

MEETING NOTES OF THE NATIONAL STOCK EFFLUENT WORKING GROUP
at
MIA premises, Wellington

12.30pm Monday 8 December 2008

Present:

Fiona Knight Frank Brenmuhl William McGimpsey Oliver Suri Ian Cox Kevin Cresswell Tony Friedlander Lew Metcalfe Isy Kennedy Mike Noon Rochelle Comber Roger Fisher Trish Burborough Murray Riley	Convenor, Federated Farmers Federated Farmers Ministry of Transport NZ Transport Agency - highways Meat Industry Association Road Transport Forum Fonterra Environment Waikato AA AA South Waikato DC MAF NZ Transport Agency – funding
---	--

Apologies: Philip Anstey Stock and Station Agents

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1. Introductions and apologies	Noted that Phillip Anstey has retired and a new representative of the stock and station agents is required.	Fiona to follow up
2. Meeting Notes of 10 September 2008	Confirmed. Most actions had been completed.	
3. Fridge magnet campaign	Noted that Fonterra had circulated in Otago and Southland only as they were this year's trouble spots. They'll be doing a major distribution next April 2009.	Fiona to circulate final text of

<p>4. Correspondence with LGNZ on barriers to getting in-transit sites established</p>	<p>Received the letter from Geoff Swainson on behalf of LGNZ President Lawrence Yule. Noted that as ratepayers, we were all interested in getting a cost-effective solution to effluent disposal, as were our organisations.</p> <p>Accepted the offer from LGNZ outlined by Fiona to meet with LGNZ and develop solutions that are win-win for all parties. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying regional council consent conditions for effluent disposal at meat works and saleyards which are inhibiting the acceptance at these sites of effluent from stock truck. Meatworks and saleyards have been using consent conditions as the reason for not making their disposal/wash facilities available to truck operators bringing in stock, and some councils seem to be imposing unnecessarily high requirements. • Working with NZTA on having regional councils coordinate the establishment and funding off in-transit disposal sites in their regions, so that costs are spread equitably across all local authorities that benefit from these sites. This could include developing a template to make it easier for regions to develop strategies, and involving the new NZTA Regional Directors. Fits with the statutory function to assist, advise, and cooperate with local authorities. • Getting MoT and Ministerial support for the above concepts • Membership to be Kevin, Tony, Rochelle, Frank/William, Ian and Fiona • Development of regional strategies for managing stock effluent • Trial of form for farmers to sign-off standing of stock - Item 9 below <p>Other actions agreed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A submission from NSEWG to the RMA review • Update the list of plants that have disposal sites, and whether these are available for use or not, and any consent problems for the site owner • 	<p>covering flier</p> <p>Fiona to circulate the E Waikato and E Southland strategies</p>
<p>5. Funding issues of in-transit sites</p>	<p>Murray advised the current NZTA policy is regardless of the facility being alongside a local road or a State highway,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - construction/renewal of a facility is funded at 50% - any necessary road improvement work required to enable vehicles to safely enter and exit the facility is funded at 100% - maintenance of the facility and disposal of effluent from the facility is funded at the "base rate" within the relevant territorial authority's programme. 	

	<p>Noted that when the cost of the necessary road improvement work equalled the facility construction cost, the effective overall funding assistance would be 75% which seemed reasonable – stopped having any “gold-plated” sites. Agreed to ask NZTA to review this funding policy to ensure that the costs of construction are not a deterrent to constructing new in-transit sites. Noted in Fiona’s draft results of the survey of in-transit sites that some maintenance costs were minimal, and the sites therefore were very cost-effective compared with having effluent all over the roads.</p> <p>Having a regional strategy for disposal sites enable costs to be spread equitably across regions and all local authorities that benefit from these sites. Agreed that the update map as supplied by Ian is the current agreed network, and that any new sites being introduced to this list needed to be considered by the national NSEWG.</p> <p>Noted it was not cost-effective to have an admin charge per each load dumped.</p>	
6. Survey of in-transit disposal sites	<p>Noted Fiona’s draft report, and range of costs for maintenance. Fiona to complete the survey. Action to research impact, if any, of the NPS on water standards.</p> <p>Noted that the 3 pond disposal system was very cost effective in regards to maintenance compared with carting effluent away (except where the effluent can be bought or the cartage costs covered by the receiver). Disposal to the town sewage supply had variable costs. Will make results of survey available to all councils, once data is complete. Noted the low number of complaints received by site owners which is very positive and mean there is good data to address NIMBY concerns.</p>	<p>Fiona to complete survey Fiona check impact of NPS on water standards</p>
7. Spreading effluent on farms	<p>Lew and Will reported on meeting between Fonterra, Meat and Wool NZ and Federated Farmers looking at the risks and hazards of disposing of effluent on farms. Mixed loads were high risk. Noted that single loads, and farm to farm stock transfers were low risk, as were pond disposal systems. Need some sort of disposal system on farms. Queried having some sort of financial incentive to receive the effluent. Also might be some RMA issues – need to research this. Tony offered to designs a low-cost gravity feed system. Fiona to add to action list educating farmers that they can have simple on-farm disposal facilities very cheaply, also meatworks and saleyards could do the same. Is this true, guys?</p> <p>Trish will clarify the MAF position on receiving effluent and biosecurity risks</p> <p>Debated the cost effectiveness of farmers all having their own disposal systems rather than publicly owned in-transit ones.</p>	<p>Fiona to make application to SSF Who? To follow up with Ruakura on lit search Tony to design receiving/disposal system with assistance from FF. FF to action farmer education campaign</p>

