

Minutes Port Noise Liaison Committee

Date:	17 March 2021
Venue:	PNL Board Room
Time:	1200hrs
Present:	Bob Dickinson (Chair), Bruce Robertson (residents' rep), Robert Styles (residents' rep), David Scott (residents' rep), Kelly Leonard (PNL rep), Allanagh Rivers (PNL rep), Matt McDonald (PNL rep), Neil Henderson (NCC Guest), L Versteeg (PNL - Minutes).

Agenda Item		Discussion	Action Points Arising
1.	Welcome & Apologies	Bob welcomed everyone to the meeting and in particular Neil Henderson.	
2.	Minutes from 26/08/20	Circulated/read/accepted Kelly/Robert	
3.	Matters Arising	<p>Conformation of Chairperson for the next two years Bob handed the meeting over to Matt. Matt nominated Bob for a further term. No further nominations received and Bob agreed to accept nomination. Matt/Kelly</p> <p>Residents Rep's tenure/formalise process for residents' rep election Kelly advised that in the meeting of 15/11/2017 the tenure was agreed to be a 5yr period. The committee discussed eligibility for nominees and Kelly outlined the process.</p> <p>Progress with Draft Contours/Noise Management Plan Kelly gave an update on the NMP and contours.</p> <p>NRMP Review and PNLC submission Kelly gave an update and advised that the draft PNL submission was with Senior Management Team. Kelly alerted the committee that the government would be</p>	Contours to be updated in the Noise Mitigation Plan – Kelly/Allanagh

		<p>revising the RMA and it was not clear how this would affect the NCC update to the District Plan.</p> <p>Report Noise Management and Mitigation Kelly advised the Ten Year Noise Report was going through final internal checking and would be released within the next week or two.</p> <p>Amended Complaints Process Discussion was had on the complaints process and the time taken analysing noises that were under the trigger noise level. Kelly reiterated that the noise monitor records all noises eg ambulances, roadworks etc, not just port noises. Matt mentioned that the MWN project had the potential to skew both current and future data analysis. David queried whether there was any additional information that could be given to residents and gave examples referencing the airport. Kelly advised that the shipping schedule was available on-line and that if the Port is aware of projects where there will potentially be additional noise, the residents are advised. Bob asked for an update on Port Chalmers practices. Kelly explained how their system uses a logarithm which can differentiate only port noise. Neil felt that Kelly was selling herself short with regard to all the investigative work that she does and perhaps more of this should be shared with residents.</p> <p>Engaging with NCC on noise Kelly gave an outline on PNL's plans to engage proactively with NCC in addition to the requirements of the NMP and have regular conversations about noise.</p> <p>Container Noise Trial Kelly advised that scheduling continues to be difficult due to the unreliability of shipping The Auckland based Acoustic Engineer together with COVID restrictions and disrupted shipping timetables. Bob expressed his concern on a reasonable timeframe for this not being achieved.</p>	<p>Kelly to have a look at the complaints process to see if there was the ability to streamline and reduce time spent on complaints that are under the noise level threshold.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Noise Monitoring Kelly gave an outline for a planned noise project. Robert queried whether we would look at a system like Port Chalmers. Kelly advised that she would be looking at the Port Chalmers setup together with exploring other emerging technologies.</p> <p>PNL Project Update Allanagh gave an update on projects – Main Wharf North (MNW), Log Yard Repaving, Stormwater Upgrade. Bob expressed his concern with the delays experienced on MWN project and queried whether the project could be expediated. Allanagh advised that COVID had played a major part in the delays and the contractor already had two crews working to finish as soon as possible.</p>	
4.	Noise Complaints	<p>Kelly presented graphs on noise complaints/complainants and significant noise events/operational events. The committee discussed the increase in complaints and the psychology behind them. Matt gave an overview on why Nelson was a 24hr port (ie tidal), the connection between shipping schedules and how they need to dovetail into other ports and that Nelson would be omitted from a vessels schedule if it couldn't enter on the appropriate tide. David suggested that FAQ be included on the website to explain more about shipping and working hours. Bruce felt that there was potential for people to complain if they don't have a clear understanding of how the port operates.</p>	Kelly to look at options for website information as part of website upgrade project.
5.	Noise Monitoring	Kelly presented the noise complaints for the period 12 th November 2020 – January 2021.	
6.	Acoustic Treatment	Kelly gave an update on acoustic reports requested by two residents.	
7.	Other Business	The committee agreed that Neil Henderson be invited as a guest to the next meeting.	
8.		Meeting closed 1.15pm Next Meeting Date: TBA	

