

CANTERBURY WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE AGENDA

FRIDAY 2 NOVEMBER 2012

AT 9.30AM

**IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, CIVIC OFFICES 53 HEREFORD STREET
(AND BY TELECONFERENCE)**

Committee: Councillor Sally Buck (Christchurch City Council)
Mayor Claire Barlow (Mackenzie District Council)
Councillor Robbie Brine (Waimakariri District Council)
Councillor Stu Burrows (Kaikoura District Council)
Councillor Dick Davison (Hurunui District Council)
Councillor Matt Henderson (Waimate District Council)
Councillor Aaron Keown (Christchurch City Council)
Councillor Glenn Livingstone (Christchurch City Council)
Councillor Pat Mulvey (Timaru District Council)
Councillor Darryl Nelson (Ashburton District Council)
Councillor Lindsay Philips (Selwyn District Council)

General Manager
Jane Parfitt
Telephone: 941-7305

Principal Adviser
Mark Christison
Telephone: 941-5734

Committee Adviser
Janet Anderson
Telephone: 941-8179

INDEX

- 1. APOLOGIES**
- 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – MEETING OF 11 AUGUST 2012**
- 3. PROPOSED NON-NATURAL RURAL WASTE (“FARM WASTE”) PROJECT – DEFERRED FROM MEETING OF 11 AUGUST 2012**

CANTERBURY WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE 2. 11. 2012

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – MEETING OF 11 AUGUST 2012 (attached)**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CANTERBURY WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE**

**Held Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, Christchurch
on Friday 10 August 2012 at 11 am.**

- PRESENT:** Councillor Sally Buck (Chairperson)(Christchurch City Council)
Councillor Robbie Brine (Waimakariri District Council)
Councillor Stu Burrows (Kaikoura District Council)
Councillor Aaron Keown (Christchurch City Council)
Councillor Glenn Livingstone (Christchurch City Council)
Councillor Pat Mulvey (Timaru District Council)
Councillor Darryl Nelson (Ashburton District Council)
Councillor Lindsay Philps (Selwyn District Council)
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Jane Parfitt (Christchurch City Council)
Brett Aldridge (Ecan)
Don Chittock (Ecan)
Carl Diamond (Ecan)
Isla Hepburn (Ecan)
Ruth Clarke (Timaru District Council)
Zefanja Potgieter (Christchurch City Council)
Kevin Crutchley (Christchurch City Council)
Kitty Waghorn (Waimakariri District Council)
Sally Cracknell (Hurunui District Council)
Gavin Sole (Selwyn District Council)
Janet Anderson (Christchurch City Council – Minutes secretary)
- APOLOGIES:** Apologies were received from Councillor Dick Davison and Mayor Claire Barlow.

1. MINUTES OF MEETING 12 AUGUST 2011

It was **resolved** on the motion of Councillor Lindsay Philps, seconded by Councillor Darryl Nelson that the minutes of the meeting held on 12 August 2011, as circulated, be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

2. CORRESPONDENCE: TREATED TIMBER WASTE MINIMISATION PROJECT

A copy of a letter from the Chair of this Committee to Environment Canterbury regarding the Treated Timber Waste Minimisation Project was received.

3. STOCKPILING OF WASTE AND ILLEGAL DUMPING

Carl Diamond gave a power point presentation explaining the work undertaken by the Waste and Environmental Management Team. The project is joint managed by Ecan and Christchurch City Council, and the team works alongside CERA, Ngai Tahu and the Territorial Authorities in the Canterbury Region. The team works “on the ground” at the demolition sites, during haulage, at transfer sites and at the end points. While its primary emphasis was on education and communication several enforcement actions had been undertaken. A problem was that storage of waste was a permitted activity under the City Plan and it was only when issues such as discharge of dust occurred that Resource Consent was required and conditions could be imposed. Following further questions and discussions it was agreed that a report back from the Waste and Environmental Management Team be a regular item on the Agenda for this Committee with this item named Waste and Environmental Management Team Report.

