Haul Out and Hardstands

Where Will You Go for Antifouling and Hull Cleaning **in the Future?**

Haul Out and Hardstands – Part of a Big Picture

- Three of four marine pests identified as present in the region are spread by the movement of bio fouled boats.
  - Fan worm, sea squirt and paddle crab are all notifiable pests
  - Caulerpa is the odd one out
- Ministry for Primary Industry information is clear that antifouling coatings and clean hulls are our best weapon against the transmission of marine pests through the movement of moored boats.
- Government's Bio Security Direction Statement – From Auckland Council's RPMP

  5. "Tomorrows Skills and Assets" A capable and sustainable workforce and world class infrastructure provide the foundation for an effective system.

What is the Problem – A Lack of Awareness?

Many boat owners may not yet be aware of two factors that will in all likelihood at least double the demand for haul out and hardstand facilities for hull cleaning and antifouling.

- Auckland Council hull inspection surveys in 2021 and 2022 show that 47% of moored boats are non-compliant with the level of fouling requirement, LOF2. Auckland Council has not yet issued any enforcement notices. What will happen when it does?
- In 2022 Auckland, Northland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty regional councils commissioned a report to investigate the availability and accessibility of haul out and hull cleaning capacity within each of the four Top of the North regions for moored vessels up to 20m in length. The 4 councils anticipate that it will be necessary for boat owners to anti-foul vessels once every year to comply with proposed rules relating to hull bio-fouling levels.

- AMUA believes owners of moored boats will be unable to maintain compliance with the Auckland region's marine biosecurity regulations - unless existing haul out and hardstand facilities are preserved and additional suitably located facilities are developed.
- Auckland Council appears unwilling to understand the problem and appears to be ignoring its leadership responsibilities under the Biosecurity Act.
- AMUA believes Auckland Council is "rolling the dice" on bio security risks with potentially devastating environmental, economic and social consequences – for Auckland and neighbouring regions.
- This presentation explains just why AMUA is so concerned.

What Do The Regulations Require

Background – Hull Cleanliness

- Managing marine pest incursions after the event is costly and can be ineffective. The current emphasis has been for identifying pathways of spread that would enable agencies to intercede at the source, thus reducing pest management costs and achieving a more effective outcome.
- Draft rules have been prepared by Auckland, Northland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty Regional Councils
- **Rule 1** requires that the owner or person in charge of a vessel must ensure that fouling on the craft does not exceed a slime layer and any macrofouling (eg: barnacles) is present on less than 5% of the visible surface – being Level of Foul 2 (LOF 2).
- **The four Top of the North Regional Council's expect annual activities to achieve compliance with Rule 1 will be:-**
  - **I x antifoul**
  - **I x lift and wash**
  - **soft cleaning of the boat hull - number and frequency depending on use**

Note:- The current/historic average antifouling frequency is 1 x 2 Years (not annual)

Data - 2017 Akarana Marine Sports Charitable Trust

- AMSCT Report related to future development of The Landing which included possible closure of the haul out and hardstand. The report concluded:
- *"There is 30% additional commercial haulage [haul out and hardstand] operational capacity in the Auckland area; if the site was removed from The Landing, overall capacity would be reduced to 28% regionally."*
- That conclusion was based on "the greater Auckland Region" which included
  - Northland facilities (Whangarei) – more than 50nm (100kms from Auckland.
  - Facilities north of Milford including Gulf Harbour, Weiti River, Sandspit, Mahurangi etc
- Antifouling frequency at that time was about once every 2 years.
- More than 350 berths have been added since that time

Data – 2021 Urban Solutions

- A 2021 report by Urban Solutions for the Orakei Local Board (relating to closure of The Landing) concluded that there is sufficient spare capacity elsewhere.
- That conclusion is not supported by any relevant analysis and assumes antifouling every 4 years!!
- AMUA believes the report's conclusion is unreliable at best.

Data - 2022 Northland, Auckland, Waikato and Bay of Plenty Regional Council's commissioned a Report

Quote from Terms of Reference (Ecometric Consultants)

- *The successful implementation of **Rule 1** will depend in part on the availability and accessibility of haul out and hull antifouling/cleaning facilities for vessel owners/operators.*

The objective was to provide the 4 regional councils with information on the availability and accessibility of haul out and hull cleaning capacity within each of the four Top of the North regions. It is focused on vessels up to 20m in length.

Ecometric Report – Summary of Results (Late 2022) – Surveyed Capacity for Antifouling

	Antifouling Every 12 mnths	Antifouling Every 18 mnths	Antifouling Every 24 mnths
Northland	79%	119%	159%
Auckland **Takes into account closure of The Landing and Pier 21** **Does not anticipate the closure of Pine Harbour and Hobsonville which provide 25% of the remaining capacity**	**33%**	**50%**	**66%**
Waikato	48%	73%	Circa 100%
Bay of Plenty	49%	74%	Circa 100%

Capacity Concerns

- The Ecometric report clearly indicates that **the Auckland region needs the capacity to TRIPLE antifouling activity to achieve annual antifouling**.
- The report comments that there is some "spare capacity" outside of peak months and changing technology may also add capacity.
- **AMUA believes on the basis of the 2017, and 2022 data and a common sense check, there is insufficient and practicable "spare capacity" to TRIPLE antifouling activity.**
- Auckland Yacht and Boating Association Inc (AYBA) and AMUA took these concerns to Auckland Council's Planning, Environment and Parks Committee 2 March 2023.
- The Planning, Environment and Parks Committee called for a report from Council officers.
- AYBA and AMUA offered to meet with officers and explained their concerns in writing.
- Officers did not take up the offer to meet and did not seek any clarification from AYBA or AMUA.

