



Rotoiti / Rotoma Sewerage
Project – RRSSC
Technical Advisory Group
Conference Call
16 June 2015

RDC-484609

Meeting Minutes – Draft for confirmation at TAG #4 - 8 July

Meeting Name	TAG Conference Call RRSSC Project		
Meeting Venue	Conference Call		
Date Of Meeting	16/06/14	Time Of Meeting	10am to approx. 12.30pm
Chairperson	Jim Bradley	Recorder	

Attendees in MWH Auckland Office

Jim Bradley
Ian McClean (Chair of RRSSC)
Dr Kepa Morgan
Craig Brown
Celia Schofield

Attendees on Phone:

Greg Manzano
Professor David Hamilton
Andy Bruere
Chris McBride
Riaan Rossouw

Apologies from Alison Lowe
Meeting began 10am

Please refer to the agenda email from Jim of 13/06/14 and RRSSC TAG Action List

1. Introduction

Introduction from Jim

Jim had discussed with Greg before this meeting on whether to have a face to face or a conference call, it was decided not to have a face to face, due to time it takes and as there are many actions to do, it would be better to have a conference call and concentrate on the action list.

Ian stated the major importance of the TAG input, and its significance. He stated that the cultural and social aspects still need community, iwi and other groups input, but the work that has been done by the TAG to deal with sewage at Rotoma and Rotoiti is of major importance and significant for the community and lakes. He stressed the use of sewage instead of sewerage.

2. TAG meeting to draft minutes circulated

Jim noted that there were comments from Craig and Andy on agenda Item 4 of minutes, in particular the adequacy or inadequacy of the minute taking. Jim suggested that Craig and Andy go over the minutes together and discuss disagreements and TAG confirm. TAG #2 minutes and these minutes at TAG #3 minutes.

Jim noted that the key starting point is how much detail TAG expects in the minutes, a detailed record or a summary overview of discussion

Andy asked if TAG are producing minutes or notes? It would be common to produce notes that keep a record of discussion; otherwise we end up with an onerous record of what was said by each person. What we are looking for is intent and a record of decisions

Greg said that notes and action points are what is required

Jim asked Kepa about the natural justice that he had brought up previously.

RDC-484609

Kepa has different point of view, TAG discussing issues important to TAG decisions and therefore should have standard minutes as used for governance. Kepa expects the formal record of meetings to be an accurate and focused document that can be referred back to, to prevent going back in circles afterwards. Kepa doesn't agree that we should just have notes as it is dumbing down a process that needs to be done at a high level.

David thinks that TAG run the risk of minuting everything and ending up with screeds of writing that will be difficult to go through. Notes can be an accurate record, if they record points of contention, specific points that want to be made and any action items. If TAG have the whole set of minutes, as in governance, it will overwhelm TAG. Need to keep to key points, which should be carefully recorded and record key points of action, so that they do not get buried.

Jim reiterated/summarised what David said and asked if Kepa could accept that.

Kepa accepts note type minutes incorporating matters outlined by David providing the meetings are recorded and the recording can be referred to if there is a point of contention.

Jim confirmed this conference call was being recorded.

- Craig and Andy – to share Craig's email on water quality points, discuss together to sort out that issue before the next TAG

3. Ian updated TAG on RRSSC meeting last Monday 9 June

Bearing in mind that Andy, Greg, Riaan, Kepa and Jim were there, Ian summarised the previous RRSSC meeting

Ian stated that the prime purpose of RRSSC meeting was to:

- Get a report from TAG which was explanation of medium and short list
- Make a decision on short list as it was reported,

Kepa has some issue with this as to the way the TAG medium to short list arose and the way it was reported to TAG in the slides.

RRSSC took report from TAG which had short list, which included 2 groups of 2 options. RRSSC decided to detach linkages and accept short list of 6 options to go to Consultation, RDC1, RDC3, RDC4, Biolytix, DRASTIC and OSET. Request was made for diagrams for consultation.

- TAG to produce diagrams for consultation

There was discussion at RRSSC of the options, but RRSSC did not seek to evaluate them.

