



Partnership Meeting

Top of the South Marine Biosecurity Partnership

16 May 2014

Held in Port Nelson Visitor Centre, 10 Low Street, Port Nelson

Chair:	Lindsay Vaughan	Tasman District Council
Present:	Peter Lawless Barrie Forrest Charmayne King Alan Johnson Andy Smith Carmen Gimpl Charmaine Gallagher Chris Ward Edwin Ainley Grant Hopkins Ian Shapcott Javier Atalah Jeannine Fischer Jen Brunton Jono Underwood Kathy Walls Ken Grange Ken Wright Pam Lambert Paul Jonkers Pete Odonoghue Phil Clerke Rose Bird Simon McDonald Steve Hainstock Stuart Barnes Stuart Slack Tama Ruruku Tony Pearson Zane Charman	Regional Coordination Team Regional Coordination Team Regional Coordination Team Marlborough District Council Talleys Port Marlborough NZ NMIT Nelson City Council MPI Response Team Cawthron Te Atiawa Trust Cawthron MPI Response Team MPI Response Team Marlborough District Council MPI Response Team NIWA Tasman District Council Friends of Nelson Haven & Tasman Bay Nelson Marina Nelson Hardstand Department of Conservation MPI MPI Response Team Harbourmaster Tasman District Council NZ King Salmon Friends of the Nelson Haven Iwi 8 Tasman Area Community Assn Sanford Havelock
Speakers:	Mayor Rachel Reese Lindsay Vaughan Bruce Lines Steve McKeown David Duncan Thomas Marchant Rebecca Clarkson Barrie Forrest Peter Lawless Chris Ward	Nelson City Council Tasman District Council Diving Services NZ Port Marlborough Harbourmaster Port Nelson Port Nelson Aquaculture NZ Regional Coordination Team Regional Coordination Team Nelson City Council

1. Welcome

Mayor Rachel Reese opened the meeting.

2. Overview (Lindsay Vaughan)

Marine biosecurity is very complex. Marine biosecurity expertise is very important to the process. Today's programme gives a perspective from our key players.

3. Annual Report of Partnership Activities (Peter Lawless)

Peter presented the Partnership's annual report and the presentation and report are available on the TOS website.

4. View from under the sea (Bruce Lines)

Bruce spoke about marine encapsulation - in-water solutions for the treatment of marine fouling.

There are many different structures. Pontoons always provide an ideal environment for marine nasties, and seem to be one of the first areas that are targeted. By nature, underwater structures can be quite difficult to deal with.

Using plastic to wrap pontoons, wharf piles etc, makes a completely sealed environment which smothers marine fouling. This is an extremely effective tool. He has experimented with using different coloured plastics so there is less impact visually.

Has successfully wrapped two whole salmon farms, and associated wharves. This can be done surprisingly quickly and is very effective.

Encapsulating small vessels is a very effective technique. Larger vessels are more technical, but he is learning about what can and can't be done.

Barges and large ocean going vessels have been successfully wrapped. Oil rigs are the next step.

Able to capture everything that comes off the vessels, then use plastic to capture all the dropped fouling in clumps

Advantages of encapsulation:

- Contain everything that is captured.
- Clean and efficient applications, reduces noise, air pollutants and interruption to marina/port users.
- Controlled treatment removal time can be established prior to removal. Wrap could be removed at different location.
- Cost effective on large scale and small scale operations.
- Lower manning requirements - ideal for confined areas such as rig platforms
- Treatment includes all intakes and areas not normally accessible.
- Possible to treat complex structures.
- Safer to apply than HP water guns and high powered brush heads.

- Quality control is easier to manage.

Plastic comes off in one sheet and is easily removed.

One wrapping gives years of treatment.

Plastic is not removed until everything is dead.

Question was asked does plastic get recycled? Silage plastic is fairly biodegradable. The other plastic has been going into landfills, but can now be recycled. Recycling is a consideration - have looked into using a reusable wrap, but the ability to contain, and cost, comes into it.

It was suggested that biodegradable wrap should be identified.

Question asked about the cost of wrapping a 10m yacht.

Smaller vessels are better to haul out and clean, but estimated cost of maybe \$300 for a small vessel.

5. View from the marinas (Steve McKeown)

Role at Port Marlborough - operations manager of marina.

Have 2.5 thousand customers. Have had a couple of incursions, the first from a large barge coming from Tauranga which had *Didemnum* on it. He was supervisor at Picton Marina at the time. There wasn't a lot of structure around how to deal with it. Tried to get boats out of the water, mooring blocks out of the water. Was an expensive exercise.

Recently had *Styela* in Picton and found there was a lot more structure around how to deal with it. From Port Marlborough perspective, it was well coordinated. From customer's perspective, they loved the feedback and good communication. They want to do the right thing, so it is very important to get the right message out

Last incursion was in Waikawa on a private mooring. This was not one of their customers. Was an interesting experience with a multi-agency approach.

He sends out a newsletter four times a year and asked if there was any interest in putting articles into the newsletter. Customers are very interested to know what is going on in the marine biosecurity area.

Is working with signage strategies at the marina. Currently there are signs on biosecurity in the marinas which need to be updated.

Nationally - had a two day forum with biosecurity as an agenda item. An inflatable dock was trialed in Westhaven, but not sure of the outcome. Northland are concerned about Mediterranean fanworm. Restricted vessels are coming into the marina without proof that vessels have been hauled out in the last few months. Three vessels were asked to be hauled out. Was some misinformation between marinas about requirements, which has now been sorted out. Vessel vectoring is a difficult issue to deal with. Would like to put more work into that area.

Marina Operators Association are currently updating their website. There is a lot of information about marine biosecurity. Have clean boating programme, and clean marinas status.

