

Minutes

Port Noise Liaison Committee

Date:	14 December 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 rep), Kathryn Halder (PNL Environmental Consultant), Colin Devenish (PNL rep), Shannon Holroyd (PNL Environmental Manager) Liz Versteeg (Minutes)

		Discussion	Action Points Arising
1.	Welcome & introductions	Bob welcomed the committee members, visitor Kathryn and introduced new PNL Reps Colin and Shannon. Shannon and Colin gave an introduction about themselves.	
2. a	Minutes from 14/09/22	Ian questioned section 3.4, from the prior meeting minutes. The minutes did not reflect his comments around communication between container handlers and Mafi truck drivers and the tooting of horns for daytime operations contravening the Noise Management Plan (NMP) Section 13.2. Kim explained that this section is relevant to night-time operations and therefore there is no contravention. Ian suggested better feedback be given when committee member queries the minutes via email. Bob requested that the final version of drafted minutes be sent out to committee members. This was checked following the meeting and the above explanation and the final version of drafted minutes was sent to the committee members on 4 October 2022. Circulated / read / revised minutes accepted Moved by Tony and seconded by Ian. Carried.	PNL will continue to a final version of drafted minutes to PNLC the time posting on the website
2. b	Update on Actions Arising from previous meeting	2b(i) Meeting with NEAG Kim noted that following the last PNLC meeting he had sent an email to Rod Duke with three proposed dates for next NEAG meeting and that Rod had confirmed 2 nd February 2023 would suit. Tony requested this date be changed as a few people would be away. Bob suggested it be a couple of weeks later and Tony agreed this would work.	Kim to go back to Rod and suggest new date

		Discussion	Action Points Arising
		<p>2b(ii) PNL Online Complaint System Kim mentioned that, based on comments from the last PNLC meeting, a copy of the complaint will be forwarded to the complainants automatically for their reference.</p> <p>2b(iii) Alternative communication between container handlers and Mafi trucks Kim reported that the Workshop and Stevedoring Team were working together to brainstorm ideas and discuss the feasibilities. This action is ongoing.</p>	
3.	Matters Arising from previous meeting	<p>3a Discussion on PNL's Response on 12 August on Ian Wright's Enquiry on 5th July regarding complaints reporting provided to members</p> <p>Ian talked to his email dated on 13 December with his further comments:</p> <p>Ideally noise monitoring recording should be on closest residential building. Ian requested clarity around what the closest residential building was, and Kim advised that the 'closest residential building' was a generic term and will change based on where the noise is generated from. In relation to noise from Main Wharf the closest residential building would be 70 Queens Road. Ian commented that his belief was that the measurement should be at this property, not where the current noise monitor is located. Kim noted that the current location is as a response to the commissioners' recommendations, modelled as the most appropriate location by the acoustic engineer and as agreed by council.</p> <p>Ian also did not appreciate the comment that readings were "well below the threshold." Tony further explained that what they were getting at was, by the time the wind factor and other factors are taken into account, the readings were always "just under the threshold." Peter concurred that "well below" was not an accurate description. He said that if the noise was sufficient to disturb residents and draw a whole lot of complaints then residents wanted more investigations to be done on those noises that are close to the limit.</p> <p>Matt explained that there are a lot of variants in establishing the readings and what has caused the noise such as wind, whether containers are full/empty, proximity of vessel.</p> <p>Tony said that he understands this but feels they are wasting the representatives time, and nothing is changing. He was woken at 1am and again at 1.45am and wonders why these noises are happening and whether the crane drivers are 'cowboys'. Matt assured Tony that all the crane drivers are very well trained and noise incidences were taken seriously, which is reflected by a decreasing trend in noise levels and no Significant Noise Events (as defined by the NRMP) recorded for more than two years.</p> <p>Ian said that there are expectations from complainants that the committee will provide information on events even if the noise is under the limit. It seems no further investigations are being done and particularly for recurring events. Peter concurred that complaints under the threshold should still be</p>	