Appendix 1 - CRM Noise Complaints 12th November 2020 – 11th March 2021

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
21.11.20	A complainant lodged a noise complaint via our online form at 0826 on the 21.11.20 to advise they were jolted awake with 3 significant booms around 0210. They asked us to confirm the dBA rating and the crane operator behaviour.	<p>The noise monitor recorded three reasonable bangs at the time of concern. These were at 0205, 0205 and 0206, and measured 87.2, 84.9 and 86.7 dBA LMax respectively. They were caused by a spreader on a single hatchlid, requiring a couple of attempts to pick it up. This is a very difficult movement especially at night. A hatchman was present to assist the crane driver. This is a blind movement as the holes for the pins become obscured from the vision of the crane driver as the spreader is lowered. After the first attempt the spreader looks to have got off square and was more difficult to land squarely and thus without noise.</p> <p>This exchange was 537 moves, including 8 hatchlids on and off (16 hatchlid moves).</p>	No response was received.
21.11.20	A complainant lodged a noise complaint via our online form at 0834 on 21.11.20 to advise bangs and clangs caused a disturbed night around 0200, with three consecutive bangs, and a particularly loud bang at 0407.	As above	No response was received.
21.11.20	A complainant lodged an online noise complaint via our online form at 1726 on the 21.11.20 to advise there was extra loud bangs approx. 2am and 4am. They went on to say they had experienced 3 consecutive nights of port noise.	As above	No response was received.

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
21.11.20	A complainant called NCC to complain about port noise from the 21st, on 23.11.20 at 0940. They go on to sat 3 loud bangs exceeded 85DbL on 21 November between 0200 and 0230 and raises concerns about the crane operators performance. They also noted a bang at approximately 0400 and says this is 85.2DbL.	As above	No response was received.
25.11.20	A complainant emailed me on the 25.11.20 to formally complain about the beeping alarm coming from the new Crane Number 4 when it is moving from one location to another.	Currently Crane 4 is in the commissioning phase, and there are only works happening on it during the day time. It does get moved during this time depending on operations. One of the changes that needed to be completed during commissioning is muffling or changing of the travel alarms, this would have happened prior it being put into service. We have now escalated that to happen as soon as we have an opportunity to complete this.	The complainant was grateful that we had responded so quickly.
30.11.20	A complainant phoned our gatehouse at 0348 to complain that they had heard some huge bangs around 0330 from operations at MW. On speaking with the complainant, they queried crane driver behaviour, and incentivising crane drivers to be better in the noise space.	<p>The wind exceeded the recommended guidelines for measuring noise at the time the complainant is concerned about. As a result the noise measurements are approximate and should be interpreted with caution.</p> <p>The noise monitor recorded nothing in the hour prior to 0330. There was one sound recorded at 0335. This had an LMax of 81.7dBA, and it was caused by a spreader on a hatchlid. There was another sound recorded at 0339 with an LMax of 78.3 dBA, and this was a spreader on a container. There was nothing else recorded between this time and 0645, meaning the 78dBA threshold was not exceeded. These sounds are well below the significant noise threshold of 89 dBA. I'm suspicious wind direction may have played a part in what was heard on this occasion.</p> <p>This exchange was 434 including two hatchlid moves. It was not under pressure to be completed in the tidal window available.</p>	No response was received.

