



## Royal Vancouver Yacht Club Coal Harbour Marina Expansion Project

Webinar Questions, Comments and Responses  
Session date: Wednesday 24 June 2020, 6:30 to 8:00 p.m.

Following is a record of verbatim questions and comments received during the 24 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
<b><i>Application Process</i></b>	
<a href="#">If this project does not get the go ahead. Does the club have an alternative?</a>	<b>RVYC:</b> We certainly hope we will receive a positive result but the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority have jurisdiction over this waterway and they will review our application and determine if there are any significant effects to the environment or the local community that can prevent it from proceeding.
<a href="#">You characterize the HMCS letter as a letter of support. Isn't this more properly characterized as a letter of non-objection?</a>	<b>RVYC:</b> The purpose of the Project and Environmental Review process is to determine if there are any significant effects to the environment or the local community that can prevent it from proceeding. The letter from the HMCS Discovery confirms that the project will not have any effects of DND operations at their site.

Question/ Comment	Response
<b>Community Concerns (public waterway, access for Vancouver Rowing Club)</b>	
<p>For Mr. Jupp. Given that rowers have been rowing here for 100 years, it seems unfair that we now have to justify our existence to you. Do you understand this?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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 to safely use the channel. RVYC supports the continuation of rowing in Coal Harbour.</p>
<p>I just read the rowers page about this and they say you want to end rowing. But it doesn't sound like that. But they are still the only ones allowed to use paddles. Why are they upset about being the only ones able to have that right?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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 to safely use the channel. It is correct that the rowers are the only non-motorized crafts who are operating in Coal Harbour. The recent public campaign by the VRC appears to be promoting open use of the harbour which would increase the traffic in the Coal Harbour basin and make it very difficult for the rowers to continue to use the channel. It should be noted that for safety reasons vessels without mechanical power are not usually permitted in Vancouver Harbour, as per the port authority information guide.</p>
<p>It frustrates me that the number of yachts in Coal Harbour is plentiful. The number of recreational rowers is a fraction. To increase the number of yachts and remove the rowers. How is that fair?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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 to safely use the channel. RVYC supports the continuation of rowing in Coal Harbour.</p> <p>It is not widely understood but the VRC also has slips for sail and motorboats and recently expanded in 2017.</p>
<p>Why is the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club unwilling to come to a compromise with the Vancouver Rowing Club on a channel design that is less disruptive and dangerous to neighbouring aquatic users? *</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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 to safely use the channel.</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</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<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>We understand that the channel width in front of the VRC marina is currently 65m wide, after a recent expansion into the channel in 2017.</p>
<p>Question: Re: rowing safety - Please list the specific concerns received from the rowing committee consulted (presumably VRC), and how strategies proposed EFFECTIVELY addresses their concerns (i.e., with what evidence)?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The VRC concerns centre on the width of the administrative channel. They state that the channel will be too dangerous to operate in and that national and international standards should not apply to them. The VRC has not provided supporting data and has based their requests on anecdotal evidence.</p> <p>The RVYC technical review is thorough and references several national and international technical guidelines and references examples of jurisdictions similar to Coal Harbour, with heavier marine traffic, where a multi-use scheme has been in operation for many years. Our application and supporting documentation are available on the project webpage.</p> <p>The administrative navigational channel is 63.4 m wide accommodating 36.4 m (representing 57% of the available administrative channel) for recreational and commercial vessels and 27 m for rowing (representing 43% of the available administrative channel).</p> <p>Under common law rowers have the right to row throughout the entire 63.4 m (208.4 Ft) width provided they do so in a safe manner considering other users.</p> <p>From a safety concern perspective an awareness and education plan and the creation of a rowing traffic scheme have been identified as best practises to promote safety.</p> <p>RVYC has offered to work with the rowers and other channel users to develop these mitigative measures. VRC agreed on the benefits of these</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>mitigative measures however RVYC awaits a response from VRC on these matters.</p> <p>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 have had several discussions with VRC about this project. We believe that there is space for everyone to safely use the channel. RVYC supports the continuation of rowing in Coal Harbour.</p> <p>It should be noted that for safety reasons vessels without mechanical power are not usually permitted in Vancouver Harbour, as per the port authority information guide.</p>
<p>RVYC has built out dock space to the water lease line closest to VRC. RVYC currently uses VRC water lease to access and leave RVYC docks. Will RVYC correct this so VRC can better use slips such as having cats on hammerhead of dock A and B of VRC?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The answer to that is yes and in fact it was done I think in December last year, so that has been corrected. There is a bit of history there it goes back who knows how long, nobody can remember. Does anybody remember when the Burrard Yacht Club was there? That's about the timeline. The channel has been widened and the rowing club have more access to their space.</p>
<p>Your response is incorrect. Perhaps we will put cats on the hammerheads to facilitate a deeper understanding with respectful communication.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> RVYC designed the proposed marina to establish a self-contained navigational passage to ensure VRC water lot would not be utilized by RVYC members. VRC can assign vessel moorage as they see fit in their marina.</p>
<p>Please confirm how far from your water lease your boats are from VRC</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> RVYC vessels are moored inside the RVYC water lot and enter and exit the channel from the RVYC water lot.</p>
<p>The Vancouver Rowing Club suggested a compromise that it could be comfortable with from a safety perspective. Did the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club explore or even consider that modification? If so, can they please communicate those efforts and results. If not, why not? *</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> Yes, we did consider them. There were a number of meetings throughout this whole process and it has been going on for several years. We had at least three planning meetings with the rowing club. And they were actually by and large fairly positive meetings, and we were looking at all various ways in which we could make the channel effective and safer.</p> <p>There was a letter sent to us by the rowing Club if memory serves me correctly in November 2018. And they proposed a marina expansion, with 81.5-meter channel, and they also noted that some of our imagery was out of date, which is, frankly, not surprising, we were in the development stages.</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>And some of the imagery was taken early 2012, and so, updating it was an issue and there were changes to this process. The compromise was discussed at a joint meeting that was called by the port authority. And we met there and went over all the issues and concerns that the rowers had. And what they told us was that they needed two inbound lanes and two outbound lanes with buffering on either side and in between them. And they felt that that should be 81.5 metres. And, in fact, the port authority asked for some details, specifications on how they came up with that number, they were, there weren't really able to provide that.</p> <p>They gave us dimensions, but they didn't give us any reference to any specific guidelines, or whatever that would generate those numbers. This was just their experience in the channel. So, we noted that the 81.5 meter was the existing channel width from our J float all the way to the south side of the channel, and I guess, we really didn't consider that to be a material compromise. The one thing we did notice in the updated material that they were kind enough to provide us, was that the rowing club themselves had expanded their Marina into the channel in 2017. And the distance across from there, to the opposite side, was about 65 meters, and we thought, well, that's sort of a little more in line with what we think, and what all our analysis tells us should work.</p> <p>And so, we thought, well, if it's 81 meters, if you protect that back into the harbor, then that would mean they would be removing some of their own slips. Which didn't make sense. And obviously, they weren't going to do that. So we scratched our heads about that a little bit and didn't, and certainly, the full channel width wasn't going to be terribly helpful to us. There was a subsequent letter than that came through from the rowing Club about a month later and in that letter, they revised their channel suggestion to 80m metres, and again that didn't really help us a lot. We did notice that on that second letter that they used an outdated orthophoto, which shows the old Marina. So I guess that was just an administrative</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>challenge that we've all had, but it did introduce some confusion in the process, and I guess where we ended up, we think that you can accommodate two inbound lanes and two outbound lanes and buffering in the channel width that is 63.4 meters, and that's essentially what we're proposing.</p>
<b>Construction</b>	
<p>What will the width of the "navigational" channel be when the barges are in place during construction?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> What we are trying to do, and we'll make best efforts, when we're putting in "K" float we will position the working barges butting the main channel, so we're going to try and keep it inside the RVYC water lot. But as we are swinging the sections around to assemble the length of "K" float there will be some minor disruptions. We believe the length of time during that process will be about 30 days, the guys at our club put in docks all the time and they've put in sections up to 600 and 400ft no problem. We don't expect to see any issues in terms of timing and things like that. And I believe it will be a minimized impact on the main channel, that's one of our biggest concerns. And then the construction going forward will be within our water lot, and there shouldn't be any disruptions to the channel other than vessels coming and going like they do today.</p>
<p>Are the hours for construction a choice of the yachter [RVYC] or told to them by the Vancouver port? They are shorter than all the construction hours that is happening for buildings in the west end right now.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> It's all in the application, and the application is 9:00 am to 5:00 pm weekdays, nothing on Saturdays nothing on the weekends, nothing on holidays. And that's our choice to build in that fashion. And it also mitigates any disturbance to neighbours in the neighbourhood as well and that's just being a good neighbour I think and that's the way it worked out and the port said hey it's in your application you have to stick to it and we said yes we'll stick to it and that is the way it is. There were other options but we're not changing it.</p>
<b>Environmental Protection</b>	
<p>The water in Coal Harbour is currently extremely polluted as is. How would 50 more large boats in the area support the Yacht Club</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> This project enhances environmental protection by replacing aging infrastructure, removing creosote coated piles and Styrofoam floats and replacing them with steel and concrete. The new boat sheds are also more environmentally friendly. They are made of a material that doesn't require painting so that</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>reduces VOCs in the environment (less chemicals) and they also have Plexiglas windows that reduce the amount of electricity required because more daylight comes in.</p> <p>RVYC is very committed to environmental protection, they have a very high standing in the Clean Marine BC program all marinas have a 4/5 or higher (two have a 5/5). RVYC participates in an annual shore clean up and they recently installed a “Seabin automated collector” at Coal Harbour. They take environmental protection very seriously and are always looking for new ways to improve. This is the only marina in Coal Harbour to have Clean Marine certification.</p>
