

Report to the Rural Services and Wairarapa Committee
from Stephen Yeats, Compliance Officer

Compliance Monitoring Annual Report 1998/99

1. Purpose

To inform the Committee of Wairarapa compliance monitoring undertaken during the 1998/99 financial year.

2. Background

- 2.1 *Compliance monitoring* refers to the monitoring of granted resource consents to determine whether the consent holder is undertaking the activity in accordance with the consent application, and is complying with consent conditions.
- 2.2 There has been an increased focus on the compliance side of the consent equation in recent times. Compliance staff remind people involved in Resource Management that under the legislation a resource consent has 20 days in which to be processed, but the life of that consent may be 20 years or more. The compliance work can be ongoing for the life of the consent.
- 2.3 The Resource Management Charging Policy was adopted by the Council in February 1997, whilst the charging policy for gravel extraction was adopted in July 1997. A Council Compliance Monitoring Procedures Manual was adopted in July 1997. All 1998/99 compliance monitoring was undertaken in accordance with these documents.
- 2.4 The compliance monitoring programme for individual discharge and water permits was set prior to the annual charges going out to consent holders in 1998. Monitoring costs are included in these charges. For land use consents, holders were charged for inspections after they were completed.

3. Consent Compliance Monitoring July 1998 - June 1999

3.1 Annual Agricultural Effluent Survey

All discharge permits were inspected, with improvements achieved in the timing and methodology of inspections. A full report is included in this agenda.

3.2 Municipal Sewage Monitoring

(1) All municipal oxidation pond systems were monitored monthly. The monitoring includes the effluent itself, and receiving water quality at sites upstream and downstream of the point of discharge. In addition, macroinvertebrates were monitored once in the summer, upstream and downstream of the sewage discharge point. An executive summary of the sewage monitoring results was presented to the Committee at its September 1997 meeting. An update will be reported again later this year.

(2) All resource consents except Castlepoint were expired, with replacement consents in varying stages of development.

- Carterton - the renewed consent was granted in March 1999.
- Greytown – the consent renewal has been applied for and publicly notified. The application is proceeding to a hearing following further Iwi consultation and receipt of a public health report.
- Masterton - The application for consent renewal has been put on hold requiring further information. Consultant proposals have recently gone to tender.
- Featherston/Martinborough. No assessment of environmental effect has yet been provided.

3.3 Discharge to Air Monitoring

All consents which incurred an annual charge were monitored with a report summarising the air discharge permits presented to the Committee in April.

3.4 Non-Agricultural Discharges to Water

- (1) There are a number of discharges from various industrial activities. They predominantly comprise gravel washwater and contaminated stormwater.
- (2) All consented discharges to water were inspected and sampled where required. There were no significant issues and a summary was reported to the Committee in June.

3.5 Non-Agricultural Discharges to Land

- (1) This category of consents is made up of activities like septic waste, aerial 1080 poison drops, and industrial waste disposed on-site.
- (2) There was some difficulty inspecting these activities. Many of them are sporadic in nature, and it is difficult to time inspections to coincide with the activity occurring.
- (3) A summary was reported to the Committee in June.

3.6 Landfills

- (1) Both Carterton and Masterton District Councils have resource consents for their landfills, which have been inspected regularly.
- (2) Masterton have been sampling the groundwater and surface water frequently, as part of the consent conditions. There have been some ongoing problems with sampling procedures, which both Councils have been trying to sort out. There is also a requirement for annual reporting on the sampling results. This is now done regularly, and Regional Council staff are pleased with the standard of reporting.
- (3) Carterton District Council have been regularly monitoring groundwater in the area. They have reported the sampling results with an analysis on the environmental effect. The reporting has been of high quality.
- (4) South Wairarapa District Council have not yet been granted resource consents for their landfills. A completed application has yet to be made.

3.7 Landuse

Of the 137 consents processed, 79 were inspected. The bulk of these were gravel consents. A full report is included in this agenda.

3.8 Water Permits

- (1) An extensive programme of compliance monitoring for water takes was undertaken this year. Forty five inspections were completed between January and March.
- (2) Two abatement notices were issued for non-compliance.
- (3) Three of the six water races in the Wairarapa breached maximum limits in their resource consents.
- (4) Low flows meant restrictions and bans were placed on various catchments.
- (5) A full report was presented to the Committee in April 1999.

3.9 Affco

The contaminated groundwater around the old freezing works anaerobic ponds was monitored monthly. A report summarising findings was prepared in August 1998. A further report will be completed in the 1999 year.

3.10 Coastal

Consents which had an annual compliance charge were inspected. In most cases these consents permit discharge of wastewater to the sea. There were no significant issues to report.

A report summarising the monitoring was presented to the Committee in February.

4. Self Monitoring

- 4.1 An increasing trend in resource consents is the requirement for the consent holder to both monitor and report on their own activity. Examples are consent conditions which require the consent holder to sample water, analyse air emissions or provide management plans.
- 4.2 Staff have generally found a low level of compliance with this type of condition, and a considerable amount of time was spent chasing consent holders up. In addition to staff having to prompt consent holders to do their compliance monitoring, staff also had to keep a close eye on the methodology used. In some instances it would be more efficient for both the consent holder and the Council if the Council undertook the monitoring and charged the holder.
- 4.3 There are exceptions, however, and some consent holders did a great job of self reporting.

5. Enforcement

5.1 Abatement Notices

There were five abatement notices issued relating to resource consents. All of these had a successful outcome. Two of the notices related to agricultural effluent, two were for illegal water takes, and one was for non-compliance with a consent for river works

5.2 Other Enforcement Action

There were a number of incidents over the 1998 year where verbal negotiation or a letter was sufficient to resolve non-compliance and no further enforcement action was required.

6. Communications

This report will be made available to the media through normal agenda distribution. Highlights will be incorporated in the forthcoming annual newsletter to consent holders.

7. Recommendation

That the Annual Compliance Monitoring report be received and its contents noted.

Report prepared by:

Approved for submission by:

Stephen Yeats
Compliance Officer

Steve Blakemore
Manager, Planning and Resources