4. REPORT BACK ON 2011/12 PROJECTS

There was an informal question and answer session about the completed projects.

The issue of Chlopyralid in compost was also raised. In response to questions from Committee Members, staff advised of measures taken to prevent Chlopyralid from getting into compost. It was agreed that previous reports about this would be circulated.

It was **resolved** on the motion of Councillor Darryl Nelson seconded by Councillor Pat Mulvey:

- (a) That the information be received.
- (b) That each Council adopt and implement the regional recommendations identified in the Biobiz Limited report as they see fit.

5. PROPOSED REGIONAL WASTE MINIMISATION PROJECTS 2011/12)

Staff spoke to their reports and answered questions from members of the Committee. Ruth Clarke presented the E-book project which "went live" the previous evening. All websites referred to were now linked and a further fifteen pages had been allowed for Councils in other regions to join, if they wished. A children's area was proposed and further work would be done on budgeting for ongoing maintenance and updating.

Kevin Crutchley talked about the savings that businesses could make from becoming more resource efficient. The Committee requested that a cost-benefit analysis be provided for the Business Resource Efficiency Projects so that businesses could see the savings that are possible. It was noted that all the Christchurch businesses involved in the project were funded through the Christchurch City Council's budget and that this Committee was funding the other regions.

The Free Materials Service required funding to cover a marketing/launching strategy and would require ongoing funding to cover administration.

E-Scrap recycling required final funding because it had not expended all funds approved in the previous year and the unspent budget had not been carried over.

The treated timber project was also dependent on funding being obtained from the Ministry for the Environment. Some timber was stored at Burwood for future use. Technology for extracting the chemical used to treat the timber was being investigated.

It was **resolved** on the motion of Councillor Lindsay Philips seconded by Councillor Pat Mulvey:

- (a) That funding of \$26,000 for the Business resource efficiency projects be approved, noting that further funding will be applied for on an annual basis.
- (b) That funding of \$4,000 for the Free Materials Service project be approved, noting that further funding will be applied for on an annual basis.
- (c) That funding of \$2,700 for the E-Scrap recycling project be approved, noting that no further funding will be sought for this project.
- (d) That funding of \$5,500 to the E-Book project be approved, noting that no further funding will be sought for this project.
- (e) That a contribution of \$15,000 to funding the Treated Timber Project be approved.
- (f) That approval of funding for the Farm Waste project be deferred to the next meeting of this Committee when a full presentation in support of the application will be made.

6. CANTERBURY HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (CHWMS) REVIEW

Don Chittock updated the Committee on the hazardous waste related projects managed by Ecan. A Project Manager is currently being sought. The projects have the support of CERA.

The Committee received the information.

The meeting concluded at 12.30pm

CANTERBURY WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE 2. 11. 2012

3. PROPOSED NON-NATURAL RURAL WASTE ('FARM WASTE') PROJECT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager City Water and Waste
Author:	Zefanja Potgieter, Senior Resource Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

- On 10 August 2012 the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee deferred consideration of a proposed Farm Waste proposal to the next meeting of the Committee, when a full presentation in support of the application would be made. Environment Canterbury, as coordinator of the proposed project, has now submitted the formal proposal in this report.

BACKGROUND

- The first five projects listed below were approved by the Committee on 10 August, with the Farm Waste project identified for future consideration.

Project	Service Provider	Budget \$
<i>Business resource efficiency projects**</i>	<i>Target Sustainability</i>	<i>26,000</i>
<i>Free Materials Service**</i>	<i>Target Sustainability</i>	<i>4,000</i>
<i>E-Scrap recycling</i>	<i>Timaru District Council/Metalcorp</i>	<i>2,700</i>
<i>E-Book</i>	<i>Timaru District Council</i>	<i>5,500</i>
<i>Treated Timber investigation</i>	<i>Ecan, CCC, BRANZ, Scion and Fraser Scott (Project Manager)</i>	<i>15,000</i>
Farm wastes project - <i>This project is presented below.</i>	Ecan	40,000*
<i>TOTAL funds allocated</i>		<i>93,200</i>
<i>Not allocated for 2012/13</i>		<i>\$16,800</i>

