

# **Annual Report on Drinking- Water Quality 2019–2020**

## Ministry of Health disclaimer

The data contained in the *Annual Report on Drinking-water Quality 2019–2020* has been supplied to the Ministry of Health by Beca Group Limited and reviewed by the Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited (ESR). The Ministry of Health cannot confirm the accuracy of the data and accepts no liability or responsibility for any acts or omissions, done or omitted in reliance, in whole or in part, on the data.

## ESR disclaimer

This report ('the Report') of the Ministry of Health uses data that has been reviewed by the Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited (ESR) solely for the benefit of the Ministry of Health in preparing the Report and as defined in the Contract between ESR and the Ministry of Health.

ESR has used all reasonable endeavours to ensure that the data provided to the Ministry of Health is accurate. However, as the data was provided by a third party, it has not been subject to the full ESR Quality Assurance process and ESR does not give any express or implied warranty as to the completeness or accuracy of that data as used or presented in the Report by the Ministry of Health or that it will be suitable for any particular purpose.

Additionally, ESR is unable to validate or verify the correctness or otherwise of that data, and neither ESR nor any of its employees makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any liability or responsibility whatsoever for use of the Report or its contents by any other person or organisation.

Citation: Ministry of Health. 2021. *Annual Report on Drinking-water Quality 2019–2020*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Published in April 2021 by the Ministry of Health  
PO Box 5013, Wellington 6140, New Zealand

ISBN 978-1-99-100718-6 (online)  
HP 7709



This document is available at [health.govt.nz](https://www.health.govt.nz)



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence. In essence, you are free to: share ie, copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format; adapt ie, remix, transform and build upon the material. You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the licence and indicate if changes were made.

# Contents

<b>Key findings</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Ministry of Health summary on the reporting period</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 COVID-19	3
2.2 Drought 2020	5
<b>3 Methods</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4 Compliance with the Health Act 1956</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1 Introduction	8
4.2 Overall compliance with the Health Act 1956	9
4.3 Comparison by size category	9
4.4 Water safety plans	10
4.5 Duties	11
4.6 Public health significance of not meeting the requirements of the Health Act	13
<b>5 Meeting the <i>Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (revised 2018)</i></b>	<b>15</b>
5.1 Introduction	15
5.2 Overall achievement of the Standards	16
5.3 Comparison by size category	17
5.4 Meeting the bacteriological Standards	18
5.5 Public health significance of bacteriological transgressions	19
5.6 Meeting the protozoal Standards	20
5.7 Public health significance of protozoal transgressions	21
5.8 Meeting the chemical Standards	21
5.9 Public health significance of chemical transgressions	23
5.10 Monitoring	23
<b>Appendix: Compliance of individual water supplies</b>	<b>24</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1:	Supply type, number of supplies and total population served	1
Table 2:	Compliance with the Act in previous and current reporting periods	9
Table 3:	Compliance rates with the Act, by supply size	10
Table 4:	Achievement of the Standards in previous and current reporting periods	17
Table 5:	Achievement of Standards: large supplies	17
Table 6:	Achievement of Standards: medium supplies	17
Table 7:	Achievement of Standards: minor supplies	18
Table 8:	Achievement of Standards: small supplies	18
Table 9:	Protozoal achievement against the Standards in previous and current reporting periods	20
Table 10:	Chemical achievement against the Standards in previous and current reporting periods	22

# Key findings

This report summarises drinking-water compliance for all 486 registered networked drinking-water supplies that served populations of more than 100 people in the compliance period from 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020. The supplies provide water to 4,142,000 people in total. This reporting period included the Alert Level 4 national lockdown due to COVID-19 from 25 March to 27 April and then Alert Level 3 until 13 May 2020. This period of lockdown significantly affected business as usual for everyone, including drinking-water suppliers and drinking-water assessors.

This report describes the compliance of the supplies with the drinking-water requirements of the Health Act 1956 (the Act) and the *Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (revised 2018)* (the Standards).

The Act groups drinking-water supplies into categories according to the size of the population served. The four supply size categories used in this report are large (more than 10,000 people), medium (5,001 to 10,000 people), minor (501 to 5,000 people) and small (101 to 500 people).

During the reporting period, data indicates that:

- 96.7 percent of the report population (4,003,000 people in 396 supplies) received drinking-water that **complied with all the legislative requirements** under the Act
- 98.0 percent of the report population (4,060,000 people in 464 supplies) received drinking-water from a supply with a **water safety plan** for which implementation had begun
- 99.97 percent of the report population (4,141,000 people in 477 supplies) received an **adequate supply of water** with appropriate notification of any interruptions
- 99.96 percent of the report population (4,140,000 people in 476 supplies) received drinking-water from a supply for which appropriate **source protection** activities took place
- 99.4 percent of the report population (4,117,000 people in 428 supplies) received drinking-water that met all the **monitoring** requirements in the Standards
- 99.5 percent of the report population (4,062,000 people in 469 supplies) received drinking-water that met the requirement for **record-keeping**
- 99.9 percent of the report population (4,139,000 people in 479 supplies) received drinking-water from a supplier that met the requirement to investigate **complaints**
- 99.5 percent of the report population (4,123,000 people in 463 supplies) received drinking-water from a supplier that took adequate **remedial action** when required.

To achieve overall compliance with the Standards, a supply must meet the bacteriological, protozoal and chemical requirements, which includes adherence to the prescribed sampling and monitoring schedule. In the reporting period, 78.6 percent of the report population (3,254,000 people) received drinking-water that complied with all the Standards, which is an increase of 2.4 percent compared with the previous reporting period.

Compliance with the Standards was generally highest for the large suppliers, and decreased progressively through suppliers in medium, minor and small population supply size categories.

During the reporting period, 95.2 percent of the report population (3,945,000 people) received drinking-water that complied with the bacteriological Standards, which is a decrease of 0.1 percent compared with the previous period. Protozoal compliance increased by 1.3 percent from 78.7 percent, with 80.0 percent (3,313,000 people) receiving drinking-water that complied with the protozoal Standards. Chemical compliance increased by 1.6 percent from 97.5 percent, with 99.1 percent (4,104,000 people) receiving drinking-water that complied with the chemical Standards.

# 1 Introduction

This report has been prepared to fulfil the requirement under the Health Act 1956 (the Act) for the Director-General of Health to prepare and publish a report on drinking-water each year. That report must give information about the quality of drinking-water, including whether that drinking-water is potable, and whether or not drinking-water suppliers comply with the Act and the *Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (Revised 2018)* (the Standards).

This report discusses drinking-water compliance for all 486 registered networked drinking-water supplies that served populations of more than 100 people (the supplies) from 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 (the reporting period), representing 4,142,000 people (the report population). It also provides a summary on events in the reporting period that affected suppliers' compliance.

The Act groups drinking-water supplies into supply size categories according to the size of the population served. The four supply size categories used in this report are large, medium, minor and small (Table 1).

Information is not gathered for supplies serving less than 101 people, self-supplies or water carriers. This means that the water supplies serving 18.6 percent of the total population of New Zealand or 944,000 people are not included in this report.

**Table 1: Supply type, number of supplies and total population served**

Supply type	Total no. of supplies	Total population served	Percentage of total population
Large (more than 10,000 people)	41	3,513,000	69.1%
Medium (5,001 to 10,000 people)	28	194,000	3.8%
Minor (501 to 5,000 people)	188	377,000	7.4%
Small (101 to 500 people)	229	58,000	1.1%
<b>Subtotal*</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>4,142,000</b>	<b>81.4%</b>
Other**	Unknown	944,000	18.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>5,086,000</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* This is the total for registered networked drinking-water supplies that served populations of more than 100 people.

\*\* These supplies consist mostly of self-supplies (rainwater tanks and bores) and very small community supplies.

The report covers:

- a Ministry of Health summary on the events in the reporting period
- compliance with the Act
- compliance with the Standards.

The Act aims to protect public health and safety by promoting adequate supplies of safe and wholesome drinking-water. The Act uses risk management concepts to promote proactive measures, including water safety plans and appropriate monitoring of drinking-water quality.

The focus of drinking-water safety plans is risk management. The Act requires all supplies serving 501 or more people to have a water safety plan. A water safety plan is a tool to help suppliers identify, manage and minimise risks.

The Standards prescribe the maximum acceptable values of micro-organisms and chemicals that may be present in drinking-water.

The appendix provides details of each individual supply and its achievement against the Standards and the requirements of the Act.



# 2 Ministry of Health summary on the reporting period

## 2.1 COVID-19

New Zealand reported its first confirmed case of COVID-19 on 28 February 2020. In response to growing case numbers internationally, New Zealand's borders were closed to all except citizens and residents on 19 March 2020.

With case numbers growing nationally, an alert level system was introduced on 21 March 2020 and New Zealand was placed immediately at Alert Level 2. The Government decided to move up to Alert Level 3 on 23 March and announced that the country would go into nationwide lockdown at midnight on 25 March (Alert Level 4) in an effort to stamp out the disease in New Zealand. In Alert Level 4 all businesses, except for essential services, were closed and people were instructed to stay at home other than for essential personal movement.

The alert level was moved down to Alert Level 3 on 27 April and certain restrictions were lifted to allow some people to return to work or school if they had to. However, the country effectively remained in lockdown until 13 May when the alert level was moved to Alert Level 2, lifting the remaining lockdown restrictions and allowing all businesses to open to the public and people to travel domestically. On 8 June 2020 New Zealand moved to Alert Level 1.

### 2.1.1 Provision of drinking-water during nationwide lockdown

In March 2020 while the country debated the effects of lockdowns and closing our borders, pressure was on suppliers of essential services to deliver their service safely. No service is more readily classified as 'essential' than the provision of safe drinking-water.

Although the Ministry of Health led the overall government response to the pandemic, responsibility for critical infrastructure sits with the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE). On 16 March 2020 MBIE set up an emergency operation centre to focus on providing support to lifeline utilities and supermarkets. Daily teleconferences were established to discuss common issues and identify and implement solutions. The Department of Internal Affairs led engagement with the drinking-water sector through the New Zealand Society of Local Government Managers and Local Government New Zealand.

Large water suppliers played a key role in supporting efforts to identify supply chains, critical supplies and options for sharing resources. The supply of chemicals for drinking-water treatment was found to be low risk, as most could be sourced within New Zealand. However, a key issue was the supply of personal protective equipment nationwide. The importance of maintaining critical spares in the country was highlighted, with supply chains impacted by the pandemic and likely to remain so throughout 2021.

It was recognised early in the response that the drinking-water workforce was crucial and vulnerable. Water suppliers were encouraged to enact their pandemic and business continuity plans and ensure that day-to-day operations could continue while maintaining safe work bubbles for essential staff.

Leniency has been applied for any compliance issues that were directly associated with the COVID-19 response or the lockdown period.

Both suppliers and the Ministry of Health discouraged site visits, as a way of helping to maintain safe work bubbles. Drinking-water assessors were advised to maintain a virtual presence, as far as possible. The Ministry of Health also supported the rapid establishment of additional laboratories to make it easier to maintain physical distancing.

## 2.1.2 Impact on compliance and reporting

The COVID-19 pandemic continues to have an impact on the public health sector and its ability to respond to health protection work that is not directly related to COVID-19. For water suppliers, this has meant that public health units may not have carried out their usual work, such as assessments of water safety plan adequacy and implementation, within the reporting period. Therefore, the default position of the regulator in these situations is that a supplier has complied with its Health Act duties because the supplier was not at fault. This assumption of compliance does not apply to other concerns or issues with the water supply, or where the supplier has made no effort to support an implementation visit or to submit an overdue water safety plan.

The annual survey is usually undertaken between 1 July and 8 August. During this annual survey, suppliers enter compliance information into Drinking-Water Online and drinking-water assessors assess this information. In 2020 the annual survey period was extended by two weeks to allow suppliers and assessors to complete this process without undue time pressure. There were delays in quality checks of the data as a consequence.

## 2.2 Drought 2020

Extremely low rainfall in the summer months of 2020 led to drier than average conditions, beginning in Northland and spreading across the North Island and areas of the South Island. The Government initially classified the drought conditions as an adverse event in February 2020 and upgraded the classification of the drought in the North Island, parts of the South Island, and the Chatham Islands to a large-scale adverse event on 12 March 2020. The classification will remain until 30 June 2021 while targeted recovery support is provided.

Risk to the adequate supply of drinking-water was highest in Northland, where private water storage tanks were depleted due to the lack of rainfall. In addition, water levels in many rivers dropped below drought flows, with some rivers recording the lowest flows in 50 years. Resource Management Act 1991 consent limits were reduced in some places to prevent degradation of the river's ecosystem. Groundwater levels also neared record lows and there was a risk of saltwater intrusion into coastal aquifers, which could lead to the water becoming brackish and unsuitable as a source of drinking-water in the future.

