

Martinborough WWTP Consent Application –Additional Information requested by the Panel

1: Provide a suite of revised management plan framework conditions (Schedule 1; Condition 4-7), which are specifically to include the following:

- When required (e.g. by a specified date or 20wd prior to Stage commissioning)
- to whom it is required to be delivered at GWRC
- certification required (consider independent certification if appropriate)
- confirmation of which conditions the respective management plan is designed to give effect
- objectives of the respective management plan
- minimum contents of the respective management plan
- required minimum qualifications and experience of person preparing management plan
- requirement to comply with the certified management plan
- process for amendment/variation (including when/how/why and amendment certification)
- confirmation that where there is conflict, the conditions prevail

Discussion

It is noted that the proposed structure for the Management Plans has changed significantly between the hearing for these consents for Martinborough WWTP and the hearing for Greytown WWTP. We agree it is preferable and important that the two consents have a consistent framework both in terms of efficiency and the operation of the activity under the respective consents and compliance management.

The framework proposed for the Greytown consents represents current preference for both GWRC and SWDC, however it is noted there are still some differences of opinion regarding the final wording of the related conditions, and in particular the number of Management Plans required. This will require a decision by the commissioners.

Recommendation/Conclusion

We are in agreement that the preference is for the Management Plan approach to be consistent across both sites, and that the commissioners decisions on the Greytown site Management Plans will necessarily be reflected in the decision for the Management Plans for the Martinborough WWTP applications.

2. Provide an outline Terms of Reference for the proposed Community Liaison Group, incorporated into a condition for Panel consideration.

Discussion

We agree some guidance for the proposed Community Liaison Group is appropriate in the consent framework. A Terms of Reference for the Community Liaison Group has been drafted and is attached (**Attachment 1** to this memo) for Panel consideration.

Recommendation/Conclusion

We agree in concluding that:

- a) the draft Terms of Reference included as **Attachment 1** (or similar with the same intent and effect) to this memorandum is appropriate; and
- b) that Schedule 1; Condition 20 is replaced with the following (or similar):
 20. *Within three (3) months of the commencement of this consent, the consent holder shall commence the process to establish a Community Liaison Group (CLG) in accordance with the Terms of Reference included as Schedule 7 to this consent.*
 - 20A. *The Terms of Reference shall be incorporated into the Operations and Maintenance Manual (Schedule 1; Condition 6); and*
 - 20B. *Amendments to the Terms of Reference may be undertaken in accordance with that Terms of Reference and/or the approved Management Plan without the need to vary the conditions of this consent.*

3: Provide a draft condition for Panel consideration that precludes the use of cut and carry crops for human consumption

Discussion

This matter was raised in the submission of Kahungunu ki Wairarapa. Subsequent communication with Kahungunu (*email comm.* Kerry Geange, with Ra Smith; 16 June 2015) has confirmed the intent of the point of submission was a restriction on the irrigation of any crops intended for direct human consumption e.g. vegetable crops, and to extend to irrigation to animal fodder crops.

The form and intent draft condition below was acceptable to Kahungunu.

We agree that our preferred response would be through the inclusion of a requirement within the Land Discharge Management Plan.

Recommendation/Conclusion

- a) It is recommended that the wording below is required to be included within the Land Discharge Management Plan (refer Schedule 1; Condition 6) through the addition of the following condition. An option is to include the following condition within the relevant section of the Management Plan framework conditions, or as a standalone Schedule 1; Condition 7A.

Use of treated effluent on crops intended for human consumption

The following shall be included within the Land Discharge Management Plan to be prepared in accordance with Schedule 1; Condition 6:

- X. *The consent holder shall not allow, or enter into any contract or arrangement which would knowingly allow, the discharge of treated effluent by irrigation directly to crops being grown for the express purpose of human consumption. (NB The irrigation of treated wastewater to crops (including pasture) for consumption by ruminant animals, irrespective of any intended potential use for human consumption (including meat, milk, or other product), is not restricted in any way by this condition).*
- b) Should the Panel consider it reasonable and necessary, the above wording could be included as a condition of consent. If this was the decision of the Panel, the condition could be included as Schedule 4; Condition 6.