PROPOSAL

Project name:	Non-natural rural waste (NNRW) management project ('Farm Wastes')
Time Frame:	45 day programme (one year project). Anticipated start date: end of November / early December.
Project district / region:	Canterbury wide.
Supervisor and partners:	Isla Hepburn, Environment Canterbury (Project Manager). Chris Keeling, Environment Canterbury (Project Owner). Jeff Matthews, GHD Ltd (consultant undertaking the work).
Outline:	<p>Background</p> <p>During 2011 / 2012, Environment Canterbury liaised with the rurally focussed Plasback and Agrecovery product stewardship schemes to catch up on progress regionally and nationally. General feedback from these schemes suggests that while the schemes are going well rural engagement could be improved, particularly in Canterbury, and there may be more general farm waste management issues that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Further discussions with Canterbury Territorial Authorities at staff level have also uncovered concerns about rural burning and burying of wastes, and it seems that on-farm waste management is somewhat of a mystery on a local and national</p>

CANTERBURY WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE 2. 11. 2012

level.

Scoping Study and Regional Assessment

From June to September 2012, both SKM and GHD completed initial studies for Environment Canterbury, with the aim of clarifying the issues around non-natural rural waste. The main findings of the reports were:

- Non-natural rural wastes (NNRW) are produced by rural communities and industries as part of their production activities and practices. NNRW excludes 'natural' organic waste from farm animals and produce.
- The legacy issues for inappropriate management of farm waste in Canterbury are potentially significant and will adversely affect the region's land and water resources, and may impact human health.
- To date, farmers have traditionally used the 3Bs (Burning, Burying and Bulk Storing) resulting in significant tonnages of waste being stockpiled and landfilled on farms. There are issues with legacy NNRW (e.g. historic caches of agrichemicals), and on going waste creation from current practices.
- There is a lack of off farm recovery, recycling and disposal provisions for many of the waste streams.
- Current efforts to recover and recycle NNRW are, at best, only capturing one third of the (plastic) materials entering the market place in Canterbury. These materials represent a small number of the various farm waste streams.
- Existing product stewardship programmes are in place; however awareness and up take is low, and the schemes are not well understood by potential users. The effectiveness of the schemes is not easily quantifiable as there is a lack of robust data held by the industry.
- The cost of official landfilling is low for certain materials so should not represent a barrier for appropriate disposal; however for more hazardous materials the cost is greater – this is a disincentive.
- New waste legislation and potential levies may result in tighter controls in NNRW, which could lead to an increase in potentially illegal fly tipping of wastes. This is an undesirable outcome for Canterbury.
- Awareness amongst smaller or individual operators is significantly lower than larger organisations or cooperatives, and these operators may benefit most from efforts to promote sustainable farm waste management practices.
- Through the consultation exercise undertaken, it is apparent there is strong support (from farmers, TAs and industry) for any initiatives in understanding the issues of NNRW and raising awareness.

Next phase of work

The next stage of this project is to build on the initial studies and get some 'on the ground' data to quantify the NNRW issue accurately. For example, what types and volumes of waste does a typical dairy farm produce? How is the waste *really* disposed of on a vineyard?

This will involve two phases of work. The first will include farm audits, where waste will be assessed on-farm by a consultant, enabling real data to be gathered and providing a valuable insight into NNRW. The audits will be carried out on a broad spectrum of farms (e.g. sheep, dairy, horticultural) and will also help further gauge prevailing attitudes of the rural community on waste disposal.

