



SEASPAN VANCOUVER DRYDOCK WATER LOT PROJECT

Public Engagement Summary Report
November 19, 2021

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY MEETING TRANSCRIPT AND QUESTION RESPONSES

In addition to availability of project information on the website, recordings, transcripts and responses to unanswered questions from the community information meetings were posted on the website and available for viewing and download.

This information is also available at <https://drydockprojects.com/community-meetings/>

Q&A Chat Transcript – July 13 community meeting



Vancouver Drydock – Proposed Water Lot Project July 13 Community Information Meeting Q&A Chat Transcript

(Please note, other than email addresses, names have been redacted for privacy reasons.)

- 13 Seaspan and VFPA representatives
- 55 community members
- 29 individuals provided comments, questions & feedback

#	Participant	Comment / Question
1	Participant 1	You were supposed to inform 7000 households and no one at 172 and 162 victory shipyard were notified. Why is that?
2	Moderator	Thank you everyone for alerting to the audio issue.
3	Participant 2	Will all of the 100 jobs be filled by City of North Vancouver residents?
4	Participant 1	What about the neighborhood? Does our health mean anything to Shipyard or all for profit
5	Participant 3	The 100 jobs is just a transfer from the existing operations from the other facility to the dry docks. So it is not an addition, correct?
6	Participant 4	Why can't Seaspan expand to the east of the drydock instead?
7	Participant 5	How long will this take? And will you be working 24/7 without any regards to your neighbors as you do now?
8	Participant 3	Can you zoom out to see the entire existing lease & water lot?
9	Participant 6	Why is the east not in the photo
10	Participant 5	So the careens are in front of the playground where the children play????!! SERIOUSLY!!!!
11	Participant 1	They are all for profit and don't care for people well being
12	Participant 2	How will residents be compensated for the loss of view and reduction in property values?
13	Participant 5	This neighborhood was planned very carefully and clearly you do not care about the impacts on the community and our health
14	Participant 5	I think you need to go back to the drawing board
15	Participant 6	What is the white building
16	Participant 1	@P. how are you trying to minimize the effect on neighborhood?
17	Participant 7	The area in front of the rail yard is fully utilized? It appears to be empty space.
18	Participant 6	Utilized with what
19	Participant 8	How is that area fully utilized? With what?



#	Participant	Comment / Question
20	Participant 6	Can't you put one of the smaller careen east and one west. If not why not please
21	Participant 5	unbelievable!
22	Participant 8	Moving further away does nothing to mitigate noise.
23	Participant 5	Community????!!!
24	Participant 9	This neighborhood seems like the real definition of a mixed-use community, but let's not forget that Seaspan has been there a whole lot longer than the first luxury condo. Didn't you say 100 years?
25	Participant 1	We are already hear the noise a block away and smell the chemicals, the studies are paid by Seaspan
26	Participant 6	P. there is a compromise here Let's find one please.
27	Participant 2	How much additional tax revenue will this generate for the city of North Vancouver? How will the significant loss in property taxes due to declining values be offset?
28	Participant 5	So, because they've been here 100 years you're saying our health doesn't matter??
29	Participant 6	Why in the after pic the barge is missing
30	Participant 2	That is horrible
31	Participant 10	can you please bring the photos back to get a better and slower look?
32	Participant 11	You should have think about multi-generational operations when Seaspan decided to sell the lands to developers
33	Participant 6	It's all too fast
34	Participant 6	What kind of lens was used
35	Participant 5	These photos are not correct a all
36	Participant 3	Has the Port of Vancouver evaluated and approved similar projects whereby there is a residential community immediately adjacent to a proposed new or expansion industrial facility? If so, what is the distance to the residential communities? What precedents to we have regarding any permitted approval process in this regard?
37	Participant 7	Just because the original docks have been here for 100 years, this area was rezoned into a community.
38	Participant 5	Exactly!!! It was a planned community
39	Participant 6	Please go back to the walkway photo
40	Participant 12	Your views are not lined up with the actual drawing lines. They are skewed to reduce the wall of structures.
41	Participant 5	Your pictures are not correct at all
42	Participant 5	Positive????!!!

#	Participant	Comment / Question
43	Participant 1	You are proud? what kind of human being are you P.?
44	Participant 13	Even a tugboat light can be seen
45	Participant 6	Why don't you move white building in front of the w building to the other side of the closest pier
46	Participant 2	You make it look beautiful, but it's not. Reality is we all be starting at barges and cranes all day long
47	Moderator	You were supposed to inform 7000 households and no one at 172 and 162 victory shipyard were notified. Why is that?
48	Participant 11	Pictures are not true
49	Participant 5	Anyone else feel bamboozled?
50	Participant 1	Seaspan is trying to snick this in, they know it is wrong and trying to make it pleas table
51	Participant 2	Please don't call it the best solution. You haven't consulted the community at all.
52	Participant 13	Agreed
53	Participant 7	What will be done about paint overspray? Vehicles in the neighbourhood get covered in paint droplets.
54	Participant 1	WTF? more noise? LOL
55	Participant 5	Seriously? Noise is already 24/7
56	Participant 6	Where is the current noise meter located
57	Participant 11	Really... Do you live in the neighbourhood?
58	Participant 7	Last night, work at 8pm reached nearly 88db in the corridor of the spirit trail.
59	Participant 1	Are you guys willing to come and live in the neighborhood? Or it is good only for the us?
60	Participant 2	All studies done by Seaspan - lots of bias here. The Port Authority needs to do an independent study
61	Participant 1	TB is taking a 2 weeks vacation. I wonder if it was paid by Seaspan?
62	Moderator	I would like to ask everyone to please be respectful this evening. We are going to do our best to address as many questions as possible. Thank you.
63	Participant 6	Again we must find a compromise. As invested stakeholders we need to also be respected
64	Participant 5	Stop making excuses please
65	Participant 5	What about the marine life? We see seals there all the time!

