

# Minutes of Meeting

Subject: Huia Water Treatment Plant (WTP) Upgrade Meeting

Date: 18 November 2015

Time: 6.30pm

Location: Glen Eden Community House, Glen Eden

Attendees: Katherine Russell (KR) (Waitākere Ranges Protection Society), Kevin Vaughan (KV) (Forest & Bird), Janey Ford (JF) (Forest & Bird), Neil Henderson (NH) (Waitākere Ranges Local Board), Mels Barton (MB) (Titirangi Ratepayers and Residents Associations), Bruce Harvey (BH) (Waitākere Community Liaison Group ), Karen Baverstock (KB) (Tonkin & Taylor Ltd), Brent Evans (BE) (Watercare Services Ltd), Alastair Stewart (AS) (Watercare Services Ltd) and Simon Greening (SG) (Watercare Services Ltd )

<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apologies:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- John Edgar (The Waitākere Ranges Protection Society Inc)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Huia WTP Replacement – Stakeholder Engagement Workshop presentation was tabled.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Introduction and Background</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BE opened meeting and welcomed those in attendance.</li> <li>• BE explained history of the Huia WTP and dams in the Waitākere Ranges (approx. 20% of Auckland’s water supply).</li> <li>• AS confirmed that WSL has only one agreed decision to date – that the Waitākere dams will remain and continue supplying Auckland with water.</li> <li>• AS detailed how the Waitākere dams and Huia WTP function together in the Waitākere.</li> <li>• AS explained natural deterioration of water quality in the dams will require changes in the treatment process.</li> <li>• KV noted that in light of future Waikato River water take applications; WSL needs to show that water from the dams is being utilised as much as possible.</li> <li>• BE explained the conjunctive water transmission system and prioritisation given to gravity fed water supplies from the Waitākere and Hunua Ranges which have cheaper operational supply costs. He also explained that the source of water doesn’t determine geographic area of use and that the</li> </ul>	

<p>conjunctive system means water from any source can end up effectively supplying any part of Metropolitan Auckland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH queried whether there is a terminal water quality deterioration in the Waitākere dams that would prevent treatment at some stage.</li> <li>• AS confirmed that there will be a change in treatment process but water will continue to be treated to an A Grade level.</li> <li>• NH asked WSL to confirm that all existing facilities have resource consents and queried what treatment WSL are proposing and whether there is a change in chemical dosing.</li> <li>• AS confirmed that Dissolved Air Flotation (DAF) is likely to be used but essentially the chemical treatment process will remain.</li> <li>• NH suggested that if any potential discharge water quality (e.g. off-spec or backwash water) can be bettered then it will likely be supported by the community.</li> <li>• SG noted that a key target of any new site is to minimise the adverse effects on the environment - any prospective site will need adequate land to enable longer retention times for better quality discharges.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Work to Date &amp; Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BE/AS stated the process to find a replacement has started</li> <li>• MB stated that WSL should be future-proofing water supply given changing climates.</li> <li>• AS highlighted the guiding principles WSL are working to (elevation, size, location, vicinity of existing infrastructure)</li> <li>• AS noted that current work to identify sites was guided by a GIS study</li> <li>• BH queried whether it could be on the existing Watercare sites?</li> <li>• BE confirmed that that is an option but the process is guided by the RMA and noted that WSL has to be transparent and show no pre-determination in site selection at these early stages.</li> <li>• BE highlighted the fact that the Waitākere Ranges is known for its vegetation and there will be effects of some sort, but these need to be considered alongside other implications.</li> <li>• AS indicated that the community could be ‘concerned’ if WSL indicated that vegetation removal was an option at this stage.</li> <li>• AS indicated that long-list sites from a GIS assessment should not be shared with the wider community to avoid any concerns before further assessments were undertaken. AS reiterated the</li> </ul>	

<p>short list would be shared when more information was available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MB queried the compliance of the existing WTP and dam (compensation flows particularly).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SG to collate</li> </ul>
<p><b>Site Selection Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KB explained the Multi-criteria Analysis (MCA) process which will consider ecology, archaeology, mana whenua values, society (noise, visual etc), consenting impediments, land ownership, engineering and cost.</li> <li>• NH queried whether these are weighted?</li> <li>• KB noted that they are not initially but a sensitivity analysis would be applied.</li> <li>• KR asked whether within the shortlisted options if various aspects (other than cost) will be quantified and costed? KR also noted it would be good to show where they are in relation to the Regional Park and Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area boundaries.</li> <li>• KB noted that the purpose of the MCA is to make a comparative assessment.</li> <li>• MB noted that the only thing she could identify at this stage was that an environmental costs-benefit analysis is missing in the MCA.</li> </ul>	<p>WSL develop map with additional features</p>
<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KR queried whether WSL is going straight to an EPA process?</li> <li>• BE/KB stated that at this stage it is unlikely as the benefit of going through a hearing process was inclusiveness of stakeholders without alienating them.</li> <li>• There was general agreement with that statement.</li> <li>• It was asked as to when the Stakeholder Group should next meet.</li> <li>• BE/AS indicated we would come back when we had further details available for a useful discussion.</li> <li>• NH asked whether Mana Whenua will be involved?</li> <li>• SG confirmed that four iwi have registered their interest and they have each been contacted to invite feedback.</li> <li>• MB noted that she thinks the right people are at the table today and that only possibly Friends of Arakaki (Yvonne Pirec) should also be included.</li> </ul>	

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SG noted that a few other interest groups have been contacted but were unable to make it (i.e. Landcare, Heritage NZ etc). Information will also be shared with others who couldn't make the meeting but had shown an interest.</li><li>• BE thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.</li></ul> |  |
|---|--|