4: High Flow channel / Instream Water Quality Monitoring

- GWRC to confirm operational regime of high flow back channel
- Experts to provide advice/recommendations on implications of high flow back channel for their previous opinions and conclusions
- Ausseil / Coffey to review appropriate monitoring locations (include review influence of GWRC high-flow channel)
- Provide reviewed recommended condition(s) for instream study (Schedule 2; Condition 8) following outcome of review of discharge location and monitoring location and implementing paragraphs 4.2.5 to 4.2.7 of the Ausseil/Coffey JWS

Discussion

Operational Regime of back channel – updated summary was provided to all experts from Nicola Arnesen (8 June 2015), as follows:

- *There was already a natural channel which has now been engineered by GWRC Flood Protection Department to be a high flow back channel*
- *The channel was dug out in the dry and is to alleviate pressure on the stop bank during high flows*
- *The channel has a lip which prevents low flows from going down the channel*
- *Although it has been designed to take excess water during high flows, it has not been engineered to operate at a certain flow – the flows going down the channel will fluctuate*
- *The channel is being left to natural processes and will not be maintained. So therefore in different years the channel will operate differently.*
- *According to GWRC records, the flow when the Commissioners did their site visit (2 June 2015) was 17 cumecs. On 4 June the flow was 37 cumecs and our river works supervisor went on site to check the channel. He reported to us that there was no flow in the channel and there was still a lot of leeway before the flows would of topped the lip and gone into the channel*

For the other matters, refer to the Joint Witness Statement (JWS) prepared by Dr Ausseil and Dr Coffey in **Attachment 2**, and the conditions prepared by Dr Coffey and reviewed by Dr Ausseil in **Attachment 3** (NB Dr Coffey is in agreement with Dr Ausseil’s review comments).

Recommendation/Conclusion

We acknowledge the recommendations and conclusions put forward in the JWS and the conditions prepared by the ecologists. It is also assumed that the reference to “less than” 20% change in condition 8D should in fact refer to “more than”. Mr Geange disagrees with the use of the QMCI decrease as a definitive determinant of actual adverse effect in the manner suggested.

5: Provide draft condition(s) for Panel consideration which provide the trigger and response framework for instream water quality monitoring. These shall outline:

- a. Identify which water quality parameters should be used as monitoring triggers, what the trigger levels should be, where the monitoring of the trigger parameters should be undertaken, bearing in mind the matters under Item 4 bullets 1 to 3 above.
- b. Specify the process of trigger monitoring and response, including for example further more intense (weekly?) monitoring to verify the 'breach', if breach occurs for a further period (say 3 weeks?) then investigate whether the WWTP discharge is responsible for the breach, if it is prepare a 'Remediation Plan' to remedy the breach occurring again, Remediation Plan to be provided to GWRC within a set period of breach first occurring (say 6 weeks?)
- c. Ensure upstream conditions are considered in any analysis
- d. Look at Env BoP consent 66950 (Waihi WWTP), among others, as an example.

5A If an instream standards approach is still recommended by GRWC advise any amendments suggested for Schedule 2 Conditions 16 and 17, particularly regarding where in the River the standards would apply and be monitored (bearing in mind the matters under Item 4 bullets 1 to 3 above), how upstream water quality would be taken into account and how the statistical significance of any exceedance would be determined

Discussion

Refer to the Joint Witness Statement (JWS) prepared by Dr Ausseil and Dr Coffey in **Attachment 2**, and the conditions prepared by Dr Coffey and reviewed by Dr Ausseil in **Attachment 3** (NB Dr Coffey is in agreement with Dr Ausseil's review comments).

Recommendation/Conclusion

We acknowledge the recommendations and conclusions put forward in the JWS and the conditions prepared by the ecologists. It is also assumed that the reference to "*less than*" 20% change in condition 8D should in fact refer to "*more than*". Mr Geange disagrees with the use of the QMCI decrease as a definitive determinant of actual adverse effect in the manner suggested.

6: Provide recommendation on how to incorporate the stormwater (I/I) component within the consent purpose

Discussion

The issue of stormwater being specifically provided for in the MDC wastewater consent was raised in the Joint Planning Statement. The MDC consent issued by GWRC includes a separate consent ID within the consent document for discharge permit to discharge stormwater runoff from the wastewater irrigation land to the Ruamahanga River and Makoura Stream.

The Panel asked how this could be dealt with in the MWWTP consent. It is considered that this is best dealt with in the purpose description of the relevant consent.

Recommendation/Conclusion

We conclude the matter can be appropriately dealt with in the purpose description of the relevant discharge consents with the following (or similar) description:

to discharge contaminants to air, land and water (including any stormwater which enters the treated or untreated waterwater stream prior to discharge) from the continued operation of the Martinborough wastewater treatment plant.