	Discussion	Action Points Arising
	<p>investigated. Ian felt the reporting was designed to comply with the Management Plan and seemed to have limited use for investigation and improvement. Bob said that there is an obligation on PNL for “continuous improvement” which would include noises under the limit.</p> <p>Tony felt that PNL was going through the motions but in reality, nothing was getting better. He felt residents were constantly being disturbed but had given up on reporting noise complaints.</p> <p>Ian questioned why the committee was not privy to information for example where PNL had correspondence with ship operators and what the response was from them.</p> <p>Matt said that this could not be supplied because it could be seen as commercially sensitive. Ian disagreed and struggled to understand why it would be commercially sensitive and if so, cross out the commercially sensitive stuff. Tony quotes the Commissioner Recommendation 07/01 (Port Noise Variation) Clause 4.10 that PNLC is in a position to advise the Port Operator on port noise issues. It was agreed Port Nelson could provide the factual extracts of correspondence relating to specific vessels.</p> <p>Peter wondered whether the committee were able to be provided with addresses attached to the individual complaints to enable a better analysis of the noise complaints. Kathryn advised this may be a breach of privacy and suburbs could be provided. Ian suggested supplying generic street names as giving suburbs would not help them assess issues.</p> <p>Discussion was had around the types of noise and why noises that were under the threshold gained a lot more complaints e.g. generator sounds. Bob commented that unfortunately as you get older the low ‘thud thud’ sounds like generators and bass speakers was a frequency that caused annoyance and thus complaints.</p> <p>Peter agreed that these noises although under the threshold were very annoying and agreed to have finer cover on street location could be valuable. He pointed out that the port was required to keep a register that had addresses and to make that register available to the committee so could not really see the problem in providing this information. Kathryn confirmed that PNL currently keep a register of the address of any complaint, if provided by the complainant, as set out in the NMP. PNL would seek advice on the Privacy Act to enable the general location of complaints to be shared with the committee.</p> <p>Ian asked for clarification whether a noise not exceeding the limits was recorded. Kathryn explained what is recorded, how it works and what data is collected and advised that this was an area that was under discussion by both national and international ports.</p>	<p>PNL to seek advice on the Privacy Act and provide more details of location of complaints as appropriate.</p> <p>Copy of original letter to be emailed to committee</p>

	Discussion	Action Points Arising
	<p>Ian also queried the distance between the silo to residential buildings and what was happening about further noise meters. Kathryn explained why this position was originally chosen and it was agreed to discuss the additional monitors as part of a later agenda item.</p> <p>Ian asked why the committee had not received a copy of the original Hegley Draft Report from Reece and only received the 'modified' final letter. Kathryn explained that PNL did not believe the original draft letter fully answered Peter's questions and she requested further clarification. This was discussed at a previous PNLC meeting and Kathryn confirmed that both drafts contained the same information however, the reviewed letter was felt to answer the PNLC questions clearer. Ian said he would like to see the original letter from Hegley presented to the Committee. Colin asked whether Ian was questioning Hegley's letter was modified based on PNL's comments. Ian said that he wanted to satisfy that there was not information in the report that PNL did not want to show.</p> <p>Ian asked what the process was with following up with PNL staff as part of the investigations into a complaint and whether the crane drivers were talked to. Kim explained the process and Ian questioned whether the individual driver was addressed. Kim advised it was done as a group i.e. with all crane drivers.</p> <p>Matt felt an assumption was being made that all crane drivers were no good and he explained the rationale around crane drivers, variations in abilities and non-performance. He believed things were not worse as was suggested and improvements had been made and historical records show this. From PNL's perspective, a lot had been done.</p> <p>Peter responded that they were not seeing evidence that actions had been taken on incidents for example, here is the video, evidence, action taken etc. He believes under the plan this information should be provided to the committee and said he had never seen this while he was on the committee or going back through the minutes for the last two years. It does not give them anything to take back to residents. He felt the role of the PNLC as described in the NMP required it to do more on reviewing follow-up actions from complaints not just about compliance.</p> <p>Matt advised that videos had been provided in the past. Bob said there needed to be an ongoing program on continuous improvement and given at each meeting i.e. what is going on, what progress is being made.</p>	<p>PNL to look at saving footage from specific complaint investigations to assist with discussions on the monthly reports at the next PNLC meeting.</p>

