
NEIGHBOURHOOD LIAISON GROUP

MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the Neighbourhood Liaison Group (NLG) held in Council Chambers, Horowhenua District Council, Oxford Street Levin on 27 August 2019 at 6.00pm.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Facilitator	Jacinta Liddell
Charles Rudd	David Clapperton (HDC)
Kerry Wales	Greg Carlyon
Jenny Rowan	Geoff Keith
Darryl Tatana	Ryan Hughes (HDC)
Phil Landmark (Stantec)	Yvette Falloon (HDC)
Trevor Hinder	Viv Bold
David Moore	Chevy Tatana
Vicki Compton	Julie Steynen (HDC)

Welcome

Jacinta welcomed the group and explained that she is acting facilitator this evening as David Forrest was unavailable. Jacinta asked people to be kind as previous meetings have been somewhat controversial contentious and confusing.

Karakia

Charles Rudd opened the meeting with Karakia

Round the Table Introductions

Jacinta: Own property affected by the Landfill

Natasha Breen: HDC

David Moore: NLG & Ngati Pareraukawa

Geoff Keith: Resident Hokio Beach, Chair WECA, CNLG and NLG

Vicki Compton: Resident

Yvette Falloon: HDC

Ryan Hughes: HDC

Julie Steynen: HDC

Phil Landmark: Stantec Consulting involved in Design and Operation of Levin Landfill

David Clapperton: Chief Executive Officer HDC

Jenny Rowan: Community Representative on the Project Management Group, From Taranaki, Mountain is Mount Taranaki and River is Whanganui, family from Scotland and Ireland, live in Paekakariki, happy to be part of this very important conversation for the Horowhenua

Trevor Hinder: Treasurer of WECA, has over 50 years of Environmental Engagement

Kerry Wales: Resident Hokio Sand Road

Viv Bold: Chair of Hokio Progressive Association and resident of Hokio for 64 years

Charles Rudd: NLG, environmentalist

Daryl Tatana: Own 2 properties adjoining the Landfill

Chevy Tatana: Neighbouring properties of Landfill

Greg Carlyon: Project Manager for the Landfill Agreement

Agreement on Appropriate Conduct Brainstorming Session

Behaviours

- No raising of voice
- No interrupting
- No shouting at each other
- No talking over the other person
- Use respectful language
- We can call time out if discussions become heated
- We use consensus minus one for decision making
- Treat each other as adults
- Mobile phones will be on silent
- Be considerate of time – facilitator can intervene
- Emphasis on working together positively

Value/Perspective

- No such thing as a dumb question
- All points of view are valid
- We respect each other by making space for each other
- Everybody to get the opportunity to speak
- We agree to disagree at times

Charles objected to the brainstorming session and questioned how many attendees were NLG Members.

Jacinta advised that she is trying to ensure this meeting is run respectfully as has not been the case at previous meetings.

David Moore raised his concern and disappointment that a representative was not in attendance from Horizons Regional Council and that the meeting did not reach its quorum.

Ryan advised that he had spoken with Hamish Sutherland today who confirmed that this can stand as an official NLG meeting without Horizons Regional Council present and noted there may have been some confusion around the purpose of the meeting being around the Landfill Agreement.

David Clapperton will write to the Chief Executive of Horizons Regional Council pointing out the responsibilities they have to the NLG Group and that a representative be present at NLG Meetings

Apologies

Pataka Moore, Peter Everton, Hamish Sutherland (HRC) and Rachael Selby

Confirmation Of Previous Meeting Minutes 4 April 2019 and Matters Arising

The Facilitator has created a list of outstanding processes, actions and issues and requests from the previous 3 NLG Meetings and circulated this to the group.

Charles Rudd advised he would not abide by anything the Facilitator said until he got legal advice as they are not NLG.

The Facilitator reminded Charles of the agreements made in the brainstorming session.

What	Is this sorted? If not how do we deal with this?	When
NLG PROCESSES		
Not clear who is able to attend meetings	Parked until later in the Agenda	
Minutes: what is to be recorded, how they are to be amended, when they are to be distributed. How people are to be referred to in the minutes		
Who sets the agenda?		
What is and isn't appropriate to discuss at NLG meetings		
The need for a Code of Conduct for NLG meetings that all agree to		
The request for questions to HDC and Horizons to be sent in advance		
Could we create an MOU to clear up confusion?		
ACTIONS		
HDC will investigate what type of waste might cause high boron levels	Ryan advised this was addressed at an earlier meeting and will re-circulate	ACTION: Ryan to send information in an Email to NLG (Hard copy to Charles) To include what high levels of Boron would mean to the community
HDC will investigate the effects(including accumulative) the LWDS water leaving the landfill has on the wildlife in Hokio Stream	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ryan sought clarification on what information is sought. • Geoff Keith responded that it is trend data over time including the effect of a range of pollutions on native fish life • Trevor Hinder added any changes in the type of vegetation which is part of the food chain. The whole stream • David Clapperton asked how this is done for just the Landfill and that a separate exercise should be done on the Hokio Stream itself then determine where it is coming from. • Ryan advised that this should be directed to HRC as it is a Stream Management Issue 	ACTION/OUTCOME Greg will circulate Logan, Kate and Olivier's evidence and this will be revisited after that Ryan to ensure Viv Bold received the reports going forward Natasha Agenda Item added for Stream Monitoring

