

Organics Processing Plant Community Liaison Group Meeting

Minutes

6:30pm to 8pm, Tuesday 21 May 2024

Waitai-Coastal-Burwood-Linwood Community Boardroom

180 Smith Street, Woolston, Christchurch 8062

Executive summary of minutes

Community Liaison Group to remain focused on the consent of the Organics Processing Plant

Carl Pascoe (Chair) proposed to the group if this meeting should remain focused on the consent of the Organics Processing Plant (OPP) or widen to encompass other concerns from the Bromley community. It was agreed by the group on the former. Carl then proposed during the last five minutes of the meeting an opportunity would be provided to raise any other concerns with the community board.

Clarity provided around the interim solution with no consenting implications as previously thought

David McArdle (Christchurch City Council (CCC) staff) explained the interim solution; the OPP site has been cleared of material being stored outside and compost is now removed from site directly from the tunnels. The compost is being transported to Kate Valley Landfill and used as a capping material. This removes the need to bring topsoil to Kate Valley Landfill as has been done previously.

David provided clarity around Kate Valley Landfill's consenting limits for trucks movements. Up to 21,000 waste trips per year and no more than 550 trips per week. At present, 83% of this limit is being used. The current use of compost as a capping material is considered construction material, not waste going into the landfill. Therefore, did not contribute to the waste trip limit.

Lynette Ellis (CCC staff) shared that Kate Valley Landfill have confirmed a need for the compost as a capping material until the end of the year.

Bruce King (community) questioned the cost of providing this material from Christchurch. CCC staff confirmed existing budgets are being used.

Community still in agreeance about a reduction in odour from the Organics Processing Plant

Geoffrey King (community) tabled his odour report and commented that there have been less days of strong odour. Carl Pascoe (Chair) asked other community members about their odour experience of late. Carol Anderson (community), Michael Walker (community) and Margaret Macpherson (community) all agreed there has been significant improvements.

Michael Walker (community) suggested an audit on the processes, to identify where the remaining odour is coming from.

Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) raised Environment Canterbury's (ECAN) consent monitoring report and the issues identified. David McArdle (CCC staff) confirmed the consent monitoring report is an annual requirement of the consent and those issues have been resolved and an updated consent monitoring report issued confirming compliance.

Ōtautahi Organics Processing Solution update

Carl Pascoe (Chair) summarised the group's concern of the risk of odour moving from one community to another. Lynette reassured the group they are two different plants and Council aren't shifting a composting plant, but are changing the way that the organics are processed at the new location.

Alec McNeil (CCC staff) advised that while the new Organics Processing Facility (OPF) is subject to consent they won't revert to stockpiling outside at the OPP. The interim solution to take compost to Kate Valley Landfill to be used as a capping material will continue, regardless of any delays to the OPF timeline. Alec acknowledged the community's concerns won't change until the OPF is operational but reassured them the key milestones are being met.

Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) suggested the language be consistent in CCC reports and on the website. CCC staff acknowledged this and took updating the website away as an action.

Organics Processing Plant biofilter performance discussion

Michael Williams (community) asked if the OPP biofilter is being monitored. David McArdle (CCC staff) reassured the community it is through two methods. Firstly, a SCADA computer system which records performance variables such as back pressure, water content and temperature. Secondly, through on-site odour monitoring completed by LE.

David referred to the independent biofilter review, which at the community's request, was completed by Tonkin + Taylor and attached to the February meeting agenda. This report included recommendations which have been actioned by Living Earth (LE).

Going forward LE will include a summary of the biofilter performance, including data on performance variables, as part of their Community Liaison Group (CLG) report.

Environment Canterbury reporting updates including improvements to the Smelt It app

Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) shared that she is working on updating Smelt It App to capture the odour profiles more accurately.

The group reflected on changes over the past 12 months and Sophie summarised ECAN now have a dedicated Resource Monitoring Officer (RMO) for the OPP and specialist dust and odour officers. Noting Bromley is primary area of focus as they build a proactive response programme.

