

Ngā Take

PERFORMANCE AND MONITORING COMMITTEE

Komiti Whakahaere

PM21-7 Thursday, 14 October 2021 Council Chambers Barkes Corner, Tauranga 9.30am



westernbay.govt.nz | Te Kaunihera a rohe mai i nga Kuri-a-Wharei ki Otamarakau ki te Uru

Performance and Monitoring Committee

Membership

Chairperson	Cr Don Thwaites						
Deputy Chairperson	Cr Murray Grainger						
Members	Cr Grant Dally						
	Cr Mark Dean						
	Cr James Denyer						
	Cr Monique Gray						
	r Anne Henry						
	Cr Kevin Marsh						
	Cr Margaret Murray-Benge						
	Deputy Mayor John Scrimgeour						
	Cr Allan Sole						
	Nayor Garry Webber						
Quorum	6						
Frequency	Six weekly						

Role:

• To monitor and review the progress of the Council's activities, projects and services.

Scope:

- To monitor the operational performance of Council's activities and services against approved levels of service.
- To monitor the effectiveness of Council, community and agency service agreements / contracts.
- To monitor the implementation of Council's strategies, plans, policies and projects as contained in the Long-Term Plan or Annual Plan.
- To monitor Community Service Contract performance, set service delivery requirements and receive annual reports from service delivery contractors.
- To review and monitor agreements between Tauranga City Council and Western Bay of Plenty District Council and recommend to the respective Councils any changes to agreements, as appropriate.
- To monitor performance against the Priority One approved contract.
- To monitor performance of Council Controlled Organisations (CCO's) against their Statement of Intent, including Tourism Bay of Plenty's Statement of Intent and make recommendations to Council on matters relating to CCO's.
- To monitor the on-going effectiveness of implemented joint projects, plans, strategies and policies with Tauranga City Council.
- To monitor performance against any Council approved joint contracts with Tauranga City Council and/or other entities.
- To monitor performance and outcomes relating to:
 - seal extensions and unsealed road maintenance
 - community halls and facilities.
- To report to Council financial outcomes and recommend any changes or variations to allocated budgets.

Power to Act:

• Subject to agreed budgets and approved levels of service, to make decisions to enable and enhance service delivery performance.

Power to Recommend:

• To make recommendations to Council and/or any Committee as it deems appropriate.

Power to sub-delegate:

The Committee may delegate any of its functions, duties or powers to a subcommittee, working group or other subordinate decision-making body, subject to the restrictions on its delegations and provided that any sub-delegation includes a statement of purpose and specification of task.

Notice is hereby given that an Performance and Monitoring Meeting will be held in the Council Chambers, Barkes Corner, Tauranga on: Thursday, 14 October 2021 at 9.30am

Order Of Business

1	Present						
2	In Attendance						
3	Apologies						
4	Conside	eration of Late Items	5				
5	Declara	tions of Interest	5				
6	Public B	Excluded Items	5				
7	Public F	Forum	5				
8	Present	ations	5				
9	Reports	s	6				
	9.1	Group Manager Finance and Technology Services' Report	6				
	9.2	New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Limited Annual Report 2020-2021	7				
	9.3	Schedule of Payments for the Month of August 2021	9				
	9.4	Civic Financial Services Half Yearly Report - 30 June 2021	10				
	9.5	Katikati Wastewater Treatment Plant Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options Assessment	11				
10	Informa	tion for Receipt	21				
11	Resolut	ion to Exclude the Public	21				
	11.1	Council Contracts Awarded or Renegotiated for the month of August 2021	21				
	11.2	Operational Risk Report October 2021 Confidential	21				
	11.3	Katikati Wastewater Treatment Plant Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options Assessment Full Report	21				
	11.4 Housing Affordability Forum Pilot Project						

1 PRESENT

- 2 IN ATTENDANCE
- 3 APOLOGIES

4 CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest that they may have.

6 PUBLIC EXCLUDED ITEMS

7 PUBLIC FORUM

A period of up to 30 minutes is set aside for a public forum. Members of the public may attend to address the Board for up to five minutes on items that fall within the delegations of the Board provided the matters are not subject to legal proceedings, or to a process providing for the hearing of submissions. Speakers may be questioned through the Chairperson by members, but questions must be confined to obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by the speaker. The Chairperson has discretion in regard to time extensions.

