

WHANGANUI PORT REVITALISATION

FREIGHT & LOGISTICS SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP TELECONFERENCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: 10 April 2017

Time: 2:30

Location: Committee Room 2

Present: Bill McDonald, (Vapour Consultants) Chris Miles (Vapour Consultants) Phil Wardale, Tom Shand, Neville Johnson (Midwest Ferries Ltd), Warwick Walbran, Nik Zangouropoulos, Bernard Corkery, Bill Carswell (WDC), Rowan McGregor (WDC)

In attendance: Merle Benson (WDC, minutes)

Apologies: Graeme Young, Rowan McGregor (for lateness)

Item	Discussion/Outcome
Update	<p>Nik Zangouropoulos commenced the meeting speaking of the Marine Environment around the Ferry proposal. If 180m vessel as proposed is used, then more dredging will be required and larger berthing facilities will be needed.</p> <p>Nik advised Maritime NZ expressed their concerns at using a 150m vessel due to wave surge and have suggested this will make it not amenable to using a 150m vessel.</p> <p>Dave Truscott ex Ferry captain, Tom Duncan, Harbour Master Nelson and former Ferry Captain and Trevor Gibson for Harbour Master Whanganui have all been spoken to. From these discussions, Wharf 1 is not viable due to its position and openness to winds.</p> <p>The Preferred option is: Wharf 3 – providing adequate structures are put in place for a turning circle to cater for 180m vessel. Midwest Ferries are keen for a sensible engagement with the project group to develop Wharf 3. There is a strong case to answer, this is a sound proposition and the teams now need to engage and get a serious resolution from the Project Team to fit Midwest’s Plan into the Masterplan.</p>

Wharf 3	<p>Phil asked for Midwest's opinion on the turning circle required inside the training wall.</p> <p>Midwest's preferred option is to move the training wall to give an optimal and larger turning circle.</p> <p>Phil asked if Mid-West considered any other scenario other than Wharf 3?</p> <p>Nik suggested that the training wall would need to be rebuilt to allow for a larger turning circle.</p> <p>With additional larger berthage facilities, Wharf 3 would need to be shored up and strengthened considerably.</p> <p>The training wall modifications would need to allow for a turning circle of 250-300m.</p> <p>Phil raised the question of vessel manoeuvrability referring to PIANC (Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses) Phil explained the organisation publishes guidelines around the navigation requirements for such vessels. They indicate that a turning circle of at least 1.8 times the length of the vessel will be required.</p> <p>Nik confirmed that Maritime NZ have indicated to Midwest that a turning circle of 300m for a modern 180m vessel with bow and stern thrusters is more than adequate. Nike suggested that their advisors have suggested that the vessel could be turned within a 250m turning circle.</p> <p>Tom Shand added that if a minimum of 250m is required as a turning circle for a 180m vessel, then the training wall would need to be realigned to take into account the sea swell environment.</p> <p>Nik agreed that the preferred option is to realign the training wall to create a larger turning circle.</p> <p>Tom added that the flood protection works upstream are based on the current alignment of the training wall and moles, so any modifications would need to involve Horizons RC.</p> <p>Phil asked that if Midwest use Wharf 3, how this would affect Q-West's occupation of their proposed hardstand areas and the Public boat ramp users.</p> <p>Neville Johnson said that nothing would change for these two areas of the port.</p>

Phil then raised questions around what type of ship Midwest would use, a stern or side loading ferry. If the boat was stern loading, how can the recreational boat ramp work?

Nik added that if the stern of the boat was to face towards the boat ramp for rear loading, then the loading end would be near the Victory shed. Q-West would remain in the middle and 200m from the boat ramp.

Phil added that Q-West take 40m, so would the recreational boat ramp need to be relocated? Phil noted his concerns that if the stern of a ferry was facing the boat ramp and the prop wash created, the ramp may need to be relocated.

Neville suggested the ferry would be 80-100m away from the ramp. The Victory shed would be 100m.