4. Consultation Strategy

Ian summarised the RRSSC Consultation Strategy:

Prior to the RRSSC meeting a Consultations Strategy was circulated to and agreed to by RRSSC, with very little discussion as at end of meeting. Core of strategy is that the consultation and Hui would be carried out in several stages

1. Complete with meeting of RRSSC 9 June, discussion of options and workshop – which is complete
2. Consultation on the short list of options is to commence immediately after RRSSC meeting, involved Hui, with Pikio and Ngati Makino, RRSSC agreed to co-operate with Marioa Kingi in organising meetings to be held on Marae, meeting with key community groups as well. Hui need to be properly advertised, community groups meeting also advertised.

RDC-484609

There are to be 6 hui over a period of two weeks from 7th of July. The hui with Ngati Pikiao be in two stages, first two to hui be at separate marae and the 3rd to bring together discussion and recommendations of the first two, give advice on how the cultural assessment should be done.

Consultation output will be brought together at RRSSC meeting on 4 August, bring recommendation to RDC on preferred option.

TAG to do further technical evaluation at same time as consultation is taking place.

From meeting on 4 August – RRSSC recommendation to RDC, to give RDC time to process and meet deadlines to meet subsidy timeline requirements

Jim asked for comments.

Andy added that there seem to be some useful comments from Iwi member around protecting lake water quality and costs. And questioned that some of the comments were that the costs were low?

Jim picked up from the RRSSC meeting that of most importance was looking after 3 lakes and cost, going back to Rotorua was to stay in and septicity issues could be overcome.

Kepa stated that that was a fair representation of what was discussed. He summarised that RDC have requested that costs submitted be independently assessed, some questions were asked about DRASTIC, have gone away and addressed, DRASTIC should be individually assessed to give confidence in neutrality. Costs need to be affordable and as long as it cleaned up the lakes, that was all some people care about. RRSSC have moved to a short list for consultation, but Kepa doesn't believe that TAG did their process properly to come up with that Short List. It would be prudent to do further evaluation of medium list before going to consultation.

Jim noted that in Kepa's opinion the medium/ short list should be further evaluated before consultation, notwithstanding that the RRSSC has unwound the shortlist to 6 to go to consultation. Jim noted that TAG #2 had considerable time on Mauriometer, we did run through the 2 pilot exercises notwithstanding time restraints. Jim thanked members for staying until 5pm.

Craig noted that he had put the suggestion forward to further evaluate the options, and Kepa agreed. At TAG#1, TAG spent a lot of time to come up with items. AT TAG#2 TAG spent time looking at traffic light list, then in very short time selected a few options for piloting. Craig objects to the short list being presented to RRSSC as TAG process to come up with shortlist was not complete

Jim acknowledged that Kepa and Craig have put something on the table, but TAG had long list, and a traffic light process had been worked through. Jim asked for any comment on the process that we went through?

Greg noted that the traffic light spreadsheet came out with 6 on a medium list with some grouped together. Greg noted that Biolytix was out on traffic light and when TAG grouped together TAG said cluster systems would be evaluated together and group RDC3&4, and OSET grouped together

Jim noted that TAG do have a slide that showed what we did, the slide was presented last Monday at RRSSC, it crossed out RDC5d and Urine separation cluster biolytix, that slide was headed up medium to short list.

Craig stated that he had 14 items marked on the traffic spreadsheet from TAG#2 was on the medium list.

Kepa said that the whiteboarding of options was during his Mauriometer, he suggested that shortlist be made on the whiteboard, RDC3&4 grouped on whiteboard due to similar technology. This was only for pragmatic reasons, to see an indication of what we might get. RDC3 could not be considered as it includes Rotoiti. Shortlist has been presented as those 6 options which can be as it was only done for pragmatic option; he thought that he had just chosen those for pilot.

RDC-484609

David said that yes it was for pragmatic reasons that we chose them, but he does think that as TAG we made good technical options for rejecting those options, and does not see a good reason for bringing them back in.

Greg stated that the options that are on the table, as a medium list or short list are ok and no point in looking at it again.

Andy said that he would want to have a brief look at traffic light spreadsheet before saying it is ok that we take the 6 we have

David said that good Andy's point was good, and that would be useful.

Kepa suggested that Craig could read the list now.