7: Consider and recommend a reword of Schedule 2; Condition 2b to ensure the intent of the Applicants strategy (moving to land discharge) is adequately described

Discussion

The Applicant has clearly stated its intent to transition to land based discharge through the application and evidence, and that at any point during the consent term stated SWDC's priority in operating the plant and discharge regime will be to discharge to land in preference to water, where practicable. We agree it is appropriate that this intent based on current knowledge is documented to provide certainty, but also agree that it is also appropriate that a level of flexibility is retained which enables changes in technology or funding streams to fast track staging or implement alternative more sustainable solutions (subject to any necessary variation to consents).

Recommendation/Conclusion

We recommend the following be inserted in under the table in Schedule 2; Condition 2b, replacing the paragraph in the draft conditions attached to the Joint Statement:

"The Consent holder acknowledges its intent to prioritise land discharge over surface water discharge, in order to so far as is reasonably practicable minimise the extent of discharges to surface water (at flows below half-median river flow for stages 1B and 2A and at flows below 3 x median for stage 2B) in accordance with the stages outlined in the conditions of this consent."

8: Provide an option for a condition for a mandatory 25-year review of the efficacy of Stage 2B for Panel consideration

Discussion

An option for a condition for a mandatory 25-year review of the efficacy of Stage 2B has been drafted and is provided as **Attachment 4** to this memorandum.

Ms Arnesen records that her recommendation remains that the consents be granted for a duration of 25-years for the reasons outlined in her report. If the Panel chooses to grant consent for the 35 year term requested, then Ms Arnesen accepts the review condition attached is appropriate.

Recommendation/Conclusion

Ms Arnesen remains of the opinion that :

- a) her recommendation that consent be granted for a 25-year duration be accepted; and
- b) should the panel grant consent for a period that exceeds 25 years, then the attached 25-year mandatory review should be adopted as a condition of consent.

Mr Geange concludes that the 35-year consent is still appropriate, and that the attached 25-year mandatory review condition will be sufficient to mitigate any potential remaining uncertainty or risk associated with the requested consent term.

9: Review the overlap of discharge to land component between Stage 1B (MWWTP Adjacent)/ Stage 2A (Pain Farm); and draft a condition for Panel consideration incorporating both a reasonable transition between stage 1B and 2A & the cease condition for Stage 1B (from Docherty Evidence Para. 49)

Discussion

This matter was raised a result of Rob Docherty's concern regarding the lack of requirement for Stage 1B to be ceased when Stage 2A commenced, and limiting the potential adverse effects on water quality associated with the continuation of Stage 1B land discharge over a longer period.

The Applicants intent was not no continue with Stage 1B discharge long term, although it is acknowledged the draft conditions do not specifically preclude this from occurring. With regards to a reasonable transition period between Stage 1B and Stage 2A discharge, discussions have been held post hearing and it has been agreed between GWRC and the Applicant that a commissioning period (transition period) of three months either side of the commencement of Stage 2A (31 December 2030) would be acceptable to both parties. Rob Docherty has confirmed he is comfortable with this period.

As the three month period prior to Stage 2A would already be covered by the "no later than" timeframes contained within Schedule 1;Condition 3 (Table 1), we consider the cessation of Stage 1B is best provided for with the addition of a new condition. A suggested condition is provided below.

Recommendation/Conclusion

We agree in concluding that the following condition will suitably provide an appropriate cessation condition with respect to Stage 1B, and recommend it be included as Schedule 1;Condition 3A, to be inserted below Schedule 1;Condition 3 (Table 1):

- Y. *All discharges associated with Stage 1B (i.e. discharge to the "MWWTP Adjacent" block) shall cease on or before March 31, 2031. The purpose of this condition is to ensure that a reasonable transition and commissioning period between Stages 1B and 2A is provided, but that Stage 1B discharge to land is not continued in preference to Stage 2A land discharge.*

10: Katie Beecroft / Rob Docherty to confer and recommend groundwater monitoring frequency. Revised conditions(s) to be supplied for Panel consideration (including Schedule 4: Condition 12 & Schedule 6: Table 1).