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phill noted that this is a complex question as the Hokio Stream has several inputs and needs a lot more consideration with a clearly defined scope and that the work that Tonkin & Taylor do may provide some of the answers • Geoff Keith as if there is some way of testing upstream of the Tatana Drain and comparing with outflow of Tatana Drain to the Stream • Jenny said she would have thought that testing would be taking place as part of the conditions of the consent and to consult the RMA for its definition of Accumulative Effect • Ryan noted that Tatana's Drain has been sampled 4 times a year for a number of years and also upstream, midstream and downstream from Tatana's Drain which is provided in the Quarterly and Annual Monitoring Reports. Ryan expanded on the sampling that takes place. This data is reported and if you would like to receive it please let him know • Viv noted that they believe the discharge is coming from further up than the Tatana Drain and to provide figures/percentages with the information • Ryan responded that this is taking place and the concentrations are reported every quarter 	
<p>Malcolm will talk with Tonkin and Taylor to get further clarification of the context of their report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ryan advised that several attempts have been made for Malcolm to meet with the Consultants and requested this action be removed. It was agreed. 	<p>ACTION/OUTCOME</p>
<p>Jacinta and David C to meet to go over proposal for a Restorative Justice Process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David C advised that Bronwyn Kerr has been engaged to go through a process with NLG • Jacinta wonders if the NLG is the right space to deal with emotionally charged issues and now with a process in place the past hurts, mending relationships etc. may be referred to the 	<p>ACTION/OUTCOME It was agreed that Bronwyn proceed with the process</p>

	<p>Restorative Justices Process instead of at the NLG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ryan noted he feels that the NLG is now working towards a common goal • Charles advised he does not think it is wise and should be kept with the NLG Charles further advised he has met with Bronwyn once and will be meeting with her again and that we are getting away from what we are here for • Jacinta responded that the point of the process is to deal properly with the abuse and hurt that has happened in the past • David M added he is supportive of the process but the restoration is the important thing and that will bring justice • Geoff K agreed that there is hurt in the Community but some who are carrying that hurt are choosing not to be here • Jacinta asked if the NLG is the place to be dealing with emotionally charged issues • David M responded he believes that basic issues of Community involvement, correct/honest communication and reasonable behaviour in past have been lots of cases where this has not occurred and can only deal with at a forum like this. • Charles supported David M • Trevor asked if there was a way to draw a line in the sand to move forward • David C noted that he thinks Bronwyn should continue with the process and this decision is held until that takes place • Jenny supported the process as it supports the apology to the Community 	
<p>Ryan to write to KCDC clarifying his email regarding compliance with a copy to David M</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David M noted that this action is as result of misleading information supplied to KCDC by HDC and David M requested it be put right 	<p>ACTION/OUTCOME Letter has now been sent</p> <p>Follow up action to ensure that David M comfortable with what has been done</p>

ISSUES		
Some members of the NLG feel the consent conditions were forced upon them by the 2015 review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Person who raised is absent and not discussed 	ACTION/OUTCOME
How the new Landfill Agreement was done, who was and wasn't involved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charles noted that without NLG people like Malcolm Hadlum and Peter Everton this decision cannot be made Charles further noted that the CNLG has no jurisdiction over the NLG and cannot make decisions 	ACTION/OUTCOME
The date at which it comes into effect? Either when it was signed by HDC or when it was signed off in the Environment Court.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is a separate Agenda Item to be discussed later 	ACTION/OUTCOME
Uncertainty about the integrity of the Agreement – does it annul previous agreements. Is there any conflict of interest for some attending NLG members?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed part of the Restorative Justice Process 	ACTION/OUTCOME
Disagreement on accuracy of Horizon's Annual Compliance Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> David M has no faith in HRC addressing this but happy to follow through in Restorative Justice Process Jenny suggested adding items like this to the Agenda for HRC to comment Greg advised that part of the Landfill Agreement there is opportunity to obtain independent expert to annually review monitoring information and compliance undertaken by HRC Trevor noted the NLG should know if the Landfill is compliant or not Greg responded that an expectation of the PMG is if there is non-compliance the PMG is alerted immediately and follows up on your behalf 	ACTION/OUTCOME
Different interpretations of what reports actually say and their relevance to NLG meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Facilitator suggested a library be created where all reports are in one place with a brief summary (with hard copies) Ryan noted when the Solid Waste Newsletter is distributed it includes several previous quarterly reports and the last annual report Minutes and reports from the PMG are shared on the Council Website 	ACTION/OUTCOME An online platform for reports to be accessed by the NLG

