

Solid Waste

(Refuse/Recycling)

Activity Management Plan

2006

Stratford District Council

Appendix O of LTCCP

Solid Waste Activity Management Plan

Content

| | | |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 1. | Introduction | |
| 1.1 | Background | 1 |
| 1.2 | LTCCP Community Outcomes | 1 |
| 1.3 | Stratford District Waste Management Plan..... | 2 |
| 1.4 | Solid Waste Activity Management Plan Purpose..... | 2 |
| 2. | Levels of Service and Detailed Activities | |
| 2.1 | Recycling Volumes | 2 |
| 2.2 | Refuse Volumes | 2 |
| 2.3 | Responsiveness..... | 2 |
| 2.4 | Reliability of Service | 3 |
| 2.5 | Service Costs Per Household..... | 3 |
| 3. | The Existing Situation Described | |
| 3.1 | Solid Waste Service..... | 3 |
| 3.2 | Issues | 3 |
| 3.3 | Financial Summary..... | 4 |
| 4. | Maintenance and Operations | |
| 4.1 | Ownership | 5 |
| 4.2 | Estimated Cost Over Next 10 years | 5 |
| 4.3 | Maintenance and Operating Issues..... | 5 |
| 4.4 | Emergency Management..... | 6 |
| 5. | Future Demand | |
| 5.1 | Future Demand Predictions | 6 |
| 6. | Capital Expenditure | |
| 6.1 | Capital Expenditure..... | 6 |
| 7. | Renewals and Depreciation | |
| 7.1 | Renewal Estimates | 6 |
| 8. | Funding | |
| 8.1 | 10 Yr Financial Plan..... | 6 |
| 8.2 | Funding Policy | 7 |
| 8.3 | Fees and Charges..... | 7 |
| 9. | Resource Consents/Property Designations | |
| 9.1 | Resource Consents | 7 |
| 10 | Demand Management..... | 8 |
| 11. | Significant Negative Effects..... | 8 |
| 12. | Significant Forecasting Assumptions, Uncertainties, Risk Management | |
| 12.1 | Assumptions and Uncertainties | 8 |
| 12.2 | Risk Management..... | 9 |
| 13. | Plan Review/Consultation | |
| 13.1 | Reference to the Public Consultation Undertaken..... | 9 |
| 13.2 | When the Plan is Intended to be Next Reviewed | 9 |
| 14. | Conclusion | 9 |
| Appendix | | |
| Appendix 1 | Resource Consents | 10 |
| Appendix 2 | Improvement Plan | 15 |
| Appendix 3 | Risk Probability and Consequence measures | 16 |

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Under the Local Government Act 2002 the purpose of local government is:

“To enable local decision making by and on behalf of citizens in their local communities to promote their social, economic, cultural and environmental well-being in the present and for the future.”

In undertaking the solid waste activity, Stratford District Council (here within the Council) is seeking to meet the requirements for the sustainable provision and adequate management of a service that meets the needs of current and future communities and supports the desired community outcomes from the LTCCP.

Council also has specific legal obligations under:

- Local Government Act 1974 and 2002.
- Health Act 1956.
- New Zealand Waste Strategy 2002.
- Regional Waste Strategy for Taranaki 2004.
- Removal of Refuse Bylaw 2001.

These Acts, strategies and the bylaw outline general duties of the local authority to improve, promote and protect public health by providing a means of dealing with the communities solid waste.

Council also has an obligation to meet the community outcomes of:

- A built environment that is attractive, safe and healthy.
- Affordable high quality core services and facilities.
- Clean air, water and land.

The purpose of this plan is to provide for the long term management of Councils solid waste management. It considers Council's Waste Management Plan for the future, examines current practices and enables the community to be more informed about district solid waste issues.

The solid waste activity encompasses the planning, maintenance and provision of waste collection and disposal services, and all associated infrastructure for the areas served.

1.2 LTCCP Community Outcomes

In preparing the first LTCCP Council has used both current and new information concerning community outcomes. To arrive at the Regional outcomes research was undertaken in conjunction with our two neighbouring Local Authorities, New Plymouth District Council and South Taranaki District Council and the Regional Authority, Taranaki Regional Council. The four Councils appointed AC Nielsen Ltd to identify community desired outcomes for the regional community; those desired outcomes that will add to or sustain the community's well-being.

