

# Draft Water New Zealand Good Practice Guide for the Beneficial Use of Organic Waste Products on Land

## Palmerston North Meeting 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2017 – Notes

Nick Walmsley presented slides on behalf of the Steering group summarising the proposed changes to the 2003 biosolids Guidelines. The slides included the formal questions raised within Volume 1. Questions and comments from the floor were encouraged and content noted below. All participants were encouraged to provide written submissions, whether in support or not, by the end of March 2017.

### Formal Questions Raised:

- 1. Should the word 'waste' be included in the title and descriptive text? Should it just refer to 'Organic Products' or 'Organic Materials'?**
  - Removing 'waste' may cause confusion for some
  - Legal definition of 'waste' – may be where organic waste fits, tell community what you are doing with waste
  - Transparency issues – removing 'waste' removes transparency of product
  - Waste = bi-product of treatment process which has been processed and reused
  - Sludge = waste (anything disposed of or discarded)
  - Title defines focus – facilitate more sustainable behaviour. If the title focuses more on the product this will help achieve this.
  - Suggested bio solids included in title.
  - Waste should be included
  - How forward looking are we? Terminology may change in 5-10 years and community perception may be working towards organic materials
- 2. Should the proposed 'Type' 1A, 1B etc be used or revert back to the previous Aa, Ab etc nomenclature used in the 2003 Biosolids Guidelines?**
  - 1, 2, 3, 4 or 1+ 1-, 2+, 2- rather than 1A, 1B; something different to the existing to differentiate, continue to group as is currently with the contaminant grade, stabilisation grade in the current order
  - Call it 'safe' and 'restricted'
- 3. Should measurement of emerging organic contaminant limits be mandatory for all biosolids applied to land so that a New Zealand database can be established more quickly, giving a greater ability for evidence based review?**
  - Limits in = data – cost? Who will monitor?
  - Database for overseas contaminants as levels varying
  - Eco toxic contaminants – compounds harming fish, for example may not affect overseas
  - Concern for the community – uncertain about levels and their effects – monitoring and other contaminants – long term trend
  - Primary sector manage own waste – adaptive routine sampling?
  - Cost of testing too high – currently using overseas testing as cheaper
  - Not many testing laboratories – how long until more can test and testing costs reduced
  - Having a database a good idea; link to trade waste monitoring?

4. **Volume 1 The Guide is intended to give practical guidance. Is the information clear enough, in the correct format, split adequately between background/supporting information (Technical Manual) and the Guide? How could it be improved?**
  - Separate into two separate guidelines, one for municipal and one for industry
  - Confusion about inclusion list covered in guidelines – needs more work i.e. flowchart
  - Agreed with current format Volume 1 = Guide, Volume 2 = Technical
5. **Are there any concerns over the proposed changes? What are they?**
  - Cultural and social issues important
6. **What positive or negative impacts will the proposed changes have on your business?**
  - Cost of testing too high – currently using overseas testing as cheaper
  - Not many testing laboratories – how long until more can test and testing costs reduced
7. **Are the changes to the guidelines able to be aligned with current regional and district plans?**
  - Look at regional plans
  - Consent directs and encourages to get right rationale
  - How widely accepted the guidelines are by regulators influences how widely you can distribute it
  - It will take time
8. **Is using the NES for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health, April 2012 an acceptable means of protecting human health in the urban environment? If not, what do you suggest as an alternative?**
  - Link between NES and guide suggested

#### Other Comments:

- Good Practice Guide has a lower level of acceptance compared to Guidelines/Standards
- Municipal = cultural differences
- Irrigation excluded
- Improvements to balance act, bulking agent to rectify
- Specific NZ works
- Distinction – biosolids from municipal waste
- Agricultural waste i.e. smelly straw vs. horse heads, NPI Act – no animal parts
- Straight forward – stabilisation periods misleading, maximum temperature from turning, - example not practical, please check (ref. composting guidelines NZS554)
- Existing guidelines acting as break – effects from new guide questioned
- Guidance on consent, interpreting results – guideline has been developed and cross referenced – soil limits
- Consultants and contractors want more the more it is trialled and distributed – rollout
- Beyond regulatory acceptance i.e. Fonterra etc.
- Needs to be widely considered by regulator groups