

## **Next Generation Project Consultative Group**

Notes from the meeting held on Thursday 25 February 2010, 7pm  
Port Otago Limited Building, Port Chalmers.

In Attendance: Allan Sutherland (Port Otago)  
Andy Pullar (Port Otago)  
Bruce Hill (DOC)  
Cheryl Adams (Blueskin Road resident)  
Chris Shaw (Otago Regional Council)  
Graeme Burns (Harrington Point Community Society)  
Graeme Carse (Quarry Beach Surf Boards)  
Irene Scurr (Otago Peninsula Community Board)  
Jan Tucker (Chalmers Community Board)  
Joan Conway (Port Environment Liaison Committee)  
John Milburn (Monarch Wildlife Cruises)  
Lincoln Coe (Port Otago)  
Keith Probert (University of Otago)  
Mark James (NIWA/Aquaticsciences Ltd)  
Martin Single (University of Canterbury)  
Nicola Reeves (South Coast Boardriders)  
Peter Brown (Port Otago)  
Roger Belton (Southern Clams)  
Roy Innes (Port Environment Liaison Committee)  
Stephen Higgs (in the Chair)  
Terry Broad (Huirapa Runanga)  
Vernon Hall (Otago Yacht Club)  
Warren Lewis (Recreational Fishing)

Apologies: Bert Youngman, Brett Hastie (South Coast Board Riders), Bill Lloyd (Port Environment Liaison Committee), Carol Meikle (Port Environment Liaison Committee), Dave O'Malley (OCTA), David Redshaw (Southern Clams), Neil McDonald (Port Chas Fishermen's Co-op), Phyllis Smith (Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki), Robert Watt, Selva Selvarajah (Otago Regional Council)

### **1. Welcome/Introductions**

Stephen opened the meeting and outlined the format for the evening, which was for a presentation from Lincoln Coe on the draft Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE), followed by questions from the floor. Mark James and Martin Single were in attendance to respond to questions.

### **2. Apologies**

The apologies for the meeting were confirmed.

### **3. Confirmation of Agenda**

The agenda, which had been circulated prior to the meeting, was confirmed. It was agreed that items of General Business not associated with the AEE presentation would be dealt with at the end of the meeting.

### **4. Overview of Project – draft AEE**

Geoff Plunket welcomed those present and introduced the presentation by outlining the process so far. He advised that Port Otago Limited (POL) was ready for the final consultation on their resource consent application and that tonight's meeting was the first step on that final consultation process. Geoff said that POL would be happy to meet with

particular groups or individuals as necessary over the next few weeks to discuss the AEE and application. The plan going forward was to receive and discuss comments from the PCG at the next meeting. Those who wanted to submit detailed responses were encouraged to provide these in writing to POL prior to the next meeting.

Lincoln Coe then provided an overview of the project, covering five key aspects, as follows:

#### **4.1 Impact of a deeper channel**

Research had shown that a deeper channel would have a very negligible impact on tidal range (16mm) and the tidal flow would actually reduce with a deeper channel. Sedimentation would be largely unchanged. There would be a small loss of inter-tidal area around the turning basin and vessel wakes would be 10-15% greater for bigger vessels.

#### **4.2 Dredging**

The process of deepening the channel would be an incremental one with low intensity dredging occurring initially (utilising POL's own dredge). The removal of rock in isolated areas would still be at the "low intensity" end of the dredging scale and would be accompanied by an appropriate monitoring regime. When the commercial need arose, dredging of the highest intensity would occur over a 6 to 8 month period. Significant work had been done on modelling dredging sedimentation and turbidity. This was outlined in detail in the AEE.

#### **4.3 Disposal**

The AEE identified the proposed site for dredge disposal. The site is in 27 metres of water and within the Southland current system so that any material placed there will not move on to shore, either within the Blueskin Bay system or further north along the Karitane coast. Scientific analysis had shown that dredged sand would settle in the disposal site area and not disperse. Dredged silt would disperse more but the Southland current would keep this away from the coastline.

#### **4.4 Berth deepening**

Some improvement to the rock wall under the container berths is the only requirement associated with deepening the berths. All other strengthening work was completed at the time of the purchase of the new ZPMC cranes.

#### **4.5 Wharf extension**

The extension of the Multi-purpose wharf (Container No 2) is designed to provide greater flexibility to handle existing shipping in light of the demand for berth space, especially during the Cruise Ship season. The effects of construction of this extension have been identified as no more than minor. The extension will include a fishing jetty at the end of the wharf for public use.

