

## Minutes Port Noise Liaison Committee

Date:	28 May 2021
Venue:	PNL Board Room
Time:	1200hrs
Present:	Bob Dickinson (Chair), Bruce Robertson (residents' rep), Robert Styles (residents' rep), Kelly Leonard (PNL rep), Allanagh Rivers (PNL rep), Matt McDonald (PNL rep), L Versteeg (PNL - Minutes).

Agenda Item		Discussion	Action Points Arising
1.	Welcome & Apologies	Bob welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2.	Minutes from 17/03/21	Circulated/read/accepted with one minor amendment Robert/Matt	
3.	Matters Arising	<p><b>Residents' Rep Election</b> Discussion was had on the up-coming election for a residents' representative for the committee and the timeframe for voting. Robert addressed the issue of delays in the postal service and not all residents receiving information. Kelly clarified distribution list and advised that there had also been a delay in posting the initial nomination papers due to delays in obtaining updated resident information from NCC for the Port Effects Control Overlay. The committee agreed that the voting forms would be sent out on Monday 31<sup>st</sup> May and forms post-stamped the 9<sup>th</sup> June would be accepted for counting.</p> <p><b>Progress with 2018 Contours</b> Kelly gave an update on the 2018 Contours and advised that NCC had provided the list of addresses in each Stage and that communications were currently being prepared to be sent out.</p> <p><b>NRMP Review – Noise Report, PNLC feedback, upcoming meeting</b> Kelly advised that PNL had sent their feedback to NCC on the</p>	Kelly to send voting papers out on Monday 31 <sup>st</sup> May 2021

	<p>Noise Report, early engagement but had not received a response. Kelly asked whether the PNLC would like to give their feedback to NCC.</p> <p>Bob thought that would be a good idea as the PNLC is separate from PNL. The committee agreed that they would like to put their views forward.</p> <p>Robert advised that he had drafted a letter on behalf of himself and Bruce and would send a copy of the draft letter to the rest of the committee on Monday. Robert outlined the content of the letter. Further discussion was had on NZ6809, clarification on how noise levels were measured, updating of PNL website and having a PNLC page which could address residents' concerns and provide transparency on what the PNLC have and are actively doing.</p> <p><b>Amended complaints process</b></p> <p>Discussion was had on a proposed new complaints process, and the paper prepared for the Committee</p> <p>Bob proposed changing the threshold by 5dba as opposed to the suggested 4dba.</p> <p>Robert asked how the new process would work. Kelly explained and outlined that there would be no change to the Significant Noise Event Investigation Process, and changes were focussed on treatment of complaints with noise monitor sounds below 84dba. The paper provided was a discussion document to gain feedback on possible changes that could be made.</p> <p>Bob proposed that a generic email address for complaints was a good idea and this was supported by the committee.</p> <p>Robert said that the PNLC would need to assess any proposed changes in relation to compliance obligations.</p> <p>Bob highlighted how complaints were investigated and that Kelly was a responsive listener and investigator. Robert concurred that Kelly had done a fantastic job to date.</p> <p>Robert questioned whether PNL had looked at the Port Otago sound recorders and whether they would look at something similar. Kelly advised that PNL were doing work in this area.</p> <p><b>Container Noise Trial Report</b></p> <p>Kelly advised that this report had not arrived in time for the meeting and that Hegley Acoustics had promised to have it to</p>	<p>Kelly to progress the set-up of a new email address for complaints</p> <p>Matt to report back to PNLC.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>her by Monday 31<sup>st</sup> May.          Bob expressed how interesting it was to be at the trial.          Robert queried whether there were options available to incentivise good work ethics around noise levels by PNL staff working on vessels. Matt covered off on this and the practicalities of it.          Discussion was also had on the possibility of use of portable acoustic barriers at Port Nelson, Matt has been asked to report in to the next PNLC Meeting on the feasibility of using acoustic barriers and their proposed action, also on their use at Port Napier.</p> <p><b>Six Monthly Report to NCC</b>          Kelly advised that she was drafting a six-monthly report to NCC. This was over and above the compliance requirements and provided greater detail than the monthly reports that she currently provided to NCC. The report gave NCC a greater understanding and the opportunity to provide feedback, and be more in touch with Port Noise on a regular basis.          Bob queried whether TDC and NCC councillors had been given the opportunity to have a port tour.          Matt advised this generally happened after the Local Body Elections.</p> <p><b>PNL Project Update</b>          Allanagh gave an update PNL projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main Wharf North</li> <li>• Log Yard Repaving</li> <li>• Stormwater Upgrade</li> <li>• Resilience</li> </ul> <p><b>Council attendance at PNLC meetings</b>          Kelly advised that Neil Henderson had resigned from his position with NCC and he advised that other NCC members would be available for any future PNLC invitations.          Bob requested that the committee's best wishes be extended to Neil, and the invitation be extended to NCC for a guest at these meetings. – Robert/Bruce</p>	<p>Allanagh to follow up on Port tour for councillors</p> <p>Kelly to draft a letter to Neil giving the committee's best wishes</p>
4.	Noise Complaints	Kelly presented the noise complaint information for the period	