Capacity Concerns (Cont)

- In the report back to the Committee Council officers stated

  "capacity can be increased if the sector shifts to spreading maintenance activities throughout the year", and

  "Staff have not identified a need for, and do not recommend, the development of a regional policy on the provision of hardstands".

- The report makes no attempt to answer the key concern which; was the lack of "quantitative evidence that the additional capacity for anti-fouling is sufficient to address the significant shortfalls identified in the Ecometric report."

Reality Check of Spare Capacity

- When AYBA and AMUA took their concerns to the Planning, Environment and Parks Committee they were seeking assurance that spare capacity is sufficient and suitably located.
- AYBA and AMUA believe officers would have reached a significantly different conclusion if they had engaged with AYBA and AMUA and considered the following common sense check.
- AMUA's reality check focusses on existing commercial facilities. Those facilities are focussed around marinas for obvious reasons and provide more than 80% of Auckland's antifouling capacity.

Marina Facilities – Central Waitemata – what will be left is in green

Location	Notes
Westhaven	
Pier 21	Privately owned - Closed – previously utilised at 80% of annual capacity
Orams	Repurposed to focus on 20m+ boats limited capacity for boats less than 20m
Floating Dock	Only available for overnight or weekend antifouls
Bayswater	Hardstand consented but never developed and now consented for residential development – subject to appeal – Council expert advised there was demand for a facility similar to Pier 21
Orakei	No facilities
The Landing	Orakei Local Board plan to close this facility and it has been decommissioned – Environment officers twice recommended retention of a short stay hardstand facility
Outboard Boating Club	No facilities

Marina Facilities – Wider Waitemata, Tamaki and Gulf – what will be left is in green

Location	Notes
Kennedy Bay	No facilities
Half Moon Bay	Redeveloped with covered work areas but reduced hardstand area
Tamaki Marine Centre	Expanded to 9000m2 hardstand but access restricted to 8m by Panmure Bridge
Pine Harbour	Privately owned - Precinct plan enables majority of hardstand area to be used for higher value residential/commercial activities
Hobsonville	Precinct plan enables hardstand area to be used for higher value residential/commercial activities
Gulf Harbour	Hardstand area increasingly used for trailerable boat storage. 40-50% loss of hardstand spaces since 2008

Reality Check – Spare Capacity at Remaining Facilities

Opportunities to Increase Capacity	Sense Check Comments
Utilise "spare capacity" outside of peak months which are typically October – December.	• Boat maintenance work goes on year round, i.e. out of peak availability for antifouling and hull cleaning is not 100% • Antifouling temperature and humidity constraints reduce antifouling productivity in winter - irrespective of covered work areas – Altex No5 - Dry Times (75 µm Dry Film Thickness (DFT) / 25°C / 50% Relative Humidity(RH)): - To Recoat - Minimum 4 hours; To Launch - Minimum 8 hours. [2 spray coats or 3 roller coats required to achieve DFT]
Invest in covered work areas to increase productivity.	• Only commercial yards can afford the investment • Requires additional equipment and boat handling – travel lift plus tug and trailer to transfer from travel lift to shed, e.g. Half Moon Bay. • Limited height for sheds (zone rules) generally precludes yachts with mast up. • Only existing covered facilities are Half Moon Bay and Tamaki Marine Centre
Expand existing hardstand facilities	• Recent losses = Pier 21 (3,000m2), The Landing (5,000m2), Bayswater (say 7,000m2), Half Moon Bay reduced by ??? • Pine Harbour and Hobsonville enabled for residential development. • Recent gains = Tamaki Marine Centre (9,000m2)
New Technology	• Not here yet and generally more suited to commercial vessels that move frequently.

Distance Table

Even if capacity exists, boats in the central Waitemata area will be required to travel significantly further as a result of the lack of facilities at Bayswater, the closure of Pier 21 and The Landing and potential future loss of Pine Harbour and Hobsonville to residential development – undermining the key objective of limiting the movement of bio-fouled vessels.

Distance Between Marinas and Haul Out and Hardstand Facilities (kms)

	Central Waitemata and Tamiki Marinas							
Haul Out and Hardstand Facilities Potential, Current, Closed and Threatened	Westhaven	Orakei	OBC	Bayswater	Half Moon Bay	Pine Harbour	Hobsonville	Kennedy Point
Pier 21	0	6	7	3	17	24	11	27
Orams	0	6	6	3	17	24	11	26
Floating Dock	0	6	6	3	17	24	11	26
The Landing	6	0	2	6	12	18	16	21
Bayswater	3	6	6	0	17	24	12	25
Half Moon Bay	17	12	13	17	0	16	27	18
Tamaki Marine Centre	25	20	21	24	8	23	35	25
McMillan and Wing	25	20	21	24	8	24	38	26
Pine Harbour	24	19	20	22	16	0	33	11
Hobsonville	10	16	16	12	27	33	0	35

Potential | Closed
Current | Threatened

Conclusions

- The 2017 report and the 2022 report by Ecometric, and the common sense check in this presentation, all support AMUA's belief - that **"spare capacity" will not enable boat owners to maintain compliance with marine biosecurity regulations - unless existing facilities are preserved and additional suitably located facilities are developed.**
- It appears Auckland Council's lack of a regional perspective and planning decisions relating to the regions marinas; which are best suited to provide commercial haul out and hardstand facilities, are impeding the implementation of biosecurity measures.
- As a consequence Auckland Council is "rolling the dice" on bio security risks, with potentially devastating environmental, economic and social consequences – for Auckland and neighbouring regions.