	Discussion	Action Points Arising
	<p>3b PNLC Annual Newsletters</p> <p>Peter questioned whether point four of the September minutes of meetings was a true and accurate recall of the September minutes. Kathryn referenced cl.4.3 of the minutes and felt it was an accurate record. Peter felt that questions raised at the meeting were not adequately answered. Bob asked what Peter expected to see. The Committee agreed to change the wording to be "Question were raised and PNL answered."</p> <p>Colins interpretation was that the process was being followed but the committee's concern was that all information was not being shared with them. Peter confirmed that they were after transparency.</p> <p>Kim asked if the committee moving forward would be happy for the newsletter to be distributed electronically and explained the process for this to happen. The committee were agreeable to this.</p> <p>3c Tony Vining Enquiry on Operations with MSC Langsar</p> <p>Tony outlined an incident while on a neighbour's deck during daytime hours wherein there were horrific noises and wondered how the operators could get it so wrong and wondered what did go wrong and why.</p> <p>Kim explained that this was normal operations and several factors come into play such as wind. Tony felt there was clearly an operational problem and said the committee needed to find out what went wrong. Peter questioned the positioning of the vessel and Kathryn confirmed that it was very forward due to it being one of the longest vessels the Port has had, and it could not berth any further north.</p> <p>Further discussions were had around crane operations, what is acceptable and what has been done. Matt reiterated that this was normal operations and could relate to more empty container movements or crane driver being on training and Kim emphasised that this was daytime operations. Ian said that this was the type of information they needed.</p> <p>Bob commented that most of the higher noise incidents were hatch-lid incidences, and this should be looked at.</p> <p>Peter felt that if an investigative report is not given to the committee, then they do not get to see the data around incidents such as this. They need to know why, how, what to do to improve otherwise the function of the PNLC is not happening.</p>	<p>PNL to amend the newsletter according to the comments.</p> <p>Request to be sent out by PNL with this year's PNLC newsletter for people to register for an electronic copy next time.</p>

		Discussion	Action Points Arising
		<p>Colin suggested feedback is needed on what caused the issues and was there a way to eliminate this. Kathryn suggested that this discussion be parked for the time being and the team would look back through the data.</p> <p>Discussion was had around video footage. Kim advised that video footage is stored only for one month and footage is also dependent on the angle of the cameras at the time. This is determined by the security team at the time and the specific operations they need to view. Peter queried whether the video technology side of monitoring needed to be reviewed. Matt informed that some cameras are fixed and some moveable and the reality was footage was generic and you did not get the finer detail. Peter suggested that technology had improved and queried what other Ports had and felt a review was warranted.</p> <p>Kim showed a video of an incident which the committee found very helpful and said that this sort of information would enable them to respond better to residents. Peter wondered whether this could be regular happening. Kim would bring some other examples to the next meeting.</p> <p>3d Peter Moffatt's Enquiry on PNL's Response on Complaints received between 4th and 7th December</p> <p>Peter was comfortable that this item had been covered earlier.</p>	<p>Kim to bring video noise examples to next meeting</p>
4.	Noise monthly reports	<p>Overview of noise monitoring data and top monthly noise events including PNLC review of noise complaints.</p> <p>Bob questioned that each report was about five pages long and did the committee still require this information. The committee confirmed that they would like to keep it.</p> <p>The committee received the monthly reports for September, October, and November</p>	
5.	Acoustic treatment of properties	<p>Update on Acoustic Treatment of Properties</p> <p>Kim provided an update on assessments in September and on progress with acoustic treatments together with assessments that were due in January 2023.</p>	
6.	PNL Project Update	<p>Kathryn provided information on the noise monitoring upgrade and advised that Nelson City Council had been on site doing an assessment in September. They indicated they would support a second noise monitor, but PNL were still waiting for the official report. Advice would be sought from Rhys on the best location for future monitor(s). Kathryn presented a map showing possible locations being considered. Tony queried whether only one monitor was being looked at. Kathryn confirmed "at least one." Tony said that 70 Queens Road would be an obvious location.</p>	

	Discussion	Action Points Arising
	<p>Peter asked whether the intention was that the compliance reading will move from the silo to the monitor in the community to remove the need to include an adjustment factor to allow for the distance of the current monitor from the residential boundary. Kathryn commented that the current compliance for the Lmax limit is at the 65dBALdn contour line on the Port Noise Contour Map and for noise mitigation at each residential property. This is not likely to change with additional monitors but that will be part of Councils review decision.</p> <p>The additional monitor gives a greater amount of information to ensure that these compliance limits are being met, each location has a main area of focus, and each have pros and cons. Collecting data as close to the noise source as possible minimises contamination from other sources and for this noise to be modelled out with distance. Compliance is still the acoustic standard and NRMP requirements of a property.</p> <p>6b Vessel Generator Noise</p> <p>Kim advised PNL had approached Marshall Day to provide a high level study on the effect of vessel generator noise in the Nelson area and Kathryn said the purpose is to understand generator noise, frequencies and how it is affected by different building materials, the topography of the area, and what mitigation measures are available to the port and visiting vessels, in essence why is generator noise causing so much disturbance at greater distances from the source. This is the start of something new as historically it has been about the clangs and bangs and Lmax levels. PNL is also working with the wider Ports of NZ and Australia group to better understand the effects from generator noise.</p> <p>Peter concurred that this sounded good as there was a big gap in their knowledge on this. Kathryn would provide feedback when it became available.</p> <p>6c PNL Master Plan Update</p> <p>Colin gave an update on the Port Nelson Master Plan and advised that the process had started and GHD had been appointed as the lead consultant for the project. The scope was the master planning would be looked at holistically. Should have some results by Jun-Jul 2023. As one of the stakeholders, PNLC would be invited to provide their comments in this planning process.</p> <p>Bob commented that the committee had already requested that under the Master Plan, Port Nelson consider the gap between MWN and BQ being filled in and that the board confirmed that it would be considered.</p>	

