

TE ANAU WASTEWATER DISCHARGE PROJECT MEETING 16 December

It is very difficult to make informed comments when the documentation is not complete. As of the midday Tuesday (yesterday) we had not received Appendix A, B, C, D, E and F. This lack of information does not help the Council, the Governance Group or other interested parties to fully evaluate the options.

Referring to Ian Evans report

Page 13

5 ***Degree of risk associated with proceeding with an alternative.***

There is considerable risk also with the Kepler scheme as the continued serious opposition to the proposal should not be overlooked. 98% of the Manapouri Community will be far more accepting of an alternative and will therefore support a resource consent application.

9 ***Council has already invested significant resources in purchasing the land at Kepler as well as all work to date.***

Further costs include:

\$300,000 for the Environment Court appeal

\$? for further resource consents which will be opposed.

Is this really a good investment?

10 ***Delays***

I believe if an application is made for an acceptable alternative the resource consent process will go smoothly and quickly. There is not the degree of risk which was associated with the Kepler proposal right from the beginning. In fact the Council will have the support of our communities.

Questions for the Council and Mayor:

1. Have the Council received a full copy of the Peter Riddell's proposal which includes costings?
2. Have the Council members and the Governance Group visited Tiwai to inspect the wastewater system which is similar to the one Peter Riddell is proposing? It requires very little management and has been operating for a number of years with no problems.

Questions for PDP

1 If the Council decides to sell the Kepler Block why would they only sell only the northern side and not the entire block? For the southern block to be used for wastewater disposal further resource consents will be required. Therefore further costs.

2 Why was Peter Riddell's proposal changed so radically? Sub surface irrigation to aerial spraying, further treatment of waste water to no further treatment.

3 It was made very clear by the owner of Smith's block that he would only accept waste water that was further treated and disposed of via sub surface irrigation. Why was this ignored?

4 As outlined on page 90, WWTP upgrade is not proposed for the Kepler or Options 1A and 1B. Can this please be explained?

5 Were the changes to the initial proposals for the Slee and Smith block's discussed with the owners prior to the draft report being presented?

6 PDP stated very clearly, and sincerely, at a meeting that community concerns would be considered. I do not believe this has been the case.

Page 93 Table 7 **Advantages and Disadvantages**
Only Option 3 refers to "*Unacceptable to iwi and other parties.*"

7 Why has the opposition to the Kepler scheme been ignored and not included in the disadvantages?

Looking more closely Table 7 a number of questions are raised:

Kepler Scheme

Further disadvantages to be added:

- *Costs for Environment Court appeal*
- *Risk of opposition to further resource consents required for the proposal.*
- *Reliability of return from cut and carry operation.*

Option 1

If Peter Riddell's proposal was considered without any changes an additional advantage would be: *no community opposition.*

The following disadvantages would not be applicable:

- *High overall operator and farm manager input*
- *High SDC management input to realise farm revenue returns and balance environmental requirements.*
- *Disposal system required to stop during extreme wet weather events.*
- *Potential low risk of spray drift and odour impacting on neighbours if not well managed.*
- *Limited possibility for future expansion at the disposal site unless more land purchased.*

This brings the disadvantages down from 8 to 2

Consideration for communities should be about enabling a community to be heard and respected. And that's the trouble with having a grand scheme imposed from the outside; it tends to permanently disrupt the fabric of a place. As such it isn't true community development.

Lance and Ruth Shaw

Additional costs for Kepler scheme which may not have been taken into consideration in the report as Appendix E outlining cost estimates has not been provided.

I would assume that gravel or concrete tracks will be required for the two irrigators as the ground is prone to ponding, and flooding.

7,660 metres (7.6 kilometres) of tracks will be required for the irrigator nearest the road and 6,729 metres (6.7 kilometres) for the irrigator going over the wet land.

The difference in figures is because a condition of the consent states that the wetland must be protected, therefore 940 metres of bridging (just under a kilometre) will be required to support the irrigator as it travels over the wetland.

The additional cost could be in the vicinity of \$400,000.