The community was actively engaged in the process to identify what they considered important and which five outcomes they thought required most attention over the next five years. While the primary focus was on outcomes common to the regional community each district was required to identify any local preferences.

The Stratford community was directly consulted on key outcomes for the district and these have formed the basis for Councils LTCCP.

The Regional and Stratford community outcomes to which Solid Waste primarily contributes are addressed in Volume One, Chapter "Levels of Service/Performance Measures" of the LTCCP.

20 A

1.3 Stratford District Waste Management Plan

Councils current Solid Waste Management Plan is Appendix T of the LTCCP. This Plan was adopted in December 2001 and is currently under review. A draft Waste Management Plan which is attached as Appendix U of the LTCCP, when adopted will replace the existing plan.

The current Solid Waste Management Plan formed the basis for the existing collection system ie. 120 litre wheelie bin for refuse and the 240 litre bin for recyclables and set in place targets for waste minimisation.

The draft Waste Management Plan has been developed in consultation with the other three Taranaki District Councils and the Regional Council to ensure an efficient and effective service for all of the regional community. Before this Plan is adopted by Council it is required to go through the special consultative procedure and it is proposed that this process be undertaken in July/August 2006 and for final adoption in September/October 2006.

As this draft Plan outlines the strategies, policies, targets and guidelines for the Council and the regions waste management in the future it should be read in conjunction with this Solid Waste Activity Management Plan

1.4 Solid Waste Activity Management Plan Purpose

The purpose of the Solid Waste Activity Management Plan is to set out how the Council provides a waste management service that meets the needs of the community and encourages waste reduction through reducing, reuse, recycling and recovery of the products we use.

This Plan also addresses the asset management and financial considerations that are not part of Councils Waste Management Plan.

2. Levels of Service and Detailed Activities

The levels of service and performance measures are discussed in Volume One of the LTCCP under the chapter "Levels Of Service/Performance Measures".

2.1 Recycling Volumes

The New Zealand Waste Strategy encourages the increase in recycled materials. Over time the Stratford District has shown an increase in the volumes of recyclables and wishes to continue to do so. From an environmental point of view it is desirable however this levels of service target needs to be considered with the economic of recycling that is becoming more expensive.

2.2 Refuse Volumes

Conversely to recycling the New Zealand Waste Strategy encourages the decrease in refuse waste. The district again has shown a decrease in volumes over time and wishes further reduce the amount of refuse waste. The rate of reduction has decreased and has stabilised in recent times. Council wishes to maintain and ideally decrease its refuse volumes.

2.3 Responsiveness

The contract for refuse and recycling collection services sets response times for service requests. Service requests may include collecting missed bins, cleaning up rubbish litter, repair or supply of bins. These response times and actions of the contractor are measured through contract reporting and monitoring.

2.4 Reliability of Service

A measure of the reliability of the service provided by the collection contractor.

2.5 Service Costs per Household

Keeping cost to a minimum and the same time not compromising the current levels of service is a focus for Council.

If service levels are improved costs may rise and affordability is an ongoing issue that has to be addressed.

3. The Existing Situation Described

To be read in reference to the draft Waste Management Plan (Appendix U of the LTCCP).

3.1 Solid Waste Service

Council provides a domestic refuse and recycling collection service to the urban areas of Stratford and Midhirst. Council also owns a transfer station located at Cordelia Street, Stratford which is available for the disposal of domestic and limited quantities of commercial solid waste and disposal of recyclables including greenwaste.

Council currently provides urban households with the following collection service:

- Weekly kerbside refuse collection of one 120 litre wheelie bin.
- Monthly kerbside recyclable collection of one 240 litre wheelie bin.

3.2 Issues

(a) **NZ Waste Strategy 2002**

Under this Strategy there is the target that 95% of properties in a district will be within 20 minutes of the nearest landfill or transfer station.

Although this standard is generally achievable in urban communities it is unlikely that this will ever be achieved in rural communities like Stratford because of size and demographics.

Council is assisting rural communities in recycling. Council will provide free recycling bins provided the communities are prepared to transport the full bins to the transfer station where they can be emptied free of charge. This is working in a number of communities that are working together to provide the collection and delivery service.

(b) **Greenwaste**

The New Zealand Waste Strategy aims at no greenwaste to be sent to landfills by 2010. Stratford District Council aims to achieve this position although this will not be without its challenges.

The community favours the use of wheelie bins for its rubbish and although the smaller 120 litre bin is provided some properties still have room for greenwaste along with their normal household rubbish.