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jenny noted this is the transparency trust part of the jigsaw puzzle • Trevor raised that minutes of meetings need to come out promptly after meetings and not just before the next meeting 	
Confusion around the parameters of the various reports	Covered above	ACTION/OUTCOME
Confusion around which reports are relevant today	Covered above	ACTION/OUTCOME
Distrust within the NLG of Horizons and HDC processes	Covered above	ACTION/OUTCOME
NLG takes issue with leachate leaving landfill site to be treated at the waste water treatment plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trevor asked if there is a consent to do that? • David M responded that it was considered to be a non-notifiable process • Viv commented fish have been seen dead a Hokio Bridge and Waiwiri Stream so the leachate that is coming from dump is the same as coming out The Pot therefore there is something happening. HRC have fobbed us off. All we wanted was a sign which we made ourselves in the end • The Facilitator responded that this is a huge issue that will take time to go through • David C responded that is not an issue but a lack of understanding. Leachate that comes from the Landfill goes to the Treatment Plant is treated at the Treatment Plant. The assumption that leachate is going straight to The Pot is incorrect. • Trevor responded that testing needs to be done to see if leachate is contaminating The Pot • Viv said they have heard that the bacteria count is the same at the Landfill, Pot and Treatment Plant • David C noted that if people are making incorrect statements like that refer them to him in the first instance • Phil advised treating leachate at the Treatment Plant is the most common way of treating it 	HDC to arrange for a specialist to come to NLG meeting to explain leachate treatment process
REQUESTS		

That the 2002 plan be respected (Eugene)	David M advised that the 2002 conditions were superseded by 2010 review which were also superseded by the 2016 review	ACTION/OUTCOME
That the minutes of the 2015 meeting be tabled (David C)		ACTION/OUTCOME To be followed up
That the coliform in the bores be tested quarterly rather than annually (Phil)		ACTION/OUTCOME Now included in sampling programme
That questions for Horizons and HDC be sent in advance (David C)		ACTION/OUTCOME Agreed
An onsite meeting at the landfill be organised (Peter)	Email Ryan if you would like to attend Trevor suggested someone takes video footage of the site for sharing	ACTION/OUTCOME Ryan advised attempts have been made Ryan to take video footage of landfill to be shared
That the Lake Trustees confirm their representative (Charles)		ACTION/OUTCOME Item to remain
That the new Landfill Agreement be made available for the public so they could see the benefits (Geoff)		ACTION/OUTCOME Available on HDC website
That a senior member from Horizons attend the NLG (Pataka and Michael)		ACTION/OUTCOME Item to remain
That part of Horizon's 2017/2018 report be retracted, reviewed and corrected (David M)	David M is doubtful this will happen and is troubled by the tone of the report and wait till Horizons member is in attendance	ACTION/OUTCOME Natasha to draft letter to HRC David M to send Natasha bullet points
The title of the Stantec report Levin Landfill Annual Compliance Report July 2017 – June 2018 to be modified (David M)		ACTION/OUTCOME Complete
That the NLG membership include all those who have a genuine interest and who make it a priority (Charles and Malcolm)		ACTION/OUTCOME To be covered later in meeting
That a MOU be created to clarify membership of the NLG (David F)	Charles advised that this information is already contained in Discharge Permit 6009 bullet point 32-34	ACTION/OUTCOME
That the Environment Court be correctly named (not environmental court) in minutes (David F)		ACTION/OUTCOME Noted
To review the lessons learned from 2008/2009 (Phil)	Phil updated that there has been a lot of progress made since the 2010 review however in subsequent years there was a downward turn in relationships	ACTION/OUTCOME
That her name be added to the attendees list 12 March (Vivienne)		ACTION/OUTCOME Noted

Viv Bold raised an issue for HRC that when they called regarding smells they are told it will take an hour or more to get to the site to monitor it which puts Public off calling.

Ryan responded that all calls to HRC and HDC are recorded and the issue will be verification by HRC of that event.

Moved: David Clapperton Seconded: Ryan Hughes

“THAT the Meeting Minutes be accepted”

CARRIED

Update from the Hokio Landfill Project Management Group

NLG Processes

It was agreed that this item takes place when the Independent Facilitator is appointed.