Such presentations do not form part of the formal business of the meeting, a brief record will be kept of matters raised during any public forum section of the meeting with matters for action to be referred through the customer contact centre request system, while those requiring further investigation will be referred to the Chief Executive.

8 **PRESENTATIONS**

9 **REPORTS**

9.1 GROUP MANAGER FINANCE AND TECHNOLOGY SERVICES' REPORT					
File Number:	A4326864				
Author:	Kumaren Perumal, Group Manager Finance and Technology Services				
Authoriser:	John Holyoake, Chief Executive Officer				

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to inform Elected Members on important issues relating to Council's finances.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Group Manager Finance and Technology Services' report dated 14 October 2021 titled 'Group Manager Finance and Technology Service's Report' be received.

KEY FINANCIAL ISSUES, KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, WARD AND DEVELOPMENT TREND STATISTICS AND QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORTS FOR THE SEPTEMBER QUARTER

Due to the timing of the Committee agenda closure being out of sequence with the report preparation cycle the Key Financial Issues, Key Performance Indicators, Ward and Development Trend Statistics and Quarterly Performance reports will be made available as supplementary reports prior to the meeting on 14 October 2021.

The Quarterly Performance Report will include operational risks, commentary and presentations where required, to highlight areas to the Committee.

9.2 NEW ZEALAND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDING AGENCY LIMITED ANNUAL REPORT 2020-2021

File Number: A4352275

Author: David Jensen, Finance Manager

Authoriser: Kumaren Perumal, Group Manager Finance and Technology Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Elected Members with the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Limited's (LGFA) Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2021, as required under Section 8 of LGFA's Statement of Intent.
- 2. LGFA's Annual Report was approved by the LGFA's Board of Directors and received by Council on the 30 August 2021.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Finance Manager's report dated 14 October 2021 titled 'New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Limited Annual Report', be received.

BACKGROUND

- 3. The New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Limited (LGFA) is a designated Council-Controlled Organisation under the Local Government Act 2002. The company was incorporated on 1 December 2011.
- 4. As a Council-Controlled Organisation, LGFA is a separate legal entity from Council and is responsible for delivery of services in accordance with an agreed Statement of Intent.
- 5. Under Section 67 of the Local Government Act 2002, within 3 months after the end of each financial year, the board of a council-controlled organisation must deliver to the shareholders, and make available to the public, a report on the organisation's operations during that year, including financial statements and auditor's report.
- 6. The Annual Report is included as **Attachment 1** to this report and can be viewed via Council's website <u>here.</u>

SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS

- LGFA have made longer dated borrowing options available to an increased number of council borrowers.
- By 30 June 2021, LGFA had loans outstanding of \$12.10 billion to participating councils, an increase over the past year of \$1.20 billion. LGFA also added five new council members to bring the number of member councils to seventy-two.
- For the 12-month period to 30 June 2021, the LGFA provided 79% of the sector borrowing and are appreciative of the support from their borrowing councils.
- A strong financial position has ensured a dividend payment of 3.512% for shareholders
- The financial strength of LGFA has been enhanced with a record Net Operating Profit of \$12.0 million for the 2020-2021 year and Shareholder Equity of \$94.7 million as at 30 June 2021. An \$856,500 dividend has been declared by the LGFA Board for the year ended 30 June 2021. The dividend rate is \$0.03426 per paid up share and was paid to councils on Friday 3 September 2021.

Annual General Meeting (AGM)

LGFA's AGM is intended to take place in Wellington on Tuesday 23 November 2021.

ATTACHMENT

1. New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Ltd – Annual Report (30 June 2021) is available for viewing via Council's website <u>here.</u>

9.3 SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST 2021

File Number:	A4326644
Author:	Sarah Bedford, Financial Controller
Authoriser:	David Jensen, Finance Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is for Elected Members to receive information on payments from ANZ Bank for the month of August 2021.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Financial Controller's report dated 14 October 2021 titled 'Schedule of Payments for the Month of August 2021' be received.

BACKGROUND

In accordance with the provisions of the legislation, the following payments were made during the month of August 2021. Computer printouts listing all the vouchers issued over the period will be available for inspection if required.