Sophie explained that any response time is from the call being received to an officer being dispatched. Going forward ECAN will provide a time from the call being received to boots in the community.

Aligning the different data sources and sets

The discussion covering aligning odour recorded by ECAN, and other independent sources such as PDP, and odour experienced by the community.

Paul McMahan (CCC Elected Member) suggested the OPP sharing their operational schedule as another reference point, which will be actioned.

Any questions or feedback can be sent to Bromley@ccc.govt.nz

Verbatim Minutes

Chair – Carl Pascoe

CCC staff – Lynette Ellis, Alec McNeil, David McArdle, Rory Crawford

CCC Elected Members – Yani Johanson, Jackie Simmons, Paul McMahon

LE – Victoria Henry

ECAN staff – Jennifer Rochford, Sophie Harland

ECAN Elected Members – Greg Byrnes

Community – Bruce King, Carol Anderson, Geoffrey King, Margaret Macpherson, Michael Williams.

Minutes – Melissa Wilson

Apologies – Jaco Kleinhans (LE), Johannes Welch (ECAN staff), Katinka Visser (community) Vickie Walker (community).

1. Welcome and Introduction

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Introduced the meeting. Shared apologies for Jaco Kleinhans (LE), Johannes Welch (ECAN staff), Katinka Visser (community) Vickie Walker (community).

2. Confirm previous meeting's minutes

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Edits to previous minutes requested; correct spelling of Greg Byrnes (ECAN Elected Member) and Margaret Macpherson's (community) last names, and Michael Williams (community) last name corrected to Williams.

3. Report back on actions from previous meeting

(February) Action 1: Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) and Jackie Simons (CCC Elected Member) to look into CCC's charges for refuse collection.

Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) - Asked for clarification on action regarding charges for the refuse collection, as he thought it was more around what Council can do to pick up the illegal dumping, rather than the refuse station gate fees.

Q. Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) - Were the minutes accurate?

A. David McArdle (CCC) – Yes, the minutes were correct. The conversation was around the cost and the issue of illegal dumping.

Michael Williams (Community) – Added he felt the discussion was about both the refuse station gate fees but also the concern around the constant flow of rubbish were raised.

Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) - Advised there is a \$17.50 minimum charge and \$415 a tonne for rubbish. Adding Councillors are currently going through the Long-Term Plan where they set fees and charges and have received submissions from residents who are concerned the Council could do more to address the illegal dumping of rubbish.

Bruce King (Community) - Noted that it's a worldwide issue and they have found that reducing the fees at the dump decreased the fly dumping.

Lynette Ellis (CCC staff) - Commented there is an element of the gate fee set by national government, not by local government.

Action 1: *Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) will investigate how the refuse station gate fees compare with the rest of the country and if there is any ability for this being reduced.*

Action 2: *Lynette Ellis (CCC staff) will provide information to the Community Board around the refuse station gate fees and requirements.*

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Clarified the need to be clear that the meeting was set up under resource consent conditions around the OPP.

Q. Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Asked the community, as the OPP issues comes to a resolution in time, is it appropriate for this group to broaden their remit to take in other community issues and become a feedback loop for the community board? Commenting from a statutory perspective it's not ECAN's issue, as it's outside of the consent.

A. Michael Williams, Geoffrey King, and Bruce King (Community) – All concurred, as did the group.

Paul McMahon (CCC Elected Member) - Agreed that the group should deal with other issues affecting the Bromley community and find other mechanisms to deal with these issues that emerges from the meeting. Paul offered for the community board and Clr. Johanson to follow up non-OPP related community issues that are raised.

Carl Pascoe (Chair) - Proposed that the group focused on the issue of the consent of the OPP and in the last five minutes of the meeting would provide the opportunity for any residents to raise any issues for the community board to look at.

Q. Jackie Simmons (CCC Elected Member) - Sought clarification on how the group would like to be responded to i.e. send information back to the group once gathered or wait until the next meeting.

A. Paul McMahon (CCC Elected Member) - Suggested that at the end of the meeting they should have any discussions at the end of the table, so they could collect individuals' contact details to respond to directly, rather than taking up the group's time.