	<p>The research into the risk analysis related to disposal of effluent on farms had yet to be commissioned – would cost between \$20,000 and \$40,000. Roger advised that Ruakura had done a literature search on risks with pond disposal and they make have some useful data. Agreed to seek funding through the Sustainable Farming Fund. AA will provide a letter of support. Trish has provided Fiona advice on accessing the SSF as it fits with the government focus on improving infrastructure.</p>	
<p>8. Educational DVD</p>	<p>This had been agreed September 2007, and was awaiting finding a source of funds. Noted it could be an expensive solution and that a one pager showing the issues and solutions might be more effective. Agreed to review the one-pager concept next year and maybe submit application to SSF for funding in July.</p>	
<p>9. Legislative issues</p>	<p>Oliver reported on the meeting to review whether any legislative change was required – notes had been circulated separately. He advised that MoT is not currently keen on having any statutory intervention at this stage, but would do so if there was justification. Noted that the survey of farmers in 2005 identified that 2/3 of farmers stood stock for only 0 – 4 hours. These are consistent with Isy's survey of farmers done at the Mystery Creek field days.</p> <p>Noted the pressure on truck operators from Environment Southland (ES), which has issued at least 3 infringement notices against truck operators for spilling effluent. ES has only recently entered into some contracts with transport operators to provide some in-transit disposal sites, and at present has no other sites in place. Discussed whether can have a system where it is a defence for truck operators if there has been non-compliance by other parties to the Code, such as not standing stock or not having disposal facilities available.</p> <p>A plan forward was agreed to trial a form whereby truck operators will demonstrate that their tanks are empty to farmers, and this will be signed off by the farmers. If subsequently, a large amount of effluent is collected, the interpretation will be that stock have not been stood. Federated Farmers to work further with their members both on standing stock, and on receiving effluent on their farms with the stock. Fonterra is meeting with ES later this month to encourage them to work with us on the trial. The hope is that ES will then work further with the farmers who have not stood stock, rather than prosecute the truck operator, and with the meat operators who have not made their</p>	<p>Oliver to seek Mot views on providing legal status to the Code Fiona to find and recirculate old papers, Isy's survey</p> <p>Frank/Will to work with members in Southland on standing stock Lew to discuss and promote new form with ES</p>

disposal facilities available for truck operators to dump any effluent when delivering their loads.

Agreed we need more information, including

- what notice is given by meat works on when stock will be required, and separately
- by truck operators to farmers about collection.
- Data on the extent of meatworks requiring stock immediately and thus being unable to give notice (previously advised by Kevin as only 5% on the time.)

10. Survey of farmers

William was preparing to undertake a new survey of farmers on standing stock. Agreed to seek truck operator views first – result of Tony’s mini-survey below. **These results suggest to me that Will goes ahead with his survey – agreed?**

Report from onelivestock carrier in each of the RTF regions. This is only indicative as it is simply a general estimate by each operator:

Region	4 Hours	12 Hours	Not at all
Northland	50%	-	50%
Waikato	5%	-	95%
Wairarapa	10%	-	90%
Taranaki	10%	-	90%
Canterbury (Sheep)	70%	20%	10%
Canterbury (dairy)	-	-	100%
Otago	19%	80%	1%
Southland	20%	70%	10%

It appears from this that the principal problem lies with dairy farmers in both islands.

The reasons offered by the farmers are:

- The procurement system whereby insufficient forward notice is provided to farmers.
- Poor facilities:
 - o inability to separate stock
 - o yards and pens under-equipped

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preference not to pug up yards. - Expectation that no standing increases animal live weight which increases payout. - No real concern for the aggravation placed upon transport operators. 	
11. Report from Environment Waikato	<p>Isy reported on the recent EW Effluent Working Group meeting. Issues considered included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An 0800 number on the backs of trucks to report any effluent being spilled – they had a map showing reported effluent spillages • one meatworks does pay more for full stock (despite the evidence against this) • Trade waste bylaw and fees payable for accepting effluent into one town sewage system • Little crash data available 	
12. General Business	Kevin noted that the Agriculture ITO might be able to have issues pertaining to effluent spillage and disposal in some of its training requirements	What action? Fiona/ who? talk with them?
12. Date of next meeting	By end February 2009. Fiona to email dates	Fiona to email