Garrymere Water Supply ADVISORY GROUP
MINUTES for the Meeting held on 27 November 2018, 5:00pm
In the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre


2. APOLOGIES: As crossed out above

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

3.1 Not applicable for initial meeting.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES:

4.1 Not applicable for initial meeting.

5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

5.1 Colin Roxburgh to provide recap of project to date (options assessment, community consultation, feedback received, establishment of group). C Roxburgh noted that the scheme currently does not comply with the Drinking water standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) and that this therefore represents an unacceptable level of safety to the scheme members. The Health Act requires Council to ‘take all practicable steps’ to comply. In March 2018 consultation was carried out with the community on four options to achieve compliance. Feedback was that costs are very high and more work is needed before anything can be proceeded with. It was proposed that an advisory group be formed. Council considered the feedback and approved the formation of the advisory group. C Roxburgh then referred to the timing for the group, in particular that the group is to report back to Council by June 2019 with a recommendation.

5.2 Colin Roxburgh to talk to Terms of Reference for Group. In particular C Roxburgh talked through the roles and responsibilities of the group, and the challenge of meeting all of these.

5.3 C Roxburgh noted Canterbury District Health Board representative unable to attend initial meeting, but can be present at future if requested by group. Group to discuss what level of input is needed. D Lundy noted that this would be valuable to have input from the CDHB, and the overall consensus of the group was in agreement with this.

6. ELECTING CHAIR FOR GROUP

6.1 Request for volunteer to chair and deputy chair for the group. D Gordon suggested ideally that the Chair should be one of the community members and asked for volunteers. S Gregory advised he would be prepared to be Deputy Chair. D Lundy suggested it should be someone who can provide the feedback from the group to Council, as ultimately it will be Council who will vote on the direction of the scheme. Therefore, Lundy nominated D Gordon to be chair. Question from C Prickett whether this would be a conflict of interest. D Gordon responded that as he has no financial interest in the group, in his opinion there is no conflict and that it is not unusual for a Councillor to chair a group after all this is a Council Advisory Group with members from the community, Community Board, Council and Council Staff.. D Lundy then confirmed his nomination of D Gordon as chair, and this was seconded by S Gregory. D Gordon was therefore confirmed as chair.
6.2 D Lundy then said that the deputy chair should be a representative from the community, therefore a resident from the Garrymere scheme. A Black nominated S Gregory, which was seconded by C Levett. S Gregory was confirmed as deputy chair.

7. IDENTIFICATION OF KEY POINTS OF INTEREST FOR GROUP

7.1 D Gordon raised a matter to the group for information before going into more in depth discussion. It was noted that at the December Council meeting it was understood that Council would be considering an option to consult on the basis of an option to share the UV treatment costs across the district, and that if this went ahead this would be of benefit to the Garrymere scheme. It was noted this option was partially in recognition of the high costs faced to upgrade some schemes, plus the fact that as a result of the Havelock North Inquiry, all schemes are expected to require UV treatment. The philosophy proposed is to share the costs of treating for protozoa across all schemes (so this would include the filtration and UV system at Garrymere), but each scheme would cover all other costs. D Gordon noted that it is unknown the specific impact this would have, and how Council would vote on this option, also noting that previous proposals to share costs had been voted against by Council.

7.2 C Prickett asked if this would be a ‘utilities budget’ or the general rate to fund this. K Simpson responded that it would be funded from water budgets only, not the general rate.

7.3 S Gregory noted that there could be residents on other schemes not happy with paying for treatment of Garrymere water given that the scheme was originally a stock scheme and that a lot of water is not used for drinking, and questioned whether this is the best approach to treat water to a high standard then irrigate with it or use it for stock water. In particular S Gregory noted the 19 unit connections with a higher flow rate than other restricted schemes.

7.4 C Roxburgh noted that other schemes such as Rangiora have unrestricted flow rates. Residents on this scheme have the ability to take large volumes of high quality drinking water and use it for irrigation of their gardens and lawns. There are also businesses and industry who use water for things other than drinking. C Roxburgh also noted that the purpose of the 19 unit connections on Garrymere is not to allow residents to use large volumes of water, but to originally allow connections without needing tanks and pumps. Flow data suggests that Garrymere residents are not using their full 19 unit allocation, and C Roxburgh generally concluded that in principle delivering treated water on the Garrymere scheme is no different to other schemes such as Rangiora.

