

Hugh Ratsey submission

Thanks for the invite to the presentation this morning. In general, I believe the update of the 2003 Biosolids guidelines is heading in the right direction. I have the following comments:

1. I agree that terminology is key to being able to effect real change towards more beneficial reuse of biosolids. Therefore, I don't think the title should include the word "waste". It is a resource. How about "Beneficial use of organic byproducts on land"?
2. I agree that if the terminology changes, so should the nomenclature. Therefore, I think it is appropriate to move on from the terms Aa, Ab, Ba and Bb, although I don't have a preference to what alternative terms are used. If the old terms are retained, this would likely provide a barrier to increased beneficial use.
3. I agree that the guide needs to have a regular, formal review process to ensure it stays current, in particular with regard to emerging contaminants. This would almost certainly need government funding. I seem to remember a government white paper 10+ years ago which aimed to achieve 90% beneficial use of biosolids by 2007 (or something similar). Government needs to contribute to be help this happen.
4. A database of concentrations of emerging contaminants in NZ organic byproducts would be very beneficial in the long run. Producers of these organic byproducts should be expected to pay for this analysis to a degree, particularly for the ongoing verification sampling. However, it would be beneficial if some funding could be available from a central source to enable producers of such byproducts that are otherwise being sent to landfill to undertake screening analysis to determine whether options for reuse may be available.