Jim said that was fine if it was brief due to time.

Craig ran through his list - tossed do nothing out, kept RDC1, tossed RDC2, kept RDC3, tossed Manawahi site, kept RDC4, tossed clusters RDC5, dotted line around RDC5b, CBB6a kept in, CB6b crossed out, DRASTC kept in, OSET1, OSET2, OSET3, CB5, CB? Kept but clustered into 1 option, CB4 kept, Offset mitigation CB2 and CB7 kept and mix and match were kept.

Jim stated that mix and match come in reserve combination this can mean that any on site CB options can be in if they fit in with OSET requirements. Questioned the point of readdressing, what would TAG be bringing back in, bearing in mind that we have the combination cover at bottom?

Kepa referred to the assessment process and identified problems. He mentioned potential improvements in many of the options and the need to address options before presented for consultation. There are also issues to address on the RDC options that need to be resolved. Issues to be addressed around the targets we are trying to achieve.

Craig suggested that we have a meeting process that reduces long list to medium list as TAG were supposed to do, TAG only piloted that process and it should be done properly.

Jim asked if TAG should be reconvening, does that need to be in person, or can TAG carry on and accommodate further evaluation as Kepa has suggested, TAG have a short list, cover and catch all and 40 tasks on the table to work through. Is the list flexible enough to take forward to meet all deadlines? Jim is of the opinion that TAG have it covered enough with the list and combinations, enough to carry on subject to biolytix discussion, and get through our options before mid-July when TAG need to have technical preference.

Andy said that as TAG grouped all OSET into one, probably not something for TAG to spend a lot of time on.

Jim noted the action on Andy to get cost for buying a farm, buy a farm still to have more comments from Andy and need to see some numbers.

Andy said he needs to confirm what P load is coming from farm.

Kepa thinks TAG need to go through evaluation of all the options, even if is just a prudent approach that what we have put to RRSSC is the best 6 to go to community, that can be done quickly. Re-running on variation of solution we are aiming for, is good to do the process TAG had proposed

Ian noted that CB2, CB4, CB7 – additions to OSET, with all of those additions cannot be implemented on their own unless OSET plan changes, OSET would still have to be complied with.

Kepa said that they could also be added to RDC3, for example if RDC3 could not give the outcome we assume to deliver.

RDC-484609

Jim said that TAG has two options – Do more review, or have discussion.

David stated that he had an understanding on leaving TAG#2 that TAG had selected the more favourable ones, should be by exception on a valid argument to bring in more,

Craig disagrees in a procedural way, should put through tools again, otherwise making decision without having proper comparison to others.

David questioned if that is that the best use of TAG time

Craig agrees on the need to be pragmatic, the aspects that can be added to augment other options, they should be separated out and included for further discussion, not on short list.

Craig said that Biolytix has numerous option, he has been asked to further develop proposal. He suggests that he go forward and develop it in a cluster format, and doesn't use urine separation. There is already a urine separation option in DRASTIC, which will shade? DRASTIC in preference, TAG need a cluster operation without urine separation.

Jim suggested holding decision on that until TAG get to that agenda item. Some that could come under OSET, some add ones to other options, buy farm. Have we got it covered and do we have time.

Andy asked if that means TAG have 7 options on table?

Craig said that no that is the biolytix option, happy to pick one that makes the most sense in terms of the overall package.

Jim noted that Biolytix was brought in at TAG#2.

Ian – noted that it was his understanding that it was not TAG that asked Biolytix to be in.

Kepa noted that Biolytix was the option that was put up in Environment Court, Jim and Greg made decision before TAG#2 to supersede Biolytix with DRASTIC.

Jim thought DRASTIC had been decided to replace Biolytix at TAG#1, at TAG#2 Craig mentioned that Biolytix has some secondary treatment, TAG listened and brought it back in.

5. Immediate Actions that we need to advance – Action List

Please refer attached actions list for action topics and status before this conference call

In the table of actions:

Green coding – immediate actions

Blue – further bits of work that need to be pulled together by end of July

Yellow –important but probably not paramount to make decisions

Items 1-4

Kepa – asked for clarification on the actions list, some are from TAG#2 but some have been added after?

