

Next Generation Project Consultative Group

Notes from the meeting held on Tuesday 18 September 2007, 7pm
Port Otago Limited Building, Port Chalmers.

In Attendance: Andre Mabon (Port Chalmers Community Board), Angela McErlane (Port Environment Liaison Committee), Andrew Noone (Dunedin City Councillor), Anne Cheng (City Planning Manager), Bert Youngman (Otago yacht Club), Bruce Hill Dept of Conservation), Bruce Inglis (Southern Clams), Bruce Ritchie (Huirapa Runanga), Dave O'Malley (Octa Associates), Geoff Plunket Port Otago), Graeme Carse (Quarry beach Surf Boards), Harold Robertson (Otago yacht Club), Hoani Langsbury (Otakou Runanga), Joan Conway (Port Environment Liaison Committee), John Christie (Otago Chamber of Commerce), John Milburn (Monarch Wildlife Cruises), John Perry (Port Environment Liaison Committee), Lincoln Coe (Port Otago), Peter Brown (Port Otago), Phil Mitchell (Mitchell Partnerships), Stephen Walker (Harbour Cycle network), Warren Lewis (Recreational Fishing)

1. Welcome

Geoff Plunket opened the meeting and advised he would act as interim chairman for the night. He welcomed all those present and introduced Mark James and Martin Single to the PCG. New attendees introduced themselves – Stephen Walker (Harbour Cycle Network), Andrew Noone (Dunedin City Councillor), Anne Cheng (DCC Planning Manager), Bert Youngman and Harold Robertson (Otago Yacht Club).

2. Apologies

Apologies from Paul Robinson and Brett Hastie were noted.

3. Notes of last meeting

The notes from the meeting held on 29 August 2007 were accepted.

4. Discussion of PCG Chair

Geoff Plunket invited nominations for the Chair and discussion ensued. The question of how the PCG related to the existing Port Environment Liaison Committee was raised alongside the suggestion that some people might use the PCG as a base for agenda lobbying unrelated to the actual “Next Generation” project. Geoff stressed that the PEC was a long-term group that would carry on after the project was completed and was a distinctly separate entity. The PCG was focused solely around the “Next Generation” project.

It was agreed that an independent chair was important and well in other groups (such as the Ravensbourne Liaison Group). Two potential candidates for the role were proposed – Neville Peat (retiring ORC councillor and environmental author) and Bill Bayliss (local businessman). Both suggestions were endorsed by the PCG and it was agreed that they be approached by POL regarding their availability.

5. Terms of Reference

A review of the draft terms of reference was undertaken and the following amendments made:

Section 1. Objective - the words “physical and social” were added to define “environmental”.

Section 3e. “and the environment” added after “harbour”.

Section 4. Membership – there were suggestions that the membership should be enlarged to include Toll/Ontrack and Marine Studies/University representatives. It was noted that technical input was covered under Section 7 Technical Group. There were also questions about who could join in future. The terms of reference provide for any individuals/groups to join the PCG.

Section 11. Disputes – deleted.

Section 9a. The mechanics of public communication were discussed. It was agreed that a regular newsletter supplemented by occasional public forums would be useful.

After discussion it was noted that the terms of reference could be altered at any time in the future (with agreement from the PCG). At that stage, the terms of reference were accepted in their amended form, to be circulated with the notes from this meeting for final confirmation at the next PCG meeting (revised version attached).

6. Project status update

Lincoln Coe and Phil Mitchell gave a presentation to the PCG on the current status of the project and the issues identified to date (copy attached). The following questions were raised:

- a) Will the project allow bigger cruise vessels to visit Port Chalmers? *Unlikely to see bigger vessels than the largest ones calling now. More likely to see more of the larger ships and less of the smaller ones.*
- b) Will other NZ Ports be able to accommodate 6000 TEU ships? *These vessels may be able to get into Auckland now (lightly laden) and Tauranga is considering deepening their channel. All other ports would need to deepen. However, there is likely to be fewer deepwater ports to service the container trade.*
- c) Was the intention to have just one South island port 6000 TEU – capable? *In our view, probably yes.*
- d) Were “offsite” or land-based effects of larger ships being considered? *Yes.*
- e) What does “chart datum” mean? *The lowest, generally expected tide at Port Chalmers.*
- f) Would other vessels be restricted in the channel? *There is currently no two-way traffic in the channel for larger ships but the intention was to maintain two-way traffic where possible.*
- g) Has the volume of dredging increased from earlier indications? *The volume of material depended on the depth to which dredging occurred as a result of the final channel design. Earlier indications had been between 2 million and 4 million m³ but now it appeared to be nearer a maximum of 5 million m³. It*

was also noted that material falling in at the sides of the channel had been included in the revised estimate.

- h) *Will deepening affect tidal velocities or other parts of the harbour? Modelling of the harbour will answer these questions and will cover accretion and erosion in the harbour.*
- i) *Why will lighting be an issue? The dredge operation is likely to run 24/7.*
- j) *How long would dredging take? A contract dredger would take 3-6 months. The New era could take up to 2 years and was unlikely to be used as the main dredge.*
- k) *Is monitoring of current disposal taking place? Yes on-going monitoring is taking place and will be made available.*
- l) *What material will be dredged? There is likely to be primarily sand with some silt, clay and mud at the Port Chalmers end of the channel with some isolated areas of rock. A different type of dredging would be required to remove rock (back-hoe operation). It was estimated that rock was only a small component of the total dredge amount and could provide an improved localised marine habitat.*
- m) *Can the dredged material be used commercially? Yes, it is possible to use it in the construction industry, depending on particle size.*
- n) *What about dredging plumes? Harbour modelling and international experience would be used to determine effects.*
- o) *What depth of water would the disposal sites be in? It was estimated these would be in 25-30m of water.*
- p) *Could the material end up at Karitane? It depended where it was placed at sea. The intention was to place the material in the Southland current so it remained offshore.*
- q) *Where does sediment from the Clutha go? Studies show that about one quarter of the 1 million m³ comes into Otago Harbour, and there is some accretion on beaches. The rest travels up the coast.*
- r) *Does the dredging have to be completed in 6 months as spreading out the dredging and disposal work might result in less environmental effect. This situation will become clearer once the environmental studies have been completed.*
- s) *Has a detailed cost analysis been done to justify the project? The project will only be completed if there is economic justification and a sensible commercial agreement with shipping lines in place. If the project proceeds to the consenting stage, there may be a delay while commercial aspects are finalised.*

7. Meeting closure

Members of the PCG thanked Port Otago for the status update and noted that it had been very informative. It was agreed that the next meeting should concentrate on the final two points of the presentation – feedback from the group on what they'd heard so far, and identification of issues and how they might be addressed. It was also agreed that PCG members could submit comments by email if they were unable to attend the next meeting.

There was brief discussion of the Department of Conservation's New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (CPS) and how it might affect the project. Bruce Hill noted the CPS

was under review but there was no timeline for completion of that review. He noted that disposal of dredging material at sea would be a restricted coastal activity.

8. Next meeting

Tuesday, 9 October, 2007 – Port Otago Promotions Room.

Meeting closed at 8.55pm.