



Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund Round 1 2021/22 Funding Recommendations

DATE SUBMITTED:	10 JUNE 2021	TRACKING #BRF-117	
SECURITY LEVEL	IN CONFIDENCE	MFE PRIORITY:	NOT URGENT

	ACTION SOUGHT:	RESPONSE BY:
HON DAVID PARKER, MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT	DECISION ON ALLOCATION OF FUNDING	24 JUNE 2021

ACTIONS FOR MINISTER'S OFFICE STAFF	RETURN THE SIGNED REPORT TO MFE
NUMBER OF APPENDICES AND ATTACHMENTS - #3	<p>Titles of appendices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 1: Contaminated sites remediation fund - panel meeting minutes and recommendations Appendix 2: Contaminated sites remediation fund - priority list Appendix 3: Contaminated sites remediation fund - eligibility and assessment criteria

Key contacts

Position	Name	Cell phone	1st contact
Principal Author	Carmel Mangan	0220134307	
Responsible Manager	Scott Priestley	0220833594	✓
Director	Glenn Wigley	0274917806	

Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund Round 1 2021/22 Funding Recommendations

Key Messages

1. This briefing seeks your decision on applications to the contestable Round 1 -2021/22 Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund (CSRF, the Fund).
2. The CSRF has an annual appropriation of \$2.628M; the full appropriation is available for 2021/22 financial year allocation.
3. Regional Councils apply for funding through the two funding rounds held in March and September each year. For each funding round a CSRF assessment panel (the Panel) convene to assess the applications against the CSRF's eligibility and assessment criteria and make recommendations to fund or decline the projects.
4. The Ministry received two applications for funding from the CSRF through the March funding round. The applicants requested a total of \$375,166, both requests being less than 50% of the estimated total cost of each project.
5. On consideration of the CSRF Assessment Panel's advice, the Ministry recommends that you approve funding for the two applications subject to conditions.

Contaminated Site Remediation Fund 2021/22 Round 1 Applications for funding

Application details

6. The Ministry received two applications for funding from the CSRF 2021/22 annual appropriation.
7. Otago Regional Council (ORC) has requested funding for the Oamaru Gasworks Investigation, a newly identified contaminated site. The estimated total cost of the project is \$424,867 and the amount being sought from the CSRF is \$197,666 being 47% of the total estimated cost.
8. Environment Southland (ES) has requested funding for the Ocean Beach Landfill, an existing contaminated site that has previously received funding from the CSRF. The estimated total cost of the project is \$422,900 and the amount being sought from the CSRF is \$177,500, being 42% of the total estimated cost.
9. An overview of the applications is as follows:

Table 1: Overview of Applications Received

Project Name	Applicant	Project Phase	Total Project Cost	CSRF Funding Requested	Priority List Site
Oamaru Gasworks Project	Otago Regional Council	2 – Site Investigation 3 – Remedial Planning	\$424,867	\$197,666	Newly Identified Site #7
Ocean Beach Project	Environment Southland	3 – Remedial Planning	\$422,900	\$177,500	#6
Total			\$847,767	\$375,166	

CSRF Project details

10. The projects recommended for your consideration are detailed as follows:

Oamaru Gasworks Site Contamination Project

11. ORC has applied to the CSRF for funding to undertake a contamination site investigation, carry out a remedial options assessment and prepare a remedial action plan, for the Oamaru Gasworks site. ORC have established project partnerships with the current site owners, the Department of Conservation (DOC), and KiwiRail.
12. The historic operation of the Gasworks from 1876 to 1980 and the waste materials that had been dumped on the site caused contamination of the soils on site. The site is only partially capped or sealed and therefore migration of contaminants and erosion of an area of the coastline, are potentially occurring on site.
13. The purpose of this former Gasworks site project is to:
 - a. undertake intrusive works to characterise and delineate the extent of contamination and assess risks to human and environmental health.
 - b. carry out a remedial options assessment to determine the appropriate remedial options for mitigating the risks to human health and the environment from the presence and exposure to gasworks waste and contaminated soil.
 - c. prepare a remedial action plan detailing how remediation will take place, based on the chosen remediation strategies best suited to the site and situation and that have the highest potential to achieve the remedial goals and objectives.
14. The objectives of this project relate to enhanced public safety on the site, reduced harm to human health and the environment on and offshore, and development of sustainable remediation options.