Payment Summary - August 2021				
Payment of Accounts				
Direct Credits and Cheques	\$7,254,888.68			
Direct Debits (Salary Payments)	\$1,266,787.48			
Direct Debits (other accounts)	\$10,764.81			
Total	\$8,532,440.97			

9.4 CIVIC FINANCIAL SERVICES HALF YEARLY REPORT - 30 JUNE 2021

File Number:	A4345435
Author:	David Jensen, Finance Manager
Authoriser:	Kumaren Perumal, Group Manager Finance and Technology Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide Elected Members with Civic Financial Services Ltd Half Yearly Accounts – 30 June 2021 for information (Attachment 1). This attachment can be viewed via Council's website <u>here.</u>

RECOMMENDATION

- 1. That the Finance Manager's report dated 14 October 2021 titled 'Civic Financial Services Half Yearly Report 30 June 2021' be received.
- 2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of low significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

KEY POINTS TO NOTE

- 1. Council is a shareholder in Civic Financial Services Limited ('CFSL') and has a number of contractual arrangements in place with the company, including public liability and indemnity cover.
- 2. CFSL's income is derived from administration services and investment income. In addition to administering Riskpool, Civic Liability Pool and the LAPP Fund, Civic Financial Services Limited administers the SuperEasy and SuperEasy KiwiSaver Superannuation Schemes which are offered to local government on an exclusive basis.
- 3. These schemes provide superannuation services to 76 councils, have well over 11,000 members and manages a portfolio of funds in excess of \$530 million. Of the councils that have a preferred provider for KiwiSaver, 91% have appointed Civic (69 out of 76 councils).
- 4. The Company is tracking above budget and has returned an (unaudited) pre-tax profit of \$0.399 million for the first half of 2021 with the company maintaining a strong financial position as at 30 June 2021.
- 5. Mr John Melville has recently been appointed as Chair of Civic Financial Services Limited having been a Director of the company and Chair of the Risk and Audit Committee for several years.
- 6. Mr Charlie Howe was appointed Chief Executive Officer on 1 September 2021 replacing lan Brown who has announced his retirement from Civic.

ATTACHMENT

7. Civic Financial Services New Appointments and Half Yearly Accounts to 30 June 2021 is available for viewing via Council's website <u>here.</u>

9.5 KATIKATI WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT EFFLUENT REUSE AND DISPOSAL OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

File Number:	A4307509
Author:	Coral-Lee Ertel, Asset and Capital Manager
Authoriser:	Gary Allis, Deputy Chief Executive & Group Manager Infrastructure Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The report on the Katikati Wastewater Treatment Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options will be presented by members of the Working Party (Te Ohu Waiora) who have been on a 5-year journey.

The Committee is requested to receive the report, thank the members of Te Ohu Waiora and refer the report to a future joint Performance and Monitoring Committee/Te Ohu Waiora workshop to go through the process, findings and next steps.

The redacted Executive Summary of the Katikati Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options Assessment report is **Attachment 1**.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1. That the Asset and Capital Manager's report dated 14 October 2021 titled 'Katikati Wastewater Treatment Plant Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options Assessment' be received.
- 2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of low significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- That the Katikati Wastewater Treatment Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options Working Party (Te Ohu Waiora) be thanked for their input, expertise and advice since 2016.
- 4. That the Katikati Wastewater Treatment Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options report be referred to a joint Performance and Monitoring Committee/Te Ohu Waiora to review the process, findings and next steps.

BACKGROUND

Western Bay of Plenty District Council has operated a Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) at Prospect Drive, Katikati since 1986. The treatment process involves a receiving chamber that screens the wastewater prior to entering aerated lagoons. The partially treated wastewater enters a maturation pond with floating wetlands for secondary treatment before passing through a UV disinfection process. The treated wastewater is then discharged through an ocean outfall pipeline that extends under the inner harbour, across Matakana Island to a discharge point around 650m off the shoreline into the Pacific Ocean.

Prior to the existing resource consent expiring in 2018, Council applied to renew this consent and was granted a new resource consent with a twenty-year term. The 20-year term aligns with the expected remaining age of the pipeline.

General feedback from local Tangata Whenua at that time opposed the idea of continuing to discharge treated wastewater directly into a water environment and had serious reservations around Council's intentions to invest in exploring alternative options. Council profited a condition in the new resource consent that required Council to look at alternative methods of discharging treated wastewater.

