



Royal Vancouver Yacht Club Coal Harbour Marina Expansion Project

Webinar Questions, Comments and Responses
Session date: Tuesday 16 June 2020, 3:00 to 4:30 p.m.

Following is a record of verbatim questions and comments received during the 16 June RVYC Coal Harbour Expansion Project Information Session, and responses provided during the webinar session, as well as additional responses to questions not addressed in the 90 minutes allotted.

Readers are advised that:

- Questions read out (in whole, in part or combined with similar themed questions) and addressed during the session are shown in black text.
- Questions not addressed during the session, responses to these questions and additional information are [noted in blue text](#).
- Similarly-themed questions that have the same answer as another are noted with an asterisk (*).
- All questions and responses will form part of the Public Comment Period for the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority PER process application review.

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| <i>Community/ Stakeholder concerns (Public waterway, access for Vancouver Rower Club)</i> | |
| <p>Based on your presentation, it seems clear that you can accomplish the vast majority of your goals by proceeding with the project WITHOUT expanding into the existing waterway. In fact, as stated by Mr. Jupp during the presentation, expansion was not always in the plans. Since expanding into the existing waterway is so dangerous, will you consider modifying your project so that it does not expand into the existing waterway?</p> | <p>RVYC: RVYC has been working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to consider community interests in the project design and as part of the review process. We believe that there is space for everyone.</p> <p>This project will improve Coal Harbour boater safety by reconfiguring the marina to provide safer entry and exits points at RVYC and eliminate the need for boats to reverse out of the marina.</p> <p>The project will enhance environmental protection by replacing aging infrastructure, including removing creosote-coated piles and replacing older boat sheds.</p> <p>It also will address growing demand for moorage by increasing the number of slips available, improving</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| | <p>services for RVYC members and visiting tourists.</p> <p>We have considered many different layouts over the history of this project and the current layout emerged as the most efficient use of space. The moorage planned for the outside of “K” Float is for vessels that currently dock at the marina. If those vessels are moored inside of “K” float that would mean removing 44 planned slips on the inside of “K” Float. Also, to accommodate the larger vessels inside of “K” Float, it would need to be moved to the edge of the water lot boundary to create enough room for the larger vessels to maneuver inside “K” Float. This would significantly curtail the benefits of the project.</p> |
| <p>The people of BC and Vancouver, are losing space that will be restricted to RVYC members only, what is the traded benefit for the people of BC and Vancouver for their loss?</p> | <p>RVYC: The yacht club is very inviting for members of other yacht clubs. We have a big reciprocal program not just locally but internationally. We invite other members of yacht clubs to come and visit and tie up they are allowed to stay two weeks at the Coal Harbour location and the Jericho location. They receive two nights free with our reciprocal privilege program. With that they are able to use our septic pump out system to pump out their waste from their tanks, both Coal Harbour and Jericho have pump out stations so the visiting boaters are allowed to use that as well as use some of the other facilities and we have maps and other interesting things about Vancouver for them to explore while they visit.</p> <p>The harbour is a commercial waterway. Like other organizations, we make annual lease payments to use it, and our members and visitors contribute to the local economy.</p> |
| <p>VRC has proposed a modified proposal for this expansion. What is the RVYC's response to this? *</p> | <p>RVYC: RVYC has been working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to consider community interests in the project design and as part of the review process. We believe that there is space for everyone.</p> <p>We have had several discussions with the Vancouver Rowing Club (VRC) about this project. In 2018 VRC proposed a channel width of 81.5 metres, which is the width of the existing channel from “J” float to the south side and would not allow for an expansion.</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| | <p>The VRC then requested two outbound and two inbound rowing lanes with buffers between and on either side of them, and the port authority-designated channel of 63.4m (208.4 feet) supports this.</p> <p>We understand that the channel width in front of the VRC marina is currently 65m wide.</p> |
| <p>I would like to ask what compromises have been offered and discussed by RVYC with the Public and VRC who have expressed concerns and offered suggested compromises? *</p> <p>Coal Harbor is a Public waterway and used by more than just 'marine goers'.... yacht owners. Can you please confirm and indicate what compromises RVYC would be willing to accept? *</p> | <p>RVYC: There were a number of discussions and meetings between RVYC the port authority and our neighbours concerning the project and there were a number of different suggestions and there were a number of changes in the layout and the boundaries of the project. We have done several adjustments. We have done a lot of studies on multi-use waterways we are confident and convinced that the waterway can be used by everyone safely. We have marked different things on the docks, and we will add mirrors to add visibility. We reconfigured "I" float to provide for better access. We have eliminated backing-out into the channel, which is a significant challenge for users of the channel; and which is a bit of an improvement.</p> |
| <p>In meetings with the RVYC as well as VRC's response to the application to the port, VRC has stated a compromise position to allow the expansion to about half of the channel width reduction that the proposal contains. What is your position on this compromise? *</p> | <p>RVYC: RVYC has been working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to consider community interests in the project design and as part of the review process. We believe that there is space for everyone.</p> <p>We have had several discussions with the Vancouver Rowing Club (VRC) about this project. In 2018 VRC proposed a channel width of 81.5 metres, which is the width of the existing channel from "J" float to the south side and would not allow for an expansion.</p> <p>The VRC then requested two outbound and two inbound rowing lanes with buffers between and on either side of them, and the port authority-designated channel of 63.4m (208.4 feet) supports this.</p> <p>We understand that the channel width in front of the VRC marina is currently 65m wide.</p> |
| <p>In a meeting between RVYC, the Port and VRC on April 26, 2019, another compromise was presented that would allow you to extend the marina without</p> | <p>RVYC: We've gone through probably a dozen iterations while we were designing the marina and we did look at that. One of the challenges is how do</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>any changes to the plan, but not provide moorage for yachts on the outside of the new dock. This would only reduce the total amount of new moorage slips by a few yachts. What is your position on this compromise? *</p> | <p>we design the marina for the vessels we have in the marina and the ones that we expect to see in the marina? That is a challenge and if we took the vessels off of “K” float and took that float out then we got redesign problem that turns out the be inefficient again and it is difficult to get the larger vessels inside so the reason that we came up with that design is so that we could put the larger vessels outside there they are linear and they have a 120 degree view so they are certainly a lot safer in terms of coming and going from the marina; they can see everything that is around them. And we have thought about putting some of the smaller vessels on the west end of “K” Float and that is another consideration perhaps. The design that we ended up with became the design that was the most efficient for our purposes so that is where we ended up where we are.</p> |
| <p>What consideration was made regarding VRC's alternative proposal for this expansion? *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: As part of the work that [we] have completed [we] haven't seen an alternate proposal put forward as part of this proposal but as [we] mentioned this information can be reiterated or brought forward through the stakeholder consultation process that is ongoing so if there is information that should be shared such as an alternative arrangements that can be incorporated as part of that feedback.</p> |
| <p>If you had all these meetings with the rowers, why have you never considered any of the alternatives to a less intrusive footprint for the expansion? *</p> | <p>RVYC: RVYC has been working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to consider community interests in the project design and as part of the review process. We believe that there is space for everyone.</p> <p>We have had several discussions with the Vancouver Rowing Club (VRC) about this project. In 2018 VRC proposed a channel width of 81.5 metres, which is the width of the existing channel from “J” float to the south side and would not allow for an expansion.</p> <p>The VRC then requested two outbound and two inbound rowing lanes with buffers between and on either side of them, and the port authority-designated channel of 63.4m (208.4 feet) supports this.</p> <p>We understand that the channel width in front of</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>For RVYC: your proposal claims to have been submitted after "consultation" with VRC, yet none of the changes you made to your proposal address VRC's primary concern: that the expanded footprint makes rowing unsafe through the navigational channel. Can you really call it "consultation" if you make no changes that incorporate other stakeholders' concerns? *</p> | <p>the VRC marina is currently 65m wide.</p> <p>RVYC: RVYC has been working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to consider community interests in the project design and as part of the review process. We believe that there is space for everyone.</p> <p>We have had several discussions with the Vancouver Rowing Club (VRC) about this project. In 2018 VRC proposed a channel width of 81.5 metres, which is the width of the existing channel from "J" float to the south side and would not allow for an expansion.</p> <p>The VRC then requested two outbound and two inbound rowing lanes with buffers between and on either side of them, and the port authority-designated channel of 63.4m (208.4 feet) supports this.</p> <p>We understand that the channel width in front of the VRC marina is currently 65m wide.</p> |