CANTERBURY WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE 2. 11. 2012

	<p>The second phase will involve the consultant undertaking a review of levels of service on a district-by-district basis. This will establish the availability of Council-run and private (including product stewardship) waste service provisions to rural properties. In conjunction with data gathering, the aim is to assess the types and volumes of on-farm NNRW, cross reference these to the levels of service in each district, and find where gaps emerge and improvements can be made.</p> <p>With this in mind, Environment Canterbury requested a proposal for further works from GHD. The proposal is shown in Attachment 1 and outlines the specific methodology that will be used to complete this phase of works.</p> <p><u>Who will this benefit and why?</u> Refer to the summary below.</p>						
<p>Deliverables:</p>	<p>A dataset and report outlining waste data from auditing, levels of service and feedback from farmers will be produced.</p> <p>The data from each site visit will be analysed and reported in terms of waste streams and waste volumes. This information will be used to 'scale up' and build a picture of total waste streams and volumes in Canterbury. The review of levels of service will be reported to complete the overall picture.</p>						
<p>Cost:</p>	<table> <tr> <td>Total project cost</td> <td>\$53,490.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Environment Canterbury contribution</td> <td>\$13,490.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CWJC funding required</td> <td>\$40,000.00</td> </tr> </table>	Total project cost	\$53,490.00	Environment Canterbury contribution	\$13,490.00	CWJC funding required	\$40,000.00
Total project cost	\$53,490.00						
Environment Canterbury contribution	\$13,490.00						
CWJC funding required	\$40,000.00						

SUMMARY

3. The benefits of this study are multiple and region-wide. The information and data gathered will quantify NNRW and give a true indication of how it is currently addressed by rural communities throughout Canterbury. The learnings will benefit all Canterbury Territorial Authorities and Environment Canterbury in terms of informing policy and planning, waste management and minimisation plans, and providing an accurate picture of the effectiveness of current rural waste provisions. The data gathered will also be of national significance, giving an accurate cross-section of waste types and volumes on different types of farms.
4. The results of this phase of works will inform Environment Canterbury and Territorial Authorities on where efforts are needed to promote, encourage and facilitate better management of NNRW. For Environment Canterbury, this will complete the data-gathering stage of the larger NNRW project and provide enough information to build a strategy to improve the management of NNRW in Canterbury.
5. This is a regionally applicable issue and offers an opportunity to engage, build and strengthen relationships with our rural communities in Canterbury, whilst focussing on a contemporary waste issue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee approve funding of \$40,000 to the Non-Natural Rural Waste (NNRW) management project.



Environment Canterbury

Proposal for Non Natural Rural Wastes Data Collection Programme

8 October 2012

Table of contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1	Methodology.....	3
1.2	GIS screening.....	4
1.3	Targeting and Site consultation.....	4
1.4	GIS route optimisation	4
1.5	Level of service data collection	4
1.6	Site inspection.....	5
1.7	Data interpretation and reporting.....	6
1.8	Audit team and timings	6
1.9	Fees.....	6

Table index

Table 1	Fees.....	6
---------	-----------	---

1. Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a proposal for the collection of data for the Non Natural Rural Waste (NNRW) streams, and to establish the level of services available to the rural community. This proposal builds upon the suggested programme detailed within the NNRW report (GHD Sept 2012) and has set out an approach to maximise data collection, and a means to understand the level of service for rural waste management and collections (actual and perceived). The NNRW waste streams include:

- Scrap metal from agricultural machinery;
- Spent agrichemicals and containers;
- Treated timber wastes and off cuts;
- Old fence posts;
- Silage wraps and other plastics;
- Crop netting;

The recent GHD report raised a series of questions regarding the significance of NNRW waste types and volumes that are not entering consented waste management recycling and disposal management chains. The GHD report phrased the term 3B (representing burn, bury and bulk store) to describe the traditional disposal practices adopted by the rural community. The report determined that the potential extent of 3B practices could represent a significant environmental legacy within Canterbury.

In view of the potential significance of the NNRW waste disposal practices and the potential environmental, social, cultural and economic risks they pose Environment Canterbury is seeking to collect data to understand and confirm the level of significance.

During the data collection phase for the GHD report there was some confusion amongst stakeholders regarding level of service and perceived value for money, as part of this next phase GHD proposes establishing the level of service across Canterbury by speaking with the various councils, waste management companies involved to gauge the collection types and frequencies. During the data collection for this next phase GHD will undertake discussions with property holders of the sites to be audited to establish a perceived value for money for the waste services.