Council staff had taken the initiative to convene a working group (Te Ohu Waiora), when the resource application process commenced in early 2016. The process was run in parallel with the resource consenting process with no fixed timeframe to complete the alternative discharge options process, however the subsequently approved resource consent requires Council to submit a 'Future Directions' report to the Bay of Plenty Regional Council, no later than December 2026

The success of an alternative treated effluent reuse or disposal solution depended on Council engaging with Tangata Whenua (particularly Hapu in close proximity to the scheme) as well as the wider community at the start of the process.

Iwi representation included the five Hapu groups from Matakana island and Iwi / Hapu representatives from the Katikati area. The invitation was also extended to other iwi representatives from the surrounding area.

The membership of the group included, Councillors, Community Board Chair, and other interested parties.

A collaborative workshop was held to discuss and agree on the 'success criteria' that should be adopted when exploring alternative options. The following Criteria were identified to assist in the scoring of all alternative reuse and disposal options using a multi-criteria analysis (MCA):

- Cultural values;
- Community needs;
- Health of water bodies; and
- Economic viability for the community.

It should be noted that the capital and operational costs associated with any of the options was not introduced or discussed during the process of reaching a shortlist of options. The inclusion of such costs was added into the final report by Council's consultants BECA / WSP, prior to releasing the final draft report. The reasoning behind this was to ensure that consideration was given to the best environmental outcome without cost influencing the decision making process.

The following approach was taken by Council over the last three years to conclude with the detailed assessment report - Katikati Wastewater Treatment Plant Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options Assessment. The Executive Summary is **Attached**.

- Establish a Katikati Wastewater Advisory Group (WWAG).
- Undertake a review of the existing current treatment system and identify any issues now or into the future.
- Conduct a series of information and educational workshops on wastewater concepts, issues and options.
- Undertake a series of field trips within the North Island looking at treatment plants and their current discharge methods.
- Form a long list of options for consideration.
- Review the potential upgrades required to the treatment plant in respect of growth and impacts on any of the discharge options.
- Undertake a high-level planning, geotechnical and archaeological desktop study to identify which
 options would be technically feasible based on treatment effluent storage requirements and
 nitrogen loading limits.
- Agree on the shortlisted alternative options using the multi criteria analysis (MCA).
- Develop Capex, Opex and NPV cost estimates for each of the technically feasible options.
- Present the conclusions to Council in a report.

The Options Assessment Report provides details on each part of the process, including the following key components:

- Introduction;
- Design Basis;
- Potential Sites;
- Assessments;

- Design Concepts;
- Multi-Criteria Analysis;
- Cost Estimates;
- Conclusions and Recommendations; and
- Supporting documentation.

Five potential irrigation land parcels have been identified through the investigations, with consideration being given to a maximum distance from the existing WWTP, minimum parcel area, maximum land slope, adequate buffer zones to property boundaries and watercourses. Single land ownership was also considered an advantage.

The study to date has been based on a high-level desktop review from information available within Council's files. No approach has been made to engage with any landowners at this stage. Therefore, the sites and areas considered remain confidential due to the early stage of the process.

This Options Assessment has provided a platform for Council to consider the next steps in the process, which involves engagement with landowners to explain the purpose of project, seek permission to undertake geotechnical investigations, identify detail on the design and costings and potentially entering into an agreement for purchasing of land to implement the plan.

The report at this point provides enough detail for Council to consider its options around including a future project within its long-term planning process. Any new disposal option will need a new resource consent.

Since commencing the options assessment process, several significant announcements have been signalled by Central Government around water reforms and the requirement to improve water discharge quality into the natural receiving environments.

This report demonstrates the time and effort that has been spent to date in addressing options of changing from a water to land based discharge solution.

SIGNIFICANCE AND ENGAGEMENT

In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy, this decision is considered to be of low significance because the decision is to receive the report. Subsequent decisions may be at a different level of significance.

ENGAGEMENT, CONSULTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Consultation so far has been limited to the parties involved in the Wastewater Alternative Discharge Options Group. The subject surrounding procurement of land for any potential development has been kept at a high level via a desktop study. Participants have been advised that confidentiality at this point is paramount.