Ocean Beach Landfill Site Contamination Project

15. ES has applied to the CSRF for funding to undertake remedial planning and prepare a remedial action plan (RAP) for the Ocean Beach Landfill site located at the entrance to the Bluff Township, in Southland. ES have existing project partnership with site owners, DOC, and Invercargill City Council (ICC).

16. Historical landfilling at the former Ocean Beach Freezing Works is widespread across the site. The contaminated soils and materials pose a high risk to human health and the environment. The landfill face is actively eroding and exposing contaminated waste along the foreshore of Ocean Beach.
17. The erosion of the landfill and the discharge of waste onto the beach has been reported in the media and is subject to high public scrutiny.
18. The purpose of this project is to assess remedial options for the Landfill site; to
 - a. carry out a remedial options assessment to determine the appropriate remedial options for mitigating the risks to human health and the environment from the presence and exposure to landfill waste and contaminated soil.
 - b. prepare a remedial action plan detailing how remediation will take place, based on the chosen remediation strategies best suited to the site and situation and that have the highest potential to achieve the goals and objectives of the project.
19. The objectives of this project relate to enhanced public safety on the site, reduced effects on cultural and ecological values and harm to human health and the environment, through sustainable remediation.

CSRF Project Assessments

20. A CSRF assessment panel (the Panel) convened to assess the application against the CSRF's eligibility and assessment criteria and make recommendations to fund or decline the project. The funding eligibility and assessment criteria is listed in Appendix 2.
21. The Panel convened on 10 May 2021 to finalise their recommendations and funding conditions. The meeting minutes are listed in Appendix 1.

Damaru Gasworks Site Contamination Project

22. The Panel considered the Damaru Gasworks contamination investigation project was eligible for funding in this funding round. The Panel felt that sufficient preliminary investigation had been undertaken and that this phase was an appropriate next step.
23. During its assessment of this application the Panel:
 - a. agreed the Project offers multiple benefits, long-term outcomes, and increased opportunities relating to enhanced public safety on the landfill site and reduced harm to human health and the environment on and offshore.
 - b. were concerned that the application had not adequately identified the site-specific exposure risks for workers, the risks from public and media scrutiny due to the issue of coastal erosion, and the potential impacts on wildlife in the area. They consider that these could be addressed in site-specific management plan/s.
 - c. felt that formal evidence of the stakeholder partnerships, the roles and responsibilities of the Project Working Party Group and clarity around the lead agency was necessary and that this could be achieved through a Term of Reference or similar.

d. agreed the Project had the potential to be of high strategic value, presenting an opportunity (in Phase 4) for developing an innovative remediation approach to a problem that is occurring at similar sites around New Zealand.

24. The Panel therefore recommend funding for the Oamaru Gasworks project subject to conditions for submitting a Terms of Reference and the required site-specific management plans, to mitigate the risk of the issues raised affecting the completion and success of the project.

Ocean Beach Landfill Site Contamination Project

25. The Panel considered the Ocean Beach Landfill remedial planning project was eligible for funding in this funding round. They noted that the project was for additional work to a previously funded phase two application and that it was an appropriate next step.

26. During the assessment of this application the Panel:

- a. agreed the project offers multiple benefits, and long-term outcomes, and that the project has the potential to be of high strategic value through the development of innovative solutions for sustainable remediation.
- b. agreed the Project Team from the previous phase have proven capabilities to undertake the project, but that roles and responsibilities and clarity around the lead agency should be secured through a Terms of Reference.
- c. felt that not all the site issues had been identified, including the safety of workers and the scrutiny the project is likely to endure and that site-specific management plans should be developed to address these issues.
- d. expressed concerns about information gaps in the sampling data and agreed that further sampling needed to consider multiple sources of contaminants at the site and include more ecological sampling. To address these concerns, they recommended that a sampling plan be developed prior to commencing works on the site.
- e. felt that the cost estimates were not as accurate as possible and that a cost analysis was necessary to ensure more precise costs are provided. They also expressed concerns about the potential for the high cost to be related to coastal protection. They also recommended that a detail costing be developed, and this was reviewed by the Ministry prior to the development of the remedial action plan commencing.

27. The Panel therefore recommend funding for the Ocean Beach Landfill project subject to conditions for submitting a Terms of Reference, a sampling plan, the required site-specific management plans, and a detailed cost analysis, to mitigate the risk of these issues affecting the completion and success of the project.

28. The Ministry has considered and agrees with the Panel's recommendations. The Panel comments and recommendations are provided in Appendix 1. Should you wish to provide comments, please do so using the 'Minister Comment' column.

