

# Draft Meeting Minutes Rotorua RPSC Technical Advisory Group Meeting #8



*Date:* Tuesday, 16 June 2015  
*Time:* 10.20 a.m. – 5.00 p.m.

<i>Venue:</i>	Bay of Plenty Regional Council Office
<i>Chairperson:</i>	Jim Bradley (JB) – MWH
<i>Attendees:</i>	Andy Bruere - BOPRC, Greg Manzano (GM)- RLC Alison Lowe (AL) – RLC (arrived at 10.30 a.m.) Kepa Morgan (KM) – Mahi Maioro Professionals Chris McBride(CM) – University of Waikato, Arturo Pingol (AP) - RLC Antoine Coffin (AC) – Te Onewa Consultants (arrived at 10.30 a.m.) David Hamilton (DH) – University of Waikato Kevan Brian (KB) – Mott MacDonald (linked by phone) from 3.10 p.m. Sarah Pauli - Minute taker
<i>Apologies:</i>	Warren Webber (WW) – Chair RPSC, Andy Bell (AB) – RLC,

PLEASE NOTE: these draft minutes are substantially verbatim as per the recording made by Sarah Pauli.

JB welcomed everyone present. JB advised that both Warren Webber and Andy Bell were invited, unfortunately, both had prior commitments.

Kepa Morgan opened the meeting with a Karakia. Kepa also acknowledged Mauriora Kingi and Jerry Collins with kind words, who recently passed away.

## 1. What is the project expecting from TAG today:

Update from Greg Manzano:

By the conclusion of this meeting, GM would like to see TAG accept the report from KB on Alternative Land Treatment Sites and the Wastewater Strategy and agree for them to be presented to the workshop of RPSC on 17 June at 9.00 a.m.

Also, TAG to wait for guidance from AC regarding the go and no go zones for the alternative discharge points to water. There are five discharge points and with guidance from AC, maybe we can agree on what are acceptable and hopefully we can present this to the RPSC workshop on 17 June.

The other item is the “add-ons.” We did not conclude our discussions on the add-ons at our last meeting. By the end of this meeting, I hope we will have a clearer understanding and provide a conclusion after the discussion on a way forward with the add-ons.

The biggest item today is the Effects Study. Again, at the conclusion of this meeting, I hope we will be able to have a better understanding of the effects and provide a clearer guidance to David in terms of what we want to see from the report in terms of the exercise.

The last item is the new minutes approach (this is an agenda item.)

JB – Mott MacDonalds Strategic Report, where do you see TAG's role in accepting that, or not, because it interlinks with TERAX?

GM – We can agree as one of the options without TERAX. We need to discuss whether we will present this to the RPSC as one option on 25 July.

**ACTION: TAG conclusion required here on how we see the Strategic Report.**

**2. Draft Agenda Review:**

JB – All of the above items are part of the draft agenda.

The draft agenda we can take as read.

**3. Confirmation of minutes of previous meeting – 28 May 2015:**

That the draft Minutes of 28 May 2015 be accepted, subject to the following minor changes and a few word additions.

Jim Bradley / Andy Bruere

CARRIED

(i) No.12 – Summary (page 48)

“JB summarised the meeting for KM.”

Amendment to be made to read as follows:

“JB summarised some parts of the meeting that KM missed.”

(ii) Referring to Page 49, we discussed the floating wetland proposal that came from the firm Waterclean. There is commercial confidence information in there in terms of their estimate or proposal or budget which are now recorded in these minutes. Are we still happy with that from a Council point of view?

We remove the estimates from our minutes.

AL – No, they were provided in confidence so I don't think the estimates should be included.

JB – So we need to exclude that price (also in the minutes JB mentioned \$.5M) – JB to check if he was referring to Kevan's earlier report.

JB to confirm the above with Sarah.

JB – There is a matter arising on that proposal that we see as a TAG. The company knows they have sent it forward to disclose. At least there was a proposal to the RPSC, but we don't need to disclose the dollars. We can say it is a very small one, somewhat in line with the Mott MacDonald report of December 2014.

(iii) KM advised he was away twice during this meeting. The minutes of 16 June only note this once. KM to advise Sarah when during the meeting he left and returned.

**4. Proposed New Approach to Minutes:**

Andy Bell has suggested future minutes be done as a summary format.  
JB to advise SP at the end of every agenda, the key points and actions.  
(A guide on the format of future minutes is attached.)