Interested/Affected Parties	Completed/Planned Engagement/Consultation/Communication		
Name of interested parties/groups	Identified property owners in the assessment report will need to be consulted with if the next stage is to progress.		
Tangata Whenua	Local Iwi/Hapu have been party to the discussions from the beginning and will continue to be part of the process.	lanned	Completed
General Public	As part of the next stage, the signalling of a potential project in the Long Term Plan will require consultation with the wider community.	Ъ	Co

ISSUES AND OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

The recommendations at this stage of the project do not require an Issues and Options Assessment.

The Recommendation is for the Committee to receive the report and to hold a workshop with the Working Party. Subsequent reports may require an Issues and Options Assessment.

STATUTORY COMPLIANCE

The process and report meet the terms of the resource consent.

FUNDING/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Budget Funding Information	Relevant Detail				
	The Options Assessment is funded from the Katikati Wastewater Resource Consent budget.				

ATTACHMENTS

1. Attachment 1 - Executive Summary - Katikati Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options Assessment - REDACTED 1

Executive Summary

Western Bay of Plenty District Council (Council) has renewed a previous consent (for a period of 20 years) to discharge treated effluent from the Katikati wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), via an ocean outfall that extends approximately 650m from **Extended** into the Pacific Ocean. One of the conditions of this consent renewal is that Council is required to investigate alternative effluent reuse and disposal options by 2021, focussing on application to land. Council is committed to investigate effluent irrigation and this report presents the options that have been assessed to date.

The process commenced by the running of a number of stakeholder workshops that provided education on wastewater, its origins, its constituents, the methods of treatment and methods of discharge available. Considerable time was also spent discussing the issues associated with the management of wastewater.

Workshops were also held discussing the different levels or extent of treatment available, the relative water qualities produced and the treatment of wastewater as a resource whereby various resources (energy, carbon, nutrients, water) can be extracted and reused, depending upon the treatment provided.

Facility visits were also conducted to various WWTPs and discharge and biosolids management facilities on the Coromandel Peninsula and in the central north Island from Rotorua to Tauranga to Otorohanga.

The majority of this report is dedicated to addressing treatment and discharge of the liquid component of the wastewater. However, the solids stream, residuals and atmospheric emissions also featured in the discussions, but are to be canvassed in more detail at the next stage of implementation.

Five potential irrigation land parcels were identified by a GIS search based on maximum distance from the WWTP, minimum parcel area, maximum slope and adequate buffer zones to property boundaries and water courses. Single ownership was also a criterion, with the exception of **second second secon**



Sections 3 and 4 contain more details on the five potential land application sites.

Analysis of the feasibility of irrigating the sites, growing crops of pasture (cut and carry) or forestry was undertaken. Because of the sensitivity of such issues, this research had to be undertaken largely as a desk top exercise, but with site visits by the technical team to each of the localities. Refer to Section 5 for the options assessed. The analysis deemed **exercise** not to be suitable for effluent irrigation. **Would only be feasible if, for three months of the year during winter, the effluent was discharged to the harbour.** Passing the effluent through wetlands at either **exercise** prior to discharge to the harbour was also assessed.

Table E-1 below presents the options that were determined to be technically feasible, and likely to be able to be consented, as well as the main components that make up each of the overall wastewater disposal scheme options. Option 11, Status Quo, is required to be included for comparison as the 'baseline' option. It represents effluent of the existing Katikati WWTP effluent quality being discharged through a new ocean outfall, 500m longer than the existing one.

To be feasible, consentable and acceptable some of the options require a much higher level of wastewater treatment than provided by the current plant. These are shown in the WWTP upgrade column above and are:

- MLE (Modified Ludzack Ettinger) which achieves a low level of nitrogen (down to 7mg/l) and clarified effluent to improve (compared to the existing pond system) the performance of UV disinfection
- MBR (membrane bioreactor) which can be configured to achieve to 5mg/l nitrogen and eliminates bacteria as the effluent passes through membrane filtration prior to UV disinfection

To compare the options, Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) was undertaken by scoring of success criteria agreed by the iwi/hapu based Katikati Wastewater Advisory Group (WWAG). The main success criteria were cultural, community, health of water bodies and economic viability. At the beginning of the options identification process, it had been agreed that the option cost estimates would not be brought into consideration prior to the MCA scoring process. Thus, the economic criterion was scored by the WWAG using a number of factors other than estimated capital and operating costs. Section 7 contains details of the MCA criteria including weighting and the scoring methodology. The MCA scoring was undertaken by the WWAG at workshops held on 19 and 30 April 2021. The overall scores and a ranking for each option are presented in Table E-2. It should be noted that under the MCA scoring methodology the **lower** the score, the more preferred that option is.