#	Participant	Comment / Question
66	Participant 8	Why is the air emission permit process from 2017 still not completed with Metro Vancouver? Did the 2017 application include this current expansion in the permit proposal? Because if it did, it was never disclosed at the 2018 Seaspan hosted meeting for the community at the Pinnacle Hotel. In your NS News article of 2017, it was reported the permit process would be completed in about 6 months. Why would we accept a proposal for expansion when there is no current permit for maximum air emissions in place?
67	Participant 2	Two shifts? What are the working hours?
68	Participant 4	So... what's in it for all the residents that live by the drydock; more noise, lights at night, more debris & dirt coating all the buildings, reduced property value? what is Seaspan going to do for the local residents?
69	Participant 5	I would like you to answer L's question regarding your permit as well.
70	Participant 1	Please answer L's question
71	Participant 2	We should get compensated 50% of our property value for the inconvenience
72	Participant 14	With the piling, what about the integrity of the local buildings? Will you be compensating for damages incurred??
73	Participant 5	Agreed
74	Participant 2	How loud will the piling installation be?
75	Participant 3	I've seen people swimming in the area. Have you evaluated any hazard to humans?
76	Participant 14	What will the increase noise levels be during the construction? Decibel value please!
77	Participant 8	Pile driving for Six weeks, 7 am - 8 pm every day but Sunday according to your reports
78	Participant 9	Did condo buyers not have a ,Buyer beware clause when they bought their units? If they were expecting peace and quiet like the suburbs they should not have bought in the Shipyards District!
79	Participant 2	Agreed, pre and post construction engineering analysis of local buildings should be paid for by Seaspan. As well as compensation for any damage
80	Participant 1	We expected what it was there already but not what you are doing now @B
81	Participant 5	B, there was a lot off community planning going into this development. When you move to the waterfront you expect your council to protect your community

#	Participant	Comment / Question
82	Participant 11	@BP - There were no discussion on expansion
83	Participant 15	Although expansion east may not be optimal or desired by season, it seems to be still workable and probably the model ideal for community consideration if expansion is required at all. I did not hear that eastward expansion was not possible - just not desired or optimal by Seaspan.
84	Participant 5	If you were an owner B and had a stake in his you might understand
85	Participant 16	Just because the increased noise and emissions fall within guidelines does not mean that they will not have a significant impact on the community.
86	Participant 2	Who will make the decision to approve or deny the application?
87	Participant 5	They don't even have a permit for the noise
88	Participant 3	Comments should be submitted before July 24th
89	Participant 3	https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/evaluations/document/139510
90	Participant 24	I was not notified and I live in 172
91	Participant 1	No one got it. stop lying
92	Participant 11	Not a good excuse
93	Participant 22	Notifications were lacking. I follow Seaspan Shipyards on Twitter and nothing said about this meeting
94	Participant 5	Propaganda
95	Participant 24	We get a clear notice for ,filming but not this?
96	Participant 5	Send me your email if you wold like to sign the petition to stop this. irene@askirene.ca
97	Participant 7	The 1 sided trophy building was engineered to act as a sound barrier not only for its residents, but for the other buildings in the neighbourhood as the dry-docks were located to the east. What guarantees and investment into the community will Seaspan & the Port of Vancouver be making to soundproof the neighbourhood from work on the docks now in front of the buildings, rather than behind the wall?
98	Participant 5	Thank you G
99	Participant 5	Really? We already breathe in paint and dust. You're wearing masks, we're not!
100	Participant 5	Excellent????!!
101	Participant 29	Where have projects like this been completed in Vancouver near residential areas and what was the impact on living conditions for local inhabitants? What happened to property value in those areas?

#	Participant	Comment / Question
102	Participant 3	Can you provide the capital cost of all the potential sittings? All the Go and NoGo options
103	Participant 9	I am 100% in favor of Seaspan's project. I live in North Vancouver and regularly visit the Shipyards area. What is most interesting for me is seeing the shipyard in action - seeing a ship getting pulled into the dry dock, various cranes carrying equipment - it's all very interesting. The fact that it is real, not some historical relic, adds tremendous character to the community. Having more real shipyard activity will be even better than it is today.
104	Participant 5	Why can't you expand at Pemberton?
105	Participant 7	@PH. Rebuild the pier.
106	Participant 11	Try harder to find another solution
107	Participant 7	so that it is structurally sound
108	Participant 5	Do you work for Seaspan B?
109	Participant 17	Wouldn't adding piling to improve the structural strength of the east pier solve the problems?
110	Participant 16	Could you not build a pier to the east that met your requirements?
111	Participant 2	Why can't you build a better structurally better pier to the east?
112	Participant 18	This expansion is not environmentally safe and the dust and paint and noise will get even worse. And we were not notified by Seaspan at all about this. This is a residential area and growing to be more residential. Its unwise to be expanding to the west when residential is growing in that area. The Port of Vancouver should not allow this expansion
113	Participant 4	So why can't Seaspan build a new pier or reinforce the existing pier to accommodate the expanded work to the east side?
114	Participant 6	Could you answer my question about the white structure
115	Participant 9	Who promised the owners of these waterfront condos that their views would never change? Was that the Port of Vancouver?
116	Participant 7	Residents now work from home in daylight hours. How will we be able to work during pile-driving?
117	Participant 6	There must be a compromise here
118	Participant 5	Do you honestly believe what you just said??!
119	Participant 7	Sound travels over water. 40metres will not minimize sound travel.
120	Participant 12	2 shifts, how long are the shifts and what are the start and end hours?
121	Participant 15	It seems like reinforcing the pier to the east (where the luxury yacht is docked) may be a better alternative - why is not this considered to make east expansion viable?
122	Participant 4	What a lame answer to compensation issue!!

#	Participant	Comment / Question
123	Participant 1	All their answers are lame
124	Participant 17	I was exposed to pile driving for some of the new bridges during the Hwy 1 expansion ... it is impossible to open windows during the time if you WFH and you need to spend time on calls due to the constant noise during the day
125	Participant 1	they are not answering
126	Participant 9	Audio is fine
127	Participant 19	Are you making, or going to make, use of new technologies to reduce dust with f.e. sand blasting and painting ?
128	Participant 20	I believe you've changed your blasting practices to a more environmentally friendly process, reducing dust in the area. Do you intend to continue using that method?
129	Participant 6	Again please tell us where the compromise is
130	Participant 5	There is a playground here, did you even consider that?
131	Participant 6	Surely you place one dry dock on either side
132	Participant 11	what about all piling and construction, will that not impact the marine life? Sure it does
133	Participant 4	so you're planning to evict the marine life?
134	Participant 5	Absolutely it does
135	Participant 20	Would these drydocks take more water space than what Burrard dry docks took?
136	Participant 1	Pollution is one the reasons?
137	Participant 18	R - It's not just marine life but people life health will go down. The noise itself will effect marine life. Majority of the people cannot even handle the noise levels right now. Your studies are false.
138	Participant 25	I just walked outside onto my patio with my notebook. I am in one of the 01 suites in Trophy. At this moment, the noise/sound coming from the current work is so loud I cannot here this presentation on my notebook! I am not exaggerating.
139	Participant 12	Has any noise measurement been taken between the Trophy & Cascade buildings at higher suite levels. This would take into account the amplification caused by the tunnel-effect of sound bouncing between the two towers.
140	Participant 6	Why are they working earlier than that then
141	Participant 1	You are not answering any of the questions.
142	Participant 6	Why can I not ask a question
143	Participant 6	Please unmute me
144	Participant 7	@PB. There has not been a community within 60metres for the last 100 years.