Some reticulated water supplies in Northland were further affected by breaks and leaks in pipes caused by soil shrinkage. Far North District Council worked hard to provide the public with drinking-water and was allocated \$2 million from the Provincial Growth Fund to establish temporary water supplies in Kaikohe, Rāwene and Kaitiāia, where water supply was critically low. The stringent water restrictions in place across many parts of the affected areas, along with public awareness campaigns by the district council, led to a decrease in water demand.

To help provide drinking-water to affected communities, the Ministry of Health supported drinking-water assessors with advice that new water carriers could be classed as temporary suppliers for up to 60 days to assist with the response. This avoided any delays associated with the registration process. The Ministry also put processes in place to enable water carriers to source safe drinking-water from alternative supplies. The New Zealand Defence Force was deployed to Northland to help deliver water to affected communities. Emergency community water collection sites were opened in some regions.

The Government provided a drought relief package to support communities in Northland and other areas of the North Island facing acute water shortages as a result of the drought. The package included \$10 million to respond to immediate and pressing needs associated with the drought, giving priority to ensuring an adequate water supply to Northland communities.

# 3 Methods

Drinking-water suppliers and laboratories entered information on drinking-water quality into the Ministry of Health's drinking-water database, Drinking-Water Online (DWO). The data from DWO was reviewed and supplemented by additional information provided by drinking-water assessors, particularly around compliance with the duty to prepare and implement a water safety plan.

The following caveats apply for the purposes of data interpretation.

The report includes all registered networked drinking-water supplies that served more than 100 people during the reporting period, based on the information contained in DWO as at 30 June 2019. Suppliers were given two weeks longer to complete entering their information as a concession due to the impact of COVID-19.

A supply may have one or more distribution zones. A distribution zone is part of the drinking-water supply network within which all consumers receive drinking-water of identical quality, from the same or similar sources, with the same treatment and usually at the same pressure. It is possible for distribution zones within a single supply to exhibit different rates of achievement against the Standards.

The population statistics in this report are calculated from the supply populations as recorded in DWO. These figures are estimates, which each supplier reassesses from time to time.

Population figures in the body of this report are rounded to the nearest thousand. The exception is when the population is less than 10,000, in which case the figures are rounded to the nearest hundred.

Compliance against the requirements of the Act is assessed for a whole supply based on information that drinking-water suppliers provide in questionnaires. Drinking-water suppliers, laboratories and drinking-water assessors enter information about achievement against the Standards into the database. Water suppliers and drinking-water assessors were given an opportunity to check the data provided for this report.

Drinking-water assessors were provided with guidance on the assessment of compliance with specific duties of the Act for this reporting period. The aim of this guidance was to improve consistency generally and provide guidance regarding the impacts of COVID-19 and the droughts that occurred within this reporting period.

The approach to reporting on the duty to monitor and the duty to take remedial action changed this year. Where previously it was assessed using an algorithm, this year compliance is based on the judgement of the drinking-water assessors. Guidance was provided to promote consistent decision-making on compliance with these two duties.

Data quality assurance was built into the data collection and analysis stages of report preparation. In addition, drinking-water assessors and water suppliers were given the opportunity to review the assessment of individual supplies' compliance with the Act and achievement against the Standards, with the exception of the requirements for monitoring and remedial action. Prior to data collection, drinking-water assessors and suppliers were trained in the use of the annual compliance component of DWO.

# 4 Compliance with the Health Act 1956

## 4.1 Introduction

This section discusses the extent to which suppliers met the requirements of the Health Act 1956 (the Act) during the reporting period. Briefly, the requirements of the Act are as follows.

- **Water safety plans:** Every networked drinking-water supplier serving more than 500 people must implement an approved water safety plan for its drinking-water supplies. The supplier must review its water safety plan within five years of approval.
- **Compliance with the drinking-water standards:** Every drinking-water supplier included in this report has a duty to comply with the Standards.
- **Provision of drinking-water:** Every drinking-water supplier included in this report must take all practicable steps to provide an adequate supply of drinking-water to each point of supply. Interruptions may occur for planned maintenance, improvements or emergency repairs. However, if the interruptions are likely to exceed eight hours, the supplier must have prior approval from the medical officer of health and must have taken all practicable steps to warn affected people. If the supply is interrupted in an emergency, the supplier has up to 24 hours to inform the medical officer of health.
- **Source protection:** Every drinking-water supplier included in this report must take reasonable steps to protect their water sources from contamination and pollution.
- **Monitoring:** Every drinking-water supplier included in this report must monitor the drinking-water it supplies, to check whether it meets the Standards.
- **Record-keeping:** Every networked drinking-water supplier serving more than 500 people must keep records of its drinking-water supplies, and those records must contain sufficient information to enable a drinking-water assessor to ascertain whether the supplier is meeting the requirements of the Act.
- **Complaints:** Every drinking-water supplier included in this report must record and investigate complaints about its supply.
- **Remedial actions:** Every drinking-water supplier included in this report must take appropriate remedial action to correct problems if its supply does not meet the Standards.

## 4.2 Overall compliance with the Health Act 1956

The Act places specific duties on drinking-water suppliers that are key to protecting the safety of drinking-water supplies. During the reporting period, 96.7 percent of the population received drinking-water from fully compliant water supplies. This is a 0.5 percent decrease since the previous reporting period (2018/19) due to a decrease in compliance with the monitoring and water safety plan requirements.

Table 2 shows the proportion of the population that received drinking-water from fully complying suppliers for each requirement during the current and previous reporting periods.

**Table 2: Compliance with the Act in previous and current reporting periods**

Requirement	2018/19	2019/20	Difference
Monitoring	99.7%	99.4%	-0.3%
Water safety plans*	98.3%	98.0%	-0.3%
Provision of drinking-water	99.9%	100%	0.0%
Source protection	100%	100%	0.0%
Records*	99.0%	99.5%	0.5%
Complaints	100%	99.9%	0.0%
Remedial action	99.3%	99.5%	0.2%
Compliant with all requirements	97.1%	96.7%	-0.5%

Note: 2018/19 and 2019/20 columns show percentage of reported population served. Difference column is 2019/20 minus 2018/19 values. Calculations were performed on actual values, then rounded to one decimal place.

\* Supplies serving fewer than 501 people do not have a statutory duty to keep records nor are they required to prepare a water safety plan unless directed by a medical officer of health. Therefore, small supplies were excluded from the calculation for these requirements.

## 4.3 Comparison by size category

Overall, compliance with the Act was highest for large supplies: 98.8 percent of the large-supply population received drinking-water from suppliers that met all their legislative requirements. The equivalent figures were 84 percent of medium, 86.1 percent of minor and 78.1 percent of small supply populations (Table 3).

**Table 3: Compliance rates with the Act, by supply size**

Requirement	Large	Medium	Minor	Small
Monitoring	100%	100%	96.2%	80.7%
Water safety plans*	99.3%	86.7%	91.6%	NA
Provision of drinking-water	100%	100%	100%	97.7%
Source protection	100%	100%	100%	96.9%
Records*	99.5%	100%	99.2%	NA
Complaints	100%	100%	99.3%	98.5%
Remedial action	100%	97.3%	97.1%	94.1%
Compliant with all requirements	98.8%	84.0%	86.1%	78.1%

Note: All percentages are for reported population served in each size band, rounded to one decimal place.

\* Supplies serving fewer than 501 people do not have a statutory duty to keep records nor are they required to prepare a water safety plan unless directed by a medical officer of health. Therefore, these requirements are noted as being not applicable (NA).

## 4.4 Water safety plans

Water safety plans are a key part of the drinking-water safety system: they are fundamental to a supplier being able to produce safe drinking-water and having confidence that the drinking-water is safe. Preparing a water safety plan requires a drinking-water supplier to assess the whole of its water supply chain, from source water through the treatment processes to the pipe network that carries the drinking-water out into the community. During this assessment, a supplier must identify all hazards and hazardous events that may pose a risk to the supply of safe drinking-water and ensure adequate preventive measures are in place to manage those risks. The plan should also state what remedial action the supplier needs to take if a contamination event occurs despite the preventive measures.

All large, medium and minor supplies must have a water safety plan. In the current reporting period, a total of 22 supplies, together serving 82,000 people, were not implementing a current, approved water safety plan as required by the Act.

Networked supplies serving fewer than 501 people are not required to have a water safety plan unless a medical officer of health requires them to do so. They may elect to comply with section 10 of the Standards by having a water safety plan. It is encouraging to see that in the current period 36,000 people received drinking-water from 139 small supplies with an implemented water safety plan.

Overall, supplies serving 97.5 percent of the report population (374 supplies, including small supplies) had water safety plans that they were implementing in the reporting period.



The rate of development and implementation of water safety plans decreased with reducing supply size. Of the 41 large supplies, 40 were implementing a water safety plan. The large supply that failed to meet the water safety plan duty was Blenheim (serving 24,000 people) as its plan had expired and it had not yet submitted a new plan for approval. Of the 28 medium supplies, 24 were implementing a water safety plan; four medium supplies (together serving 25,800 people) had an expired plan and had not yet submitted a revised plan for approval. The four medium supplies that failed to meet the duty were Kaitāia, Kerikeri, Thames and Alexandra. Of the 188 minor supplies, 171 are implementing a plan. Of the 17 minor supplies that are not implementing a plan (collectively serving 32,000 people), one had an approved plan that it is yet to implement, one was drafting a plan and 15 had expired plans.

## 4.5 Duties

This part of the report covers the remaining legislative requirements under the Act.

### 4.5.1 Monitoring

The Act requires all drinking-water supplies covered by this report to monitor their drinking-water quality in accordance with the requirements of the Standards, because monitoring is a key verification component in managing drinking-water supplies. Monitoring allows a drinking-water supplier to determine whether drinking-water quality meets that specified by the Standards, and can indicate when remedial action is required.

Overall, supplies serving 99.4 percent of the report population (4,117,000 people) met the monitoring requirements during the reporting period. This is a decrease of 0.3 percent compared with the previous reporting period. The decrease is likely to be linked to the change in the approach to assessing compliance with this duty, which was moved from using an algorithm to an assessment by the drinking-water assessor.

Compliance increased with the size of the population served by a supply. Suppliers met monitoring requirements in the reporting period for 100 percent of the population served by large and medium supplies, 96.2 percent of those served by minor supplies (7 supplies did not comply) and 80.7 percent served by small supplies (51 supplies did not comply).

### 4.5.2 Provision of drinking-water

Unsanitary conditions can arise when a community is without drinking-water; in these circumstances, consumers may seek other, possibly unsafe sources of water. To avoid such outcomes, drinking-water suppliers are required to take all practicable steps to provide an adequate supply of drinking-water and, if a planned or unplanned interruption occurs, to take appropriate action.

Overall, supplies serving 99.97 percent of the report population, or 4,141,000 people, met this requirement during the reporting period. Nine small supplies that together served 1,300 people failed to meet the provision of drinking-water requirements.

### 4.5.3 Source protection

Protecting the quality of source waters is one of the most important components of the multi-barrier approach to managing drinking-water supplies. Protection of source waters can prevent contaminants from entering the source water and reduce the contaminants that a water treatment system must deal with, which in turn reduces the severity of the consequences for public health if water treatment fails.

Overall, supplies serving 99.96 percent of the report population, or 4,140,000 people, met the requirement to take reasonable steps to contribute to the protection of their water sources during the reporting period. Ten small supplies, collectively serving 1,800 people, failed to meet the source protection requirements.

### 4.5.4 Records

Record-keeping helps drinking-water suppliers and drinking-water assessors to determine whether each supply is complying with the requirements of the Act and the Standards. It also helps people unfamiliar with a supply to understand the way the supply should be operated and what operational parameters are typical. If a waterborne disease outbreak or any other incident resulting from system failure occurs, well-kept records may assist suppliers and authorities to understand what has gone wrong and how the problem could be prevented in the future.

Overall, supplies serving 99.5 percent of the report population (4,062,000 people) maintained records with sufficient information during the reporting period. All medium supplies met the record-keeping requirements. One large supply (serving 19,000 people) and two minor supplies (collectively serving 2,900 people) did not meet the record-keeping requirement.

### 4.5.5 Complaints

Most complaints about drinking-water quality relate to the aesthetic properties of the water (taste, odour and appearance). Drinking-water suppliers need to investigate complaints, because they may inform the supplier of a problem about which they may not otherwise be aware. Consumer concerns about the aesthetic properties of water, if sufficiently severe, may lead to the consumer seeking another source of drinking-water. While the alternative source may not have the aesthetic problems associated with the original drinking-water supply, it may contain health-significant contaminants that human senses cannot detect.