Action 3: *Carl Pascoe will build time into future agendas so a discussion can be held in the last five minutes, for any other issues that individuals would like to discuss with the community board.*

(February) Action 2: *David McArdle (CCC staff) to provide a detailed list of progress milestones prior to or at the next CLG meeting.*

David McArdle (CCC staff) – Responded this action has been completed with a newsletter sent to the Bromley mailing list on 21st March 2024. Adding the timeline has also been included as part of CCC's CLG report.

Offered a further update that monthly project meetings are being held with Ecogas and we are currently in the design phase. Shared further information will be communicated with the group once available.

Q. Bruce King (Community) – Asked if the consent for the new OPF has been lodged?

A. David McArdle (CCC staff) - Advised not yet.

Q. Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) - Questioned whether the solution was behind time or on schedule?

A. David McArdle (CCC staff) - Confirmed that the interim solution was not behind, and everything is on track to schedule.

(February) Action 3: *Lynette Ellis (CCC staff) and Johannes Welch (ECan staff) to clarify regarding the resource consent variation for truck movements.*

David McArdle (CCC staff) – Talked to the information provided as part of the agenda for this meeting. Advising there are three phases: peak season solution, interim solution and then transitioning to the new OPF.

Currently we are delivering the peak season solution. This involves the compost is taken directly from tunnels at the OPP in Bromley to Kate valley Landfill where it is being used as a capping material for the landfill. Transwaste is consented for 21,000 waste trips per year, and no more than 550 trips per week, but the current use of the compost is classified as a construction material and therefore is not contribute to the waste trips limits. Prior to this Kate Valley bought in topsoil for capping. Referring back to waste trips (not construction material trips), at present 83% of the waste trips consent limit is being used.

Q. Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) - Asked how much capping material does the peak solution require?

A. Victoria Henry (LE) - Kate Valley Landfill have confirmed they have a need for this product until the end of the year.

Q. Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) – For the consent for the interim solution, how many additional truck movements does it require, if any? We don't know the difference between the truck movements that are currently consented and the truck movements that are required for the interim solution.

A. Lynette Ellis (CCC Staff) – Responded the solution in place now, the compost being transported to Kate Valley Landfill to be used as a capping material, is the peak season solution but can also considered an interim solution. If that interim solution must change, we will be back to report on what that change is. But now we don't have to make changes because there is a need for the capping material. It is replacing construction trips that would have been made for topsoil. An interim solution is in place and running. The peak season solution is an interim solution, and it is working. We have a 12-month period which is needed for the use of the compost as capping material at Kate Valley Landfill.

Q. Bruce King (Community) – Raised that the topsoil that would normally be used as a capping material at Kate Valley wouldn't be bought from Christchurch, so what's the extra cost involved in bringing it from Christchurch out to Kate Valley?

A. Lynette Ellis (CCC Staff) – Responded there is an additional cost to that, and it's being managed through the budgets at CCC.

David McArdle (CCC staff) – Added this was made public in the December report to Council.

Q. Geoffrey King (Community) – Asked will Kate Valley Landfill plant over the capping material?

A. Lynette Ellis (CCC Staff) – Confirmed yes, they will.

4. Resident lived experiences since last meeting including the Geoffrey King odour report (10 minutes)

Geoffrey King (community) – References his odour report for the CLG reporting period of February to April 2024. There were 41 odour events in this 90-day period. In February there were 17 out of 29 days with two at five out of six, seven at four out of six and eight at three out of six odour. In March there were 14 out of 31 days with six at four out of six, and eight at three out of six odour. In April there were 10 out of 30 days with one at five out of six, four at four out of six and five at three out of six odour.

Commented the intensity since January has gone down, but we still get it. We haven't had to leave home or sleep in the car in the Sumner or New Brighton laybys. There has been a lot of northwesterners and southwesterners, and as the intensity is not as great so we've been able to have some windows open.

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Opened the floor to the the other community members about their experience of the odour recently.

Q. Michael Williams (Community) – Asked Geoffrey in his opinion what percentage of reduction are the community experiencing?