The following sections set out the proposed methodology.

1.1 Methodology

GHD is proposing a stepped approach towards site auditing to determine the level of service, as follows:

- GIS screening
- Targeting and Site consultation;
- GIS route optimisation;
- Level of service data collection;
- Site inspection; and

- Data interpretation and reporting.

The following sections provide an explanation of each step:

1.2 GIS screening

GHD will use the information supplied to GHD by Environment Canterbury to date, and any suitable additional data held on file (after discussion with Environment Canterbury GIS team) to identify clusters of farms that may be appropriate and willing to be audited. The purpose of the screening is to identify areas and target clusters of farms with sufficient densities in proximity to each other to maximise the potential number that could be audited in a day.

1.3 Targeting and Site consultation

Once target clusters have been identified through the GIS screening exercise each farm will be contacted to;

- explain the purpose of the visit;
- confirm anonymity and secure participation;
- let them know that materials and guidance notes will be passed on;
- post to the farm a copy of the checklist for self completion if possible; and
- confirm the likely date and time of the visit.

This process will help identify the number of farms willing to participate within each cluster, if the number is low within a particular cluster then the GHD project manager will decide if audits will take place or if another cluster is to be visited.

The output from this stage for agreement with Environment Canterbury project manager will be an audit programme that will show the anticipated number of farms to be audited.

1.4 GIS route optimisation

Christchurch will be the audit team base and routes will be circular routes radiating out from Christchurch. GIS will be used to map the best routes to maximise the linkages between clusters. It is anticipated that the routes will equate to one day drive as the intention is to maximise data collection. The intention is to identify clusters of farms that can be audited either in the same day or over a number of days. The routes ideally will be circular so no time is wasted while travelling back to Christchurch. The focus on the Christchurch region will help maximise the number of farms audited whilst managing costs (there will be minimal accommodation costs).

GIS will also be used to identify the best circular route out of Christchurch to cover the Canterbury region, again identifying clusters that can be targeted.

1.5 Level of service data collection

GHD will investigate the levels of service provided within each of the districts by speaking with the local councils, and the waste contractors. GHD will review available information and documents from the councils (waste management plans etc) and waste management contractors. GHD will also discuss with each farm visited as part of the site inspection process, the services they receive or subscribe

to specifically for NNRW streams. In addition GHD will also gauge the perceived value for money or quality of service the farmer receives. A standard checklist will be developed prior to any site visit containing the questions to be asked, this will be submitted to Environment Canterbury for content discussion and agreement.

To review the levels of rural waste management and disposal service in each Canterbury district we propose to undertake a two staged approach. Each stage is described in more detail below:

1. The first stage will include a review of the available information from commercial waste disposal community and privately run collection providers (eg, frequency of collections, volumes of disposal specific to respective districts, type of waste collected, location of landfill sites/transfer stations and cost of disposal). Information will also be collected by telephone canvassing of waste/transfer organisations and councils for information such as presence and availability of product stewardship schemes, volumes and types of waste collected, disposed of and recycled (ie, general, recyclable and green waste) and cost of operations;
2. The second stage will involve GHD consulting directly with farmers, residential residents and commercial organisations within respective districts to ascertain their level of satisfaction with their current waste collection providers, actual costs borne by each farmer associated with their waste services, additional/alternative waste services identified by farmers and residents, quantity and type of waste produced by each user and overall waste stream characterisation for each user type (ie, rural, residential and commercial)

1.6 Site inspection

The three stage audit methodology (pre-audit, audit and post audit) set out within the NNRW 2012 report will be followed. This comprises pre audit, audit and post audit stages. As part of the pre-audit stage the dates and logistics will be confirmed prior to the visit. As part of the post audit stage a summary email or discussion of the days findings will be sent to the Environment Canterbury project manager.

