

Draft Water New Zealand Good Practice Guide for the Beneficial Use of Organic Waste Products on Land

Hamilton Meeting 21st February 2017 – Notes

Nick Walmsley presented slides on behalf of the Steering group summarising the proposed changes to the 2003 biosolids Guidelines. The slides included the formal questions raised within Volume 1. Questions and comments from the floor were encouraged and content noted below. All participants were encouraged to provide written submissions, whether in support or not, by the end of March 2017.

Formal Questions Raised:

- 1. Should the word ‘waste’ be included in the title and descriptive text? Should it just refer to ‘Organic Products’ or ‘Organic Materials’?**
 - Social – afford to be pragmatic and keep waste, not marketing.
 - It’s a guideline, people understand what waste is
 - Disagree that waste should be in title. Need to change perception between something discarded and a product fit for use in competition with fertilisers
 - Markets rather than disposal
 - Recovering resource – organic products = resource. Wording important, biosolids terminology misused
 - Overseas ‘resource recovery’ plants promotes different attitude
 - Sustainability – take on frame of mind. Impact on long term use of land.
 - ‘Use’ of organic product rather than ‘dispose;
- 2. Should the proposed ‘Type’ 1A, 1B etc be used or revert back to the previous Aa, Ab etc nomenclature used in the 2003 Biosolids Guidelines?**
 - Needs to differentiate to prevent confusion
- 3. Should measurement of emerging organic contaminant limits be mandatory for all biosolids applied to land so that a New Zealand database can be established more quickly, giving a greater ability for evidence based review?**
 - Having a database a good idea; who will monitor?
 - Costly and collecting data for the sake of it doesn’t justify the cost. Needs to be public and useful.
 - Who would fund; water NZ, central Government, councils?
 - Needs to be compulsory
- 4. Volume 1 The Guide is intended to give practical guidance. Is the information clear enough, in the correct format, split adequately between background/supporting information (Technical Manual) and the Guide? How could it be improved?**
 - Agreed with current format Volume 1 = Guide, Volume 2 = Technical
- 5. Are there any concerns over the proposed changes? What are they?**
 - Cultural and social issues important
- 6. What positive or negative impacts will the proposed changes have on your business?**
 - Not many testing laboratories – how long until more can test and testing costs reduced

- 7. Are the changes to the guidelines able to be aligned with current regional and district plans?**
 - It will take time
- 8. Is using the NES for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health, April 2012 an acceptable means of protecting human health in the urban environment? If not, what do you suggest as an alternative?**
 - Link between NES and guide suggested

Other Comments:

- Difficult process – social aspects. How do we address?
- Important to cover lagoon sludge
- 2003 metal limits forced sludge into landfills
- Specific considerations how to recognise types in consent processes will streamline consent timetables
- Reference to PDP soil mixing guide and techniques
- Change to EOCs positive
- Changes proposed are great, especially metal limit use
- Sampling frequencies – use water guideline style i.e. relaxed sampling with lower risk (trade waste control)
- First line of Volume 1 poor start i.e. 'good quality waste'.
- Could guidelines enable different public engagement?
- Provide strong backing to roll-out with councils.
- Acceptance for non-biosolids not such an issue; wastewater sludge is the 'animal'.
- Regular reviews important. How?
- Needs multi – pronged roll-out across industry. Include education at point of sale
- Timeline for completion given impending election?