's environmentally respectful design?	<p><b>RVYC:</b> As part of the application review process technical studies were completed. Considerable focus on environmental management, minimizing light and view effects, and habitat and fisheries assessments. Application documents, including the technical studies, are available for review at the project web page and on the port authority website.</p> <p>A construction environmental management plan (CEMP) has been developed for this project and is available on our webpage.</p>
What have you considered re helping the environment by conserving energy? e.g. types of lighting etc.	<p><b>RVYC:</b> One of the things we're doing with the proposed marina is having new conduits and utilities put into place, new transformers, new wiring so that'll make it more efficient. We're going to LED lighting in the boat houses and lower down in the walkways. Right now, we have spotlights around the area, but we want to keep the light shade down and use a softer yellow LED lighting, sort of courtesy lighting around the boats and that sort of thing. That's the best way we do it.</p> <p>The other way we do it is each slip is metered, electrically metered, and that tells us if someone is overusing their power and we talk to these people and try to educate them saying 'hey you know, it may be winter and you don't want mildew to occur inside your boat but really if you're heating it up you're giving it a better environment, so what we really want you to do is have a fan in there that is moving the air around' It's less costly to the</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>member, it's more efficient and it safer for everybody.</p> <p>Those are the types of things we are doing, it's a constant upgrading of education and materials in and around the marina.</p>
<b>General Comments / Questions</b>	
<p>Hey FARRAH! Are you listening? We the public are not allowed to use that space. Only rowers of a private club.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The yachters want to rent water that is not being rented and no one needs. It's not brain surgery.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Can we just call this what it is - a push for a bunch of rich people to subsidize their dock improvements by taking away space from the rest of the public?</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<b>General Comments (Rowing)</b>	
<p>Not a question but... a big part of the speed restriction for power boats is the wake. Rowing shells leave a minimal wake.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The narrow part of the channel is the terminal end, so rowing shells are going slow or stopping. To be safe, a rowing shell "at speed" requires a wider channel.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>To address question 4. Please note the rowing club has an established date of 1886. Which is approx. 20 years before RVYC. Rowing fundamentally is a backwards sport</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Further there are more than 50 rowing shells at VRC</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>I suggest that the members of the project team sit in a rowing shell to understand the issues that the rowers are identifying</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The port authority project and environmental review (PER) team accepted an invitation from the Vancouver Rowing Club to accompany them on the water during a training session on the evening of September 24, 2019. The PER team accompanied VRC personnel in support boats and navigated the Coal Harbour basin as evening rowing commenced.</p>
<b>Marina Design</b>	
<p>If you want to protect all users of the waterway then just rebuild your docks within the space, you</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> RVYC has been working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>already have. Leave the rest of us alone. The pictures you used showed the RVYC already has a good chunk of real estate - stick to what you have and work within it.</p>	<p>consider community interests in the project design and as part of the review process. We believe that there is space for everyone to safely use the channel.</p>
<p>How many new slips can be incorporated with reconfiguration rather than expanding?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> We have considered many different layouts over the history of this project and the current layout emerged as the most efficient use of space. Without expansion there will be no new slips. Also, four slips were removed at the west entrance, as part of a separate permit, to provide safe entry and exits to the channel for both VRC and RVYC. So, the RVYC now has less slips than when they entered this process.</p> <p>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>Why does the proposal only mention ingress and egress from/to the marina at two points? With boats moored all along K-float you have ingress and egress along the entire marina. There have been several near - collisions with boats coming from the current float parallel to the channel, not just those backing out. The last one happened just last Friday.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> You are referencing a boat coming out from the existing marina and you know there are some boat sheds that could happen from. But we've moved those in the new design so boats coming out of the marina do come in and out SE and SW corners. The boats that are along “K” float and they have a good view of the channel before they enter it and to maneuver before they enter the channel. The boats along “K” float as you correctly point out are adjacent to the channel, but they have a good 180-degree view of the water and through education they should not be entering that channel unless it is safe to do so. I hope that answers the question.</p> <p>The proposed expansion provides improved safety by: (i) relocating existing boat sheds to either the interior or along the east side of the marina, so no boats can exit from them perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the channel/waterway; (ii) apart from K-Float, boats leaving the marina would do so at the south-west or south-east corners of the marina, where they have a very good view of the</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>channel/waterway, where they have room to hold up before establishing that it is safe to proceed into the channel, and where warning lights and mirrors would assist in identifying rowing shells on the course; (iii) the boats moored along the side of K-Float have a full 180 degree view of the channel/waterway, and would not leave their slip unless safe to do so. RVYC has a campaign in progress to promote awareness of and safety for rowing skulls and is committed to improving and expanding this program.</p>
<p>What is the width of the safety/maneuvering lane between the rowing lane and the moored yachts on K-float? Looking at the plans I don't see such a safety/maneuvering lane.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> "K" float has boats parallel to the channel, and as I said earlier, they have a 180-degree view of the channel. They would not enter or leave the channel unless it was safe to do so and that is through education and a requirement.</p> <p>Boats on "K" Float are moored parallel to the longitudinal axis of the channel/waterway and have a 180-degree view of boats in the channel and would only enter or leave their slip when safe to do so. A maneuvering lane is not required as the channel width is available to all users. The manoeuvre of the vessel to or from "K" float itself would entail moving sideways in or out of the slip in a controlled fashion, with vessel captains standing by until safe to depart, similar to parallel parking a car and varies with the type of vessel and equipment on board. A large sailboat without a bow thruster, for example, could leave the slip even in a south wind by "springing" off the dock face, while a modern power boat could use a bow thruster and directional main propeller to move off without requiring the use of spring lines to do so.</p>
<p>If there is no safety/maneuvering lane next to K-float, how will yachts avoid blocking the rowing lanes while they dock or come out? The process of ingress/egress from K-float will take much longer than simply crossing the rowing lane at the western and eastern end of the marina.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The transit of vessels from "K" float will be a lot quicker than backing out and turning around.</p> <p>This is a multi-use channel and everyone using the channel will have to allow any given vessel (including rowing shells) time to maneuver, just as they do now.</p> <p>Boats on K-Float are moored parallel to the longitudinal axis of the channel/waterway and have a 180-degree view of boats in the channel and would only enter or leave their slip when safe to do so. A maneuvering lane is not required, as the channel width is available to all users. The</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>manoeuvre itself would entail moving sideways in or out of the slip in a controlled fashion, with vessel captains standing by until safe to depart, similar to parallel parking a car. This varies with the type of vessel and equipment on board. A large sailboat without a bow thruster, for example, could leave the slip even in a south wind by "springing" off the dock face, while a modern power boat could use a bow thruster and directional main propeller to move off without requiring the use of spring lines to do so.</p>
<p>The VRC has been active since 1886, and this expansion would in all fairness, effectively end rowing as we know it in Coal Harbour - an inclusive club that makes outdoor water sports accessible to hundreds of Vancouver residents every year. Why can the Yacht Club not update their facilities without encroaching on the publics' already small waterway? *</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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.</p> <p>RVYC has acknowledged and supports the continuation of rowing on Coal Harbour. It should be noted that for safety reasons vessels without mechanical power are not usually permitted in Vancouver Harbour.</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. 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 to safely use the channel.</p>
<p>The questions I have is what is the current width of water? How much more is going to be used and will that allow for boats on the outside to be moored.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The water width is currently 81.5m from the RVYC marina to the South. The current multi use channel accepted by the port authority is 63.4m (208.5 Ft) and that will allow RVYC to widen the water lot lease by 18m. This will allow for vessels to be tied on the outside of "K" Float and not encroach into the administrative channel.</p>
<p>From your Marina Design slide, the Marina across the way has a visible setback from the Navigational Channel. In this diagram I can see that boats are intended to be moored along the K float. Will there be a restriction to size of boats/yachts? As imagine larger boats will be wider and encroach on navigation channel space.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> All vessels alongside "K" Float must be entirely within RVYC water lot. No moored vessels will encroach on the administrative channel. This will restrict the beam of any vessels tied there and they will have a maximum beam width of 7m. That maximum beam equates to a vessel length of 80 feet. Which is the maximum we will permit. There</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>Are there required setbacks from the Navigation channel?</p>	<p>are no required setbacks from the administrative channel.</p>
<p>Did the Yacht club request designs that enhance environmental protection and improve boater safety without expanding the footprint of the club? Or is this truly what was stated at the beginning of the webinar "a search for more space" guised as environmental and safety improvements? *</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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 to safely use the channel.</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. 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 to safely use the channel. We environmental and safety upgrades are a very important part the project in keeping with ongoing commitments by the RVYC.</p>
<p><b>Navigation/ Administrative Channel</b></p>	
<p>How did the Port of Vancouver arrive at their decision that transposing buoyed lanes from an international rowing course appropriate for Coal Harbour when these courses are completely buoyed at 10 metre intervals and exclude any adjoining marinas and marine traffic?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> 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>Based on the responses from the RVYC and the Port from the first meeting, it seems that the Port has accepted the applicant's use of FISA guidelines for rowing racing courses as relevant to this application. Why does the Port continue to accept this faulty analogy, and refuse to consider the Vancouver Rowing Club's feedback that this expansion's constriction of the channel will be disastrous to a development and learning oriented rowing program?</p>	<p>As this channel is not used for commercial navigation, our assessment of it against these standards is an administrative exercise to assess 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>
<p>If you acknowledge the busy and multi-user nature of Coal Harbour, why do you consider narrowing the available channel at all?</p>	<p></p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a visual representation of how all activities could safely take place in Coal Harbour</li> <li>2. Help the port authority to determine areas for safe navigation and in considering proposed lease boundary amendments</li> </ol>