During the audit, where permitted, photographic evidence will be captured to back up data counts and observations. A checklist will be used to record information (it is anticipated that this will be similar to the checklist used within the NNRW report 2012). During the audit there will also be a discussion to raise environmental and NNRW waste management awareness, the audit team will pass on to the farmer Environment Canterbury guidance notes and materials. At this stage the GHD audit team will also explain how the information from the audit (after confirming anonymity) will be used. They will be informed that, if they are willing to participate there will be a follow up call to let the farmer know how they compare to their peers. An average farming model will be developed based on an assessment of all the collected data. The farmer will then be informed of how they compare against the average.

It is anticipated that the audit programme will take place over 15 consecutive days, with a two man audit team working on each farm (30 working days in total). GHD is aiming for a minimum number of farms and has set a stretch target of 50 farms to be audited, and a minimum number of farms to be audited of 3 per day, with a maximum of two hours on site per farm. GHD will be proactive in communicating with the Environment Canterbury project manager progress against this target and will provide ongoing forecasts on how the audit team is tracking.

1.7 Data interpretation and reporting

The data gathered from each site visit will be analysed in terms of observed NNRW waste streams. Information will set out the count or number of observations, and an estimate of the mass (Kg). A series of standards will be developed that can be used for mass calculations i.e., average container weights for each size. This information will then be reported to Environment Canterbury as a separate letter report that builds on the GHD NNRW 2012 report. A series of models for each activity type will be developed (dairy, livestock, aquaculture etc). The model will set out the average NNRW waste types and volumes for the farm type. In addition a ranked table detailing the total mass at each farm will be developed.

1.8 Audit team and timings

The audit team will comprise Jeff Matthews, Jade M^cConchie and Dean Spiers. It is anticipated that Jade will be a permanent fixture on the team and Jeff and Dean will have an equal split over the three week period.

It is anticipated that the actual auditing of sites will start towards the end of November, but the GIS and Targeting exercises will commence shortly after any contract award.

1.9 Fees

Table 1 sets out the fee estimate for each stage of the project:

Table 1 Fees

<i>Stage</i>	<i>Fee excl of GST</i>	<i>Number of work days</i>
Project management	\$705.00	½ day
GIS screening	\$3,232.00	3 days
Targeting and Site consultation	\$2,480.00	2
GIS route optimisation	\$1,580.00	1 ½ days
Level of service data gathering	\$5,387.00	5 days
Site inspection block 1	\$10,503.00	10 work days in total
Site inspection block 2	\$10,503.00	10 work days in total
Site inspection block 3	\$10,503.00	10 work days in total
Data interpretation and reporting	\$3,595	3
Disbursements	\$5000.00	Flights, fuel and accommodation
Total	\$53,490.00 excl GST	45 days in total

1.9.1 Assumptions

With regard to the timings of the site investigations (15 days in total) it is suggested that after each 5 day block that there is a discussion with the Environment Canterbury project manager to track auditing performance. After the discussion process GHD and Environment Canterbury will inform the other if they want to proceed with the next stage.

The fee is based on time and disbursements, and represents a ceiling figure. The GHD job manager will inform the Environment Canterbury job manager of progress against fees.

GHD has tried to put together a programme that will maximise data gathering and will maximise value for money. The ambitious target of 50 farms represents a real stretch target that may not be achievable due to circumstances beyond GHD's control.

The contract terms and conditions will be agreed by both parties prior to project acceptance and commencement.

GHD



Level 16, ASB Bank Centre
135 Albert Street, Auckland 1010
T: 64 9 307 7373 F: 64 9 307 7300 E: akmail@ghd.com

© GHD 2012

This document is and shall remain the property of GHD. The document may only be used for the purpose of assessing our offer of services and for inclusion in documentation for the engagement of GHD. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

C:\Users\jmatthews\Documents\31077\Auditing Proposal\NNRW Auditing Proposal v3a.docx

Document Status

Rev No.	Author	Reviewer		Approved for Issue		
		Name	Signature	Name	Signature	Date
1.0	Jeff Matthews	M.Fletcher		H.Anderson		8/10/2012

www.ghd.com

