

Minutes
Redvale Landfill
Community Liaison Committee Meeting
Held at the Redvale Landfill Office- Monday 14/07/2025 at 6:30 pm

Meeting started at: 6:30 pm.

Attendees:

W Hojem (Chairman), B Gibbs, K Hills (School), M Drury (PRP), L Johnston (Local Board Member), A McNeil, N de Witte (RESPI), T Cowley, K Mason, A Parsonage, L Bentley (AC), E Singh (AC), G Jujnovich (WM), E Maehl (WM), J Jefferis (WM), M McSaveney (WM), I Cronin Knight (WM), T Wiggill.

Apologies:

L Richardson (RESPI), R Hopkins

Absent:

Iwi Representation

Minutes of Previous Meeting:

The minutes were not circulated. It was agreed that they will be reviewed and approved at the next meeting.

1. Email Correspondence In/Out:

Not discussed, as this was a special meeting.

2. Matters arising:

To be addressed at the next scheduled meeting in September 2025.

3. REPSI Questions:

- I. Glen: I requested PRP Reports on at least one occasion, possibly twice, over the preceding period prior to March 3, 2025. Why weren't my requests recorded in the minutes, and why weren't the reports made available to the CLC at the required times?
 - G Jujnovich confirmed all overdue PRP reports have now been circulated.
 - E Singh will develop an improvement plan with the PRP to ensure timely distribution.
 - M Drury recommended reinstating PRP reports as a standing agenda item.
 - T Wiggill to update the agenda template accordingly.

Action
T Wiggill
- II. Mark Drury: It has been standard practice for the PRP member to table the PRP Reports as they became available at CLC meetings. Why didn't you bring this to the attention of the CLC or WM that the reports weren't available at the meetings you attended?
 - M Drury acknowledged the oversight.
- III. Elizabeth-AC and Mark Drury: Condition 22 requires the LMP to be reviewed annually. Please provide details of the annual reviews and any amendments required. Additionally, please provide details for any waiver of the annual review from 2017, as per condition 27D.
 - L Bentley explained that the PRP reviews all monitoring activities at the WM site and provides technical feedback on complex reports. Their role is to assist both AC and the CLC in understanding the scientific monitoring being conducted.
 - A Parsonage asked whether, as of today, AC had identified any concerns based on the reports.
 - E Singh referred to the most recent PRP Report (No. 65), which was reviewed by AC's landfill specialists. She noted that WM is generally compliant, though there is room for improvement. Recommendations have been provided to WM.
 - E Singh suggested that a standing item be added to future agendas for AC to provide a compliance review at each CLC meeting.
 - T Wiggill to update the agenda accordingly.

