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Part 2 – Trade competition questions

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission?

☐ Yes
☒ No

*Note if your answer is ‘Yes’ you must satisfy the criteria below.*

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition you must be directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that –

(a) adversely affects the environment; and
(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

☐ Yes, I am directly affected and (a) and (b) are satisfied

Part 3 – Your submission *(Please See Attached)*

**Provisions**

Please provide comments on specific provision numbers and pages and refer to them as *Objective 1.1, page 26*
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*(Use separate sheet(s) if necessary)*
Decision
State clearly the suggested changes you are seeking to be made in respect of the provision eg. I would like the policy reworded to state the following....
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(Use separate sheet(s) if necessary)

Please tick applicable box(es)

☑ I do wish to be heard in support of my submission (This means that you wish to speak at the hearing)

☐ I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission (This means you have elected not to speak at the hearing)

☐ If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signature .................................................. Date 26/3/11

(Person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf or making submission)
Submitted on the Proposed Regional Coastal Plan:
Kermadec and Subantarctic Islands Under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Proposed Regional Coastal Management Plan: Kermadec and Subantarctic Islands. Heritage Expeditions is appreciative of being consulted in the process of the preparation of this plan. We recognise these places as having special qualities and status that deserve careful and thoughtful management. There are some unique challenges for management because of their isolated wilderness locations.

Background

1. Heritage Expeditions Ltd was founded in 1985 by former New Zealand Wildlife Service Officer Rodney Russ. The objectives and goals of the Company where as clear and defined then as they are now except that they have now taken on more of an international perspective where it was originally New Zealand focused. The objective is to create Ambassadors for Conservation through genuine wilderness travel experiences. The Company operated its first “commercial” expedition to the New Zealand Sub Antarctic Islands in 1989 and has operated annually since then. It has operated over 100 expeditions to the Islands – many of them in conjunction with Expeditions to Antarctica. The Sub Antarctic remains the companies “signature” destination but it has expanded its operation over the years to include the SW Pacific and more recently The Russian Far East.

2. In 1993/94 the company took a lease on a 50 berth former ice strengthened Russian Polar Research Vessel. It currently operates this class of vessel. This or a similar class of vessel up to 125 metres carrying 50 – 100 passengers fits perfectly with the ethos of the company – that is too reduce the impact on the environment but at same time give participants a genuine wilderness and wildlife experience. The vessel is managed and equipped by the company to the highest possible standard. Preventive maintenance has reduced fuel emissions significantly, annual dry docking and antifouling has eliminated bio fouling, crew selection, training and best practices have further reduced our impact on the environment.
3. The same is true of our expeditions. Through detailed planning, attention to detail, staff selection and training we believe that we have increased the passenger experience and at the same time reduced the impact on the environment. The company has pioneered many of what are now considered “best practices” in the industry including boot washing, quarantine checks and detailed landing briefings. The level of repeat business and the “positive” reporting of the Government Observers would endorse that.

4. The company is recognised internationally as a competitive market leader and pioneer of genuine expedition travel. This is due largely to the fact that it is a family owned and operated business. The second generation is now taking an active role in the management of the company and are committed to continuing the strong growth and international standing the company has earned over the years.

This submission

5. Heritage Expeditions decided to depart from our usual approach and have commissioned an independent review of the plan. This is because the plan is important for New Zealand’s management of these remarkable offshore islands’ marine environment and as their special character contributes to our heritage. Further we see this plan as being significant for all who like to go to these special places (including, but not limited to, our company), and also for those who are interested in how our marine environment is managed, may never go to any of these isolated locations, yet like to know they are well managed.

6. Tourism Resource Consultants prepared the attached report and Heritage Expeditions agrees with its findings and it is to be considered as part of our submission.

7. We also asked our Captain Dmitriy Zinchenko to prepare a report on the moorings and have enclosed this for your information.

8. There are some key issues of concern that we wish to highlight in addition to those in the report:
   a. Business continuance, certainty and enabling
   b. Govt processes and the linkage between them all - and also international regs
   c. Tourism growth
   d. Threats
      (a) Bio security issues – MAFBSNZ
      (b) Oil spill
   e. Anchoring
   f. Boat length and trends
   g. We wish to be heard
9. **Continuance, certainty and enabling of business** are key strategic considerations for any business that intends to be sustainable over time. Sustainability is a cornerstone concept of the RMA. Accordingly there is no specific mention made of this in the plan beyond the page 3—Purpose of the Regional Plan paragraph 2 references. Business continuance for existing users requires reasonable certainty of the management requirements and rules for operating in these environments. Until now this has been managed primarily by the DOC permitting process. To enable a business to grow often requires the borrowing of capital for investment and to do so there must be evidence of positive conditions for business certainty. These key factors that give the business its best chance of success include some certainty in the operating environment, certainty of key factors that underpin a business—in our case permitted access—demonstration of sustainability and potential for growth.