| <p>Mr. Jupp says that this project will improve safety for yachters, however, the Vancouver Rowing Club says this will make rowing unsafe. Why have you ignored the concerns of the Vancouver Rowing Club? *</p> | <p>RVYC: RVYC has been working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to consider community interests in the project design and as part of the review process. We believe that there is space for everyone.</p> <p>This project will improve Coal Harbour boater safety by reconfiguring the marina to provide safer entry and exits points at RVYC and eliminate the need for boats to reverse out of the marina.</p> |
| <p>What changes specifically were made to address rower's concerns about the narrowing of the channel? *</p> | <p>RVYC: The primary safety benefit of the current design is to eliminate vessels backing into the channel and eliminate potential blind spots. The channel is a little narrower, but we believe it is safer.</p> <p>We met numerous times with VRC representatives. We also met with the VRC and the port authority to discuss concerns. The VRC requested two outbound lanes and two inbound lanes with buffer zones. The 63.4m (208.5 ft) channel allows for that.</p> <p>Prior to preparing the PER application and submitting it to the port authority we moved the design of the proposed marina south boundary north by 2m, decreasing our proposed water lot expansion. This was in direct response to feedback</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| | <p>from local stakeholders.</p> <p>In late 2019, under a separate project permit, we removed six existing slips from the west side of the marina to provide a wider access channel into the harbour, improving the safety of this entrance for people using the entrance and for people in the channel.</p> |
| <p>RVYC is a non-profit but it is a private and exclusive club. Why should public areas be used to subsidized and financially benefit a club that has an exclusive and private membership? *</p> | <p>RVYC: Our commercial lease in this waterway comes with obligations and rights between the port authority and the RVYC. We are applying for authorization to expand in accordance with the same rules and regulations that pertain to all commercial leaseholders. We believe that even with our proposed expansion, there is space for everyone.</p> <p>More than 10 years of planning and technical studies have informed this application, including working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to ensure that community interests are considered in the design of the project and as part of the review process.</p> |
| <p>There seems to be quite an emphasis on creating value for yachters and visiting yachters and the benefits to the yachting community. The rowing community has been very vocal in indicating the concerns this channel design has to the rowing community and their ability to use a shared waterway. Why does RVYC believe that they should have the ability to park boats in a public space that could be shared and used by many across the Coal Harbour Community? *</p> | <p>RVYC: It comes to your philosophy – it is valuable space. It is a commercial waterway. And we believe that there is space for everyone.</p> <p>Our commercial lease in this waterway comes with obligations and rights between the port authority and the RVYC. We are applying for authorization to expand in accordance with the same rules and regulations that pertain to all commercial leaseholders. We believe that even with our proposed expansion, there is space for everyone.</p> <p>More than 10 years of planning and technical studies have informed this application, including working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to ensure that community interests are considered in the design of the project and as part of the review process.</p> |
| <p>For Yacht Club: Given that the Rowing Club has been a good neighbour for such a long time, why don't you simply respect their wishes and not expand? *</p> | <p>RVYC: More than 10 years of planning and technical studies have informed this application. RVYC has been working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to ensure that community interests are considered in the design of the project and as part of the review process. We</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| | believe that there is space for everyone. |
| Construction | |
| During the construction, to what degree with the channel be impacted? | RVYC: Equipment will abut the navigation channel during “K” Float installation, and then for the remainder of construction all works will be inside the marina water lot, with very little impact on the channel at all. |
| Environmental Protection | |
| What enhancements will you make, or have you made to improve your environmental stewardship? | RVYC: The existing marina has a lot of old creosote piles that are being removed and replaced with steel. There are a lot of old foam flotation under the docks that tends to crumble; that's all being replaced. The boats sheds all have a factory-applied coating so that we don't have to do annual recoating and painting and we avoid all that sanding and having VOC emissions. The docks will all be concrete so we will get away from treated timber and pressure washing. We've got LED lighting, which drastically reduces electrical load and directs the light down more effectively. We have done handicap-access for people; we have garbage recycling and environmental containers around the docks for processing, waste and other hazardous materials; and those are the types of things that have been incorporated into the design. |
| General Comment (environmentally friendly transportation) | |
| In this day and age, why do you think adding more large motorized vessels inside a city is a good idea, while the city tries to encourage biking and walking over car traffic. | Comment noted. |
| General Question (addressed to rowers) | |
| Has the Rowing Club expressed how they are going to monitor the rowers on the water along with their training boats.? | Moderator acknowledged the comment and noted the question was addressed to the VRC. |
| Marina Design and Best Practices | |
| Does RVYC meet recommended standards for marina best practices as some others do? | RVYC: Applicable recommended best practices for construction and operations are and will be followed by RVYC. This includes a Construction Environmental Management Plan that outlines best practices for project construction. RVYC already has a ranking of 4 out of 5 anchors from the Clean Marine BC program, the only |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| | marina with this ranking in the Coal Harbour Basin. This project will help meet the commitment to obtain a 5 out of 5 anchors ranking for our Coal Harbour marina. |
| One of the major concerns from the Vancouver Rowing Club is that this will create dangerous and unsafe “blind spots” from the new structure. As a result, the rowers will not be able to row as close to the new structure as your diagram shows. How do you address this? | <p>RVYC: Reducing the number of entrances into the channel from the RVYC marina will significantly increase safety. Mirrors installed on “K” Float will also help RVYC members to see oncoming traffic. There will be a long, wide space to the west of “K” Float for vessels to observe and hold if necessary and wait for traffic to pass.</p> <p>In 2019, under a separate permit, we removed six slips from “I” Float adjacent to the west entrance to provide better access and more space for people using the entrance and for people in the channel.</p> |
| No, you don't move K-Float out, but you leave the unused area for the public to use | Comment noted. |
| What is the maximum boat size that will be allowable on the south side of K dock? | RVYC: [The] maximum size on the outside of “K” Float will be 80 feet. |
| Does the drawing illustrating the western wharf K (channel-side)? include the beam of any boat that would be moored on the outside? | RVYC: Vessels on the outside of “K” Float will not extend beyond the proposed water lot boundary. The outer edge of “K” Float is set back from the water lot boundary to accommodate the width of vessels that would be tied there. |
| Navigation/ Administrative Channel | |
| This question is for the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority representatives: given that Vancouver waterways are overseen by a patchwork of different and overlapping regulatory bodies, and my understanding that the Port Authority's mandate is more focused on commerce/trade than recreational and sporting use, and the Parks Board have expressed concern over RVYC's plan to build further out into a shared waterway, can you give us some assurance that you will be working with the Parks Board in considering RVYCs proposal, and will you be taking the Vancouver Non-Motorized Recreation Strategy into account when reviewing this proposal? This proposed expansion seriously endangers VRC's ability to continue offering the opportunity to train and learn to row in coal harbour, approving this proposal in its current state would seem to counter the priorities of the Parks | Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: The mandate of the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is to facilitate trade through the Port of Vancouver but in doing that we certainly look to fulfilling trade objectives but we also do that while at the same time ensuring safety, environmental protection and consideration for local communities so there isn't a hierarchy in that regard. In that sense we are the authority with jurisdiction here and we do have that control we try to look at any project that we have in the process through that lens. In terms of some of the other issues that are being raised around the channel and the rower's ability to continue to row safely that's something that we are taking into account as we do our analysis and review the application. That goes with understanding what the channel is. It is not technically a navigation channel, that is reserved for larger ocean going vessels, this is an administrative channel, it is not |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>Board's recreation strategy. *</p> | <p>posted on any charts or any publications but it's there for administrative purposes and allows us to certainly understand what is required in the Coal Harbour area with regards to users but also with regard to lease holders that are adjacent to the channel.</p> <p>As the federal agency responsible for the stewardship of the federal lands and waters that make up the Port of Vancouver (including the waterways around Stanley Park), the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority oversees the administration, management and control of land and water that fall within its jurisdiction, including ensuring that any proposed works and activities within its jurisdiction are carefully reviewed and considered before determining whether they should proceed, through our PER process.</p> <p>As part of the PER process the Vancouver Parks Board have been engaged to provide feedback on the proposed project. Comments received from all stakeholders will be considered in our review of the project.</p> <p>While the port authority is consulting has notified these stakeholders, the port authority is ultimately the federal agency responsible for the lands and waters with its jurisdiction. The PER process is how the port authority reviews and considers potential effects for all proposed project development on federal lands and waters.</p> <p>As outlined in the Port of Vancouver Port Information Guide pg. 129: "For safety reasons, vessels engaged in fishing, personal watercraft such as jet skis, row boats, canoes and vessels, sailing or proceeding without mechanical power, are not permitted within the boundaries of First Narrows TCZ (TCZ-1), Second Narrows TCZ (TCZ-2) and all areas of Vancouver Harbour in between."</p> |