Action
T Wiggill

- N de Witte asked Auckland Council whether the landfill consent is reviewed annually, or if this is the first major review.
 - L Bentley responded that a major review was conducted in 2021 when the Landfill Management Plan (LMP) was submitted. At that time, the LMP was found to be unsatisfactory and was only finalised in 2024. The current 2025 LMP is now under review, and moving forward, the LMP will be streamlined and reviewed annually.
- IV.** Glen: At the August 2023 CLC meeting, I asked you if the landfill suffered any damage from the January/February floods. Your response was emphatic no. However, from reading the PRP Reports, it does indicate that there was damage to the landfill. Please clarify this.
- G Jujnovich reported no structural damage, only minor differential settlement around LM1A.
- V.** Mark Drury and Glen: PRP Report 65 mentions that leachate from LCS3 has entered an adjacent finger pond. Could you please provide the amount of leachate that entered the pond, the level of contamination, and where the affected water was disposed of?
- G Jujnovich During LCS3 maintenance a small leak discharged minor leachate into a finger pond drain; it was contained, removed for off-site treatment, and no downstream contamination occurred.
- VI.** Glen: The last Dairy Flat Newsletter stated that it is going paperless. Condition 27C requires the WM to give notice of upcoming meetings in local media, such as the Dairy Flat Newsletter. This is the only medium you have to liaise with your local community, and you want to stop it!
- N de Witte expressed concern that a paperless newsletter could reduce community reach and suggested a two-page printed summary be delivered to letterboxes.
 - G Jujnovich confirmed newsletters remain available online and agreed to investigate digital-download metrics.
 - W Hojem asked for download-rate data to justify future printed distribution.
- Action**
G Jujnovich
- VII.** Glen: Air Quality Consulting NZ Report 2024. Has WM implemented any of the recommendations yet? If so, which ones? Are there any recommendations that WM will not implement, and if so, why?
- G Jujnovich confirmed all Air Quality Consulting NZ recommendations have been addressed; odour assessments are conducted downwind of complaints, reported via the Power BI app within one working day, and an improved automated acknowledgement system is in development with One NZ.
 - A Parsonage reported inconsistent technician feedback and requested clearer acknowledgments; G Jujnovich will review past interactions and propose improvements.
 - W Hojem invited M Drury's comment on gas-well monitoring; Drury confirmed PRP satisfaction with current practices.
 - G Jujnovich noted a H₂S analyser trial is complete and the final report is under review.
 - N de Witte asked about handheld odour-detection devices; G Jujnovich is awaiting an environmental engineer's recommendations.
 - K Hills suggested neighbour feedback on odour-cannon effectiveness; G Jujnovich will pass this to the project team.
 - G Jujnovich clarified that wind-direction data are recorded both on-site and at investigation locations for consistency.
- VIII.** Glen: Do you think there are any improvements that could be made to control odour to an acceptable level, both within the notional odour boundary and outside of it?
- G Jujnovich affirmed WM's odour management is robust but acknowledged room for improvement; N de Witte noted the high complaint rate.
 - G Jujnovich confirmed a blocked culvert was cleared and shot-blasted, leading to reduced odour.
 - J Jefferis reported a slight odour at 132 Horseshoe Bush Rd likely due to inadequate cover; WM uses end-of-day photo verification to ensure standards.

- M Drury WM operates seven odour cannons with an eighth arriving in ~12 weeks.
- N de Witte requested more detailed feedback on complaint responses; G Jujnovich will review and improve communication.
- K Mason queried the weighbridge odour-check process; G Jujnovich explained waste-type reviewed 30 minutes pre-complaint and operator alert procedures.
- I Cronin-Knight asked about waste acceptance criteria; G Jujnovich outlined the pre-approval and specialist-review process for special wastes.

IX. N de Witte: It's been noticed that some requirements of Condition 27E have been removed from the community webpage. For example, information about the CLC, its role, time, and venue, and the complaints procedure, including out-of-hours contact details and an online form for logging complaints.

- Why and when have these areas been removed and when they will be reinstated?
- G Jujnovich noted the CLC webpage lacks its stated purpose and that WM will update the complaints procedure, including after-hours contact to "24-hour contact number."
- WM confirmed it remains the primary out-of-hours contact (Council can also receive reports).
- L Bentley to provide details on Council's complaint-response process if requested.

X. Glen: I've noticed that the WM boundary has been tidied up and looks much better. However, some areas of planting on the HSB side of the chain link fence have disappeared, leaving the fence and landfill operations around the ponds visible. I do understand that the planting on the HSB side of the fence is not part of WM's property or in the LMP landscaping section, therefore not part of the conditions. Nevertheless, after the fence was erected in the early 2000s or thereabouts, many locals complained that the fence with barbed wire on top looked like a compound fence. WM agreed to plant in front of the fence to hide it. Could WM please reinstate planting to the areas where the fence and internal operations are now visible?

- G Jujnovich requested documentation of the original planting agreement.
- N de Witte stated that Chris Wills had approved planting at the time.
- G Jujnovich will review past minutes and consider carefully reinstating planting behind the fence.

Action
N de Witte

XI. Glen: For 30 years, WM has promised that the landfill will be used for recreational purposes shortly after its closure. However, we have recently been informed by you that recreational activities will not be possible at the landfill until 30 years after closure. I do understand that you have briefly explained the reasons behind this, but I did not find this satisfactory. Could you please provide a more detailed explanation so we can fully understand the reasoning behind this? How does WM propose to remedy the loss of this area and facility to the community?