Overall, in the reporting period, drinking-water suppliers met the duty to investigate complaints they received about the drinking-water supplied to 99.9 percent of the report population (4,139,000 people). All large and medium supplies met this requirement. One minor supply (serving 2,500 people) and six small supplies (collectively serving 900 people) did not meet the requirement.

## 4.5.6 Remedial action

The Act requires drinking-water suppliers to take all practicable steps to carry out appropriate remedial action if drinking-water does not meet the Standards. Prompt action is required when the contaminants are microbiological, because pathogens can cause acute illness. Prompt action is also required when chemical contaminants are present at levels that could cause acute illness. Drinking-water suppliers must seek to remedy any faults they have identified in their system that may adversely affect the safety or compliance of the supply.

Remedial action in response to transgressions was taken, when necessary, in supplies serving 99.5 percent of the report population (4,123,000 people) during the reporting period.

Water suppliers did not take prompt remedial action in 23 supplies, consisting of one medium supply (serving 5,200 people), six minor supplies (collectively serving 11,000 people) and 16 small supplies (collectively serving 3,400 people). The medium-sized supplier that did not meet this requirement was Carterton District Council for the Carterton Supply.

## 4.6 Public health significance of not meeting the requirements of the Health Act

How significant non-compliance is to public health varies depending on which requirements of the Act it relates to, in addition to the manner and frequency of the failure(s).

The duty to prepare and implement a water safety plan is of the highest public health significance. This is because this is the document where the water supplier identifies all of the risks to its supply, and how it is managing those risks, as well as other important aspects of its water supply.

The duty to protect source water ensures that the highest-quality source water is being used to provide drinking-water. Any subsequent failure in treatment is less likely to cause illness if the source water is of the highest quality.

Of immediate public health significance is the duty of the water supplier to take adequate remedial action once a problem has been identified.

A failure to meet the monitoring requirements may have minor public health significance in some cases, such as when a water supplier fails to monitor on a sufficient number of days of the week or misses the collection of a single water sample. However, if a water supplier fails to monitor its water supply at all, that failure could have major public health consequences.

Failure to provide an adequate supply of drinking-water may have minor public health significance in cases such as where planned repairs take longer than expected but affected consumers are well informed about the delay. However, if interruptions to supply are protracted or poorly communicated and there are vulnerable consumers on the supply, this failure may have a significant impact.

Failing to keep good records, including of complaint management, may not have a direct public health impact. However, such a failure is an indication the water supplier does not have good-quality systems in place and may miss picking up on important changes in the supply through customer complaints.

# 5 Meeting the *Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (revised 2018)*

## 5.1 Introduction

Drinking-water suppliers must ensure that the drinking-water they supply complies with the *Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (revised 2018)* (the Standards). The Standards have three main components:

- the water **quality standards**, which specify the maximum acceptable values (MAVs) of a range of microbiological, chemical and radiological properties of drinking-water (determinands). The MAVs are set at a level below which there is no significant risk to a consumer over a lifetime of drinking-water consumption
- the **compliance criteria** and **reporting requirements**, which define the checks needed to demonstrate a drinking-water supply is not exceeding the drinking-water quality standards. The stringency of these checks reflects the level of risk that the drinking-water supply poses
- the **remedial actions** are the minimum actions that a supplier must take in the event of a transgression. A transgression occurs when the MAV is exceeded, or some operational requirement of the drinking-water supply is not met.

To achieve overall compliance with the Standards, over a 12-month period a supplier must:

- achieve the quality standards over 95 percent of the time
- monitor the drinking-water in line with the compliance criteria
- if a transgression occurs, take remedial actions to protect public health and to prevent the transgression from reoccurring.

All supplies covered by this report must achieve overall compliance with the Standards. The compliance criteria depend on several factors; primarily the size of the population served by a supply and the nature of the determinand. The criteria were designed to balance risks to public health and costs. To manage public health risks, the monitoring requirements increase with the number of people served by a supply, to provide greater certainty that the drinking-water meets the quality standards.

In this report, the quality of drinking-water is assessed in terms of suppliers' achievement of the microbiological and chemical Standards.

Microbiological achievement of a Standard is based on the monitoring for and detection of indicator organisms, combined with assessment of barriers to contamination, rather than on the measurement of the concentrations of micro-organisms in the drinking-water. Microbiological achievement is based on two main microbiological reference organisms, *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) and *Cryptosporidium*. **Bacteriological achievement** is determined primarily using *E. coli* monitoring; no *E. coli* should be detected in the drinking-water distribution zones. **Protozoal achievement** is based on monitoring the effectiveness of the treatment processes used to remove or inactivate *Cryptosporidium*.

The chemical Standards are designed to ensure that, based on current knowledge, people can drink water that meets the standards over a lifetime with no adverse health effects. For most chemical determinands, an occasional exceedance of the MAV in the Standards is not a significant risk to public health. **Chemical achievement** is assessed for supplies that have been identified as containing chemicals at levels that require regular monitoring to ensure the chemical does not exceed a level that would cause adverse health effects to the consumer (known as Priority 2 determinands). A drinking-water supply achieves the chemical requirements of the Standards if it has no Priority 2 determinands, or if it has been adequately monitored and any Priority 2 determinands present are shown to be within acceptable levels.

## 5.2 Overall achievement of the Standards

Every drinking-water supplier has a duty to take all practicable steps to ensure that the drinking-water it supplies meets the Standards. Overall achievement against the Standards requires a drinking-water supply to achieve the bacteriological, protozoal and chemical Standards. It is possible to fail to meet the Standards either for technical reasons, such as inadequate monitoring, or for reasons that are a public health concern, such as exceeding the MAV for bacteria in the drinking-water supply.

In the reporting period:

- 78.6 percent of the report population (3,254,000 people) received drinking-water that fully met **all Standards**
- 95.2 percent of the report population (3,945,000 people) received drinking-water that fully met the **bacteriological Standards**
- 80.0 percent of the report population (3,313,000 people) received drinking-water that fully met the **protozoal Standards**
- 99.1 percent of the report population (4,104,000 people) received drinking-water that fully met the **chemical Standards**.

Table 4 shows the proportion of the population that received drinking-water that achieved the Standards during the current and previous reporting periods.

**Table 4: Achievement of the Standards in previous and current reporting periods**

Standards	2018/19	2019/20	Difference
Bacteriological	95.3%	95.2%	-0.1%
Protozoal	78.7%	80.0%	1.3%
Chemical	97.5%	99.1%	1.6%
Overall	76.2%	78.6%	2.4%

Note: 2018/19 and 2019/20 columns show percentage of reported population served. Difference column is 2019/20 minus 2018/19 values. Calculations were performed on actual values, then rounded to one decimal place.

Compared with the previous reporting period, bacteriological achievement decreased by 0.1 percent, protozoal achievement increased by 1.3 percent and chemical achievement increased by 1.6 percent.

## 5.3 Comparison by size category

Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 show achievement of Standards for each size supply. Larger supplies demonstrated a higher level of achievement than smaller supplies.

**Table 5: Achievement of Standards: large supplies**

41 large supplies together serve 3,513,000 people

Standard	Population	Percentage	Supplies
Bacteriological achievement	3,470,000	98.8%	38
Protozoal achievement	3,018,000	85.9%	34
Chemical achievement	3,513,000	100%	41
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2,988,000</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>32</b>

**Table 6: Achievement of Standards: medium supplies**

28 medium supplies together serve 194,000 people

Standard	Population	Percentage	Supplies
Bacteriological achievement	148,000	76.5%	19
Protozoal achievement	97,000	50.0%	13
Chemical achievement	188,000	96.9%	27
<b>Overall</b>	<b>83,000</b>	<b>43.0%</b>	<b>11</b>

**Table 7: Achievement of Standards: minor supplies**

188 minor supplies together serve 377,000 people

Standard	Population	Percentage	Supplies
Bacteriological achievement	289,000	76.6%	145
Protozoal achievement	179,000	47.4%	84
Chemical achievement	346,000	91.9%	172
<b>Overall</b>	<b>165,000</b>	<b>43.8%</b>	<b>78</b>

**Table 8: Achievement of Standards: small supplies**

229 small supplies together serve 58,000 people

Standard	Population	Percentage	Supplies
Bacteriological achievement	38,000	65.4%	140
Protozoal achievement	20,000	33.9%	73
Chemical achievement	57,000	97.8%	225
<b>Overall</b>	<b>18,000</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>67</b>

Note: For Tables 5–8: 'Population' and 'Percentage' columns are for the reported population served. Population is the sum of the populations served for all distribution zones (with their treatment plants) with supplies of the size band specified. Therefore, if a supply has multiple zones, the population contributed here may be all, some or none of the supply population as a whole. Percentages are rounded to one decimal place. Supplies is a count of supplies that met the relevant Standard in full.

## 5.4 Meeting the bacteriological Standards

Exceedance of a microbiological MAV is of greater immediate concern than exceedance of a chemical MAV, because of the time scales over which their adverse effects are likely to be experienced. Pathogens can cause acute illness following a single contamination event. Those most at risk of infection are infants and young children, the immune suppressed, the sick and the elderly. For this reason, immediate remedial action is of paramount importance in response to microbiological exceedances.

During the reporting period, 95.2 percent of the report population (3,945,000 people) were supplied with drinking-water that met the bacteriological Standards.

Supplies achieved the bacteriological Standards for 98.8 percent of people in large supplies, 76.5 percent in medium supplies, 76.6 percent in minor supplies and 65.4 percent in small supplies.

Three large supplies (Cambridge, Te Awamutu and Pirongia, and Tokoroa) and nine medium supplies failed to meet the bacteriological Standards during the reporting period.



In the reporting period a supply could have failed bacteriological compliance for the following reasons.

Consumers received drinking-water that was inadequately monitored or not monitored for *E. coli* or total coliforms.

Consumers received drinking-water with an excessive number of *E. coli* transgressions.

Consumers received drinking-water from a supply in which transgressions occurred that were not followed up with appropriate corrective actions.

Consumers received drinking-water that had not been treated in accordance with the compliance criteria.

Where monitoring is inadequate or absent, the supplier is unlikely to fully understand the quality of the drinking-water, identify issues or be able to assure consumers that the water is safe to drink.

## 5.5 Public health significance of bacteriological transgressions

Excessive transgressions of the bacteriological Standards, and/or a failure to follow up on transgressions with immediate corrective action, can put public health at risk.

The presence of *E. coli* in water indicates recent contamination with faeces. The presence of *E. coli* in drinking-water demonstrates that the treatment has been inadequate, or that the water has been contaminated post-treatment during its distribution to the community. In either case, the presence of *E. coli* means that other faecal pathogens could also be present in the water. Although the presence of these pathogenic organisms is not monitored, their presence must be assumed; consequently, any detection of *E. coli* in the water must be seen as a potential risk to public health.

In addition, detection of *E. coli* shows that the barriers between contaminants and the community have failed. Consequently, suppliers must immediately investigate all *E. coli* transgressions and take remedial action. Depending on the result of the investigation, they may also need to modify the supply's water safety plan.

During the reporting period, water suppliers analysed approximately 86,000 *E. coli* monitoring samples, of which 178 (0.2 percent of samples) tested positive for *E. coli*. During the previous reporting period, water suppliers analysed approximately 89,000 monitoring samples, of which 177 (0.1 percent) tested positive for *E. coli*.

## 5.6 Meeting the protozoal Standards

During the reporting period, 80.0 percent of the report population (3,313,000 people) were supplied with drinking-water that fully achieved the protozoal Standards (Table 9). This is an increase of 1.3 percent compared with the previous reporting period, when 78.7 percent of people received water that fully achieved the protozoal Standards.

**Table 9: Protozoal achievement against the Standards in previous and current reporting periods**

Type of supplier	2018/19	2019/20	Difference
Large	83.7%	85.9%	2.2%
Medium	58.9%	50.0%	-8.9%
Minor	49.5%	47.4%	-2.1%
Small	30.7%	33.9%	3.2%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>78.7%</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>

Note: \* 2018/19 and 2019/20 columns show percentage of reported population served. Difference column is 2019/20 minus 2018/19 values. Calculations were performed on actual values, then rounded to one decimal place.

Seven large supplies failed to meet the protozoal Standards: Tokoroa, Taupō – Lake Terrace, Hastings Urban, Ashburton, Christchurch, Queenstown and Wānaka. Fifteen medium supplies failed to achieve compliance with the protozoal Standards.

Failing to meet the protozoal Standards does not necessarily mean that pathogenic protozoa (*Giardia* spp. and *Cryptosporidium* spp.) were present in the drinking-water. Achieving compliance with the protozoal Standards is based on the likelihood that the treatment processes in operation will adequately protect the community if pathogenic protozoa are present in the source water. To achieve this, the drinking-water supplier must meet the following two requirements.

