

This Table has been by the Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

Working Draft to go to TAG – Thursday 1 May – Greg / RDC to input/review. This is done to keep things moving and get something on the table with the TAG for the 5 May 2014.

Rotoiti/Rotoma Sewerage Scheme Options Investigations- Rotoma/Rotoiti Steering Committees

Goals, Issues and TAGs Suggested Evaluation Criteria

Goals of the Rotoma Rotoiti Sewerage Steering Committee The Committee is to select amongst options for the sewerage scheme the one that overall the Best Practicable Option, and which:-	Category	TAG's Key Issues to be Considered Under Each Goal	TAG's Evaluation Criteria for Comparing and Shortlisting Options Against Goals (Note for this issue these criteria yet to be confirmed/revamped by TAG following the identification of an appropriate decision tool)
1. Contributes best to improving the water quality in Lakes Rotoiti, Rotoehu and Rotoma by reducing such nutrient and contaminant flows from homes and properties as enter into the lakes.	Lakes Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieve the Rotoiti, Rotoma and Rotoehu Lake Action Plans for target reductions from a septic tank nutrients perspective. Reducing other sewage derived contaminants entering the lakes. Discharge / disposal of residual nutrients (after treatment) into appropriate catchments. Ability of vegetation and soils to accept treated sewage sustainability over the long term. Adverse cumulative effects over time on the lakes environment. Effects of climate change and mitigation against these. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets Lakes Action Plan nutrient reduction targets from sewage perspective. Reduces other sewage contaminants. Discharge/disposes treated sewage into appropriate catchments.
2. Best meets the cultural needs of Tangata Whenua.	Tangata Whenua Cultural	<p>Kepa please (reference Kepa's email to Ian McLean 10-04-2014).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kepa - What are the key cultural issues to tangata whenua in this area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kepa please (based on issues)
3. Achieves community environmental outcomes. TAG Note – RRSSC and Community (through consultation) yet to determine this.	Community Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure a safe healthy environment on individual environments – (e.g. no flooding from septic tank discharges). Separation distances (NIMBY) from sewerage scheme infrastructure. Maintain / enhance amenity value. Odour nuisance and odour management from sewage facilities. Protection and enhancement of lakes water quality and ecology for recreational and food gathering activities – (overlaps with Lakes Environmental category above). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well located sewage infrastructure. Odour potential and management. Recreational/food gathering environment.
4. Best Safeguards Public Health.	Public Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides safe public health and sanitation on individual properties. Meets the approval of the Medical Officer of Health and Area Health Board. Protects potable water supplies. Ensures safe water quality for recreation and food gathering. Odour management to avoid objectionable and/or nuisance odours. Separates people from human waste. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protects and enhances Public Health. Gains Medical Officer of Health/Area Health Board approval.
5. Complies with Regulatory Requirements – National And Regional.	Statutory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment with the provisions of the RMA 1991 and National Policy Statement for Freshwater 2011. Meets RDC's requirements under the Local Government Act 2002 and Health Act 1956 in terms of public health protection and safe sanitation. Alignment with the purpose of the Local Government Act 2002 in terms of democratic local decision making and provision of good quality local infrastructure that is efficient and effective, most cost effective and meet's present and future circumstances. Meets the BoPRC's Proposed RPS, Regional Plans including OSET and RDC's District Plan and other Plans, Policies and Strategies and (any?) Iwi Management Plans. Consentability and obtaining other approvals that maybe required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment with key legislation and planning instruments. Consentability.
6. Retains the MoH Subsidy if that is appropriate.	MoH Subsidy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the subsidy be available for the option? Meets the specific requirements of Central Governments Ministry of Health Sanitary Works Subsidy Scheme (SWSS) as to scheme type and scheme procurement procedures. Meets the specific timelines and other conditions the Minister of Health has set down for in order to retain subsidy. This includes completion by 30 June 2017. Is the scheme(s) an RDC scheme(s) or individual on-site property owner scheme or some 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RDC scheme that will retain MoH subsidy. <p>(Greg – there is no issue about retaining the other subsidies for RRR schemes, is there?)</p>

This Table has been by the Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

Working Draft to go to TAG – Thursday 1 May – Greg / RDC to input/review. This is done to keep things moving and get something on the table with the TAG for the 5 May 2014.

Goals of the Rotoma Rotoiti Sewerage Steering Committee The Committee is to select amongst options for the sewerage scheme the one that overall the Best Practicable Option, and which:-	Category	TAG's Key Issues to be Considered Under Each Goal	TAG's Evaluation Criteria for Comparing and Shortlisting Options Against Goals (Note for this issue these criteria yet to be confirmed/revamped by TAG following the identification of an appropriate decision tool)
		other option e.g. adaptive management approach.	
7. Is the most cost effective option for local rate payers as well as RDC.	Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets the purpose of the Local Government Act 2002 for good – quality local infrastructure that is “most cost effective” for householders and businesses (note good quality means effective, efficient and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances). “Cost effectiveness” is to consider both capital and ongoing operation and maintenance costs, that is lifecycle costs. This encompasses Capital Cost (Capex) and Operating and Maintenance (Opex) cost considerations. Consenting costs. For an RDC Sewerage Scheme(s) equitable and consistent capital charging and annual rates (operating cost) across the entire area served by a Scheme(s) unless special local circumstances require other procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordability to property owners. If RDC scheme, most cost-effective for householders and businesses. If RDC scheme, equity and consistency of sewerage/wastewater schemes.
8. Has community support. TAG Note – RRSSC and Community (through consultation) yet to determine this.	Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of community support for the Proposed Scheme(s) type. Support for the location of the components of the Proposed Scheme – sensitive land use. Community support through the (any) Resource Consents and other approvals processes. Perception of sewerage scheme type. Acceptance / limitations of on-site sewage facilities and ground soakage. Socio-economic considerations (overlaps with Economic above). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socially acceptable. Perception of scheme type. Householder acceptance of siting and operation of onsite facilities. Location of sewage facilities. Recreational / amenity values.
TAG's Suggested Additional Goals for RRSSC Consideration 9. RDC Scheme options are to use proven, reliable, robust and resilient technology consistent with RDC's wastewater infrastructure requirements (TAG yet to consider)	Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of engineering resilience to natural hazards (landslip, earthquake, flooding etc) and climate change. Provision of proven and reliable technology consistent with RDC's Activity Management and Asset Management provisions. Approach to future capacity, redundancy and possible changing environmental conditions. Cost effectiveness of ongoing operation and maintenance. Number of schemes. Availability of suitable solids/sludge management procedures. Other to come? Risks identification and appropriate mitigation. Greg – refine? Others? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proven and effective. Future flexibility, redundancy. Ease of operation. Solids/sludge management. Availability. Acceptable risk and risk management profile. Meets RDC's wastewater policies and procedures or requires changes to these. Engineering resilience.