RC220255 (CODC) AND RM220834 (QLDC) - HEARING PANEL QUESTIONS TO THE QL HARBOURMASTER

1. The applications for RC220255 (CODC) and RM220834 (QLDC) provide the following detail regarding the anchor/mooring system for the dredge operation:

Anchoring/Mooring

The dredge utilises two 500kg main mooring anchors to position itself in the river. These anchors are located within the river wet bed with the anchor warps crossed over for stability. This means that the anchor warps are immediately in front of the dredge (not out to the sides) and typically submerge within 10-20m. To minimise the risk of anchor failure (slippage), the anchors themselves are also tied back with wire rope to the riverbank where possible usually to a large willow tree or rock protrusion. There is no impediment to river users and minimum risk to other vessels.

Due to the size of the Clutha River and the bespoke anchoring system, substantial clear passage is provided down at least one side and normally both sides for other river users to pass. On occasion where side lines are utilised, typically when moored against the riverbank during a flood event or for maintenance, these are highlighted with marking tape and/or marker buoys.

The dredge also occasionally requires two 150kg stern anchors where necessary for stability.

The diagrams at Attachment 1 shows the anchoring system for the dredge in two scenarios depending on the form of the river.

Question:

Do the diagrams at Attachment 1 reflect your understanding of the anchoring/mooring system as described in the AEE when you reviewed the applications in June 2023? NO. As above the original application indicated that the anchores would be directly in front of the dredge and not protrude out into the river flow.

2. Based on previous advice of the Harbormaster, a condition was recommended by the planner which required:

No mooring or anchor lines are permitted to extend into the riverbed beyond the port or starboard beam of the dredge.

The applicant proposes to change this by deleting the word 'bed' from riverbed.

No mooring or anchor lines are permitted to extend into the riverbed beyond the port or starboard beam of the dredge.

Question:

Would the amended condition continue to align with the intent of your condition as originally promoted? The concern around navigational safety is dependent on the depth of the mooring lines below the water surface. It would be expected that Mooring lines entering the water from the bow of the dredge to a riverbed anchor as initially described, would enter the water close to the front of the dredge add clear the water surface quickly of any navigational hazard. Lines extending from the port or starboard beams or the dredge bow and tethered to the opposing riverbank as indicated in the animation, I would suspect would the majority of the time surface bearing, creating a significant navigational hazard.

3. Attached separately is an animation prepared by a submitter which shows the movement of the mooring/anchor lines through the water column.

Question:

In your review of the animation, do you consider this to be a realistic representation of the movement of the mooring lines as affected by current and, if so, given this movement, do you consider that the applicant would reasonably be able to give effect the condition set out in 2 above (either the original condition or as amended by the applicant)? The animation I feel does represent the effects on the anchor lines however as there no description of anchor line makeup I would suggest these lines would be predominantly surface bearing therefore creating an ongoing navigational Hazard

Question:

If the mooring lines do move through the water column as shown in the animation, do you consider that this is a risk to other water users which has been adequately addressed by the applicant and, if not, can you advise of other situations where this type of risk has been adequately mitigated and how? Unless the lines are clear of the water surface (significantly above or below the surface), there is at times a risk to other river users. Even closing the river to other users or prominent signage in experience does not stop everyone, whether they enter the river in ignorance of the danger or choose to ignore the closure.

4. The applicant has agreed to erect warning signage and promotes the following condition:

Signage must be erected alerting river users that the dredge is operating. The sign must include the co-ordinates of the relevant 1500m stretch from the Annual Work Plan. The locations where signage is required are:

Upstream: Albert Town boat ramp, Eely Point Boat Ramp and Wanaka Marina

Boat Ramp or Signage at the Red Bridge (subject to consent from NZTA

as the Road Controlling Authority).

Downstream: Bendigo Conservation Area Boat Ramp, Lake Dunstan Boat Ramp,

Perriam Cove

The consent holder must consult with the ORC and QLDC Harbour Masters regarding location of the signage. Radio and local News Papers

Question: Is the Harbourmaster comfortable with the level of signage proposed?

- 5. The proposes that the following commercial operators and organisations must be notified by email each week, of dredge location and the movements over the next week or at any other time the dredge moves location:
 - a) Go Jet
 - b) Lakeland Adventures
 - c) Wanaka Fishing Charters
 - d) Aspiring Fishing Guide
 - e) Southern Rivers Fishing
 - f) Alpine Fishing Guides
 - g) Paddle Wanaka
 - h) ORC Harbour Master
 - i) QLDC Harbour Master

j) Any other party who requests to be notified must be added to the list.

Question: Are there any other parties who should be included on that list? Not at this time

but section j, applies. Otago kayak and white water groups

6. The Panel seek to understand the range of recreational river users for the proposed operational area of the river.

Question: Does the Harbourmaster hold/collect any data regarding recreational river usage from the Red Bridge at Luggate to the Lindis River confluence (or CODC boundary)?

Not officially but aware it is used by those commercil operators listed and multiple private school and recreational groups user groups

7. The Panel seek to understand the differences in flow rates between where the dredge currently operates in the lower Clutha River/ Mata Au (Etrrick to below Beaumont) and the proposed operation area Red Bridge to the Lindis confluence.

Question: Does the Harbourmaster have any information regarding flow rates (knots or m/s) in the proposed operational areas of the Upper Clutha versus the Lower Clutha?

Water Monitoring and Alerts (orc.govt.nz)

Attachment 1



