

Te Puke WWTP - Questions for the S42A Author

RM19-0204 - water

Condition	Question
6.4	Would it be clearer to refer “Prior to receiving any wastewater from the Rangiuuru ...”
9.3	Should the third line refer to “ the UV monitoring device’s specifications.”?
9.14 and 9.15	What is the purpose of these conditions given the applicant’s intent to decommission the wetland?
10.3(a)	What is the intent of the word “design”?
10.3(c)4	Are the cross-references correct? If they are what is the intent of the condition?
11.1	Would it be more consistent to refer to “... the UV monitoring device ...” consistently throughout?
11.2	What is intended by the word “Equipment”?
12.3	Is the signage intended to be upstream or downstream of the discharge?
12.4	What do the words “... where microbial levels warrant additional warnings” mean in practice?
14.1 1 st & 3 rd & 4 th bullets	To whom is the Kaitiaki Group reporting back to?
14.1 2 nd bullet	Is it appropriate to have the Kaitiaki Group commission monitoring or should that be the role of the consent holder? What heritage, economic and recreational aspects are being referred to here?
14.1 6 th bullet	What exactly is envisaged by this wide-ranging function and what would be the outcome of any recommendations?
14.1 7 th bullet	What would be the basis of the assessment of these effects and what outcome is envisaged?
14.1 8 th bullet	Should this be confined to the effects of the WWTP discharge?
14.3	Is it appropriate to enable the Group to “require” meetings?
14.5	Do the regional plans enable a financial contribution condition such as this or would it need to be offered by the applicant on an <i>Augier</i> basis?
14.6 1 st bullet	What is Te Ohu Waiora and what is its relevance to this discharge consent?
14.6 2 nd bullet	Are the words in brackets part of the condition?
14.6 3 rd & 4 th bullets	What is the basis and intent of these conditions?
14.8	Would it be more appropriate to refer to a majority of the Group?
15.4	Would it be appropriate to refer consistently to “the Chief Executive of the Regional Council or delegate” throughout?
15.5 & 15.6	What is Te Maru o Kaituna and why is it included here?

Condition	Question
15.7	Wouldn't the load to the Stream and the Estuary be the same?
15.7 5 th bullet	What is the intent of this condition? Is this the role of the consent holder (who must comply with their discharge standards) or more properly the role of BOPRC?
15.7 6 th bullet	What is the intent of the condition and how would it be implemented? Can one summarise potential adverse effects?
15.8	What tangata whenua are referred to here other than those already represented on the Kaitiaki Group?
15.9	What merit is there in annual reporting given the detailed reporting set out in 16.4?
16.1	Is this a vires condition? How will compliance with a directive for "positive commitment" be monitored by BOPRC?
16.2	Do the regional plans enable a financial contribution condition such as this or would it need to be offered by the applicant on an <i>Augier</i> basis? What tangata whenua are referred to here other than those already represented on the Kaitiaki Group? Is it appropriate to have the WWAG appoint people or should that be the role of the consent holder?
16.3 2 nd bullet	Who determines what is "necessary"?
16.3 3 rd bullet	What does this condition mean?
17.2	What are "emerging contaminants"?

RM19-0204 -air

Condition	Question
6.1	Is the cross-reference to 5.3 correct?
6.1(2)	This refers to BPO in 6.4 but 6.4 does not mention BPO?
6.3(1)	Is it <i>vires</i> to refer to off-site activities in a consent that relates to a specific WWTP location?

RM19-0204 - stream bed

Condition	Question
7.2	What Site Operation and Maintenance Plan is being referred to here?
7.4	What is the merit of this condition, given the wetland is artificial and is to be decommissioned? What adverse effects are being addressed?