A. Bruce King (Community) – Responded on Geoffrey's behalf and said it must be about 20%.

Carol Anderson (community) - Agreed that it hasn't been as bad. The level of intensity has not been as bad, however it is still there. Last week the level of intensity was very gassy one day and had a pungent smell which lasted several hours, like a leaking gas pipe.

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Suggested this could have been the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Community – A member of the community, unable to clarify who, commented the Wastewater Treatment Plant ponds have been smelling bad lately.

Carol Anderson (community) – Added if you drive down Cuthberts Drive, some days are pretty bad.

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Suggested we are getting slow and incrementally.

Geoffrey King (community) – Agreed with Carl and added the intensity is not what it used to be, but it's still there. Shared his opinion that it should have been shut down 15 years ago by "E-can't".

Margaret Macpherson (community) – Believes it has decreased quite significantly.

Michael Williams (community) – Believes there has been a significant improvement, but maybe now is the time to do an audit on the processes that are being used now to find out where the remaining odour is coming from and closing the remaining gaps. Keep pushing forward and keep these incremental improvements until everyone can say it isn't affecting their life. We've got to this point - review and see what we can do about fine tuning the operation.

Q. Paul McMahon (CCC Elected Member) - Do we know why the community is still experiencing odour on certain days? This is the utility of the audit, to figure out whether there are any operational changes that can be made to improve it.

A. Victoria Henry (LE) - Noted LE are happy to make more changes to understand what is causing those odours, such as wind conditions.

Carl Pascoe (Chair) - Reminded the group that last year Lynette Ellis (CCC staff) committed they will continue improving, making changes and making things better. Carl acknowledged that while it's great that the community's experiences are reduced, it would be nice to have some tangible evidence through an audit to see whether it's real or not.

Bruce King (community) – Commented what worries him is we have been at this stage four years ago when they were going to enclose the plant. Then it was suggested that that “*would create a bomb*”. So that was not proceeded. Now we haven't got the approval for it [the new facility], how do we know it's not going to another closing of the next month? “*This is what pisses me off about the place. The whole place is full of BS and they're full of intellectual idiots - people who may have the brainpower but no practical experience.*”

Lynette Ellis (CCC Staff) – Responded that she does not like being called an intellectual idiot.

Geoffrey King (Community) – “*Well if that cap fits*”

Lynette Ellis (CCC Staff) - Advised that the difference is there is a signed contract with new facility providers, and we are working to provide the new facility but it will take time and a lot of work to get the consent. We have done everything at the OPP to take the outside work away. The site has been cleaned, there are no stockpiles at all, for anything, and the material comes out of the tunnels, straight into trucks and goes to Kate Valley. We have substantially changed how we are operating and will keep going, and continuing to make incremental changes where we can.

Action 4: *Alec McNeil and David McArdle (CCC Staff) to find a solution for arranging an audit.*

5. CCC report, including Ōtautahi Organics Processing Solution update, and questions arising (10 minutes)

Q. Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) - Noted that ECAN did an audit and found there were pipes that were not sealed properly and questioned why the regulator had picked it up instead of CCC and Waste Management.

A. David McArdle (CCC staff) – Firstly addressed the request for an audit. CCC continue to engage Pattle Delamore Partners (PDP) to conduct independent odour monitoring. PDP produce monthly reports summarising their odour monitoring and the last two months have recently been finalised and will be published to CCC's OPP webpage. Since the last CLG, PDP have produced reports for the past three months, which include several specific dates for which odour assessments were conducted, and no objectionable odour detected beyond the boundary.

Secondly responded to Clr. Johanson's question. Each year LE provide documentation to ECAN to demonstrate they meet the resource consent conditions. ECAN review this documentation and then write their annual consent monitoring report, this has been done every year the resource consent has been issued. This year ECAN did identify some things that needing fixing, such as air pipes, and since they've been identified they have been resolved. In March ECAN published an update consent monitoring report to confirm everything is compliant with the resource consent.