**Note: There will always be an audio recording of the full minutes which will be kept on files of the archives of Rotorua Lakes Council, if ever needed.**

Jim Bradley / Andy Bruere  
CARRIED

**5. Brief Verbal Report on RPSC Activities and upcoming Workshop with Kevan Brian, Mott MacDonald on Alternative Land Treatment Sites, Wastewater Strategy and Meeting on 25 June 2015:**

GM/AL to give a brief report on the RPSC activities since the last meeting.

GM - No update received from Warren since the last meeting.

JB – We had some questions at the last RPSC, particularly from Peter Staite. One of them was about any UV System that has rotating UV lights rather than rotating the water. JB found some references on that and sent them to Peter Staite advising we have not found one, but here is some information and we will give a line report to the next RPSC meeting. There are two more questions of Peter's that have not been answered as yet, one is on the agenda today about viruses and particle sizes and the other was about gasification. Information on gasification has been sent to Peter. Virus still under action.

Next Thursday, 25 June, there is a full workshop in the morning and a committee meeting in the afternoon. Kevan Brian will be there for both reports.

**6. Cultural Assessment Sub-committee Update with focus on feedback and further technical/siting/other requirements from TAG:**

Update from Antoine:

JB asked AC for an update on what CAS is still expecting from TAG and also answers to an email sent through from KM with various questions as they relate to our groups interactions and particularly sites.

The key points of Antoine's update are as follows:

- CAS have not met since the last meeting.
- What is Council looking at in terms of options, because there are lots of options on the table and how serious is the Council at looking at some of those alternative land disposal points.
- I don't think the view of the CAS has changed.
- The CAS members I have talked to were all interested in all three alternative site proposals and started offering other parcels of land that could possibly be looked at.
- It was identified that there will be implications of going and talking to land owners, specifically with Maori land owners. Those hapu and iwi may not have been involved with this process at all up to this point. This could mean starting a fresh consultation with these groups as we would presume they would not be up to play like the CAS members. There will be really sensitive conversations with them. There is certainly not enough time for that before consents applied for.

- Land discharge alternatives are still very much the favour of the CAS group I talked to. After our last meeting and the comments of the Chair, I listened to what “not” being said rather than what “is” being said. What I took from that is that the idea of discharging directly into the lake is potentially a strong option with the treatment plant treating water to the highest quality, possibly discharging directly into the lake without land application.
- A long list of possible mitigations that have been mentioned by the CAS group will be provided to the TAG.

#### Key Matters Raised:

- KM – The suggestion in the minutes is that there was a reluctance on the part of the Iwi members to conduct a Mauri Model Assessment and I suggested they may be interested to do their own independent Mauri Model Assessments. This will enable them to understand how it works in terms of familiarity so that then they can decide whether they want to adopt that as a process going forward, because I think that the discussion was that there was not a lot of familiarity with the process anyway.
- KM – Suggested a change to the alignment of the pipeline to alternative discharge points 4 and 5. At the moment it is running through two maraes, which could get the Iwi offside.
- JB – TAG considered the discharge location sites at the last meeting. Site 2, which is situated at Sulphur Point on the side of the lake, was considered as probably a no go. It was noted that CAS considers Site 1 as the least problematic among the five discharge sites. Site 3 up at the bridge on the road does offer some options in terms of location because of existing infrastructure. 1 and 3 are staying in from a TAG perspective, 2 not preferred at all. In terms of 4 and 5, the ones up the side of the lake, they are staying in the modelling and they also provided launching points for discharge out to the lake. We have given CM a brief to go back with, preferably somewhere offshore within 2km and hopefully within 10 meters of water. AC confirmed that there is no update from a CAS point of view on those five water discharges.
- JB – In terms of offset mitigations, 1½ years ago, the government came out with a very strong favour of offset mitigation, including financial contributions, providing it was put forward by the consent applicant and not hoisted on for consent via the Consent Authority. That has not gained much traction but there was very strong recommendation for it to be implemented.
- KM suggested that the Mauri Model Assessment would not only inform the TAG and the main committee of issues related to the options and their mitigations, but rather it will set an anticipated monitoring regime of performance of the solution after it is put in place. There is a stronger incentive for the Iwi to put everything in, because they would realise that whatever the solution is that is chosen is going to be monitored against normal parameters and in addition, these parameters that they believe are relevant to the solution. What that means is we can better choose the right solution but with the knowledge that there is a responsibility that the solution delivers against those as well as we have portrayed it, in terms of that preliminary assessment.