7.5 K Simpson noted that we only drink a fraction of water produced in general, but that all water must be treated to a drinking water standard, to ensure that what is consumed is compliant. Alternatives such as duel systems would not be economic, however the other option of point of use treatment can be explored by the group.

7.6 D Gordon suggested that we put this issue aside at this point, and move back onto the planned discussion items.

7.7 Group to discuss key points of interest for discussion. Potential items to work through are:

a) The need for an upgrade (why is it needed).

C Roxburgh asked the group whether there was consensus that the upgrade needs to occur, or whether the group wanted to explore more why the upgrade is required. C Levett stated that her view was that there was acceptance that the upgrade needs to happen, but the key issues are around the options and costs.

S Gregory stated that there was predominantly agreement, but there were some in the community that thought that chlorination alone should be sufficient, and also an argument that we don’t necessary need to treat at the source.
D Gordon concluded that overall there was consensus that the upgrade is required, and that the group could then focus the discussion about how this can be achieved.

b) Options assessment (Drilling, joining with Summerhill scheme, treating existing). Discuss whether the group wants to focus on all the above options, or whether some can be discounted to focus the future discussions.

c) C Prickett asked for information about how backflow is dealt with on this scheme as this could affect which type of option is preferred. C Roxburgh stated that in the past the backflow prevention policy has focused on urban schemes with commercial and industrial properties. Restricted schemes generally meet the policy by having an air gap at the tanks, but during the Water Safety Plan work that has been carried out recently a potential gap was identified with further backflow survey work required on the 19 unit properties that may not have tanks, to determine whether any additional work is required on these properties. C Roxburgh also stated that this is a side issue, that is relatively minor compared to the source upgrade project, and that needs to be dealt with regardless so can be considered separate to the source upgrade work.

d) D Gordon then directed the group to discuss the options presented to ensure that the group can determine which options to explore further. C Roxburgh stated that the key options are those identified during consultation (Treat at source, drill a new well, connection with Summerhill) as well as the option of point of use treatment which a number of residents raised.

e) C Prickett asked whether more work could be done on the option to join with Ashley, given that some pipes are being increased in size within the scheme to increase capacity.

f) C Roxburgh responded that there were a number of reasons for the Ashley scheme option not being viable, with the pipe sizing only one of them.

g) C Levett noted that there was a perception in the community that the ‘commercial man’ who spoke about point of use treatment was brought in by Council. C Roxburgh stated that while he is someone who has worked for Council who was interested in the project (after providing advice about costings of point of use), but he chose to attend the meeting out of his own interest, and was not engaged or directed by Council to be there. D Gordon reiterated that he was not there at instruction or with knowledge from elected members. K Simpson reiterated that staff are open to all potential options.

h) D Gordon noted that Hurunui had looked at point of use treatment options, and suggested that we invite a representative (David Edge) from Hurunui to attend the next meeting to discuss this. ACTION – STAFF TO INVITE DAVID EDGE (K Simpson to follow up).

i) S Gregory noted that he is aware of residents taking over a scheme from Council in Southland and running it on their own. There was discussion about whether this should be considered.

j) K Simpson noted that if residents take over the scheme, they would still have the same obligations that Council currently has. C Roxburgh noted that there is a process to go through, including consulting with the Medical Officer of...
Health, and that this may provide a challenging barrier to explain how public health would be protected under this scenario. It was noted that the two possibilities are the residents take over and run the scheme, or the scheme be entirely disbanded.

k) D Gordon suggested that he would not recommend seriously considering these options, but recommended that staff research this scheme and report back with information. **ACTION – STAFF TO RESEARCH AND REPORT BACK TO GROUP ON THE SOUTHLAND SCHEME BEING RUN BY RESIDENTS (Colin R to contact engineer who has made contact previously).**

l) D Gordon noted also that Central Government has recently released information and updates on the Three Waters Review currently being conducted. It was requested that staff provide a briefing of updates on this. **ACTION – STAFF TO PREPARE BRIEFING MATERIAL BEFORE NEXT MEETING (Colin R to prepare).**

m) D Gordon said it is important that the group covers off all potential options before reporting back to residents / the community.