They must either use groundwater meeting the secure bore water criteria of the Standards or have treatment processes in operation that can remove or inactivate an adequate percentage of any protozoa present in the source water.

They must be able to show that they are operating the treatment processes sufficiently well to meet the target percentage of protozoal removal or inactivation.

Failure to meet the protozoal Standards is therefore due to a lack of infrastructure or failure to meet the compliance criteria.

## 5.7 Public health significance of protozoal transgressions

The majority of protozoa are freshwater organisms that have no public health significance. However, two groups of protozoa can cause adverse health reactions:

- enteric protozoa that live in the gut of humans and other animals such as some species of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia*
- free-living organisms that are opportunistic pathogens in humans and may cause serious illness, such as *Naegleria fowleri* and some species of *Acanthamoeba*.

*Cryptosporidium* has been identified as one of the most important waterborne human pathogens in developed countries and is responsible for many outbreaks.

Even very low numbers of protozoa of either of the groups identified above can cause illness in people, therefore the presence of any of these organisms in the drinking-water supply can put public health at risk.

## 5.8 Meeting the chemical Standards

Not all supplies need to monitor chemical determinands. Treatment plants or distribution zones can be assigned Priority 2a or 2b determinands when treatment methods, supply characteristics or testing indicate that levels of any chemical may approach the MAV. Chemicals used for disinfection or other treatment processes are not usually assigned as Priority 2 determinands, because the resulting water concentrations of those chemicals generally do not approach MAVs. Nevertheless, they may require monitoring as part of assessing whether a supply has achieved bacteriological or protozoal compliance. That type of monitoring is external to the assessment of Priority 2 determinands that this section covers.

Where a supply has been assigned Priority 2 determinands, it must meet the Standard for all chemical determinands assigned to the supply's treatment plant and distribution zones in order to achieve compliance. (Distribution zones are parts of the drinking-water supply network within which all consumers receive drinking-water of identical quality, from the same or similar sources, with the same treatment, and usually at the same pressure.)

In addition, suppliers are required to either demonstrate that the drinking-water supplied to consumers is not plumbosolvent or, if the supply services more than 500 people, publish newspaper notifications and provide public warnings to consumers at least twice a year.

During the reporting period, 99.1 percent of the report population (4,104,000 people) was supplied with drinking-water that met the chemical Standards. Conversely 0.9 percent (38,000 people) received water that did not meet the Standards. Table 10 compares chemical achievement between reporting periods.

**Table 10: Chemical achievement against the Standards in previous and current reporting periods**

Type of supplier	2018/19	2019/20	Difference
Large	98.2%	100%	1.8%
Medium	100%	96.9%	-3.1%
Minor	90.0%	91.9%	1.8%
Small	97.8%	97.8%	0.0%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>97.5%</b>	<b>99.1%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>

Note: 2018/19 and 2019/20 columns show percentage of reported population served. 'Difference' column is 2019/20 minus 2018/19 values. Calculations were performed on actual values, then rounded to one decimal place.

Note that the high level of chemical achievement for small supplies arises by default, because Priority 2 determinands are usually assigned only to zones with populations of more than 500 people.

During the reporting period, 67.2 percent of the report population (2,783,000 people) were assigned one or more chemical determinands. The chemical Standards were achieved for water supplied to 98.1 percent (2,730,000) of that population, and not achieved for 1.9 percent (53,000 people).

Fluoride was the most commonly assigned chemical in terms of the percentage of the population served. Fluoride was assigned to supplies for 2,514,000 people; 99.8 percent of those supplies achieved the chemical Standards for this determinand. The concentration of naturally occurring fluoride in drinking-water sources is low in New Zealand, and does not need to be monitored; however, all fluoridated water supplies must monitor and control the level of fluoride added to the drinking-water.

The next most commonly assigned chemical determinand was for disinfection by-products assigned to supplies for 268,000 people (with 83.0 percent achievement). Following that, nitrate was assigned to supplies for 61,000 people (with 100 percent achievement), arsenic to supplies for 35,000 people (with 73.9 percent achievement) and lead to supplies for 17,000 people (with 97.6 percent achievement).

During the reporting period, one supply (serving 152 people) demonstrated that the water from its supply was not plumbosolvent. A total of 410 supplies serving plumbosolvent water to 99.3 percent of the report population (4,112,000 people) provided warnings to the public in compliance with the chemical Standards. Warnings were not provided to the consumers of 75 supplies, consisting of 13 minor supplies (collectively serving 15,000 people) and 62 small supplies (collectively serving 14,000 people). Small supplies (each serving 500 people or fewer) are not required to provide warnings about plumbosolvency to comply with chemical Standards.

All large supplies met chemical compliance. One medium supply failed to meet chemical compliance. Greymouth failed compliance, as drinking-water for 6,000 people exceeded the MAV for disinfection by-products on two occasions and the drinking-water assessor was not notified when the transgressions occurred.

## 5.9 Public health significance of chemical transgressions

The chemical Standards define water that, based on current knowledge, can be drunk over a lifetime with no adverse health effects. In New Zealand, an adult body weight of 70 kilograms and a consumption of 2 litres of water per day over a lifetime is used to calculate the majority of MAVs. Short-term exceedances of the MAV rarely pose a public health risk unless the chemical is present at a level that could cause acute illness.

Chemicals exceeding their MAVs were disinfection by-products (trihalomethanes, haloacetic acids and dichloroacetic acid), and arsenic. Specifically, 13 supplies had exceedances for disinfection by-products and 7 supplies had exceedances for arsenic.

Action to reduce the concentration of disinfection by-products is encouraged, but disinfection itself must not be compromised. A disinfection by-product poses a considerably lower risk than a pathogenic micro-organism in water that has not been disinfected.

## 5.10 Monitoring

Eleven supplies, together serving 17,000 people, failed to meet the chemical Standards due to inadequate monitoring. Without monitoring information, water suppliers cannot make well-informed decisions about actions they can take to meet the Standards, and the health significance of concentrations of chemicals assigned to a distribution zone cannot be readily assessed.

# Appendix: Compliance of individual water supplies

## Northland

Supplier: Carrington Farms Jade LP

Carrington Estate			Population: 120
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

Supplier: Doubtless Bay Water Supply Co

Doubtless Bay			Population: 2,000
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Doubtless Bay failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues.			

Supplier: Far North District Council

Kaikohe			Population: 4,200
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Kaikohe did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).			

Kaitiāia			Population: 5,400
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Kaitiāia did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).			

**Kawakawa/Moerewa** **Population: 3,500**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. Kawakawa/Moerewa did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).

---

**Kerikeri** **Population: 6,700**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Kerikeri did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).

---

**Okaihau** **Population: 800**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. Okaihau did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).

---

**Omanaia** **Population: 180**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water and is treated with UV. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period. Omanaia failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and failed to keep adequate records. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZD). Omanaia failed the bacteriological Standards for 120 people because it did not take any *E. coli* samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards for 120 people because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Omapere** **Population: 900**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Not met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. Omapere did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z). Omapere failed the chemical Standards because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV and a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process sampling was inadequate.

---

**Paihia** **Population: 4,000**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Not met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Paihia did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z). Paihia failed the chemical Standards for 2,000 people because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV.

---

<b>Rāwene</b>	<b>Population: 600</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and is chlorinated.			
Rāwene did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).			

## Supplier: Hukerenui Community

<b>Hukerenui</b>	<b>Population: 250</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Hukerenui failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Hukerenui failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

## Supplier: Kaipara District Council

<b>Dargaville</b>	<b>Population: 4,683</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Kaihū-Dargaville</b>	<b>Population: 324</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Kaihū-Dargaville failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZF).			
Kaihū-Dargaville failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

<b>Mangawhai Heads</b>	<b>Population: 200</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Maungaturoto</b>	<b>Population: 980</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Ruawai</b>	<b>Population: 426</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.			



## Supplier: Ngāti Rēhia Wai Trust

**Ngāti Rēhia Wai Trust** **Population: 120**

Health Act: **Not complied** Standards: Bacterial **Not met** Protozoal **Not met** Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Ngāti Rēhia Wai Trust failed to provide adequate safe drinking-water, failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply, failed to keep adequate records, failed to adequately investigate complaints and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69S, 69Y, 69ZD, 69ZE and 69ZF).

Ngāti Rēhia Wai Trust failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Pakanae Community Water Supply

**Pakanae** **Population: 160**

Health Act: **Complied** Standards: Bacterial **Met** Protozoal **Met** Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

---

## Supplier: Russell Township-Commercial

**Russell Township-Commercial** **Population: 200**

Health Act: **Not complied** Standards: Bacterial **Not met** Protozoal **Not met** Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.

Russell Township-Commercial failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Russell Township-Commercial failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Waimā Hapū Community

**Waimā Hapū Community** **Population: 200**

Health Act: **Not complied** Standards: Bacterial **Not met** Protozoal **Not met** Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Waimā Hapū Community failed to provide adequate safe drinking-water, failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply, failed to keep adequate records and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69S, 69Y, 69ZD and 69ZF).

Waimā Hapū Community failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Whangarei District Council

<b>Bream Bay</b>	<b>Population: 14,800</b>
------------------	---------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

<b>Maungakaramea</b>	<b>Population: 200</b>
----------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

<b>Whangārei</b>	<b>Population: 56,530</b>
------------------	---------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

## Supplier: Whangaroa Health Services Trust

<b>Kaeo Hospital</b>	<b>Population: 134</b>
----------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

## Supplier: Whirinaki Water Board

<b>Whirinaki</b>	<b>Population: 400</b>
------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

## North, West, Central and South Auckland

### Supplier: Auckland Council

<b>Āwhitu Regional Park</b>	<b>Population: 250</b>
-----------------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

<b>Matiatia Wharf</b>	<b>Population: 800</b>
-----------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

## Supplier: Beachlands Networks Ltd

Beachlands Networks			Population: 350
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

## Supplier: BP Oil NZ Ltd, Bombay

Bombay Motorway Services			Population: 200
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Bombay Motorway Services failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

## Supplier: Haranui Whānau

Haranui Whānau			Population: 200
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.			

## Supplier: Kingseat Foundation

Kingseat Community			Population: 400
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

## Supplier: Pine Harbour Living Limited

Pine Harbour			Population: 300
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			

## Supplier: Southpark Utilities Ltd

Kensington Park			Population: 450
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
Kensington Park failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate.			

## Supplier: Veolia Water, Papakura

Burnside Road			Population: 352
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

<b>Papakura</b>	<b>Population: 48,513</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

## Supplier: Watercare Services Ltd

<b>Auckland</b>	<b>Population: 1,373,739</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

<b>Bombay</b>	<b>Population: 609</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Helensville/Parakai</b>	<b>Population: 4,579</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>Huia Village</b>	<b>Population: 597</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>Muriwai</b>	<b>Population: 563</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Snells/Algies</b>	<b>Population: 4,664</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Waiuku</b>	<b>Population: 8,697</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Warkworth</b>	<b>Population: 4,111</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Wellsford/Te Hana</b>		<b>Population: 2,114</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

## Waikato

### Supplier: Department of Conservation (Whakapapa V)

<b>Whakapapa Village</b>		<b>Population: 200</b>	
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Whakapapa Village failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Whakapapa Village failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring.			

### Supplier: Fonterra Waitoa

<b>Waitoa</b>		<b>Population: 500</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Not met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.			
Waitoa failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the chemical Standards because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV.			

### Supplier: Hahei Water Supply Association

<b>Hahei, Pa Road</b>		<b>Population: 200</b>	
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			
Hahei, Pa Road failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Hahei, Pa Road failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

### Supplier: Hamilton City Council

<b>Hamilton</b>		<b>Population: 169,325</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

## Supplier: Hauraki District Council

<b>Kaimanawa</b>	<b>Population: 204</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Kaimanawa failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 7.7 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.	

<b>Kerepehi</b>	<b>Population: 2,552</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	
Kerepehi failed the bacteriological Standards because monitoring was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and some process measurements exceeded limits.	

<b>Paeroa</b>	<b>Population: 4,887</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.	
Paeroa failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and some process measurements exceeded limits.	

<b>Waihi</b>	<b>Population: 4,927</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.	
Waihi failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and some process measurements exceeded limits.	

<b>Waitakaruru</b>	<b>Population: 2,076</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	
Waitakaruru failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and some process measurements exceeded limits.	

## Supplier: Land Information New Zealand

<b>Tokanui</b>	<b>Population: 250</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	
Tokanui failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 2.6 percent of monitoring samples.	

## Supplier: Matamata Piako District Council

<b>Matamata</b>	<b>Population: 6,943</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Matamata failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.	