The CSRF Priority List

29. The CSRF prioritisation tool (the Tool) comprises a list of probable and confirmed contaminated sites identified by regional councils as priorities for their region. Currently, there are 46 sites on the Ministry prioritisation tool.
30. The Priority List is published on the Ministry's website and comprises the 10 highest ranked confirmed contaminated sites on the CSRF prioritisation tool that are eligible for funding. The public release of the Priority List was notified to Cabinet in May 2014 [EGI (14) 104].
31. The Priority List has been successful at placing a greater focus on sites with significant contamination issues and encouraging the responsible regional councils and landowners to address their respective priority sites through applications to the CSRF.
32. With the addition of the Oamaru Gasworks, the Priority List has changed since we previously informed you in the December 2020/21 Funding Recommendations Briefing Note [2020-B-07304]. The Priority List will be updated and published on the Ministry's Website.
33. A copy of the Priority List is attached in Appendix 2.

Proactively released under the Official Information Act 1982

Recommendations

We recommend that you:

- **Note** that the Ministry considered and endorses the Panel's funding recommendations. Yes/No
- **Approve** Otago Regional Council's application for funding for the Oamaru Gasworks Investigation project subject to conditions as requested (\$197,666). Yes/No
- **Approve** Environment Southland's application for funding for the Ocean Beach Landfill remedial planning project subject to conditions as requested (\$177,500). Yes/No
- **Note** that we will contact all successful applicants to confirm their intent to proceed and advise unsuccessful applications of the outcome of their applications to the Fund. Yes/No
- **Agree** to publish on the Ministry's website, the updated Priority List presented in Appendix 2. Yes/No
- **Meet** with officials for further discussion on the content of this briefing. Yes/No
- **Agree** that this briefing and appendices will be released proactively on the Ministry for the Environment's website following the signing of the deeds of funding for the approved projects. Yes/No

Signature

GLENN WIGLEY	
DIRECTOR, POLICY AND REGULATORY	
WASTE AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY	
DAVID PARKER, MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT	
[DATE FIELD]	

*Discuss how to
the future we can
cut this down back
some times we are
better to plan by
starting + then
assessing how it's
going.*

** ① I am concerned that we are a couple of months away from having to spend close to \$1m on processes before full work starts. ② The verbiage in these reports should be cut down.*

Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund Round 1 2021/22 Funding Recommendations

Supporting material

Purpose

34. This briefing seeks your decision on applications to the contestable Round 1 – 2021/22 (Round 1) of the Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund (CSRF, the Fund). As Minister for the Environment, you approve funding for applications to the CSRF.
35. It also seeks your approval to publish the updated CSRF Priority List (the Priority List) on the Ministry for the Environment's (the Ministry) website. As Minister for the Environment, you approve the Priority List for publication in conjunction with CSRF funding rounds.

Context

Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund

36. The CSRF is a contestable fund administered by the Ministry with an annual appropriation of \$2.628M. The Fund was established in 2003 for a three-year trial following on from development of the Orphaned Sites Remediation Fund which began in 1999.
37. The purpose of the CSRF is to support regional councils, unitary authorities, and territorial authorities to fulfil their obligations for contaminated land management under the Resource Management Act 1991. Regional councils and unitary authorities can submit applications for contaminated sites that they consider priorities for investigation or remediation. The eligibility criteria for the Fund (Appendix 3) is structured to enable this.
38. Funding is directed towards detailed site investigations, remedial planning, and/or remediation. Typically, funding from the CSRF contributes up to 50% of the total project costs; however, in some cases, the Fund can contribute a higher proportion of costs. There is a Cabinet requirement that at least \$0.87M be made available for projects each financial year.
39. Funding rounds are bi-annual and close on the last working day of March and September. In addition to the bi-annual funding rounds, the Ministry will consider applications for emergency/priority funding outside of the normal funding rounds. This is subject to funds being available.

CSRF Project Process

40. Projects that are approved by you, will then be invited to Stage II, Project Planning. This includes developing a Work Programme and negotiating a deed of funding. If any conditions of funding are set for a project, they will be addressed during this period.

