

Minutes Port Noise Liaison Committee

Date:	14 September 2022
Venue:	PNL Training Centre
Time:	1200hrs
Present:	Bob Dickinson (Chair), Ian Wright (residents' rep), Tony Vining (residents' rep), Peter Moffatt (residents' rep), Matt McDonald (PNL rep), Kim Lui (PNL Environmental Officer), Kathryn Halder (PNL Environmental Consultant), Hayden Grainger (PNL Stevedoring), Alex Haughey (PNL Marine Operations Manager) Liz Versteeg (Minutes)

		Discussion	Action Points Arising
1.	Welcome & introductions	Bob welcomed the committee members, and visitors Kathryn, Hayden and Alex Mr Rod Duke sent his apologies as he is unable to attend the meeting due to being overseas Tony sent his apologies and noted he would be slightly late to the meeting	
2.	Minutes from 8/6/22	Circulated / read / accepted Moved by Ian and seconded by Peter. Carried.	
3.	Matters Arising from previous meeting	<p>3.1 Operational Constraints of the wharves</p> <p>A map was presented showing the wharves and associated constraints. Matt gave an overview.</p> <p>3.2 Meeting with NEAG</p> <p>Bob questioned whether NEAG were still interested in a meeting.</p> <p>It was note that Mr Duke was the person requesting meeting and the “driver” of this and was currently overseas. Peter thought that Rod wanted the committee to suggest dates. Tony confirmed when he arrived that close-out was still required on several questions raised by Mr Duke before proposed dates for the next meeting could be agreed with NEAG. Kathryn noted that these were additional questions to the ones PNL had already responded and included for discussion in the PNLC meeting.</p>	<p>A pdf copy to be issued to PNLC members</p> <p>PNL to reply on Rod's further enquiries. PNL to propose times to meet with NEAG</p>

		Discussion	Action Points Arising
4.	Issued tabled by PNL & resident reps	<p>4.1 Noisy Vessel – Safeen Prime</p> <p>Kim gave an overview on complaints regarding this vessel and all the work that was being done by PNL, the shipping line, the vessel and the acoustic engineers to identify and manage generator noise for this vessel. The owner of the vessel had been contacted regarding mitigation of noise and the requirement for silencers to be installed as a matter of urgency. The vessel had advised it would take around 10 weeks to get a silencer and then additional time to install it.</p> <p>Matt advised that he had talked to the shipping line and confirmed that it will be the vessel's last visit to Nelson tomorrow (15th September) for at least this year, with the service being paused for the remainder of the year. Matt also noted that ANL were actively trying to get rid of the vessel visiting NZ ports and were hopeful it wouldn't be back. Although PNL had restricted this call of the vessel to day-time, unfortunately, due to tides, the vessel will arrive around 11 am not leave port until around midnight. Matt advised that PNL would be sending public communication out regarding the vessels visit.</p> <p>Kim discussed there being a specification being developed for NZ around ships noise based on international standard NEPTUNES. He would be attending a conference on this with other Ports in October.</p> <p>4.2 Discussion on matters raised by Roderick Duke on 16 August</p> <p>Bob sought clarification on Rod's request regarding draft minutes being available on the website within 1 month of the PNLC meetings. Kathryn gave an overview of the current process for context. Tony thought that Rod's point on the minutes was very valid.</p> <p>Bob advised a PNLC meeting was required to ratify minutes and proposed new process to enable draft minutes to be made available on the website within 1 month of a meeting and then ratified following the next PNLC meeting and a final copy added to the website, replacing the draft minutes.</p> <p>Tony said that the minutes need to reflect discussions in a clear manner that related to the issues discussed. It was agreed that draft minutes would be circulated to the PNLC for comment within 1 week of the meeting. All comments to be received within 3 working days. Minutes to be updated by PNL and circulated. If no further comments received the draft minutes will be loaded to the PNLC website.</p> <p>Discussion was had on the four questions that Rod had raised:</p>	<p>Minutes to be drafted by PNL and circulated for comments</p>

	Discussion	Action Points Arising
	<p><u>Keta Berthed at Main Wharf instead of Brunt Quay</u> - Alex explained that the key outcome of any mooring arrangement was symmetry between the forward and after lines to ensure that there was no resultant force in any direction and that the maximum size of vessel that was able to achieve this symmetry and therefore an acceptable level of health and safety risk at Brunt Quay is 180m. Even if a vessel could physically be berthed at a particular wharf, the main deciding factor was the risk level. Hayden advised that Health and Safety were paramount and ultimately the Master has the final say.</p> <p>Tony said that residents don't understand what is going on and why vessels berth at the different wharves. Peter wondered whether there was anything that could be done to get vessels off Main Wharf. Tony said that this had been done by way of the Main Wharf Upgrade but felt that the net result was minimal.</p> <p>Discussion around options was had however there was no straight forward answer nor any quick easy fix. Ultimately any vessels over 180m are berthed at Main Wharf and as far north as possible to allow for stevedoring to occur safely.</p> <p>Bob stated that the further extension of Main Wharf is to be considered by PNL Board in the Master Plan. Bob queried whether the shallow area between Main Wharf and brunt Quay was part of the next dredging campaign. Matt said PNL did not have consent to do this. Tony thought that that would be part of the earlier consent for the Main Wharf.</p> <p>Bob brought the discussions to a close and Matt said that this could be discussed further at the NEAG meeting to help address Rod's question but ultimately it came down to health and safety and risk level.</p> <p><u>Stevedoring Operation Time</u> – Hayden responded as to why there were issues with this particular event. He said the PNL were also not happy with situation and was outside of PNL's control on this occasion. It was an abnormal operation contributed by unscheduled last-minute changes to plans made by the shipping line amongst several other factors.</p> <p><u>Napier's Ports Soft Touch Down Technology</u> – Kim advised that he had contacted Port of Napier and they were using the same technology as Port Nelson the only difference is the manufacturer which is linked to the type of cranes at each port. Tony asked when will the other cranes be fitted with this technology. Matt advised that cranes 1 & 2 were too old to be retro fitted and that PNL was looking into whether it could be fitting into crane 3. Peter said apparently there was a huge difference at Napier and wondered why. Hayden said it was impossible to know without knowing what it was like</p>	