10. At the moment there are rules providing certainty of access for ships up to 75m—permitted. The rules for ships between 75m and 125m are classified as discretionary. We do not agree with this.

11. Vessel length is used as an easy way to classify vessels. However to our knowledge over the last 20 years the following vessels have visited the Subantarctic Islands—this is not an exhaustive list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Length in metres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Discoverer</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clipper Odyssey</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier Spirit now Bremen</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shokalskiy</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit of Enderby</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Tsvetaeva</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapitan Khlebnikov</td>
<td>122.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the proposed rules only Heritage Expedition’s current vessel, Spirit of Enderby, would be a permitted activity and all the other vessels would be discretionary.

12. The current vessel, The Spirit of Enderby, we use for expeditions is 72m long. It is also ice strengthened and double hulled. These 2 factors help reduce risk of oil spill. The proposed plan enables our current operation to continue as permitted. However it is well established in maritime circles that the trend in new vessels of this type, designed to do expeditionary voyaging, is for some increase in length, increased manouevrability and use of very sophisticated technology (some is retro fitted into existing vessels also). This includes almost real-time availability of weather forecasting (3 hour delay) in the area and related predictions of the wind speed, sea waves, swell waves, tides, currents and visibility. Other trends include an increase in horsepower, the presence and power of bow thrusters and/or stern thrusters. The manouevrability of these vessels is impressive. Even larger vessels can
typically turn within their own length.\textsuperscript{1} The trend in new vessel size is driven by operational cost benefit efficiencies. New or rebuilt (refurbished) vessels planning to work in Antarctic waters must also take into account the proposed new Polar Shipping Code being developed by IMO. Any vessel working in the NZ Sub Antarctic Islands will almost certainly be visiting Antarctic and so this Code will have to be taken into account when selecting replacement vessel(s).

13. In the possible event of us deciding to upgrade our ship - currently 25 years old and nearing the end of its life - we would be looking to charter a more modern ice strengthened and double hulled vessel and that would by definition increase its length to approximately 100 metres. It would be not exceed 125 metres.

14. Accordingly we do not agree with the vessel size of 75m-125m triggering discretionary access as proposed in the plan. It does not give us sufficient business certainty or create an enabling environment for us strategically as we look forward. This approach does not create an enabling environment in which we can continue our sustainable business over time. This would also apply for other operators.

15. Further the rationale given for discretion is that increasing length of vessel increases the risk of oil spills. The length of the vessel is not an indication of risk alone. It may be considered a reasonable proxy for management purposes if based on a reasonable understanding of the range of variables that impact upon risk. However the plan does not state a rationale for this. Please see attached comment from Captain Joanne Laing Lyttelton Port of Christchurch Ltd, Harbour Pilot\textsuperscript{2} and a long list of numerous vessel specifications and related factors that impact on risk. Further she also says in her “opinion vessels up to 150 metres in length do not pose a risk to navigational safety nor threat of oil spill based on length alone.”\textsuperscript{3}

16. On p59 the definition of a ship is “a vessel of any type whatsoever operating in the marine environment and includes ancillary craft, hydrofoil boats, air-cushion vehicles, submersibles, floating craft, fixed or floating platforms, floating storage units (FSU’s) and floating production storage and off loading units (FPSO’s).”

17. The above would imply that a floating platform of 75 metres in length would be able to manoeuvre within 300m of the shore where as a 90 metre powered vessel of superior manoeuvring characteristics would only be able to come within 600m of the shore.

\textsuperscript{1} Technical Maritime advice for the preparation of a regional coastal Plan for New Zealand’s offshore islands, DOC, Bucken, Young, and Haazen 2009 p11
\textsuperscript{2} Joanne Laing has considerable experience of vessel length through piloting almost 4000 ships from 40 to 295 metres in length into and out of the Port of Lyttelton in varying weather conditions. See attachment for further details.
\textsuperscript{3} Vessels of over 150 metres in length start to become more unmanageable in the conditions associated with the sub Antarctic Islands and therefore the risk does increase with length. The windage on vessels over this length generally becomes exponentially greater and the manoeuvring characteristics do not counteract the affect.
18. For the majority of DOC concessions in National Parks the length of life of the concession is 30 years - in the case of our investment in taking people to the Subantarctics our current permit is annual while we await the CMS review, and then if we change ships it will become discretionary as it currently proposed in the RCP. This is unsatisfactory because for reasonable business certainty minimum of 15 years is recommended.