Jim - indicated the 2 headings on the table, TAG actions and actions from post meeting discussion.

Andy – won't be getting raw numbers from Paul White. Item 4 – been to Water Quality TAG, P load should be high in research, 1kg/ha, will bring something back in writing shortly.

Craig – what is going to come out of that?

RDC-484609

Andy – Nitrogen and P loads coming from various components, including land use

Craig – effectively best figures we have in respect to action plan

Andy – **Item 5** – wall close in September 08, Greg was going to look at reticulation

Greg – haven't checked Okawa Bay yet

Andy – yes numbers coming shortly, relied on numbers from TAG and other numbers being added up

Jim – Ian, offset mitigation needs some lay description, makes sense in principle, but some key differences

Craig – do we have a rough timeline?

Andy – Chris has done some work, but it need to be updated. Numbers on buying farm are easy to do, can do by early next week.

CMB – **Item 6** buying land to offset, numbers have changed in light of catchment loads, land use may have to be something that is looked at as well as system, instead of as alternative to options

Andy – was discussed at Water Quality TAG (WQTAG), need to do something about P coming from septic tanks, as well as a reconsideration that something needs to be done around land use. Andy is going to pull something together to give to TAG.

Jim – clarification on higher?

Andy – there is a higher level of P coming into catchment than previously thought

Chirs – do we need to do land use as well?

Ian – does converse apply? If stop all P coming from land do we need to still do further?

Andy – would need to look at it. Need to be aware of certainty of getting reduction from land use. Are using best numbers. A lot of uncertainty involved.

Jim – **Item 7** – fine, on Chris but don't want long on yellows.

Chris – fine, will do

Jim – **Item 8** – reworking various options from a removal point of view (POV), Kepa came through with figures other night, Alison is looking at this, checking, updating and fixing if required, making an assumptions list, annotating plan. Detailed assessment in TAG#1 minutes, has included Kepas new numbers

Jim – **Item 9** – HUE numbers, Greg, assessment that will change them from costing perspective

Ian – question is basis of whether land which has no dwelling shares part of the capital cost? If reviewed them cost per HUE of alternatives goes up.

Greg – doing work of what would happen to cost per hue if land with no dwelling did not share cost.

Ian – items came out at RRSSC

Question was asked to check the HUE numbers at TAG#2

Jim – **Item 10** – quick one that was parked last TAG, plans were held back as Kepa had a question for Greg,

RDC-484609

Greg – only record that RDC had is a the plan, only kept at project level

Jim – can rest of core TAG have those plans?

Kepa – Does RDC have a policy?

Greg – will check but not aware of any policy

Kepa – yes please, should do in accordance with RDC procedures

Ian – if RDC does not have a formal procedure then proceed with great cautions

Jim – continue to hold maps

Jim – **Item 11**

Kepa – wording of non-point source needs clearing up, depends on Chris's answer as to whether we have an idea of where the extra P is coming from that is going into Rotoma, what has changed

Chris – not much has changed in catchment, can only speculate, can only provide revision of load estimate,

Jim – need to move on, **Item 12** – in terms of John Harding email distributed, that related to DRASTIC only, does not relate to Biolytix, may need to go back

Jim – **Item 13&14** – in hand, next run done based on pilot were circulated for comment, feedback would be useful

Jim – **Item 15** – update?

Greg – hasn't got time to look through, is it still relevant?

Kepa – yes, as if there was a fatal flaw with PDP recommendation, need to know why RDC moved away from a cluster approach.

Greg- will report on that by next meeting

Jim – **Item 16** – taken as read, acknowledged we only did Rotoma in pilot exercises

Jim – **Item 17** – hold this in this form, comes back to it as it is also item 37

Jim – **Item 18** – Kepa has refined and presented to RRSSC

Kepa – the question of does it sufficiently advance, can go through and quickly map for RDC4 and annotate why numbers change if they do, do by exception to get understanding of the other options

Jim – **item 37** – are we doing it now or are we doing it when the other tasks are well advanced, Jims opinion, is that further items of key work done before MCA and MauriOmeter are reworked.