		<p>since the last meeting.                  Robert advised that a resident had commented to him that it was not "business like" that it took four months before the minutes of the PNLC were put on the website.                  Kelly suggested that the draft minutes could be sent to the committee for earlier comment/approval and once approved, they could be put on the website in a more timely manner.</p>	<p>Kelly to organise earlier approval of minutes for website publication</p>
5.	Noise Monitoring	<p>Kelly presented the monthly and significant noise event information for the period Feb-Apr 2021.</p>	
6.	Acoustic Treatment	<p>Kelly gave an update on two acoustic reports that were being prepared.                  Bob moved that the committee accept the prescribed acoustic treatment on 113 Queens Road be approved due to the delay of receipt of the acoustic report. Bob/Bruce                  Robert commented that he was surprised at some of the new contour lines. Further discussion was had on the proposed changes.</p>	
7.		<p>Meeting closed 1.40pm                  Next Meeting Date: 11<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p>	

## CRM Noise Complaints 13 March 2021 – 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary
15.03.21	The complainant lodged a noise complaint via our online form to advise of a low deep intermittent buzzing/vibration running 5 seconds on, 5 seconds off from 10 pm for the last two nights.	<p>The noise source of this complaint was prior to vessel ops commencing on the MAJD and there was no container vessels in Port the previous night when a similar noise observation was made. There was a vessel at McGlashen Quay the previous night but it had departed prior to receiving the complaint on the 11th, so I'm unable to tie this to a vessel operation.</p> <p>The noise monitor did not pick up anything of note, and the 78dBA threshold was not exceeded at, around or before this time. There was nothing unusual in the background sound files that was obvious. Discussions with the operational staff haven't revealed anything unusual happening at the time of concern that was possibly the cause.</p> <p>From the description given of a low intermittent buzzing/vibration I suspect if this noise was a Port noise it could have been reefer container engines cycling in and out. It is approaching peak fruit season and perhaps it was either a combination of a reasonably full terminal with reefer containers, or one with an engine fault meaning it was noisier than usual. However I'm not convinced it was this either as it would be unusual to hear the individual cycling of reefer at 5 seconds on and off from the residential area as they are not synched in terms of cycle time. Each one runs on it's own cycle to keep at the specified temperature. More often it is heard as a background type buzzing noise.</p> <p>As I'm unable to pinpoint a link between a Port activity and this noise the alternative consideration is that it was something off Port, such as LPG being refilled at BP, tank farm refurbishment at Z (but these works were not happening at night), roadworks or something else.</p>
20.03.21	A complainant called the Gatehouse at 0055 on the 20th March to advise they could hear the banging and crashing of containers, they go on to say it had been going on all night.	<p>Vessel operations on the Cali commenced at 1510 on the 19th, and took a break at 0150 on the 20th during night time hours. Ops on this vessel resumed at 0550 on the 20th until completion at 1135. This exchange was 597, and there was no time pressure to complete.</p> <p>The noise monitor did not record any sounds between 2200 on the 19th and 0700 on the 20th. This means the recording threshold of 78dBA LMax was not exceeded. The location of this complainant relative to the noise monitor location and operations at Main Wharf means they are in an ideal location for the noise monitor to detect noise received at this location, noting they are some distance from Main Wharf.</p> <p>There is nothing unusual noted on the ops report that indicates a cause for unusual noise during this operation. The wind was moderate at the time from a SSE direction, and this was fairly consistent through the night time period.</p> <p>The investigation hasn't revealed a cause for the noise heard on this occasion.</p>