#### **ACTIONS:**

1. AC to confirm with the CAS their position regarding the use of the Mauri Model Assessment for their evaluation of options.
2. CAS members or individual Iwi members who would wish to learn and do it should submit resourcing proposal to the Project Manager.
3. CM to revise drawing to avoid running through the two maraes but run straight through Vaughan Road.
4. AC to confirm CAS point of view on the five discharge to water locations.
5. AC to provide a copy of the mitigation list to KM and the TAG.

## 7. **Effects Study Presentation and Discussion:**

### **(Lake Rotorua Treated Wastewater Discharge: Environmental Effects Study (Draft Report) – attached)**

This document is in draft form only, prepared for Rotorua Lakes Council by Jonathan Abell, Chris McBride and David Hamilton.

CM advised that this report reflects background that occurred prior to this particular project starting up because of some of the modelling that has been done for Rotorua for a long period of time and also reflects a lot of work completed by Jonathan Abell.

CM and DH spoke to the above document and displayed a number of the charts, graphs and tables on the screen as the presentation/discussion took place.

Discussion took place and questions asked, as follows:

#### **ACTIONS:**

1. Link web to this report for TAG.
2. Questions asked by JB – Does TAG want to confirm unders/overs, that there is no change through those discharge contact approaches. TAG confirms that general assumption. There is an assumption that these are all the same. We need to make this clear.
3. Page 30
  - JB – When you meet the committee next, is there some way, in a lay way, explaining to them all those natural processes, by alum or not. In terms of 'N' that goes in and 'N' that goes out, that we are losing a lot through natural lake processes.
  - DH – We could do a conceptual diagram, start at stream inflow and work our way out to the lake, to show the potential points where the alum. is.
4. Page 41
  - Agreement between the technical and environmental approach on mean TN and TP.
5. Page 43, Table 15
  - DH advised that just to re-emphasise with the exceptions of the bottom three on this table, the total phosphate has alum. dosing.
  - Action: DH/CM to make this table clearer. Include a column for alum. dosing.
6. Page 42, Table 14, No.22
  - The question here is "is that the scenario for Option 5, for discharging 30 and 3 going to the lake." Table needs to indicate this.
  - There was also discussion on data received from KB (attached.) Clarification of these figures (treated wastewater for effects) to be discussed with KB later in the meeting. These figures to go into the Strategic Report.
7. Page 53
  - Remove Table 21
  - Table 20 – out in the Wastewater Strategy for MBR Plant
  - Amalgamate tables 20 and 21
  - KM requested a PDF of this report, in colour.

**Meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45 p.m. with a blessing from Kepa.**

**Meeting reconvened at 1.20 p.m. .**

Discussion continued on the Effects Study.

8. Page 55, Figure 10
  - CM/DH to (a) Plot the variability by year with a base case and (b) Separately present the full scenario period averages for all the 23 scenarios next to each other.
  - JB – If we do get a tick going forward on the full MBR, this needs to be in here also.
  - Rename those scenarios as full MBR Option, Option 6.
  - We need to put in cost efficiency going lower with TP in the Kevan Brian treatment options in terms of NPSFM objective A2 maintenance or enhancement.

#### AC left the meeting at 1.30 p.m.

9. Page 57, Table 22
  - Should read ... "Statistics for nitrate-nitrogen concentrations based on toxicity, not ...?"
  - We have presented mass balance ...
  - Need to recognise in a future AEE history of 56TM
  - The staging of a water discharge option table, we need to keep on the table.
10. Page 60, Figure 13
  - The staging on a water discharge option table is something we need to keep on the table, particularly as we narrow down the options.
11. Page 61, Figure 14
  - Table should be representing the MPS monitoring time period, especially for E.coli.  
**CM/DH to forward through table to TAG when corrected.**
12. Table 6 (Page 26) and Table 23 (Page 58) are incorrect.
  - Needs to read annual maximum as per MPS Freshwater 2014
13. Page 62, Paragraph 2  
Period 5 to mention substrate in Puarenga
14. Page 66, Table 26
  - Include comment good validity in modelling.
15. Page 68, Figure 20
  - Add Option 6 – Treated Wastewater
16. Page 69, Figure 21
  - Change groundwater to ungauged groundwater.
17. Page 70, Table 28
  - Add Option 6.
  - Another column to be added to present relative change and TL 13 standard.
18. Page 71, Figure 22
  - Add Option 6
19. Page 72, Table 29
  - Add Option 6
20. Page 73  
AB suggested this report be summarised at the end so that people have a better understanding. This won't be helpful for the Steering Committee.
  - DH/CM to approach Johnathan Abell requesting his assistance in writing a lay extended executive summary to be understood by the Steering Committee.
20. Page 74, Table 30
  - Add Option 6 (this should be added to all appropriate tables.)
21. Page 79, Figure 27
  - Set tracer as dilution times
  - Change scale to 100 units
22. Page 81, Figure 29
  - Should be 2km off (to clarify)