<p>To the Port, how does an expansion of RVYC further the use of Coal Harbour as a multi-use waterway?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> No decision has been made on the proposed project at this time. The proposed project is currently in the application review phase under the port authority's Project and Environmental Review (PER) or permitting process. All proposed works within the port authority's jurisdiction are carefully reviewed through our 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>Question: What parties were consulted to determine the width needed to ensure safe rowing training for the rowers themselves? That is, with multiple rowing shells going in each direction, there needs to be a reasonable lane for each direction and a gap between the two directions to ensure safety, especially for novices as we all know it's the rower's back that faces in the forward direction.</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The port authority does not seek public input when designing channels within its jurisdiction. The Coal Harbour channel is an administrative tool to assist the port authority in determining areas for safe navigation and review proposed lease boundary amendments. As the Coal Harbour area is considered a shared waterway, the port authority has no intention to develop practices and procedures specific to the Coal Harbour Channel.</p>
<p>Question for Chris Bishop - you have made a point of stating that the channel in question in Coal Harbour is NOT a navigable channel. As per Canadian Navigable Waters Act this channel is a navigable waterway. Why do you repeatedly state that this is not a navigable channel when it clearly is under the CNWA?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The Coal Harbour channel is an administrative tool to assist the port authority in determining areas for safe navigation and review proposed lease boundary amendments. This channel will not be published in nautical publications or in the Port Information Guide. As the Coal Harbour area is a considerate shared waterway, the port authority has no intention to develop practices and procedures specific to the Coal Harbour Channel.</p> <p>For clarity, this is a navigable area (i.e. one can navigate into the Coal Harbour basin in a variety of watercraft) but it is not a navigation channel (i.e. it is not published or documented in any nautical publications or navigational charts).</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>Port of Vancouver - the space that this proposed dock expansion takes up is used by rowers on a daily basis. The Vancouver Rowing Club has over 200 rowers that use this space on a regular basis - as do other aquatic users in the area as this space is shared. Please indicate why the Port Authority would consider allowing this shared space to be sold off by an independent party for their own exclusive use as a parking space?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> No decision has been made on the proposed project at this time. The proposed project is currently in the application review phase under the port authority's Project and Environmental Review (PER) or permitting process. All proposed works within the port authority's jurisdiction are carefully reviewed through our 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>Has RVYC engaged Ports Vancouver together with other "tenants" of the Coal Harbour waterway to discuss a master plan that would benefit all stakeholders? For example, perhaps there is a way in which RVYC and VRC docks can be reconfigured - and leases revised - in order to achieve the desired objectives of the many rather than the objectives of just one? The RVYC team has raised the notion of a "strategic plan" for the waterway, but that strategic planning effort would be put into process after RVYC has received approval for their project. The overall strategic plan should precede that approval.</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The port authority is aware of the applicants' plan for their marina, which was used in the development of this proposal. No engagement has been conducted with regards to an overall master plan for the Coal Harbour area.</p> <p>The port authority has a jurisdiction wide Land Use Plan that describes our long-term land use policy directions and our commitment to accommodating future trade growth in a socially, environmentally and economically responsible way.</p> <p>The Land Use Plan sets out land and water designations, each with a specific intent and list of primary and conditional uses, the subject area is designated for commercial use. The Land Use Plan also sets out the framework for the Project and Environmental Review Process for which this proposal is being assessed under.</p>
<p>How many rowers are using the middle space?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The port authority does not know the number of rowers or skiffs using the middle of the administrative channel at any given time.</p>
<p>Question for the Chris Bishop: you stated that this engagement is about how RVYC uses their lease area, not the navigational channel. Can you please explain what this means? Does this mean the port will not be considering impacts to the safety of users of the navigational channel due to the expansion in RVYC's lease area? How does</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> I think it's important to note to start that no decision has been made on the proposed project at this time. It's very much still in the review phase. And a part of that application review phase is the public engagement process which we are currently sitting in and that ties into other processes such as the stakeholder consultation, indigenous consultation, also our internal technical review of</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>this align with the Port's mandate to manage the waters safely for all Canadians?</p>	<p>the project that's lead by our environmental team, planning team, engineering and marine operations specialists. The review is very much ongoing and there is no decision being made on the project at this time.</p>
<p>Follow up question to Chris Bishop: if a lease was issued for this area, what consultation process was undertaken prior to the lease being issued?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> In terms of lease, the existing lease with the Royal Van Yacht Club predates my time with the port authority so I can't speak to the consultation process specifically that was undertaken in that instance. But in terms of this process that we're in right now regarding Royal Van and their proposed works, that lease area against the channel will be considered as a part of this lease, it's integral to what they are proposing to do. So unnecessarily it needs to be considered at the same time. But again, the reason that we are here to gain feedback and to hear what the public has to say so that we can consider that as part of our decision as we move forward.</p>
<p><b>Other Regulatory process</b></p>	
<p><a href="#">Hello Does the Canadian Navigable Waters Act apply and how is it being addressed?</a></p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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. That information is also available on the RVYC website.</p>
<p><b>Project and Environmental Review process</b></p>	
<p>1. Why is the City of Vancouver open to this expansion, when, at the same time, it is reducing car traffic and encouraging bikers? Is this not counterproductive?</p> <p>2. The City of Vancouver markets itself as a city of natural beauty. How is an enlarged boat parking lot beautiful? How does increased boat traffic not deter wildlife from swimming in the area? When I worked at the Convention Centre, a visitor from outside Canada remarked on the early morning view, "This scenery makes me want to be a better person." Do you think he would have made the same comment if he looked out on a boat parking lot?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Thanks Pam, so as Chris had mentioned in the intro the proposed project is located in the jurisdiction of the port authority and through our project environmental review process we carefully review and consider projects that are proposed within the port's jurisdiction. Our reviews are broad and encompass a range of potential impacts from projects proposed including environmental and visual impacts as had been mentioned in the enquiry. We are the team specialists who are reviewing this proposal and this review is concurrent to the current public engagement process. In order to capture the City of Vancouver's feedback as suggested in the question, as the city is an important stakeholder,</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>3. The rowers add to the healthy living, clean air picture. Why would the city consider restricting rowers and prevent them from healthy social exercise? IF the city wants to consider the local residents and the visitors to the Coal Harbour area, this expansion will NOT be allowed.</p>	<p>we have invited them to take part in our stakeholder consultation process which also runs concurrent to this public engagement.</p>
<p>How was the information for this meeting publicized? You mentioned an announcement in the newspaper, can you tell us which paper and when this announcement appeared?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> An advertisement was placed in the Vancouver Sun newspaper on June 2, 2020 and in the Georgia Straight newspaper on June 4, 2020 (also available in the online editions). A postcard was delivered to residences and businesses in Coal Harbour prior to the start date of June 2, 2020. The Royal Vancouver Yacht Club also posted geographic targeted social media posts for the Coal Harbour and West End neighbourhoods and sent multiple emails to the RVYC members encouraging them to share the information widely with their networks.</p> <p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> As part of the PER public engagement requirements for a Category C review process, the applicant was required to notify the public of the engagement process. These requirements are set out in the <a href="#">PER External Guidelines for Public Engagement</a> document, which can be found on the port authority website. These guidelines have further been supplemented with <a href="#">guidelines for engagement during COVID-19</a>.</p> <p>The applicant, in line with current and new engagement policies placed advertisements in the Vancouver Sun newspaper on June 2 and Georgia Straight newspaper on June 4, 2020. The engagement sessions have been promoted widely on social media using geographic and interest-based targeting tools. Notification was also sent by the applicant to the Vancouver Rowing Club and to the Coal Harbour Residents Association. The resident's association sent out an email to their membership. RVYC's membership was also notified and asked to widely disseminate.</p>
<p>How many RVYC members are employed by VFPA and what is done to fully avoid conflict of interest?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> A few port authority employees are members of RVYC. All port authority employees are required to disclose conflicts of interest in accordance with our code of</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	conduct and are required to recuse themselves from decision making processes where they have a conflict of interest.
The manager of planning, Chris Bishop, stated one of the three pillars of the Port mandate is "consideration of the local community". How does allocation of a large expanse of water at the narrowest point to a single user meet the Port mandate?	<b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> No decision has been made on the proposed project at this time. The proposed project is currently in the application review phase under the port authority's Project and Environmental Review (PER) or permitting process. All proposed works within the port authority's jurisdiction are carefully reviewed through our 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.
For Port: How controversial would you say this project is compare to the other projects that the Port reviews?	<b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> All proposed works within the port authority's jurisdiction are carefully reviewed through our Project and Environmental Review 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.  While some projects draw more public interest than others, all projects are evaluated by the PER process.
For Port: Are there any members of the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club on the Board of Directors of the Port?	<b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Yes, and they have disclosed this in accordance with our code of conduct. Please note that the board of directors has delegated authority for permitting decisions to management and will have no involvement in the process.
For Port: Are there any members of the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club in senior staff roles at the Port of Vancouver?	<b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The project and environmental review team is aware of one member of the executive who is an honorary member. Please see the response below.
For Port: Are there any members of the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club who are involved in reviewing this project?	<b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> There are no members of the project and environmental review team for this project who are members of the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club.