Discussion

Rob Docherty and Katie Beecroft have conferred on this matter. Mr Docherty has advised GWRC that Katie Beecroft is in agreement with the recommended changes proposed in Mr Docherty's evidence as follows (confirmed by email from Rob Docherty to Nicola Arnesen, GWRC, 19 June 2015):

- Schedule 4, Condition 11 (wrongly referred to as condition 12 in Mr Docherty's evidence and e-mail) which makes reference to Schedule 6 and proposes an advice note; and
- Schedule 6, Table 1 which makes reference to certain groundwater parameters be monitored, and that they be monitored 6 monthly for seepage related monitoring, and monthly then 3 monthly for land application related monitoring.

Recommendation/Conclusion

We agree that the following conditions could be inserted;

- Schedule 4, Condition 11 – *refer Item 14 below; discussion on Paragraph 55.*
- Schedule 6, Table 1 - The following table can replace Table 1 in its entirety -

Table 1: Sampling Parameters, Frequency and Location

Location	Inlet	Outlet	Land discharge area	Ruamahanga River	Groundwater sampling (pond seepage)	Groundwater sampling (land application area)
Constituent	Post inlet screening	Post UV		At locations in Table 2 and Figure 1	At locations in Table 2 and Figure 1	At locations in Table 2 and Figure 1
Flow	Every 15 minutes	Every 15 minutes	Daily		Water level below top of casing monthly	Water level below top of casing monthly
Inspection	Daily	Daily	Daily		6 Monthly	Monthly
Pond level		Daily				
Soil moisture and Rainfall			Daily			
UV Dosage			Daily			
Biological Oxygen Demand BOD	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
Suspended Solids SS	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
<i>E. coli</i>		Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
Faecal Coliforms		Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
Ammoniacal Nitrogen NH3-N	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
Nitrate Nitrogen NO3-N	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
Total Phosphorus TP	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
Total Nitrogen TN	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus DRP	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
Particulate Organic Matter POM		Monthly		Monthly		
pH	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first

						year, then every 3 months
Conductivity	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months
Temperature	TBC	Monthly		Monthly		
Clarity (black disc)		Monthly		Monthly		
Dissolved Oxygen DO	TBC	Monthly		Monthly	6 Monthly	Monthly for the first year, then every 3 months

Note: Schedule 1 : Condition 12 applies to Schedule 6: Table 1 to the extent that where an approved management plan or manual (including any review in accordance with Schedule 1:Condition 7) contains a parameter, frequency, or detection limit which differs from those specific methodologies contained within this table, the management plan or manual methodology shall prevail. This is to ensure that current appropriate industry methodologies can be applied without the need for an unnecessary variation to conditions (subject to the endorsement of the Manager).

11: Copies of the CDC and MDC wastewater consents

Discussion

The Panel requested a copy of the Carterton District Council and Masterton District Council consents and these are included as **Attachment 5**.

Recommendation/Conclusion

N/A

12: Wastewater irrigation standards (ref. RPH Para 10 – Schedule 4, Condition 6). Review recommendation on inclusion of irrigation standards in the context of District Plan standards relating to the same.

Discussion

Regional Public Health supported the removal of the condition duplicating the provisions of the Wairarapa Combined District Plan relating to treated effluent irrigation (the original draft Schedule 4; Condition 6 in its oral submission at the hearing.

The issue raised by RPH was ensuring that the potential effects of *E.Coli* contamination of groundwater is not overlooked. This is discussed in response to point 13 below.

Plan Change 3 to the WCDP (included as **Attachment 6**) was specifically introduced to regulate various operational irrigation parameters including the setback distances from boundaries. The intent of this provision was to manage the potential effects of the discharge of aerosols from municipal wastewater discharges to land. Standards include minimum setbacks, minimum water quality standards (including *E. coli.*), wind parameters, and limitations of irrigation equipment.

The decision on the Plan Change identifies these standards as being appropriately conservative. We both agree this is the case. Odour is managed under a separate consent and conditions separately provided for.

We both remain in agreement that the inclusion of the irrigation standards contained within the District Plan as a condition of this GWRC consent is regulatory “double dipping” and unnecessary. GWRC is satisfied the associated effects can be appropriately managed through compliance with those standards through the District Plan. Should SWDC be unable to design an irrigation system which complies with those standards, a separate consent application would be required on which GWRC and other affected parties would have the reasonable opportunity for input. In addition, in the event the District Plan standards are subject to a Plan Change, a variation to this consent could also then be required.

Recommendation/Conclusion

We recommend that the WCDP Plan Change 3 parameters condition not be included in the consent, and that Schedule 4; Condition 6 be deleted.

The alternative available to the Panel is to include the condition as originally drafted.