Ideally this greenwaste should be composted or taken to the transfer station where there is a cheaper rate for disposal than for normal refuse.

Another option is that Council operates a separate greenwaste collection in addition to the normal refuse and recycling collections. However there has been no demand from the community for such a collection. For those that want a greenwaste collection there are private contractors who provide such a service:

20 A

| | | |
|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Greenwaste Collected</i> | | |
| Transfer Station | 360 | tonnes per annum |
| Commercial Collection | <u>150</u> | tonnes per annum |
| | 510 | tonnes per annum |

Council needs to educate the community that greenwaste is a valuable resource and should not be dumped as another form of rubbish.

(c) **Recycling**

Council has an undertaking to ensure the continued promotion and provision of recycling throughout the main urban areas of the Stratford District.

This is achieved by providing a monthly kerbside collection in the Stratford and Midhirst urban areas and in the rural areas providing wheelie bins for recyclables where the community accepts the responsibility of supervising and emptying the bins. Recyclables can also be dropped at the Cordelia Street transfer station free of charge.

The current amounts being recycled are:

| | | |
|---------------------|------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Recycling</i> | | |
| Kerbside Collection | 350 | tonnes per annum |
| Transfer Station | <u>580</u> | tonnes per annum |
| Total | 930 | tonnes per annum |

3.3 Financial Summary

(a) **Current 10Year Budget Projections**

Current 10 year budget projections are based on the acceptance of the Waste Management tender for the next seven years. This contract is for the kerbside collection of domestic refuse and recyclables from the Stratford and Midhirst areas and the operation of the transfer station on Cordelia Street south. Financial details are included in the LTCCP.

The only item of renewal in the budget is \$30,000 in 2009/10 for an upgrade on the transfer station.

(b) **Summary of current valuations and depreciations (2003 Telfar Young Ltd)**

NOTE: that new valuations and depreciations come into effect on 30 June 2006. However Council has decided not to fund depreciation on buildings and therefore any essentials needed to maintain the asset at the current level of service will be classified as R & M Major Works and funded directly from rates.

| TRANSFER STATION ASSET | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------|-------|------|-------------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| HISTORY | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | No | Description | Size | Built | Life | Replacement | Purchase | Depreciated | Annual Fund |
| <i>LAND</i> | | Land | | | | | 22272 | NA | NA |
| <i>BUILDING</i> | 801 | Main | (50x15) | 1975 | 50 | 85000 | 32980 | 14511 | 660 |
| | | 2002 Improvements | | 2002 | 50 | | 83646 | 81973 | 1673 |
| | | 2004 Improvements | | 2004 | 50 | 75987 | | | |
| | | 2004 Improvements (Sewer) | | | | 5815 | | | |
| | 803 | Office | (12.5x5.5) | 1985 | 50 | 38000 | 8138 | 5208 | 163 |
| | | 2002 Improvements | | 2002 | 50 | | 5348 | 5241 | 107 |
| | 804 | Nizzen | (25x6.7) | 1975 | 30 | 18000 | 5140 | 343 | 171 |
| | | 2002 Improvements | | 2002 | 30 | | 5978 | 5779 | 199 |

20 A

| TRANSFER STATION ASSET | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----|-------------------|-------------|------|----|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| HISTORY | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>YARDS</i> | 805 | K&C | 172 m | | | | | | |
| | | 2002 Improvements | | 2002 | 70 | | 10978 | 10821 | 157 |
| | 806 | Basecourse | 1350 sm | 1975 | 25 | | 5140 | 0 | 206 |
| | | 2002 Improvements | | 2002 | 25 | | 10605 | 10181 | 424 |
| | | 2004 Improvements | | | | 1455 | | | |
| | 807 | Seal | 1350 sm | | | | | | |
| | | 2002 Improvements | | 2002 | 7 | | 10455 | 8961 | 1494 |
| | 808 | Storm | (See Base) | | | | | | |
| | | 2002 Improvements | | 2002 | 65 | | 8588 | 8456 | 132 |
| | | 2004 Improvements | | | | 3120 | | | |
| | 809 | Fences & Signs | (See Base) | 1975 | 15 | | 1713 | -1485 | 114 |
| | | 2002 Improvements | | 2002 | 15 | | 11579 | 10807 | 772 |
| | 810 | Plantings | | | | | | | |
| | | 2002 Improvements | | 2002 | 15 | | 3750 | 3500 | 250 |
| | | | | | | <i>Total</i> | <i>204037</i> | <i>164296</i> | <i>6521</i> |
| | | Qty | Size | | | | Value | | |
| <i>WHEELIE BINS</i> | | 2400 | 120lt | 2002 | 10 | 211200 | \$88/bin | NA | |
| | | 2400 | 240lt | 1993 | 10 | 300000 | \$125/Bin | NA | |

