcoast / Wairoa Districts the supply charges are the highest in NZ. This district has the highest indices of poverty in NZ and by definition that population is unable to articulate a response or to contribute to a study such as this. It is a fact that the Eastcoast Lines Company (owned and controlled by Eastcoast Community Trust aka ECT) has been found wanting by the Commission in the past (overcharging and under-maintaining) but it has escaped penalty because it claims to be consumer owned and it claims to distribute profits to consumers. It has never distributed to consumers as a whole. It has made grants to favoured groups and charities and its operating companies have also made such grants with the consequence annual profits which should be reaching the trust are held back by the operating companies . Instead ECT has accumulated wealth and invested millions outside the Region including overseas. It could very easily reduce the cost of supply to consumers. Last Friday it "gave" \$5 million to the Gisborne District Council (GDC) owned airport development account. It is giving millions to GDC in October this year for the 250<sup>th</sup> celebration of Cook's discovery of NZ (at Gisborne) the Sestercentennial under the aegis of Dame Jenny Shipley. All these things are nice but in my opinion the benefits of the trust should be for electricity consumers who are the income beneficiaries. GDC gets the lot as capital beneficiary when the trust winds up in 2073. Distributions to consumers take place in other electricity trust locations where the trustees are elected and not appointed by a self indulgent territorial local authority.

My primary point is that a single distributor is the most efficient means of managing supply and this can be achieved by regulation.

My secondary point is rogue electricity trusts should be reminded of their trust law obligations to their income beneficiaries; the consumers

Yours faithfully  
Winston Moreton  
A former (1977-1983) electrical supply authority chair

[Redacted]