13. Recommend conditions for UV treatment (to manage E.Coli levels) for discharge to land (from Regional Public Health oral evidence Para. 11). Schedule 4 Cond. 1-3). Review associated groundwater standards.

Discussion

Regional Public Health requested an *E.Coli*. standard for the discharge to land consent. In reviewing the draft conditions, it is acknowledged that RPH are correct, the water quality standards for land discharge at Schedule 4; Condition 3 do not contain an E.Coli standard. The UV treatment standard applied to surface water discharge under Schedule 2; Condition 4 do not currently apply to land discharge. This was not an intention of the Applicant.

It is considered that it is appropriate to provide a UV treatment standard to land discharge.

It is considered appropriate that the UV treatment standards currently applying to surface water discharge (Schedule 2; Condition 4) be applied to effluent being discharged to land.

Two options to achieve this are provided in the recommendation below.

Recommendation/Conclusion

We conclude that either of the two approaches below will sufficiently mitigate the potential adverse effect raised in the submission of RPH, and correct the unintended anomaly in the draft conditions:

- a) Replicate the UV treatment standards from Schedule 2: Condition 4 directly into Schedule 4, above the advice note relating to existing Condition 1, 2, and 3, and include reference to the new condition into the advice note; or
- b) Move the UV treatment standards from Schedule 2: Condition 4, into Schedule 1 and include as a general condition to apply to both discharge to water and to land.

Our preference is option a) above, which we consider will provide greater certainty in implementation across the term of all consents and subsequent stages.

14. Provide recommendation and options for inclusion of land discharge matters raised in Docherty evidence Paras 50, 51, 52, 55 and 56 as these were the matters that the reporting officer considered needed to be reflected in conditions. If a nitrate standard is recommended advise what its purpose is.

Discussion

Each of the paragraph's referenced above is discussed below:

Para 50 – This relates to the level of detail required by conditions of consent for the respective plans. These matters will be covered by the new detailed Management Plan framework conditions to be inserted into Schedule 1 and covered in Item 1 (and Attachment 1) of this document.

We both agree that no additional amendments are required in direct response to this paragraph.

Para 51 – The reporting officer was in agreement at the hearing that this recommended insertion for Schedule 1; Condition 19(b) be included to allow more detail on monitoring trends to be analysed. Therefore Ms Arnesen considers Schedule 1; Condition 19(b) should read:

b) a discussion and analysis of any trends (particularly relating to flow increases, organic load increases, declining effluent quality, or changes in river water quality) or changes in environmental effects evident from the monitoring data, both within the annual period and compared to previous years...

Mr Geange considers that the existing framework is sufficient, in that Condition 19(a) already requires the analysis of all monitoring undertaken, and Condition 19(d) requires an analysis and discussion of associated actual and potential adverse effects. Mr Geange considers the recommendation of Docherty to be unnecessary duplication.

Para 52 – The reporting officer is happy for Schedule 2, item 16 to contain a nitrate limit. Schedule 2, item 16 is the receiving water standards and this condition is being reworked post-hearing. An appropriate nitrate limit can be agreed upon by the ecologists during this rework and added into the condition.

Para 55 – Ms Arnesen advised at the hearing that the detail would go into the Land Discharge Management Plan however was happy for this advice note to be included to alleviate Mr Docherty's concerns. Therefore Schedule 4, condition 11 (wrongly referred to as condition 12 in Mr Docherty's evidence) should read:

The Consent Holder shall carry out groundwater sampling according to the constituents and frequency specified in the Environmental Monitoring Plan; and samples shall be taken in accordance with the most recent version of Wellington Regional Councils' groundwater sampling protocol.

Note: The Environmental Management Plan should have a particular focus on the analysis of Nitrate, Ammonia, Total Nitrogen and Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus in the

groundwater, as well as Ruamahanga River and the surface water flow paths within and surrounding Pain Farm.

Mr Geange considers the advice note is unnecessary with the drafting of the management Plan Framework, as outlined in Item 1, and that the advice note is therefore unnecessary. However, should the Panel consider the advice note is necessary, Mr Geange considers that the advice note should clearly relate to the effects of the discharge on the receiving environment, not the general water bodies or catchments. This could be achieved simply with the following amendment:

Note: The Environmental Management Plan should have a particular focus on the analysis of the actual effects of the discharge on levels of Nitrate, Ammonia, Total Nitrogen and Dissolved Reactive Phosphorus in the groundwater, as well as Ruamahanga River and the surface water flow paths within and surrounding Pain Farm. Wider and general State of the Environment analysis and reporting will not be required under this consent.