4. Maintenance and Operating

4.1 Ownership

Council intends to continue to retain, control and manage the solid waste management service and associated transfer station. The collection services for domestic refuse and recyclables is provided by independent contractors Stratford Metal Supplies and Egmont Refuse respectively, and the transfer station is operated under the Facilities Management Contract by J & L Taranaki Ltd. These contracts continue until 30 September 2006 when the Council preferred option is that Waste Management become the provider of all three services. The estimated saving by accepting this offer and providing the same level of service is \$59,000 per annum. The Waste Management Contract would commence on 1 October 2006 and be for a period of seven years.

This contract is managed by the Operations Department of Council with major design and development components contracted out to specialists on an as needed basis.

4.2 Estimated Costs Over Next 10 Years

The estimated cost of operations and maintenance (including depreciation and other overheads) for the next ten years are detailed in the financial sections of the LTCCP. Apart from normal inflation there should be no significant rises in operational costs for the next ten years unless there is a change in the level of service provided.

4.3 Maintenance and Operating Issues

(a) **Recycling Contamination**

When the 240 litre wheelie bin was introduced as the container for recyclables there was considerable contamination of the collected material with general refuse. Some of this contamination could have been the result of genuine mistakes but some was a blatant disregard for the system and the recycling bin treated as an additional option for the disposal of refuse.

The present system of collection results in the content of each bin being inspected before it is emptied. Any bin containing contaminants is rejected and the bin not emptied. If there are more than three transgressions the bin is removed from the property.

20 A

This system has virtually eliminated any contamination.

After 1 October 2006 the new contractor will have to introduce a similar system of monitoring to ensure that the contamination of the recyclables is not permitted to again become an issue.

4.4 Emergency Management

District wide emergency management is centrally coordinated by the Taranaki Regional Council. Stratford District Council has emergency response agreement under its Facilities Management Contract that addresses minor emergency responses.

However Council recognises the need to formalise a Solid Waste Response and Action Plan that clearly identifies timeframes, actions and procedures in case of emergency.

5. Future Demand

5.1 Future Demand Predictions

Stratford District Council has targeted the population to grow by 33% to 12,000. This desire is reflective of the outcomes from the LTCCP. There is no defining timeframe for this growth and no provision has been made for any possible growth. If a population increase is to occur it is anticipated that it will be a progressive trend happening over a number of years. It is not considered that it will have much impact on the seven year collection contract that commences on 1 October 2006. If there is any substantial growth in population in the urban area during this time the Council preferred contractor Waste Management NZ Ltd will have the resources to accommodate any such increases. The Regional landfill should also be able to absorb any future demand.

The current transfer station is only using a third of its capacity therefore it is assumed that this will have no effect on the Solid Waste activity as the current service provision would meet the increase in demand.

6. Capital Expenditure

6.1 Capital Expenditure

The only historic capital works involve the establishment of the transfer station in 2002/2003 at a cost of \$398,500 plus an additional \$86,000 in 2003/04.

7. Renewals and Depreciation

7.1 Renewal Estimates

Future works are limited to building renewals in the transfer station of \$30,000 in 2009/10 and \$30,000 in 2014/15.

The need for this work will be reviewed closer to the time. Funding would have to come from the targeted rate or loan.

8. Funding

8.1 10 Year Financial Plan

Councils solid waste activity 10 Year financial summary is shown in the financial sections of the LTCCP.

20 A

8.2 Funding Policy

Activity: Solid Waste

Description of Activity:

“The provision of a solid waste management service that meets the needs of the community and encourages waste reduction through reuse and recycling.”

Reason Why Activity is Engaged in: see Section 1.1.