7

#	Participant	Comment / Question
145	Participant 7	This area was rezoned, and Seaspan will need to adapt to that.
146	Participant 1	Just all these disturbance for 65Mil?
147	Participant 1	rediculous
148	Participant 2	If you are proud to be part of the community then stop encroaching on the residential areas.
149	Participant 18	Seaspan has ignored the community totally on this project.
150	Participant 7	Will the port of Vancouver and Seaspan pay for independent engineers (picked by the community) to monitor impacts on the residential buildings.
151	Participant 21	will this create more local jobs?
152	Participant 1	@A, they don't know
153	Participant 18	D I've worked with pile driving. The noise is very loud. I don't know what school of science you went to but it's very loud.
154	Participant 5	Ana, their employees come from all over Canada and the US. No benefit to North Vancouver residents directly
155	Participant 8	Why did the Port of Vancouver inform us in writing that ,The proposed expansion plans of the dry dock operations were submitted to Metro Vancouver AS PART OF THE ORIGINAL AIR QUALITY PERMIT SUBMISSION and will be captured in the air quality permit once finalized? This contradicts what you just told us, and suggests this was planned as far back as 2017 and was not disclosed at the 2018 public meeting. Please explain.
156	Participant 1	The guy is on vacation
157	Participant 11	who is the director of planning and development
158	Participant 22	Why did your report include a very large barge in the aerial view when showing renderings? This barge is rarely there. It wasn't included in other renderings? Was it included to make it appear new proposed operation would extend no further west than current operation? This is misleading.
159	Participant 23	Still can't believe that you have not fully answered the eastern pier option. At some time you WILL have to upgrade that pier to the extent of effective utilization of that water lot. So why are you then not upgrading that pier to allow for the more appropriate eastern expansion. It seems to meet your current needs so why not future with the new Drydocks.
160	Participant 11	TB is on vacation for the next two weeks and he is named as the supervisor. please give us another contact person in Port Authority
161	Participant 24	Yes, who do we contact other than TB?

#	Participant	Comment / Question
162	Participant 18	Hi C This expansion is not well thought out and should be cancelled. Its not environmentally safe for marine nor the residences that live in that area. The continued pollution including noise pollution is a major effect on people C do the right thing and don't allow for the expansion
163	Participant 25	As G has noted, every understands this is a mixed use residential area. Given how close all the residences are to the current docks, it is reasonable to ask why industrial would be mover "closer" to the residences, rather than east and "away" from them.
164	Participant 26	Regarding the water lot expansion to the west: 1) Has Port of Vancouver provided any early indication to Seaspan that this could be a reasonably acceptable solution? 2) To what extent will the western expansion and resulting operations increase impacts/disturbances to localized ocean water currents and circulation? Will it be similar to existing impacts but expanded 40 meters to the west? Thank you.
165	Participant 7	@PH. ,Moving further away. they are directly in front of the buildings rather than beside.
166	Participant 7	Sound TRAVELS over the water.
167	Participant 1	Are you guys planning to walk in the neighborhood? We like to show you how we will be affected
168	Participant 12	Your drawing of the new drydocks show only 2 cranes yet your document talks of 4 or more. Please advise what the count will actually be.
169	Participant 17	You skipped these two questions which are important:
170	Participant 18	CB with the Port of Vancouver. This project expansion has all the residences up in roar now and this expansion shouldn't be allowed.
171	Participant 17	Where have projects like this been completed in Vancouver near residential areas and what was the impact on living conditions for local inhabitants? What happened to property value in those areas? Can you provide the capital cost of all the potential sittings? All the Go and NoGo options
172	Participant 22	You said moving 40 meters south reduces noise. What decibel reduction would be achieved in moving 40 meters South? I presume you have an answer to this if you are making such a claim.
173	Participant 6	Utilized with what

#	Participant	Comment / Question
174	Participant 5	Can you please provide the contact information for the developer a the Port who will be looking at this applicaiton
175	Participant 2	Can we please have the Director of Planning and staff from the Port Authority meet with a group of residents at the site and have them justify even considering this project?
176	Participant 16	Do you have any quantitative data showing the reduction in noise level by moving out 40 meters?
177	Participant 6	What is the white building
178	Participant 5	So all the planning of development to ensure the noise and dirt are contained?
179	Participant 2	So the Port Authority disregards community?
180	Participant 1	You are not answering
181	Participant 7	@CB Residents here have spent their life savings on their homes here. Any impact is a significant hit to people's investments. Please ensure this is considered in any decision making.
182	Participant 19	can you tell us more about the jobs generated as a result of this expansion ? what type of jobs ? Local or expats ?
183	Participant 12	I expect the WHITE building to the east that people are asking about is probably the boat house, has a arched roof.
184	Participant 19	Have you ever thought about putting a roof over the dock ?
185	Participant 6	Thanks for answering that L Could that not be moved
186	Participant 7	Can the Washington's move their yacht and that space be utilized?
187	Participant 21	Do the kinds of vessels being repaired at Vancouver Drydock do anything to help Canada? Are they all barges? Are any of them mobilized to do environmental work or for the Navy?
188	Participant 22	Please explain why east of W building isn't an option
189	Participant 27	When s ship is anchored in Bravo and laying stern to the north it is very tight and sometimes dangerous for an inbound ship to get up the North Shore to berths on the North Shore
190	Participant 18	With PH answers it seems that people will never reach the moon and we would not have electric cars.
191	Participant 13	There is so much brown run off that must be impacting the marine life
192	Participant 1	@R, do you work for Aquarium and keep whales in activity?
193	Participant 2	How often do you look out for the marine life?
194	Participant 18	If ships have to slow down cause of effects on whales and thus why does R think that pilings will not be effecting marine life?
195	Participant 11	What about water pollution? I have seen dirty water contaminated with chemicals are released into the area. what's the impact and will that be increased with the proposed expansion?

10

#	Participant	Comment / Question
196	Participant 28	What were the other 3 sites mentioned? Why were they initially picked and why were they dismissed? What would be the cost to build on the east side?
197	Participant 6	What is currently in the white structure
198	Participant 18	So no noise Decibels testing nor environmental testing has been done it seems and no measurements have been done. This should be sent to the Federal Govt to stop this expansion.
199	Participant 11	We need her email address please?
200	Participant 7	Can you please provide contact information for T.
201	Participant 5	Can you please give us T's contact information
202	Participant 11	Please type the contact information in the Chat
203	Participant 1	What is T email address?
204	Participant 6	But why does the barge appear and disappear (in the renderings)
205	Participant 23	It should be made clear that, in addition to the two Drydocks there will probably be another floating ship moored on that pontoon. The 40 meter move of the Drydocks south just seems to now also allow you to keep that waterfront moorage which allows another floating ship to remain on that western waterfront side. So that's effectively 3 new ships in the west side. That's a lot of extra tugboat activity that also needs to be addressed.
206	Participant 27:	It appears expansion east is more expensive for Seaspan but plan could be modified to include access to the w building, True?
207	Port Authority	All - feedback and comments on this project can be sent directly to the Port at PER@portvancouver.com. Please and thank you.
208	Participant 11	No, we need Theresa's contact information
209	Participant 7	IT IS NOT FURTHER AWAY.
210	Moderator	Hi Everyone - Questions and comments to the Port can be sent to \PER@portvancouver.com
211	Participant 1	Is the decision made already by port authority and we are just wasting out time?
212	Participant 23	What form of previous discussion took place with the city of North North Vancouver? Did they support this western expansion.
213	Participant 18	So in the end PH it is feasible to move to the East side and avoid the West side. All things are possible but it seems that more engineering planning needs to be done and that is all. It may be more costly but doable to move to the East. This is what I am getting from your last answer