		Discussion	Action Points Arising
		<p>6d Port Noise Contour Review</p> <p>Kim explained that in accordance with the Nelson Resource Management Plan, the existing Port Noise Contour would be reviewed in April 2023. He has engaged Hegley Acoustic to review the information for their modelling work.</p> <p>Ian asked what that physically involved, and Kim advised the work based on the figures of the plant's usage and the operations at different part of the Port Operational Area.</p> <p>Ian asked what dates would be chosen to model noise levels and the contours, and Kim answered that the modelling will be done for five consecutive busy days.</p> <p>Ian felt that the information would be invalid if a review of the contour plan did not use larger ships. Discussion was had on container movement, how many empty containers and transhipped containers. It was felt that since the last contour review, what happens on Main Wharf North has changed dramatically including the number of containers stacked. Kathryn advised the review will consider the changes that have happened since the last modelling was undertaken such as changes in equipment and operations etc. Matt also gave examples on how the review model works.</p> <p>Tony suggested that for the Master Plan, it should focus on the mitigation measures of noise at the operations instead of the treatment at the properties.</p>	
7.	Other Business	<p>Ian advised that availability of committee member for proposed next meeting was negligible and could another date be considered.</p> <p>Bob suggested 29th March 2023 which was agreed on and wished everyone a Merry Christmas.</p>	
9.	Next meeting	Wednesday 29 th March 2023	

Appendix 1 – Email from Ian Wright dated on 5th July 2022

From: Ian Wright
Sent: Tuesday, 5 July 2022 4:42 pm
To: Kim Lui; Bob + Jill Dickinson; Peter Moffatt; Tony Vining
Subject: Port Noise Monitoring

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello Bob, Kim and PNLC,

Thanks Kim for these reports on complaints received June 26th. Having read your responses I am prompted to make the following observations:-

- The Leq15 remained very close to the threshold for the whole night period. ie. between 60.2 and 64.9
- There were 8 Lmax alerts ranging from 78.6 to 85.1.
- Your reports don't appear to tell us the location where each complaint came from... could you please advise and include in future reports?

Looking at the noise levels, similar to the monthly reports we again see ranges of single noise events and 15 minute sequences, that, while reported just short of significant limits, were still sufficiently loud to cause three residents to lodge complaints. Arguably, there would have been many more affected who did not complain. This backs up the point I made at our last meeting... that the noise reported close to, but not quite reaching current thresholds is still keeping residents awake.

As residents reps Tony, Peter and I are concerned that, only when recordings show actual breaches of the prescribed threshold will complaints be treated seriously. Further, we think it is possible that the adjustments necessitated by the current placement of recording equipment, it's distance from dwellings, it's susceptibility to wind influence and other residual sound, may be disguising the true noise level that is reaching dwellings.

With this in mind, we would like to better understand The Port's decision to install new measuring and recording hardware. For example,

- What opportunities will it provide for more accurate monitoring and reporting?
- How might it alter present procedures as prescribed in the current plan?
- How might it provide for The Port and PNLC to better identify the source and the extent of the noise problem?
- Ultimately, how could it go further to identify and contribute to mitigation opportunities and procedures?

In short, we believe that it is important for the PNLC reps to clearly understand, be able to assess, and maybe even contribute to the changes being instigated by the Port.

Accordingly, we suggest that the PNLC, or at least the residents reps, have an opportunity to meet with Marshall Day Consultants to be briefed on the points raised in this email. Possibly Allnagh could arrange for this when they are next in Nelson?

Many thanks,

Ian Wright.
for PNLC Residents Representatives.