Q. Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) – Asked why does it take an annual review by ECAN to identify operational issues that might cause problems rather than continuous improvement to identify issues before the regulator?

A. Lynette Ellis (CCC staff) – Assured Clr. Johanson we are doing that [continuous improvement].

Q. Geoffrey King (community) – Asked David if those ECAN reports are publicly available?

A. David McArdle (CCC staff) – Confirmed yes. Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) also confirmed those reports are publicly available.

Alec McNeil (CCC staff) – Acknowledged what Bruce King has been through but wanted to clarify that while the Hornby situation is subject to consent and we will keep progressing that, but we won't revert to stockpiling outside. The interim solution to take material to Kate Valley Landfill will continue regardless of any delays or adjustments to the timeline for Hornby and you won't see stockpiling again at the Bromley site, which was a contributed to the odour you experienced.

Bruce King (Community) – Noted he believes that the residents of Hornby are concerned about the odour, and he is concerned if they [the Hornby community] get a group to go into ECAN to get the consent blocked, they [LE] will continue to get pollute the atmosphere.

Geoffrey King (Community) - Questioned why the facility is being put in the city, instead of out in the country.

Carl Pascoe (Chair) - Reminded the group that the Hornby issues are for Hornby residents. If it has impact back here [Bromley], then they will be addressed.

Greg Byrnes (CCC Elected Member) – Added that it is the job of the four elected members to ensure that timelines being committed to are being met, and invited residents to come to him directly and be categorical about what is happening on the day.

Q. Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Sought clarification the community that they are raising concerns about risk of smell shifting from one community to another.

A. Lynette Ellis (CCC Staff) - Reminded the group that they are two different plants and Council aren't shifting a composting plant, but are changing the way that the organics are processed at new location. The experience and feedback from the residents has all fed into the process of finding the solution and make it a completely different facility.

Q. Bruce King (Community) - Raised concerns that the new plant could be turned down and asked if anyone did any research as to whether anywhere else has been considered such as an industrial area like Rolleston.

A. Alec McNeil (CCC staff) - Advised they have gone through a procurement process, so the community won't repeat the same experience. Due diligence and submissions were done to form the reasons for picking Hornby. There were several reasons why they picked that physical site. If it didn't go ahead, then we would have to be open to go through another procurement process.

A. Paul McMahon (CCC Elected Member) – Added it is understandable given what the community has been through, but it won't do us any good worrying about what could go wrong. It would cost everyone here a lot of time, energy and unpleasantness if it did go wrong. I have hope this is going to be fixed.

A. Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) - Advised that he has been informed CCC do have alternatives for another site.

A. David McArdle (CCC staff) – Reassured the community as part of the procurement process, prospective suppliers had independent third parties assess the likelihood of a consent being granted, reviewing the Resource Management Act, and that a lot of work has been put in to get this stage.

Q. Michael Williams (community) – Requested it be noted in the minutes there was a commitment from CCC that they will continue to remove the compost [from the OPP] to Kate Valley Landfill irrespective of any subsequent delays.

A. Alec McNeil (CCC staff) - Confirmed this is the new operational practice and it won't change.

Q. Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) - Shared the concern around getting a consent from in two months and asked if ECAN are able to treat this as a top priority.

A. Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) – Shared that their consent team that deals with special priority projects are in conversation with CCC. Whilst the consent hasn't been lodged, they are very committed to treat it with priority once it comes through.

Q. Bruce King (community) - If you have a procurement contract with this company, why in September to December is it going out to tender for construction?

A. Alec McNeil (CCC staff) - Advised that when Ecogas were awarded the contract, that's when their workstream starts so they build a project at that point. The construction tender is Ecogas going out for their construction work. They will still have a procurement process that satisfies their internal board and finances. They can't commit to going to construction until they have the consent in case the consent impacts the construction.

Q. Bruce King (community) – Raised that CCC should know the cost, therefore it is comes out we can't do that for that price anymore, then we have another delaying tactic? *“We've had all this crap for years, it's making me wild now.”*

A. Alec McNeil (CCC staff) – Reassured Bruce it's not a delaying tactic, it's part of their process. They have an estimate and an understanding of the cost, and they've been back to their suppliers to build that picture. The final piece of the jigsaw is to get the consent and make sure there is no fundamental changes. They can't engage a contractor until they have a consent.

