

Note: This document was received as an email and has been converted to a PDF format

Response from Peter Kemp

I am still a believer that to put the pipes under the river are best from an environment and beauty of the area point of view. I note that Matthew Bayliss has dismissed the direct drilling option only on the basis that the Suppliers were reluctant to provide a fixed and unconditional price for the directional drilling. Two points come from that as follows:-

1. On the basis of that statement, is every other option price on all the schemes "fixed and unconditional"? i.e there is no risk of any of the bridge options costing more than figures quoted so the Ratepayers are effectively guaranteed that no further money would be required. If all prices are not fixed and unconditional then we are not comparing like with like and costings for direct drilling should be obtained from potential Suppliers not involved in any bridge contract to ensure no bias.
2. Gore District Council did, rather on the quiet, as far as Ratepayers were concerned put pipelines under the river to assist in obtaining the Mataura Valley Milk business to the area. They therefore have direct experience and some knowledge of costings etc.

The Council seem desperate to erect an ugly bridge and seem to me to be just looking for reasons not to consider seriously other options. I think it should be insisted that Gore District Council obtain at least 3 independent estimates on the direct drilling option before any decision can be made and the matter progressed.

Peter Kemp