19. Accordingly for reasons of continuance, certainty and enabling business, and the inaccuracy of using increased length of vessel as defining increasing risk of oil spill at the 75-125m vessel length we recommend these changes.

20. Recommendations:
   - That all rules and maps (pages 34 -51 and 61 -71) with vessel length restrictions be rewritten to have a vessel length of 25 - 125m as a permitted use with a distance of 300 - 600m to MHWS.
   - That the narrative in the proposed plan (Control of surface water activities: page 25 paragraph 3, Control of discharges: page 27, paragraph 2,) and supporting report (section 2.1.1 pages12 - 14, section 3.11 page 44 paragraph 2) be rewritten to reflect accurately the nature of risk from increased boat length and the rationale for applying boat length as the criteria for assessing risk. If boat length is a proxy for other factors then this should be stated clearly.
   - For reasonable business certainty the permitted activities of vessels between 25-125 metres be for a minimum of 15 years
   - Consider whether a tighter definition of vessel is advantageous to exclude large inshore platforms that have limited manoeuvrability compared to ships.


There are number of government processes that are underway that have a direct bearing on the Kermadec and Subantarctic Islands. The CMS is the only one mentioned (page 6) in the proposed plan. However there is also the implementation of the Marine Protected Areas Policy in the Territorial Seas of the Subantarctic and Biogeographic Region of New Zealand and the Vessel Biofouling Import Health Standard development by MAF Biosecurity New Zealand that details hull fouling policies for New Zealand. The connection and relationships between these processes and this proposed plan is not spelt out.

22. In the case of the later MAFBNZ has recently funded a review into ship cleaning technologies - see http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/about-us/our-publications/technical-papers#inwater-clean. MAFBNZ is also currently involved in the review of the ANZECC (Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council) Code of Practice for in-water cleaning of vessels that is examining appropriate situations when in-water cleaning can be used while minimising risk to the environment. MAFBNZ are continuing to work, both nationally and internationally to promote investment in the development of systems and technologies to
improve hull maintenance and mitigation options. MAFBNZ notes that facilities to decontaminate large vessels are limited or unavailable in New Zealand. The preventative approach of encouraging continual good hull maintenance practice is a critical part of the solution to this issue. The scenario modelling project will examine mitigation measures for non-compliant large vessels and their cost and feasibility for use under various circumstances.

23. The IHS is expected to be released in September 2011, from which time vessel operators and industries will be expected to refine their anti-fouling practices, as necessary, to meet the standard by September 2012.

24. **Recommendation:**

25. The closely connected government processes underway as outlined above should be explicitly stated in the proposed Regional Coastal Plan and their relationship to this plan and the implications of these relationships on the management of the coastal marine areas in question should be spelt out (page 54).

26. On hull cleaning the Regional Coastal Plan should apply the approach taken by the lead agency of Biosecurity New Zealand and this should be stated as the rule, and acknowledgment of the practical limitations of decontamination in New Zealand especially for large vessels. This should be specifically referenced in the proposed plan (pages 42, 43 and 44) and in the narrative.

27. **Tourism growth**

Based on our 25 years of experience and knowledge of tourism to the Subantarctics and Kermadec Islands tourism currently is not growing. There have been some spikes historically typically coinciding with activities such as significant Antarctic Anniversaries or as in 89-90 the ICBP (International Council Bird Preservation) and ICO (International Ornithological Congress) conferences which were held in NZ. Interest is always significantly more than actual demand. The cost and rigour of expeditionary travel deters many, as the initial rush of enthusiasm moves to a realisation of cost and the likely physical hardship – acute sea sickness typically for several days in the roughest seas in the world.

28. **Recommendation**

The plan should accurately state the tourism dynamic, as stated in the attached report.

29. **Threats**

The proposed plan (page 22) identifies two key risks of bio security breaches and oil spills. We agree these are the main threats. They are currently mitigated by the permit process and in our case by the careful practises that we apply.

30. **Biosecurity**
The threat from our operation of bio security breaches is considered small as we anti-foul annually and have in place strict and practical procedures to reduce and ideally eliminate such threats.

31. A greater risk is posed from the Scampi fishing boats that shelter during rough weather, 7-8 at a time for up to 3-4 weeks in the Auckland Islands. These boats are typically under 20 metres and as such are likely to moor close to shore, as small vessels. Such vessels may be mooring well within the rat swimming distance range of up to about 300 metres.