Kepa – some clarifications of basis assumptions needed first, Jim requested a justification for evenly weighting four well beings.

Jim – suggested we discuss at end of meeting, has implications on re-run of MCA

Jim – **Item 19** – Riaan went to Craig for definition,

Craig – yes happy to go forward and fill gaps of various Biolytix options into one

RDC-484609

Greg and Riaan – happy with that, understanding during that time, if Craig could define what the Biolytix item looks like, then can undertake **Item 20**

Craig - will do 1 pager and schematic

Greg will give to external consultant for evaluation and costing

Jim – it is an urgent part of **Item 21** Independent Review of Cost Estimates, looking at external consultant that is not MWH, for clarification,

Greg – one suggested by Kepa, one is Opus, he is writing formal brief at the moment

Kepa – can he get the spreadsheet of cluster HUEs used for the 9 clusters, so he is on the same page as what Greg is assuming, so when he goes to different land owners for disposal sites he can work out a required land area required?

Greg – have map of 9 clusters

Kepa -but is there a spreadsheet?

Greg – yes from MBR, will send.

Craig – what is the per capita flow rate this is based on?

Greg – thinks it is 220L per head per day

Jim – Item of septicity, still apply to some extent to RDC3 and RDC4 as it is a detention time etc, getting review of septicity from external consultant

Jim – Biolytix, question now being answered

Jim – **Item 25** – Terry and Annaka, further refinement of OSET and cost table, advancing well. Package OSET costs for external consultation

Jim – **Item 24** – long list of questions starting to come through on urine separation, are we pulling together that list of questions? Is Craig having first cut at answer? Are we getting external review of answers?

Kepa – suggest send questions to Craig, then send to external consultant for review.

Jim – Yes and then some will go to consultation

Craig – he will answer questions then questions that are not answered or considered inadequate can go to external consultation

Jim – Want list of questions by Thursday this week, will be co-ordinated by Jim. Need to get this to the 20th

Kepa – suggest the answers we have from Craig – he will point out the questions

Jim – need questions through to Jim by COB Wednesday 25 June

Greg – choose external consultant by finding one that has been involved in a project like this, probably one from Australia,

Craig will email a contact

RDC-484609

Jim – **Item 26** siting prelim investigations, to be advanced enough for end of July deadline, Greg pulling together consulting package, with mirror item 27

Kepa – Can he have GIS layering from Greg

Item 27 – advance that work and are working on it

Kepa – have had a number of discussions with some Trusts, bring discussed, including worm farm location, will update, needs HUEs to finish specific areas.

Item 28 – discussed, residuals and nutrients – Alison working on it

Item 29 – P in detergents – Alison to bring together, have had various statements about what could be achieved and what is available

Kepa – want procedure on how to do in community

Jim – identify what is available commercially

Chris – minor reduction of overall target

Item 30 – Jim – Riaan / Greg, we need to do fairly high level risk assessment, following ANZ (Aust/NZ) standard, brings in cost risk from consultant doing estimated cost review.

Kepa – I teach some of this stuff. Why are we excluding the social cultural risk.

Jim – do technical and cost risk independently, as need hui and cultural assessment input to move forward.

Craig – you are suggesting to remove cultural and social aspects, I am concerned with that

Jim – limit on how far TAG can take social and cultural aspects

Kepa – supposed to give a global perspective, not sure what code will give that is extra if remove cultural and social

Jim – can set up for social and cultural to be fed in after consultation.. Had high level to start with traffic light, but need proper input from community and hui. TAG needs to be mindful of these bits

Craig – did this come from TAG, or was this something you always intended on doing?

Jim – this is prudent and very important to do, will be developed and sent to TAG for assessment. Having done in documentation for WW projects, need to line up risks and show probability and consequence

Craig – when does it go to TAG?

Jim – up to Riaan and Greg,

Kepa – I could have good input on this if he is involved early

Jim – important tool, Greg and Riaan happy to circulate matrix and how cultural and social as it is developed.

Greg – let us start off will draft, then will give to Jim

Andy – we should probably talk at TAG about how we approach with this, I have no idea about this and how this will go

RDC-484609

Kepa – it can go a lot of ways; need to get the thinking that underpins it right before undertaking

Greg and Riaan will draft approach and outcomes

Item 32 – out of catchment

Kepa – has emails live at the moment – looking at sites at Piangaroa (spell?)