Funding Sources and Mechanisms:

Access to the Solid Waste service has been determined as private good due to the user being identified as the household. Council does not provide a commercial collection as it does not want to compete with the private sector for this service. Therefore a targeted rate on residential properties is the main sources of funding. The general rate portion funds the management of old rural landfills and provides a partial subsidy on the disposal of greenwaste.

| Desired Benefits | | Modified Benefits | | Funding Mechanism | |
|------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private |
| 5% | 95% | 5% | 95% | | 90% Targeted Rates 10% Charges |

The main source of funds, on average 83%, is through targeted rates which include refuse and recycling collection charges - see details in the financial sections of the LTCCP.

8.3 Schedule of Fees and Charges

These are the current (2005) charges for target rates for the solid waste service.

| Refuse | | | | | |
|---|------|------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Wheelaway replacement bin - purchase cost | | | | | |
| | | | | | \$125.00 |
| Transfer Station | Cars | Standard Trailer | Vans Utes | Tandem Trailer | m ³ |
| Green Waste | \$4 | \$8 | \$12 | \$30 | \$12 |
| Recyclables | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| Construction & Demolition | \$8 | \$16 | \$32 | \$50 | \$32 |
| Scrap Metal | \$4 | \$8 | \$12 | \$30 | \$12 |
| General Refuse | \$11 | \$19 | \$29 | \$69 | \$29 |

These charges are reviewed annually by Council. In discussions at the Regional Solid Waste Working Party meetings it has been suggested that there should be a degree of consistency in transfer station charges in the region so that cheaper stations are not targeted by users. Details of these still have to be determined.

9. Resource Consents

9.1 Resource Consents

Existing consents with the Taranaki Regional Council (TRC) relate to the discharge to land, water and air, and aftercare, from the landfill sites.

There are three landfill sites. The Douglas and Pukengahu rural landfills are both closed and are managed under aftercare consents expiring when judged suitable by the Taranaki Regional Council.

The Stratford landfill site on Victoria Road is closed to the public but useable up to 2008 for Council sludge discharge. The three consents are for discharge to water, land and air, and after 2008 the site will be managed under aftercare consent.

There are no current issues with the consents.

Current Consents (see Appendix 1).

| Location | No | Action | Expires | Status |
|-----------|------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|
| Stratford | 4605 | Discharge 100m3 to land | 1 June 2008 | Current |
| Stratford | 4606 | Discharge to air | 1 June 2008 | Current |
| Stratford | 3889 | Discharge to Water | 1 June 2010 | Current |
| Douglas | 3890 | Aftercare landfill | - | Current |
| Pukengahu | 3891 | Aftercare landfill | - | Current |

10. Demand Management

Refer to draft Waste Management Plan (Appendix U of LTCCP).

11. Significant Negative Effects

Refer to draft Waste Management Plan (Appendix U of LTCCP).

12. Significant Forecasting Assumptions, Uncertainties, Risk Management

12.1 Assumptions and Uncertainties

| General Assumptions and Uncertainties | |
|--|--|
| Asset Life | Based on industry and accounting standards. |
| Capital cost impact on operations | Improvements and additions to an asset may lead to changes in operational costs due to the maintenance requirements and efficiencies of improved infrastructure that will exist. |
| Constraints of Council | The level of investment in planning, analysis and improvements is limited to what best suits the community both in practical and affordability terms. |
| Depreciation | Based on 2006 valuations and no depreciation is funded for this activity. |
| Financial Values | All at 2006 values. |
| Funding allocations | All funding is based on expenditure predictions and as at June 2006. |
| Historic assumptions | Up to now Council has operated on historic assumptions and has managed the district according to the level the district can afford. The LTCCP process will determine its future approach to many areas of its asset management |
| Inflation | Based on the BERL price level change adjuster. |
| Interest on investments | 5% |
| Interest rate on loans | 9% |
| Knowledge | No commitment or contingencies that Council is aware of are excluded. |
| Population Growth | Assumed constant at 9,000. |
| Service Levels | Unless stated are remaining constant. |
| Valuations | Current valuations are based on 2006 figures. |
| Activity Assumptions and Uncertainties | |
| Activity management Plans (AMP) | This is the first AMP for Solid Waste. As such it will be the subject of continual improvement as information and analysis develop. |
| Asset Information - Biz@asset management system. | Over the next 12 months an asset management system will be adopted and this will permit more manageable and accurate control of asset information. |
| Costs | All costs of the service will be recovered from the consumer. |
| Landfill disposal | The outcomes of the options for a regional landfill disposal (discussed in the Waste Management Plan) will influence the costs of the service to the community. |
| New Zealand Waste Strategy 2002 | As it continues to be reviewed it will have ongoing influences on Stratford management of its solid waste. |
| Private Services | Council does not intend to accept responsibility for private refuse collection services. |
| Recycling costs | The cost of this service will continually need to be reviewed by Council against the environmental benefit. |
| Resource Consents | All current resource consents assumed to be permitted to continue. |
| Regional Waste Strategy for Taranaki | This partnership provides guidance for Stratford Waste management and will continue to influence its activities and outcomes in the future. |
| Waste Management Plan | This forms much of the Activity Management Plan and will continue to be revised according to both regional and local issues of waste management. |