32. These boats are not currently subjected to controls when seeking shelter or likely to undertake the same precautions as expeditionary cruising nor are their visits documented. Specific risk mitigation of this threat is required. A de-ratting certificate and guidelines in the event of landing would help reduce this risk. It is understood they are prohibited from landing however if holed up for extended periods it is likely this is breached. Accordingly a guideline issued to the fleet about the Subantarctic Islands should help ensure they are more aware of the unique character and special status of the islands. This along with a requirement for a de-ratting certificate would reduce this risk.

33. Oil spills

Oil spills are a recognised threat. However the risk remains small from expeditionary vessels as they are typically double skinned and ice strengthened making oil spill unlikely unless they are deeply penetrated below the water line.

34. We undertook some analysis of marine incidents in relation to the Subantarctic Islands and this revealed the following (See appendix 2 for fuller analysis): of all the vessels wrecked, with the exception of the yacht Totororoe at the Antipodes in 1999, all were totally reliant on sailing. There have been no wrecks of motor vessels on any of the islands.

35. Recommendations:

On hull cleaning and antifouling the Regional Coastal Plan should apply the approach taken by the lead agency of Biosecurity New Zealand – see earlier recommendation on this

36. Specific risk mitigation of biosecurity breaches should be put in place for fishing vessels and others seeking shelter – this requires an additional policy and rule.

37. As the likelihood of oil spill from motor vessels remains low for vessels under 125m and this should be stated in the rationale for the rules Page 44, Section 32 report.

38. Anchoring

We find the maps in the plan helpful, and we discussed all the following anchorages in the consultations. However it appears there are a number of errors or omissions in the maps in relation to anchoring, existing anchorages and the related rules:
a) Enderby Island — this has been used historically for years (and years) yet it is not shown on map not is it included in Rule 46.
b) Erebus Cove - it is shown on Map as SW of Shoe Island and included in Rule 46
c) Ranui Cove — again a very historic anchorage — it is shown for vessels up to 25 metres — but we have used it for over 20 years with this vessel and it was agreed that it would be up to included in Rule 46
d) Musgrave Inlet — discussed and shown on Map — but not in Rule 46.
e) Tagua Bay - shown on Map — very historic anchorage
f) Raynal Point (Carnley Harbour) shown on map but not included in Rule 46 – we have used it often since 1993.
g) Coleridge Bay — shown on map but not included in Rule 46 – used occasionally since 1993. However we request the description of this anchorage amended to read ‘North of Mask Island’ this amendment is the result of experience in the 2010/11 season when there was a strong southerly blowing and we needed to access Camp Cove – this was the only anchorage we could do it from.
h) Western Arm – Historic Anchorage for us in good weather - discussed at length included on Map – not shown in Rule 46 and wrongly shown in the key on map A2.
i) Perseverance Harbour - shown on map and included in Rule 46.

39. The current maps and the text of Rule 46 don’t match. Further the plan should allow for anchoring for vessels up to 125 metres as per our earlier recommendation.

40. Recommendation:

41. All the above anchorages be shown on the maps and included in the rules.

42. All references to vessel length on the maps be altered to show the recommended class of 25 -125 metres and as permitted.

43. Changes to Rule 36 and Error in Rule 36 as it is written – it says “Access to the coastal marine area of the Sub Antarctic Islands ....” yet in the Standards/terms/conditions it includes ‘Northeast of Macauley Island ...’ that is in Kermadecs. This rule should make provision for vessels up to 125 metres – this is imperative for safety of zodiac (passenger) operations. The rationale is the closer you can get into a “lee “shore the more shelter from wind and swell you will get – making embarking and disembarking into and from zodiacs much safer.

44. Recommendation

The reference to Macauley Island be removed from rule 36, and provision be made for vessels up to 125 metres – to ensure passenger safety embarking and disembarking from zodiacs

45. One ship in a bay at any one time

46. Rules 36, 38, 40, 41, 45 and 46 all stipulate that ‘No more than one cruise ship in a bay at any one time” - this raises two questions “a bay” is not defined does a bay equate to Port Ross. For example you can have bays within a Port or Harbour. Under this definition you could have a cruise ship at Sandy Bay (Enderby Island) and Erebus Cove (or bay) – both of these
are in Port Ross. It is suggested that Harbour would be a better term to ensure the preservation of the remoteness and the wilderness values. A harbour is a larger spatial area, as compared to a bay. So the use of the word harbour rather than bay would ensure the preservation of the remoteness and the wilderness values.