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>Mail drop? I live in Coal harbour and I didn't not receive any notice of this consultation. I only know if it because I am a Rowing club member. I question the knowledge of the public for today's consultation.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> A postcard was delivered to residences and businesses in Coal Harbour prior to the start date of June 2, 2020. An advertisement was placed in the Vancouver Sun newspaper on June 2, 2020 and in the Georgia Straight newspaper on June 4, 2020 (also available in the online editions). The Rowing Club was notified by mail and the Coal Harbour Residents Association was notified by email and they sent an email to their members. The Royal Vancouver Yacht Club also posted geographic targeted social media posts for the Coal Harbour and West End neighbourhoods.</p> <p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> As part of the PER public engagement requirements for a Category C review process, the applicant was required to notify the public of the public engagement process. These requirements are set out in the <a href="#">PER External Guidelines for Public Engagement</a> document, which can be found on the port authority website. These guidelines have further been supplemented with <a href="#">guidelines for engagement during COVID-19</a>.</p> <p>As per the guidelines, a mail drop notification map area was provided to the applicant in order to satisfy the port authority requirements for a mail drop. The map is a geographic area drawn within a 500 m radius of the proposed project site. This is a standard procedure within the PER process. Depending on where the attendee who asked the question lives, they may not have received a notice.</p> <p>The applicant, in line with current and new engagement policies, also placed advertisements in the Vancouver Sun on June 2 and Georgia Straight newspaper on June 4, 2020. The engagement sessions have been promoted widely on social media using geographic and interest-based targeting tools. Notification was also sent by the applicant to the Vancouver Rowing Club and to the Coal Harbour Residents Association. The resident's association sent out an email to their membership. RVYC's membership was also notified and asked to widely disseminate.</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>Will there be an opportunity for another webinar discussion in light of all of the questions that have been asked in the 2 webinars</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> 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 <a href="mailto:CHExpansion@royalvan.com">CHExpansion@royalvan.com</a>) directly with a representative from the project team.</p> <p>The applicant and the port authority have both committed to responding in written form to all questions raised during the two webinar events. The Q&amp;A documents will be sent out to all attendees and will be posted on the two organizations websites respectively.</p> <p>All input received from the public will be reviewed as part of the PER 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 are 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>Does VFPA consider RVYC's application to be complete at this time? What is the VFPA's timeline for its decision?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Through our PER process, we fulfill our federal responsibilities under the Canada Marine Act and the Impact Assessment Act, carefully reviewing and considering potential effects from all proposed project development on federal lands and waters, and neighbouring communities before determining if a project should proceed.</p>
<p>How does VFPA consider and weigh various inputs from stakeholders to arrive at its decision.</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Decisions are based on careful review and consideration of potential effects from a project's possible development on federal lands and waters, and a project's impacts on neighbouring communities.</p> <p>All studies, reports, engagement input, site visits, observations, historic knowledge and public,</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>stakeholder and Indigenous comments and feedback are considered as part of any decision.</p>
<p>Does VFPA disclose the reasons for its decision and approach used to arrive at their decision?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The proposed project is currently in the application review phase under the port authority's Project and Environmental Review (PER) or permitting process. All proposed works within the port authority's jurisdiction are reviewed through our 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>The Project and Environmental Review process occurs before a decision is made, and involves a broad range of specialists that contribute to the review, including planners, environmental scientists, engineers, consultation professionals and if needed, independent consultants, assess factors such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on biophysical environment</li> <li>• Changes to traffic and transportation Impact of noise, lighting, views, and other effects on communities</li> <li>• Effects on the rights and interests of Indigenous groups.</li> </ul> <p>Should a proposed project be approved, the port authority posts the PER project permit report and the project permit to the port authority's website for public reference.</p>
<p>Question for the Chris Bishop: you stated that this engagement is about how RVYC uses their lease area, not the navigational channel. Can you please explain what this means? Does this mean the port will not be considering impacts to the safety of users of the navigational channel due to the expansion in RVYC's lease area? How does this align with the Port's mandate to manage the waters safely for all Canadians?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> What I meant by that statement is that the subject of this evening's public engagement session is the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club expansion, so the work and the changes that they propose to do in and about their lease area and the areas that front onto the Coal Harbour navigational area. And so, in stating that I wanted people to know that we're not debating the navigation area, we're here to hear what people's concerns and comments are on the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club first and foremost. When it comes to safety, of course that is paramount for us, and we do our review, we are</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>looking at safety and so accessing into the navigation area in Coal Harbour is clearly a safety issue so we will be looking at that and our marine operations crew and other experts are assessing that and how the lease area that RVYC has in their expansion are being factored in to how the channel functions.</p> <p>The proposed project is currently in the application review phase under the port authority's Project and Environmental Review (PER) or permitting process. Safety is an important aspect of our review of the project.</p> <p>The proposed marina expansion and subsequent extension to the applicant's lease area is the focus of the port authority PER process.</p>
<p>Follow up question to Chris Bishop: if a lease was issued for this area, what consultation process was undertaken prior to the lease being issued?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> In terms of lease, the existing lease with the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club predates my time with the port authority so I can't speak to the consultation process specifically that was undertaken in that instance. But in terms of this process that we're in right now regarding Royal Van and their proposed works, that lease area against the channel will be considered as part of this lease, it's integral to what they are proposing to do. So, it needs to be considered at the same time. But again, the reason that we are here is to gain feedback and to hear what the public has to say so that we can consider that as part of our decision as we move forward.</p> <p>The proposed marina expansion and subsequent extension to the applicant's lease area is the focus of this review. Therefore, all consultation, including this information session, forms part of the broader ongoing engagement on this proposed project and will be considered as part of the proposed extended lease area.</p>
<p>The questions at this open house appear to have been stacked with "soft ball" questions that will enable RVYC and the Port to avoid speaking to the concerns raised by other community members. Instead they will be addressed in a copy and paste exercise, much like the lazy and</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The questions answered during the June 24 webinar were received either in advance of the webinar, submitted via email from the public, or typed by attendees during the session itself.</p> <p>As noted by the moderator during the event, questions were answered in the order they were</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>dismissive consultation record compiled from the previous open house.</p>	<p>received. All questions are reported in this document for transparency and all questions have been answered.</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 <a href="mailto:CHExpansion@royalvan.com">CHExpansion@royalvan.com</a>) 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 written responses (letters and emails), phone calls, questions raised in webinars and questionnaire responses. All feedback will form part of the engagement summary and consideration reports will be submitted 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>If this proposal is accepted or denied, what appeal process exists to have the decision reviewed and or reversed? At what point does the decision become final?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> That is a fairly technical question and one that we would want to make sure that we have correct procedurally. That would be one that we would take offline and get back to you with in terms of sort of steps that would be taken in that situation.</p> <p><i>Update:</i> The port authority does not have an internal appeals process. We apologize for any confusion from our preliminary response.</p>
<p>Why do you waste everybody's time with this useless filibuster on softball questions that were probably submitted by the proponent themselves?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The questions submitted before, during and after the public engagement sessions were not submitted by the port or proponent.</p>
<p>Are members of the public participating in this webinar, or is it RVan members only?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> I don't know who is participating today because I can only see names I don't know what group people are affiliated with but this is part of the public engagement process so the applicant posted adverts in the newspaper, there was a mail drop,</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>there's been social media posts inviting people to participate in this event. So, it's open to everybody in the public, whether they belong to the rowing club, the yacht club or they live in Coal Harbour, it is open to all. And to follow up on what Regan said earlier, we'd like to point out that no decision has been made at this time. We would really like to encourage everybody to participate in the feedback, so if you've asked a question tonight that's great. If we don't get a chance to get to it today it will be followed up through the Q&amp;A process which will be posted on the Yacht Club's website and the port authority's website. And also form part of the review. We also have an online engagement survey which you can find through the yacht club's website. And as of today, I understand at least 500 people have submitted their comments, which is great. So, we really would encourage everybody to give their thoughts and feedback and it all is part of the review process that we undertake.</p>
<p>Please explain how this constitutes a public consultation session when we are not entitled to speak, and we can't see other questions being submitted?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> In light of COVID-19 the port authority released new guidelines for public engagement during COVID-19, which provides guidelines for engagement practices that adhere to health authority guidelines for physical distancing, while continuing to facilitate important discussion and obtain feedback about projects. The COVID guidelines are an addendum to the existing Project and Environmental Review (PER) public engagement guidelines, with a lens for remote and digital engagement to be undertaken while physical distancing recommendations are in place. As per the new COVID guidelines, the public engagement period for this Category C project has also been extended from 20-business days to 25-business days to accommodate additional participation.</p> <p>To align with these guidelines, the applicant chose to run the webinar with all participants in mute mode to ensure the technology worked efficiently and effectively for all. This practice is in line with other engagement processes currently run by the port authority and external organizations such as municipalities and others. It is standard for written</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>questions to be submitted prior to or during an event.</p> <p>While we acknowledge the frustration felt by attendees, the port authority reiterates that the applicant has set up a dedicated telephone number and email address to receive feedback on the proposed project. Members of the public can request to speak to the applicant directly and all calls and emails form part of the engagement summary and consideration reports, which will be reviewed as part of the PER process prior to a decision being made.</p> <p>The port authority has confirmed with the applicant that GoToWebinar does not have the ability for participants to view submitted questions. Prior to the second webinar the port authority worked with the applicant to see if alternative ways for questions to be submitted would be possible. In light of this change, participants were requested to submit written questions in advance. These were incorporate into the presentation (unless they were received after the 3pm cut off time, in which case they were read out during the event itself). One of the positive aspects of a purely digital process is that all questions submitted are recorded (as written) and will form part of the engagement process. The applicant committed publicly to answering all questions submitted during the event.</p>
<p>Why did the rowers get to expand their mooring area? Did they go through the same process to do that?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> A PER project permit was approved in November 2016 which allowed the Vancouver Rowing Club to extend portions of their existing marina, known as “Docks C, D and E”. The PER project number is: No. 15-257. The project was reviewed as a Category B project and did not require any public engagement (although stakeholder and Indigenous engagement was undertaken). The permit allowed the Vancouver Rowing Club to add up to 19 additional berths for recreational vessels ranging from 9m (30ft) up to 23m (75ft) in length. The project also increased the Clubs lease area to accommodate the extensions. The increase was approximately 1609 square metres (17,319 sq ft).</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<b><i>Project and Environmental Review process – Indigenous Consultation</i></b>	
<p>The Squamish First Nation appears to have a strong connection to the area in question. Is there a report outlining the results of First Nation consultation process with the Squamish First Nation and other Rights holder First Nations in the area?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The port authority is consulting with Indigenous groups on the proposed project application, including Squamish Nation. A summary of these comments would be made available in the PER Report, should the proposed application be approved.</p>
<b><i>Project and Environmental Review process – Stakeholder Consultation</i></b>	
<p>If the Vancouver Rowing Club, Rowing BC and Rowing Canada are greatly concerned with the ability for rowers to train and be safe, why does the Port of Vancouver feel otherwise? *</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> No decision has been made on the proposed project at this time. The proposed project is currently in the application review phase under the port authority's Project and Environmental Review (PER) or permitting process. The Vancouver Rowing Club have been engaged as part of the stakeholder consultation process which forms part of this Project and Environmental Review. VRC have been requested to provide their feedback on the proposed project which will be considered as part of our review.</p>
<p>Why would the Port of Vancouver accept the assertion of RVYC that rowing would be unaffected in Coal Harbour when The Vancouver Rowing Club, Rowing BC and Rowing Canada are emphatic that rowing would be severely compromised for its two hundred members in the rowing section and the hundreds of Vancouver citizens who take Learn to Row lessons? *</p>	
<p>Will the governing bodies for rowing- Rowing BC and Rowing Canada- be consulted to provide information about sport specific training environments for community rowers on multi-use waterways? (and not the racing/competition field of play technical specifications that were referenced earlier) *</p>	
<p>Rowing Canada say: "We concur with the concerns the [Vancouver Rowing] club has outlined regarding the RVYC proposal and also think that proceeding with the expansion as described would compromise rowing in Coal Harbour." How do you respond to this? *</p>	
<p>Rowing BC says: "The Royal Vancouver Yacht Club's proposed expansion project will make it difficult to maintain the minimum level of safety required for rowing to continue on Coal Harbour." How do you respond to this? *</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The Vancouver Rowing Club has been engaged as part of the stakeholder consultation process, which forms part of this Project and Environmental Review. While Rowing Canada and Rowing BC have not been formally consulted through the port authority's Project and Environmental Review process, the port authority encourages the Vancouver Rowing Club to incorporate comments received from their governing bodies.</p>
<p>The experts in this space are the Vancouver Aquarium... have they endorsed the project?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The Vancouver Aquarium have not been identified as a stakeholder in Coal Harbour. They may submit comments or concerns through the public engagement forum, the dedicated phone number</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>or email address as posted, should they wish to provide information or comments.</p>
<p>Who is being consulted in the stakeholders engagement process?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> 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"> <li>• City of Vancouver</li> <li>• Vancouver Parks Board</li> <li>• Transport Canada</li> <li>• Vancouver Rowing Club</li> <li>• Mainstream Properties</li> <li>• SWA Vancouver Hotel Nominee Inc.</li> </ul> <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>Spencer Chandra-Herbert, MLA for Vancouver West End, says " I believe the changes would make it much more dangerous for rowers, and other local users of the water, and would disrupt our local maritime tourism, and active sport economy for little benefit. These proposed changes would have long term negative community, economic and environmental impact and for these reasons, I do not support this proposed expansion." How do you respond to this?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Spencer Chandra-Herbert, MLA for Vancouver West End corresponded with the port authority in May 2019 regarding concerns his constituents had raised with regards to the proposed project, as well as voicing his own thoughts. The port authority responded to Mr. Chandra-Herbert thanking him for his comments, explaining the port authority PER process in more detail, and inviting him to meet with us should he require any additional information. The port authority committed to notifying the MLA's office once the public engagement process was underway for the proposed project. A notification was sent on May 28, 2020 regarding the June 2 - July 7 consultation period.</p> <p>Mr. Chandra-Herbert's comments will be reviewed, along with other letters and emails received by the port authority prior to the start of the formal public engagement process, as part of the PER review process.</p>
<p>Kennedy Stewart, Mayor of Vancouver, says "City Council shares the VRC's concerns that the proposed expansion of the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club's (RVYC) marina, and subsequent</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The City of Vancouver has been engaged as part of the stakeholder consultation process which forms part of this Project and Environmental Review. The</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>narrowing of the Coal Harbour waterway, will have a negative impact on its rowing programs by increasing the number of large motorized boats in the waterway and reducing sight lines." How do you respond to this?</p>	<p>City has been requested to provide their feedback on the proposed project, which will be considered as part of our review.</p>
<p>In a video released by the Rowing Club in summer 2019, Dr. Don Arnold and Derek Porter – both Olympic rowers who won gold for Canada – say that proceeding with the Yacht Club’s expansion plans would likely cause the destruction of the Vancouver Rowing Club. How do you respond to this?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The Vancouver Rowing Club has been engaged as part of the stakeholder consultation process, which forms part of this Project and Environmental Review. VRC have been requested to provide their feedback on the proposed project which will be considered as part of our review.</p>
<p><b>Project Benefits</b></p>	
<p>How many visiting vessels do you see in a year? Do you really think this is a significant enough contribution to the Vancouver economy that justifies taking space away from the public?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> In a 5-year period there have been 213 guest moorages. Guests can stay for two weeks at Coal Harbour Marina.</p> <p>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>
<p>You earlier stated the economic value of this project proceeding. What is the economic benefit to the Vancouver community (estimated dollar over three-year period)? Additionally, what revenue at risk assessments have been done to evaluate what revenue may be lost by other entities due to this project?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> This is a \$12 million project will create a significant number of jobs during construction.</p> <p>The environmental improvements benefit habitat in the Coal Harbour basin and the new infrastructure will improve aesthetics for neighbours in the harbour. Also, the RVYC Coal Harbour marina provides significant employment within our community and supports many small businesses in the area.</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>There are also additional lease revenues paid to the port authority for their ongoing operations. The lease agreements are negotiated after the project is approved.</p>
<p>The justification for the project seems to be: safety, replacement of aging infrastructure, as well as alleged benefits to the environment... Can those objectives not be achieved without requiring more space and adding 47 new slips? The new slips benefit the RVYC only, and not any other user of the waterway. *</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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 marina, its 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> <p>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.</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. 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 to safely use the channel.</p> <p>This is a \$12 million project will create a significant number of jobs during construction.</p> <p>The environmental improvements benefit habitat in the Coal Harbour basin and the new infrastructure will improve aesthetics for neighbours in the harbour. Also, the RVYC Coal Harbour marina provides significant employment</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>within our community and supports many small businesses in the area.</p> <p>There are also additional lease revenues paid to the port authority for their ongoing operations. The lease agreements are negotiated after the project is approved.</p>
<p>I note that neither safety nor the environment were mentioned by Ron in his explanation as to why RVYC cannot entertain the option of replacing infrastructure without expanding its footprint. I have also heard that the benefit is to RVYC members and their yachting guests from reciprocating clubs. How can this project be seen as a winning solution for Vancouverites? *</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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> <p>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.</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. 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 to safely use the channel.</p> <p>This is a \$12 million project will create a significant number of jobs during construction.</p> <p>The environmental improvements benefit habitat in the Coal Harbour basin and the new</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>infrastructure will improve aesthetics for neighbours in the harbour. Also, the RVYC Coal Harbour marina provides significant employment within our community and supports many small businesses in the area.</p> <p>There are also additional lease revenues paid to the port authority for their ongoing operations. The lease agreements are negotiated after the project is approved.</p>
<p>Beyond the RVYC and their members, who will benefit from this expansion?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> Well we do get a lot of guests coming in to use our facilities. We have a reciprocal exchange sort of program with other yacht clubs and we have at least 53 different clubs that we have reciprocal agreements with. And we're open to any recognized yacht club using our facility. So that's probably the primary group. I guess it is a bit of an economic opportunity for Vancouver as well. I mean it's additional vessels, they generate revenue and keep local businesses busy so there's benefits there too. Thank you.</p> <p>This is a \$12 million project will create a significant number of jobs during construction.</p> <p>The environmental improvements benefit habitat in the Coal Harbour basin and the new infrastructure will improve aesthetics for neighbours in the harbour. Also, the RVYC Coal Harbour marina provides significant employment within our community and supports many small businesses in the area.</p> <p>There are also additional lease revenues paid to the port authority for their ongoing operations. The lease agreements are negotiated after the project is approved.</p>
<p>Why not just replace the rotting infrastructure rather than expand the footprint?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> Well we could do that, the problem with it is there's been a long-term request, demand, by our members for more moorage. I mean there is a greater need for moorage kind of everywhere in the Lower Mainland so that's what the big driver was behind this project to start with. We then got into recognizing that we needed to do some more work inside the marina itself because of the age of it all and then further recognized as we combine the two together you can get a much more efficient layout, utilize the space better, and</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>hopefully not impinge on the channels all that much. So that is kind of what got us to where we are. So, the process of replacing just the inside of the marina doesn't rally meet our goals for our members. But, well I guess that's the answer.</p>
<b>Recreational Boating</b>	
<p>I'm not sure who can answer these for me. Please try. I live near the lagoon and want to use coal harbour for kayaking.</p> <p>I read on a port of Vancouver brochure that there was supposed to be no sailing, rowing, or paddling in that area of coal harbour. Do I have to be a member of the rowing club to be able to row or kayak in coal harbour?</p> <p>If I don't need to be a member of a private club, where are the public supposed to access the channel?</p> <p>If I do need to be a member of a private club, can I join any private club or only the rowing club?</p> <p>Can I buy a rower shell and use the space? I don't want to row in English Bay.</p> <p>Also, I read about the yacht club making money from getting more space. Do they pay for that space? Do all the marinas pay the same amount for their space? What does the port do with that money?</p> <p>I like that it seems like the yacht club wants to improve the environment, but does that help if even if the other marinas are not doing the same? Are they cleaning up after the other yachters? Can I read all the questions and answers somewhere?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Unfortunately kayaking is not permitted in Coal Harbour, and this is stated in our port information guide. And if you do want to row in Coal Harbour, you will have to be a member of the Vancouver Rowing Club and it is my understanding the Vancouver Rowing Club does not, that kayaking is not part of their thing, they are a rowing club. So that's sort of your in is with the Vancouver Rowing Club for rowing only. In terms of access to the channel for the public that's actually by water through the inner harbour and past Deadman's Island, there's no land access for the public within Coal Harbour itself. So yes, you do need to be a member of a club and I would say for Coal Harbour that is the rowing club.</p> <p>There are leases throughout the Coal Harbour basin if you will and you know those are needed or used for managing and maintaining our leases throughout the port authority and they're reflective of the cost to do that. Yeah that is sort of the simplest answer.</p> <p><a href="#">Additionally, for context to some of the questions in this section, 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."</a></p> <p><b>RVYC:</b> We do a lot of things for the environment the first thing I wanted to say is that I think all the marine users in the basin are trying to keep the place clean we're all very concerned with the environment, we are out on the water all the time and we want to see a clean environment as best as we can.</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>At Royal Van, this would be year number 3 Covid permitting, but we do a shoreline clean up around the Coal Harbour basin, we pick up bits and pieces of garbage that have accumulated in the inter tidal zone and we find some really bizarre things, I found a toilet one year, we find hypodermic needles and other plastic and microplastics and things like that.</p> <p>We also have safety checks that we check the inside of the boats to make sure their bilges are clean, and that people are doing good housekeeping practices with that. And one thing that we are really excited about is we purchased a Seabin machine, you can actually go online and look at the Seabin, and it's a machine that sits in the water and it collects all the surficial debris in and around the area very gently and you get about a five gallon pail you know microplastics and bits and pieces that are floating around in the basin and we empty that several times a day. And that's been a great success its cleaning up all the debris that comes through a little bit of the oil sheen that shows up throughout the basin, to all sorts of activities you know draining from the parking lots and that sort of thing. We're pretty excited about it and we do improve the environment and I honestly believe everyone else is on the same page there and they are trying to do their best. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> We have an environmental programs department within the port authority, and they have a number of initiatives throughout the port to ensure sustainable practices at the various, not just marinas but terminals and other lease areas governed by the port authority.</p>
<p>Thank you for all the time. If you need to answer the other questions in the printed Q&amp;A, that is fine. I found the last one. I'm disappointed that I can't use the space, but I like the info. thx.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> Thank you for taking the time to participate and we are happy to answer additional questions at any time.</p>
<p>To the Port of Vancouver, how does the proposed expansion of RVYC correlate with the accessible water strategy of the Parks Board and City of Vancouver?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The port authority manages the lands and waters under the federal legislation, Canada Marine Act. 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</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>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>The availability of safe waterways for recreational users (canoes, kayaks, rowing, dragon boating, sup, outriggers, etc... Both Coal Harbour and False Creek are becoming havens for powered craft at the expense of recreational users. Why are recreational users continually getting a back seat?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Coal Harbour falls within the port authority jurisdiction, while False Creek does not.</p> <p>As identified in the answer above, the port authority manages the lands and waters under the federal legislation, Canada Marine Act. 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>In a busy waterway why are the rowing shells allowed to row backward at three times the posted speed limit with no chase boats to monitor their safety?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Again, not being a rower myself, but I can understand the question for sure. The channel, again, is, is not a navigation channel. It is navigable, you can take a boat in there and I just want to clarify that bit of nuance in language, but it's not something that's, that's published on a navigation chart or any kind of publication. Hence our use of the word is administrative. In that sense, you know, the port authority does not police, for lack of a better word, or monitor the use of the channel in terms of boat speeds and those sorts of things on a regular basis. And so, it's really up to the members are the source. The members to users certainly in this case would be the rowing club members to operate in a safe manner.</p>
<p><b><i>RVYC Operations and Financial information</i></b></p>	
<p>I read that these new slips will be sold for lump sums of up to \$150,000. Given that RVYC membership is by invitation only, and costs up to \$29,000 to join, how does the club feel that this expansion offer any real accessibility to the general public (as opposed to the very wealthy) to waterfront in our city's most popular park?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> There are several parts to that, first of all we are a non-profit organization. We set rates for our members based on recovering each year's cost and we are not selling the slips. I know there's been some weird statements on various social media sites and websites and so on that say we are selling the slips. That simply isn't true. You can't believe everything you read online.</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>The members have voted about 81% to pay for this project. And they are paying for it through increases in moorage costs and through special assessments to pay for the entire cost of the project. What we have done in the past and are doing in this case for some of our slips, the new ones the net new ones, because we're building many new slips remember, there's only 47 that are additional to the total count. So out of those what we are asking our members to do that take those slips is to pay moorage in advance. So, they will be paying a number of months of moorage in advance.</p> <p>That gives us some cash to build the marina, rather than borrowing money. And then the member uses that slip and does not pay monthly moorage until that moorage value is used up. The club gets a lump sum loan from the member, based on his monthly moorage, and foregoes monthly revenue from that slip until that pre-paid moorage is paid down. And that's the process. It's not purchasing the slip, the assets remain with the yacht club, they always do, they're always rented, and they're always rented to members.</p>
<p>Is the club invitation only?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> Anyone can apply for membership in the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club.</p>
<p>How many additional RVYC members will this expansion provide?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The expansion does not provide for new members. New membership application is a separate process conducted by our executive and administration. We have 300 current members currently on a waitlist because they have moorage at other facilities but would like to acquire moorage at Coal Harbour. This is the need that this project addresses.</p>
<p>What are the repercussions for members if they don't obey the courtesy signs?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> Well I guess we have essentially a staged disciplinary process. I mean obviously the first thing we do is talk to the individual and address the issue. If there is continued bad behaviour that gets referred to our membership committee and if the behaviour is bad enough, they will be asked to leave the club.</p>
<p>1) How many rowing shells are there and how many motorized vessels are moored in the marinas in Coal Harbour?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> That's a tricky one and one that I don't have on the top of my head. So, I would have to get back to you with that number and, again, that can change depending on</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>2) Is RVYC a not-for-profit organization?</p>	<p>the day how many boats are within the basin versus out.</p> <p><b>RVYC:</b> Yes, we are a non-profit organization. I guess that's one way in which the Rowing Club and us are very similar we are both non-profit organizations. In terms of the number of vessels, in the information that we have, I guess, around a thousand vessels moored in the harbor, plus or minus. I mean, we've got about 320 currently in our marina, I think, the Rowers have probably closer to 270, something like that, and then there's all the other side. And I think some of the discussions with the Rowers, say, have about 25 plus rowing shells something in that order? I think those numbers need to be checked and confirmed as the numbers, and I recall.</p>
<p>Q1: Where is the marina planning to accommodate visitors and tourist mooring who would not necessarily be familiar with the local traffic pattern and different water users in the area?</p> <p>Q2: 47 new slips with 12 of them (for the bigger boats) located in the navigation channel will have a big impact in the flow of traffic - how will reducing the channel size help to minimize the potential conflict?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b></p> <p>Q1: Visitors are assigned moorage slips, within the Marina, that are vacant when members are out using their vessels. The visiting vessels would enter and leave at one of the two proposed access channels which will improve safety significantly.</p> <p>Q2: 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. The new marina design eliminates vessels backing out directly into the channel. In 2019, under a separate permit, we removed four 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>
<p>How often are the RVYC yachts actually used? As someone that has observed the waterway for years and years, most yachts are PARKED there vs actually used more than once or twice a year. I am extremely confused how this project be approved to take away waterway from us rowers that use it daily? To take away an environmentally friendly activity for people of all ages? To prevent</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> RVYC vessels are used year-round, but a casual observer may not see that. Some vessels are in sheds and it is difficult to see if they are there or not. All vessels leaving the marina need to file a sailing plan stating how long they are away. Vacant slips are usually filled by other members with vessels on the moorage waiting list who want to spend time in Coal Harbour. The marina looks full, but there is a lot of movement. In fact, it is club policy that members vessels must</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
and limit the ability to teach and bring new people to a sport?	<p>leave the marina at least four times per year. We want the marina for people who are boaters and use their vessels.</p> <p>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 to safely use the channel.</p>
For Mr. Jupp. What is minimum cost for someone to join the Yacht Club, and moor their yacht at the Coal Harbour Marina on an annual basis?	<p><b>RVYC:</b> Moorage is charged at \$.72 per Sq Ft per month for open moorage. The minimum cost for joining the club is zero, as a junior member. Members who join as adults pay a joining fee based on age. If they require moorage, they are placed on a waiting list. This Coal Harbour wait list already has 300 members on it. It can take anywhere from three to twenty years to be assigned moorage.</p>
Is it not true that the costs of this project by the RVYC is hefty and to reduce the costs to the wealthy individuals that can afford to pay the \$150K per slip plus membership, they are taking away space from us rowers to use the harbour/channel to subsidize their parking lot? How can this be allowed? How can the priority of big expensive yachts that already litter the harbour be chosen over recreational use of the water way? *	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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 who will occupy the 47 new slips are 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>The members will pay the total cost of this project and it has been approved by over 80% of the voting membership.</p>
Has the RVYC already sold off the 47 yacht berth slips they intend to add as a part of this expansion? *	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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>
<b>Safety</b>	
The RVYC has been adamant that this expansion will not only benefit 47 local yacht owners but also visiting yachters who can stay for up to 2 weeks. What plan does RVYC have to ensure that these visitors understand the unique safety concerns with respect to rowers in the channel?	<p><b>RVYC:</b> RVYC has a campaign in progress, aimed at members, to promote awareness of and safety for rowing skulls and is committed to improving and expanding this program. Visitors are assigned moorage slips within the marina that are vacant when members are out using their vessels. The visiting vessels would enter and leave at one of</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	the two proposed access channels which will improve safety significantly.