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary
23.03.21	A complainant emailed directly to query why the vessel Seaspan is at Main Wharf and not at Brunt Quay, also complaining that noise was excessive at 1704, 1747 and 1757.	<p>The Seaspan Hannover arrived into Nelson for the first time at 1300 on the 23rd, it was 207.5m long on arrival meaning it is too long to be safely berthed at Brunt Quay. She departed Nelson at 0200.</p> <p>The vessel was operated during day time hours, the first lift occurred at 1350, and the last lift 2145. This exchange was 295 including 20 hatchlid movements. The noise monitor recorded three sounds during the period Mr Hogg was concerned about, one at 1703, this had a measured LMax value of 85.6dBA and was a hatchlid being placed on the wharf. The noise monitor also recorded a sound at 1747, this had a measured LMax value of 78.9dBA and was a container on the wharf. The third was at 1757, had a measured LMax value of 81.7 dBA and this was a twin lift empty containers being placed on the wharf. The recording threshold on the noise monitor is 78dBA, sounds in the 78-81 range generally do not cause complaints, particularly during the day, when the background noise from the city is prevalent.</p> <p>There was nothing unusual noted on the ops report for this vessel.</p>
02.04.21	A complainant emailed directly to advise they were experiencing generator noise from the vessel on Brunt Quay which was berthed with the exhausts facing their location. They go on to say it sounds like its parked right next to us, and it's not great when you're trying to sleep.	<p>This vessel was berthed with its exhausts facing the residential area. This was not the preferred berth or orientation for this vessel, however on this occasion there was no other berthing options available for it.</p> <p>Berthing at Main Wharf South with the exhausts facing away from residents was the preferred option for this vessel, it's length means it would not usually be considered for Brunt Quay. The location of the gangway on this vessel and the only available safe mooring line configuration meant the gangway would have been lowered into the yet to be constructed area of Main Wharf North. This vessel was unable to be shifted to the South as the necessary bollards on the coastal berth could not be accessed due to another vessel being on this berth, and due to construction works at Main Wharf.</p> <p>The vessel was not able to be orientated the other way around on Brunt Quay due to the safe overhang and location of the mooring lines on this vessel. On this occasion there was no other options for berthing this vessel.</p> <p>The noise monitor did not measure anything unusual in terms of noise, or noise increase at this time. It is not in a favourable location for measuring this type of noise from Brunt Quay.</p>
02.04.21	A complainant called our gatehouse at 2250 on April 02nd to advice they were experiencing continuous throbbing engine noises from the vessel at BQ.	<p>This vessel was berthed with its exhausts facing the residential area. This was not the preferred berth or orientation for this vessel, however on this occasion there was no other berthing options available for it.</p> <p>Berthing at Main Wharf South with the exhausts facing away from residents was the preferred option for this vessel, it's length means it would not usually be considered for Brunt Quay. The location of the gangway on this vessel and the only available safe mooring line configuration meant the gangway would have been lowered into the yet to be constructed area of Main Wharf North. This vessel was unable to be shifted to the South as the necessary bollards on the coastal berth could not be accessed due to another vessel being on this berth, and due to construction works at Main Wharf.</p> <p>The vessel was not able to be orientated the other way around on Brunt Quay due to the safe overhang and location of the mooring</p>

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary
		<p>lines on this vessel. On this occasion there was no other options for berthing this vessel.</p> <p>The noise monitor did not measure anything unusual in terms of noise, or noise increase at this time. It is not in a favourable location for measuring this type of noise from Brunt Quay.</p>
10.04.21	<p>A complainant emailed retrospectively on Saturday at 1552 to advise a hatch cover being moved by crane 1 working on Brunt Quay was 72dB between inner and outer contour, exceeds NZS 6809 as the max permitted is 65 at inner boundary, no rubber matting evident. 17 degrees C</p>	<p>The SAGITTA was being worked at Main Wharf South at the time of concern for this complainant. This was a large exchange with 1251 moves including 34 hatchlid moves, this vessel was in Port for a 4 tide stay.</p> <p>It was raining and windy at the time of this complainants concerns (and throughout the night). The wind exceeds the recommended value for measuring noise, so measurements from our noise monitor should be considered as approximate only.</p> <p>At the time of concern the complainant notes Crane 1 picked up a hatch lid (one of the 34 moved) off the vessel (a blind movement), and placed it on the wharf. This movement looks to have been carefully done, as it was very slowly lowered to the wharf. I expect from the time noted on the complaint form this relates to the placement of the hatchlid on the wharf.</p> <p>The noise monitor did not record any sounds between 2300 and 0115, this means the 78dBA LMax recording threshold was not exceeded in this specific period, or during this movement. In other words the noise monitor did not record a clang or bang from this movement, or any other movement between 2300 and 0015. The inner and outer noise contour values the complainant refers to are an Ldn parameter, and I'm unsure how this correlates to any noise measurement provided. Noise recordings from cell phones and other uncalibrated devices should be interpreted with caution. I note from the location of this complaint address they would not have been able to see this part of the operation so I'm unsure where the noise measurement they refer to was taken from.</p>

Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary
12.04.21	<p>A complainant made a noise complaint via our online form at 2241 on the 12th about noise at 2230 on the 12th. Their concern was about banging and shifting containers by a forklift. The information provided says "Forklift Collins Street inner Contour 76.2dBL . 18 degrees, Fails to comply with NZS6809 - 1999. (65dBL max ) Measurement should be at the boundary Not 405 m away on top of the Cement silo (CIAL ruling)".</p>	<p>The Nefeli was being worked at Brunt Quay at the time the complainant was concerned about. This exchange was 500 moves including 18 hatchlid moves, this vessel was in Port for a two tide stay.</p> <p>It was windy at the time noted in the complaint, and the wind exceeded the recommended value for measuring noise at this time, so measurements from our noise monitor should be considered as approximate only. It also rained heavily at time throughout the night time period.</p> <p>The noise monitor did not record any sounds during the night time period (2200 and 0700), this means the 78dBA LMax recording threshold was not exceeded in this specific period. The inner and outer noise contour values the complainant refers to are an Ldn parameter, and I'm unsure how this correlates to any noise measurement provided. Noise recordings from cell phones and other uncalibrated devices should be interpreted with caution.</p> <p>Nothing unusual was noted on the ops report for this vessel, and on this occasion I haven't been able to identify unusual Port noise at the time of concern as part of this investigation.</p>
14.04.21	<p>A complainant lodged a complaint via our online complaint form to complain about noise from the reefer engines facing the residential boundary. Their complaint notification said "Stacks engines facing and next to southern boundary . Contrary to information provided to Rys Hegley by PNL.(page 9 of the November 2018 report.) Photos taken for EC."</p>	<p>We try whenever possible to keep the southern row of reefer full, as these are orientated with their engines facing away from the residential area. However cargo coming through the Port is transient, and back to back container vessels on Sunday and Monday saw the containers in those grids loaded onto those vessels and that southern most row had not been able to be replenished by the time of this complaint.</p>



Date of event	Concern	Investigation Summary
07.05.21	<p>A complainant made a retrospective complaint via the Ports online complaint form on Sunday 09th at 0600 about noise all night on the 07th. They go on to say I am contacting the Port of Nelson to lay a formal complaint for the record as part of an ongoing investigation as to the effects of the Nelson Port noise has on Nelson residents and their wellbeing. I would like to try find a solution for the effect the noise caused by the Nelson Port is having on my personal wellbeing. It is having an effect on my ability to sleep which causes a number of associated problems. I am writing on my behalf but having spoken out I know I am not alone. I would appreciate it if a Port representative could get on contact with me to discuss a potential solution.</p>	<p>The noise monitor did not detect anything unusual during the night time period on the 07th. Between 2200 and 0700 it measured one Port noise from container operations with an LMax of 78.7 which is just over the recording threshold, and wouldn't usually a noise issue at this level. Therefore I suspect it was log operations noise that was heard, and this was likely influenced by atmospheric conditions including an inversion layer being present.</p> <p>The vessel Great Reward was having the top of the holds, and above deck cargo loaded during the night on this date in two bays, generator noise from this vessel may also have been heard. The noise monitor indicates the LAeq value for the night time period was 61.1 dBA as the total noise received at the noise monitor location. Unfortunately noise from log operations has been extensively investigated for noise minimisation, and there is very little practicable solutions that can be put into this part of the operation to further minimise the noise.</p>