41. Once the deed of funding is signed by both the Ministry and the funding recipient, the project may begin. Any costs incurred prior to the deed signing will not be liable for payment under the CSRF.
42. Projects are typically run by regional councils and unitary authorities partnering with landowners and territorial authorities. A suitably qualified environmental practitioner with experience in contaminated land assessments and/or remediation projects is contracted to undertake the works on behalf of councils. The council then reports to the Ministry on the findings of the investigation or progress of remediation.
43. Site works and any reports must comply with requirements of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2012 and the Contaminated Land Management Guidelines Nos. 1¹ and 5².

Assessment of Round 1 2021/2022 Applications

44. An assessment panel, comprising of one local government representative, one suitably qualified environmental practitioner and two Ministry staff, convened to assess the applications against the criteria for approving funding. The Panel assessed the applications against the CSRF funding eligibility and assessment criteria (Appendix 3). The criteria are summarised below:
 - a. The actual, or potential, significant risk to human health or the environment.
 - b. The demonstration of a partnership between the regional council and interested parties.
 - c. Whether the level of funding from other sources reflects the responsibility for the contamination; and,
 - d. The site's ranking on the CSRF Priority List.
45. Assessment panel members were selected based on their technical knowledge and experience in the contaminated land industry. The assessment panel included:
 - a. Bruce Croucher (non-voting Chair) – Principal Analyst, Ministry for the Environment.
 - b. Anne Pezaro – Senior Analyst, Policy and Regulatory, Ministry for the Environment.
 - c. Isla Hepburn – Senior Analyst, Waste Operations, Ministry for the Environment.
 - d. Terre Nicolson – Certified environmental practitioner (CEnvP) specialising in soil contamination for HDGeo Ltd.
 - e. Caitlin Holm – Scientist, Contaminated Land, Waikato Regional Council.
46. The Ministry received two applications to Round 1 of the CSRF, requesting \$375,166 in funding towards \$847,767 total project costs.

¹ Ministry for the Environment, 2001: Contaminated land management guidelines No. 1: Reporting on contaminated sites in New Zealand (revised 2011).

² Ministry for the Environment, 2004: Contaminated Land Management Guidelines No 5: Site Investigation and Analysis of Soils (revised 2011).

47. The Panel have recommended the two applications for funding.
48. The Ministry has considered and agrees with the Panel's recommendations. The panel comments and recommendations are provided in Appendix 1 for your information.

Additional information regarding the applicant's projects

Oamaru Gasworks Site

49. Otago Regional Council have applied for funding to undertake an investigation of the former Oamaru Gasworks site located north of the Oamaru Harbour and Holmes Wharf.
50. The gas-making facility operated from 1876 to 1980 resulting in soil contamination from contaminants of concern characteristic of gasworks sites. Similar contaminants have also been identified in waste materials that have been dumped on the site.
51. The investigation's objective is to characterise the extent of contamination and delineate the gasworks material and risk from erosion, to inform decisions about suitable and sustainable remedial/management options.
52. The Oamaru Gasworks site is ranked seventh on the CSRF Priority list and eligible for priority funding.

Ocean Beach Landfill site

53. Environment Southland have applied for funding to undertake remedial assessment of options to address contaminated soil and waste at the Ocean Beach Landfill site and located at the entrance of the Bluff township, south of the state highway.
54. Contamination of the project site occurred between 1982 and 1991, when the burial of industrial and building demolition waste took place as part of an on-going redevelopment of the freezing works by former site owners. Recent Phase II investigations have confirmed contaminants of concern including asbestos and heavy metals are present both on and off site.
55. The purpose of the Phase II Remedial Planning is to determine which remediation strategies best suit the site and situation and that have the highest potential to achieve the goals and objectives of the project.
56. The Ocean Beach Landfill site is ranked sixth on the CSRF Priority list and is eligible for priority funding.

Analysis and Advice

Funding recommendations for applications to the CSRF

57. The Panel assessed the two applications received through the contestable funding round and recommended both applications for funding.
58. When considering the Oamaru Gasworks project, the Panel:
 - a. were in agreement that the application was eligible, and that the potential risk to human health and the environment had been clearly demonstrated. There was consensus that

the tasks and activities related to the objectives, that they were achievable in the timeframe set out, that significant and long-term benefits had been identified and that the project would be an opportunity to be strategically valuable.