### **5. Questions and Answers**

- (a) Irene Scurr asked about the disposal of dredged rock and whether it could be used for groynes or other harbour structures. Lincoln advised that if the rock was suitable, first call would be to use it on the rock wall alongside the container berths. He advised that getting the dredged rock to groynes was not easy and that it might be simpler to use quarried rock that was the correct size for the job.
- (b) John Milburn asked about sedimentation and whether maintenance dredging in peripheral areas was included in the project. He was advised that there was no increase in sedimentation expected. The impact of the project on other parts of the Harbour was a wider issue for the Otago Regional Council to consider, and had not been part of POL's focus.
- (c) Cheryl Adams asked why the consultative process had changed during 2009, with little or no involvement of the PCG in finalising the reports, and in particular those

concerning traffic and noise. Geoff Plunket responded that, as far as POL was concerned, there had been no conscious change in process and that there had been considerable PCG input into the reports over the last two years.

- (d) Roger Belton noted that holding the next meeting on 18 March did not allow time for comment on the AEE. He asked whether the period for comments could be extended by at least another month. He was advised that POL wanted to see real progress on the application and that the reports presented in the AEE were essentially the same as the draft ones circulated prior to the December 2008 meeting. There were no major changes and so reading the reports and preparing comments would not be too onerous in the time provided.
- (e) Nicola Reeves asked if the AEE and attachments would be available on line. POL confirmed it would be from 5pm 26 February 2010.
- (f) Bruce Hill asked if the consent of the existing dredging site was part of this application. He was advised that the existing dredging consent was a separate matter. Bruce also asked if the New Era could be used for dredging disposal at the new site. Lincoln advised that it was estimated the New Era would only be able to travel to the new site approximately 50% of the time (due to sea conditions).
- (g) Roger Belton asked if there was any baseline data regarding the impact of disposal on habitats. Mark James responded that there was some research on re-colonisation and earlier work on the maintenance sites outlined in the report. The disposal site would only receive a few millimetres of sedimentation each day with the smaller dredges and a few centimetres per day with the capital dredging. Re-colonisation will occur but could take several years for larger organisms. Thus the impact would be short to medium term.
- (h) Graeme Carse asked whether the Next Generation project would see more or less sand disposed of at Heyward Point. Lincoln advised that the maintenance dredging programme remained essentially the same and so there would be no increase of disposal above the volume already consented.
- (i) Nicola Reeves asked if, when the Heyward Point disposal consent was renewed, the volume consented would remain the same. Lincoln confirmed that consent renewal for existing disposal sites would be sought and it would be for the same volume as currently exists (up to 450,000m<sup>3</sup>).
- (j) Irene Scurr asked if some of the dredged sand could be used within the Harbour (for beach re-nourishment, especially at Te Rauone Beach). Geoff Plunket advised that the Te Rauone project being undertaken by Port Otago in conjunction with the local community was separate to the Next Generation project, but it was hoped that the enhancement of groynes in that area would naturally lead to beach re-nourishment.
- (k) Graeme Burns asked whether some of the rock from dredging could be used within the Harbour to enhance recreational fishing areas. It was agreed that this could be considered.
- (l) Cheryl Adams asked whether POL intended to commission any peer reviews of the research reports included in the draft AEE. Geoff Plunket advised that POL would not be doing this. Cheryl also asked if the summary reports not included in the draft AEE would be available soon. Lincoln advised they would be available within two weeks.

## **6. Timeline/Next steps**

The next meeting of the PCG was planned for 18 March and it had been anticipated that PCG members would make comment on the draft AEE at that meeting. Several members of the PCG felt that the timeframe between 25 February and 18 March was too short for meaningful comment and it was suggested that the next meeting be delayed, by up to a month. John Milburn pointed out that the reports had all been circulated to PCG members

in draft form previously and that there was nothing much new in the final reports. His view was that there was sufficient time for people to focus on their areas of concern and make appropriate submissions. Geoff Plunket confirmed that Port Otago would proceed with the 18 March meeting, but agreed that another, later meeting would be considered.

## **7. Next Meeting**

It was confirmed that the date of the next meeting would be 18 March 2010, in the Promotions Room, Port Otago, Port Chalmers.