Powers to restrict boat movements? They own the facilities, but have no right to stop vessels. If a vessel is heavily fouled, have powers to get vessels hauled out or ask them to leave.

Who bore the cost of the cleanup and containment of incursions? Vessel owners paid for direct costs and haul out costs. The vessel came down from Auckland.

For *Styela* - four agencies have agreement on costs.

6. View from the ports (Captain David Duncan & Thomas Marchant)

Thomas Marchant:

Marine biosecurity is a reasonably new field. Has mainly been terrestrial biosecurity until now. Marine biosecurity has come through in the last couple of years.

Environmental management at the port:

- PNL Environment management
- Harbourmaster Role
- Raroa FPSO
- Maintenance of structures
- Calwell Slipway
- What should/could be done better?

Dave Duncan:

Has a meeting with all harbourmasters throughout New Zealand in July and will be talking about marine biosecurity.

Has had a recent vessel that he wouldn't allow into Nelson because it was fouled with Mediterranean fanworm. The skipper wanted to know what to do. The vessel was wrapped in Nelson. Skipper was very cooperative. Education is very important.

When Raroa came to Nelson (biggest ship ever to come to Nelson) - he was talking with the owners nine months before it came. Got proof from owners that the vessel wasn't fouled. Had only 1 metre clearance between ship and seabed. Ship is regularly surveyed and was found to be clean.

Was noted that the two tugs that were brought to Nelson to assist weren't inspected, which is a gap that will be looked at in the future.

Any value in quarantine process for suspect vessels?

- Yes but who would pay? Would that then stop people coming to Nelson? Prefer to talk to Harbourmaster in Auckland and get vessels wrapped. There is a potential for business here in Nelson. It's all about education.

Can anyone arrive in the port without notification.

- Yes, no obligation for them to notify that they are coming.

Is there a risk profile for international vessels?

- No risk profile, treat all as nasties. If from Asia - would take a close look. If from Tasmania where water is colder, probably wouldn't look.

MPI have Craft Risk Management Standard - which has become official today. Will now have risk profiles for vessels.

7. Mussel eye view (Rebecca Clarkson)

Underpinning the aquaculture development strategy is a firm commitment to further build the environmental sustainability and integrity of the sector.

The industry's current environmental framework is composed of Environmental Codes of Practice (ECOPs) specific to each species. These ECOPs have been independently benchmarked against similar international standards and performed exceptionally well in comparison. However the environmental sustainability landscape is rapidly changing and there is an ever increasing need to demonstrate verification of our sustainable practices to both the New Zealand public and our international markets. In order to achieve this, the industry intends to develop an evolving and cohesive environmental management framework that:

- Improves environmental outcomes
- Delivers operational benefits to sector participants
- Maximises market opportunity for New Zealand's aquaculture products
- Recognises the expectations of stakeholders and communities
- Enhances the sector's reputation for credible environmental stewardship.

The New Zealand aquaculture industry recognises the value of the rich biodiversity of the New Zealand marine environment and the need for its protection.

The ECOPs recognise that industry can manage its activities to reduce its own vector risks, particularly relating to the movement of stock and gear.

The ECOPs identify objectives, targets and indicators relating to biosecurity and link to a reviewable biosecurity management plan in the Appendices of the documents. Industry is also mindful of the need to work closely with a range of stakeholders to identify and manage the range of additional vector pathways that are outside the industry's control.

8. Science perspectives (Barrie Forrest)

Barrie set out a review of current science that related to the top of the south. He described the range of management, goals and activities from the international border to managing effects in places. He said that borders would always be leaky.

He described the six monthly high risk site surveillance and incursion responses, but concluded that new incursions invariably spread domestically through human activities.

The implications for the top of the south were a need to:

- Manage risk pathways into and within the top of the south
- Manage target pests, even though they may not be managed nationally.

The best outcome will usually be that pest spread is reduced regionally.

He reviewed the spread of *Styela* and *Sabella* in the region. He said there was a cycle of marine pest management:

- Pests well established when detected
- Failed attempt to eradicate or contain
- Pest spreads beyond managed area and budgets get diluted
- Funding discontinued
- Uncontrolled spread.

He said that a possible exception was *Undaria* in Breaksea Sound.

Pest population management:

- Provides tangible focus for efforts
- Easier to motivate support for a tangible risk
- Intensive population control may fail to eradicate, but in vector hubs (e.g. ports, marinas) can greatly reduce vector risk

but:

- High cost, must be ongoing because of unmanaged populations and pathways outside TOS
- Only practical to intensively manage small areas
- Focus on 'high-risk' exotic pests whose potential impacts may not eventuate, or be less than other unmanaged species
- Pathway focus a logical priority, and provides best bang for buck, but not reflected in TOS actions in last 12 months:

Pathway management: ca. 20K direct costs:

Styela & fanworm control: ca. 125K direct costs (not including support from MPI, DOC, PML, etc).

Scope for TOS to develop pathways-based approach, building on existing MPI work and guidance.

Need to evaluate where regional population management sits as a tool to manage specific pests. What pests should be targeted and why?

9. Pathways project (Peter Lawless)

Peter outlined what was required for development of a Regional Marine Biosecurity Pathways Plan. He said that analysis of the requirements for a legally binding plan and the costs and benefits would be completed in 2014 for consideration by the three councils and MPI. He said that effective vector management would be:

- Engages the full range of stakeholders in reducing biosecurity risks
- Identifies high risk vessels
- Inspects high risk vessels and other vectors
- Removes the risk or excludes the high risk vector from the region
- Allows low risk vessels to move freely with a minimum of compliance requirements.

10. Summing up and closing of meeting (Chris Ward)

Chris Ward summed up the discussion and reflected that biosecurity is everyone's business. He thanked the speakers and the team for their contributions.