	—	=	

Capital cost estimates for each main component of the feasible options and the total option capital costs are presented below in Table E-3. The estimated total scheme operating and Net Present Value (NPV) costs for each option as a whole are shown in Table E-4.

The cost estimates do not include land purchase costs or income from pasture and tree harvesting. It should be noted these cost estimates are for comparative purposes only and should not be used for setting budgets.

-	=	≞	_	=	Ξ	Ξ

-	Ξ	==	=

The main conclusions that can be drawn from the MCA scores and cost estimates are:

- Any effluent discharge to the marine environment (harbour or ocean) is not acceptable. It makes little difference from a cultural perspective if the effluent is treated to a high standard (options with MBR) or only discharged to the harbour for quarter of each year (hybrid options)
- Culturally, irrigation to land is preferred further from the harbour compared to close to the harbour
- From a Health of Water Bodies perspective, irrigation to land is also preferred
- Higher levels of effluent treatment (MLE and MBR) improve the Health of Water Bodies scores for the discharge to water options (compared to cultural) but not significantly so. This is with the exception of MBR treated effluent discharged to the ocean 1,150m off
- There is little variation between the Community Needs scores (compared to the other main success criteria), with the exception of the Status Quo (ocean outfall) options that score poorly
- There is a large range in the option cost estimates and consequently economic viability MCA scores
- **These** options also have the lowest capital costs, as well as lowest and third to lowest NPV costs respectively.

- Irrigation on **Example 1** is next preferred with little separating pasture or forestry on an MCA basis, with or without enhanced (MBR) treatment. Inclusion of MBR significantly increases the cost for those options however
- A number of the cost estimates are within the limits of accuracy considering a high level desk top assessment has only been undertaken to date. Land purchase cost, revenue from crops (forestry in particular), carbon costs/offsets etc needs to be factored in for the next stage of this project.

The MCA scoring has provided a clear mandate that effluent irrigation on the mainland, as opposed to is the preferred option. Therefore a staged approach moving forward is recommended as

follows:

- 1. Council to contact the **Example 1** land owner and explain the background to the Katikati effluent irrigation investigations and the interest in their land parcel and the likely timing and implications
- 2. If permission is provided by the **second second** land owner to undertake site investigations (soil permeability, groundwater level, crop compatibility, effluent sodium & potassium levels as well as any other undesirable compounds) then Council proceeds to do that to confirm the feasibility of effluent irrigation on this site
- 3. If permission is not granted then expand the GIS property search to find possible irrigation site(s) with multiple ownership that may be feasible for effluent irrigation
- 4. If suitable site(s) can be found, request permission to undertake site investigations (as above)
- 5. If permission is not forthcoming, then irrigating effluent on remains a viable option
- 6. The **Example 1** WWAG reps to then request permission from their iwi/hapu for site investigations to be undertaken on the

In parallel, Council intends to run effluent irrigation trials to land owned by Council at the Katikati WWTP site currently occupied by kiwifruit, to provide further data to assist with implementing an effluent irrigation scheme. A specialist consultant needs to be engaged to set up, monitor and report on the irrigation trials. In addition, a plant scientist could be engaged to review the most suitable crops and tree species to be irrigated with treated effluent in the local conditions.

10 INFORMATION FOR RECEIPT

11 **RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

RECOMMENDATION

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
11.1 - Council Contracts Awarded or Renegotiated for the month of August 2021	s7(2)(b)(ii) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information	s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
	s7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	
11.2 - Operational Risk Report October 2021 Confidential	s7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
11.3 - Katikati Wastewater Treatment Plant Effluent Reuse and Disposal Options Assessment Full Report	s7(2)(e) - the withholding of the information is necessary to avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public s7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7

11.4 - Housing Affordability Forum Pilot Project	s7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
---	--	---