20 A

12.2 Risk Management

A high level risk assessment of Council activities has been undertaken and is considered within the LTCCP. This covers the generic issues of governance and business practices and common issues in group activity areas.

The table below outlines some of the key asset risk issues and rates them according to the guidelines in Appendix 2.

Further more in depth analysis for risk for the solid waste activity could be undertaken in the future.

| Risk | Controls | Consequence | Likelihood | Accept Risk |
|---|---|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Contractor business failure | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contract• Bond• Other local providers | Minor | Unlikely | Yes |
| Environment hazard caused by physical damage to a landfill site caused by flood, slips sinkage etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consent System• Independent monitoring• Landfill design, positioning• Management processes | Moderate | Rare | Yes |

13. Plan Review / Public Consultation

13.1 Reference to the Public Consultation Undertaken

Council has consulted the community to establish funding levels and agreed community outcomes as discussed in the introduction of this plan.

In addition Council continues other practices such as:

- Specific project or issue consultation.
- Community surveys.
- Annual Plan submissions.

Council will continue to consult with the community as it further develops its LTCCP and undertakes its normal business practices.

13.2 When the Plan is Intended to be Next Reviewed

The Plan will be reviewed on an annual basis by 30 June. Any changes and development will be expressed through the Annual Plan and LTCCP process.

14. Conclusion

This Activity Plan is the first for solid waste. As such it will be improved as more asset information, planning and analysis are developed. The improvement plan in Appendix 1 outlines some of the works required.

The solid waste activity over the next 10 years is mainly focused on meeting the requirements of the:

1. Stratford District Waste Management Plan 2005;
2. Regional Waste Strategy for Taranaki 2004; and
3. New Zealand Waste Strategy 2002.

20 A

Appendix 1

Resource Consents

Consent 4605-3



CHIEF EXECUTIVE
PRIVATE BAG 713
47 CLOTEN ROAD
STRATFORD
NEW ZEALAND
PHONE 06-765 7127
FAX 06-765 5097

Please quote our file number
on all correspondence

**Discharge Permit
Pursuant to the Resource Management Act 1991
a resource consent is hereby granted by the
Taranaki Regional Council**

Name of
Consent Holder: Stratford District Council
P O Box 320
STRATFORD

Consent Granted
Date: 24 May 2005

Conditions of Consent

Consent Granted: To discharge solid waste onto and into land at the Stratford
municipal landfill at or about GR: Q20:223-060

Expiry Date: 1 June 2008

Review Date(s): June 2006

Site Location: Stratford municipal landfill, Victoria Road, Stratford

Legal Description: Lots 5 & 6 DP 1942 Blk II Ngaere SD

Catchment: Patea

20 A

Consent 4606-3



Discharge Permit
Pursuant to the Resource Management Act 1991
a resource consent is hereby granted by the
Taranaki Regional Council

CHIEF EXECUTIVE
PRIVATE BAG 713
47 CLOTEN ROAD
STRATFORD
NEW ZEALAND
PHONE 06-765 7127
FAX 06-765 5097

Please quote our file number
on all correspondence

Name of
Consent Holder: Stratford District Council
P O Box 320
STRATFORD

Consent Granted
Date: 24 May 2005

Conditions of Consent

Consent Granted: To discharge emissions into the air from landfilling and
associated activities at the Stratford municipal landfill at or
about GR: Q20:223-060

Expiry Date: 1 June 2008

Review Date(s): June 2006

Site Location: Stratford Landfill, Victoria Road, Stratford

Legal Description: Lots 5 & 6 DP 1942 Blk II Ngaere SD

Catchment: Patea

20 A

TRK963890

COPY



DISCHARGE PERMIT

**Pursuant to the RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991
a resource consent is hereby granted by the
Taranaki Regional Council**