- b. felt the partner organisations and stakeholders involved in the project and making up the Project Working Party Group would contribute specific expertise to the project and support its delivery. However, as project management will be achieved through the Group, they agreed a formal agreement between the parties such as a Terms of Reference should be in place, where the roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.
 - c. agreed that several site-specific management plans would be necessary to address all the risks and issues the project faces, including some that were overlooked. The safety of workers and the scrutiny the project is likely to endure needs to be addressed through robust risk management. All proposed mitigation/management strategies should be critically evaluated for their impact on the completion and success of the project.
 - d. felt that the estimated costs were reasonable for the activities proposed and directly related to the delivery of the project. That 47% funding was considered appropriate with the remaining financial contributions coming from landowners DOC and KiwiRail.
59. The Panel therefore recommend funding is approved conditional to the following being provided during the Stage II process and prior to the deed being signed:
- a. a site-specific Health and Safety Plan, a Communications Management Plan, and a Wildlife Management Plan.
 - b. a Terms of Reference for the Working Party Group that includes the functions, make-up, and procedure of the Group.
60. When assessing the Ocean Beach Landfill project, the Panel:
- a. were in agreeance that the application was eligible, and that the contamination risk to human health and the environment had been clearly demonstrated. There was consensus that the tasks and activities related to the objectives, that they were achievable in the timeframe set out, albeit that it was unclear why two years was required. There was consensus that the project would enhance and protect the site, the public and the coastal area, it offered long-term benefits, and that sustainable remediation options have the potential to be of high strategic value where the learnings can be shared with other agencies.
 - b. noted the Project Governance structure included key stakeholders, specialists and experienced persons that were involved with the previous phase. However, clarity on roles and responsibilities of the lead agency, the Governance Group, and the Ocean Beach Landfill Investigation Working Group, was required and should be defined through a Terms of Reference.
 - c. considered there was a need for some additional sampling to fill data gaps and assess offsite risks to ecological and environmental receptors, prior to the design stage. It was proposed that a sampling plan covering the Panel's concerns should be submitted to the Ministry for approval prior to the project commencing.
 - d. agreed that several site-specific management plans would be necessary to address all the risks and issues the project faces, including some that were overlooked. The safety of workers and the scrutiny the project is likely to endure needs to be addressed through

- robust risk management. All proposed mitigation/management strategies should be critically evaluated for their impact on the completion and success of the project.
- e. felt that the estimated costs were high in relation to the proposed tasks and activities and that a detailed cost analysis was necessary. With a more detailed breakdown of costs and landowners DOC and ICC financial contributions, 42% funding was considered appropriate.
 - f. that the Ministry needed to be satisfied that the project does not end up being management of coastal erosion issue rather than remediation of a contaminated site.
61. The Panel therefore recommended funding is approved conditional to the following being provided during the Stage II process and prior to the deed being signed:
 - a. a site-specific Health Safety and Environment Plan, and a Communications Management Plan.
 - b. a detailed costing for the remedial action plan
 - c. a detailed sampling plan
 - d. a Terms of Reference for the Governance Group that details the functions, make-up, and procedures of the Group.
 62. The intent of the conditions of funding recommended is to set the projects on a pathway to success whilst reducing potential risks to the Ministry. Ministry officials will address the details of these conditions, the acceptable standard the Plans are to meet with the applicants during the project planning stage.
 63. Table 2 is an overview of the applications received. A summary of the minutes from the Panel's assessment meeting are included in Appendix 1.
 64. The Ministry considers the applications have clearly demonstrated their project benefits and/or how they will improve environmental and human health outcomes.
 65. The Ministry endorses the Panel's recommendations. We consider the Panel undertook a robust assessment of the applications against the Fund's assessment criteria.

Table 2: Overview of applications and Panel comments

Project Name	Applicant	Project Phase	Total Project Cost	CSRF Funding Requested	Funding \$/%	Comments
Oamaru Gasworks Project	Otago Regional Council	2 – Site Investigation 3 – Remedial Planning	\$424,867	\$197,666	47%	Recommend funding approved subject to conditions
Ocean Beach Landfill Project	Environment Southland	3 – Remedial Planning	\$422,900	\$177,500	42%	Recommended funding approved subject to conditions
Total			\$847,767	\$375,166		

Updates to the CSRF Priority List following Round 2 – 2020/21

66. The Ministry reviews the Priority List prior to each funding round. Regional councils usually provide details for new sites in the form of applications to the CSRF. When sites have been successfully managed or remediated, they are removed from the Priority List. It is not a comprehensive list of all the contaminated sites in New Zealand.
67. Following any revisions, we provide you with a revised Priority List for approval. As Minister for the Environment, you approve the Priority List for publication in conjunction with CSRF funding rounds. You last approved publications of the updated Priority List in December 2020/21 Funding Recommendations Briefing Note [2020-B-07304]. The Priority List has, with the addition of the Oamaru Gasworks, changed since then. A copy of the updated Priority List is attached as Appendix 2.

