

**Otago Regional Council
DIRECTIONS OF THE COMMISSIONER**

- [1] I have received and read the DCC's comprehensive suite of evidence.
- [2] To assist the facilitation of an efficient Hearing, I have compiled the questions that I have at this stage for the DCC witnesses based on my reading of their material.
- [3] My questions are focused on the detail and efficacy of some of the recommended conditions of consent.
- [4] I would appreciate it if the various witnesses could provide a written response to these questions prior to the commencement of the Hearing scheduled for Tuesday 18 March 2025.
- [5] Maurice Dale is permitted to defer questions posed to him to appropriate expert witnesses if the subject of a question is outside his area of expertise.
- [6] The responses should be in the form of a consolidated WORD document provided to the ORC Hearings Administrator, Tamsin Grigg.
- [7] There are several witnesses for whom I have no questions:
 - Sandra Graham
 - Christopher Henderson
 - Adrian Roberts
 - Simonne Eldridge
 - Anthony Dixon
 - Debbie Fellows
 - Sue McManaway
- [8] Other than Adrian Roberts (questions for him may arise during the Hearing), those witnesses need not attend the Hearing on my account, but they are of course welcome to attend should they wish to do so.



Rob van Voorthuysen
Commissioner
6 March 2025

PARAGRAPH or PAGE or CONDITION	QUESTIONS
Dusk Mains	
36	What in your opinion would be a suite of 'essential' leachate indicator parameters?
42	<p>You say you are “<i>open to a review condition following 3 years of monitoring of the new well cluster and BH103</i>”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does that refer to installing a new deep well in Line 3? ▪ If it does, what would the monitoring data need to show for you to be satisfied a new deep well in Line 3 is necessary?
44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What (and why) are the contaminants of concern that you consider should have trigger levels? ▪ Would trigger levels based on historical monitoring data (which Mary Woods proposes) be more or less conservative than those recommended by Peter Wilson?
Mary Wood	
47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why are trigger levels based on previous sampling results more appropriate (in terms of avoiding or mitigating potential adverse effects on the environment) compared to trigger levels based on recognised Guidelines as recommended by Peter Wilson? ▪ Would trigger levels based on previous sampling results be more or less conservative than those recommended by Peter Wilson?
Peter Stacey	
91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What exactly is your concern with the wording of general Condition 4 recommended by Ms McDonald, recognising that conditions must clear, certain and enforceable?
Tanya Blakely	
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the benefit of an updated HHERA in 3 years' time given the evidence that there is no discernible effect of landfill leachate on stream or estuarine water quality or ecology? ▪ Would the completion of an updated HHERA be likely to result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New of different groundwater or surface water monitoring? ○ New or different leachate or stormwater mitigations? ○ New or amended conditions of consent?
23	<p>You consider it appropriate to include ecotoxicology investigations in the Adaptive Management Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What would be the purpose of the ecotoxicology investigations? ▪ Would ecotoxicology investigations be likely to result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New of different groundwater or surface water monitoring?

PARAGRAPH or PAGE or CONDITION	QUESTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New or different leachate or stormwater mitigations? ○ New or amended conditions of consent?
Kylie Dodd	
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the absence of “a catchment wide monitoring programme”, is there any merit in undertaking a further HHERA in three years’ time?
Maurice Dale	
	<p>You seem to suggest that the bond document entered into in 1994 (your Schedule A Attachment B) meets Ms McDonald’s recommendation that a bond be imposed should DCC decide to privatise the landfill in the future. The 31 year old 1994 document only provides for a fixed bond of \$1,000,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should bond conditions be imposed on the Green Island Landfill that mirror the (or are similar to) the more contemporary bond conditions imposed on the Smooth Hill Landfill?
	Would it be useful to have a condition that lists all of the management plans that are to be prepared for ORC certification?
Questions on your Attachment 1 amendments	
Schedule 1 – General Conditions	
Conditions 5 to 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Given there are only two neutral submissions from lay persons, what in your view is the benefit of a CLG?
Condition 41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Why wait 3 months to lodge a drilling permit? (b) Why wait 3 months to drill the well?
Condition 47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can you explain why trigger levels based on past levels of contamination are protective of the receiving environment? ▪ Can you explain what the problem is with trigger levels based on Guideline values?
Condition 54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is it intended that “contingency actions” would only be required if ecotoxicology investigations demonstrated adverse effects? ▪ What are the envisaged “contingency actions”?
Schedule B - Discharge Permit RM23.185.01	
Condition 3952	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why wait 3 months to provide firefighting equipment?
Schedule G - Discharge Permit RM23.185.06	
Condition 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who would be responsible for ascertaining if the odour causes an adverse effect at or beyond the site boundary?
Condition 11	(a) What is the rationale for having 2 years to install the additional landfill gas wells?
Condition 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What remedial actions are envisaged to reduce methane gas emissions?