

Minutes

Port Noise Liaison Committee

Date:	21 May 2025
Venue:	Training and Development Centre, 8 Vickerman Street
Time:	0930-1100
Present:	Catherine Taylor (Chair), Ian Wright (residents' rep), Robin Whalley (residents' rep), Tony Vining (residents' rep), Kim Lui (PNL Environmental Compliance Officer), Andrew James (PNL General Manager – Environment, Infrastructure & Maintenance), Paul Williams (PNL General Manager – Operations),
Guests:	Clare Piper (NCC rep), Ryno Botha (NCC rep), Corey Parsons (NCC rep), Rod Duke (Resident)
Apologies:	Nikita Takai (Minutes)

		Discussion	Action Points Arising
s1.	Welcome	<p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> <p>Between meetings the Chair had met with the residents group, PNL staff and spoken to NCC staff including the NCC CEO to progress issues that are of concern to this committee. In particular the stop-start proposed review of the NRMP had been raised with the NCC CEO, the Chair noting this matter was creating tension within the committee.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed NCC representatives to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance and provision of the response to the questions raised after the last meeting.</p>	
2.	Minutes from 19/2/2025 and action points	<p>Minutes Circulated/Read</p> <p><i>a. Noise monitor data drop out.</i></p> <p>A noise event had not been recorded due to a noise monitor data drop out. When noting noise events for the calendar year it was proposed this event be noted with an explanation the exact noise level could not be determined.</p> <p>The minutes were approved.</p>	

3.	Matters arising for discussion	<p><i>a. Noise Audit Result - 70 Queens Road – Tonkin+Taylor</i> The Tonkin+Taylor Report had been circulated to the committee. Tonkin+Taylor had compared 11 noise events recorded at the silo monitor with the noise level recorded at a temporary monitor located at 70 Queens Road. The difference in the L_{Amax} levels was reported. In summary the measured variation between the L_{max} levels ranged from 3.4 dB to 9.4 dB with the average difference being 6 dB. Tonkin+Taylor concluded the 4 dB correction was at the lower level of the range and stated it was an appropriate correction. It was noted there were only a few noise events with L_{Max} ≥ 78 dB within the audit period. PNL advised six container vessels visited the Port in that period which was typical.</p> <p><i>b. Second Noise Monitor Installation</i> PNL confirmed the second noise monitor had been installed at the end of April. It was unclear how this data was going to be used to understand better issues relating to port noise. It was agreed the raw data should be released from May 2025, noting the report format might change due to the Envirosuite platform upgrade.</p> <p><i>c. Noise Complaint - 30 July 2024 – Movement of containers after hours to prepare for a ship arrival</i> PNL advised that, in general, housekeeping works will not be undertaken after hours. From time to time, due to some critical operations, there may remain occasions when devanning and loading movements within the container yard are still required. In response to a question relating to the internal PNL process to review working procedures PNL confirmed that reviews were undertaken, and findings presented to the relevant teams. Residents asked to attend a toolbox meeting. PNL to arrange that for an afternoon shift handover time.</p>	<p>PNL to include the raw noise data from the second noise monitor in the monthly report from May 2025.</p> <p>PNL and NCC to determine how to utilise and present the data.</p> <p>PNL to liaise with residents to attend a toolbox.</p>
----	--------------------------------	---	---

		<p>It was further noted Port Noise Management Plan (PNMP) clause 13.8 stated PNL's noise minimisation objectives may be audited externally. Had such an audit been undertaken? This question raised the need for a review of the PNMP given some parts of it were no longer relevant and/or out-of-date. It was finalised in 2011. This was a matter that could be reviewed by this committee in accordance with clause 16.2 of the PNMP.</p> <p>It was noted a review of the PNMP would be best undertaken as part of the broader review of the NRMP being undertaken by NCC.</p>	
4.	Nelson City Council	<p><i>a. Residents' Representatives' Questions to Jon Styles</i> The response from Jon Styles was circulated to the committee before the meeting. The Chair questioned whether any changes could or should be made prior to the review underway at the moment.</p> <p>NCC advised they are following their typical plan change process with implementation expected in 2027.</p> <p>The Chair noted the time taken to make progress is of concern to residents and advised that a letter would be sent to the NCC CEO in her position to request NCC keep the review process moving.</p> <p>The Chair suggested the Port could "voluntarily" change the monthly reporting data based on the preliminary results from Jon Styles, as part of a trial, prior to an updated NRMP.</p> <p>The meeting requested Jon Styles clarity as to what the parameters mean; Leq15min, L10, L50, L90, Ldn(1 day), Ldn(5 days). At the moment the focus seemed to be on LAmx information and the meeting was unclear what other data presented every month meant. What conclusions could be drawn from the data and how does it support evaluation of PNL's performance?</p> <p>The committee agreed to leave the technical questions to the acoustic consultant who will attend the next meeting.</p>	<p>The Chair to write to NCC CEO re plan change timing.</p> <p>PNL to consider reporting template and potential for change.</p>