Questions raised by JB, DH, CM and actions:

1. Referring to the Micro-pollutants which are on the table for the committee, as long as we have got your dilutions there in understandable language, we can work through that one.
2. Viruses on the table - the only bug you have done is E.coli. As long as we have got your dilutions, we can work through that to the degree needed.
3. Are there any other parameters that were in your brief, or should have been looking at, particularly going back to ANZECC (Australian and NZ Environment and Conservation Council) days where we used to do a whole range of parameters for these kinds of things. Are there any others that we should/could have looked at that might have been in the original brief?

CM was not aware of any, unless there are some in mind specifically.

JB advised that they were interested in colour however, you have got that reasonably covered.

CM – I have got this to some extent the way that you may want to refer to 3D simulations.

4. In the draft discussion, you comment on the marked lack of effect on the six different options, although looking at the graphs and charts, not sure whether this holds. You say in terms of managing lake water quality to achieve and maintain TLI, the lack of marked difference between the six treatment options suggest that we should carefully consider the economic course associated with each option.
5. Earlier in the project we had some data, which Andy has been part of on the cost per tonne for different nutrient removal procedures and mitigations around the lake.

Is that something that your project Greg should be following?

GM advised initial work was done by Deloitte with follow up work being done by BOPRC.

6. The RMA Mixing - After reasonable mix, could we have something in the report that says your assessment of how you did the modelling. I would like to see some reference somewhere after reasonable mixing and tying it back to RMA. Is that a fair question?

CM – The 3D model is the one that you would want and someone would have to judge what is reasonable mixing, which could be based on a percentage.

**ACTIONS: DH, CM and JA to complete final draft taking into consideration comments from the TAG. The final draft will be presented through a workshop with RPSC.**

**KB joined the meeting at 3.10 p.m. linked by phone from Australia.**

JB thanked DH and CM for their work and asked for thanks to be relayed back to Johnathan. JB will also relay thanks back to Johnathan on behalf of TAG.

## **8. Alternative Land Treatment Sites Update – June 2015 (Draft Report):**

KB spoke to his report starting with an overview since the last TAG meeting.

- Updated the report to look at the sensitivity of increasing the hydraulic loading rate from 5mm to 20mm a day on the existing site and then adding on 20% for buffer areas.
- The CAPEX and OPEX have been updated.
- Investigated reusing the existing infrastructure for land area Option 2, which is the area close to the existing LTS. This involves using the existing rising main for the first part of the pipe line and then putting in a new pump station on the end of that and then pumping the effluent to that proposed site. CAPEX and OPEX were estimated based on this new configuration.

Key Comments:

- JB – My major concern is, and I did put this in an email to yourself and GM, was how you packaged the 20mm a day. Looking at Section 3.1.4 in your updated previous report, you introduce the 5mm being considered appropriate as part of the preliminary stage of identified areas and then you say at the TAG meeting on 28 May, requested a 20mm a day which was from KM. In the early draft, you actually had a 10mm and you dropped that from the early draft. Now we have introduced 20mm without any discussion, as I read it, of whether or not it would stack up. The problem I can potentially see is that these reports will go public. 20mm knocks a fair amount out of the area and quite a lot out of the capital cost and someone will say, “we’ll have one of those please.” I think we need some pretty strong qualification on the 20mm in this report, bringing in the fact that 9 or 10 now on the current system seems to be at the top level. I am not sure how the rest of TAG see that but I am quite nervous about being able to defend that 20mm or not having it buttoned down. It seems to me that might give people false hope.
- AB – My comment on this report is that there is no real recommendation here or no real guidance. We don’t have enough environmental knowledge as to what any of those options are going to achieve/not achieve. To enhance a report like this, we need to compare those options that we have, not only on cost, but some other technical environmental issues and to do that, maybe that requires some more work. Unless you are going to do a lot of work, narrowing it down a little bit, will cost a lot of money.
- KM – Going to 20mm is actually saying that this is potentially an economically feasible option which opens up the opportunity of land treatment, which I think is a lot more than the previous 5mm per day application rate was portrayed. If we can get away with 20mm rate of application, then we should be pursuing that with scientific information, maybe using overseer and getting a full understanding of what that 20mm application rate means. The other thing that we should be doing around that is not adding on additional treatments and things on an assumption that they are needed. I think we should have a sound basis for actually ramping up the costs by adding on tag-ons.
- JB - I think we need to put some provisos up to the 20mm and mention that the current system seems to be about 9mm-10mm and that a considerable amount of further detailed work would be needed, subject to land availability, that 20mm was sustainable over the long term, or could be higher. Also, beef up your bit about further work, because you do have a section on further work. I am not saying drop it at all, I am saying be very careful on how it is packaged. 20 was a relatively high figure and to proceed with detailed specific site investigations would be needed and noting what they do now.