#	Participant	Comment / Question
214	Participant 3	Why the option further east was not included in the report? The one that you have indicated that it is not a solid pier to support operations. That is east of the W building Even to include it as NoGo option. This is the place where the Attessa III is usually parked. This gives the impression it was never considered as an alternative option.
215	Participant 7	Noise measurements taken from Esplanade near the rail yards has nothing to do with dB measurements taken in the community, and at the location of the residences. Will new studies be done (paid for by the Port / Seaspan) and conducted by independent consultants chosen by the community?
216	Participant 22	where can we find the recording
217	Participant 22	Why is this new lighting system not being used in current operations?
218	Participant 17	For the people looking to contact Theresa Rawle directly you can try theresa.rawle@portvancouver.com
219	Participant 11	Thank you K
220	Participant 28	Do you have an example of where the Port Authority granted approval to expand an existing operation into an existing residential area?
221	Participant 27	Have you approached Allied Shipbuilders to lease, and expand there
222	Participant 8	The 2017 estimated emissions were 77 tonnes/year of volatile organic compound, 22 tones/year of particulates and 3 tonnes/year of metals. Will these numbers change with the expansion? What were your last actual reported emissions results? How do we know this estimate is still valid?
223	Participant 18	CB what is your email too.
224	Participant 15	If the peripheral / secondary site for shipbuilding (white building) is moved to Pemberton so all shipbuilding happens at one site (Pemberton) and dry dock happens at this location with eastward expansion, it seems like this would be way more efficient for Seaspan and also consider feedback from the community which we should note is decidedly against this proposal.
225	Participant 1	Why are you so cheery N? Nothing fun here
226	Participant 3	What is the noise impact of the acoustic effect between Cascade W and E in the beach area. It has a "U" shape if you add the Atrium buildings East and West at the back?

#	Participant	Comment / Question
227	Participant 18	CB it seems from Seaspan answers that the studies done (noise and environmental) are not independent and not even done with integrity nor scientific, the pictures shown for the expansion are photo shop to make it small looking, S and P answers seems to justify my conclusion that studies are not properly done.
228	Participant 17	This is the extent of the "noise study": BKL evaluated existing noise conditions by performing a week long noise measurement at a residential balcony overlooking the Project starting from late February 2021. The noise measurements captured various drydock activities including vessel arrivals, and ultra-high pressure washing (UHP) which was identified as the loudest activity that would occur at Vancouver Drydock. From: https://drydockprojects.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/9-Environmental-Noise-Assessment.pdf
229	Participant 7	If this moves forward, and this is a ,multigenerational, private business. What future expansions can we expect in our community?
230	Participant 8	Sean, you didn't answer the actual emissions question. What ACTUAL air emission results can you share, and when were they taken?
231	Participant 7	Extrapolation of dB levels is not an accurate study. Will there be a more thorough independent study conducted.
232	Participant 23	Will the port authority consider adding an air quality monitor to the shipyards area. The current monitor is in Mahon park. I don't think the Mahon park monitor accurately represent air quality in our lower lonsdale shipyards area
233	Participant 5	But why no commitment to your neighbors for clean air and quality blivig
234	Participant 11	Why not?
235	Participant 3	Residents: can you email me.
236	Participant 3	joseluisandino@gmail.com
237	Participant 1	We need to have an email group and communicate.
238	Participant 23	It is in Mahon park. To far away
239	Participant 1	Please all send an email to J to arrange for a community protest
240	Participant 5	Respectfully, there is no air monitoring here and there needs to be before this expansion can move forward
241	Participant 11	Mahon Park is far away from Shipyard district
242	Participant 1	IS THE DECISION MADE ALREADY

#	Participant	Comment / Question
243	Participant 8	At no time during this presentation has Seaspan claimed that eastern expansion Can't be done. Their position that it is more expensive and not as operationally convenient to go East vs. West is clear. Seaspan has taken the position that cost effectiveness and convenience is more important than the interest of the community. There are alternatives that this community would support, and had we been consulted at the outset, Seaspan could have had community support.
244	Participant 18	No commitment to neighbors, no monitoring of environmental issues, dumping of sewage issues into the water, noise pollutions (inadequate testing and totally biased, Air and Water quality issues disregarded. No proper independent testing nor professionally done. Chris from all of this you can see this is not passable. The federal govt needs to be involved.
245	Participant 17	there are no questions because we're not getting proper answers so this feels very futile
246	Participant 6	What is in the white building Can that be moved creating extra space
247	Participant 1	C, can you come and talk to neighbors please
248	Participant 2	When will the decision be made? And how will the community be apprised of updates throughout the process?
249	Participant 15	Because of multi-generational decision making.
250	Participant 1	We didn't get any proper answers, they were all repeated claims
251	Participant 27	When a ship is anchored in Bravo and laying stern to the north it is very tight and sometimes dangerous for an inbound ship to get up the North Shore to berths on the North Shore. Will Moving Careen 40 meter south impact this situation more?
252	Participant 7	@Portofvancouver staff. Many of us are not against expansion. We are against expansion WEST. What additional alternatives have Seaspan explored that have not been mentioned here tonight?
253	Participant 5	Were you in the talks with the city when this development was approved? Were you part of that plan as well Paul?
254	Participant 17	I echo G ... my vote is against expansion west specifically
255	Participant 5	100%
256	Participant 6	I'm asking about the white building on the water what is that used for
257	Participant 1	No expansion to west please
258	Participant 23	Why is he not talking about the second water lot to the east and that other pier.