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
31.12.20	A complainant emailed me directly to complain about a siren activated in the Port area around 0230 for approx. 15 minutes. They note it was the second night in a row this has gone off, volume and pitch of the alarm is piercing and it seems to take an eternity for anyone to deal with it.	The siren was noted by our security staff on both nights from Z Energy's tank farm site. I followed up with Z Energy and they confirmed both alarms were theirs. On the night of the 30th was a tank high level alarm and on the 31st was a driver deadman alarm. They have electricians onsite this morning looking at the faults.	Z Energy followed up with this complainant directly.
24.01.21	A complainant lodged a noise complaint through our online noise complaint form on the 24th at 0538 to complain about a screeching alarm going off at 0517. They go on to say it happens regularly, often waking them up in the early morning.	This was not Port Nelson, it was an alarm at Z Energy. According to Z energy it is a continuation of the faults experienced on 31.12.20.	Z Energy followed up with this complainant directly.
27.01.21	A complainant lodged a noise complaint via our online complaint form about noise at 1230 on the 27th of January. The complainant alleges forklifts, trucks, and containers were the source of noise concern, the Collins St boundary reader had 82Dbl and 18 degrees, and this woke up residents.	<p>Container operations on the vessel ANL Emora at Brunt Quay were underway at the time of the complaint. The investigation for this complaint didn't reveal what the cause of concern was for this complaint. Measurements from the noise monitor did not indicate anything unusually noisy during operations on this vessel. There were no sounds recorded during the night time period between 2200 and 0700, meaning the 78dBA recording threshold on the noise monitor was not exceeded.</p> <p>There was also nothing unusual from an operational perspective, noted in the ops report with the exception of there being a large number of hatchlid moves. This vessel had an exchange of 360 moves, including 34 hatchlids. There was no time pressure to complete this exchange.</p> <p>There were no trucks in the Port for receipt and delivery of containers. Any truck movements on the highway are not a port noise.</p>	The complainant responded to advise there were no trucks on the highway at 1220.

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
		<p>Noise measurements from cell phones and other uncalibrated devices should also be interpreted with caution.</p>	
29.01.21	<p>A complainant phoned our gatehouse at 2205 to advise they heard huge crashes and bangs just before 2200 from container operations at MWS.</p>	<p>Container operations on the MSC Alabama commenced at 1215 on the 29th and were completed at 0435 on the 30th. The exchange on this vessel was 660 including 20 hatchlids.</p> <p>The noise monitor recorded two sounds around the time the call was received. The first was a crane picking up a hatchlid off the wharf at 2156. This had an Lmax of 86.0dBA. The second was a crane picking up a hatchlid from the wharf at 2205 with an LMax of 84.3dBA. Outside of this, noise doesn't look too bad during the night time period. The significant noise event threshold was not exceeded. The crane was working at the southern end of MW at the time.</p> <p>We have uncovered a difference in the function of Crane 4 which impacts the ease with which hatchlids are picked up. We have technicians from Liebherr coming to site late in February to look at this further. Until this time we will put Crane 4 at the northern end of MW whenever we are able. Some ships configurations mean this might not always be possible.</p>	<p>The complainant thanked us for this response, and noted it was pleasing to see the improvement from the new crane. They advised the noises were loud to them and was surprised they didn't trigger the threshold.</p>
01.02.21	<p>A complainant lodged three noise complaints via the online form, the first was received at 0420 about noise at 0403. They cites bangs and screeches from containers being moved around the terminal and a 79DbI reading from the upstairs bedroom window. The second was received at 0828 and the complainant says they are concerned about the time between 0300 and 0700, and in the comments the complainant writes Clause 13.4iii of the PNNM Plan -</p>	<p>The Safmarine Bayete was being worked at MW at this time, and the containers exchanged were being moved throughout the terminal.</p> <p>The noise monitor did not record any sounds between 0300 and 0430 meaning the 78dBA recording threshold was not exceeded. Unusually this exchange was all empty containers, with a total of 420 exchanged, and empties are noisier by nature to move around. All of the container handler operators on this shift were experienced, and none were in training.</p> <p>There is a main Port internal roadway inside the Haven Rd boundary fence and containers were being moved away from the wharf up this roadway. They were being placed in a stack reasonably close to this boundary fence during this exchange. Unfortunately, it is not practical to have a container barrier in</p>	<p>No response was received.</p>