Q. Bruce King (community) – They have given you a price and when they put it out to construction and it comes in higher, what are we going to end up with? Another ten years of crap?

A. Alec McNeil (CCC staff) – As part of their contract if they have a blow out on cost it will have to absorb it as per the contract.

Carl Pascoe (Chair) - Summarised that the community in their experience are now at the point that until the contract is awarded, the construction starts and is finally completed, the community will hold its scepticism.

Q. Geoffrey King (Community) – Asked CCC if they are worried that they won't get consent? Before Alec replied Geoffrey added his opinion that *“No you'll get consent because you've got consent now from ECAN - no odour over the boundary and they do nothing about it.”*

A. Alec McNeil (CCC staff) – Agreed with Carl that the level of concern from the community won't change until the new facility is built and operating. Offered assurance there's a series of milestones and they are meeting those milestones. The facility is on track and the next step of consent application is on track to be lodged. Then it is a matter for the regulating authority and a key consideration will be how it is notified, that will trigger the level of response from the surrounding community.

Greg Byrnes (ECAN Elected Member) - Noted that the fact ECAN are already talking to CCC gives him confidence, and the key for him is the milestones are being met.

Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) – Requested for the terminology and language to be simplified and kept consistent between the CCC report and website, particularly for key milestones, possibly with a traffic light system. Referencing CCC's website.

Lynette Ellis (CCC Staff) - Confirmed this will be aligned going forward.

Action 5: *David McArdle (CCC staff) to update the CCC OPP webpage with regards to the interim solution and the progress that has been made. Focusing on consistency with the language used.*

6. Living Earth answer any questions arising from their CLG report (10 minutes)

Q. Michael Williams (community) - Have we got a level we monitor the biofilter to, that is acceptable as part of the overall odour management? I know we do it at the fence line. Does it meet some sort of standard that biofilters have to meet in terms of the release of odour?

A. Victoria Henry (LE) - If the odour from the biofilter goes past the boundary then that's an issue.

Q. Michael Williams (community) – Are we monitoring at the source? I've stood next to it and thrown up, our Mayor, we've both thrown up it was that bad.

A. Victoria Henry (LE) – Absolutely, we have daily monitoring.

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Summarised the community requesting evidence the biofilter is working to its best operational standard, minimal amount of odour and complies with standards for biofilter operation.

Q. Michael Williams (community) – What standard has the business set for biofilter operation? A regular monitoring regime, to be reported at the next meeting.

A. Victoria Henry (LE) – Reassured the community the biofilter is being 24 hours a day, seven days a week to meet standards.

A. David McArdle (CCC staff) – Added there's two ways in which LE monitor the biofilter. The first being the SCADA System which records different variables, in the tunnels and the biofilter, such as back pressure, water content, temperature and so on, which all impact the performance of the biofilter. If the biofilter isn't performing this will lead to odour. Second there are on site odour assessment completed daily by LE. The biofilter performance was raised two CLGs ago and there was a request from Geoffrey for an independent report on the performance of the biofilter. LE have paid for and commissioned that report, which was completed by Tonkin + Taylor and attached to the last CLG. It was a full review of the biofilter including recommendations which have been actioned by LE.

Michael Williams (community) – Requested reporting on the ongoing monitoring of the biofilter performance.

David McArdle (CCC staff) – LE provide a monthly SCADA report on the biofilter performance. David suggested as part of LE's CLG report they can provide a summary of the biofilter performance with data and performance variables.