Para 56 – These matters (groundwater monitoring) have been discussed between Rob Docherty (for GWRC) and Katie Beecroft (for SWDC) and are considered in the response to Item 10 of this document.

Recommendation/Conclusion

We are in agreement that the changes to the Management Plan conditions; Schedule 1, condition 19(b); and Schedule 4 Condition 11 are appropriate to the extent outlined in the above discussion. In addition we agree with and support the agreements reached by Rob Docherty and Katie Beecroft in relation to Schedule 6, Table 1, as concluded in Item 10 above.

15. Investigate and confirm any stockwater takes from the River within the mixing zone

Discussion

There are a number of different land owners on the northern bank of the River for a distance 1km from the discharge point. It appears from GWRC records and recent discussions with these landowners that none of them have stockwater takes from the river.

On the south side of the river is SWDC WWTP site.

The main land owner on the north side of the river located within the 500 metre sampling/mixing zone area is a dairy farm owned by Albert, Richard and Sylvia Osborne. Richard Osborne holds consent (WAR110114) to take surfacewater from the Ruamahanga River for the irrigation of pasture and this intake point is located approximately 600 metres from the discharge point.

Nicola Arnesen (GWRC) has spoken to Richard Osborne and he has informed her that this surface water take is only used for irrigation of pasture. He has a bore which is very close to the intake point and this is used for stock and house water.

Recommendation/Conclusion

That the panel acknowledges and receives the above information and uses as they see fit.

16: Confirm whether there is any impediment to the consent holder bringing forward any stage.

Discussion

The intent of the question is understood to be whether there is any impediment to the consent holder commissioning any respective stage before the indicated stage commencement stage in Schedule 1; Condition 3.

The current condition 3 requires that the upgrades be stages in accordance with Table 1 of that condition. In terms of timing that table specifies that each "Stage to commence no later than" (our emphasis in underline).

In addition Mr Allingham confirmed SWDC intent in this respect in evidence (at Paragraph 54), stating that *"Council is committed to the upgrade project, and if possible, the subsequent stages would be pulled forward in the programme. The stages outlined are "maximums", not targets. If additional subsidy or funding becomes available or technological or operational changes make Stage 2A & 2B feasible earlier, Council will investigate and take that opportunity where it is not at the expense of other services, and where it meets community objectives."*

We also note that neither of us are aware of any conflicting statement in the AEE which would indicate any intent by the applicant that the stage programme was 'absolute'.

Recommendation/Conclusion

We are in agreement that there is no impediment to the consent holder bringing forward any respective stage under the draft conditions of consent.

17: Assessment of relevant provisions of the proposed Natural Resource Plan

See supplementary report in **Attachment 7**

ATTACHMENT 1: Point 2 – Terms of Reference for the proposed Community Liaison Group

Martinborough WWTP: Community Liaison Group Terms of Reference

Purpose

The purpose of the Community Liaison Group (CLG) is to provide a forum for discussion and the exchange of information and to create and maintain channels of communication between the community, South Wairarapa District Council (SWDC), and Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) on any issues or developments arising from the operation of the Martinborough Wastewater Treatment Plant (MWWTP) and the discharge of treated effluent to land both at the MWWTP site (during Stage 1B) and at Pain Farm (during Stage 2A & 2B). The CLG does not have a regulatory function.

The CLG will work in a collaborative manner with the CLG for the Featherston and Greytown WWTP's, including joint meetings and resourcing. This is intended to provide efficiency, and also facilitate the catchment approach outlined in the SWDC Wastewater Strategy.

Membership

The CLG will be open to the following members:

- Martinborough Community Board (1 representative)
- Martinborough residents (Any submitter and/or 2 resident representatives)
- South Wairarapa District Council (1 representative)
- Wellington Regional Council (1 representative)
- Kahungunu ki Wairarapa (1 representative)
- Rangitane o Wairarapa iwi (1 representative)

Where a community representative steps down, the position will be filled with a replacement person agreed by the majority of the remainder of the CLG.

The Chairperson will be appointed by a majority of the CLG, provided however, that if considered necessary and appropriate, SWDC may appoint an independent Chairperson from outside of the CLG membership.