#	Participant	Comment / Question
259	Participant 3	The Attesa III parks east of the pier (east of the white building). Why not studying this as an alternative option. The permit application doesn't add this as an option
260	Participant 7	@channel Who from the City of north vancouver needs to be contacted to become part of this engagement process?
261	Participant 11	Why cannot you move the W building
262	Participant 6	Sorry not great
263	Participant 6	Why can that not be moved to provide space
264	Participant 5	Were you in the talks with the city when this development was approved? Were you part of that plan as well Paul?
265	Participant 6	Please answer that question
266	Participant 5	I agree, why can you not move where the white building is?
267	Participant 7	Is anyone from community relations @portvancouver on the call here this evening as well?
268	Participant 11	Move the W building to the East and you would have enough space
269	Participant 15	The white building is used to assist Pemberton activities with ship building and repairs. It seems that it is cheaper and more profitable for Seaspan to expand the Drydock west than move the white building to where it could actually be more efficient. It seemingly is more convenient for them to barge boats and components back and forth to Pemberton it seems than expanding westwards.
270	Participant 3	This public notice indicate written documents to be submitted before July 24thj https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/evaluations/document/139510
271	Participant 23	Why again is he not discussing the adjacent water lot to the east and that under-utilized pier. What's necessary to upgrade it?
272	Participant 1	Stop the expansion
273	Participant 5	The shipbuilding business is booming, so additional costs o go East should be warranted
274	Participant 17	Gregory I think the key person for community affairs from the Port Authority is Duncan Wilson Vice President, Environment, Community and Government Affairs Duncan.Wilson@portvancouver.com
275	Participant 1	Nicola, we didn't get sufficient answers
276	Participant 7	Thank you @K
277	Participant 1	and we don't give a shit about your concerns! please continue N

Q&A Chat Transcript – July 15 community meeting



Vancouver Drydock – Proposed Water Lot Project July 15 Community Information Meeting Q&A Chat Transcript

(Please note, other than email addresses, names have been redacted for privacy reasons.)

- 13 Seaspan and VFPA representatives
- 72 community members
- 38 individuals provided comments, questions & feedback

#	Participant	Comment
1	Participant 1	Have the question/answers from the first session been posted?
2	Participant 2	Further to the 40metres west how much further west does Seaspan have water rights and in the next 10 years or so are there thoughts of going even more to the west and expand further?
3	Participant 3	What indigenous groups have been consulted so far, and where can their feedback be viewed?
4	Participant 4	Interested to know more about Green Marine mentioned on the website and how that impacts the environment positively ?
5	Participant 5	Quoted from Government of Canada website: ,The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority must determine whether the proposed Seaspan Vancouver Drydock water lot expansion, located at 203 East Esplanade, North Vancouver B.C. is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. Written comments to be received by July 24, 2021. But you also indicated that the public consultation process is 25 days and comments should be sent by end of the month. Please explain the difference between these two processes. Given the short time frame notice about this project, the process error leaving comments submitted after July 24th outside the review based on Government of Canada website. Please clarify it
6	Participant 6	Public engagement- how much weight does the Port Authority place on this project?
7	Participant 7	Post cards went to junk mail
8	Participant 8	Reposting: I have created a gmail account. We need to add more people to the efforts. For tomorrow if you could please add this to the chat (or something along the lines). We need to post this intermittently throughout the meeting in the chat section. We are residents at the Shipyards community. Please join our effort if you are being affected. Join and email us at: drydocknorthvan@gmail.com

1

9	Participant 9	we live a few hundred yards from the drydock and never received the postcard 172 Victory Ship Way
10	Participant 5	Question6. Last meeting it was indicated that 7,200 letters were sent to people within 1km radius. How many letters were sent to households within 200m radius from the Drydocks? How many letters were sent to residents at Trophy, Cascade East and West and Atrium East and West. I am pretty sure it is quite easy to determine. When were the Strata Councils of this buildings communicated about this Project expansion?
11	Participant 6	Can you give details of the indigenous communities that have been engaged on this project?
12	Participant 10	Why no billboard in the area like developers do
13	Participant 11	please collect this feedback: we do not want this to happen
14	Participant 3	The ads placed in the north shore news stated that the expansion would take place to the east. Have new ads been placed to correct the error and notify the community of the increased impacts to the west.
15	Participant 4	We have received a postcard thank you and we live on Esplanade
16	Participant 12	I agree, this should NOT happen and it is not wanted in our community
17	Participant 9	Will all feedback be given to the Port Authority? I believe that there is a conflict of interest if Seaspan collates and edits the feedback.
18	Participant 13	Why can't the white building be moved to Pemberton?
19	Participant 14	We did not receive a notification. To which neighbourhood the notifications were sent? Our building is right beside the Seaspan site! Please clarify
20	Participant 9	What is to the east of the right most blue circle. is it only yacht storage?
21	Participant 3	If there is lack of space in the dry docks, why are they routinely rented out for film production, taking away business from local sound stages?
22	Participant 15	Question to KG, who is assigned the water lot lease to the east of the proposed expansion water lot?
23	Participant 5	Question1. I couldn't find any economic impact analysis in your permit application. Has it been done? If so, it has been hasn't been disclosed. This economic impact study should be carried out undertaking all the externalities about this project. I appreciate that Seaspan is a donor to Lions Gate Hospital and is a contributor to the GDP but this project expansion should be analyzed on a standalone merits including the economic externalities caused to the residents that is a reduction in property values as a result of

		the project expansion. This economic cost/benefit analysis is customary in any infrastructure project. The Permit application is silent in this regard (the 100 new jobs statement could be a misleading as an economic indicator of the economic impact without a proper economic analysis). In essence, the Application is silent regarding the economic impact analysis. (note that residents are concerned about environmental but also economic impact).
24	Participant 4	I also see on the website a mention of Scholarship program; is this still ongoing as it says it was introduced in 2005!!!
25	Participant 8	We are residents at the Shipyards community. Please join our effort if you are being affected. Join and email us at: drydocknorthvan@gmail.com
26	Participant 16	We also did not receive any information before, and we live right in front of the new expansion at Cascade
27	Participant 14	Why does not Seaspan allow the maintenance of smaller ships be handled by smaller companies? Are they not any smaller companies that can provide the similar maintenance services?
28	Participant 17	We have been told by Canada Post that a total of 19 flyers were delivered in our neighbourhood in 199/185/175 Victory Ship Way. How can you justify you've provided appropriate notice?
29	Participant 9	In use for yacht storage You can even see it in the picture
30	Participant 8	if you really cared for neighborhood and coexist, you would move the current dry dock to the East alongside the new projects. why you are not removing the correct dry docks to the East? Seaspan makes enough profit to do something nice for the neighborhood.
31	Participant 18	How close to the Burrard Pier will these docks be? Given the proximity of the new expansion and the noise it would be hard to imagine anyone wanting to sit outside on a patio since it's already too noisy as it is. In fact, this would be decrease in local jobs.
32	Participant 12	The proposal is outrageous. All of the residents of the Shipyards area have invested our life savings into our new homes. Your changes will completely block my view and reduce the value of my home by hundreds of thousands of dollars. PLEASE do this to the EAST!!! you can afford it.
33	Participant 16	19 flyers for 3 buildings???? I think there are more than 300 units there. I would like to know what Seaspan answer???
34	Participant 19	Will this increase the amount of jobs to local workers.
35	Participant 9	Does the lease arrangement with the port authority allow for storage of private yachts. I don't see how those yachts are part of the Season business.
36	Participant 8	K do you work for the Seaspan?
37	Participant 9	Seaspan - not Season