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
	<p>Statement of intent. "Placing stacks of empty containers where practical, to form a buffer between the Port Hills and Port Operations , subject to obtaining a balance between noise mitigation and adverse visual effects, and determining that there is no adverse effects due to deflection of noise" This is being completely ignored by Port Management. The work was being carried out behind the BP Depot. The metal fences exacerbate the output. No Container Barrier.</p> <p>The third was received at 2023 about noise between 0300 and 0700 on the 01st, the complainant says Hyster 2046 and 2050 operating within 120m of my Boundary . 79DbL . PNL sound recording equipment is 400m from this point and round the Haven Road Corner. Above Wakefield Quay. This is not in accordance with the Environment Court recommendation. No Container barrier on the Port Boundary.</p>	<p>this area as it is a main internal roadway.</p> <p>Noise measurements from cell phones and other uncalibrated devices should also be interpreted with caution.</p>	
01.02.21	<p>A complainant lodged a noise complaint via the online form at 0702 to advise the noise of containers crashing has seldom been loud enough to keep her awake from what she assumes is the new crane, is very noisy indeed between 0300 and 0400.</p>		<p>The complainant enquired after the next PNLC Meeting in her response.</p>

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
01.02.21	A complainant phoned our gatehouse at 0753 on the 01st to advise at 0740 they heard crashes and bang from the operation at MWS.	<p>The Safmarine Bayete was operating at MWS at the time the complainant was concerned about. The exchange on this vessel was 420.</p> <p>The noise likely heard was a crane landing a hatchlid on the wharf. The crane had several attempts between 0742 and 0743 to attach the spreader to the hatchlid and this generated three sounds files with a LMax's readings of 85.6, 85.2, and 84.7dBA. The crane driver on at the time is an experienced operator, and he had a hatchman giving him distance information via radio. This was this particular vessels first call to Nelson, and it's possible the hatchlid was slightly different to normal. This occurred outside of night time hours therefore the significant noise event threshold does not apply however these sound files were less than this threshold trigger level.</p> <p>We have uncovered a difference in the function of Crane 4 which impacts the ease with which hatchlids are picked up. We have technicians from Liebherr coming to site late in February to look at this further. Until this time we will put Crane 4 at the northern end of MW whenever we are able. Some ships configurations mean this might not always be possible.</p>	No response received.
02.02.21	A complainant emailed me directly at 2318 to advise they experienced unacceptable levels of noise, bangs and crashes from hatchlid removal. They advised they were woken at 22:58, they are continuing at the time of writing and they heard up to 8 or 10 separate crashes.	<p>The Cali was being worked at MWS at the time this complainant was concerned about. The noise monitor recorded four sounds specific to two hatchlid movements at this time. They had an Lmax of 78.6, 79.8, 79.1, and 80.0dBA LMax at 22:56, 22:57, 23:02, and 23:12.</p> <p>Crane 4 was working the southern finger of MWS at this time which is the closest part of the operation to the residential boundary. It unusual that LMax values less than 80dBA generate complaints.</p> <p>We have uncovered a difference in the function of Crane 4 which impacts the ease with which hatchlids are picked up. We have technicians from Liebherr coming to site late in February to look at this further. Until this time we will put Crane 4 at the northern end of MW whenever we are able. Some ships configurations mean this might not always be possible.</p>	No response received.