| <p>Chris - are you able to share more details about the difference between an administrative channel vs a navigable channel?</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: In November 2017, the port authority confirmed that the channel meets the 2014 PIANC Harbour Approach Channel Design Guidelines, as well as the 2010 International Federation of Rowing Associations (FISA) guidelines.</p> <p>As this channel is not used for commercial</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| | <p>navigation, our assessment of it against these standards is an administrative exercise to access safety only.</p> <p>The Coal Harbour area is a multiuse waterway in which recreational powerboats, sailboats, charter vessels and recreational rowers co-exist. Under the Canada Marine Act, the port authority is responsible for maintaining safe and efficient movement of marine traffic within our jurisdiction for all port users. In order to review the proposed expansion and increase the water lot lease, a navigational channel was designed for two functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Provide a visual representation of how all activities could safely take place in Coal Harbour. 2) Help the port authority to determine areas for safe navigation and in considering proposed lease boundary amendments |
| <p>Comment and Question: I have been rowing for 32 years at all levels of local and international rowing competitions. It is absolutely incorrect that rowers only need 13.5m for a rowing lane. The quoted 13.5m in the plans is intended for a racecourse, where you have buoys every 10m and referees to control traffic and there are no other boats to worry about. It is totally different when you have unmarked water accessible to all kinds of boats with no real traffic control. In order to make this less-controlled environment safe, we need much more space to see traffic and change course to avoid collisions. We barely have enough space as it is with today's configuration. Will you promise to stop using the 13.5m argument to justify that you have left a safe space for the rowers? *</p> | <p>RVYC: We have never said that they have to row in a 13.5 m lane. The channel is going to be 210 feet wide and they can use the whole channel just like they do today. The only time that channel width was made reference to was in assembling a minimum channel width that would be safe for everybody and somehow that has taken on a life of its own but there is no intent to have rowers' row in 13.5-meter lanes.</p> |
| <p>Your comparison of this channel to lane width for rowing races is a comparison of apples to oranges - not a true reflection of what is safe in THIS waterway and neither the Provincial or Federal rowing organizations have been consulted or backed up your claims. *</p> | <p>RVYC: We have never said that they have to row in a 13.5 m lane. The channel is going to be 210 feet wide and they can use the whole channel just like they do today. The only time that channel width was made reference to was in assembling a minimum channel width that would be safe for everybody and somehow that has taken on a life of its own but there is no intent to have rowers' row in 13.5-meter lanes.</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>Those ARE COMPLETELY WRONG for the operation of a coached rowing program for beginners and developing rowers, which is most of our members. This is like using the width of the Panama Canal for the design of shipping lanes to a commercial harbour. *</p> | <p>RVYC: We have never said that they have to row in a 13.5 m lane. The channel is going to be 210 feet wide and they can use the whole channel just like they do today. The only time that channel width was made reference to was in assembling a minimum channel width that would be safe for everybody and somehow that has taken on a life of its own but there is no intent to have rowers' row in 13.5-meter lanes.</p> |
| <p>The applicant's assertion that a single racing lane is good enough as a standard for safe rowing for a community rowing club goes unchallenged in this public consultation format. *</p> | <p>RVYC: We have never said that they have to row in a 13.5 m lane. The channel is going to be 210 feet wide and they can use the whole channel just like they do today. The only time that channel width was made reference to was in assembling a minimum channel width that would be safe for everybody and somehow that has taken on a life of its own but there is no intent to have rowers' row in 13.5-meter lanes.</p> |
| <p>It's going to become a much busier channel. Would it not be safer for channel users like rowers and other small craft to forgo the southwest access to k-float and just have one on the southeast?</p> | <p>RVYC: The layout of RVYC marina requires two entry and exit points. The entrances to the RVYC marina are each shared with our neighbours (VRC and HMCS Discovery). If we eliminate the southwest entrance the VRC, vessels would not have access to exit and enter to their marina.</p> |
| <p>This is a very busy area. 1000 recreational boats and five commercial tourism operators. Also, the busiest water aerodrome in Canada. This is not just a channel but a turning basin for all who use it either home ported or visiting from False Creek or other origins. Harbour Cruises alone has 20 movements per day during the tourism season.</p> <p>The Magic Spirit, which is presently moored opposite, is 155 feet long. It [must] turn 180 degrees with each departure or arrival. It is tight now; it will be severely impaired with "K" Float.</p> <p>The barge escape from North Van last year was arrested with tugs working from where the "K" Float extension will go. This would have failed if the "K" Float was in place.</p> | <p>RVYC: RVYC acknowledges these statements. Our obligation is to compel vessels operating in our marina to operate within the requirements of the designated channel. We are not responsible for setting the requirements or for the actions of other vessels.</p> |
| <p>Until a few years ago the CH waterway was used by rowers, boaters and float planes. The float planes are now at the float plan dock further east. Obviously, moving the float plans out of CH improved safety but prior to that, had there been</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: Our marine operations crew and division deal with safety on the water which is a bit priority for us. Moving the float plane facility further to the east out of Coal Harbour has certainly help that. Don't know if there was a</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>significant safety incidents in the waterway? Given the float planes are no longer operating in the waterway, it seems to me that there is ample space in the redefined waterway. The effective width of the proposed waterway will be only slightly narrower at the current extreme limit of the current marina than the current waterway.</p> | <p>specific safety incident or if someone is looking for just over all but that is something that I would have to take offline.</p> |
| <p>False Creek is a very small club. VCR has over 200 rowers.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> |
| <p>Anyone who is out in Coal Harbour during a busy day can tell you that it is BUSY. Boats have to stop and wait for others, and there are already a lot of close calls. Narrowing the channel seems like an absolutely nuts thing to do. Why are you proceeding with it? *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: The channel in Coal Harbour is not technically a navigation channel it is an administrative channel and it does not appear on charts and mapping and whatnot but it is really there so that area can be kept open but it also allows the port authority to work with lease holders so that they know where that boundary is or that lot line is if you want to call it that. And that allows applications such as this that we have seen in that basin there to move forward effectively with some curb lines along that channel.</p> <p>Through this public engagement process the applicant is seeking feedback on the proposed project design, which is not connected to any change in the channel itself, but an expansion and upgrade of the existing Coal Harbour Marina.</p> |
| <p>My question to Port Authority also included whether they would take the Non-Motorized Recreation Strategy into consideration when reviewing. Thank you. *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: That is certainly something that through the PER Process we can fold in consideration of I would note that on our Port Users Guide we do not currently allow non-motorized recreation between the first narrows traffic control zone and the second narrows traffic control zone which of course would include the Coal Harbour waterway. Of course, we certainly acknowledge the rowing presence in Coal Harbour so that's to the exclusion of rowers being permitted in that area. More broadly speaking, throughout our jurisdiction part of our consideration for local communities is recreation it is one of those facets that we do consider as part of the PER process.</p> <p>We take into consideration all port tenants in that vicinity and we are reaching out to those tenants as part of our stakeholder consultation, so VRC being one of those local tenants we consider their feedback through the stakeholder consultation</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| | <p>process.</p> <p>As outlined in the Port of Vancouver Port Information Guide pg. 129: “For safety reasons, vessels engaged in fishing, personal watercraft such as jet skis, row boats, canoes and vessels, sailing or proceeding without mechanical power, are not permitted within the boundaries of First Narrows TCZ (TCZ-1), Second Narrows TCZ (TCZ-2) and all areas of Vancouver Harbour in between.”</p> |
| <p>False Creek harbor has tremendous volume recreational boating traffic especially during weekends inclusive of paddle, rowing, power and sail boats. Boating lanes are chaotic or non-existent especially in narrow corridors or in anchoring areas, but it all seems to work out reasonably well with boaters accommodating each other. Have the reviewers and RVYC compared and contrasted traffic in both harbors?</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: False Creek is not under the port authority jurisdiction. That is the City of Vancouver with the assistance of Transport Canada.</p> |
| <p>Port Authority: please make a clear statement about the channel design, when will the channel design will be discussed and what is the potential of changing this design?</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: In November 2017, the port authority confirmed that the channel meets the 2014 PIANC Harbour Approach Channel Design Guidelines, as well as the 2010 International Federation of Rowing Associations (FISA) guidelines.</p> <p>As this channel is not used for commercial navigation, our assessment of it against these standards is an administrative exercise to access safety only.</p> <p>The Coal Harbour area is a multiuse waterway in which recreational powerboats, sailboats, charter vessels and recreational rowers co-exist. Under the Canada Marine Act, the port authority is responsible for maintaining safe and efficient movement of marine traffic within our jurisdiction for all port users. In order to review the proposed expansion and increase the water lot lease, a navigational channel was designed for two functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). Provide a visual representation of how all activities could safely take place in Coal Harbour 2). Help the port authority to determine areas for safe navigation and in considering proposed lease boundary amendments |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| Project and Environmental Review process | |
| <p>Will the Port Authority validate some of the arguments presented by RVYC and their interpretation which has been twisted to present their case in a better light?</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: The proposed project and all material provided in support of the application and used as part of the consultation process will be carefully reviewed through our Project and Environmental Review (PER) process. The PER process evaluates physical works and activities proposed to take place within our jurisdiction, to ensure works will not likely cause significant adverse environmental effects and takes into consideration the interests of local communities.</p> |
| <p>Does RVYC have a requirement to prove rowing is still safe? How are they supposed to do this? Maybe it's my engineering background, but when it comes to safety, detailed verification, analysis and testing is needed with clear pass/fail criteria. Please point us to the document with this verification.</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: The channel design was accepted by the port authority as it meets industry standards in the form of the 2014 PIANC "<i>Harbour Approach Channels Design Guidelines</i>" and the 2010 FISA "<i>Guidelines for Rowing</i>" having regard for the dimensions and maneuverability of vessels currently operated in this vicinity</p> <p>The strength of prevailing cross winds and tidal currents were also taken into account</p> <p>The port authority also conducted a waterside visual review of the channel which reinforced the perspective that the channel, as re-designed is both safe and suitable for the intended combination of use.</p> <p>Through the Project and Environmental Review process the port authority will review and consider potential impacts of the proposed project on stakeholders.</p> |
| <p>Limiting discourse in the public consultation to questions only effectively eliminates criticism of what we're hearing, which is dangerously uniformed about how this will impact safety in the harbor. The only voice we hear are [RVYC] voices.</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: The port authority is of the opinion that the applicant has followed the port authority's new public engagement requirements during COVID-19. They have provided a range of input opportunities, given the current requirements for social distancing, including two webinars, an online survey, and the option for people to request one-to-one phone or email response (604.224.4400 or CHExpansion@royalvan.com) directly with a representative from the project team.</p> <p>All input received from the public will be reviewed as part of the PER review process. This includes all</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| | <p>written responses (letters and emails), phone calls, questions raised in webinars and questionnaire responses.</p> <p>All feedback will form part of the engagement summary and consideration reports which again for reviewed as part of the PER review.</p> <p>The port authority would encourage all to provide their thoughts on the expansion project via the various avenues available.</p> |
| <p>Another question for the Port Authority: does this engagement satisfy your requirements for public consultation? We are not being permitted to speak, or to see one another's questions, we started half an hour late and are still watching a presentation rather than addressing questions/concerns from the community!?!? *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: We have been working with the applicant prior to COVID happening and we were all lined up to do this in person and then the world changed. At the port authority we've been busy developing public engagement requirements specific to dealing with COVID and everything has moved to being digital and online. We are working through the process and we have requirements for the applicant to increase their promotion and making sure that they are avenues for people to submit comments in a non-digital fashion so by email and by phone which the applicant have. We've ensured that the applicant has an online questionnaire. And yes it may be frustrating that you can only type your question but I am sure many of you in these past few months have been engaging in zoom and FaceTime conversations where there are multiple people online at once and it gets to the point where no one can hear and the sound doesn't work people are talking over each other so this is kind of the best way to deal with how we get your questions answered. So hopefully that answers that question. The team have committed to ensuring that all the questions and answers are entered along with the feedback forms which is part of the review process so all the questions will be answered at that time.</p> |
| <p>The only voice that are expressing a point of view ARE RVYC'S *</p> | <p>Moderator: Your comment is noted and will be recorded.</p> <p>RVYC: We acknowledge that our responses reflect our opinion, but these opinions are based on 10 years of study. Ultimately, the port authority will determine the appropriateness of our study conclusions.</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>Also wondering if RVYC has been asked by the Port Authority to consult or collaborate with the First Nations who might claim rights to the seabed of Coal Harbour? The Parks Board's Non-Motorized Recreation Strategy states that future decisions regarding use of public waterways must include consultation and collaboration with First Nations.</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: Port authority has several prongs for our engagement as Regan has noted we do stakeholder engagement, we do public engagement and we also do Indigenous engagement so that is a separate stream that is running concurrently with this one we have written to the various Indigenous groups and their feedback will be part of the review process moving forward.</p> |
| <p>It is very difficult for people to properly have their voice heard during the COVID pandemic, and frankly, it seems a little bit unfair. Further, this public info session started more than 30 minutes late. Given this, will you commit to hosting a third public consultation session? *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: The technical difficulties experienced by the applicant were unfortunate. A notice was posted during the delay, but due to the format of the platform, was small and therefore likely unnoticed by all attendees.</p> <p>The GoToWebinar platform used by the applicant captures data pertaining to participation. As such, the applicant has followed up with all attendees who left the webinar prior to the start to invite them to either join the June 24 webinar or to discuss the project on the telephone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 83 people registered for the webinar and 71 attended (86% of registrants). • 51 attendees stayed online for the full session – between 3:30 p.m. and 4:55 p.m. • 16 attendees participated intermittently (left and came back at least once or entered late/left early) but were in attendance for a majority of the session. • 3 attendees exited the session before it started at 3:30 p.m. and did not return. These attendees were contacted to invite them to the second webinar or to connect via email or phone. • One attendee exited after the session started at 3:30 p.m., with a note that that they were unable to attend for the duration, or Webinar #2. The applicant advised that they could follow up with the applicant by phone or email. |
| <p>This is EMPHATICALLY NOT a replacement for a public meeting, or even a Zoom call. Discourse is COMPLETELY controlled by the applicant. No comments are allowed. And questions are re-</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: Unlike an in-person meeting, all comments and questions are recorded verbatim and responded to (either during the meeting or online), as captured in this</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>interpreted, with key points dropped or soft-pedalled. *</p> | <p>document.</p> <p>In the interest of time, similar questions were grouped together by the moderator to maximize the range of questions that could be responded to.</p> <p>The moderator combined and paraphrased similar questions, a technique widely used in facilitation, to help with the fluidity of the event by ensuring non-repetition.</p> |
| <p>Will the Port Authority fully review concerns and requests being put forth to reconsider the expansion plans as is?</p> <p>Is this meeting today ‘smoke and mirrors’ and RVYC plan has been approved as is?</p> <p>During today’s discussion at no time has RVRC spoken to the needs of the VRC and general public. *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: The port authority will review all input received from the public as part of the PER review process. This includes all written responses (letters and emails), phone calls, questions raised in webinars and questionnaire responses.</p> <p>All feedback will form part of the engagement summary and consideration reports which again for reviewed as part of the PER review.</p> <p>The port authority would encourage all to provide their thoughts on the expansion project via the various avenues available.</p> <p>The port authority is of the opinion that the applicant has followed the port authority’s new public engagement requirements during COVID-19. They have provided a range of input opportunities, given the current requirements for social distancing, including two webinars, an online survey, and the option for people to request one-to-one phone or email response (604.224.4400 or CHExpansion@royalvan.com) directly with a representative from the project team.</p> |
| <p>On the call, one of the proponents said that it was not possible to allow people to ask questions verbally/visually because “everybody talks at once.” This is false - the moderator of a large call can allow only one person at a time to speak and be seen. Being limited to only type questions seems very unfair. Will you commit to hosting the next public consultation sessions via video chat? (many facilitators know how to do this, if yours doesn’t).</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: Currently at the moment we only have two webinars planned. Based on feedback we can certainly look into that obviously with social distancing it is not appropriate to have an in person event and that is why we have resorted to using technology such as this as I say this is new technology for the port and probably for the applicant and we can take it back and have some internal discussions.</p> |
| <p>The alternative plan was presented to RVYC, not the Port. This miscommunication by the facilitator going uncorrected is yet another example of how this forum is limited, inaccurate, and ultimately</p> | <p>RVYC: We have had several discussions with the Vancouver Rowing Club about (VRC) this project. In 2018 VRC proposed a channel width of 81.5 metres, which is the width of the existing</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>favors the applicant. *</p> | <p>channel from “J” float to the south side and would not allow for an expansion.</p> <p>The VRC then requested two outbound and two inbound rowing lanes with buffers between and on either side of them, and the port authority-designated channel of 63.4m (208.4 feet) supports this.</p> |
| <p>Next time, if you let everyone see each other's questions, you will avoid repeats. I don't think it [is] for you to decide whether or not our privacy is protected.</p> | <p>RVYC: As noted during the webinar, questions are not shown on this platform for privacy reasons. Similar questions were grouped during the session to maximize the range of topics that could be covered. Verbatim questions and comments are included in this document to be recorded as part of the public record.</p> |
| <p>Stakeholder Consultation - Project and Environmental Review process</p> | |
| <p>Has RVYC reached out to stakeholders like businesses operating large vessels through that administration channel? Do they have concerns about being able to safely navigate/turn in that narrow space?</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: The port authority has reached out to the following stakeholders through the stakeholder consultation process which is conducted concurrently to the public engagement process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Vancouver • Vancouver Parks Board • Transport Canada • Vancouver Rowing Club • Mainstream Properties • SWA Vancouver Hotel Nominee Inc. <p>The port authority will engage with interested stakeholders directly to ensure that their feedback on the proposed project is considered as part of the overall review.</p> |
| <p>As you may know, Rowing Canada and Rowing BC are the official rowing bodies that set and interpret local rowing safety standards here in Vancouver. Have you consulted with Rowing Canada and Rowing BC? And if not, will you commit to doing so? *</p> | <p>RVYC: Directly, we have not consulted Rowing Canada. We have referenced literature associated with operations and I just want to highlight one or two things for everyone’s edification. In terms of multi-use and safety in the waterway, there are a couple of documents that are very valuable in terms of defining how multiuse waterways can be supported. One is called a “<i>A Guide to Multiple Use of Waterway Management</i>” produced by the National Water Safety Congress and the National Transportation Safety Board. The other is a study</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| | <p>that was done on waterway safety (<i>“National Transportation Safety Board Safety Recommendation Report Shared Waterways: Safety of Recreational and Commercial Vessels in Marine Transportation System”</i>) and we can easily provide those documents. In regard to rowing in Canada, we have referenced certain specifics that are found in the Canada amateur rules of racing that were approved on the 28 January 2018 that states the width of rowing lanes. Similar mandates are found in South Africa, New Zealand and Australia. That all guided us towards addressing things from a rowing perspective.</p> <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: While Rowing Canada and Rowing BC have not been formally consulted through the port authority’s Project and Environmental Review process the port authority encourage the Vancouver Rowing Club to incorporate comments received from their governing bodies.</p> |
| <p>Are you aware that the City of Vancouver has passed a unanimous motion supporting the Vancouver Rowing Club is this matter, which was followed by a letter from the Mayor of Vancouver to the Port of Vancouver? And that the local MLA (Spencer Chandra Herbert) has also written a letter of support for the Vancouver Rowing Club? Does this make you think you should take the Rowing Club’s concerns more seriously?</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: We are aware of those letters. It is a joint thing between the planning department and public consultation. But the feedback we get will form part of the review process and they will be considered.</p> |
| <p>Question regarding the ability for the rowers to continue rowing/training safely with the new channel design: I see that the UBC rowing club was consulted for confirmation of international racing rowing standards for rowing lane widths. Why were the Canadian/BC governing bodies of rowing (RCA and Rowing BC) not consulted regarding safety width and channels needed for rowing/training in Coal Harbour? *</p> | <p>RYVC: We have met with VRC representatives and we have looked at the literature about safety, protocols and how to manage multiuse waterways. We consulted two multi-use guidelines reference points, and adopted two key recommendations from those studies as part of our mitigation plan: (1) establish an Education and Awareness plan for all users of the waterway as the best means to address safety issues, and (2) establish rowing traffic schemes that illustrate the general locations of where rowers go when they do it and the training programs available. We endorse these and will incorporate them to the best of our ability, but from a legislative and regulatory point of view, we also have to coordinate with regulators.</p> <p>We have had at least three meetings with VRC</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| | <p>representatives; we have had joint meetings with VRC and the port authority; and we understand that the port authority has met directly with VRC representatives. Extensive documents were exchanged between ourselves and the rowers and the port authority, and VRC has received virtually all of our internal communications because we have joint members so there has been a lot of discussion and input between the parties.</p> |
| <p>This project encroaches on water space that has been traditionally used for recreational rowing for more than 100 years. How was the Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation consulted by the project proponent and by the Port Authority? *</p> | <p>RVYC: We haven't met directly with the Parks Board; it is under the port authority jurisdiction so that was [not] our focus.</p> <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: We are running our stakeholder consultation process in parallel with the public consultation process and we have reached out to the Parks Board to get their input on the proposal and will consider that as we review the project.</p> |
| <p>Regarding Rowing Canada and Rowing BC, the second half of the question was not answered. Will you commit to consulting with them? *</p> | <p>RVYC: Directly, we have not consulted Rowing Canada. We have referenced literature associated with operations and I just want to highlight one or two things for everyone's edification. In terms of multi-use and safety in the waterway, there are a couple of documents that are very valuable in terms of defining how multiuse waterways can be supported. One is called a "<i>A Guide to Multiple Use of Waterway Management</i>" produced by the National Water Safety Congress and the National Transportation Safety Board. The other is a study that was done on waterway safety for shared waterways, safety for commercial and recreational vessels in a marine transportation system ("<i>National Transportation Safety Board Safety Recommendation Report Shared Waterways: Safety of Recreational and Commercial Vessels in Marine Transportation System</i>") and we can easily provide those documents. In regard to rowing in Canada, we have referenced certain specifics that are found in the Canada amateur rules of racing that were approved on the 28 January 2018 that states the width of rowing lanes. Similar mandates are found in South Africa, New Zealand and Australia. That all guided us towards addressing things from a rowing perspective.</p> |
| <p>Why were Vancouver Harbour Flight Centre, Coal</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: All Vancouver</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>Harbour Marina, and Harbour Cruises not included in the stakeholder consultation in the latest document?</p> | <p>Fraser Port Authority tenants in the Coal Harbour area are being consulted through the Project and Environmental Review of the proposed project.</p> <p>The port authority would encourage all other businesses and members of the public to provide their thoughts on the expansion project via the various public engagement avenues available.</p> |
| <p>Rowing lanes as described in the project are not designed for this purpose. The multiuse answer was cut-off and I was not able to hear who was consulted. To be clear, Rowing BC was not consulted. This format of consultation is challenging. I do not feel that this format is allowing open two-way consultation. I would encourage the RVYC to extend the consultation period to allow for proper consultation. *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: While Rowing Canada and Rowing BC have not been formally consulted through the port authority's Project and Environmental Review process the port authority encourage the Vancouver Rowing Club to incorporate comments received from their governing bodies.</p> <p>The port authority is of the opinion that the applicant has followed the port authority's new public engagement requirements during COVID-19. They have provided a range of input opportunities, given the current requirements for social distancing, including two webinars, an online survey, and the option for people to request one-to-one phone or email response (604.224.4400 or CHExpansion@royalvan.com) directly with a representative from the project team.</p> |
| <p>When will the stakeholder engagement process with the Vancouver Rowing Club and other groups commence? *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: We are running our stakeholder consultation process in parallel with the public consultation process.</p> |
| <p>Will VRC be included in the stakeholder process run by the Port Authority? *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: We take into account feedback received from different stakeholders in the area including port tenants like the Vancouver Rowing Club.</p> |
| <p>They still did not answer the question as to whether or not they will consult with Rowing Canada and Rowing BC. Will you do so? *</p> | <p>RVYC: Directly, we have not consulted Rowing Canada. We have referenced literature associated with operations and I just want to highlight one or two things for everyone's edification. In terms of multi-use and safety in the waterway, there are a couple of documents that are very valuable in terms of defining how multiuse waterways can be supported. One is called a "<i>A Guide to Multiple Use of Waterway Management</i>" produced by the National Water Safety Congress and the National Transportation Safety Board. The other is a study that was done on waterway safety for shared waterways, safety for commercial and recreational</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| | <p>vessels in a marine transportation system (<i>“National Transportation Safety Board Safety Recommendation Report Shared Waterways: Safety of Recreational and Commercial Vessels in Marine Transportation System”</i>) and we can easily provide those documents. In regard to rowing in Canada, we have referenced certain specifics that are found in the Canada amateur rules of racing that were approved on the 28 January 2018 that states the width of rowing lanes. Similar mandates are found in South Africa, New Zealand and Australia. That all guided us towards addressing things from a rowing perspective.</p> <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: While Rowing Canada and Rowing BC have not been formally consulted through the port authority’s Project and Environmental Review process the port authority encourage the Vancouver Rowing Club to incorporate comments received from their governing bodies.</p> |
| <p>Was the stakeholder engagement invitation sent to Rowing BC and Rowing Canada? Both organisations have written to the Port Authority and expressed their desire to provide input in this process. *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: While Rowing Canada and Rowing BC have not been formally consulted through the port authority’s Project and Environmental Review process the port authority encourage the Vancouver Rowing Club to incorporate comments received from their governing bodies.</p> |
| <p>To both sides’ satisfaction?</p> | <p>Question posted without additional context; assumed to be addressed above.</p> |
| <p>I fail to understand how the proposed expansion is beneficial to the General Public. The cost to purchase a slip is \$115,000 for existing members and \$150,000 for non-members. For a ‘Public Waterway’, how is this deemed inclusive to the Public at large and to benefit the wellbeing of the General Public.</p> <p>Narrowing the channel will result in the collapse of a Public Amateur sport facility. What consideration has been given to the Amateur Sporting community? *</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: As mentioned, we run a few different processes as part of the PER process. This being part of the as the public engagement aspect of that. We take into account comments from the general public from these events as well as comments submitted as part of the public comment period and also the other process is our stakeholder consultation process which takes into consideration feedback received from different stakeholders in the area, so port tenants, municipalities, in this case we have reached out specifically to the Parks Board as well and other users of the area. We do have different aspects for our review, and we try to seek feedback from a broad range of stakeholders and consider their feedback as part of the PER process review.</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| Project Benefits | |
| <p>The benefits that you list are red herrings. #1 The pilings being replaced would be part of regular maintenance, also, pulling pilings and replacement in a new area is a concern for the environment.</p> | <p>RVYC: Removing creosote piles is part of the program that we have ongoing throughout all of our marinas when we have the opportunity to upgrade to steel. The creosote pilings are not an environmentally conscious thing to do these days and steel is a much more advantageous thing to put into the water. We are also going to be sleeving the piles with high density polyethylene plastic which will allow any creatures to grow on them without any issues. Also sleeving the piles will allow us to not have anodes on the piles for cathodic protection which also eliminates the need for additional wastage. The piles will be driven and then they the sleeves will be put on top and then they will be sealed, and they will last for a very long time, eliminating the need for pile drivers to come back in and out do maintenance. Anything we can upgrade to steel we have taken the opportunity as part of this program.</p> <p>It is noted that the project will advance the timing of the replacements within our Coal Harbour marina.</p> |
| <p>Do you believe this project is in the public interest?</p> | <p>RVYC: This project addresses the growing demand for moorage at Coal Harbour and opportunities to enhance environmental protection by replacing aging infrastructure including removing creosote coated wood piles and installing replacement boat sheds with the latest environmental features and fire protection systems. RVYC members and visitors contribute to the local economy.</p> <p>Boater safety is improved for all Coal Harbour users by reconfiguring the marina to provide safer entry and exits points from RVYC by eliminating any need for boats to reverse out of the marina.</p> <p>RVYC has a ranking of 4 out of 5 anchors from the Clean Marine BC program, the only marina with this ranking in the Coal Harbour Basin, and this project will help meet the commitment to obtain a 5 out of 5 anchors ranking.</p> |
| Recreational Boating | |
| <p>I am an amateur rower and have rowed in Coal Harbor. I see on the rowing club website that there are about 200 rowing members listed. It appears the rowing club is advocating actively on behalf of</p> | <p>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: We have a number of specialists on our team to review the project and the impacts of the project include environmental specialists, engineers and with those</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>its rowing members probably against the RVYC proposal. Has the Port Authority assessed the actual number of active rowers using Coal Harbor in comparison to power boats?</p> | <p>marine operations division as well and so we will rely on their technical review through the process and they will be looking at specifics as to the implications of the project on other marine users and their impacts to navigation.</p> |
| <p>Regulatory Process (Transport Canada)</p> | |
| <p>Comment, Transport Canada has mandate in ensuring the public right to navigate is maintained. TC will be reviewing the application under the Canadian Navigable Waters Act and will also be open to comments on the Common Project Search 30 days starting the second webinar.</p> | <p>Moderator: Acknowledged the comment and noted that information is also available on the RVYC website.</p> |
| <p>RVYC Operations and Financial information</p> | |
| <p>Last year, the RVYC sent an email to members indicating that if this project proceeded without expansion, fees would go up dramatically. Based on this letter, isn't it true that your own financial considerations are driving this expansion? And how is that fair to neighbouring clubs which have managed their finances WITHOUT having to expand? *</p> | <p>RVYC: The yacht club is a non-profit organization, so basically all we would really be doing is recovering our costs. It is a \$12 million project. So, members would have to pay for that, collected through a moorage increase or an assessment – and in our case it would be both; so there is no economic benefit that you would see like in a traditional marina that is a for profit organization. It is not the way we work. I guess the other economic benefit is that by doing this all at once, we are funding the whole thing upfront, but on the basis that we know that this is the long-term (probably more economical) solution, rather than going in and trying to replace a boat shed one at a time or trying to pull pilings one at a time and fit a pile driver in and out and disrupt everybody over a 20+ year period. We think this is a more economic approach, so that is why we decided to go this way. But it [is] definitely not an economic benefit as you would see in a private organization.</p> <p>The choice faced by the club, and referenced in this question, was whether to proceed with the project or not. 81% of our membership voted in favour to proceed with the project even though it is a significant cost now, because it gets all the work done quickly and will likely be cheaper and less disruptive in the long run.</p> |
| <p>Question: How much does a new moorage slip bring RVYC? *</p> | <p>RVYC: RVYC does not sell berths or any of its other assets. Berths are leased monthly to members, similar to other marinas in the area. Monthly moorage fees are adjusted annually to</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>Question: How much is RVYC expecting to profit financially by appropriating parts of a public waterway? *</p> | <p>reflect operating costs.</p> <p>RVYC: The yacht club is a non-profit organization, so basically all we would really be doing is recovering our costs. It is a \$12 million project, so the members would have to pay for that, collected through a moorage increase or an assessment – and in our case it would be both; so there is no economic benefit that you would see like in a traditional marina that is a for profit organization .It is not the way we work. I guess the other economic benefit is that by doing this all at once we are funding the whole thing upfront but on the basis that we know that this is the long-term (probably more economical) solution rather than going in and trying to replace a boat shed one at a time or trying to pull pilings one at a time and fit a pile driver in and out and disrupt everybody over a 20+ year period. We think this is a more economic approach so that is why we decided to go this way. But it [is] definitely not an economic benefit as you would see in a private organization.</p> <p>RVYC is not appropriating any part of the public waterway. We have applied to the port authority for permission to increase our leased water lot.</p> |
| <p>Question: I understand that the money raised by RVYC's expansion is motivated by the need to fund the renovations, as described today. Why should we, the public, have to suffer loss of this public waterway just to help RVYC foot the bill for their renovation project? *</p> | <p>RVYC: When we looked at the cost of repairing and replacing infrastructure compared with the cost of doing one larger project, it makes more economic sense to undertake the larger short-term expense to offset the longer-term cost, which is bound to grow over time. That was the driving factor in making this decision. No one knows what the future holds, but by doing this project all at one time, we solve a lot of longer-term challenges we would otherwise have to address. We think it's the most economic choice.</p> <p>RVYC is a non-profit organization and our revenue source is members fees in the form of monthly dues and monthly moorage from those who have boats in our marinas. The monthly charges that our members pay are set annually on a cost-recovery basis. Our costs include all operating expenses, repair and replacement costs, as well as other things of value to our members such as our sailing programs.</p> <p>Our members voted by a margin of 81% to approve</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| | <p>this project. Monthly member costs will increase to pay for the project.</p> |
| <p>Following up on my last question: I am assuming the expansion helps RVYC to save about \$5M from the estimated \$12M project. Where does the other \$7M come from? If RVYC has that much in hand already, have they considered scaling back their plans? \$7M will still get plenty of “rebuild and renewal” without adding any expansion. *</p> | <p>RVYC: When we looked at the cost of repairing and replacing infrastructure compared with the cost of doing one larger project, it makes more economic sense to undertake the larger short-term expense to offset the longer-term cost, which is bound to grow over time. That was the driving factor in making this decision. No one knows what the future holds, but by doing this project all at one time, we solve a lot of longer-term challenges we would otherwise have to address. We think it's the most economic choice.</p> |
| <p>It is an economic benefit in the sense that less of the cost of the renovation will be passed on to current members. *</p> | <p>RVYC: When we looked at the cost of repairing and replacing infrastructure compared with the cost of doing one larger project, it makes more economic sense to undertake the larger short-term expense to offset the longer-term cost, which is bound to grow over time. That was the driving factor in making this decision. No one knows what the future holds, but by doing this project all at one time, we solve a lot of longer-term challenges we would otherwise have to address. We think it's the most economic choice.</p> <p>RVYC is a non-profit organization and our revenue source is members fees in the form of monthly dues and monthly moorage from those who have boats in our marinas.</p> <p>The monthly charges that our members pay are set annually on a cost-recovery basis. Our costs include all operating expenses, repair and replacement costs, as well as other things of value to our members such as our sailing programs.</p> |
| <p>Mr. Jupp did not answer the economic benefit question fairly, because you did not ask the question as written, which is not fair.</p> | <p>Moderator: Similar questions were grouped during the webinar to maximize the range of questions that could be responded to in the time allotted.</p> |
| <p>On June 7, 2019, the Commodore of the Yacht Club wrote to members, stating: “Remember, replacement of existing infrastructure without expansion will cost \$8 million over the next 10 years.” This seemingly confirms that internal financial concerns of the Yacht Club are what is driving this process. Please address this. *</p> | <p>RVYC: I am not aware of specifically the comment that they are referring to. When we looked at the cost of repairing and replacing infrastructure compared with the cost of doing one larger project, it makes more economic sense to undertake the larger short term expense to offset the longer term cost which is bound to grow over time so that was really the driving factors that got us to making this</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| | <p>decision. I mean no one knows what the future holds but by doing this project all at one time we solve a lot of longer term challenges that we are going to have, and we think it's the most economic choice to make and so that's why we are doing it. It is going to cost us a fair bit of money up front and it is the members who pay for that. No magic bullet here. And expanding the water lot lease is costing us as well so all of that has to be taken into account but we think it is the best overall long-term solution for us.</p> |
| <p>IS it true that RVYC intends to sell moorage at somewhere around \$150K per berth? *</p> | <p>RVYC: RVYC does not sell berths or any of its other assets. Berths are leased to members in the same way as other marinas in the area do.</p> <p>Members were asked to prepay their monthly rent to reduce the amount of borrowing for this project. Ownership of the slips will always remain with the club.</p> |
| <p>Ron: On June 7, 2019, the Commodore of the Yacht Club wrote to members, stating:</p> <p>“New slips are to be offered in order of seniority to members at an average prepayment cost of \$115,000 each and, if not fully subscribed, then to vetted new members at an average moorage prepayment cost of \$150,000 each.” This seems to confirm that this project is being used to raise much-needed funds for the RVYC. Why don't you just raise your members fees, instead of profiting off of an expansion into public waters? *</p> | <p>RVYC: When we looked at the cost of repairing and replacing infrastructure compared with the cost of doing one larger project, it makes more economic sense to undertake the larger short-term expense to offset the longer-term cost, which is bound to grow over time. That was the driving factor in making this decision. No one knows what the future holds, but by doing this project all at one time, we solve a lot of longer-term challenges we would otherwise have to address. We think it's the most economic choice.</p> <p>Members were asked to prepay their monthly rent to reduce the amount of borrowing for this project. Ownership of the slips will always remain with the club.</p> |
| <p>In my letter to the Port I noted that RVYC on their website is 'proud to be recognized as an elite Club and is touted as being a 'premier' yacht club in the world with 7 outposts.' The website also promotes their focus is on having a good time, dock parties where the intent is to sink the dock. Additionally, you must be a minimum of 25 years of age.</p> <p>If a dock expansion is required why this could not be undertaken at their Jericho outpost where there is less traffic?</p> <p>How will the proposed expansion be inclusive and</p> | <p>RVYC: We have members of all age ranges including junior memberships. Sailing lessons are offered to all ages with no membership requirements.</p> <p>RVYC members and their vessels participate in several community events that raise funds for local charities, including the Boat for Hope and Special Children's Cruise. Visitors, club members and their vessels also significantly contribute to the local economy.</p> <p>We considered our Jericho facility as an alternate</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| support all Members of the 'public community' when there are age and financial constrictions? | location, but it has deeper water, which makes construction more difficult, and is closer to deep sea anchorages that limit expansion possibilities. Our members voted by a margin of 81% to approve this project. |
| #3. What tourist would be permitted to "Visit the marina? * | RVYC: We have reciprocal moorage agreements with dozens of yacht clubs around the world. Vancouver is a popular destination. |
| How much does each new moorage slip cost? * | RVYC: RVYC does not sell berths or any of its other assets. Berths are leased to members on a monthly basis. Rates are set annually to recover costs. |
| Can you advise how many tourists per annum berth at RVYC and how many days they stay? | RVYC: In a 5-year period there have been 213 guest moorages. Guests can stay for two weeks at Coal Harbour Marina. |
| Specifically, which other clubs have reciprocal privileges at RVYC Coal Harbour? * | RVYC: We have documented reciprocal agreements with 50+ clubs, however we will accept visitors from any recognized yacht club in the world. We also work in cooperation with yachtdestinations.org . |
| Technical Studies | |
| The western water lease line looks different from other documents I have seen. Is this drawing correctly portrayed because there is no channel between VRC and RVYC - the existing use of the "channel" is actually on the VRC water lease. Does this drawing truly represent the surveyed water lease line on the west? | Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: So the lease areas are what the port authority uses when working with the tenants and the lease holders throughout the port authority not just in Coal Harbour and they are surveyed in much the same way you would on land, albeit in a little different fashion but that allows the port authority to know where neighbours rub up against each other where those common lot lines are where things can be built and where things can't be built based on those lease areas - it is a survey process. RVYC: In 2019, under a separate permit, we removed six slips from the area of "I" Float, adjacent to the west lease line boundary. This created a wider channel and people using the entrance and for people in the channel. |
| The drawing that appeared define the new look has been removed from the webinar. How much narrower is the [channel], from wharf to wharf | Vancouver Fraser Port Authority: There have been a number of required revisions to application material, accepted application material can be found on the applicant's project webpage as well as the port authority's PER application webpage. The design of the proposed project that is currently |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| | <p>under review does not encroach into the channel that was accepted by the port authority in 2017.</p> <p>While the channel is not a part of the application under review, there has been some discrepancies between the applicant's understanding of the channel and the port authority. The port authority deems the channel to be 63.4 m.</p> |
| <p>Request: Please provide us with all your references for multi-use waterways and rowing associations with which you have consulted. I just heard references to rowing guidelines from multiple countries, but I don't see how that justifies the limited space left for all users of Coal Harbour. *</p> | <p>RYVC: Reference material consulted as part of this project include "<i>A Guide to Multiple Use of Waterway Management</i>" produced by the National Water Safety Congress and the National Transportation Safety Board and ("<i>National Transportation Safety Board Safety Recommendation Report Shared Waterways: Safety of Recreational and Commercial Vessels in Marine Transportation System</i>").</p> |
| <p>What process did you use the understand the unique safety needs of the rowers from the VRC? This is not a racing club, it is a club that service all users of all ages and all abilities - from recreation, novice, junior kids, etc. Consulting rowing organizations or literature for racing in rowing does not appear to respect the needs of this community neighbour, to ensure its safety to continue in this 'administrative' waterway. *</p> | <p>RYVC: When we look at the project from a rowing point of view, we have met with the rowing club and we have looked at the literature about safety, protocols and how to manage multiuse waterways. Indirectly, that responds to some of the safety concerns that the rowing community may have. I have referenced two multi use guidelines in a previous answer. They are the bibles upon which multi-use corridors can be established, and we have used that as a reference point. Two recommendations came that out of those studies are things that the club supports fully and endorses as part of our mitigation plan. Any multi-use corridor that includes rowing should establish an Education and Awareness plan not only for VRC but for all users of the waterway and is one of the best means to address safety issues and it is our objective going forward that we support that initiative not only within ourselves and our own club but with the broader basin users all together so everyone is aware of the issues and safety concerns rowers have within Coal Harbour. The second mitigation strategy comes from Victoria – in Canada there have been on occasion the establishment of rowing traffic schemes that illustrate the general locations of where rowers go when they do it and the training programs that are available to them. That was another recommendation that we provided as part of our review and we fully endorse that as well. Obviously,</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| | <p>we endorse them but from a legislative and regulatory point of view we have to coordinate that with other regulators that are involved with the management of the waterway. They were two mitigative strategies that we identified and supported in our literature to support safety issues in the multiuse waterway inclusive of the rowing club.</p> <p>We have had at least three meetings with VRC representatives and we have had joint meetings with VRC and the port authority and I believe that the port authority has met directly with VRC and there was several extensive documents exchanged between ourselves and VRC and the port authority with their concerns and VRC have received virtually all of our internal communications because we have joint members so there has been a lot of discussion and input between the parties.</p> |
| <p>How does the reduced safety of the decreased fairway get accounted for?</p> | <p>RVYC: We don't believe that safety is reduced. The proposed marina layout eliminates backing out into the channel which uses channel space and can be a challenging manoeuvre. The proposed design includes two entrances from the marina into the channel, and activity at those two entrances will be easier to control.</p> |
| <p>Where was the Victoria flow pattern from that Russ referenced?</p> | <p>RVYC: Victoria rowing traffic scheme that we referenced and there was also a rowing traffic scheme that was in Lake Washington that we referenced as part of the review.</p> |
| <p>In a video that the Vancouver Rowing Club released last year, two Olympic gold medal-winning rowers stated that they believe this expansion will mean the end of rowing in Vancouver. Are you aware of this? And if so, why do you think that you know better than they do? For reference, the rowers were Don Arnold and Derek Porter.</p> | <p>RVYC: The Coal Harbour channel width, accepted by the port, meets international standards for rowing. It is approximately 210 (208.3) feet wide and provides adequate room for all users while accommodating the proposed project.</p> |
| <p>Comments and questions to facilitator/ organizer</p> | |
| <p>Please note that I will need to disengage. My time to attend this session is limited, it being business hours. Moreover, this session was scheduled during Dr. Henry's 3:00pm daily update. I am uncertain whether I (or others) can attend your second session on Wednesday, June 24, at 6:00pm. I would encourage you to ensure you</p> | <p>Moderator: We appreciate you letting us know. We will follow up with the port authority regarding your suggestion. We can also arrange for a phone call with you. I've made a note that you may have to leave. If you are still on, please confirm.</p> |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| introduce a third date for public consultation in order to accommodate fair access and transparency in these proceedings. | |
| Can you please publish all questions asked (after the meeting is ok) since participants cannot see them in this webinar format? The public should also see written responses to every question. * | Moderator: The reason that we used this approach is to make sure that we address as many questions as possible and there are quite a few. This is not the only opportunity for you to provide your input. If you have additional feedback that maybe isn't in the form of a question certainly feel free to complete the feedback from that is available online and you can send in specific comments online either to the project or even emailing the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority directly. Someone else had a question about whether questions and answers are going to be shared and they are. The reason you can't see them is because it is a matter of privacy. And all the questions and comments will be complied with the answers and those will be shared together. |
| This format is very limited without the ability for participants from the public to converse with your presenters. Can we speak openly instead of only using the chat box? * | RVYC: The reason for this approach is to make sure that we address as many questions as possible and there are quite a few. This is not the only opportunity for you to provide your input. If you have additional feedback that maybe isn't in the form of a question certainly feel free to complete the feedback from that is available online and you can send in specific comments online either to the project or even emailing the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority directly. |
| Great job in spite of learning challenges from new technology. | Moderator: Thank you. And thanks to all participants for the comments and questions. |
| Why do you allow the facilitator to paraphrase the question instead of reading as stated and provide an answer to the actual question? * | Moderator: We have a couple of comments from folks who are not happy with my combining questions and are asking that I read them specifically so I will do that but I want to let folks know that there are a lot of question and we are trying to make sure that we are addressing a range of questions today so that everyone can be heard. Just a reminder that all of the questions as written and all of the response will be published in the coming days after this session. So, I will endeavour to do a better job of posing the questions as written and not summarizing quite as much because I am trying to accommodate more than one question. |
| Please read the questions as they are written. Do | RVYC: The reason for this approach is to make |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| not "interpret" them. * | sure that we address as many questions as possible and there are quite a few. This is not the only opportunity for you to provide your input. If you have additional feedback that maybe isn't in the form of a question certainly feel free to complete the feedback from that is available online and you can send in specific comments online either to the project or even emailing the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority directly. |
| This is ridiculous. | Frustrations of certain participants are noted; however, as noted at the outset, similar questions were combined to allow for a greater variety of topics. Lengthy questions were abbreviated for timeliness while noting that all questions and comments would be posted verbatim. |
| Facilitator: you committed to reading the questions verbatim, but that is not happening.... * | As noted during the session, similar questions were combined to allow for a greater variety of topics. Lengthy questions were abbreviated for timeliness while noting that all questions and comments would be posted verbatim. |
| Could you please post the speakers list for this webinar again? This was one of the first slides of who the webinar participants are. | The speakers list was re-posted during the session in response to the question. |
| Facilitator: are there questions that were unanswered? * | Questions that were not addressed due to time constraints have been captured and addressed in this document. These questions and comments will be recorded as part of the public comment period. |
| Facilitator: were there questions asked that did not get answered? * | Questions that were not addressed due to time constraints have been captured and addressed in this document. These questions and comments will be recorded as part of the public comment period. |
| Why are you not reading the questions as written? Why are you re-phrasing everything? * | Moderator: The reason for this approach is to make sure that we address as many questions as possible and there are quite a few. This is not the only opportunity for you to provide your input. If you have additional feedback that maybe isn't in the form of a question certainly feel free to complete the feedback from that is available online and you can send in specific comments online either to the project or even emailing the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority directly. |
| Please read the questions as written* | Moderator: The reason for this approach is to make sure that we address as many questions as possible and there are quite a few. This is not the |

| Question/ Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| | <p>only opportunity for you to provide your input. If you have additional feedback that maybe isn't in the form of a question certainly feel free to complete the feedback from that is available online and you can send in specific comments online either to the project or even emailing the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority directly.</p> |
| <p>Please read the questions as written*</p> | <p>Moderator: The reason for this approach is to make sure that we address as many questions as possible and there are quite a few. This is not the only opportunity for you to provide your input. If you have additional feedback that maybe isn't in the form of a question certainly feel free to complete the feedback from that is available online and you can send in specific comments online either to the project or even emailing the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority directly.</p> |
| <p>The facilitator is re-stating questions in a manner that's most palatable to the applicant. *</p> | <p>As noted during the session, similar questions were combined to allow for a greater variety of topics. Lengthy questions were abbreviated for timeliness while noting that all questions and comments would be posted verbatim.</p> |
| <p>If you don't read comments, it's not a public consultation. *</p> | <p>As noted during the session, similar questions were combined to allow for a greater variety of topics. Lengthy questions were abbreviated for timeliness while noting that all questions and comments would be posted verbatim.</p> |