38	Participant 13	This is not a good location, right by the playground. Please tell us how the air and noise are currently being measured
39	Participant 5	Port Authority: Can you show a slide with a photo including the entire existing lease to the East (further east beyond the helicopter platform)?
40	Participant 20	Only 100 new jobs is not economic advantage
41	Participant 21	I would like to see the yellow line all the way across
42	Participant 10	You are really moving 61 meters to the west
43	Participant 8	last night at 930 we were walking my dog and the noise from sanding was so loud and annoying that we couldn't hear ourselves talking. how are you saying it is safe and within range?
44	Participant 18	The blasting ended at 12:20am and the night before it was 10:40pm
45	Participant 13	It is mixed used but it's a safety issue
46	Participant 3:	In the event this project proceeds, does the Port of Vancouver guarantee the residents and community that the Port will monitor (at this location) and enforce promised air quality, sound levels, and environmental standards, and ensure appropriate immediate response to any breaches of the quoted levels?
47	Participant 8	why don't you move the current large blue dry docks to the East along with the new development. why you don't want to be a good neighbor.
48	Moderator	Thank you everyone for your feedback. We would like to remind everyone that we would like to maintain a respectful and safe space for all. Thank you.
49	Participant 9	Is there an appeal process? and what are the penalties to Seaspan if they don't meet their commitments?
50	Participant 8	We are residents at the Shipyards community. Please join our effort if you are being affected. Join and email us at: drydocknorthvan@gmail.com
51	Participant 21	The Trophy building is working as a buffer to the noise. Expanding west will totally defeat that advantage. Please expand east. Thanks
52	Participant 20	Concerned also about the quality of the water in front of our homes with this expansion.
53	Participant 3:	In speaking with several residents since Tuesday's meeting, we felt that many of our questions and concerns were not answered or addressed directly, and that insufficient study has been completed on the impact to our community. Based on our questions and concerns, what additional study and additional community engagement will be conducted prior to a decision being made to ensure the quiet and peaceful enjoyment of our residences? Additionally, what compensation to the community will Seaspan

		and the Port of Vancouver impart to residents due to frequent and ongoing interference or unreasonable disturbances to that peaceful enjoyment?
54	Participant 4	Are your charitable programs mentioned on the website still active and have you done anything to support local business during COVID times?
55	Participant 9	How about to the east of area 2. There is water access there.
56	Participant 3:	Yes or no question: Would moving the Washington Family's (owner of Seaspan) mega-yacht (which is not even registered in Vancouver, but the Cayman Islands) provide additional drydock space to the East of the community for part of this expansion project? Ie: Would the 55m dock fit in that space?
57	Participant 5	Question4: The permit application indicates alternative sitting options, and it reaches a conclusion that option 3 NoGo is more expensive than Working Region 3. What is the basis for that conclusion? It doesn't provide any level of magnitude regarding capital costs for any of the options. Has an independent third-party engineer study been commissioned to quantify the capital cost assessment? If so, why this is not made public available?
58	Participant 3:	Location #1 is behind the sound reinforced wall and would be more beneficial to the community than in front of the glass windows. Where are the results of the study that location #1 would be louder within the residences?
59	Participant 20	We are the East end of the Quay that is really making an economic impact for North Vancouver. This will shrink this public/tourist attraction as people will not want to be around this noise etc. Will certainly impact our home values and public enjoyment.
60	Participant 22	The question was asked at the last meeting but was not answered. Does the Port Authority have an example where the Port Authority has granted an expansion of an existing industrial operation to expand into a residential area?
61	Participant 17	It is now also a residential community!!
62	Participant 5	Question5. The permit application is silent regarding an additional option further east from the pier and the white building (not next to the Panamax drydock but further east. There is an Helicopter platform there). Why didn't the permit application consider this as an option? Last meeting it was mentioned that the pier is not solid enough to hold operations and the white building covers a boat. I am pretty sure engineering could make the pier stable enough with appropriate upgrades. Again, we would need an independent third-party study to evaluate this. With all due respect if there is a will there is a way.

63	Participant 3:	During Tuesday's meeting, you stated that the pier to the east wasn't structurally stable. Has a study been conducted on what it would take to make that a viable option?
64	Participant 23	I have a friend that use to have a stall in the night markets who mentioned vendors were allowed to park in the Seaspan parking lot. Do you intend to carry on with that?
65	Participant 5	Question13. What is the total height (in meters) for the proposed cranes when fully erected vertically? How many of them are proposed to be installed?
66	Participant 3:	Have these renderings been updated since Tuesday's meeting where concerns about the size of ships and number of cranes don't represent the actual operations to take place?
67	Participant 24	everyone opposed- can we please start a fb page so we can have a meeting as well to discuss further
68	Participant 21	this barge is very misleading as the barge in not usually there
69	Participant 8	Please join our effort if you are being affected. Join and email us at: drydocknorthvan@gmail.com
70	Participant 3:	In Tuesday's meeting the question was asked about air quality monitoring and the station's location. Since that meeting have you determined the nearest metro Vancouver monitoring station to the community, and have you changed your stance on installing one closer to the shipyards to protect its residents as part of this expansion?
71	Participant 9	So no view walking south on the spirit trail. No fun for the kids at the park. i guess that the kid binoculars can be removed.
72	Participant 3:	The environmental noise assessment states that construction noise is excluded from the report. What dB and noise levels can residents expect for the months of construction?
73	Participant 20	this is terrible
74	Participant 3:	We were told on Tuesday that work hours would be until 10pm. That same evening, work continued until at least midnight. Can you please clarify work hours for residents?
75	Participant 25	The waterfront in Vancouver is completely dominated by these kind of developments and it's so depressing.
76	Participant 11	saying is bright as it needs to be is saying no info at all!
77	Participant 11	how bright that is
78	Participant 11	how noisy that is?
79	Participant 9	Can dark sky friendly be installed in the rest of your operations at the vancouver dry dock. I had to install blackout blinds.
80	Participant 3:	The environmental noise assessment states that heights above the 3rd floor, the wing walls of the new drydocks are not expected to provide any adequate shielding of noise. The two Cascade