Activities

The CLG meetings will provide a forum for:

- Updating CLG members about MWWTP and its upgrade and operation, including progress and notice of any changes to work schedules and/or general compliance with resource consents.
- Discussion of specific questions and/or issues arising from the operation and upgrade of MWWTP on behalf of the community.
- Explaining technical matters to the members of the CLG

- Collating comments to be provided to GWRC on any of the management plans set out in the conditions of the resource consent, within the required timeframe (see Appendix 1 for the management plans).
- To discuss compliance/non-compliance with conditions of consent and for SWDC to explain actions taken or to be taken to comply with conditions.
- Identifying relevant items to be included on the relevant SWDC website project page

Role/responsibility of SWDC

- Organise administrative support at meetings, including recording of minutes and circulating minutes within appropriate timeframes
- Maintain and regularly update the SWDC website to include relevant information relating to the Project.

- Provide project staff/advisers to attend meetings as required to respond to technical questions raised
- Make technical staff available to the CLG to explain any technical reports, management plans, technical processes and current project status
- Provide copies of the reports and plans required by Schedule 1 conditions 18, 19, 20 and 22, to the CLG members. Where appropriate this will be email link rather than hard copy.
- Follow up relevant action items in an appropriate timeframe
- Advise the CLG of actions / feedback following any issues raised in this forum

Role/responsibility of Chairperson

- The orderly running of the meetings in a fair and independent way.
- Ensure adherence to the agenda and enforcement of the Group's Terms of Reference.
- Manage the collation and distribution of comments from the CLG on the various management plans.
- Work with CLG members to set meeting agenda items
- Monitor progress on action items to ensure they are undertaken within appropriate timeframes
- Final sign-off and authority for any matters on behalf of the CLG

Role/responsibility of GWRC

- Provide a conduit between SWDC and the GWRC by disseminating information from the CLG and keeping colleagues informed.
- Making technical staff available to the CLG as required
- Keeping the CLG informed of compliance / non-compliance with conditions.
- Explain any reasons for compliance decisions or actions taken by GWRC.

Role/responsibility of iwi and community representative members

- Represent their iwi, communities, organisations or interest groups and bring forward issues, concerns and ideas raised by their members to CLG meetings
- Provide a conduit between SWDC, iwi, and the community by disseminating information from the CLG and bringing feedback to meetings
- Pass updates and information discussed at the meetings to iwi and the community
- Report iwi and community concerns and issues to the CLG
- Assist the CLG with any relevant local

knowledge

- Provide input into the project updates for the website
- To co-ordinate iwi and community input into the Management Plans and assist to provide related comment to GWRC through required reporting.

General role/responsibility of all CLG members

- Commit to abide by terms of reference
- Regularly attend and participate in meetings
- Advise the chairperson in advance if they are not attending a meeting
- Suggest agenda items for discussion at meetings
- Respect the confidentiality of items of business which SWDC may determine are confidential in nature.
- Abide by the CLG's media and public speaking protocol.
- Ensure that any defined timeframes are met.

Meeting procedure

The CLG will meet quarterly from its inauguration or as otherwise agreed by the CLG members. Members who cannot attend a meeting should give their apologies in advance to the Chairperson. Community representatives may send a nominee to a meeting in their place.

All questions asked during or in between meetings are to be directed *via* the Chairperson. Questions without notice received during meetings will be addressed if possible, otherwise added to the agenda for a later meeting.

SWDC will provide the secretariat for the CLG. SWDC is responsible for the cost of all administration of the meetings.

Detailed minutes shall be kept as a record of the meeting and these will be agreed at the following meeting, subject to any amendment proposed by any member of the group.

Meeting agendas, papers and notes will be distributed to members no less than three days prior to or following each meeting.

Confirmed agendas and minutes will be loaded into the MWWTP project webpage. CLG members may distribute these confirmed documents more widely.

Members of the public wishing to attend a meeting must advise a CLG representative and / or the Chairperson in advance. The Chairperson will advise the rest of the CLG of this in advance of the meeting commencing. Members of the public will have no speaking rights. Any questions from members of the public should be sent in advance to the Chairperson or should be directed through a CLG community representative. The CLG retains the right to *revert* to closed meetings at any time and also close the meeting to the public for parts of the meeting at any time.

Remuneration

There will be no remuneration payable to CLG members for attendance at or participation in the CLG.

Project Updates

SWDC must develop and maintain a project webpage highlighting programs, status, and issues relating to the MWWTP project. The cost of producing and

maintaining the webpage will be met by SWDC.