47. It is noted that this is only for a cruise ship and on Page 25 last paragraph it talks about "the preservation of the remoteness and wilderness values." These rules would allow a cruise ship, and an undetermined number of research and other vessels at one time - this does not enable the remoteness and wilderness experiences of those people on the cruise ship or on the other vessels.

49. Recommendations:
That in rules 36, 38, 40, 41, 45 and 46 bay be replaced by the word "Harbour" to ensure the preservation of the remoteness and the wilderness values.

50. That in rules 36, 38, 40, 41, 45 and 46 the words cruise ship in a bay be changed to, "vessel in a harbour at any one time."

51. That the last sentence page 25 be clarified to include any type of vessel - read "..... such as only one vessel visiting a harbour in any one day."

52. Willingness to continue to engage
Heritage Expeditions continues to be willing to engage in both formal and informal processes for the management of the Kermadec and the Subantarctic Islands.

53. Heritage Expedition wishes to be heard in relation to this submission including the attached report.

Yours sincerely

Rodney Russ
Managing Director
Heritage Expeditions
Antarctic House PO Box 7218
53B Montreal Street,
Christchurch, New Zealand
Appendix 1

PROPOSED COASTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR SUB ANTARCTIC ISLANDS

Captain Joanne Laing

- This submission covers section #7 regarding the risk of Oil Pollution and Bio Security Breach.

- I would like to make comments on Section 32 report Page 44, 3.11 paragraph 2 last sentence, regarding the statement that the 'larger the vessel, is the more restricted the rules should be.

  Under these proposed rules the definition of a vessel is "a vessel of any type whatsoever operating in the marine environment and includes ancillary craft, hydrofoil boats, air-cushion vehicles, submersibles, floating craft, fixed or floating platforms, floating storage units (FSU's) and floating production storage and off loading units (FPSO's)."

- The above would imply that an unpowered floatation platform of 75 metres in length would be able to manoeuvre within 300m of the shore where as a 90 metre powered vessel of superior manoeuving characteristics would only be able to come with in 600m of the shore.

  The length of the vessel is not an indication of risk alone and is therefore inappropriate for solely establishing the Rules.

  Risk is related to numerous factors but not limited to:

1. The type of main propulsion system of the vessel.
2. The horse power of the main propulsion system of the vessel.
3. The number of propellers.
4. Whether the propellers are fixed or variable pitch.
5. Whether the propellers are inward turning or out ward turning.
6. The distance apart of the two (or 3) propellers.
7. The number of rudders
8. Whether the rudder is spade, active or shilling.
9. Whether the rudders can operate independently or synchronised or both.
10. The presence of bow thrusters or stern thrusters.
11. The power of the bow and/or stern thrusters.
12. The windage of the vessel in relation to power available.
13. Draft in relation to the available depth of water.
14. Available weather predictions in the area and the availability of other weather prediction sources. Wind speed, sea waves, swell waves, visibility.
15. Prediction of tidal and other currents.
16. Aids to Navigation fitted on the vessel.
18. Up to date Navigation Charts.
19. Experience of Master and Officers within the sub Antarctic group.
20. Thorough Passage planning for transiting and anchorages within the Sub Antarctic Islands.
21. Strict parameters set for weather conditions
22. Hazard Identification
23. Procedures for emergency situations.
24. Double Skinned Hulls
25. Ice strengthened Hulls
26. A Reputable Planned Maintenance System

In my opinion vessels up to 150metres in length do not pose a risk to navigational safety nor threat of Oil spill based on Length alone.

- Vessels of over 150 meters in length start to become more unmanageable in the conditions associated with the sub Antarctic Islands and therefore the risk does increase with length. The windage on vessels over this length generally becomes exponentially greater and the manoeuvring characteristics do not counteract the affect.

Captain Joanne Laing

- I started my career at sea in 1981 with Union Steam Ship Company NZ Ltd as an Apprenticed Deck Cadet trading around New Zealand, the Pacific Islands and Australia on various ships.
- In 1984 I gained my 2nd Mate Foreign Going Certificate and worked with P&O New Zealand Ltd as a Third Navigating Officer on Container ships Trading World Wide.
- In 1987 I gained my Chief Mate Foreign Going Certificate and then in 1988 transferred to Jardine Ship Management Ltd of Hong Kong as 2nd navigating Officer trading worldwide on Bulk Cargo, Container and General Cargo ships. I spent almost 10 years with Jardines – the last 5 as Master on Container Ships and Bulk Carriers. I gained my Master Foreign Going Certificate in 1990.
- In 1997 I started with Lyttelton Port of Christchurch Ltd as a Harbour Pilot and am still with them today. In this time I have Piloted almost 4000 ships from 40 to 295 metres in length into and out of the Port of Lyttelton in varying weather conditions.

Prepared by: Joanne Laing, Harbour Pilot, Lyttelton Port of Christchurch Ltd, March 2011
Appendix 2

Shipping and the Sub Antarctic Islands

Please note in the time available to Research this no attempt has been made to separate out the various islands visited by individual ships. For example we know that more ships have visited Campbell Island than the Bounty and Antipodes but for this review we have treated the sub Antarctic Islands as one destination.

Since the discovery of the NZ sub Antarctic Islands (which covered the period 1788-1810) apart from two flights by a Catalina aircraft to Campbell island in 1946 and 1951 the only way to reach these islands was by ship, until the late 1980’s when helicopters were first used. Helicopters regularly visit these islands for Search Rescue, Research and Management purposes today. Shipping is still by far the most common means of transport.

The majority of the vessels visiting the islands originate from NZ ports, apart from a few

a) in the sealing era (1806 – 1820)
b) The pelagic sealers ie American Ships in the 1850’s
c) Antarctic Discovery ships during the discovery and Heroic period of exploration 1830’s –1917 when Hobart was a more popular port.
d) A limited number of the Tourist ships. Some are originating from Hobart; occasionally they are coming out of South American Ports.

In the time from their Discovery to the present day there have been over 462 ship visits* to these islands.

This we believe is understated by about 20% as it excludes:-

a. Fishing vessels either to Snares Island or those seeking shelter at Auckland and Campbell Island. Or those prospecting around the Islands. Where it is known that fishing vessels have landed personnel for research purposes’ we have included them.
b. American Sealing Ships in the 1850’s – not all recorded
c. Vessel movements associated with the Hardwicke settlement – they had 8 ships working from the Settlement – and there is no record of their movements.
d. It is probable that the Government steamer visits 1864 – 1920’s are understated.
e. Coastwatching era is understated
f. Campbell Island Resupply 1945 – 1995 is incomplete
g. Some vessels in period 1975 to present day which transported scientists are missing from the list
h. Some private yachts are possibly missing from the list.

Those 462 ship visits have been made by at least 164 Individual vessels. The largest vessel recorded was the Sir James Clark Ross which made a number of visits to Campbell island during the 1920’s and
during one visit remained there for at least 3 days with its 6 catchers also anchored in the harbour – giving over 10,000 Gross tonnage at anchor at one time – surely a record for Campbell island.

Sir James Clark Ross
Length: 470ft.3in
Breath: 58ft 5in
Draft: 31ft 3in
Gross Tons 9725.

The smallest Vessel sailed to the Islands was the yacht Ketiga in the summer of 1972/73 which we understand was about 20ft in length. This yacht visited all the Sub Antarctic Islands. Almost all visits were of few days duration, some only for a few hours although the Southern Cross (1899) spent almost 6 months anchored at Campbell Islands.

It is worth while noting that of the 462 ship visits by 164 different ships there has only been 12 ship wrecks of these 12, nine were outbound from Australia to the Cape Horn and all were wrecked on the exposed west coast of the Auckland Islands or Antipodes Islands they were not destined for the Sub Antarctic Islands and only became wrecks because of inaccurate charting and inclement weather (a scenario that is unlikely to happen again) so therefore do not form part of the statistics.

Of the other three one, The Perseverance was a sealing vessel wrecked at Campbell Island in 1828 – the circumstances surrounding this wreck and its location are not known - probably in the Harbour. The Grafton dragged its anchor in Carnley Harbour in the Auckland Islands in 1854. The most recent wreck was of the yacht Totorore at the Antipodes Island – probably on the South Coast in 1999.

It is interesting to note that all of the vessels wrecked, with exception of Totorore were totally reliant on sailing – had no engine at all. Totorore was equipped with an engine – but it was well known that it was faulty and possibly was not working at the time of its accident. There have been no wrecks of motor vessels on any of the Islands. Three wrecks out of 462 ship visits represent less than 1%.

Of those 164 individual ships only 14 (or 8.5 %) have been tourist ships. (Two of these vessels the Tiama and Acheron have also undertaken a significant number of science or Management expeditions as well. We estimate that of the 462 visits to the Islands 84 or 18.2 % have been tourist ships. In the period Nov 2010 – March 2011 there were a total of 26 ship visits to the Sub Antarctic Islands of those only 10 or 38% where tourist visits. (If you include the unknown/undocumented visits by fishing boats – this % could be as low as 10%).


Appendix 3 – see over
Notes on Navigating in the New Zealand Sub Antarctic Islands and Kermadec Islands.

Prepared by Captain Dmitriy Zinchenko Feb 2011

Dmitriy Zinchenko graduated from The Far East Institute of Fishing Industry in Vladivostok in 1981 as Navigator. He first visited the Southern Ocean in 1982 and again 1983. In 1990 he was appointed captain of the research vessel Mys Ynona, which examined the population of Krill in the Pacific sector of Antarctica.

He worked as Chief Mate on the vessel Akademik Shokalskiy in 1993 and during the period from 1995 till 2000 visited New Zealand Sub Antarctic Islands, Macquarie Island and Antarctica (Ross Sea and Commonwealth Bay) for Heritage Expeditions.

In 2006 he was appointed captain of the vessel Prof. Khromov (trading as Spirit of Enderby) again for Heritage Expeditions. He has commanded this vessel every Austral summer since then in the Sub Antarctic and Antarctica. He first visited Kermadec Islands as a captain was in 2008 and again 2011 prior to that he had visited them as Chief mate on one occasion.

He has made about 42 expeditions as a Chief Mate and 36 expeditions as a Captain, perhaps more than any other officer in the history of these islands.

I. Charts

Charts of New Zealand: Numbers 1460, 14612, 2414, 2862, 3114, 2225 are mostly used for navigating in Sub Antarctic Islands.

As an additional navigating tool the vessel is equipped dKart electronic Navigation system.

II. Weather Forecasting

Facsimile weather charts from the Australian and New Zealand meteorological centers are used extensively. The Australian Charts are received every 12 hours and New Zealand Charts are received every 6 hours. In the vessel owners subscribe to Xaxero Marine Service which allows us to upload wind forecasts for 6 hourly intervals for up to 72 hours in advance.
III. Pilot Books

Pilot books are adequate for these regions but should not be relied upon – should be read in conjunction with updated charts.

(Please note that these notes refer to cables 1 cable = 185.2 meters)

Auckland Islands.

1) Port Ross

a) Enderby Island

The entrance to the Port Ross is from the east side. When approaching, the strong tidal currents from the north and south should be taken into account. Currents can reach 1-2 knots. The best anchorage is in Sandy Bay. It is well sheltered from north through westerly winds. Swell enters the Port Ross Bay with easterly winds. Minimum anchoring distance to the shore is -1.5 - 2 cables. Depth is 10 -14 meters. The bottom is sand. In strong South West – Southerly winds it is recommended to deploy two anchors because if the winds reach 20-30 knots (from these directions) it is possible to drag at anchor. The current chart is accurate in all respects and is sufficient for safe navigation.

b) Erebus Cove
Approach to the anchorage is possible from the north and south of Shoe Island. There are no dangers.
Berth is 2.5 cables to the east of Ohnson Point. It is protected from winds and waves. Excellent holding in all winds.

c) Ranui Cove

Approach to the anchorage is from the north between Ocean Island and Ewing Island. It's necessary to be very careful while approaching as it is sufficiently but not well sounded. Anchoring should not be attempted in strong winds. There are large patches of Kelp in the bay. There are strong tidal currents in the straits between the Islands. Berth is 3 cables to the north-west of the Frenchs Island. Bottom is rocky and uneven but never the less good holding. The Eastern passage between Ewing Island and Frenchs Island is poorly studied and full of danger.

d) Musgrave Inlet

The approach to the Musgrave Inlet is from the East along an obvious approach. It's a deep water passage. North of the approach or to the east of the bay is uncharted area. Kelp is visible in that area. The depth and nature of the bottom allow to anchorage 2.5 cables away from the northern and southern shores in the north-western part of the bay. Anchorage is advisable only in good weather. There are squalls when westerly winds occur. The bay is not protected from weather from easterly quarter. There is a large concentration of kelp along the shores of the north-western arm of the bay.
e) Tagua Bay

This is the most protected bay in Carnley Harbor and provides good shelter in stormy weather. The entrance to the bay is from the south. It’s a deep-water bay. The depths in the middle part are 50-60 meters and allow anchoring only in the north-western part of the bay, 1.8 cables from the western shoreline. The Prevailing winds are north-westerly and westerly in very strong winds it is possible for the anchor to drag. There are good soundings and chart is accurate for this bay.

f) Epigwatt

It is possible to anchor 3 cables to the north-west of Raynal Pt. Cape when it is relatively calm or wind from easterly quarter occurs.

g) Masked Island

The bottom around the island is precipitous. The depth allows anchoring only 1.5 cables off the northern coast and when the sea is calm. There is good holding.

e) FairChilds Garden

The approach along the western arm of Carnley Harbor is relatively narrow and the bottom has a cup shaped profile. The depth, bottom relief and the narrow strait limit the amount of anchor chain that can be deployed. Bottom is rocky and is not good holding. Anchoring should only be attempted in calm weather and should not be considered for overnight or extended periods. Ideal for zodiac operations to SW Cape.
Preservance Harbor

There are beacons (established in 1967?), which indicate a safe approach. At the entrance it is necessary to pay attention to the shallows around the South Pt. There is an uncharted area to the south of this Point. There are strong currents up to 2 knots in both southern and northern directions. It is very important to take into account the fact that the winds which flow from the slopes of the hills are as a rule always stronger inside the bay rather than outside. There is a shoal (Terror Reef) in the middle of the arm, covered with kelp, it is well charted.

The bottom in the western portion of the bay has a shape of a cup and is silt (mud). Anchors do not hold well and anchor flukes can become stuck with silt and lose holding power. When the weather is windy it is recommended to lie at 2 anchors but even this is not the guarantee against dragging. While riding at two anchors it is important to monitor wind direction as it can change very quickly and lead to the anchor chain twisting around each other. When there is the southern-westerly wind it is better to drop the anchor 2.5 cables off the Beeman Pt. from the southern side of the approach. When there is the north-westerly wind it is best to anchor 2 cables off the eastern shore which is
north from the approach. This anchorage requires continuous anchor watch!!!. Chart detail and information is accurate.

3) Snares Island

a) There is no anchoring here – but vessels have to come close in shore to Launch Zodiacs and disembark and embark passengers. This operation is affected alot by both wind and swell.

b) With strong W, NW, SW winds the swell interference around the Island is obvious. The most suitable and safe place for disembarkation away from the influence or affect of this swell is 1.5 – 2 cables to the east of Mollymawk Bay. There are strong 1 - 2 knots tidal currents of the northern and the southern directions. When there are the northern, southern and eastern winds and swell - zodiacs embarkation is impossible.
When there are northern and northern-easterly winds and swell zodiacs embarkation/disembarkation is possible on the southern side of the island, 2 cables off the south coast in South Bay. But prevailing western swell and strong southern current sometimes make this operation difficult.

4) Antipodes Island

a) As for Snares Island
b) Anchoring in the southern-eastern part of the Island in Ringdove Bay is impossible because of deep water.
Disembarking and embarking passengers into zodiacs is only possible while vessel is drifting and then no further than 2.5 cables from the shore. This is only possible with light breeze/swell from all quarters except the west, when it is possible to operate in stronger winds as the Bay is protected from westerly swell.

It is possible to anchor in Anchorage Bay (between Antipodes and Bollons Island) and embark or disembark passengers into zodiacs but only in relatively calm conditions.

Only Ring Dove and Anchorage Cove are charted in any detail - the remainder of the Island is poorly chartered.

5) Bounty Islands
a) As for Snares and Antipodes Islands
b) There are no places for anchoring in the area near the Islands. Very little charting of the area has been done the chart is not detailed and is of small-scale. Approach to the islands is only from the northern-eastern side when the favorable (moderate) breeze and swell occur. There are very strong currents of alternating directions in the straits between the islands. Zodiacs embarkation/disembarkation is possible only in a limited area, 2 cables from the northern coast of Lion Island.


Note, these comments relate to expeditions made in late summer early autumn. There is often a easterly swell which wraps around the island at this time of the year. There are also strong tidal currents especially around the headlands but the current is not nearly as strong in the bays.

Raoul Island

a) Fishing Rock – anchoring here is a minimum of 3 cables, ideally 4 – 5 cables. In 15-20 meters of water. Rocky bottom but swell can sometimes be a problem.
b) Meyer Islands – this anchorage is sheltered from the easterly wind – but swell can be a problem. Anchoring point is 3 – 4 cables off shore in about 30 meters of water. Holding is generally good but not tested in strong wind.

c) Boat Cove – no experience

d) Chanter Islands – no experience.

e) Deham Bay – anchoring point is 3 cables off Te Kanui Point in approx 40 metres of water. Holding appears to be good but not tested in strong winds. Nearly always a easterly swell.

Macauley Island.

a) Anchorage is at NE extremity of island, north of Haszard Islet. 2-3 cables off shore in 40 meters of water (but soundings are inaccurate here). Strong tidal currents experienced in this vicinity, also not protected from swell.

Cheeseman and Curtis Islands

a) Anchorage is between the Islands on the north side. 3+ cables off the shore line of both islands, in about 25 30 meters of water. The area is poorly sounded, charts do show a rock, there could be more. There are strong tidal currents flowing between and around these islands.