<b>Morrinsville</b>	<b>Population: 6,603</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	
Morrinsville failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.	

<b>Tahuna</b>	<b>Population: 120</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.	
Tahuna failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring.	

<b>Te Aroha</b>	<b>Population: 3,838</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.	

## Supplier: Ngahinapouri School Board of Trustees

<b>Ngahinapouri School</b>	<b>Population: 200</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.	
Ngahinapouri School failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).	
Ngahinapouri School failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 11.1 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Ōtorohanga District Council

<b>Arohena</b>	<b>Population: 260</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.	
Arohena failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

**Kāwhia** **Population: 390**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Kāwhia failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

**Ōtorohanga** **Population: 3,050**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. Ōtorohanga failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because disinfectant levels were not always adequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

**Tihiroa** **Population: 400**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Tihiroa failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

## Supplier: Paterangi School Board of Trustees

**Paterangi School** **Population: 150**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.

Paterangi School failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Paterangi School failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Piriaka Community Group Inc

**Piriaka** **Population: 120**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection.

Piriaka failed to provide adequate safe drinking-water, did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination, failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply, failed to keep adequate records, failed to adequately investigate complaints and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69S, 69U, 69Y, 69ZD, 69ZE and 69ZF).

Piriaka failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 11.1 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---



## Supplier: Puhue School Board of Trustees

Puhue School			Population: 170
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.			

## Supplier: Pukeatua School

Pukeatua School			Population: 125
Health Act: <a href="#">Not complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.			
Pukeatua School failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Pukeatua School failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

## Supplier: Ruapehu District Council

National Park			Population: 240
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
National Park failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high and some process measurements exceeded limits.			

Ohakune			Population: 1,500
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Ohakune failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, disinfectant levels were not always adequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

Ōhura			Population: 160
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Ōhura failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

Owhango			Population: 200
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.			
Owhango failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

<b>Raetihi</b>		<b>Population: 749</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Taumarunui</b>		<b>Population: 4,870</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

## Supplier: South Waikato District Council

<b>Arapuni</b>		<b>Population: 300</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Arapuni failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

<b>Putāruru</b>		<b>Population: 4,116</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Putāruru failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 0.2 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues, there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

<b>Tīrau</b>		<b>Population: 700</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Tīrau failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues and there were gaps in monitoring.			

<b>Tokoroa</b>		<b>Population: 13,300</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			
Tokoroa failed the bacteriological Standards because monitoring was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

## Supplier: Taharoa Ironsands Ltd

<b>Taharoa Village</b>	<b>Population: 350</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.	
Taharoa Village failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).	
Taharoa Village failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, record-keeping was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring.	

## Supplier: Tatua Co-operative Dairy Co. Ltd

<b>Tatua Co-operative Dairy Co Ltd</b>	<b>Population: 331</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.	

## Supplier: Te Aputa Water Supply Society

<b>Te Puru – Aputa Ave</b>	<b>Population: 250</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV.	
Te Puru – Aputa Ave failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZF).	
Te Puru – Aputa Ave failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 12.5 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring.	

## Supplier: Te Mata School Board of Trustees

<b>Te Mata School</b>	<b>Population: 150</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.	
Te Mata School failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).	
Te Mata School failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Thames Coromandel District Council

<b>Coromandel</b>	<b>Population: 1,718</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	
Coromandel failed the bacteriological Standards because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.	

**Matarangi** **Population: 317**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**    Protozoal **Not met**    Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.

Matarangi failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

**Matatoki** **Population: 150**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**    Protozoal **Not met**    Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Matatoki failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Matatoki failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Onemana** **Population: 116**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**    Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Onemana failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

**Pāuanui** **Population: 750**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**    Protozoal **Not met**    Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Pāuanui did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).

Pāuanui failed the bacteriological Standards for 732 people because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring.

---

**Pūriri** **Population: 150**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**    Protozoal **Not met**    Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Pūriri failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Pūriri failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Tairua** **Population: 1,314**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**    Protozoal **Not met**    Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Tairua failed the bacteriological Standards because treatment was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

<b>Thames</b>	<b>Population: 7,657</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.	
Thames did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).	
Thames failed the bacteriological Standards because treatment was inadequate.	

<b>Thames Valley</b>	<b>Population: 200</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Thames Valley failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).	
Thames Valley failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

<b>Whangamatā</b>	<b>Population: 3,674</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.	
Whangamatā failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring.	

<b>Whitianga</b>	<b>Population: 4,550</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.	
Whitianga failed the bacteriological Standards because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and some process measurements exceeded limits.	

## Supplier: Waikato District Council

<b>Huntly</b>	<b>Population: 7,340</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.	

<b>Ngāruawāhia</b>	<b>Population: 6,879</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.	

**North Western District, Waikato District Council** **Population: 115**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

**Pōkeno** **Population: 4,567**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

**Raglan** **Population: 4,000**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

---

**Southern Districts, Waikato District Council** **Population: 5,466**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

**Te Kauwhata** **Population: 2,149**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

**Tūākau** **Population: 4,719**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

## Supplier: Waikato Regional Airport

**Hamilton Airport, East Side Terminal** **Population: 400**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.

---

**Hamilton Airport, West Side Aviation Area** **Population: 350**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Hamilton Airport, West Side Aviation Area failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring.

---

## Supplier: Waipā District Council

<b>Cambridge</b>		<b>Population: 20,833</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Cambridge failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate.			

<b>Kihikihi</b>		<b>Population: 2,000</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

<b>Pukerimu Rural</b>		<b>Population: 3,387</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			
Pukerimu Rural failed the bacteriological Standards for 2,846 people because sampling was inadequate.			

<b>Te Awamutu and Pirongia</b>		<b>Population: 10,665</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Te Awamutu and Pirongia failed the bacteriological Standards for 9,165 people because sampling was inadequate.			

## Supplier: Waitomo District Council

<b>Benneydale</b>		<b>Population: 280</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Benneydale failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring, turbidity levels at times were too high and some process measurements exceeded limits.			

<b>Mōkau, Waitomo</b>		<b>Population: 200</b>	
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Mōkau, Waitomo failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring, turbidity levels at times were too high and some process measurements exceeded limits.			

<b>Piopio</b>	<b>Population: 500</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			
Piopio failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

<b>Te Kuiti</b>	<b>Population: 4,612</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Te Kuiti failed the bacteriological Standards because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate.			

### Supplier: Waitomo Holdings Ltd

<b>Waitomo Caves</b>	<b>Population: 500</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Waitomo Caves failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Waitomo Caves failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

## Tauranga

### Supplier: Otamarakau School

<b>Otamarakau</b>	<b>Population: 111</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			
Otamarakau failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

### Supplier: Tauranga City Council

<b>Tauranga</b>	<b>Population: 146,097</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			



## Supplier: Western Bay of Plenty District Council

<b>Athenree</b>	<b>Population: 5,125</b>
-----------------	--------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Athenree failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

<b>Katikati</b>	<b>Population: 5,700</b>
-----------------	--------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Katikati failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

<b>Omokoroa Minden</b>	<b>Population: 6,450</b>
------------------------	--------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Omokoroa Minden failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

<b>Pongakawa</b>	<b>Population: 4,600</b>
------------------	--------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Pongakawa failed the bacteriological Standards because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

<b>Te Puke</b>	<b>Population: 8,460</b>
----------------	--------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Te Puke failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

## Eastern Bay of Plenty

### Supplier: Bryans Beach Water Society

<b>Bryans Beach</b>	<b>Population: 200</b>
---------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Bryans Beach failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring.

---

## Supplier: Hinekopurangi Trust

<b>Ruatahuna Village</b>	<b>Population: 300</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection.	
Ruatahuna Village failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Kawerau District Council

<b>Kawerau</b>	<b>Population: 7,721</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with UV. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Kawerau failed the bacteriological Standards for 800 people because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 0.2 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because some process measurements exceeded limits.	

## Supplier: Kutarere Community Water Supply

<b>Kutarere</b>	<b>Population: 300</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.	
Kutarere failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZF).	
Kutarere failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Omaio Waterline Committee

<b>Omaio</b>	<b>Population: 180</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Omaio failed to provide adequate safe drinking-water, did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination, failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and failed to keep adequate records. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69S, 69U, 69Y and 69ZD).	
Omaio failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Ōpōtiki District Council

Ōpōtiki	Population: 4,530
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.	
Ōpōtiki did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).	
Ōpōtiki failed the bacteriological Standards because the compliance criteria for drinking-water leaving the treatment plant have not been met.	

Te Kaha	Population: 150
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	
Te Kaha failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Waiohau Waiora Incorporated

Waiohau	Population: 250
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.	
Waiohau failed the bacteriological Standards because it did not take any <i>E. coli</i> samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Whakatāne District Council

Matatā	Population: 690
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.	

Murupara	Population: 1,674
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.	
Murupara failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

Otumahi	Population: 2,841
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	

<b>Rangitaiki Plains</b>	<b>Population: 2,897</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Not met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Rangitaiki Plains did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69ZF).			
Rangitaiki Plains failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards because arsenic exceeded the MAV and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.			
<b>Rūātoki</b>	<b>Population: 560</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
Rūātoki failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because some process measurements exceeded limits.			
<b>Tāneatua</b>	<b>Population: 790</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Te Mahoe</b>	<b>Population: 120</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.			
<b>Waimana</b>	<b>Population: 160</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Whakatāne</b>	<b>Population: 21,020</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

## Supplier: Whanarua Bay Water Supply

<b>Whanarua Bay</b>	<b>Population: 200</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection			
Whanarua Bay failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Whanarua Bay failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

## Rotorua and Taupō

### Supplier: Brunswick Stage Three/Four Limited

<b>Brunswick 4</b>	<b>Population: 110</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a> Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Brunswick 4 failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 8.3 percent of monitoring samples.	

### Supplier: Kaingaroa Forest Village Papakāinga Trust

<b>Kaingaroa</b>	<b>Population: 400</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Not complied</a> Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Not met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Kaingaroa did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69ZF).	
Kaingaroa failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 3.1 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and it took inadequate actions to address that issue. It failed the chemical Standards because copper sampling was inadequate and lead sampling was inadequate.	

### Supplier: Kinloch Park Residents Association

<b>Kinloch Park</b>	<b>Population: 140</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a> Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Kinloch Park failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 2.1 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

### Supplier: Rotorua Lakes Council

<b>Hamurana/Kaharoa</b>	<b>Population: 1,700</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a> Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.	

  

<b>Mamaku</b>	<b>Population: 868</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a> Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	

<b>Ngongotahā</b>	<b>Population: 4,826</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Reporoa</b>	<b>Population: 1,060</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Rotoiti</b>	<b>Population: 880</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Rotomā</b>	<b>Population: 340</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Rotorua Central</b>	<b>Population: 42,500</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Rotorua East</b>	<b>Population: 10,330</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			

### Supplier: Taupō District Council

<b>Acacia Bay</b>	<b>Population: 2,381</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Not met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.			
Acacia Bay failed the bacteriological Standards because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards for 1,512 people because arsenic exceeded the MAV and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.			
<b>Atiamuri Village</b>	<b>Population: 134</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Atiamuri Village failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

**Bonshaw Park** **Population: 152**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Bonshaw Park failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Centennial Drive** **Population: 200**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Not met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

Centennial Drive failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards because arsenic exceeded the MAV and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.

---

**Hatepe Village** **Population: 174**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Not met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

Hatepe Village failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards because arsenic exceeded the MAV, arsenic sampling was inadequate and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.

---

**Kinloch** **Population: 1,696**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Not met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Kinloch failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 1.3 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards because arsenic exceeded the MAV and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.

---

**Mangakino** **Population: 1,312**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

Mangakino failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Motuoapa** **Population: 739**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Not met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

Motuoapa failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards because arsenic exceeded the MAV, arsenic sampling was inadequate and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.

---

**Omori/Kuratau/Pūkawa** **Population: 1,883**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Not met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

Omori/Kuratau/Pūkawa failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards because arsenic exceeded the MAV, it took inadequate actions to address that issue and arsenic sampling was inadequate.

**River Rd Reporoa** **Population: 197**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

River Rd Reporoa failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

**Taupō – Lake Terrace** **Population: 23,810**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

Taupō – Lake Terrace failed the protozoal Standards because some process measurements exceeded limits.

**Tirohanga Valley Community** **Population: 327**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

Tirohanga Valley Community failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

**Tūrangi** **Population: 3,938**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

Tūrangi failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring.

