

Good afternoon,

I'm here as a representative of Sustainable Glenorchy, a group of Glenorchy residents who have concerns about the proposed Glenorchy Sewage Scheme.

The concerns are that the scheme will be undersized, will blow out on costs, and will not allow the community to move towards sustainability.

So we welcome the fact that today's Mayors report informs Council that further work is to be undertaken on the objectives for the scheme, as this may present opportunities to achieve a better outcome for all of us.

Glenorchy is unique and requires a unique solution. It has a small population base that will have to pay 100% of the scheme costs. It has a significant amount of existing, high standard residential infrastructure and large section sizes suitable for onsite treatment. Onsite discharge remains the cheapest solution for residential homeowners but a number of commercial and publicly owned facilities don't have the land to deal with their discharges. Therefore we need the lowest cost scheme that is also equitable and does not penalise those who have already paid for good systems.

What we need is achievable but by proposing to have an open tender, specifying ONLY the discharge quality, tenderers will simply bid for what they would like to supply. Given the small number of tenders expected and an uncompetitive contract market this is unlikely to be what would suit the community best.

So rather than going straight to tender, good governance would see the next step as a partnership of staff expertise and robust input from the community to identify the best solution. The tender process should then aim to secure the best price for that 'best' solution.

That, in a nutshell, is our hope and perhaps the revised objectives for the scheme might lead us there.

Many of you are aware that we have been trying unsuccessfully to meet with Council to resolve these and other concerns. Together we can get a better outcome. If differences are resolved, we can move forward. If the scheme delivers what the community aspire to, they will rally behind it.

We support a scheme that works for us, not one that will take us backwards and bankrupt us. Your urgent intervention is required to help us achieve the former and avoid the latter.

We'd now like to bring to your attention some facts. These facts raise questions about the current cost estimates and support our request for a tender based on the best solution rather than discharge quality.

1. You'll be aware that Council has now applied to the ORC for a discharge consent to the Peninsular Recreation Reserve in Glenorchy. The application is on hold, with the ORC awaiting the answers to three pages of questions; that includes a full page questioning the flow predictions which underpin both the land treatment regime and the cost estimates.

2. You may not be aware that the consent application actually uses the word 'guess' in the context of projected waste flows. That guesswork has dangerously understated the towns

future wastewater flows; the 35yr flow estimates are actually less than what the town took from the bore 3 years ago. And if we have underestimated the flows we have also underestimated the costs!

3. Did you know that the application proposes to discharge waste that has more than double the nitrogen levels coming from some existing on-site treatment systems in Glenorchy? There are lots of high quality on site treatment units in the town, modern septic tanks and installed infrastructure serving recent subdivisions; retaining this infrastructure would significantly reduce the size, cost and adverse effects of a community scheme.

4. We know there is a 30% probability of a magnitude 8 earthquake in the next 50 years. And we know the pipework for this sewerage scheme will not be insurable. Given that, we need a scheme that minimises the financial, environmental and health risks associated with the earthquake hazard.

5. We want you to know that last year's Shaping our Future forum reaffirmed the community's desire to move towards sustainability. Camp Glenorchy will now showcase state of the art wastewater systems to educate its guests. We propose a scheme that can encourage sustainable behaviours and the adoption of sustainable technologies by the whole community. A scheme that allows waster water flows to be measured can achieve that.

6. You should also know that there is a real risk that Council has prejudiced its procurement strategy by, on the one hand telling the community and bidders that it does not favor a particular scheme and on the other hand stating in its resource consent application that it envisages construction of a traditional sewer and the removal of all existing on site treatment. This statement of preference means that tenders for schemes other than Hybrid Gravity are unlikely; it also means that Council has exposed itself to financial claims from contractors proposing alternative solutions.

7. Our final point raises an issue that applies to the discharge and cannot be fixed by adopting a particular scheme. The Council is proposing discharge to 6ha of Recreation Reserve. In 2014 QLDC posted a consultation document on its website which assured us that access to the land would not be compromised by the discharge. The 6ha site is currently used by the Pony Club but it has just come to light that they will be fenced out if consent is granted. They had plans for a toilet, a shelter and an arena but those plans will be thwarted by a discharge consent. Councillors should also know that the 6ha site is the only part of the reserve that the community has access to due to a grazing lease which doesn't expire until 2039. Alternative locations are available and need to be considered to avoid an expensive designation process.