Resolved

**This TAG was in general agreement that Mott MacDonald look at having further discussion around the 20mm or more in terms of the need for detail onsite specific investigations at higher rates, whereas the 5mm is considered fairly conservative for a first cut at that lower level.**

- KM – In terms of land availability, I don’t think that really is taking into account the current developments around Rotorua Lakes Council. We can’t go past the fact that Iwi have a large investment. At the political level that has happened in the last month or so, sure, but I think going forward, I think it is something that we need to look at harder. Te Arawa own a lot of land and I think it is probably a bit short sighted not to investigate that properly because if Te Arawa is going to be most happy with the land based disposal, I wouldn’t think that they would then frustrate that by having land associated costs being too high for it to be the economically viable solution. Kevan’s final report should comment that we have got a statutory board set up that is going through with Council, where the Council governance is much more inclusive of Iwi. That should be one point. The second should be that Iwi do have control and ownership of a significant amount of the land that we are talking about.



KM to write a statement that could state the above point. This statement would be attributed to TAG.

- Tables that have an object ID. Are they lot numbers (tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3?)
- AL – Table 5.2, 5.4, just wanting to compare it to the rapid infiltration costs and to the original technical for cost for Options 1, 2 and 3. What is meant by misc?

#### **ACTIONS:**

1. Footnote to go under Table 5.2 and 5.4 that misc. concludes, refer cost detailed costs appendices. Just cross reference it.
2. KB to review the object ID.
3. KB to update/expand first draft report with matters discussed.
4. JB to summarise updates etc. for KB as a cross check to KB on matters discussed .
5. KB to issue next draft report for distribution/presentation to RPSC on 25 June 2015.
6. JB/GM to distribute next draft of Mott MacDonald report to AC for CAS confidential information.
7. KM to write a statement that could state the above point. This statement would be attributed to TAG.

#### **9. Supplementary Report – Alternative Land Treatment Sites – June 2015 (Draft Report):**

KB spoke to his report starting with an overview since the last TAG meeting.

- Investigated this possibility of using the existing pipe and infrastructure as part of that option, which was excluded last time. This sub option includes reusing the first part of the pipe line that is there at the moment which goes up to the holding pond and then another pump station from there to a new area.
- Investigated the possibility of using rapid filtration using the favourable soils on the portion of the current LTS site. The option of the rapid infiltration fits well but it is not comparable to the land treatment options because it is more of a means of disposing rather than a means of treating. We have then added on what you would have to do with the plant to make the RI equivalent to the land treatment option.
- CAPEX and OPEX costs were developed.

**AB left at 4.10 p.m.**

#### **Comments and Discussions:**

- AL - It is looking like we are having to spend a lot of money to move away from the current land treatment system. I am wondering if where in any of the work that we have done, have we captured what it would cost us to have a long term sustainable solution. If we assume that the land is going to run out of its phosphorous, we are going to have to alum. dose at the treatment plant, even if we were to run with the existing land treatment system which would require an upgrade. People seem to be nervous about the fact that it is costing us money to move away from the land treatment system, whereas it is actually costing us money to look at a long term sustainable solution. We haven't looked at the cost of what we would have to do, and is there some way that we could build that in to this report, because it is the existing system. What would it cost us if we weren't going to move away from land treatment system.

KB – That would be relatively simple. I would need some guidance on where you think the nitrogen applied load would sit relative to where it is now. The phosphorous part of it is relatively easy. If you think that the application rate of nitrogen that is going at the moment is okay, we don't need to do anything. If it is not then we have to make a call on what needs to be removed.