Charles noted that the agreement by the CNLG that went to Environmental Court, those who did not signed the agreement was because we did not have our day in court and gave warning that when it goes through court it could be challenged.

Nominations for The Independent Facilitator Role

David M suggested that expressions of interest or nominations are sought for consideration.

Greg advised there is a clear link between the conditions and the Landfill Agreement. In the event that there is a significant challenge in the PMG around making a determination or in day to day business there is a role for the Facilitator generated by the NLG conditions.

Greg further advised that consideration is request for the right type of person who can assist NLG and PMG.

Geoff, Trevor, Jenny and Pataka volunteered (David M will let Pataka know) to form a panel for reviewing nominations for Independent Facilitator.

Update from the Hokio Landfill Project Management Group

Greg C provided a copy to meeting participants of the Project Management Group update, for ease of reference please find attached a copy of this update accompanying the meeting notes.

Key Notes from PMG Update – Refer to Handout for full details

- Meeting as frequently as required
- Group is functioning incredibly well
- One key function is to establish the Technical Advisory Group
- Phil, Chris and Simone from Tonkin & Taylor has been engage to provide Independent Expert Advise
- We are looking for early closure of Landfill
- Meeting with Technical Advisors in early October
- There are significant challenges at the Landfill
- Tonkin & Taylor want their position to be informed by the data
- The Apology is critical and work is underway

- The Apology will come from the Council
- Co-Chairs are meeting with Council regularly
- Will keep Community informed
- The reconciliation process is intended to bring the Community together
- Council has agreed to meet the Professional Costs of the Community Groups involved in litigation
- Potential further legal action – possibility is always there for any party
- Environment Court has met once
- Feel free to contact PMG members – Lisa and Jenny are Co-Chairs

Trevor asked if it is true for all sub parts of the agreements that the PMG are within the timeframe for the Landfill Agreement?

Greg responded that if there are concerns that not meeting timeframe requirement please raise them and Greg is confident and clarified that an update is being provided to the Environment Court in December on the Landfill plans.

Jenny advised that it is a privilege to serve on the PMG there is a collective discipline to address this properly and legally, with deep desire of the healing process that needs to take place. Principles of Engagement by Ngati Pareraukawa are in place. Jenny again stressed the importance of the apology and the way that it is delivered.

Jenny noted that she is also committed to see the Landfill Closed as soon as possible and aware of the existing contracts that are in place.

Jenny thanks Jacinta for an excellent meeting this evening.

David C added that he made a conscious decision to be on the PMG as he believes it is very important to have leadership around this important initiative.

David C noted that he should have perhaps previously met with Darryl and Chevy Tatana regarding Landfill Agreement and asked for group to respect that they are affected parties.

Jenny advised that the Environment Court are overseeing this process and as far as Jenny is concerned we are still inside the Courts view.

Greg further added that there are declaratory and Enforcement Proceedings that stay live so options are open to The Community to reinvigorate Legal Proceedings.

Geoff thanked the members of the PMG and noted it is heartening to get into the actual process of The Agreement being taken seriously and worked through.

Ryan added that the soft plastics may need to be taken to Landfill prior to the next NLG Meeting.

Trevor referred to the trucks that have Zero Waste on them and asked if that is true, further added that he is for Waste Minimisation and that stated it should be run parallel with the closure.

Ryan responded that Trevor is referring to the Zero Waste Hero Slogan which was a Facebook competition run through the Council Facebook page to bring to the forefront the new recycling system and the perspective Council would like people to take on it. Ryan noted that the person who entered that slogan intended it to mean Zero Waste to Landfill.

Trevor questioned if Council runs a forum for Waste Minimisation.

Ryan responded that there has been interest from The Community and Council has facilitated what it can and are happy to help out where they can and advised he is happy to have this discussion but it would be outside of this group and it is not a function of the NLG.

Trevor noted his question was that there should be an organisation trying to Minimise Waste going forward and tackling the big problems.

David C added that he believes the Recycling Programme that Council has recently put in place will make a difference in mindset in the Community.

Ryan advised the Council are running Zero Waste Workshops that are open to the Community and are actively doing what they can.

General Business

Ryan updated that the new kerbside recycling system is in place and that there is around 200-300 tons of soft plastics that are likely to have to go to Landfill, all other avenues have been exhausted and no one wants it.

Next Meeting Date:

Early December 2019

Meeting Closure and Karakia

Charles Rudd closed the meeting with a Karakia

ACTION LIST

Action Item	Person/s Responsible	Status
David Clapperton to write to CE of HRC reminding them of their responsibilities to the NLG Meetings	David C	
Outline the Process for the Independent Facilitator Role	Greg C/David M	
Invitation to be sent inviting people to put names forward for Independent Facilitator Role	David C said this	