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
02.02.21	<p>A complainant emailed me directly as a reply to the email discussed above at 0727 on the morning of the 02nd to advise more specifically they were woken to a series of five booming bangs between 2255 and 2303. They note they needed to close all windows and doors to block out the noise from Crane 4 operating so close to their location. They go on to say Crane 4 and its proximity to their location has not helped what is already known to be a serious and ongoing problem.</p>	<p>The Cali was being worked at MWS at the time this complainant is concerned about. The noise monitor recorded three sounds specific to two hatchlid movements at this time. They had an LMax of 78.6, 79.8, 79.1 dBA LMax at 22:56, 22:57 and 23:02. Crane 4 was working the southern finger of MWS at this time which is the closest part of the operation to the residential boundary. It unusual that LMax values less than 80dBA generate complaints.</p> <p>We have uncovered a difference in the function of Crane 4 which impacts the ease with which hatchlids are picked up. We have technicians from Liebherr coming to site late in February to look at this further. Until this time we will put Crane 4 at the northern end of MW whenever we are able. Some ships configurations mean this might not always be possible.</p> <p>Crane 4 was at the southern end of MWS in response to an earlier request from this group of residents to have the newest crane at the southern end of the wharf, closest to the residential area. In light of these recent concerns and what is noted above, as an interim measure we will operate Crane 4 on the northern end of the operating platform when we are able. Due to the exchange configurations on some vessels this is not always possible.</p> <p>Acoustic treatment to habitable spaces does not function to minimise noise internally when windows and doors are open.</p>	No response received.
02.02.21	<p>A complainant emailed Council directly to complain about Port Noise on the night of the 02nd. They advised it was some of the loudest bangs and crashes residents have witnessed.</p> <p>Council passed this on to me at 1619 on the 03rd.</p>	<p>The Cali was being worked at MWS at the time this complainant is concerned about. The noise monitor recorded four sounds specific to two hatchlid movements at this time. They had an LMax of 78.6, 79.8, 79.1, and 80.0 dBA LMax at 22:56, 22:57, 23:02, and 2312. Crane 4 was working the southern finger of MWS at this time which is the closest part of the operation to the residential boundary. It unusual that LMax values less than 80dBA generate complaints.</p> <p>We have uncovered a difference in the function of Crane 4 which impacts the ease with which hatchlids are picked up. We have</p>	No response received.

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
		<p>technicians from Liebherr coming to site late in February to look at this further. Until this time we will put Crane 4 at the northern end of MW whenever we are able. Some ships configurations mean this might not always be possible.</p> <p>Crane 4 was at the southern end of MWS in response to an earlier request from this group of residents to have the newest crane at the southern end of the wharf, closest to the residential area. In light of these recent concerns and what is noted above, as an interim measure we will operate Crane 4 on the northern end of the operating platform when we are able. Due to the exchange configurations on some vessels this is not always possible.</p>	
02.02.21	<p>A complainant made a retrospective noise complaint on the 03rd at 2151 to advise on the 02nd it was a very noisy night from the Port. They go on to say we have tolerated a moderate amount of noise over the 18 months in our new home but last night was very loud and led to a very disturbed sleep - can't imagine what residents closer to the port have to put up with. Although the house is double glazed it is completely unreasonable to expect us to have all windows closed on hot summer nights. Surely something must be done about this constant problem.</p>	<p>The Cali was being worked at MWS at the time Mr Hill is concerned about. No specific time information was given in the noise complaint. The noise monitor recorded four sounds specific to two hatchlid movements around 11pm. They had an Lmax of 78.6, 79.8, 79.1, and 80.0 dBA LMax at 22:56, 22:57, 23:02, and 2312. Crane 4 was working the southern finger of MWS at this time which is the closest part of the operation to the residential boundary. There was one further sound recorded at 0428, this was a container handler on a container and it had an LMax of 80.0. It unusual that LMax values less than 80dBA generate complaints. The exchange on this vessel was 416.</p> <p>We have uncovered a difference in the function of Crane 4 which impacts the ease with which hatchlids are picked up, and may have affected what was heard on this night. We have technicians from Liebherr coming to site late in February to look at this further. Until this time we will put Crane 4 at the northern end of MW whenever we are able. Some ships configurations mean this might not always be possible.</p> <p>Acoustic treatment to habitable spaces does not function to minimise noise internally when windows and doors are open.</p>	