PRIVATE BAG 713
47 CLOTON ROAD
STRATFORD
NEW ZEALAND
PHONE 0-6-765 7127
FAX 0-6-765 5097

Name of Consent Holder: STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL
PO BOX 320 STRATFORD

Renewal Granted Date: 17 October 1996

CONDITIONS OF CONSENT

Consent Granted: TO DISCHARGE UP TO 230 CUBIC METRES/DAY [20 LITRES/SECOND] OF STORMWATER AND LEACHATE FROM A FORMER LANDFILL SITE ONTO AND INTO LAND IN THE VICINITY OF AN UNNAMED TRIBUTARY OF THE MAKURI STREAM IN THE PATEA CATCHMENT AT OR ABOUT GR: Q20:370-150

Expiry Date: 1 June 2016

Review Date[s]: June 2004 and June 2010

Site Location: HUIROA LANDFILL, DOUGLAS ROAD, DOUGLAS

Legal Description: ROAD RESERVE BLK IX NGATIMARU SD

Catchment: PATEA 343.000

Tributary: MAKURI 343.250
UNNAMED TRIBUTARY

For General, Standard and Special Conditions pertaining to this consent please see reverse side of this document.

20 A

TRK983891



DISCHARGE PERMIT

Pursuant to the RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991
a resource consent is hereby granted by the
Taranaki Regional Council

PRIVATE BAG 713
47 CLOTON ROAD
STRATFORD
NEW ZEALAND
PHONE 0-6-765 7127
FAX 0-6-765 5097

Name of
Consent Holder: STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL
PO BOX 320 STRATFORD

Renewal
Granted Date: 12 February 1998

CONDITIONS OF CONSENT

Consent Granted: TO DISCHARGE UP TO 910 CUBIC METRES/DAY [84 LITRES/SECOND] OF STORMWATER AND LEACHATE FROM THE FORMER PUKENGAHU LANDFILL INTO AN UNNAMED TRIBUTARY OF THE WAIHAPA STREAM IN THE PATEA CATCHMENT AT OR ABOUT GR: Q20:292-016

Expiry Date: 1 June 2016

Review Date[s]: June 2004 and June 2010

Site Location: FORMER LANDFILL, WINGROVE ROAD, STRATFORD

Legal Description: ROAD RESERVE WINGROVE ROAD PUKENGAHU BLK VII
NGAERE SD

Catchment: PATEA 343.000

Tributary: WAIHAPA 343.280
UNNAMED TRIBUTARY

For General, Standard and Special Conditions pertaining to this consent please see reverse side of this document.

20 A

TRK983889



DISCHARGE PERMIT

**Pursuant to the RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991
a resource consent is hereby granted by the
Taranaki Regional Council**

PRIVATE BAG 713
47 CLOTEN ROAD
STRATFORD
NEW ZEALAND
PHONE 0-6-765 7127
FAX 0-6-765 5097

Name of
Consent Holder: STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL
PO BOX 320 STRATFORD

Renewal
Granted Date: 27 February 1998

CONDITIONS OF CONSENT

Consent Granted: TO DISCHARGE UP TO 910 CUBIC METRES/DAY [24 LITRES/SECOND] OF STORMWATER AND LEACHATE FROM THE STRATFORD MUNICIPAL LANDFILL INTO THE PATEA RIVER AT OR ABOUT GR: Q20:222-062

Expiry Date: 1 June 2010

Review Date[s]: June 2004 and June 2007

Site Location: SWANSEA ROAD STRATFORD

Legal Description: PT LOT 4 LOT 5 DP1942 TOWN OF STRATFORD BLK II
NGAERE SD.

Catchment: PATEA 343.000

For General, Standard and Special Conditions pertaining to this consent please see reverse side of this document.

20 A

Appendix 2

Improvement Plan

Note: SAM = Services Asset Manager, OM = Operations Manager, CE= Chief Executive,

| Item | Task | 2006/07 | | | | 2007/08 | | | | 2008/09 | | | | Responsibility |
|--------------------|---|----------|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|
| | | Quarters | | | | Quarters | | | | Quarters | | | | |
| | | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | |
| Emergency Response | Formalise local emergency response procedure for the districts solid waste service. | | | | | | | | | | | | | SAM/OM |
| Greenwaste | Determine strategies to promote the outcome of no greenwaste disposed at landfills by 2010. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Request monitoring | Review current systems of requests/complaints recording for monitoring, reporting and improvement purposes. | | | | | | | | | | | | | SAM/OM/CE |
| User Satisfaction | Consider and as appropriate determine a community consultation strategy for solid waste issues. | | | | | | | | | | | | | SAM/OM/CE |