<p>Many of the questions and concerns you have heard from rowers regarding channel access for slips located on K float are due to near misses with the folks across the channel. Happy to have you hear our concerns over these slips and hoping if this float is approved you have a successful education program with all Coal Harbour users that will benefit members of RVYC, VRC and all other parties in the harbour.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> From a safety concern perspective an awareness and education plan and the creation of a rowing traffic scheme have been identified as best practises to promote safety. RVYC has offered to work with the rowers and other channel users to develop these mitigative measures. VRC agreed on the benefits of these mitigative measures however RVYC awaits a response from VRC on these matters.</p>
<p>I was rowing along the South side of the channel on Tuesday morning. A RVYC yacht came out and travelled dead center down the channel, squeezing me further to the south side. How are you going to make sure the rowers have dedicated space going forward, once you narrow the channel to FISA size lanes (appropriate for experienced rowers in a fully controlled environment?)</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The administrative navigational channel is 63.4 m wide accommodating 36.4 m (representing 57% of the available administrative channel) for recreational and commercial vessels and 27 m for rowing (representing 43% of the available administrative channel). Under common law rowers have the right to row throughout the entire 63.4 m width provided they do so in a safe manner considering other users.</p>
<b>Technical Studies</b>	
<p>To RVYC, how can you state 65 metres is the width of the channel at VRC's marina when this distance is only at the very, very end of the course where rowers stop?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The VRC recently expanded its E dock into the channel and the perpendicular distance from E dock to the opposing water lot on the south shore is 65 m. Their suggested channel width of 80m would result in VRC having to remove part of their own expansion.</p>
<p>How can you equate the Montlake Cut in Seattle to a model for Coal Harbour for rowing when the Cut is bounded by concrete on both sides, no boats and is used primarily for transiting between Lake Union and Lake Washington and twice a year for races without marine traffic and is heavily monitored?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The Montlake Cut is recognized as part of a very active multiuse waterway as defined by the Lake Washington Rowing Scheme. Both rowing skulls and commercial and marine traffic use this area and share the waterway. On occasion the areas are closed for racing. The Montlake cut is 45m wide and the Coal Harbour Administrative Channel is 63.4 m wide.</p>
<p>Given tide, wind and steering challenges, does the RVYC seriously think that it is acceptable for two rowing shells travelling in opposite direction to be separated by only 9.5 metres as stated by Russ Tyson, given that there would be no buoys and this is even less than the apocryphal international rowing lane?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> If two rowing skulls are traveling in opposite directions the total distance separating the 2 skulls is 36.4 m or 119 feet.</p> <p>If rowers were in training and had 2 rowing skulls travelling in one direction and 2 traveling in the other direction, they would have 9.4 m (31 feet) separation distance between them follows The</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>port authority-designated channel of 63.4m (208.4 feet) supports both scenarios.</p> <p>All users of the channel are responsible for the safe operation of their vessels and that includes the rowers. All evidence suggests that with reasonable precautions by all users the channel should be safe.</p> <p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> 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>I am a 3rd year rower at VRC. Please read this question verbatim and do not interpret. Most rowers, like me, are novice - not Olympians. I would like to know what sources you consulted that have indicated that an Olympic size rowing lane is appropriate for amateur rowers. In addition, I would like to know how you will ensure that no other traffic is in the lane at the same time as rowers, which is the same way an Olympic lane would work. Thank you.</p>	<p><b>RYVC:</b> Ok thank you and thank you for the question. Under the common law right of navigation rowers are allowed to row through the complete extent of 63.4 metres. We are not restricting your ability to row in Coal Harbour. As the VFPA had stated it is an administrative width that we used as a reference to accommodate both commercial and recreational use as well as rowing use in the harbour. But again, we have to recognize that you under common law, or any rower or any user of the waterway have a right to navigate within the entire 63.4 metre channel. And this was just an administrative function to ascertain whether all vessels and users could be accommodated based on existing standards that exist. The FISA guidelines are the international guidelines, as you acknowledge, however when we looked at benchmarks in other countries and</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>looked at the Canadian Amateur Rowing Association 13.5 metres as a rowing lane did come up. But at the end of the day if there is no multi-use or commercial recreational use happening in the channel you have two inbound two outbound rowing lanes plus 9.4 metres of separation and buffer to accommodate your rowing activities. Thank you.</p>
<p>How does the expansion plan mitigate for the impact on the channel safety for the rowing community? People learn at VRC and that takes a larger safety margin that is greater. Many hundreds of people have experienced the benefits of healthy activity and the beauty of the waters while learning the skills of rowing in VRC in Coal Harbour, without having to own a boat. That is social accessibility.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> If two rowing skulls are traveling in opposite directions the total distance separating the 2 skulls is 36.4 m or 119 feet.</p> <p>If rowers were in training and had 2 rowing skulls travelling in one direction and 2 traveling in the other direction, they would have 9.4 m 31 feet) separation distance between them follows. The port authority-designated channel of 63.4m (208.4 feet) supports both scenarios.</p> <p>All users of the channel are responsible for the safe operation of their vessels and that includes the rowers. All evidence suggests that with reasonable precautions by all users the channel should be safe.</p> <p>We understand that the channel width in front of the VRC marina is currently 65m wide.</p>
<p>Why did the technical studies conducted by Typlan Planning and Management focus on "Rules of Racing" and FISA racing regulations for rowers - the Coal Harbour waterway is not a racing site as has been stated by the Vancouver Rowing Club on numerous occasions - in both written letters to the port and via the previous engagement process. The validity of the these measures as appropriate safety measures are in question - does the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club commit to more appropriate safety reviews? Given this is not a racing site but rather a site used for new and recreational rowers to learn to row additional safety buffers and extra care are required for yachters and rowers to coexist.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> Thank you, well we've kind of answered the question. We just referenced the FISA guidelines as a proxy. But we also note in those same guidelines they do talk about training requirements, I believe it's rule 56, and it talks about one lane going one way and one outbound land and one inbound lane separated by another lane or swimming lane of equal distance so that the skulls do not impact on each other. The bottom line is we have one outbound lane, one inbound lane and then a safety lane, or a swimming lane, of 36.4 metres which is equivalent to the recreational and commercial lane that exists in the harbour. We have to understand and recognize that this is a multi-use channel, and we have to accommodate through design various marine type activities. All of which requires certain widths to accommodate use.</p>
<p>Russ mentioned "best practices" in "sharing a multi-use waterways". Please elaborate as to</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> RVYC has been working with the port authority and local stakeholders since 2017 to</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>how having one group park in what should be a shared space is a best practice of sharing a waterway.</p>	<p>consider community interests in the project design and as part of the review process. We believe that there is space for everyone to safely use the channel.</p> <p>The VRC 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>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>From a safety concern perspective an awareness and education plan and the creation of a rowing traffic scheme have been identified as best practises to promote safety. RVYC has offered to work with the rowers and other channel users to develop these mitigative measures. VRC agreed on the benefits of these mitigative measures however RVYC awaits a response from VRC on these matters.</p>
<p>What is current boundary based on? In what document?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> Thanks Pam, so in terms of the boundary I'm going to take that to be the boundary of the lease area that Royal Van is currently operating under versus the area that they're looking to include in their lease, maybe we need some clarification on that. But I guess what that is based on, that's based on a lease agreement with the port authority.</p> <p><b>Moderator:</b> Ok thanks, it does seem to be there is a few questions from others around the actual water lot lease line so they actually appear to be some pretty technical questions that may need some follow up. What I'll do then is</p> <p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Maybe I can just add, typically the lease areas are based on, obviously negotiation and discussion, but they take into account the areas that are needed for the lessee to operate. So, in order to maneuver boats, to gain access to utilize their lease area. And do it safely.</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>You stated that the expansion would have positive impacts on the local economy. Was a study conducted to quantify this potential impact?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> No specific economic benefit study was undertaken in accordance with the British Columbia Input Output Model but 47 boats slips assumes an additional 100 consumers frequenting small businesses in the area as well as hiring trades personnel to maintain the vessels.</p> <p>This is a \$12 million project will create a significant number of jobs during construction.</p> <p>The environmental improvements benefit habitat in the Coal Harbour basin and the new infrastructure will improve aesthetics for neighbours in the harbour. Also, the RVYC Coal Harbour marina provides significant employment within our community and supports many small businesses in the area.</p> <p>There are also additional lease revenues paid to the port authority for their ongoing operations. The lease agreements are negotiated after the project is approved.</p>
<p>The Coal harbour area has existed with a certain capacity to support vessels, particularly motor vessels. Why is RVYC not considering expansion elsewhere. When will VFPA and the City define the full capacity of the coal harbour basin. (particularly if sustainability is a consideration - given the majority of the slips proposed at RVYC are considered for motor vessels which discharge oils and gray water continuously)</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> We considered our Jericho facility as an alternate 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.</p> <p>RVYC is committed to minimizing effects on the environment and we believe all marine users in the basin are committed to the same. RVYC vessels do not discharge oil and grey water continuously. There are strict rules in the club about discharging any deleterious material into the water. Vessel safety checks are conducted regularly, and vessels must pass inspections in order to remain in RVYC marinas.</p> <p>We do a shoreline clean up around the Coal Harbour basin every year. We also have safety checks that we check the inside of the boats to make sure their bilges are clean, and that people are doing good housekeeping practices with that. And one thing that we are really excited about is we purchased a Seabin machine, you can actually go online and look at the Seabin, and it's a machine that sits in the water and it collects all the surficial debris in and around the area very gently</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>and you get about a five gallon pail you know microplastics and bits and pieces that are floating around in the basin and we empty that several times a day. And that's been a great success its cleaning up all the debris that comes through a little bit of the oil sheen that shows up throughout the basin.</p> <p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> Vessels within Coal Harbour are regulated by Transport Canada and cannot discharge oil or grey water into the marine environment. For more information on compliance with sewage discharge regulations, refer to the Transport Canada's Complying with Sewage Discharge Regulations.</p>
<p>When you view the larger on water area, there are two existing navigation fixed aids, if you draw the line from these navigation aids... you will note that RVYC docks and boat house fall within this existing navigation area, including an existing navigation aid on one of the boat house in RVYC. Why then does RVYC require to expand beyond this existing navigation area (which has existed for many years)</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The existing navigational aids are not associated with our marina. They mark navigational hazards for all marine users.</p> <p>We have a commercial lease in this waterway that we are paying for. That lease comes with obligations and rights between the port authority and the RVYC just like the 100's of port authority tenants in the harbour, including our neighbours to the west.</p> <p>After lengthy and careful planning, we have applied to the port authority for a project to expand and renew our Marina. VRC expanded their marina in 2017 under the same process.</p> <p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The Navigational aids mentioned within Coal Harbour mark the shoal off Deadman Island. These aids are for navigational purposes only and do not mark the extremity or lease area of any existing facility in Coal Harbour. The Navigational Aids on RVYC docks are private markers and owned by the yacht club.</p>
<p>RVYC has drawn their boundary at the edge of "K" float. if vessels are moored will they not protrude out into the channel further</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> All vessels on the proposed "K" Float will be moored inside the leased water lot boundary as shown in plans contained in our application.</p>
<p>The Montlake Cut is NOT relevant. UW rowers do not train IN the Cut, they row through it to get to practice areas in larger bodies of water on either side. *</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> The Montlake Cut is recognized as part of a very active multiuse waterway as defined by the Lake Washington Rowing Scheme. Both rowing skulls and commercial and marine traffic use this area and share the waterway. On occasion the areas are closed for racing. The Montlake cut is</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	45m wide and the Coal Harbour Administrative Channel is 63.4 m wide.
