

From: Mark Goodlet
To: [StrategyandReform](#)
Subject: Environmental Risk Assessment Framework and Regulator Controls - Responses
Date: Thursday, 11 February 2016 12:19:29 PM
Attachments: [image002.jpg](#)

Comment on Guidance Statement of the Environmental Risk Assessment Framework.

1. I support the risk based approach to the assessment and regulation of prescribed premises.
2. The Department of Health WA has adopted the "Australian Guidelines for Water Recycling: Managing Health and Environmental Risks" which takes a risk based approach to the assessment of water recycling schemes, and which are often on prescribed premises. The current requirements to assess recycled water schemes under the "Australian Guidelines for Water Recycling: Managing Health and Environmental Risks" by the Department of Health WA necessitates a health and an environment risk assessment. This work is carried out, but the environmental risk assessment is effectively wasted because the focus of the Department of Health is with the health related risks and not the environmental risks. It is recommended that the Australian Guidelines for Water Recycling Managing Health and Environmental risks becomes the reference document for the Department of Environment's assessment of recycled water schemes. It is based on a risk approach and will eliminate the current situation in which the applicant completes the assessment of the requirements of the "Australian Guidelines for Water Recycling: Managing Health and Environmental Risks" which includes an environmental assessment but then discards the environmental assessment in the form required by the "Australian Guidelines for Water Recycling: Managing Health and Environmental Risks" and reconfigures the information for submission in a different format required by the Department of Environmental Regulation. Use of the Guidelines by both Departments for assessing these schemes would comply with a risk assessment approach and would provide applicants with a more streamlined passage for approvals. It is also a very comprehensive guidelines covering all aspects of a scheme and its use will improve the overall performance of the industries using recycled water. It is also recommended that a similar approach to be applied to the document "Australian Guidelines for Water Recycling: Managing Health and Environmental Risks (Phase 2) Managed Aquifer Recharge, respect to managed aquifer recharge projects.
3. Under part 1. (e) (i) of the "General Process for Assessments of the Regulatory Assessment Framework" refers to a referral of applications to "local government authorities , where the application is still under planning approval" it is unclear what this means and a number of possibilities may arise. The meaning of the words "still" and "under" in this context is unclear. Is it;
 - A) referring to a planning application which is live;
 - B) a development that has already been approved and is therefore is "still" live; or
 - C) making a distinction between development that is subject to local government planning approval as distinct from developments that are approved by other authorities eg: Swan River Trust, WAPC, SAT? Clarity on the intent of this clause needs to be provided and circulated to all local government for comment.

Comment on Guidance Statement of the Regulatory Controls Matrix.

1. The definition of a prescribed premise for recycled water schemes and for managed aquifer schemes needs consideration. The irrigation site for a recycled water scheme may or may not 'treat' wastewater and may simply dispose directly to the land. The current definition of the prescribed premise. Category 54, Sewage Treatment Facility, are premises "(a) on which sewage is treated (excluding septic tanks); or (b) from which treated sewage is discharged onto land or into waters." There is a typographical error with the doubling of the (a) and the (b). This aside my interpretation is that this is referring to the treatment facility and not the site where the irrigation is happening. In some instances, further treatment of the water by way of chlorination (for instance) is done at the irrigation site where there is short term storage occurring. This then begs the question, 'does this site become premises for the purpose of the Regulation?' My view is that the secondary treatment site should only be regarded as a prescribed premise when its activity removes a certain threshold amount of pollutant. A chlorinator, for example removes no pollutant, it simply kills bacteria. A filter, however, may remove particulates, this premise should then be assessed to see whether it removes a threshold amount of pollutant. If it does, then it too becomes a "prescribed premise". If not, it doesn't and the head treatment facility remains as the prescribed premises. It would be helpful to clarify this for recycled water and managed aquifer schemes in subsidiary guidelines.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Regards

Mark Goodlet
Director Technical Services

