

3 November, 1972

Memo : City Engineer
Health & By-laws Committee

re: Ivon Watkins-Dow - Interim Report

As a result of recent press publicity regarding a further accidental discharge of detergent material from the above Company's premises to the Paritutu outfall, and the earlier expressed intentions of the Company to remove the cooling water by September this year, further discussions have recently been held with the Company.

Recapitulating Essential Points:

- * 1. The Company is legally entitled to discharge cooling and stormwater via the existing drainage and outfall.
- * 2. The Council is legally entitled to discharge stormwater via the outfall.
3. There is a longstanding resolution to pipe the discharge below low water mark.
4. The occasional spillage of chemical materials (4 this year) within the Company's premises is inevitable and in dry weather these are washed into the stormwater system and carried to the outfall by the cooling water (approx. 300,000 a day).
5. Approximately half of the Company's yard drainage is piped to the Paritutu outfall and the remaining half to the Herekawa Stream area.
6. The Company's current proposal is to recycle the cooling water (cost approx. \$30,000 to \$40,000). This will resolve part of the problem of spillage discharges at the outfall.
7. Spillage occurring in wet weather would still be discharged to the outfall.

CONCLUSION:

In view of the difficulties associated with these matters further technical discussions will be necessary with the Company. These will include :-

1. The desirability of piping below low water mark if the cooling water is removed. There may be little real value in proceeding with this work in relation to costs, future pollution problems and classification standards.
2. The question of insite treatment and retention and the redirection of monies in this area in lieu of recycling of cooling water.
3. The question of discharging to the Herekawa area.

Should the Company proceed with the recycling of cooling water this would not be affected until about June, 1973. Accidental spillages would have to be accepted by all parties in the interim.

It is the opinion of this office that Council is not faced with a serious pollution problem from the Paritutu outfall with the type of discharges experienced to date and questions whether this type of incident can be regarded as pollution in the normally accepted sense. The incidents are certainly not of the order that should stampede either Council or the Company into any hurried decisions merely for the sake of placating genuine but uninformed concern. Whatever the final solutions, they are likely to be irreversible and costly.

Discussions with the Company are continuing and a report with final recommendations to Council will be presented as soon as these are completed, sometime within the next two months.

.....

W. J. McNICHOLAS
Chief City Health Inspector