Appendix 3

Risk Consequence / Impact Guidelines (Qualitative Measures)

| Risk Score | Risk Rating | Risk Description | Description of Impacts in example activity areas | | | |
|------------|----------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| | | | Financial risk management | Human resources | Political | Business risks |
| | | Generic Impact Description | Revenue loss, Cost Increases & Financial or Budget Liability | Security incident, OH&S effect, Reduced performance, Key people/Resources unavailable | Adverse press, Reputation damage, Legal repercussions | Clients not served, Operations interrupted. Assets/Infrastructure unusable, Info Systems out |
| 5 | Catastrophic | Disaster with potential to lead to business failure | Huge financial loss. Significant over expenditure at Organisational and output level, where there is no capacity to adjust budget across the Portfolio or no means to seek additional funding. 100% loss of Business Unit funding. | Multiple staff or public affected, debilitating injuries and fatalities or widespread medical attention required. Loss of a significant number of key management level staff, impacting on skills, knowledge, and expertise needs. Severe staff morale problems. | Concentrated public and political interest and major loss of public support. Union involvement. | Major detrimental effects on clients. Consequences would threaten survival of the service, and also the organization. Long-term sustained loss of production capability. |
| 4 | Major | Critical event, which will be endured with proper management | Major financial loss. Significant overrun at Organisational and output level, where management response requires significant additional funding, or termination or reduction of other initiatives. Possible 75% loss of Business Unit funding. | Extensive effects, injuries, hospitalisation or single fatality. Loss of some key staff, resulting in skills, knowledge, and expertise deficits. Severe morale or other organisational problems affecting performance and productivity. | Short-term public and political interest. Constant media attention, major internal inquiry and some union resistance. | Loss of production capability. Consequences would threaten survival or continued effective function of the service. Requires top-level management intervention. |
| 3 | Moderate | Significant event, which can be managed under normal circumstances | Significant financial loss, up to 50% of budget funding. Business Unit impact only, with some redistribution of existing budget. | Significant effects needing management action. Medical treatment, but no fatalities. Short-term skills, knowledge, expertise deficits. | Isolated public interest. Some medial interest and/or industry complaints, small internal inquiry. | Consequences could mean that the service is subjected to a significant performance review or a changed way of operating. Senior management involvement. |
| 2 | Minor | Event with consequences, which can be readily absorbed, but which requires management effort to minimize the impact | Some financial loss contained within Unit, 25% loss of budget funding. Minor over expenditure requiring monitoring and corrective action within existing budget. | Minor effects – injuries, but no fatalities. Health impact or probability leads to lost time or potential of public liability claim. Little skills deficit. | Local issue, isolated concerns raised by interest groups, with little media interest. | Consequences affect efficiency or effectiveness of the service. Managed internally. |
| 1 | Insignificant | Not worth worrying about. Existing controls and procedures will cope with the event. | Little or no financial loss, <5% budget funding impact. | No injuries or fatalities, little supporter action required. No skills or knowledge loss occurring. | No investigation required. Minimal to no effect on public reputation. | Affects only a small group of clients. Negligible service impacts dealt with by routine operations. |

Risk Probability Examples

| Risk Score | Risk Rating | Description of Event | Frequency |
|-------------------|--------------------|--|------------------|
| 5 | Almost Certain | The event is expected to occur in most circumstances High level of known incidences Strong likelihood of re-occurring with high opportunities / means to re-occur | Daily / Weekly |
| 4 | Likely | The event will probably occur in most circumstances. Regular incidences known (recorded / experienced) Considerable opportunity / means to occur | Monthly |
| 3 | Moderate | The event should occur at some time A few infrequent, random occurrences (recorded / experienced) Some opportunity or means to occur Council engineering projects usually designed to this level | Annually |
| 2 | Unlikely | The event could occur at some time No known incidences recorded or experienced Little opportunity, means or reason to occur Council engineering projects would require some compelling Capital risk justification to design to this level | Every 2-5 years |
| 1 | Rare | The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances Highly unheard of Almost no opportunity to occur Council Engineering would require very compelling Capital Risk justification to design to this level. | Every 10 years |

70 A