n) C Prickett noted that Hurunui now has a common rate across its water supplies, which would be of benefit to a scheme like Garrymere if Waimakariri District Council did this (which will be considered as part of the next Long Term Plan). He pointed out that if Garrymere was run by residents, it would lose this potential opportunity in the future. D Gordon noted that a 3 Waters Rate was considered previously but not favoured by Council at the time due to the costs on the larger schemes being too great. He also noted that the new proposal of a common rate for UV treatment is a more 'creative' way of achieving a similar outcome, but without the impact being as high to the larger schemes.

o) D Gordon noted that there is a lot of information, and requested that staff send out an information pack to residents with background material. **ACTION – STAFF TO COMPILE AND SEND OUT INFORMATION OF BACKGROUND MATERIAL IN POST (Colin R).**

p) S Gregory noted that there are others going through similar issues and we need to look at what others are doing. C Roxburgh mentioned that he has been in contact with residents from the Glen Tui scheme which is a small privately run scheme. They are installing a filtration and UV system currently, and will be able to provide cost information on this. Initial indications are that the total cost is significantly less than the estimate for the Garrymere system so there may be opportunities if more work is done on the treat at source option of minimising the cost. **ACTION – STAFF TO REPORT BACK WITH MORE INFORMATION FROM GLEN TUI ABOUT THEIR SCHEME (Colin R).**

q) C Prickett noted that as part of the options assessment we should include the benefits of the various options, noting that the treatment of the existing source may be the lowest cost option but other options may have other benefits that should be considered.

r) D Gordon noted that staff will also need to report back about outcome of December Council meeting about potential ‘UV treatment rate’, and also ensure that CDHB are represented **ACTION – STAFF REPORT BACK BEFORE NEXT MEETING AND CONFIRM TIMING WITH KATHRYN RUSSELL OF CDHB.**

s) D Gordon suggested that given there is a lot more information to be collated, that one more meeting before Christmas would be valuable. Discussed location and residents agreed Rangiora is an ok location. A site visit to Glen Tui was considered but not required at this stage.
t) D Gordon confirmed the options to be presented at next meeting with others in the group. These were confirmed as those below.
- Treat existing at source
- Treat at property (point of entry)
- Drill a new deep well
- Join with Summerhill (noting there is a suboption of this).
- Join with the Ashley scheme.

u) It was agreed that staff should prepare a PowerPoint presentation of the options above ready for the next meeting. ACTION – STAFF PREPARE PRESENTATION

v) Following the presentation the intention is that the group decides which options to invest more time investigating.

w) S Gregory noted that for all options it is important to know what is and isn’t included in cost estimates (i.e. does it include a new building, new tanks etc). C Roxburgh noted that this information is available but was not presented initially, but will be ready as part of the presentation.

x) D Gordon suggested that a date be pencilled in for the next meeting. The Group agreed on Weds 19 Dec at 5 – 8pm, subject to the availability of Kathryn Russell and David Edge.

y) S Gregory noted that a neighbour to the scheme has installed a centre pivot irrigator abstracting water from the Gary River, and irrigating for a dairy farm within the catchment of well. It was questioned whether this was an issue for the source, in particular around nitrates.

z) K Simpson noted that the source is protected through the Community Drinking Water Protection Zone, and that Government is currently reviewing how these zones are calculated. These zones place restrictions on the types of activities that can occur with the catchments of groundwater sources. C Roxburgh noted that the treatment system proposed is designed to sufficiently treat rural catchments with farming activities, so the drinking water standards allow for this kind of catchment and the treatment system would be appropriate for this, while still noting that a multi barrier approach is best and that all efforts should be made to protect that catchment regardless.

aa) D Gordon requested that staff investigate this and report back with more information on the consent and farming activity. ACTION – STAFF INVESTIGATE THIS CONSENT.

8. GENERAL BUSINESS

8.1 Noted above.

8.2 Meeting closed at 6:51 pm

9. NEXT MEETING: Proposed date Weds 19 Dec 5 – 8pm, pending availability of guests.