Item 33 – worm farm – septic tank septage disposal –Kepa on it

Item 34 – Jim – would like to see lay summary of WQ science, bring in action plan numbers, need a lay for front end of consultation material. Having trouble putting in order the importance of N & P in Rotoma and Rotoiti

David – the WQTAG made a statement Nov 2006 – relates to Rotoiti and Rotoma, should use that as a template, look to specifically put at bottom loads that relate to Rotoma and Rotoiti. Statement contains info about relative importance of N & P, lake water quality and lake weed growth, covers just about everything. In latest TAG meeting agreed to put together a statement on sewage derived statement on nutrient to the lakes. Andy do you have an updated version of that statement?

Kepa – suggest that be more specific in that Rotoma and Rotoiti have different problems

Craig – should Rotoehu be in?

Ian – this is a statement of N & P and how they relate to algae growth and macro growth in lakes, this a general thing, lakes Action Plans have specifics. This is a general statement about nitrification on lakes.

David – little bit more than that, about 20 pages. Do we then put a one pager on each of the lakes? And for each of those put together nutrient budget and issues specific to each of these. Suggest looking at statement bits that pertain specifically to those lakes.

Ian – long version on website, shortened version to go out. Under option RDC3 – nutrients may flow back into Rotoehu.

David – of significant – we haven't done a full check of Rotoehu, get up for two lakes and look at Rotoehu at later stage

Craig – concerned that a decision has been made to exclude a community that shouldn't have been?

Ian – we can't go back and change decisions that have already been made?

Andy – the issue that is confronted – community will be required to upgrade to OSET and it will cost them more

Ian – agree, they were invited but did not come to last committee meeting.

Issue Parked – bigger than TAG – been through RDC's Council decisions.

Yes info on Lake Rotoehu useful but not required at this stage. Expect it will be needed later.

Need this by end of next week – David, Andy and Chris will do by the end of this week.

Item 35 – Lake Action Plans – have discussed where Chris and others are at on that

Item 36 – Feeds into risk matrix – high level planning assessment in terms of consents and other approvals.

RDC-484609

Greg has asked MWH for a fee.

Kepa – Kepa had assumed that this was tied to costings mentioned earlier, is this semi legal assessment?

Jim – Quasi legal, mainly planning, looks at how well the options could meet the planning tests.

Craig – this will favour the options that have been used before

Kepa – what is the use of this?

Jim – start of the planning process, will take into account the Environment Court decision,

Kepa – planning application in a region where Environment Court decision has been made. Opinion should be from somewhere that has planning and legal expertise

Jim – Planning assessment then goes through legal audit

Kepa – can save effort here just by getting a legal context of what you are up against. A planning level assessment of some clauses will be trumped by legal.

Jim – propose to bring in Paula Hunter at end to discuss this approach and four wellbeing's and this suggested planning assessment

Jim – **Item 37 and traverses into Item 39 Technical information for RRSSC consultation round-** MCA – further develop – to be done with further work in MauriOmeter, no need to do this before consultation, better data after consultation and can re run after. Core TAG to re-run individually and then have it combined.

Craig – why are we doing this individually?

Jim – Ideally do it round the table, but may not have time. Preference for around the table when we have further data.

Jim – next meeting – 8th July – may have a conference call before. Fine for Andy

Kepa – putting up MCA and MauriOmeter for what purpose

Jim – to look at where TAG has got to with technical preference. Social and cultural come from consultation. TAG needs to look at more technical issues.

Craig – Concerned about considering a complex sociotechnical system by looking at component parts in isolation as the entire system has emergent qualities which cannot be understood with a reductionist analysis.

Kepa – understand that TAG put together to do evaluations that are holistic. Have talked about tools as a guide.

Craig – concerned about taking out social and technical

Jim – No – TAG decides on technical and cost, social and cultural comes from consultation.