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
02.02.21	<p>A complainant emailed retrospectively on the 04th at 0940 to advise they experienced loud crashes at about 11pm. They go on to say regrettably the noise continued well into the night and it seems the port has no interest in the sleep deprivation issue that exists for many near the port or if it does there is no action arising out of mitigation measures, and that they wish to report the ongoing failures of the Company at noise mitigation.</p>	<p>The Cali was being worked at MWS at the time the complainant is concerned about. The noise monitor recorded four sounds specific to two hatchlid movements at this time. They had an Lmax of 78.6, 79.8, 79.1, and 80.0 dBA LMax at 22:56, 22:57, 23:02, and 2312. Crane 4 was working the southern finger of MWS at this time which is the closest part of the operation to the residential boundary. There was one further sound recorded at 0428, this was a container handler on a container and it had an LMax of 80.0. It unusual that LMax values less than 80dBA generate complaints.</p> <p>We have uncovered a difference in the function of Crane 4 which impacts the ease with which hatchlids are picked up. We have technicians from Liebherr coming to site late in February to look at this further. Until this time we will put Crane 4 at the northern end of MW whenever we are able. Some ships configurations mean this might not always be possible.</p> <p>Crane 4 was at the southern end of MWS in response to an earlier request from this group of residents to have the newest crane at the southern end of the wharf, closest to the residential area. In light of these recent concerns and what is noted above, as an interim measure we will operate Crane 4 on the northern end of the operating platform when we are able. Due to the exchange configurations on some vessels this is not always possible.</p>	<p>The complainant had other questions on clauses in the Noise Management Plan. They were around vessels at MW and crane noise. These were answered.</p>
10.02.21	<p>A complainant emailed me directly at 1108 on the 10th to make a retrospective noise complaint about container operations at Main Wharf South. They cite the times 0330 to 0400 and 0730 as having excessive bangs. They query why these 2 vessels are at MWS when they can fit on Brunt Quay. They also go on to say Crane 2 has been</p>	<p>The Hansa Freyberg was being worked at the time the complainant is concerned about. This exchange was 402 moves including 14 hatchlids.</p> <p>The weather at the time made operations challenging with both high winds and intermittent heavy rain throughout this exchange, challenging precision and visibility of the operators. There were also several stoppages throughout due to the safe wind threshold in the terminal being exceeded.</p> <p>The wind was in excess of the recommended threshold for</p>	<p>The complainant queried the berthing of these vessels at MW which was answered in the supplied complaint file.</p>

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
	<p>indicated as one of the noisiest cranes and yet was used as the closest one to residential property.</p>	<p>measuring noise at the time the complainant is concerned about, meaning the noise monitoring data should be viewed as approximate.</p> <p>The noise monitor did not record any sounds between 0330 and 0400, meaning the 78dBA LMax threshold was not exceeded in this time period. At 0730 there was several attempts at picking up a hatchlid at the southern end of Main Wharf. These were at 0725, 0730, and 0731 with LMax values of 89.6, 84.3, and 79.3dBA respectively.</p> <p>Crane 2 was at the southern end of Main Wharf following an earlier complaint alleging excessive noise from Crane 4. In response we agreed that when we are able, we will work Crane 4 at the northern end of Main Wharf, further from the residential boundary. This means another crane needs to be positioned at the southern end. Currently Crane 3 is having some unscheduled repairs, and Crane 1 was removed from service prior to this shift as a fault was identified. Both of these cranes were perceived by the supervisors as being noisier in operation due to their respective faults, which contributed to their removal from service.</p> <p>Crane 3 is currently under repairs, including having its boom lowered on Brunt Quay inside the operating platform for this wharf. Unfortunately, there were no suitable alternative locations for this to occur. This resulted in it not being practicable to service this vessel at Brunt Quay on this occasion as it was not available.</p>	