	Discussion	Action Points Arising
	<p>before the technology was fitted.</p> <p>Peter recalled that prior committee member Bruce provided some information in this arena and wonder what came of it.</p> <p>Tony couldn't comprehend why the cranes couldn't have better sensors like motor vehicles that would indicate when a spreader was coming close to a hatchlid or container. Hayden advised that PNL was looking in-house at spreader technology which could have positive spin-offs.</p> <p>Discussion was had around new crane in this financial year and whether electric cranes and second hand cranes would be looked at. Matt advised yes we would look at electric cranes, and second hand should there be anything worthy of looking at. Matt also noted some of the challenges that would be associated with getting power to the mobile cranes and managing operations around any cabling.</p> <p><u>Further Extension of Main Wharf</u> – Matt advised that this would be considered as part of the Master Plan project which is on this financial year's agenda. Tony referred to the last paragraph of Rod's recent letter and said that Rod was still keen to have a follow-on meeting and that NEAG wanted a detailed response before the meeting. Matt advised that this would happen.</p> <p>4.3 Discussion on matters raised by Peter Moffatt on 8 August regarding his complaint on 24 July</p> <p>Peter wanted a better understanding of what generates actions from complaints and referenced the Complaints Reporting Procedure. He went through his complaint which he entered on-line, subsequently discussed with both Marta and Kim, and detailed in his August 8th email. He noted that a second complaint was lodged by another resident of a similar incident occurring some minutes later. This event was reported to have an Lmax of 88.0dBA being 1dBA under the significant noise threshold and was the highest Lmax reading in the July Monthly Sound Report. He asked what action had been taken. Did PNL look at footage, was the operator talked to, what learnings are there and how are they disseminated, what mitigation is there to prevent it from happening again.</p> <p>Kim explained the complaint process: following a complaint an investigation report of the noise data is run for the time of concern. If there is a soundtrack or noise alert recorded, this will be listened to identify the noise at the time, it will be supported by a review of the footage to confirm the noise source and any specific events happening at the time. However, the available footage can be constrained as playback only allows you to see what was being viewed by the operations security</p>	<p>PNL to reply on Rod's further enquiries.</p>

		Discussion	Action Points Arising
		<p>team at the time. For Peter's complaint, during the time of concern, there was a limited vision from the footage which was zoomed in focusing on the landing of the containers on the wharf instead of showing the whole crane operations. Also, due to the limitation of the access agreement to the footage, we can watch the footage but cannot download or export the video record. The video footage is saved for 1 month before being overwritten.</p> <p>Hayden commented that due to leave it was a pity that he had not been able to view the footage at the time as it would have been useful to see what was happening in light of Peter's comments in the meeting. It will now have been recorded over as footage is only stored for 1 month. From discussions the lifting of multiple containers in the way described is unusual and may have been due to equipment sticking on the containers but cannot be confirmed. Hayden and Matt clarified the internal process on learnings from an event and will continue to monitor.</p> <p>Peter quoted The Port Nelson Management Plan, Complaints Procedure Appendix B which requires video monitoring footage to be used where possible... in order to reduce the occurrence of significant noise. Complaint and investigation report tabled at next PNLC meeting to include... a review of actions undertaken.</p> <p>4.4 Discussion on PNL's response on 12 August on Ian Wright's enquiry on 5 July</p> <p>Ian advised that he was happy for his discussion to be deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
5.	Noise monthly reports	<p>5.1 Overview of noise monitoring data and top monthly noise events including PNLC review of noise complaints.</p> <p>The committee received the monthly reports for June, July and August.</p>	
6.	Acoustic treatment of properties	<p>6.1 Acoustic Assessment to 22 September 2022.</p> <p>Kim provided an up-date on progress with acoustic assessment and treatments.</p> <p>6.2 Acoustic Treatment contributed.</p> <p>Based on those assessment Port has contributed to the mitigation measures for 14 Stanley Crescent (Partial).</p> <p>6.3 Acoustic Treatment in progress.</p> <p>Details were provided on works in progress.</p>	

		Discussion	Action Points Arising
7.	PNL Project Update	<p>7.1 Noise Monitoring Upgrade</p> <p>Kathryn provided information on the noise monitoring upgrade and explained the noise learning software, Kathryn noted the recommendation from Marshall Day was to not develop a bespoke PNL system but to instead work with other NZ ports and the manufacturer to improve the existing Envirosuite software to provide this capability. Marshall Day noted that this could take a few years to be developed. In the interim PNL are working with Rhys to model noise generation at the port and identify the best locations either on Port or in the community where new monitors should be installed. PNL are also seeking prices for new monitors that would be compatible with our current system and software.</p> <p>Tony queried whether PNL had considered a location for a monitor on the property owned at Queens Road and whether there were any other locations and also whether there was need for triangulation.</p> <p>Kathryn confirmed that legalities were in place at the Queens Road property should it be confirmed that this was an appropriate location for a noise monitor. She said that Rhys Hegley would be assessing locations for monitors which may also include a location more to the north of the operations area.</p> <p>Tony reminded that height would need to be a factored into location of monitors.</p>	
8.	Other Business	No other business and committee adjourned to visit the crane simulator.	
9.	Next meeting	Wednesday 14th December 2022	