Risks and mitigations

68. The Panel has conducted a rigorous assessment of all applications against the Fund's criteria. The assessment process enables the Panel to determine the extent to which and how well the project meets the assessment criteria so that the Ministry can be satisfied the applicant has demonstrated capabilities and formed the appropriate partnerships, to successfully investigate and remediate a contaminated site, and to properly manage the funding received.
69. If a project is funded outside of the Ministry's recommendations (for example, allowed to proceed without adequate certainty, or without the conditions of funding) there is an increased risk that the project will either not support the intended outcomes or not meet its stated objectives.
70. If a project is not approved for funding, there is an increased risk that the regional council will not have appropriate funds to commit to the site and the cost to investigate the sites may fall on the local rate payers.
71. The Funds eligibility and assessment criteria are intended to ensure the Ministry can assess the project's viability and value to ensure a project will be completed to the standards required by the Ministry and to ensure there is accountability for the use of public funds.
72. The CSRF assessment process enables the Panel to evaluate whether objectives and goals are achievable and timely, the project costs are sufficient and reasonable for the activities proposed, and whether the risks, benefits, strategic values, and effectiveness of the project will contribute to the community values and aspirations for the site. The assessment enables to Panel to ensure that the appropriate roles, groups, and processes are put in place, giving greater certainty that decisions will be made consistently and robustly, money is spent responsibly, and that change, increased project costs and risk are addressed and managed effectively, prior to a funding decision being made.
73. The assessment process also enables the Panel to determine if a landfill remediation project is proposing remedial strategies relating to contamination effects or to coastal erosion effects. The CSRF has received and declined several applications seeking to undertake coastal protection type of work. However, the Government's Community Resilience Work Programme and the Ministry's National Climate Change Risk Assessment are investigating coastal protection solutions to help councils with landfills at risk from the effects of climate

change. There is potential for any CSRF funding for vulnerable landfills to conflict with this work or set a precedent that undermines or predetermines any processes developed.

Legal issues

Financial, regulatory, and legislative implications

74. Appropriation of \$2.628M is currently available for the 2021/2022 financial year.
75. If you accept the two projects for funding, this will require \$375,166 from the Fund. There will be approximately \$2.25M available for Round 2 2021/2022, to be run in September 2021, unless any emergency/priority funding is allocated outside of the normal funding rounds.
76. If you decline the two projects for funding, the full appropriation will be available for Round 2 2021/2022, to be run in September 2021, unless any emergency/priority funding is allocated outside of the normal funding rounds.
77. Ministry officials have been informed by Regional Councils that there are several sites that may apply for funding to Round 2 2021/2022.

Next Steps

78. Following your decision, we will:
 - a. Advise successful and unsuccessful applicants on the outcomes of their applications.
 - b. Enter negotiations with successful applications to agree the final scope of their project and address any conditions of funding; and,
79. Publish the updated Priority List on the Ministry's website.

Proactively released under the Official Information Act 1982

Appendices

1. Applications Recommended for Funding
2. CSRF Priority List
3. Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund Eligibility and Assessment Criteria

Proactively released under the Official Informations Act 1982

Appendix 2. Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund - Priority List