Action 6: *Victoria Henry (LE) as part of LE's CLG report going forward to include a summary of the biofilter performance including data on the variables measured.*

7. ECAN answer questions arising from their CLG report (10 minutes)

Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) - During the reporting period there were 36 Smelt Its received from February to April which were attributed to LE, with eight Pollution Events. Each event is made up of multiple residents notifying ECAN about the odour within one hour. The average response time to investigate was 10 minutes. ECAN now has five warranted officers out in the field conducting visits around LE. During this time, they didn't substantiate odour beyond boundary. As the odour in Bromley is changing, so is ECAN's response out in the community. Officers were out in the community for 45 hours, reactivity or proactively investigating the odour. Sophie directed people to their website included in their report for more information.

Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) shared that she is working on updating the Smelt It App to capture the odour profiles more accurately.

Action 7: *Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) will update the group at the next CLG of changes that are being made to the Smelt-It App to more accurately capture the odour profiles.*

Q. Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Summarised the group has clearly articulated in many meetings on endless occasions about the monitoring performance and responsiveness from ECAN has been a challenge. Carl asked Sophie if she went back 12 months what would be the difference now?

A. Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) – How ECAN have provisioned the team. There is now a dedicated Resource Monitoring Officer (RMO), someone who deep dives into consent conditions and works with the operator on a regular basis to under the operations on site. Also there is now specialist dust and odour officers who are responding to hot spots in the community, such as Bromley which is our primary response area. We proactively build a programme of work based on weather conditions.

Q. Carl Pascoe (Chair) – What would have your response time been compared to a year ago?

A. Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) – Longer yes, as within the team there was a finite amount of resources to respond to issues across the city. The difference now is I have dedicated staff for dust and odour response as we know we have hotspots within the community.

Q. Michael Williams (community) – Sought explanation on the disparity between what ECAN are finding versus what being reporting in regard to odour. No alignment.

A. Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) – In Bromley we do a 360-odour assessment against a map to substantiate odour in the community. It's not that we haven't substantiated odour in the community, we have. It we have not substantiated odour from LE.

Q. Geoffrey King (community) – So you've substantiated odour, what have you done? *"Got a wet bus ticket out?"*

A. Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) – Highlighted this is not the point of this discussion here, but directed people to ECAN's website which details a list for the month previous enforcement outcomes they've able to comment on. Which range from educate, enable to enforce.

Q. Paul McMahon (CCC Elected Member) – Can you name any of the other sites that have produced the odours?

A. Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) – I can, but I don't think it's appropriate to get stuck in that conversation in this forum. Obviously one of the primary odour discharges in this area at the moment is the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Q. Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Asked ECAN if they have ever done a collation of the reported odour in Geoffrey's report, against the data that ECAN is receiving?

Q. Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) Geoffrey, are you lodging the odour you are experiencing through us or are you just keeping your own record?

A. Geoffrey King (community) - Sometimes, but other times it's just a waste of time because you do nothing.

Michael Williams (community) – Commented we need some alignment.

Alec McNeil (CCC staff) – Another independent source of reports are the PDP reports that CCC have commissioned. They have certainly shown a change. They do give an indication of the odour type in their report, some could be attributable to the OPP potentially, some solvent and other odour types. I know you've lost confidence but the Smelt-it App is the best way to log it in the system, then CCC can look at the Smelt It App and see if any of the dates align with what was in the PDP report.

Carl Pascoe (Chair) - Noted the challenge is aligning the different framing between the science-based odour measuring against the resident's experience. We've done well in getting the resident's experience as valid measure, it is a valid measure. The challenge for ECAN is to get the correlation between the three data points.

Bruce King (community) - Going by past experience and one of the ex-ECAN employees said in the CCC meeting last year, the experience that I've had dealing with ECAN people inspecting the stink is abysmal. You can smell them coming from over 10 metres away because they've put new perfume on before they come to your place. I've given up on anything to do with ECAN because their experience is pathetic.

Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) – Added to the earlier conversation about comparing to 12 months ago, that ECAN were not recording response times. Therefore, to get a response time is good, but in his opinion using averages doesn't give an appropriate sense of what's happened. Is it ten minutes from the first or last call? Is there a way to understand more about the time from the first call to the first assistance, including a breakdown of afterhours complaints being investigated?