Kepa – but to separate out and say community should be deciding

Ian – Cultural input come from Ngati Pikiao, not just from Kepa

Kepa – I am from Pikiao

RDC-484609

Ian – Cultural impact was on a different scheme

Kepa – not that it did include it

Jim – Social and cultural input will come from consultation, and TAG needs to be careful how it goes in. TAG cannot work in isolation; MCA needs the widest possible input.

Kepa – have to have a process that we have identified and stick to that

Jim –that is re-running the process that we had a pilot on, with the extra information that will come in, re work tools with the extra information that will come in.

Kepa – that is not even useful as you have mis-information that goes out

Ian – the intention is to put accurate information out and to interpret it.

Kepa – why don't we do useful work for the community and get it out.

Ian – there is simply not time –

Craig – sounds like you want to take out the social and community input

Ian – no that is absolutely not correct.

Craig – how is TAG going to take out the social and cultural aspects out?

Jim – The MCA includes the cultural and social, those will come in from the consultation, and it needs wider distillation from Ian or the committee to feed it in, the MCA does not just look at technical. The point to be made is that the TAG itself will not make the social and cultural decision.

Craig – so community info will be gathered in 9 days without a proper process

RRSSC decided that consultation will go out, based on material primarily sourced from TAG. There will be a page on each of them that will go out to Hui and community.

Kepa – issue that he has – should have gone through a robust list to process. We are putting a preferred list back to the community, so that TAG can go back through the evaluation process.

Ian – we are not presenting the social and cultural opinion of the TAG.

Kepa – action items to add

Gave sections 5 response on the RMA

What is the basis of changing the four even weighted approach

Also around the cultural issues, they have been raised earlier; Greg was going to provide a technical solution for WaiHapu Bay (Bluff Area) for the RDC1

Jim – anyone else with extra action items?

No response

Items 38 – 39 - 40 – progressively worked up and distributed. – Refer Item 37 above

Item 41 other item -action points

RDC-484609

Kepa – Raised with Terry when he suggested significant Public health issues with some sites, Kepa requested location of individual sites, can Terry please give Kepa those sites so he can do something about them?

Should start thinking along lines of a trial of the cluster technology. Andy had said that was something that EBOP would support, Ngati Pikiao would also support. TAG should look to doing a pilot in time available between now and submission of consent application

Greg / Ian – trial of which system, Biolytix or DRASTIC

Kepa – trial Biolytix, there are areas of issues, as Terry has said

Craig – no harm in trialling some urine separation toilets as well.

Ian – so trial Biolytix as a cluster

Kepa – if we can find a community that is happy to go with it, where is the downside?

Ian – it is a sensible solution, should be trialling any unused technology

Greg – if you really want to do a trial, you are looking at a potential 700 properties that could possibly be a recipient of a system that we don't know about yet

Kepa – trial on 10 properties that will assess an option, to better inform a solution

Ian – won't be able to do trial before the RRSSC is required to give preferred option answer. A trial needs to be there for a reasonable length of time. It does not help in choosing a preferred solution.

Jim – what do we want to do? Trial useful, but time an issue.

Ian – Kepa should put up a paper on what a trial study would look like, how it will be done, implemented and how it be assessed,

Kepa to come up with a proposal and TAG will consider it.

6. Conference Call Review?

How has the conference call worked? Especially from a logic point of view?

Yes, useful catch-up, did get through a fair amount of information.

Difficult to get to an outcome on some points.

Greg - Still need to do a face to face to deal with the key issues at hand

Jim – do we stick with 8th of July next face to face TAG? – Yes fine. Suggested 9 to 9.30am start if possible. Would like brief Rotorua RPSC TAG if possible. 9am start accepted. –A note added by Jim to these minutes this would be at the Rotorua WWTP

Further TAG first.

22 July did not suit Kepa – 23rd July could be difficult for David

Ian – on behalf of the RRSSC thank you for all the work you have been doing.

Jim thanked Ian and the TAG and invited Kepa to close the meeting

Kepa – closed the meeting with a Karakia

Ian thanked TAG for it's work.



Rotoiti / Rotoma Sewerage
Project – RRSSC
Technical Advisory Group
Conference Call
16 June 2015

RDC-484609

Meeting finished 12.30pm approx

A discussion followed with the Auckland group on the matter relating to the four well-beings.