JB – Our starting point is that we are leaving the forest.

AL – I know and this is our starting point. It is not like we are considering it as an option, but do we want to demonstrate that. If we are not leaving the forest, we would have to spend this much money anyway. We are spending this money, not because the Iwi are forcing us out of the forest, which is what some people are saying, we are spending this money because we would have to in the end anyway. Is that something that we would want to demonstrate or are we just looking at options.

KB - There is a difference between the RI bed cost in our earliest report of December 2014 and this one. The difference between them is because the information we have for soils are very suitable to RI, which we all chose. There was a lot of disposal options and because we didn't know a lot about the soils, we didn't know where we should put it, so we made an assumption for the reports. We didn't know what the soils were like and the ground water etc., they were very high. I think what will cost us for the current option is about \$5M-\$6M and the other one was about \$17M.

JB – The Supplementary Report for the rapid infiltration does not have a table like the risks and considerations for the other land treatment systems, for technical considerations, i.e. environmental risks, financial risks etc. for completeness. This information should be included in the final draft.

AL – Are we anticipating that the Steering Group might ask us about cut and carry and we haven't made any comment on that and do we need to tick that off as an option?

JB – Sections on cut and carry and costs is in the main report of December 2014.

AL – The report does say it may not be practical because half of the water is nitrate, and the low ammonia content which you could easily deal with at the treatment plant. I think we need to investigate this further.

#### **ACTIONS:**

1. KB to update Supplementary Report with matters discussed and agreed above
2. KB to have next draft of Supplementary Report completed for issue and presentation to RPSC on 25 June 2015 and to AC for CAS confidential information, as soon as available.
3. JB to send KB a list of points to be addressed as a cross-check for ICB.
4. KB to include information on risks in table format.

KM left midway through the meeting at 4.25 p.m. with a Karakia. However, the meeting did continue.

JB thanked KM for his input.

#### **10. Wastewater Strategy Report**

KB gave an overview of the updated report presented to the last TAG meeting.

- The Executive Summary was missing last time so that has been reviewed and a summary is now included in this report.
- The OPEX cost that we looked at, just trying to make it consistent with the TERAX project, because it has got additional OPEX cost with nett over what you are doing now and that is in the table rather than the total. Discussions with PDP resulted in an agreement that the best way to compare options is to compare the difference in OPEX rather than the total number. That is why that number is different from last time.
- All the calculations to support the costs are behind there. We can change anyway necessary. I just tried to prevent it so when it is compared next to what PDP are doing, we can just split across the figures so that they correlate rather than being on a completely different basis.

Comments and Discussion:

AL – It is out of sync. now with the rest of our options because the OPEX is different.

KB - It's very hard to compare them now because it has been built up on a slightly different basis. It is not that difficult to normalise them all if that is what's necessary, but I wasn't sure whether the scope of the strategy study was a bit confused with that sitting with TERAX. Picking out whether that goes ahead rather putting it against the options for the treatment plant, it is almost straddling two different contexts.

GM – We started this off with TERAX as the initial premise. We have presented Options 1, 2 and 3 to the committee saying the premise TERAX is included. When we present this, we should say, TERAX is under review. If TERAX is not going to happen this is what it could look like and the cost implications of this are ..... If TERAX proceeds, then we will have to look at the other options and review the cost line that says "without TERAX." If we are happy with the content of the report in terms of the technical content, this will be presented on Thursday. We can explain the context of the costs and where they came from, then maybe we could present it.

**ACTIONS:**

1. KB to update report to next draft with matters discussed and agreed to, as per above discussions.
2. KB to incorporate comments and present final draft to RPSC in a workshop on 25 June 2015 and to AC for CAS confidential information, as soon as possible.
3. GM to develop Cost Table of all options for presentation to RPSC workshop on 25 June 2015.
4. JB to provide KB with a check list of matters discussed/agreed, for the next issue of the report.

**11. Agenda Items**

Referring to the attached Agenda, some of the items were not addressed due to time constraints for each item.

**Meeting concluded at 4.50 p.m.**

**Next Meeting: 15 July 2015**



RDC effects  
assessment\_Interim r



Mott MacDonald Full  
MBR Plant Treated W.



Mott MacDonald  
Wasterwater Strateg



RPSC TAG meeting  
#8 Agenda 16 June 2



V1 Final Draft -  
Alternative Land Disp



V1 Final Draft -  
Alternative Land Disp

Supplementary  
Report