***Action 8:** Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) will look into the response data to help the group understand time from the first call to the first assistance and a breakdown of afterhours complaints being investigated.*

Q. Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) – Referred back to the earlier discussed Compliance Monitoring Report, do we know how long the air pipes were not adequately sealed? Do we know if in previous assessments it was said they were okay or is this something new?

A. Victoria Henry (LE staff) – To put it into perspective, when we're talking about inadequate pipes we mean a drip of water.

A. David McArdle (CCC staff) – As part of the annual Consent Monitoring Report, each consent condition is reviewed and assessed by ECAN as part of that report.

A. Lynette Ellis (CCC staff) – Suggested CCC staff will come back to the group with further details.

***Action 9:** David McArdle (CCC staff) to look into ECAN Consent Monitoring Report history, specifically regarding Condition 10 of CRC080301.1.*

Q. Bruce King (community) – One thing I disagree with is the ten-minute response time. By the time you get the message, you get into the car, which will take three to four minutes. Then you're leaving six minutes to drive from where your office is. They're flying. They're breaking the law. Ten minutes is bullshit.

A. Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) – Proposed she can change the terminology to capture this better. Response time is the time from receiving the call within the office, triaging it to her officer and having the officer in a car. That is ten minutes. Then proposed, if the group would like, is the time from first call to boots in the community.

Geoffrey King (community) – Then we have the corruption of ECAN calling these people and telling them they're on the way. Don't shake your head because that has happened, that's the past experience.

8. Any further questions about resource consent compliant for the Organics Processing Plant (10 minutes)

Geoffrey King (community) – When the city councillors went in a bus there in 2017, seven or eight years ago. They ring up LE and they turn everything off so there's no odour going out of the biofilter.

Victoria Henry (LE) – Responded she cannot comment on what happened two/three years ago, but right now the operation is very rigid and strict. The same things happen at the same time every day. Potentially that could help with having ECAN out at certain points of the day to understanding what is going on. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday we have the same operation.

Sophie Harland (ECAN staff) – Explained there is two lines of operation. One where they do plan to come on site with the RMO who monitors the consent. Then there is a programme of work, which is not shared, and this is with the dust and odour specialists in the community and based on hotspots and weather conditions where it is likely to see odour. This is planned internally.

Q. Paul McMahon (CCC Elected Member) - Asked whether the group can have access to the operating schedule of the OPP. To provide greater transparency for the community.

A. Lynette Ellis (CCC staff) - CCC will supply this.

Action 10: *David McArdle (CCC staff) to supply the operating schedule of the OPP.*

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Summarised these a range of data points happening. Wind, OPP operating process, response times, Smelt-it data, Geoffrey's data. What the community are asking for, as he hears it, is how it can be pulled together to form an evidence based, complete picture that links up all the information.

Michael Williams (community) – Added with the goal to provide a proactive response rather than a reactive response. We have to try some different approaches. We're closing the gaps.

Bruce King (Community) – Shared there's a big push to plant trees in the Bromley Reserve and asked if this is change the wind direction. Bruce added if it is stinky he will go see the new residents in the new Golden Homes to talk to them and hopefully we might get some more people along. The poor people are paying \$800,000 to \$1,000,000 for section they could be stunk out of in six months.

9. General business (5 minutes)

Yani Johanson (CCC Elected Member) – Referred back to the discussion about cost. Shared there is additional money, he was unsure if a timing issue or additional cost, but in the public session today at CCC for the Long Term there was a 0.3% rates increase for 2024/2025 but a reciprocal reduction in the following year, and there is about \$7 million or \$8.4 million being put on as well for 2025/2026 for the additional costs for the Bromley/Hornby site changeover period.

Lynette Ellis (CCC staff) – Commented that is currently being reviewed and staff will report back to the group.

Action 11: *David McArdle (CCC staff) to confirm final amounts budgeted in the LTP for the additional costs for the Bromley/Hornby sites changeover period.*

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Opened the floor for all other questions or statements.

The group broke off in the final five minutes to raise concerns outside of the agenda with the community board members and CCC staff.

10. Concluding remarks – Chair (5 minutes)

Carl Pascoe (Chair) – Concluded the meeting.