Phil suggested that looking at the Midwest's plans, the edge of the proposed travel lift would be nearly 100m away from the stern of the vessel, so the vessel in fact would be very close to the boat ramp.

Neville suggested the vessel would still be 80m away from the boat ramp if located at the existing Wharf 3.

Phil will send a copy of the Masterplan to Neville detailing Q-West's location and the size of the vessels alongside the existing wharves to show some scale.

In response to a question from Nik, Phil advised that Wharf 2 is 242m, The travel lift area will take approximately 30m.

Phil said prop wash, and bow thrusters water disturbance must be taken into consideration. The boat ramp cannot stay where it is if a 180m stern loading ship is to be used on Wharf 3. Phil suggested the relocation of the boat ramp must be taken into account in the project budget if wharf 3 is the preferred location.

Nik asked if Wharf 3 can be contemplated as the main Wharf in the Masterplan?

Phil said a better understanding was needed of the whole concept as the option of using Wharf 3, turns the Masterplan upside down. It's not just about berthage, marshalling areas are required and the need to understand what land will be utilised.

Nik added this is a stage gate, we need to understand the most sensible option for the Masterplan and Midwest's plan to come together and work forward from here.

Nik added that the project is dependent on government support and then how to address the options.

Bill McDonald recapped:

- 1st May is a key date for Council to receive Midwest's Feasibility Study report;
- The project team will not compromise stage 1 of the Port Revitalisation project being the relocation of Q-West's business premises; and
- June/July are dates for Midwest's investors.

Nik added that if the project does not attract government investment, then how much credibility does the Pot Revitalisation project have in the wider community, and how will the next feasibility and business case phase be approached as it is estimated to cost between \$1.5 to \$2m.

Bill McDonald made the following suggestions;

- After 1st May, put the plan out to the community.
- The Masterplan is aspirational
- Dredging is much harder
- Stage 1 is to re-locate Q-West and nothing compromises this at this stage;
- Further back there will need to be more dredging;
- Will need to cover these off by 1st May.
- Stage 1 needs to happen.

- Warwick added that investors are not excited about the Masterplan, but acknowledged there is a need to mesh both plan.

- Phil made the following comments:
 - Why is Wharf 2 not suitable?
 - Concern about Q-West having Ferry berthing at Wharf 3 as it appears tight, for instance where would the bow ropes be tied to?
 - Wharf 2 can extend to Wharf 1 space
 - Need to exhaust all options on using Wharf 2.
 - Measure Wharves 2 and 3 for accurate space.

Phil added that the Q-West site as a site is one of the few sites with flat ground, and close to the water. The plan shows a tight area from the shed doors to the water and this area would minimise investment in heavy lifting equipment hence the reason this site was selected.

Nik said he would need to know how much space there is available around the Wharf 2 option and how much there is left from Wharf 3. He

	<p>also added that there is an assumption that a marina will be built around the Wharf 2 area, so this will entail structures.</p> <p>Phil added a Marina is aspirational, but if it goes ahead, it will have a wave attenuator to reduce the motion of waves to the recreational boat ramp.</p> <p>Tom Shand suggested the Tanae Bank may be reinstated on the southern side of the river which will assist the wave attenuation getting into the port and the boat ramp.</p> <p>Neville suggested the bar will be removed through deeper dredging, but acknowledged that the dredging it will create greater swells.</p> <p>Nik said he would look at Wharf 2 rather than Wharf 3 with no structure but would struggle for a turning bay outside of the training wall at Wharf 3.</p> <p>Phil added that a 250m turning circle with the assumption that the turning basin will not have any structures will monopolise the area.</p> <p>Warwick said if the project is to progress and attract investors, both plans need to be meshed together as the Ferry Plan is saying one thing and the Masterplan another.</p> <p>Nik said he is happy to work with the Port Revitalisation project team and engage more often.</p> <p>Nik said the same considerations were being given at Motueka although there are not the same physical constraints.</p>
Meeting Close	The meeting closed at 3.30