

ENM Submission to Nature Calls

9 July 2020

Disclaimer:

On this occasion, ENM finds it very hard to make a well informed and considered submission. This is despite the additional information provided by Council in the supporting documentation following meetings with the public. We appreciated the opportunity to have an Environment Sector specific information session during which a lot of pertinent questions were asked. While we got the impression during the Q+A session that a lot of good work has been done, it also became obvious that we are being asked to make submissions at a time when not enough detail could be shared. The additional information shared in early July has provided some insights on the rating of the various options against the assessment criteria.

However, we believe that only the next phase of Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) to be undertaken in late 2020 will provide the necessary level of detail to make an educated call on the preferable option(s). This phase will involve technical experts and iwi, who will be asked to assess a range of criteria for each of the options in further detail, to inform Council and key partners in their MCA weighting and scoring.

ENM appreciates the offer by staff to continue the engagement with community in a more in-depth workshop.

Submission ENM

This submission is in the main following the questions provided by council – see below. In addition, we submit:

That Council supports engagement with the wider community through a MCA like decision making process. This will help people to gain a better understanding and will hopefully help to reduce the risk of litigation at a later stage.

Council Question:

1. Please rank the options in order of your preference

The additional information provided, appears to suggest that options 4 and 5 would provide the best scores against the recommended criteria.

2. Which option do you prefer and why?

We prefer the option that provides the best possible outcome for the long-term health of the river, the land and the people

3. What don't you like about the other options?

Everything that does not minimise the impact on the environment will compromise the river (or the sea), the land and the people in the long run. Everything that requires extensive infrastructure will reduce resilience and flexibility going forward

4. What matters most to you?

The mauri, lifeforce of the river. Kei te ora te wai, kei te ora te whenua, kei te ora te tangata - if the water is healthy, the land and people are nourished – PNCC should live up to the motto of the Manawatū River Leaders' Forum and show leadership.

5. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

Yes, here are some additional questions

- a. How would the recommended criteria/scores change if we were to talk about a "water resource" rather than wastewater? E.g.
 - i. Could treatment of the water to quasi drinking water level and discharge to the river in a culturally acceptable way help to improve the mauri of the river?
 - ii. Could water of this quality be used by the trade sector and make it more resilient during draught periods?
 - iii. Would it be possible to offset the cost for better treatment with savings from a lesser requirement on infrastructure build and potential gains in future proofing the health of the river?
 - iv. Would the ratepayers' collective of the Manawatu Catchment be prepared to help fund such a solution?
 - v. What economic income streams could be unlocked with a water resource of the right quality?
- b. Where does microplastic feature in current thinking? Do we know whether or not this is an issue in our current treatment process? And how can we ensure that if it is or becomes an issue at a later stage that the chosen solution can address this issue?

Should there be an opportunity at some stage to speak to this submission, ENM would wish to do so.

Heike Schiele
Co-chair ENM
021 0263 7789