**Whakamaru** **Population: 116**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Whakamaru failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

**Whareroa** **Population: 313**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Whareroa failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.



## Supplier: Wairakei Resort

### **Wairakei Terraces** **Population: 500**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.

Wairakei Terraces failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

## Gisborne

### Supplier: Gisborne District Council

### **Gisborne City** **Population: 30,600**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

### **Te Karaka** **Population: 491**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

---

### **Whatatutu** **Population: 200**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

---

## Supplier: Mangahauini Inc

### **Enihau** **Population: 130**

Health Act: [Not complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Enihau failed to provide adequate safe drinking-water and failed to keep adequate records. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69S and 69ZD).

Enihau failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring.

---

## Supplier: Ngāti Porou Hauora

<b>Te Puia Springs</b>			<b>Population: 300</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Te Puia Springs failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, there were calibration issues, there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

## Taranaki

### Supplier: Cold Creek Community Water Supply Ltd

<b>Cold Creek (Pihama)</b>			<b>Population: 350</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.			

### Supplier: New Plymouth District Council

<b>Inglewood</b>			<b>Population: 3,983</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>New Plymouth</b>			<b>Population: 59,072</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>Ōakura</b>			<b>Population: 1,625</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

<b>Ōkato</b>			<b>Population: 530</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

### Supplier: South Taranaki District Council

<b>Eltham</b>			<b>Population: 1,980</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>Hāwera</b>	<b>Population: 9,710</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

<b>Inaha</b>	<b>Population: 495</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>Ōpunake</b>	<b>Population: 1,370</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>Pātea</b>	<b>Population: 1,150</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			

<b>Rāhotu</b>	<b>Population: 115</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>Waimate West</b>	<b>Population: 2,880</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>Waverley</b>	<b>Population: 950</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			

## Supplier: Stratford District Council

<b>Midhirst</b>	<b>Population: 200</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Stratford</b>	<b>Population: 6,773</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

## Hawke's Bay

### Supplier: Central Hawke's Bay District Council

<b>Pōrangahau</b>				<b>Population: 160</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.				
Pōrangahau failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.				

<b>Takapau</b>				<b>Population: 570</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.				
Takapau failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring.				

<b>Waipawa</b>				<b>Population: 2,355</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.				

<b>Waipukurau</b>				<b>Population: 3,666</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.				
Waipukurau failed the bacteriological Standards for unknown reasons. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.				

### Supplier: Farm Road Water Supply Ltd

<b>Farm Road</b>				<b>Population: 120</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.				
Farm Road did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination and failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69U and 69Y).				
Farm Road failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.				

### Supplier: Hastings District Council

<b>Clive</b>				<b>Population: 560</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.				

**Hastings Urban** **Population: 64,764**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

Hastings Urban failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

**Haumoana / Te Awanga** **Population: 1,900**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

---

**Ōmāhu** **Population: 126**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

---

**Waimārama** **Population: 260**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Waimārama failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and there were calibration issues.

---

**Whakatū** **Population: 337**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

---

**Whirinaki, Hawke's Bay** **Population: 800**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Whirinaki, Hawke's Bay failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

## Supplier: Napier City Council

**Napier** **Population: 57,660**

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

---

## Supplier: Ngāti Pāhauwera Incorporated Society

### **Raupunga** **Population: 250**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Raupunga did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination, failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply, failed to keep adequate records, failed to adequately investigate complaints and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69U, 69Y, 69ZD, 69ZE and 69ZF).

Raupunga failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Wairoa District Council

### **Blue Bay** **Population: 117**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.

Blue Bay failed to provide adequate safe drinking-water, did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination, failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply, failed to keep adequate records, failed to adequately investigate complaints and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69S, 69U, 69Y, 69ZD, 69ZE and 69ZF).

Blue Bay failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 100 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

### **Tuai Village** **Population: 300**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV.

---

### **Wairoa** **Population: 4,650**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and UV and is chlorinated.

---

## Whanganui, Rangitikei and Southern Ruapehu

Supplier: Ministry of Defence, Waiōuru

Waiōuru	Population: 2,800
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Not met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. Waiōuru did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69ZF). Waiōuru failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 2.2 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the chemical Standards because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.	

Supplier: Rangitikei District Council

Bulls	Population: 1,419
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Bulls failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high and some process measurements exceeded limits.	

Hunternville	Population: 480
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Hunternville failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high and some process measurements exceeded limits.	

Mangaweka	Population: 150
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Mangaweka failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate.	

Marton	Population: 4,764
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Not met</b>	
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Marton failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the chemical Standards because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV and a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process sampling was inadequate.	

<b>Rātana</b>				<b>Population: 337</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.				

<b>Taihape</b>				<b>Population: 1,584</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Taihape failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high and some process measurements exceeded limits.				

## Supplier: Whanganui District Council

<b>Fordell</b>				<b>Population: 350</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.				

<b>Maxwell</b>				<b>Population: 200</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.				

<b>Mōwhānau Beach</b>				<b>Population: 300</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.				

<b>Whanganui</b>				<b>Population: 39,475</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with ozone and is chlorinated.				

## Manawatū

### Supplier: Brandlines Ltd

<b>Longburn, Brandlines</b>				<b>Population: 150</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Not complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>	
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.				
Longburn, Brandlines failed to provide adequate safe drinking-water, did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination, failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply, failed to keep adequate records, failed to adequately investigate complaints and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69S, 69U, 69Y, 69ZD, 69ZE and 69ZF).				
Longburn, Brandlines failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.				



## Supplier: Horowhenua District Council

### **Foxton** **Population: 2,700**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Not met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.

Foxton failed the chemical Standards because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process sampling was inadequate, a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process sampling was not undertaken, a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.

### **Foxton Beach** **Population: 1,900**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.

### **Levin** **Population: 20,000**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

### **Shannon** **Population: 1,436**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.

### **Tokomaru** **Population: 550**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Not met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Tokomaru failed the chemical Standards because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV.

## Supplier: Kiwitea Rural Scheme

### **Kiwitea Rural** **Population: 230**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses mixed sources and is chlorinated.

Kiwitea Rural failed the bacteriological Standards for unknown reasons. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

## Supplier: Longburn Adventist College

### **Longburn Adventist College** **Population: 300**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.

Longburn Adventist College failed the bacteriological Standards for unknown reasons. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

## Supplier: Manawatu District Council

<b>Feilding</b>	<b>Population: 15,419</b>
-----------------	---------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

<b>Halcombe-Stanway</b>	<b>Population: 328</b>
-------------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.

Halcombe-Stanway failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

<b>Himatangi Beach</b>	<b>Population: 423</b>
------------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

<b>Rongotea</b>	<b>Population: 163</b>
-----------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

<b>Sanson</b>	<b>Population: 462</b>
---------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

<b>Waituna West</b>	<b>Population: 226</b>
---------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

## Supplier: Massey University

<b>Massey University</b>	<b>Population: 9,000</b>
--------------------------	--------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

## Supplier: Ministry of Defence, Ohakea

<b>Ohakea</b>	<b>Population: 800</b>
---------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#) Standards: Bacterial [Met](#) Protozoal [Not met](#) Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Ohakea failed the protozoal Standards because disinfectant levels were not always adequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.

## Supplier: New Zealand Defence Force

<b>Linton Military Camp</b>		<b>Population: 3,500</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			
Linton Military Camp failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			

## Supplier: Palmerston North City Council

<b>Ashhurst</b>		<b>Population: 2,800</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

<b>Bunnythorpe</b>		<b>Population: 493</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

<b>Longburn</b>		<b>Population: 350</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

<b>Palmerston North City</b>		<b>Population: 72,284</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

## Supplier: Tararua District Council

<b>Dannevirke</b>		<b>Population: 6,000</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
Dannevirke failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, disinfectant levels were not always adequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

<b>Eketahuna</b>		<b>Population: 456</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Eketahuna failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, disinfectant levels were not always adequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

**Norsewood** **Population: 200**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Norsewood failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Pahiatua** **Population: 2,700**

Health Act: [Not complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

Pahiatua did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).

Pahiatua failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Pongaroa** **Population: 200**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Pongaroa failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate.

---

**Woodville** **Population: 1,500**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Woodville failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, disinfectant levels were not always adequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

## Wellington and Hutt

### Supplier: Hutt City Council

**Lower Hutt** **Population: 103,872**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

### Supplier: Kāpiti Coast District Council

**Hautere** **Population: 700**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

---

**Ōtaki** **Population: 5,700**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

Otaki failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted and turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

**Paekākāriki** **Population: 1,665**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

---

**Waikanae/Paraparaumu/Raumati** **Population: 35,800**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

### Supplier: Porirua City Council

**Judgeford** **Population: 175**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

**Porirua** **Population: 54,830**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

### Supplier: Upper Hutt City Council

**Upper Hutt** **Population: 39,927**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

### Supplier: Wellington City Council

**Wellington City** **Population: 210,637**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

# Wairarapa

## Supplier: Carterton District Council

<b>Carterton</b>	<b>Population: 5,230</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	
Carterton did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69ZF).	
Carterton failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring, it took inadequate actions to address that issue, disinfectant levels were not always adequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.	

## Supplier: Fernridge Water Supply Association Inc

<b>Fernridge</b>	<b>Population: 320</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Fernridge did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69U).	
Fernridge failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 4.8 percent of monitoring samples.	

## Supplier: Masterton District Council

<b>Masterton</b>	<b>Population: 19,000</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.	

<b>Tinui</b>	<b>Population: 120</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	

## Supplier: Opaki Water Supply Association

<b>Opaki</b>	<b>Population: 1,500</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.	
Opaki failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues.	

## Supplier: South Wairarapa District Council

<b>Featherston</b>	<b>Population: 2,599</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Not met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Featherston failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process sampling was inadequate.	

<b>Greytown</b>	<b>Population: 2,623</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.	
Greytown failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

<b>Martinborough</b>	<b>Population: 1,776</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.	
Martinborough failed the bacteriological Standards because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

## Nelson

### Supplier: Appleby Hills Residents Association Inc

<b>Appleby Hills</b>	<b>Population: 250</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.	

### Supplier: Central Tākaka Water Board

<b>Central Tākaka</b>	<b>Population: 125</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Central Tākaka failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZF).	
Central Tākaka failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Department of Conservation (St Arnaud)

Lake Rotoiti	Population: 200
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV.	
Lake Rotoiti failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).	
Lake Rotoiti failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring.	

## Supplier: Lions Den Holdings Ltd

Glenwood	Population: 150
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV.	

## Supplier: Lower Moutere Water Scheme Ltd

Lower Moutere Water Scheme 1	Population: 450
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.	
Lower Moutere Water Scheme 1 failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).	
Lower Moutere Water Scheme 1 failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Nelson City Council

Nelson	Population: 52,400
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	

## Supplier: Tasman District Council

Collingwood	Population: 240
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.	
Collingwood failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 5.3 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	



**Dovedale Rural** **Population: 450**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Dovedale Rural failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 2.6 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Eighty Eight Valley Rural** **Population: 450**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

Eighty Eight Valley Rural failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Hope/Brightwater** **Population: 2,730**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Hope/Brightwater failed the protozoal Standards for 2,100 people because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Kaiteriteri** **Population: 420**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.

Kaiteriteri failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

**Motueka** **Population: 1,200**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.

Motueka failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Murchison** **Population: 490**

Health Act: [Not complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

Murchison failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Murchison failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

<b>Pōhara</b>	<b>Population: 160</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.			
Pōhara failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 2.5 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Redwood Valley 1</b>	<b>Population: 180</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Redwood Valley 1 failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Redwood Valley 2</b>	<b>Population: 370</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Redwood Valley 2 failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Richmond/Waimea Industrial</b>	<b>Population: 14,000</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.			
<b>Tapawera</b>	<b>Population: 400</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Waimea Māpua Ruby Bay</b>	<b>Population: 2,500</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Waimea Māpua Ruby Bay failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Wakefield</b>	<b>Population: 2,100</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Wakefield failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

# Marlborough

## Supplier: Edgewater Estate Ltd

<b>Edgewater Subdivision</b>	<b>Population: 200</b>
------------------------------	------------------------

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.

Edgewater Subdivision failed to provide adequate safe drinking-water and failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69S and 69Y).

Edgewater Subdivision failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring.

---

## Supplier: Flaxbourne Water Scheme Inc

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Population: 250</b>
-------------	------------------------

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Ward failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 1.1 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

## Supplier: Marlborough District Council

<b>Awatere</b>	<b>Population: 1,333</b>
----------------	--------------------------

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Awatere failed the bacteriological Standards for 333 people because *E. coli* was detected in 3.0 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

<b>Blenheim</b>	<b>Population: 24,028</b>
-----------------	---------------------------

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.