Media and public speaking

All media enquiries should be directed directly to SWDC. Community representatives, including the chair of the CLG approached to provide comment on the project, consents, or the CLG must make clear their response is a personal *view*, rather than the collective *view* of the CLG. As a courtesy, community representatives asked for media or public comment, should *advise* the Chairperson prior to providing comment, or as soon as possible afterwards (if it is not practicable to *advise* prior).

Review

These terms of reference may be reviewed and amended, as agreed by all CLG members.

Acceptance of Terms of Reference

We, the undersigned, have read the Terms of Reference and agree to abide by them.

[All members to sign and date]

Appendix 1: Management Plans

Management Plans (refer Schedule 1: Condition 6) to be provided to the CLG for information and comment

Management Plan Title	Purpose
MWWTP Operations and Maintenance Manual	To ensure that construction related noise is managed in accordance with NZ standards and does not exceed these
Tangata Whenua Values Monitoring Plan	To ensure that appropriate cultural health indicators and monitoring are documented and managed.
Wastewater Discharge Management Plan	The EDMP will detail the effluent discharge regimes to the Ruamahanga River, operational and management matters, and refer to relevant other compliance and monitoring as appropriate (including adaptive management responses where
Land Discharge Management Plan	The LDMP will detail the effluent discharge regimes to land, operational and management matters, and refer to relevant other compliance and monitoring as appropriate (including adaptive management responses where
Odour Management Plan	To ensure that any odour generated by MWWTP related activity (including irrigation of treated effluent) is minimised to prevent adverse effects
Environmental Monitoring Plan	To document the environmental monitoring requirements and programmes associated with the MWWTP discharges, including monitoring locations, methodologies, and

ATTACHMENT 2: Joint Witness Statement – Dr Ausseil and Dr Coffey

ATTACHMENT 3: Proposed Conditions - Dr Ausseil and Dr Coffey

ATTACHMENT 4: Point 8 – Mandatory 25 year review condition

Review of efficacy of Stage 2B

- X.1 No later than the 25th anniversary of the grant of this consent, the Consent Holder shall provide to the Manager, an independent report, reviewing the efficacy of the Stages 2A and 2B land treatment in terms of avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects of the discharges to the environment.
- X.2 The review shall include, but not be restricted to, the following:
- a) A full description of the discharge to land regime (including storage) at Pain Farm under Stage 2B, including a review of Stage 2A;
 - b) A summary of the compliance record of Stages 2A and 2B with the conditions of this consent, and with the requirements of any Management Plan prepared under the conditions of this consent;
 - c) The results of any technical reports undertaken in relation to the Stage 2A and/or 2B discharges.
 - d) A description of any changes required to the land discharge regime at Pain Farm, since the implementation of Stage 2A, including:
 - a. reasons why any such changes were required,
 - b. specifically what effects (or operational constraints) those changes were required to mitigate;
 - c. the effectiveness of those changes in terms of the specified effect or constraint; and
 - d. any programmed or identified future changes and/or works required to mitigate identified adverse effects, including the purpose for each of those changes and/or works.
 - e) An assessment of the effectiveness and effects of the Stages 2A and 2B land treatment scheme since their commissioning, supported by monitoring data, including actual effects on surface water and groundwater resulting from the discharge, and the discharge to air of effluent and of odour from the irrigation of effluent;
 - f) Confirmation of the number and volume of discharges directly to surface water in the Ruamahanga River (including emergency discharges) since the commissioning of Stage 2B, a description of the circumstances leading to each such discharge, and an

assessment of any actual and potential effects of any such discharge;

g) Any other matter considered relevant by the consent holder.

- X.3 The review shall be carried out and report prepared by appropriately qualified persons and all costs shall be borne by the consent holder.
- Y1. In the event that the report prepared under Condition X above identifies significant or potentially significant, adverse effects on the environment as a direct result of discharges to land, water or air at Pain farm, and where no suitable means of avoiding, remedying or mitigating such effects is described within the report, GWRC may, within 6 months of the receipt of the report, initiate a review of conditions of this consent under section 128 of the Resource Management Act 1991, for the purpose of determining whether changes are required to the conditions of consent to address such effects, including but not limited to changes relating to the volumes of effluent permitted to be discharged to land at Pain Farm, and the volume of effluent storage in the system.
- Y2 A copy of the technical review, shall be provided to the Community Liaison Group and to any persons or parties who were consulted as part of the review.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT