### Biosecurity Risks of In-Water Cleaning of Vessels

Chela Zabin, Smithsonian Environmental Research Center, Tiburon CA Vessel In-Water Cleaning Meeting June 22 2015 Honolulu, HI



# **Biofouling reduction**

- Fuel efficiency
- Maintenance (prop polishing, etc.)
- Biosecurity
- Regulatory requirements



# **Biofouling reduction**

- First line of defense: fouling prevention
- Anti-fouling paint applied in drydock ~5 yrs
- Fouling builds up in unpainted and "niche" areas



Before and after cleaning

Photos: Franmarine



# **Biofouling reduction**

- Limited performance after ~18 months
- Periodic cleaning to remove biofouling, refresh paint
- Typically done in-water (IWC)



## IWC also presents some risks

- -contaminant release (copper, other toxins)
- -release of non-native biota
- -may damage paint, encouraging further growth



non-natives invertebrate species targeted for watch in Alaska (info at http://platewatch.nisbase.org)

## Assessing biosecurity risk posed by IWC of fouled vessels



-Adapted from Hopkins & Forrest 2008

## Baseline biosecurity risk

Baseline risk factors: -Species present -Species condition -Level of fouling

Baseline risk -Release of adult organisms, propagules, fragments -Does vessel travel strictly in Hawaii?

If yes, minimizes baseline risk -Condition of species? Often difficult to determine -Level of fouling? More fouling, higher risk

### Options for managing biofouling risk



#### No-management option

Baseline risk -Release of adult organisms, propagules, fragments

No management

-Does vessel travel strictly in Hawaii?
If yes, minimizes baseline risk
-Condition of species?
Often difficult to determine
-Level of fouling?
More fouling, higher risk
-Time spent in HI?
Less time, lower risk
-Movements within HI?
Fewer stops, lower risk

## Dry dock/haul out option





## Dry dock/haul out option



-<sup>1</sup>Coutts et al. 2010, <sup>2</sup>Woods et al. 2012, <sup>3</sup>McClary&Nelligan 2001

## Dry dock/haul out option



Incompletely cleaned patches

Remaining organisms: reduced survival?

# IWC option





## **IWC** option

#### Vessel set up/dive ops<sup>1</sup>



<sup>5</sup>Davidson et al. 2008, <sup>6</sup>Hopkins et al. 2010

## In general, IWC = greater survival



- Woods et al. 2012 comparison methods
- Floerl et al. 2003, 70% of organisms survived and viable following IWC

# Minimizing risk of IWC

- Hopkins & Forrest 2008 (NZ)
- recognized that risks of IWC might outweigh not managing biofouling
- Recommended careful assessment of options

# Minimizing risk of IWC

- Floerl et al. 2010 (Australia) recommended:
- Allow IWC only on vessels with non-biocidal coatings and slime layer only
- OK on heavier fouling if local origin
- Cleaning method must not damage paint
- Proactive maintenance of niche areas
- Development of capture technologies

# Minimizing risk of IWC

- Inglis et al. 2012 (NZ) reviewed various scenarios of vessel type, fouling and stays in NZ
- recommended against IWC as a management option for most non-compliant (fouled) vessels unless debris could be contained

## Options for managing biofouling risk



### **Risk comparison**

#### -Does vessel travel strictly in Hawaii?

If yes, minimizes baseline risk -Condition of species? Often difficult to determine -Level of fouling? More fouling, higher risk -Time spent in HI? Less time, lower risk -Movements within HI? Fewer stops, lower risk