Blenheim did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).

---

<b>Havelock</b>	<b>Population: 618</b>
-----------------	------------------------

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Havelock failed the bacteriological Standards because there was a treatment plant failure during the reporting period and the response was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

<b>Picton/Waikawa</b>				<b>Population: 4,185</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation and UV and is chlorinated.				

<b>Renwick</b>				<b>Population: 1,884</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.				
Renwick failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.				

<b>Riverlands Industrial</b>				<b>Population: 740</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.				
Riverlands Industrial failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.				

<b>Wairau Valley Township</b>				<b>Population: 160</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.				
Wairau Valley Township failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.				

### Supplier: Ministry of Defence, Woodbourne

<b>Woodbourne RNZAF Base</b>				<b>Population: 1,500</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.				
Woodbourne RNZAF Base failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues, turbidity levels at times were too high and some process measurements exceeded limits.				

### Supplier: Okiwi Bay Ratepayers Association Inc

<b>Ōkiwi Bay</b>				<b>Population: 160</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV.				

### Supplier: Rarangi North Water Supply Inc

<b>Rārangi</b>				<b>Population: 160</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.				

## West Coast

### Supplier: Buller District Council

#### **Little Wanganui** **Population: 150**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Little Wanganui failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and failed to keep adequate records. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZD).

Little Wanganui failed the bacteriological Standards because it did not take any *E. coli* samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

#### **Punakaiki** **Population: 230**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Punakaiki failed the bacteriological Standards because there was a treatment plant failure during the reporting period. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate and some process measurements exceeded limits.

---

#### **Reefton** **Population: 951**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Reefton failed the bacteriological Standards because there was a treatment plant failure during the reporting period. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, turbidity levels at times were too high and some process measurements exceeded limits.

---

#### **Waimangaroa** **Population: 300**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Waimangaroa failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and failed to keep adequate records. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZD).

Waimangaroa failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 50.0 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

<b>Westport</b>	<b>Population: 4,974</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Westport failed the bacteriological Standards because monitoring was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate and some process measurements exceeded limits.			

## Supplier: Grey District Council

<b>Blackball</b>	<b>Population: 280</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			

<b>Greymouth</b>	<b>Population: 8,320</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Not met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Greymouth failed the chemical Standards for 5,950 people because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.			

<b>Rūnanga</b>	<b>Population: 1,090</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			

## Supplier: Ngākawau – Hector Water Society Inc

<b>Hector/Ngākawau</b>	<b>Population: 219</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Not complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Hector/Ngākawau failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and failed to keep adequate records. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZD).			
Hector/Ngākawau failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

## Supplier: Westland District Council

### **Arahura Pā** **Population: 105**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Arahura Pā failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Arahura Pā failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

### **Fox Glacier** **Population: 252**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Fox Glacier failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 4.6 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and record-keeping was inadequate.

---

### **Franz Josef** **Population: 2,611**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Franz Josef failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues and record-keeping was inadequate.

---

### **Haast** **Population: 110**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.

Haast failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 1.4 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate and some process measurements exceeded limits.

---

### **Harihari** **Population: 348**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.

Harihari failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, there were calibration issues and record-keeping was inadequate.

---

### **Hokitika** **Population: 3,447**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.

Hokitika failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues, record-keeping was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

**Kumara** **Population: 318**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Kumara failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues and record-keeping was inadequate.

---

**Ross** **Population: 291**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.

Ross failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues, record-keeping was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.

---

**Whataroa** **Population: 405**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.

Whataroa failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues and record-keeping was inadequate.

---

## Canterbury

### Supplier: Ashburton District Council

**Ashburton** **Population: 19,000**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Ashburton failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

**Chertsey** **Population: 230**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Chertsey failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

**Fairton** **Population: 210**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

---

**Hakaterere Upper** **Population: 110**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

Hakaterere Upper failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---



<b>Hinds</b>	<b>Population: 340</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Hinds failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			

<b>Mayfield</b>	<b>Population: 160</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Mayfield failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			

<b>Methven</b>	<b>Population: 1,700</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Not met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			
Methven failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69Z).			
Methven failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the chemical Standards because fluoride sampling was inadequate.			

<b>Mt Somers</b>	<b>Population: 260</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Mt Somers failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, disinfectant levels were not always adequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.			

<b>Rakaia</b>	<b>Population: 1,100</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

## Supplier: Chatham Islands Council

<b>Waitangi, Chatham Islands</b>	<b>Population: 125</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Waitangi, Chatham Islands failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 4.2 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and there were calibration issues.			

## Supplier: Christchurch City Council

<b>Akaroa</b>	<b>Population: 1,350</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			
<b>Birdlings Flat</b>	<b>Population: 150</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.			
Birdlings Flat failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Birdlings Flat failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues.			
<b>Brooklands / Kainga</b>	<b>Population: 1,600</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Brooklands / Kainga failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Christchurch</b>	<b>Population: 335,500</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Christchurch failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Duvauchelle</b>	<b>Population: 250</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Duvauchelle failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Duvauchelle failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.			
<b>Little River</b>	<b>Population: 240</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources and is treated with filtration and UV.			
Little River failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Little River failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate.			

<b>Lyttelton</b>			<b>Population: 4,450</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Lyttelton failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			

<b>Takamatua</b>			<b>Population: 150</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.			

<b>Wainui</b>			<b>Population: 200</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

### Supplier: Christchurch International Airport

<b>Christchurch International Airport</b>			<b>Population: 6,100</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.			
Christchurch International Airport failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

### Supplier: Defence Department, Burnham

<b>Burnham Military Camp</b>			<b>Population: 1,700</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Burnham Military Camp failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

### Supplier: Dorie School

<b>Dorie School</b>			<b>Population: 110</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.			
Dorie School failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Dorie School failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, there were calibration issues and there were gaps in monitoring.			

## Supplier: Highbank Water Society

Highbank Society Water Supply			Population: 220
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.			

## Supplier: Hurunui District Council

Amberley			Population: 1,921
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

Amuri Plains Rural Water Supply			Population: 699
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
Amuri Plains Rural Water Supply failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

Ashley Rural			Population: 5,832
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
Ashley Rural failed the protozoal Standards for 5,430 people because compliance was not attempted.			

Balmoral Rural			Population: 273
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.			
Balmoral Rural failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			

Broomfield			Population: 565
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

Cheviot			Population: 888
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Cheviot failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			

Culverden			Population: 366
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

<b>Hanmer</b>	<b>Population: 948</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Hanmer failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, record-keeping was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring.			
<b>Hawarden</b>	<b>Population: 753</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. Hawarden failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Kaiwara</b>	<b>Population: 129</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period. Kaiwara failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			
<b>Lower Waitohi</b>	<b>Population: 315</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. Lower Waitohi failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			
<b>Motunau, Greta, Scargill</b>	<b>Population: 681</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period. Motunau, Greta, Scargill failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			
<b>Parnassus Rural</b>	<b>Population: 210</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. Parnassus Rural failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			
<b>Waiiau Rural</b>	<b>Population: 435</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. Waiiau Rural failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.			
<b>Waiiau Township</b>	<b>Population: 255</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.			

**Waipara Township** **Population: 285**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Waipara Township failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

**Waitohi Upper** **Population: 513**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

Waitohi Upper failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

## Supplier: Kaikōura District Council

**Fernleigh Rural Water Supply** **Population: 150**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Fernleigh Rural Water Supply failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Kaikōura** **Population: 2,500**

Health Act: [Not complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Kaikōura failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Kaikōura failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.

---

**Kaikōura East Coast Rural** **Population: 150**

Health Act: [Not complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Kaikōura East Coast Rural failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply, failed to keep adequate records and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y, 69ZD and 69ZF).

Kaikōura East Coast Rural failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Kincaid Rural Water Supply** **Population: 120**

Health Act: **Not complied** Standards: Bacterial **Not met** Protozoal **Not met** Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Kincaid Rural Water Supply failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Kincaid Rural Water Supply failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 0.7 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues, record-keeping was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.

**Oaro** **Population: 400**

Health Act: **Not complied** Standards: Bacterial **Not met** Protozoal **Not met** Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.

Oaro failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Oaro failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

**Ocean Ridge** **Population: 500**

Health Act: **Not complied** Standards: Bacterial **Not met** Protozoal **Not met** Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Ocean Ridge failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Ocean Ridge failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

## Supplier: Living Springs Trust

**Living Springs** **Population: 180**

Health Act: **Complied** Standards: Bacterial **Met** Protozoal **Met** Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV.

## Supplier: Lyndhurst Water Scheme Co-Operative Ltd

**Lyndhurst** **Population: 250**

Health Act: **Complied** Standards: Bacterial **Met** Protozoal **Met** Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

## Supplier: Okains Bay Water Committee

<b>Okains Bay</b>	<b>Population: 105</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, without disinfection.	
Okains Bay failed to provide adequate safe drinking-water, did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination, failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply, failed to keep adequate records, failed to adequately investigate complaints and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69S, 69U, 69Y, 69ZD, 69ZE and 69ZF).	
Okains Bay failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Selwyn District Council

<b>Arthurs Pass</b>	<b>Population: 350</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with UV. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Arthurs Pass failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.	

<b>Castle Hill</b>	<b>Population: 370</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.	
Castle Hill failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.	

<b>Claremont</b>	<b>Population: 170</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.	

<b>Darfield</b>	<b>Population: 3,720</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.	

<b>Dunsandel &amp; Sherwood Estate</b>	<b>Population: 495</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.	

<b>Edendale, Sandy Knolls</b>	<b>Population: 200</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b> Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.	



<b>Kirwee</b>	<b>Population: 1,300</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.			
<b>Lake Coleridge</b>	<b>Population: 165</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with UV. Lake Coleridge failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high.			
<b>Leeston</b>	<b>Population: 3,000</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
<b>Lincoln</b>	<b>Population: 7,200</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			
<b>Malvern Hills Rural Water Scheme</b>	<b>Population: 1,684</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Malvern Hills Rural Water Scheme failed the protozoal Standards for 1,493 people because record-keeping was inadequate.			
<b>Prebbleton</b>	<b>Population: 4,500</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			
<b>Rakaia Huts</b>	<b>Population: 320</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			
<b>Rolleston</b>	<b>Population: 18,550</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV. Rolleston failed to keep adequate records. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69ZD).			

<b>Selwyn RWS</b>	<b>Population: 1,160</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Selwyn RWS failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.			
<b>Sheffield/Waddington</b>	<b>Population: 585</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Sheffield/Waddington failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate.			
<b>Southbridge</b>	<b>Population: 990</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Southbridge failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Springfield</b>	<b>Population: 580</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Springfield failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.			
<b>Springston</b>	<b>Population: 530</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			
<b>Tai Tapu</b>	<b>Population: 760</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			
<b>West Melton</b>	<b>Population: 2,270</b>		
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			

## Supplier: Southpark Utilities Ltd

### **Waterloo Business Park, Christchurch** **Population: 1,600**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.

Waterloo Business Park, Christchurch failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69Z).

Waterloo Business Park, Christchurch failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and record-keeping was inadequate.

## Supplier: Waimakariri District Council

### **Cust** **Population: 330**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.

### **Garrymere** **Population: 105**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Garrymere failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

### **Kaiapoi** **Population: 12,630**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.

### **Mandeville** **Population: 2,353**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

Mandeville failed the bacteriological Standards for unknown reasons. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate, compliance was not attempted and turbidity levels at times were too high.

### **Ohoka** **Population: 280**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

### **Oxford Rural No. 1** **Population: 828**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses mixed sources and is chlorinated.

<b>Oxford Urban – Rural No. 2</b>	<b>Population: 2,993</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			

<b>Pegasus – Woodend</b>	<b>Population: 7,325</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

<b>Poyntz Road, Eyrewell</b>	<b>Population: 215</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			
Poyntz Road, Eyrewell failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

<b>Rangiora</b>	<b>Population: 17,880</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

<b>Waikuku</b>	<b>Population: 1,150</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.			

<b>West Eyreton</b>	<b>Population: 613</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.			

## South Canterbury

### Supplier: Arowhenua Rūnanga

<b>Arowhenua</b>	<b>Population: 215</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.			
Arowhenua failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Arowhenua failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

## Supplier: Department of Conservation Aoraki Mt Cook

<b>Mt Cook</b>			<b>Population: 350</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with UV.			