Updated CSRF Priority List – as at 24 May 2021

Rank	Site Name	Town/City	Regional Council	CSRF Funded Project	Description
1	Historic Christchurch Landfill	Christchurch	Environment Canterbury	Current Project: Phase 2 – Site Investigation (2017/18)	The site includes several residential properties impacted by historical landfilling. Several un-associated investigations have taken place on individual properties, mainly because of insurance works after the Canterbury Earthquakes in 2010/11 which identified fill material and exceedances of relevant human health guidelines. HAIL Category: G3
2	Concours Electroplaters	Timaru	Environment Canterbury	Past Projects: Phase 2 – Site Investigation Phase 3 – Remedial Planning (2019/20)	A former electroplating works was used to store large volumes of hazardous chemicals. A preliminary site investigation which took place in June 2016 indicated that the soil on the site may be contaminated from the electroplating works and hazardous waste stored on the site. The hazardous waste was removed from the site in late 2016. Further investigation has been undertaken to determine the extent of contamination on the site and the preferred remedial option that will inform development of the RAP. HAIL Categories: D3 A4 A17
3	Puhipuhi Mine	Whangarei	Northland Regional Council	Current Projects: Phase 2 – Site Investigation Phase 3 – Remedial Planning (2020/21)	The mine site occupies an area of about 5 ha within the 32.5 ha of the Waikiore Conservation Area and is a significant historic site in Whangarei. Between 1910 and 1945, the mining of cinnabar and disposal of waste tailings has resulted in the contamination of the surrounding soils and nearby watercourses. The historic mine site is potentially impacted by a variety of contamination sources such as infrastructure, buildings, and the mining activities. The full extent of contamination is unknown. HAIL Categories: E.7, G3, G5, A.17, D.5, E.1 and I
4	Kopeopeo Canal	Whakatāne	Bay of Plenty Regional Council	Past Project: Phase 4 – Remediation (2016/17)	The Kopeopeo Canal was constructed to carry surface run-off and flood waters from low lying farmland in the Rangitāiki plains into the Whakatāne Estuary. Between 1950 and 1989 the canal was contaminated by dioxin from surface run-off and storm water discharges from the NZ Forest Products Ltd Sawmill. Investigations in 2005 found that the levels of dioxins in the sediment and in eels were elevated. The remediation project of the portion of the Canal was successfully completed in 2020. HAIL Category: H
5	Waikanae Stream	Gisborne	Gisborne District Council	Past Project: Phase 2 – Site Investigation (2016/17)	There are several industrial and landfill sites situated in the Waikanae Stream catchment. These sites are potentially discharging contaminants into the stream and negatively affecting human and environmental health
6	Ocean Beach Landfill	Bluff	Southland Regional Council	Past Project: Phase 2 – Site Investigation (2019/20)	Asbestos was discovered at the beach adjacent to the former Frozen Meat Company freezing works. Historically, the rear of the former freezing works has been used to carry out landfilling and rubbish dumping. The full extent of landfilling in the area has been determined, the investigation informing the assessment of remedial options. HAIL Categories: A16, G3
7	Oamaru Gasworks	Oamaru	Otago Regional Council		The historic operation of the gasworks during 1860-1980 caused contamination in soils on site include hydrocarbons, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), benzene, cyanide, zinc, lead, copper, nickel, phenols, pH, and sulphide. Similar contaminants were also identified in waste materials that had been dumped over the rock wall. HAIL Categories: A7, G5
8	Onehunga Aquifer	Auckland	Auckland Council	N/A	The former New Zealand Farmers Fertiliser Works operated from 1910 to 1984. Fertiliser products were manufactured, stored, and handled onsite. Contamination of the site, groundwater and surface water was caused by on-site storage of raw material and effluent. Off-site effluent discharges have also affected nearby waterways including the Miami Stream and Manukau Harbour HAIL Category: A6
9	Miramar Gas Works	Miramar	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Past Project: Phase 2 – Site Investigation Phase 3 – Remedial Planning (2019/20)	The Wellington Gas Company operated a coal gas plant on the site between 1915 and 1972. Following demolition of the plant in 1972, the site was subdivided for industrial development and properties were sold to private purchasers. The former gasworks site is contaminated by a variety of organic compounds including polyaromatic hydrocarbons and benzene that are typical of gasworks waste. There is also some risk to the environment because of contaminated groundwater entering the storm water system and discharging into the Wellington Harbour. HAIL Category: A7
10	Te Mome Stream	Lower Hutt	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Past Project: Phase 2 – Site Investigation (2006/07)	A dead arm of the Hutt River receives stormwater from the Hutt Valley, main contamination concern is from a lead battery recycling plant. HAIL Category: B1

Appendix 1. Panel Meeting Minutes and Recommendations for funding through the Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund

