

Taumata Arowai webinar 24 Nov Q & A

<p>A session on notifications would be good for labs as we are now required to report all MAV exceedances on tests of samples from registered or unregistered drinking water supplies. We are unsure where the obligations lie to determine whether a sample is from an unregistered supply? Is the lab to find out or the supplier to advise? Do the 75,000 new suppliers know they are unregistered suppliers? Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>Will there be guidance on what a WSP should be or are we still using the MoH guidance? Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>I thought small supplies had 5 years for WSP Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>how can you find out if you are a registered supplier or not? Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>Need to consider DOC when using chlorine to prevent DBP formation. Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>Why 1 micron absolute cartridge as the final cartridge when using validated UV? Double protozoa protection? Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>30 minutes why? if you have UV. Chlorine yes for residual disinfectant but not for primary disinfection if UV is installed. Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>Do these rules apply to small household suppliers? Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>Easier to comply with T1 rules than T2</p>
<p>Are the equipment provided to small household suppliers? Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>T2 Rules why is turbidity limit higher for 1 micro (absolute) cartridge filters ? 1 NTU vs 0.5 NTU Table 12 Note 16 Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>Adding to my previous question, the bore/spring acceptable solution asks for 5 micron nominal cartridges before validated UV. Trying to understand why the difference when both that and the rules also require validated UV and chlorination Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>When are we able to provide feedback on the Acceptable Solutions? Public consultation on the first three Acceptable Solutions will begin in early 2022. Taumata Arowai will send out communications inviting feedback when this commences.</p>
<p>Can we have an acceptable solution that allows for end point treatment for a small bore supply to only 20 or so lifestyle blocks? This does not currently fit into the rural category as most of the water is used for domestic supply. Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>With regards to acceptable solutions vs rules vs the act Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>What is the maximum distance the "end point" treatment is allowed to be (if any) from the households? Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>where UF membrane is used as primary treatment do you still require UV and chlorination, or is disinfection with chlorination alone acceptable Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>With regards to acceptable solutions vs rules vs the act. I note that T1/D1 say nothing about chlorine being required, but if they choose say the bore acceptable solution then chlorination is required, and the act says it is required. So...is it required or not? Right now it looks like a group of 12 houses would be better to follow the T1 and write a water safety plan than to adopt the acceptable solution Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>We note that the acceptable solution for bore and spring supplies does not include provision for nitrate removal. In Canterbury we have many supplies and source waters with high nitrate concentrations (above 50% MAV) so the acceptable solution will not be effective in ensuring safe drinking water. It would be helpful if the acceptable solution provided a pathway that allowed for the Canterbury type scenario - i.e. a pathway that allows use of an acceptable solution provided nitrate removal is included as part of the treatment system. Answered During Webinar</p>
<p>The acceptable solutions are great, the feedback I have had is it makes it all less scary for the very small supplies That's great to hear. Thanks for your feedback.</p>
<p>With plumbo solvency testing where is this expected to take place as the issue often presents itself inside the private property boundary (i.e. household plumbing) and not the public network.</p>

The water supplier needs to determine the sampling sites, taking account of the circumstances of the network. However, they need to be representative samples. I wouldn't expect samples to be taken from dead ends, but sites need to include the outlying parts of the network. We don't expect the water supplier to take samples from beyond a supply point (toby).

If a supplier opts to use continuous monitoring in the reticulation for FAC and turbidity can they use D2 rules or do they have to use D3 rules? This will be clarified when the continuous monitoring rules are prepared, but at this time our expectation is a small supplier that wants to use continuous monitoring in a distribution network should be able to do so.

So the rules India just explained (thanks) are for 50-500 household supplies? What is planned for the very small supplies 2-49 households? A separate classification called Very Small water supplies applies to those with populations of less than 50 people. These are in the draft Quality Assurance Rules but not yet covered in this webinar series.

Hi Jim, India and Ray, for the small rural suppliers acceptable solution, is the exemption from S30 Water Safety Plan, in alignment with work being done by MfE on SWRMPs? No. There is not a deliberate connection. The reason for not requiring a WSP if an Acceptable Solution is used is that the Acceptable Solution is designed to manage the risks.

For Rural Argic Supplies can the householder/property owner be responsible for maintenance and testing of their end point treatment? What responsibility does the water supplier have for the end prior treatment? Answered During Webinar

I am seeing rapid advancements in nano-technology, basically putting a chemical testing lab on a chip, for in situ real time measurement of many contaminants in the agri sector. These aren't IANZ services but seem likely to be highly cost effective. Will these be considered as acceptable for the small rural supply situations - maybe a question for consultation period? We are always considering the effects that new technology might have on rules and compliance. Many tests (e.g. turbidity, FAC) are not laboratory tests and we do not specify what equipment can or cannot be used.

What are the record keeping requirements (if any) for supplies adopting the acceptable solutions? The record keeping requirements are set out in the Acceptable Solutions. See draft Acceptable Solutions on our website <https://www.taumataarowai.govt.nz/for-water-suppliers/new-compliance-rules-and-standards-2/>

Is chlorination still required if only 1 household is supplied from an untreated bore, with UV and filter cartridge fitted on the line to the house? If the water supply is for a single domestic household, then they are not classified as a drinking water supplier under the Water Services Act 2021. If it is a water supply for more than a single household, then treatment needs to be in place as per the Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules or an appropriate Acceptable Solution. It depends on the configuration of the supply which of these is required.

How are Taumata Arowai ensuring very small suppliers are aware they understand these rules apply to them? We are developing guidance and will work with very small suppliers to understand their needs and circumstances to ensure any solutions and requirements are fit for purpose

Do you have any estimates of the costs to install and operate each of the acceptable solutions? And is the Act silent on who bears the cost? I'm interested in the implications of this for the very small supplies where there is no contractual arrangement between the supplier and those who receive the water. We have done some work on the costs of the Acceptable Solutions but it depends on the supply and what arrangements are already in place. Each supply is different. It is the drinking water supplier's responsibility to ensure the supply complies with the acceptable solution, so they are ultimately responsible for the cost, however they may make arrangements with consumers as to how those cost will be met. There are also some cost-related provisions in

the Water Services Act 2021 in relation to backflow prevention and end-point treatment that drinking water supplies may be able to rely on, depending on the detail of their supply.

Who has the duty of care to supply water if a supplier disconnects a supply? This is a complex situation and is covered by a combination of provisions in the Water Services Act 2021 and the Local Government Act 2002. The starting expectation is that the drinking water supplier, Taumata Arowai, and the relevant territorial authority will collaboratively examine solutions to ensure that drinking water remains available. Ultimately, it may fall to the territorial authority to ensure that drinking water is provided to affected consumers (although not necessarily through the same supply arrangement).

what is required for a RADWS when water is delivered by direct pressure rather than trickle feed into a tank. In that situation the supply is an on-demand supply and must comply with the on-demand rules for the size of the supply.