		<p>The Chair was confused with the response to questions relating to the location of the second noise monitor. Reference was made in the response to the “4dB difference”.</p> <p>Given the Tonkin+Taylor audit had addressed the “4dB difference” question, which it was believed related to the difference between the recording at the silo monitor and the 65 dBA noise boundary, PNLC requested clarification of the points made by Jon Styles. This would occur at the next meeting.</p> <p>The question relating to the noise contour lines and the height of a residential building compared with a high-rise apartment was still unanswered</p> <p><i>b. Review of the NRMP in relation to Port Noise</i></p> <p>The residents observed the excellent working relationship at Port Napier and suggested PNL reach to Port Napier to understand their approach to the management of noise matters.</p> <p>There may be opportunities for quick fixes, which could involve greater utilisation of Brunt Quay by large container vessels.</p> <p>The residents proposed a more informal conversation with PNL to explore some of these options in more detail so they can better understand the limitations and/or options available to PNL.</p> <p>PNL agreed with this suggestion and asked the residents to work with Andrew James to set up a meeting. Andrew suggested residents provide their list of quick fixes and schedule a separate meeting to talk through</p>	<p>Jon Styles to review his response to the “4dB difference” on the second noise monitor, and address questions in the next meeting.</p> <p>PNL to respond.</p> <p>PNL to reach out to Port Napier to understand how they approach.</p> <p>Residents to send PNL a list of suggestions and set up a meeting with PNL to discuss.</p>
5.	Noise Monthly Reports	<p><i>a. Summary of Noise Events</i></p> <p>PNL presented a “Summary of Noise Events” for the last seven years. (Chart attached). This chart showed a significant improvement in port noise performance.</p> <p><i>b. Process to Review Complaints</i></p> <p>Cath suggested a residents rep meet with PNL monthly to review complaints together, with a view to resolving complaints more efficiently and reducing protracted e-mail traffic.</p>	<p>PNL to arrange the first trial review</p>

		<p>c. <i>PNLC Review of Noise Complaints Received –February to April 2025</i></p> <p>d. <i>Complaint Investigation – Video Footage</i></p> <p>i. <i>9th March 2025 and 31st March 2025</i></p> <p>These complaints related to Crane 5 operations. PNL explained the operational challenges that had arisen with the new electric-powered crane, which was configured slightly differently from the other cranes. The crane had been withdrawn from service following these events given these problems. The manufacturer of the crane was in Nelson to rectify these differences.</p> <p>The residents questioned the use of the soft touch technology and requested assurance that it was in use all the time. PNL advised he would investigate and report back on this matter at the next meeting</p> <p>ii. <i>13th April 2025</i></p> <p>PNL explained rocks under the crane stabilising pad caused the noise events and that regular sweeping is now required at Main Wharf.</p> <p>Kim advised that there was unexpected noise data loss from May 7 to 14 due to the biannual factory calibration process. There were complaints received within that time regarding vessel generator noise.</p>	<p>meeting with all PNL reps in attendance.</p> <p>PNL to investigate the turning on/off on the soft touch technology, and report back</p>
6.	Update on Acoustic Treatment of Properties	<p>a. <i>Update on Acoustic Treatment</i></p> <p>b. <i>Potential Purchase of 197 Haven Road</i></p> <p>This property owner had approached PNL to sell the property, and now waiting for further information from the owner for the purchase process.</p>	
7.	What's Currently Happening on Port	<p>a. <i>Crane 5</i></p> <p>Discussion referring to Point 5 d(i).</p>	
8.	Other Business	NCC noted the noise complaints regarding the vessel generator noise issues.	

		<p>PNL explained there is no existing regulation to control the vessel generator noise, and all NZ ports have engaged Marshall Day to establish the simplified measurement from NEPTUNES using a derived noise label scoring system. NZ Port operators had not banned these noisy vessels from their ports, but together were putting pressure on the vessel owners to improve their performance.</p> <p>NCC noted RMA s16 could be applied to the vessel operator/owner requesting they mitigate the vessel generator noise issue if the vessel operator/owner was taking no action.</p> <p>PNL advised it was working proactively with the shipping lines and vessel owners on the noisy vessels and pointed out that three noisy vessels (Maersk Nadi, Maersk Nansha, & Safeen Prime) had stopped visiting New Zealand. Another noisy vessel was working on silencer installation and another one was likely to be replaced.</p> <p>The Residents tabled the residents’ representatives’ paper ‘Limitation on Effectiveness of the PNLC’ for PNL’s awareness and discussion at their informal meeting.</p> <p>The Chair thanked all participants for their positive and constructive contribution to the meeting. A lot of progress has been made and our expectation is that NCC’s acoustic consultant will be present at the next meeting to respond to the committee’s questions.</p> <p><i>Next Meeting – 27 August 2025</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

5. Noise Reports

a. Summary of Noise Events

	No. of Noise Events LMax ≥ 85dBA	No. of Significant Noise Events LMax ≥ 89dBA	Container Handled – Empty & Full	Containers Handled / Noise Events ≥ 85dBA	Containers Handled / Noise Events ≥ 89dBA
FY17/18	38	9	121,483	3197	13498
FY18/19	36	8	119,074	3308	14884
FY19/20	28	4	110,969	3963	27742
FY20/21	18	1	102,865	5715	102865
FY21/22	10	0	103,186	10319	103186
FY22/23	18	0	105,466	5859	105466
FY23/24	16	2	105,224	6576.5	52612
FY24/25 (til Apr)	8	0	85,338	10667	85338