		buildings are predicted to show the highest changes in overall noise simply due to the closer proximity to noise sources with the addition of the drydocks. The predicted future LLF at the residences varies from 71 to 75 dB which suggests a slight likelihood of noise-induced rattles. What kind of financial investment into our homes and community will Seaspan and the Port contribute to prevent these noise-induced rattles, and what kind of monitoring will be installed to ensure damage doesn't take place from continuous low frequency sound?
81	Participant 17	Speaking of the Coast Guard Vessel, in terms of the environmental impact, why was there no spill response in front of the residential buildings when there was an oil spill on June 7, 2021 at 8:30pm? I have pictures. How can the community be assured of environmental protections?
82	Participant 22	Earlier today standing on the east side of Seaspan you could not notice the noise from the shipyard but the noise was so loud at our unit was so loud that the windows had to be closed. You could not sit on the balcony.
83	Participant 18	There is page on NextDoor to share your concerns: https://ca.nextdoor.com/g/k68o939uh/
84	Participant 3:	The environmental noise assessment states that: Based on these assumptions [Noise measured during February 26 without UHP activities], BKL predicts an increase in the Total Noise Level for the Future scenario of 3 dBA., While A 3dB increase in sound energy doesn't sound like much, on the decibel scale every increase in 3dB of measured sound means that the sound pressure levels will DOUBLE and perceived noise levels received by the human ear will double. This will bring an unacceptable level of ,Continuous sound interruption to the quiet enjoyment residents in the City of North Vancouver are entitled to under its bylaws.
85	Participant 3:	City of North Vancouver bylaws indicate that in an ,Activity area, continuous sound (,Any sound occurring for a duration of more than three minutes, or occurring continually, sporadically or erratically, but totaling more than three minutes in any fifteen minute period of time) should not exceed 60dBA in the daytime (07:00 20:00), or 55dBA at night time (20:00 07:00). Based on the environmental noise assessment provided, predicted future dB ratings are expected to be 71-75 dB of continuous sound (which is 11-15 dB above bylaw levels). Current activity already exceeds the levels residents have a right to. How do you explain this breach of resident's rights to quiet enjoyment in their homes? Please explain in detail.
86	Participant 9	3dB is a doubling of the sound energy. BTW vacuums are loud

87	Participant 16	100 new jobs, that is very good, but have The Port of Vancouver or Seaspan or any authority make any studies for the impact that this construction will make in the business around Shipyards?, I would like to know your opinion, for sure many of the community business will be affected and how many people will be unemployed??
88	Participant 26	We live in the trophy on front unit and need to shut the patio door due to current noise from the ongoing work. What is the current noise level right now ?
89	Participant 13	Where is the current noise and pollution monitored?
90	Participant 9	The jobs will still exist if the expansion is to the east. We are not saying no to the project, but to an east expansion instead of west.
91	Participant 15	You sound slide gave 1-3 db increase shows the min. value increased by 3 and the highest value increased by 1db. Why have both values increased by the largest expected increase?
92	Participant 13	There were so many other questions and you answered one about parking? Can you please answer the questions
93	Participant 5	Was a traffic study done? Not only of the additional 100 people but trucks and suppliers
94	Participant 8	they were supposed to answer questions from 630. they are stalling
95	Participant 27	@Port Authority and @Port of Vancouver clearly everyone sees that this proposal is very negative to the residents and the neighbourhood as a whole. Seaspan is dodging our questions, and there's no feasibility study as to why this can't happen to the East. Why are you allowing them to waste everyone's time and go through this proposal? No one is in support of this. Let's be clear, they NEVER notified the residents of this. And they already exceed the noise levels allowed in the area.
96	Participant 28	Moving careen 40 m south will do little to mitigate sound especially with water blasting which can be heard at Lonsdale Quay maybe 400m away. What else do you plan?
97	Moderator	Hello Everyone. We will be going through as many questions as possible once the presentation is complete. Any unanswered questions will be posted on the website following the meeting.
98	Participant 3:	Can you please indicate anticipated dB levels during construction, as many residents now work from home during the day.
99	Participant 3:	Question for DG please: What qualifies a light fixture as ,Dark Sky compliant? Is it the reflector design, or the light source? presumably LEDs, or both?
100	Participant 29	SOMEONE NEEDS TO INVOLVE ENVIROMENT CANADA TO AUDIT THEIR BULLSHIT REPORTS The Province of B.C. relies on the public to report activity that causes pollution to the environment. By

8

		reporting pollution you are helping us act promptly to minimize harm to the environment and public health. The RAPP program is a toll-free tip line and online service that also allows you to report known or suspected violations of fisheries, wildlife, or environmental protection laws anonymously and without risk of confronting the offender.
101	Participant 29	1-877-952 RAPP
102	Participant 26	How will Seaspan compensate existing Condo Owners for reduced value due to loss of view and/or increased noise levels?
103	Participant 13	thank you J
104	Participant 27	Thank you J. I've made note of this and will give them a call.
105	Participant 2	I understand 1-3 Dicebels but what about the number of decibels per 24 hours; how much of an increase will that be?
106	Participant 12	This is so discouraging! All of the speakers talk as if this is a done deal. This should NOT be approved. Do it to the EAST and all is good!
107	Participant 30	Where on the website, specifically please, and when will the answers to all questions be posted
108	Participant 3:	Will the chat feed here also be posted?
109	Participant 22	Although no longer visible in the photos a private yacht was moored to the east side in a area where there appears to be unused space
110	Participant 3:	That private yacht belongs to the owner of Seaspan, and is not even registered in Canada.
111	Participant 3:	Does the Port of Vancouver have the ability to modify the area of the water lot, allowing it to move to the east?
112	Participant 22	Will Port Authority not allow any additional boats or barges to be temporarily moored to the west of the proposed structures.
113	Participant 9	Stalling
114	Participant 5	Question2: I can appreciate that the Shipyards have been involved in the community for more than 100 years. Communities evolve and standards change over time. Can the Port of Vancouver list any examples of Permit Applications submitted to the Port Authority within the last 5 years for new or expansion projects of an industrial facility immediately adjacent to a Residential community (less than 200m). You can appreciate that the permit approval process and quality of living has changed from last century even decades ago. If there are not any precedent projects, who do we ensure that the permitting and approval guidelines and threshold are appropriate and applicable for this project expansion? If there are precedent cases, how many of them were approved or rejected and the reasons to do so?

115	Participant 10	Please clarify that you are actually going 61 meters west from the blue Drydock
116	Participant 23	Have you thought about decorating the side of one of the new docks with First Nations images, similar to what BC Ferries have. That would look cool to see from Lonsdale Quay.
117	Participant 5	Port of Vancouver: Please indicate if this approval decision is made by a committee or by a single individual? Can the Port of Vancouver make the approval guidelines public available?
118	Participant 22	By not showing the east extension of the water lot it presumes that only west is considered or possible. The east is possible and preferred. It is only held back by dollars.
119	Participant 31	Where is the water lease (yellow line) boundary to the east? Paul answered this question referring to South boundary
120	Participant 13	Woohoo!
121	Participant 5	Thank you K
122	Participant 5	Question3. Has the Port of Vancouver evaluated the economic impact of this expansion? Has the Port of Vancouver evaluated other options west of the Drydocks that could represent economic value add to the community? From an urban development perspective, could the Port of Vancouver consider other type of projects in the area west from the Drydocks and east from the Seabus terminal. For example, could a Marina be developed in this area? This would represent a terrific economic value added for local businesses, the City of North Vancouver, Seaspan and residents if done properly. By expanding the drydock to the west of the pier, you limit the development of projects of any land/water uses.
123	Participant 32	From the last meeting in the end Seaspan rep did say that East is doable but cost is more. Seaspan in order to be a good community member should spend those \$\$\$ on the east side to respect the community wishes. If only dollars is a factor then Seaspan should spend this \$\$\$ to engineer on the east side.
124	Participant 33	How did you receive a contract from the federal government if they new you did not have adequate facilities.
125	Participant 5	Question8. Port of Vancouver: Please indicate if this approval decision is made by a committee or by a single individual? Can the Port of Vancouver make the approval guidelines public available?
126		
127		
128	Participant 30	I mean they absolutely have the money to do it elsewhere. They would rather inconvenience multiple communities to save a few dollars
129	Participant 25	What is the cost difference from building to the east vs the west?