## Supplier: Hakataramea Water Scheme Inc

<b>Hakataramea Valley Rural</b>			<b>Population: 165</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Hakataramea Valley Rural failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).			
Hakataramea Valley Rural failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 1.9 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

## Supplier: Mackenzie District Council

<b>Albury Rural</b>			<b>Population: 125</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.			
Albury Rural failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

<b>Allandale</b>			<b>Population: 150</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Allandale failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZF).			
Allandale failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 3.1 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

<b>Fairlie</b>			<b>Population: 1,000</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.			
Fairlie failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

<b>Tekapō</b>				<b>Population: 500</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.				
Tekapō failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.				

<b>Twizel</b>				<b>Population: 1,300</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.				
Twizel failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate, there were gaps in monitoring and turbidity levels at times were too high.				

## Supplier: Timaru District Council

<b>Downlands</b>				<b>Population: 4,550</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.				
Downlands failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.				

<b>Geraldine</b>				<b>Population: 2,121</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.				
Geraldine failed to keep adequate records. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69ZD).				
Geraldine failed the bacteriological Standards because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate.				

<b>Hadlow</b>				<b>Population: 312</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with ozone and is chlorinated.				

<b>Pareora</b>				<b>Population: 450</b>
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.				
Pareora failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).				
Pareora failed the bacteriological Standards because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate.				

<b>Peel Forest</b>				<b>Population: 130</b>
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>	
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.				

**Pleasant Point** **Population: 1,200**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with UV.

Pleasant Point failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Pleasant Point failed the bacteriological Standards because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate.

---

**Seadown** **Population: 895**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

---

**St Andrews** **Population: 280**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

St Andrews failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Te Moana Scheme** **Population: 1,650**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses mixed sources, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Te Moana Scheme failed the bacteriological Standards for 650 people because there were gaps in monitoring. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Temuka** **Population: 4,620**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

---

**Timaru City** **Population: 26,832**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with ozone and is chlorinated.

---

## Supplier: Waimate District Council

**Cannington/Motukaika Rural** **Population: 120**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Cannington/Motukaika Rural failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 0.9 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Hook/Waituna Rural** **Population: 1,350**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Hook/Waituna Rural failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 0.8 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Lower Waihao Rural** **Population: 600**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Lower Waihao Rural failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Otaio/Makikihi Rural** **Population: 430**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Otaio/Makikihi Rural failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Waihaorunga Rural** **Population: 141**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Waihaorunga Rural failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Waikakāhi Rural** **Population: 360**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Waikakāhi Rural failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Waimate** **Population: 3,000**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Waimate failed the protozoal Standards because record-keeping was inadequate.

---



# Otago

## Supplier: Camphill Estate Utilities Society

### **Camphill Estate** **Population: 132**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.

Camphill Estate failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Cardrona Water Co Ltd

### **Cardrona Township** **Population: 300**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Cardrona Township failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 3.2 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues and there were gaps in monitoring.

---

## Supplier: Central Otago District Council

### **Alexandra** **Population: 6,000**

Health Act: [Not complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Alexandra did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).

Alexandra failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

### **Clyde** **Population: 2,200**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Clyde failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

### **Cromwell** **Population: 8,000**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Cromwell failed the bacteriological Standards for 450 people because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

<b>Naseby</b>	<b>Population: 420</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Naseby failed the bacteriological Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.	
<b>Ōmakau/Ophir</b>	<b>Population: 400</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.	
Ōmakau/Ophir failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	
<b>Pātearoa</b>	<b>Population: 260</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.	
Pātearoa failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	
<b>Pisa Village</b>	<b>Population: 250</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.	
Pisa Village failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	
<b>Ranfurlly</b>	<b>Population: 950</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.	
Ranfurlly failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	
<b>Roxburgh</b>	<b>Population: 790</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Roxburgh failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high.	

## Supplier: Closeburn Water Company

Closeburn	Population: 150
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.	
Closeburn did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination and failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69U and 69Y).	
Closeburn failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

## Supplier: Clutha District Council

Balclutha	Population: 3,918
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.	

Clydevale-Pomahaka Rural	Population: 778
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.	
Clydevale-Pomahaka Rural failed to keep adequate records. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69ZD).	
Clydevale-Pomahaka Rural failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.	

Glenkenich Rural	Population: 705
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Not met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Glenkenich Rural did not have an implemented WSP and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Z and 69ZF).	
Glenkenich Rural failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 3.0 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV and it took inadequate actions to address that issue.	

Kaitangata	Population: 812
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b> Protozoal <b>Not met</b> Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.	
Kaitangata failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

**Lawrence** **Population: 417**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. Lawrence failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Milton** **Population: 2,529**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Not met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

Milton failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply, failed to adequately investigate complaints and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y, 69ZE and 69ZF).

Milton failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV, a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process sampling was inadequate, it took inadequate actions to address that issue and fluoride sampling was inadequate.

---

**Moa Flat** **Population: 534**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Moa Flat failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 1.1 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**North Bruce Rural** **Population: 928**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Not met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.

North Bruce Rural failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69Y and 69ZF).

North Bruce Rural failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted. It failed the chemical Standards for 658 people because a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process exceeded the MAV, a disinfection by-product produced as part of the disinfection process sampling was inadequate, it took inadequate actions to address that issue and trichloroacetic acid sampling was inadequate.

---

**Ōwaka** **Population: 303**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

Ōwaka failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Ōwaka failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Richardson Rural** **Population: 1,003**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Richardson Rural failed the bacteriological Standards for 312 people because *E. coli* was detected in 0.3 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Stirling** **Population: 737**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.

Stirling failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Tapanui** **Population: 726**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

Tapanui failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Tuapeka West** **Population: 283**

Health Act: [Not complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Tuapeka West did not take reasonable steps to protect source water from contamination and did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (sections 69U and 69ZF).

Tuapeka West failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 24.8 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Waitahuna Rural** **Population: 922**

Health Act: [Not complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Waitahuna Rural did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69ZF).

Waitahuna Rural failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 5.4 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Dunedin City Council

<b>Dunedin City</b>	<b>Population: 112,515</b>
---------------------	----------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.

---

<b>Outram</b>	<b>Population: 750</b>
---------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

---

<b>Waikouaiti</b>	<b>Population: 1,642</b>
-------------------	--------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.

---

<b>West Taieri</b>	<b>Population: 450</b>
--------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated.

---

## Supplier: Earnsclough Domestic Water Co. Ltd

<b>Earnsclough Water Scheme</b>	<b>Population: 120</b>
---------------------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.

Earnsclough Water Scheme failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Last Chance Community Scheme

<b>Last Chance</b>	<b>Population: 120</b>
--------------------	------------------------

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.

Last Chance failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure

---

## Supplier: Maheno Water Committee

**Maheno** **Population: 152**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.

Maheno failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).

Maheno failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were gaps in monitoring.

---

## Supplier: Millers Flat Water Company Ltd

**Millers Flat** **Population: 180**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water and is treated with filtration and UV.

Millers Flat failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues, record-keeping was inadequate and there were gaps in monitoring.

---

## Supplier: Pisa Moorings Utilities Society

**Pisa Moorings** **Population: 260**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses ground water, without disinfection.

Pisa Moorings failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Waitaki District Council

**Awamoko** **Population: 399**

Health Act: **Not complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Not met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.

Awamoko did not take all appropriate actions to protect public health after an issue was discovered. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69ZF).

Awamoko failed the bacteriological Standards because *E. coli* was detected in 1.3 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Kauru Hill** **Population: 197**

Health Act: **Complied**      Standards: Bacterial **Met**      Protozoal **Not met**      Chemical **Met**

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

Kauru Hill failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

<b>Kurow</b>	<b>Population: 330</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Lower Waitaki, Rural</b>	<b>Population: 778</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Ōamaru</b>	<b>Population: 15,561</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and ozone and is chlorinated.			
<b>Ōmarama</b>	<b>Population: 270</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. Ōmarama failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Otematata</b>	<b>Population: 195</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated. Otematata failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high.			
<b>Tokarahi/Livingstone</b>	<b>Population: 573</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. Tokarahi/Livingstone did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z). Tokarahi/Livingstone failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			
<b>Waihemo</b>	<b>Population: 1,357</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Windsor</b>	<b>Population: 137</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Not met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period. Windsor failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 10.8 percent of monitoring samples and it took inadequate actions to address that issue. It failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			



# Southland

## Supplier: Gore District Council

<b>Gore</b>		<b>Population: 7,480</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Gore failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

<b>Mataura</b>		<b>Population: 1,790</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation and filtration and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Mataura failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.			

<b>Otama</b>		<b>Population: 300</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.			
Otama failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 0.7 percent of monitoring samples. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.			

## Supplier: Invercargill City Council

<b>Invercargill</b>		<b>Population: 50,456</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated. The water is fluoridated.			

## Supplier: Jacks Point Limited

<b>Jacks Point</b>		<b>Population: 669</b>	
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
Jacks Point failed the protozoal Standards because turbidity levels at times were too high.			

## Supplier: M Bashford

<b>The Old Plough</b>			
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a>	Protozoal <a href="#">Met</a>	Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply was not operational during the survey period.			

## Supplier: Milford Sound Infrastructure Ltd

<b>Milford Sound</b>	<b>Population: 850</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Not met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses surface water and is treated with filtration and UV. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.	
Milford Sound failed the bacteriological Standards because <i>E. coli</i> was detected in 6.7 percent of monitoring samples and sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and turbidity levels at times were too high.	

## Supplier: Queenstown Lakes District Council

<b>Arrowtown</b>	<b>Population: 4,366</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.	
Arrowtown failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

<b>Arthurs Point</b>	<b>Population: 1,631</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.	
Arthurs Point failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

<b>Glenorchy</b>	<b>Population: 1,232</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.	
Glenorchy failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

<b>Hāwea</b>	<b>Population: 3,767</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.	
Hāwea failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.	

<b>Lake Hayes</b>	<b>Population: 3,743</b>
Health Act: <a href="#">Not complied</a>	Standards: Bacterial <a href="#">Met</a> Protozoal <a href="#">Not met</a> Chemical <a href="#">Met</a>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.	
Lake Hayes failed to meet drinking-water monitoring requirements for the supply. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Y).	
Lake Hayes failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues, there were gaps in monitoring and some process measurements exceeded limits.	

**Luggate** **Population: 855**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated. A temporary boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Luggate failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Queenstown** **Population: 25,271**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

Queenstown failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Wānaka** **Population: 13,633**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated.

Wānaka failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

**Wanaka Airport** **Population: 150**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water and is chlorinated.

Wanaka Airport failed the protozoal Standards because compliance was not attempted.

---

## Supplier: Southland District Council

**Eastern Bush / Ōtahu Flat Rural Water Scheme** **Population: 180**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Not met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water and is chlorinated. A permanent boil-water notice was in place during the reporting period.

Eastern Bush / Ōtahu Flat Rural Water Scheme failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate. It failed the protozoal Standards because the infrastructure available was inadequate and compliance was not attempted.

---

**Edendale/Wyndham** **Population: 1,152**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

---

**Lumsden/Balfour** **Population: 1,061**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

---

**Manapōuri** **Population: 228**

Health Act: [Complied](#)      Standards: Bacterial [Not met](#)      Protozoal [Met](#)      Chemical [Met](#)

The water supply uses surface water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.

Manapōuri failed the bacteriological Standards because sampling was inadequate.

---

<b>Mossburn</b>	<b>Population: 201</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Ōhai/Nightcaps</b>	<b>Population: 667</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Not met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses surface water, is treated with filtration and is chlorinated.			
Ōhai/Nightcaps failed the protozoal Standards because there were calibration issues and there were gaps in monitoring.			
<b>Ōtautau</b>	<b>Population: 798</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Ōtautau did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).			
<b>Riverton</b>	<b>Population: 1,506</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with coagulation, filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Riverton did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).			
<b>Te Anau</b>	<b>Population: 2,628</b>		
Health Act: <b>Complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with UV and is chlorinated.			
<b>Tūātapere</b>	<b>Population: 561</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Tūātapere did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).			
<b>Winton</b>	<b>Population: 2,436</b>		
Health Act: <b>Not complied</b>	Standards: Bacterial <b>Met</b>	Protozoal <b>Met</b>	Chemical <b>Met</b>
The water supply uses ground water, is treated with filtration and UV and is chlorinated.			
Winton did not have an implemented WSP. It therefore failed to comply with the Health Act (section 69Z).			