Yachters are likely referring to the Opening Day race (and perhaps the Head of the Lake), which race through the Cut on a specific day. But rowers do not as a rule train there. *	<b>RVYC:</b> The Montlake Cut is recognized as part of a very active multiuse waterway as defined by the Lake Washington Rowing Scheme. Both rowing skulls and commercial and marine traffic use this area and share the waterway. On occasion the areas are closed for racing. The Montlake cut is 45m wide and the Coal Harbour Administrative Channel is 63.4 m wide.
Can you please provide an accurate, to-scale, high-resolution readable map that shows the channel? This should include the 4 proposed rowing lanes, the safety lane in-between, and the maneuvering lanes between the rowing lanes on both south and north sides of the channel and the moored vessels. The maps in the proposal documents are low-resolution copies in a PDF file, difficult to read and interpret. Such a map should also show K-float and proposed lease-line, up to which boats may be moored. A second such map at the same scale, showing the channel as it is today, would allow the public to see the current state and compare it to the proposed future state.	<b>RVYC:</b> All documents required by the port authority to support our application are available for review on our project webpage and the port authority website.
Why has the safety lane between the rowing lanes been reduced from the width in the FISA guidelines to a width of 9.4 m, which is less safe? According to the FISA manual you quoted the neutral lane is supposed to be the width of a full lane (13.5 m) marked with large buoys (40-50cm diameter).	<b>RVYC:</b> If training is occurring with one inbound and one outbound skull the separation zone is 36.4 m or 119ft. If two inbound and two outbound lanes are being used for training, 9.4 m (31 feet) must be made available for separation.  Commercial and recreational marine traffic transit the administrative channel to access marinas in Coal Harbour so large buoy markers are not conducive to this multi-use channel.
The total area of the RVYC Lease is roughly 731,000ft sq. What percentage of that area is subject to redevelopment (the orange project boundary)? What is the additional area being sought for new lease? As a percentage how many additional slips are resulting from the new lease are vs. the existing project area?	<b>RVYC:</b> The proposed marina, after the proposed expansion, would be 97,305.75 sqft which is a 13 % increase in area.

Question/ Comment	Response
<p>The existing irregular Water Lot Lease line was established some years ago and presumably based on some reasonable consideration for the same stakeholder engagement and usage constraints. What was the rationale for establishing the irregular shape of the current lease line and is that same rationale being respected here?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> The current lease was issued on September 15, 2003, prior to the amalgamation of the Port Authorities.</p>
<p>The existing aesthetic of the irregular shaped lease boundary appear to blend well with the surrounding natural shoreline. Reconfiguring the existing lease line to a what is essentially a parallel lane will impact the aerial view of the Harbour from an elevated perspective. Have these stakeholders been consulted such as Harbour Air and the Coal Harbour Community Association and condo owners?</p>	<p><b>Vancouver Fraser Port Authority:</b> 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"> <li>• City of Vancouver</li> <li>• Vancouver Parks Board</li> <li>• Transport Canada</li> <li>• Vancouver Rowing Club</li> <li>• Mainstream Properties</li> <li>• SWA Vancouver Hotel Nominee Inc.</li> </ul> <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. All other community members are encouraged to provide feedback on the proposed project through this public engagement process.</p>
<p>I would appreciate if you read this question in full and did not paraphrase it. Safety concerns have been raised through this process by community members, and that is the focus of my question: The rowing channel in RVYC's proposal is based off FISA buoyed racecourse guidelines and a concrete two-way channel (the Montlake Cut in Seattle). There are clear differences between these environments and coal harbour, as has been brought to RVYC's attention by community members from the rowing club (e.g. the existence of traffic across the harbour from numerous slips, as opposed to controlled two-way traffic flows). These differences create hazards to community recreational users. How has RVYC addressed the safety concerns raised by the rowing community?</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> And just as a preface, safety is everyone's concern, especially in the marine environment. In terms of the Montlake cut the actual width of the Montlake cut is 45 meters and the proposed navigational channel in Coal Harbour is 63.4 meters. So, an additional 18 meters inter-relationship to the two comparisons. From a safety perspective, we have been working on this project for over 10 years, and we've looked at best practices that we could find that would suggest collaboration and co-use of multi-use waterways.</p> <p>And I'm just going to reference, as I did, in the last webinar, two documents. One is a multiple use waterway guide management guideline. And the second one is shared waterways, safety of recreational and commercial vessels in the marine transportation system. These documents talk</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>about the emergence of paddle sports in commercial and recreational based waterways. They highlight that the issues are compounding because of the growth of all sports, and they've done some studies to ascertain. What are the best management practices to deal with safety? We've taken those best management practices and incorporated them into our program.</p> <p>So, for just some background, the key issue associated with any multi-use waterway is education and awareness of both sides of the fence, whether it be paddle sport, boaters, understanding of the rules and regulations that commercial and recreational users have to adhere to, and vice versa. The sensitivities associated with paddle sports rowing and kayaking in these multi-use waterways were waves and visibility as key issues. At the end of the day, one of the key methods of promoting safety going forward is establishing a comprehensive education and awareness program, basin wide, so that all user groups can understand the issues of each user group and protect those user groups in perpetuity.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the RVYC is currently doing that work, and, as Craig mentioned, this morning, or in today's presentation, we have also initiated similar types activities within the club itself, but what we have recommended as part of our program is to do a basin wide educational awareness program that incorporates issues associated with all multiple users of the waterway, so that we can share the waterway, collectively and safely.</p> <p>Another aspect of what can be done is called a rowing traffic scheme. There's a rowing traffic scheme established in Lake Washington and what that basically defines is an area in which rowers should be rowing and which commercial use should be using. Suffice it to say, if people are aware of these areas and are aware of the differences between uses, safety will improve.</p> <p>So, based on those two things, we have recommended the creation of an education and awareness program for the entire Coal Harbor as part of our mitigation strategy and the potential</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	<p>implementation of a rowing traffic scheme to address safety issues. We acknowledge that the implementation of this requires numerous groups to come to the table to facilitate how this is implemented. But they are the two best management practices to address the issue of safety in a multi-use environment.</p> <p>However, we have yet to receive any support from the rowing community to become involved with these best practices.</p>
<p>You have referred to the “Guide for Multiple Use Waterway Management” as the bible. The Guide states that you should make reasoned, principled and science-based decisions. In considering rower safety you have referenced FISA guidelines with respect to rowing lanes (which are not applicable to the needs of recreational rowers) but what efforts have you made to look at rower safety from a scientific/engineering perspective? Taking into account things such as human factors (response times) and sightlines.</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> 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. The entire application is based on reasoned, principled and science-based decisions. There is ample evidence and technical support for all the recommendations made in this application. We believe that there is space for everyone to safely use the channel.</p> <p>The VRC 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>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>From a safety concern perspective an awareness and education plan and the creation of a rowing traffic scheme have been identified as best practises to promote safety. RVYC has offered to work with the rowers and other channel users to develop these mitigative measures. VRC agreed on the benefits of these mitigative measures however RVYC awaits a response from VRC on these matters.</p>
<p><b>Comments and questions to facilitator/ organizer</b></p>	
<p>I submitted questions by email in advance that were not addressed</p>	<p><b>RVYC:</b> We requested that all questions be submitted by 3:00 pm on the day of the webinar. We address all questions that were submitted before the start of the webinar. If your question was not addressed, then you question was submitted after the start time of the webinar but</p>

Question/ Comment	Response
	will be captured and addressed in this document and recorded as part of the public comment period.
MODERATOR: again, PLEASE read questions verbatim; do not say things like "I'm not sure so-and-so can answer that". Please let the questions stand on their own merit *	<b>RVYC:</b> The reason that we used this approach was to make sure that we addressed as many questions as possible. This is not the only opportunity to provide your input. If you have additional feedback or questions you can complete the feedback form that is available online and you can send in specific comments or questions either to the project or the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority directly by email or phone. And all the questions and comments will be compiled with the answers and those will be shared together.