

# Progress Towards a Preferred Option for Rotorua WWTP - beyond December 2019

*Summary by Warren Webber, RPSC Chair 20<sup>th</sup> August 2015*

# Three Key Topics

- A. Treatment Prior to Discharge
- B. Consenting Challenges re TN & TP discharge
- C. Actual Discharge Location & Affects Assessment

# Treatment Prior to Discharge

Two treatment options have emerged as front-runners:

1. Option 3a

WWTP base upgrade + denitrifying tertiary filtration + UV

NPV \$39.7m

1. Option 6b

WWTP base upgrade + 100% MBR + extra P removal + UV

NPV \$37.2m

# Option 3a

WWTP base upgrade + denitrifying tertiary filtration + UV

NPV \$39.7m

## Pros:

- ▶ Greatest potential TN reduction
  - ▶ TN:  $2.63\text{mgTN/L} \times 20\text{ML current influent} = 19.2\text{tTN per year (target}<30\text{tTN per year)}$
  - ▶ TN:  $2.63\text{mgTN/L} \times 23.81\text{ML projected influent Year 2051} = 22.9\text{tTN per year (target}<30\text{tTN pa)}$
- ▶ Adequate TP reduction
  - ▶ TP:  $0.20\text{mgTP/L} \times 23.81\text{ML projected influent Year 2051} = 1.7\text{tTP (target}< 3\text{tTP)}$

## Cons:

- ▶ Backwash requirement for sand-filter adds variability to performance
- ▶ Capacity risk under extreme events
- ▶ Technology proven overseas but not (yet) used in NZ
- ▶ UV can be effective for pathogen kill (unless filtration is bypassed), but is only a single barrier system to remove pathogens

# Option 6b

WWTP base upgrade + 100% MBR + extra P removal+ UV

NPV \$37.2m

## Pros:

- ▶ Excellent TP removal. ie.  $0.175\text{mgTP/L} \times 23.81$  projected influent = 1.5tTP (target < 3tTP)
- ▶ Makes full use of influent carbon in raw wastewater by bypassing the existing primary treatment tanks
- ▶ A **double barrier** (MBR + UV) to remove pathogens

## Cons:

- ▶ TN removal is adequate **but** projected TN discharge for Yr 2051 **at limit of 30tTN acceptable level** (possible consent challenge?)
  - ▶ TN:  $3.53\text{mgTN/L} \times 20\text{ML}$  current influent = 25.8tTN per year (target < 30tTN per year)
  - ▶ TN:  $3.53\text{mgTN/L} \times 23.81$  projected influent Year 2051 = **30.7tTN** per year (target < 30tTN per year)
- ▶ Hydraulically limited (can only pass a fixed amount through membranes, so membrane selection and adequate capacity is important). Note: management of capacity & storage can avoid this issue

# Consenting Challenge re TN & TP discharge

Under **Option 6b** at 3.53mg/l and a 20ML discharge the upgraded plant would discharge approx. **26tTN p.a.**

**Hypothetical “worst-case” scenario:** for simplicity, assume 5yr for LTS Legacy Load to deplete, with 6tTN p.a. reductions

- ▶ 2019: WWTP discharge via LTS = max. 30tTN per year
- ▶ 2020: WWTP discharge 26tTN per year + max. 30tTN per year as LTS legacy load = 56tN
- ▶ 2021: WWTP discharge 26tTN per year + max. 24tTN per year as LTS legacy load = 50tN
- ▶ 2022: WWTP discharge 26tTN per year + max. 18tTN per year as LTS legacy load = 44tN
- ▶ 2023: WWTP discharge 26tTN per year + max. 12tTN per year as LTS legacy load = 38tN
- ▶ 2024: WWTP discharge 26tTN per year + max. 6tTN per year as LTS legacy load = 32tN
- ▶ 2025: WWTP discharge 26tTN per year + max. 0tTN per year as LTS legacy load = 26tN



= 26tN

# Discharge Location & Affects Assessment of Discharge Location

Three discharge options have emerged as front-runners

## 1. Puarenga Stream Discharge after Land Contact

- a. Modest financial cost (\$.m?)
- b. Significant cultural cost for iwi associated with the Puarenga (Ngati Hurunga Te Rangi, Ngati Hinemihi, Ngati Te Kahu, and Ngati Tumatawera)
- c. Improves dilution of discharge before reaches lake, and therefore has lowest risk of localised algal blooms in the lake

## 2. Sulphur Bay Discharge after Land Contact

- a. Modest financial cost (\$.m?)
- b. Lesser cultural impact?
- c. Minimal dilution of discharge before reaches lake. Risk of algal blooms comparable to offshore option?
- d. Potential for constructed rock-bed (open) or gabion-baskets (exposed at ground-level only) through to lake shore
- e. Lined discharge channel to minimise infiltration of old dump site?
- f. How would this be configured?

## 3. Offshore (2km) Lake Bed Discharge with Diffuser

- a. Expensive (capital approx. \$10m?)
- b. Possible increased risk of algal blooms compared to Puarenga option. Difference may not significant.
- c. How would this be configured?