

File No: WGN140064 [32533], [32534], [32435, [32536], [32537], [32538] and [32539]
26 November 2013

Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140

For: Stavros Michael

Dear Stavros

Wellington City Council, Southern Landfill - Commissioning of a peer review report for the proposed stage 4 landfill extension, under section 92(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <i>Applicant:</i> | <i>Wellington City Council</i> |
| <i>Proposal:</i> | <i>Various consents associated with landfilling activities</i> |
| <i>Location:</i> | <i>Southern Landfill, Landfill Road, Happy Valley, Wellington</i> |

I am writing to formally notify you that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GW) is commissioning an independent consultant to peer review the technical elements and adequacy of the hydrogeological, leachate, geotechnical and stormwater reports/management options proposed on site and the proposed ecological compensation, which is detailed in your application received by GWRC on 4 September 2013.

The peer review of leachate and hydrogeology will focus largely on the content of sections 5.2, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6 5.7, 7.2, and 7.3 of the AEE document, the hydrogeology report and the concept design report and how well these reports addresses appropriate leachate and hydrogeological management options. The purpose of this review is to undertake a “gap assessment” – that is, to identify areas of the AEE where clarification or further information is required (if at all).

The peer review of the proposed ecological compensation will focus on the ecological report and how well this report addresses appropriate mitigation/compensation.

You are required under section 92B(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to respond to this notification by **17 December 2013** (see below).

Who will conduct the peer review?

I have contacted Kyle Christensen of Pattle Delamore Partners who has advised he and a team are available to complete the peer review in relation to the leachate and hydrogeology aspects of you

proposal. Mr Christensen is a chartered natural resources engineer with experience in water resource engineering projects.

As you are aware, Keith Hamill from River Lake Limited undertook a peer review of the ecological aspects of your proposal prior to lodgement. I have contacted Mr Hamill who has advised he is available to undertake a restricted review of the final ecological report provided. Mr Hamill has experience in reviewing ecological assessments.

We have advised our reviewers that they will need to make themselves available to meet with the URS team to discuss any concerns or matters of clarification prior to the completion of any Peer Review reports.

Charges associated with the peer review

I have provided Mr Christensen with a scope of the review and asked him to prepare an estimate of costs associated with this peer review. Mr Christensen has advised the following staff will review each technical area:

- Stormwater management - Mr Christensen (\$230/hr)
- Leachate treatment/management – Andrew Rumsby (\$170/hr) and Gerald Strayton (\$220/hr)
- Hydrogeology – Chris Woodhouse (\$100/hr) and Alan Prattle (\$280/hr)
- Geotechnics – Gerald Strayton (\$220/hr)

Overall the estimated cost of the review from PDP is \$12,528 excl GST.

I have provided Mr Hamill with a scope of the review and asked him to prepare an estimate of the costs associated with this peer review. Mr Hamill has advised that the review should take approximately 8 hours to complete with an initial budget estimate of \$1,200 (exclusive of GST). Any further work will be undertaken at an hourly rates of \$150 per hour.

Time limit to respond to this notification and processing of your application

Under section 92B(1) you must, by **17 December 2013**, give GW *written notice* of whether you agree to the commissioning of the peer review reports.

If you do not provide written notice whether you agree to the commissioning of the peer review or you refuse to agree to the commissioning of the report GWRC will continue to process your application under section 104. However, if GWRC considers that there is inadequate information to determine the application then the application may be declined, pursuant to section 104(6) of the Act.

Please note that GWRC does not have the in-house expertise to review this type of application as such we consider that these peer reviews are fundamental to us understanding whether the adverse effects of your proposal have been appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.

We look forward to hearing from you soon with the confirmation of the peer review.

Your application has been placed on hold, and the statutory 'clock' stopped³, until one of the above occurs. If you agree in written notice to the commissioning of the peer review your application will, under section 88C of the RMA, remain 'on hold' from the date of this notification until we receive the final peer review report. This is similar to requests for further information under section 92(1) of the RMA.

As soon as I receive confirmation from you, I will come back to you on the time needed by PDP to review the information and provide the initial part of the assessment. Following that we can arrange discussions between the experts.

Yours sincerely

Ashlee Farrow
Resource Advisor, Environmental Regulation

³ Under section 88C of the Resource Management Act 1991