Applicant	Location	Project outline and Panel comments (<u>project title</u> , brief project description, <i>summary of panel comments</i>)	Total Project Cost	CSRF \$ applied for	Panel recommendation (endorsed by the Ministry)	Minister Comment
Otago Regional Council	Oamaru	<p><u>Oamaru Gasworks (No. 7 CSRF Priority List)</u></p> <p>The Oamaru Gasworks project objective is to undertake intrusive works to characterise and delineate the extent of contamination and assess risks to human and environmental health; and to carry out a remedial options assessment and prepare a remedial action plan.</p> <p>Panel comments: <i>agreed</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel <i>were in agreement</i> that the application was eligible, and that the potential risk to human health and the environment had been clearly demonstrated. There was <i>good</i> consensus that the project was worthwhile and would be an opportunity to be strategically valuable. The Working Party Group is made up of key stakeholders, but the roles and responsibilities need to be clearly defined through a Terms of Reference. It was determined that several site-specific management plans would be necessary to critically evaluate and manage the risks identified, and that the Ministry would need to review the plans. It was agreed that, subject to a condition about submitting the required plans, 47% funding was appropriate for the project. The Panel reached a unanimous decision to recommend declining funding this project for this funding round. <p>Risks and Mitigations: There are no significant risks identified with this project at this time.</p>	\$424,867	\$197,666	<p><u>Panel Recommendation</u> – Approve funding subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A site-specific Health and Safety Plan, Communications Management Plan, and Wildlife Management Plan, are to be submitted to MfE for approval during the Stage II process. The Terms of Reference for the Working Party Group that includes the functions, make-up, and procedure of the Group is to be submitted to MfE for approval prior to the deed being signed. 	
Environment Southland	Bluff	<p><u>Ocean Beach Landfill (No. 6 CSRF Priority List)</u></p> <p>The Ocean Beach Landfill project objective is to undertake remedial planning and prepare a remedial action plan (RAP) recommending the appropriate actions to isolate, manage or remove the risks.</p> <p>Panel Comments: <i>agreed</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel <i>were in agreement</i> that the application was eligible, and that the contamination risk to human health and the environment had been clearly demonstrated. There was <i>good</i> consensus that the project would enhance and protect the site, the public and the coastal area. The Panel felt sustainable remediation options have the potential to be of high strategic value if the learnings can be shared with other agencies. The Project Governance structure included key stakeholders and specialist and experienced persons, but the roles and responsibilities need to be clearly defined through a Terms of Reference. It was determined that some additional sampling and a detailed cost analysis was necessary. Site-specific risk management plans were also needed to address safety of workers and the scrutiny the project is likely to endure. It was agreed that, subject to conditions, 42% funding was appropriate for the project. The Panel reached a unanimous decision to recommend funding this project for this round. <p>Risks and Mitigations: There are no significant risks identified with this project at this time.</p>	\$422,900	\$177,500	<p><u>Panel Recommendation</u> – Approve funding subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A site-specific Health Safety and Environment Plan, and a Communications Management Plan to be submitted to MfE for approval during the Stage II process. A detailed cost analysis and sampling plan prior to design to be submitted to MfE for approval during the Stage II process A Terms of Reference for the Governance Group that includes the functions, make-up, and procedure of the Group to be submitted to MfE for approval prior to the deed being signed. 	

Provisionally released under the Official Information Act 1982



Appendix 3: Contaminated Sites Remediation Fund Eligibility and Assessment Criteria

Eligibility Criteria	
1	A project will only be considered for funding after a completed application form has been submitted to the Ministry.
2	The site must have been undertaking activities likely to result in site contamination at one of the following points in time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> before the Resource Management Act (RMA) was enacted in 1991 after the RMA was enacted in 1991 but no enforcement could be undertaken by RCs, ORs or territorial authorities to investigate and/or remediate the contamination, and the activities that caused the contamination have since stopped.
3	The application must be for one or more of the following phases of remediation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> two – detailed site investigation three – remediation planning four – site remediation. Note that funding is not available for phase one (desk top study).
4	Funding is only requested for the years in which the site investigation, remediation planning and site remediation are undertaken.
5	Funding may not be used for retrospective costs (ie, for work undertaken before the application form was received by the Ministry) or for works undertaken that are outside the scope of the funding deed.
6	The application must be received from a regional council/unitary authority.

Assessment Criteria & Guidance	
Partnerships	Is there a demonstrated partnership between the regional council/unitary authority and other interested parties?
Risk	Does the site pose (or potentially pose) significant risk to human health or to the environment?
Project management	Has the project manager and/or regional council/unitary authority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrated their project management expertise using best practice project management methodologies and tools established appropriate project management structures demonstrated capability to undertake the project (including the practicality and feasibility of the proposed actions)?
Priority	Does the site hold a ranking on the CSRF Priority List?
Responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does funding reflect the responsibility for the contamination? Does the landowner/occupier's contribution towards the project costs reflect their degree of responsibility for contaminating the site (fully or partially)?
Capability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do contributions from other parties reflect on their ability and/or willingness to contribute to the project?