- N de Witte questioned why closed landfill areas aren't available for recreation after two years, citing past advice from A Ross.
- G Jujnovich clarified that after 1 January 2029 a multi-year closure and aftercare period applies; a master plan and improved CLC communication will follow.
- M Drury explained that a 30-year aftercare period is standard to maintain gas-well access and monitor emissions.
- N de Witte requested a clear closure timeline; G Jujnovich will work with J Jefferis to develop one.
- B Gibbs suggested increasing the final cover to 3 metres for earlier access; G Jujnovich noted the consented design requires a 1 metre engineered clay cap (plus cover layers of daily, intermediate, and growth medium).

Action
G Jujnovich/J Jefferis

XII. Glen: Several items in the conditions and other information require regular reporting, primarily regulatory items such as reviews, LMP changes, airspace, and others. Some items are reported every six months or annually, while others are reported every CLC meeting. Over the years, the reporting process has been haphazard, with some items never being in the agenda or reported on, while others have come and gone. I would like to see the agenda updated to capture all the regulatory requirements from the conditions rather than relying on members' memories or incidents that trigger queries.

- Agenda amendments are already noted under earlier action items

XIII. Warwick/Glen: I am concerned that not all relevant items raised or discussed at CLC meetings are captured in the minutes. For example, at the last meeting, I mentioned the use of an odour app like the one used by Environment Canterbury. Jim Jefferis said he would follow up on this, but it is not included in the minutes. This is just one example, I am sure most other members would recall similar instances where items have not been recorded. Could both of you look into this?

- T Wiggill to ensure minutes are clearly marked as draft when sent to CLC members for review.
- L Johnston asked about increasing weekend daily cover to reduce odour; G Jujnovich will investigate (current cover is 300–500 mm).

Action
T Wiggill

4. Discussion on CLC roles and representation

- Warwick Hojem – Chairman, Nick de Witte – REPSI, Lloyd Richardson – REPSI, Tony Cowley – Dairy Flat Representation, Katherine Mason – Dairy Flat Representation, Rhys Hopkins – Horseshoe Bush Road, Bob Gibbs – Richards Road, Andrew McNeil – Tender Road, Angela Parsonage – Dairy Flat Highway
- A Parsonage leaves the meeting at 20:35pm.

5. WM to brief the CLC on the consultation process

- I Cronin Knight briefed on the next consultation phase (2/3) which will launch on July 28 for how we solve waste disposal in Auckland post Redvale ceasing taking waste in 2029 and ARL coming online. The solution to rebalance across existing landfills includes three potential options (reconsent Redvale; shift all waste to Whitford; split waste between sites). There are four variants under Option 3.
- WM presently favours Option 1 (status quo), but no decisions have been made, and this consultations feedback will be used as part of the Board.
- Community betterment was discussed which was agreed to work with local stakeholders to work through the priorities and how it would be administered, suggestion from N de Witte consider a 1 km boundary and W Hojem consider the prevailing wind.
- Engaged an independent resource to meet with neighbours 1on1 if they chose.
- Letters sent to all submitters if they wanted a 1on1 briefing before going live and sessions will be booked at the Dairy flat community. The next third and final stage of consultation will be around a resource consent application for the solution chosen and this will include all the technical expertise reports which accompany a consent application.
- Consultation closes 25 August.
- Key actions:
 - I Cronin Knight to work with W Hojem on community betterment and REPSI to consider how it might provide feedback.

6. Interim base line monitoring update

- J Jefferis confirmed baseline health monitoring (heavy metals and BTX compounds) is underway across all site directions and that all results to date meet health standards; VOCs will also be sampled using cloth shields over two-week periods.
- L Johnston requested asbestos testing in the Class 2 area; J Jefferis will evaluate adding asbestos to future assessments.
- W Hojem asked about Benevap particulate monitoring; J Jefferis will include dust-deposition gauges in the ongoing health risk assessment.

Meeting Closed at: 21:37