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
11.02.21	A complainant phoned our gatehouse at 0326 on the 11th to advise they heard three large bangs an hour prior to their call and one at 0319, starting at approx. 0226. They note there was a small container vessel at MWS.	<p>The Hansa Offenburg was being worked at MWS at the time of the complaint. This exchange was 328 moves including 14 hatchlids.</p> <p>The noise monitor only picked up two sounds between 0226 and 0400 in the time period the complainant was concerned about. Both were hatchlid moves, one at 1452 and one at 0329. These had LMax values of 82.8 and 78.7 dBA's respectively.</p> <p>Crane 3 is currently under repairs, this includes having its boom lowered on Brunt Quay inside the operating platform for this wharf. Unfortunately there were no suitable alternative locations for this to occur. This resulted in it not being practicable to service this vessel at Brunt Quay on this occasion, as it was not available.</p>	No response received.
12.02.21	NCC emailed me directly at 0919 on the 12th to advise they received a noise complaint at 0401 on the 10 th . The complainant describes banging noise from the Port woke the person up at 0230, and it's now 4am.	<p>The Hansa Freyberg was being worked at the time the complainant is concerned about. This exchange was 402 moves including 14 hatchlids. This vessel had a high number of empty containers, and these being moved through the terminal to various stacks are possibly a cause of what Mr Blyth heard. However cargo was being loaded at this time, as opposed to being discharged.</p> <p>The weather at the time made operations pretty challenging with both high winds and intermittent heavy rain throughout this exchange, challenging the precision and visibility of the operators. There were also several stoppages throughout due to the safe wind threshold in the terminal being exceeded.</p> <p>The wind was in excess of the recommended threshold for measuring noise at this time, meaning the noise monitoring data should be viewed as approximate. The noise monitor recorded two sounds between 0100 and 0400. The first was at 0235 and was a spreader on a container, this had an Lmax of 84.4 dBA. The second was at 0256 and was a container screeching on a vessel guide below deck, and this had an Lmax of 81.5. The wind was audible in the sound files for these two events.</p>	No response received.

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
		<p>The only notes on the ops report were about weather and wind closures, nothing else unusual was reported.</p>	
13.02.21	<p>A complainant phoned our gatehouse at 0315 on the 13th they advised bangs and clangs were keeping them awake. They go on to say 3 or 4 nights out of the last 5 nights. They know BQ wasn't available but wonders why the crane repairs couldn't be done at MW.</p>	<p>Operations commenced on this vessel at 0125, following its arrival. This was a large exchange of 962 moves including 28 hatchlid moves. There were issues with the locking mechanism on one spreader noted in the ops report which possibly influenced some container noise, this was changed out when the issue was identified, followed by a full crane change after a fault was also identified with one of the cranes.</p> <p>The noise monitor picked up three sounds in the hour prior to this complainants call. They were at 0235, 0244, and 0258. These measured 79.7, 78.9, and 82.4dBA LMax and all three were caused by container handlers picking up containers on the wharf. All were much less than the significant noise threshold.</p> <p>The crane repairs did not influence the berthing of this vessel, as it is too long to be safely berthed and operated at Brunt Quay. These unscheduled and urgent crane repairs could not be completed on Main Wharf because it would have resulted in only Brunt Quay being available for servicing container vessels. All container vessels, and in particular the container vessels in the schedule during the repair window were not able to all be received to Brunt Quay, due to their size. Using Main Wharf for crane repairs would have compromised our ability to service the scheduled container vessels.</p>	No response received.
10.02.21	<p>NCC emailed through a noise complaint from a complainant on the 18th at 1535. The complaint was about noise on the 10th. NCC provide details the complainant heard loud bangs on the 10th at 0127 - 0330, with another one at 0420 and 0730</p>	<p>The Hansa Freyberg was being worked at MWS at the time of this complaint. This exchange was 402 including 14 hatchlid movements.</p> <p>The weather at the time made operations pretty challenging with both high winds and intermittent heavy rain throughout this exchange, challenging precision and visibility of the operators. There were also several stoppages throughout due to the safe wind threshold in the terminal being exceeded.</p>	No response received.

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary	Complainant Feedback
		<p>The wind speed exceeded the recommended threshold values for measuring noise at the time of the complaint. Noise measurements should be interpreted as approximate. The noise monitor did not record any sounds between 0100 and 0230, or around 0330 meaning the 78dBA threshold was not exceeded. There was a sound recorded at 0418, this had an Lmax of 86.5dBA and this was a spreader on a hatchlid. At 0730 there was several attempts at picking up a hatchlid at the southern end of Main Wharf. These were at 0725, 0730, and 0731 with LMax values of 89.6, 84.3, and 79.3dBA respectively.</p> <p>Crane 3 was under repairs at the time of this complaint, this necessitated having its boom lowered on Brunt Quay inside the operating platform for this wharf. Unfortunately, there were no suitable alternative locations for this to occur. This resulted in it not being practicable to service this vessel at Brunt Quay on this occasion, as it was not available.</p>	