130	Participant 34	FWIW: the yacht KOGO currently docked in North Van was owned by MO. It is currently up for sale. Nothing to do with the owners of Seaspan.
131	Participant 20	has financial compensation for existing owners been considered for loss of enjoyment and home value?
132	Participant 4	Interested to know more about ,Green Marine mentioned on the company website and how that impacts the environment positively ?
133	Participant 9	Never got it Atrium east
134	Participant 32	Hi CB from these meetings it seems that the community is not happy with the West side development by Seaspan. Will this play part in your decision making.
135	Participant 22	Never got the notice. Cascade East.
136	Participant 10	Why no large billboard in the shipyards area like developers do. still time
137	Participant 27	A stack of flyers to be left in multi-family dwellings that don't allow that??? And what do these flyers look like??? Is there anyone on this call who got these mentioned notices???
138	Participant 8	never got any flyer
139	Participant 14	@ Port Authority - Since no postcards were delivered to public, Could you postpone the application process until Seaspan correctly notify the 7000 neighbors
140	Participant 20	no
141	Participant 18	Perhaps Seaspan can ask the NSN to put the article with the corrected information since it was their mistake
142	Participant 9	Canada Post would have placed it in your mail box. Its unaddressed admail
143	Participant 27	Yeah, no one got the flyers
144	Participant 25	Well who did you organize with at Canada Post for this large mail drop? I would like to get their confirmation
145	Participant 1	Can we please see a visual of the eastern boundary of the water lot.
146	Participant 9	Move that white building to the east. its only used for yacht storage so not an issue
147	Participant 5	What about locating where the helicopter platform is placed?
148	Participant 9	What is the purpose of the white building in the water.
149	Participant 32	So it seems not a thorough job was done on the planning phase. of this whole project to even think about the community and environmental effects
150	Participant 18	The City of North Vancouver has poured \$\$\$ into creating a vibrant hub in the LOLO area, this expansion directly affects that so even

		though a few more jobs might be created, so many people will be affected by this. The late night hydroblasting will impact the people wanting to stroll on the pier or enjoy the outside patios.
151	Participant 11	that didn't answer the question
152	Participant 14	Please answer the question correctly
153	Participant 8	there are not answering just repeated claims
154	Participant 5	How many employees does Seaspan currently have in the maintenance and repair business if you add the two locations: the Drydocks and Vancouver Shipyards (Pemberton)? You indicated that the expansion will add 100 jobs in the drydocks, but you will remove jobs in the Vancouver Shipyards in the maintenance and repair business as the premises on Pemberton will be used for the icebreaker. The construction of the icebreaker (a project recently awarded) will absorb the jobs lost in the Vancouver Shipyards from the maintenance and repair business (as you plan to consolidate the maintenance operations at the Drydocks. The net effect of job creation of relocating the platforms to the Drydocks is null from an economic standpoint in the maintenance and repair business. There is no net economic value added. The real economic value add is in the construction of the icebreaker but not the relocation of the platform to the Drydock. So if the icebreaker project was not awarded and the docks were relocated, would you
155	Participant 3:	Yes or no question for the Port: Can the Seaspan lease of the water lot be modified to move to the project to the east?
156	Participant 35	Would you approve of the proposed project if you were a resident in either the Trophy or Cascade development? Gulzar Mitha
157	Participant 10	That eastern water lot should give Seaspan plenty of space to locate the two Drydocks.
158	Participant 32	The east side planning would be more beneficial as the cost \$\$\$ would be more and create more jobs.
159	Participant 5	An economic impact study is needed when different layers of stakeholders are involved; specially, if there are multi jurisdictions
160	Participant 9	Yacht storage? build a new dock!
161	Participant 21	Fix it !!!!!
162	Participant 9	what activities????
163	Participant 10	Currently 8 vehicles parked on it his morning
164	Participant 30	Feel free to elucidate what the other activities are
165	Participant 22	Improve the strength of the dock, problem solved!!
166	Participant 11	unused for other activities?
167	Participant 30	What a poor excuse

168	Participant 8	haha other activities means parking the owner yacht
169	Participant 32	Its used by the movie industry. No excuse not to expand to the east.
170	Participant 9	I believe that the decision was made at higher levels at Seaspan
171	Participant 3:	Has a plan been explored to strengthen the pier to the east?
172	Participant 9	Its for yacht storage- P is not allowed to admit it.
173	Participant 14	Can the zoning be changed?
174	Participant 20	can you apply for a zoning change?
175	Participant 10	The use of the eastern pier would not impact access to the W building. I don't know why he keeps saying that.
176	Participant 3:	Can the designation of the Water lot to the east be re-designated, similar to how a land lot can be rezoned?
177	Participant 22	Move the floating white dock to the east. Use the empty space to the east to load the barges to take the equipment to Pemberton Dock and use the new space created to put in the new docks
178	Participant 18	Since everyone seems to be opposed to this expansion to the west and that's the only option, perhaps this expansion should not take place. It's seems pretty obvious that the entire community is against this.
179	Participant 32	Hi CB it seems that Environment Canada should be involved in this too to see the environmental impact to marine life on this expansion. It seems that this expansion will exponentially effect air and water quality and thus community and marine life
180	Participant 32	Has Seaspan contacted Environment Canada in regards to this expansion
181	Participant 36	Moderator, you skipped over the question from Leo about Canada Post reporting only 19 flyers were delivered. Please back up to that question
182	Participant 8	we want to arrange a few protests and being CBC and other real news outlets. please join and email us at: drydocknorthvan@gmail.com
183	Participant 5	Question9. There is a Noise Assessment Screening Worksheet. Why there is not any input from a third party? Please also comment who provided the weights when calculated the total Weighted Project Score? There is a category called: Population Exposed to Project Noise. It has more than 100 residents as indicated in the worksheet (which is the highest). Surprisingly, the weight in importance is only 1.0. This is lowest weight if compared to all the attribute criteria. The Reflections and Shading category has a weight of 1.8. So Reflections is more important that People based on your assessment?. There is a self-assessment bias here.

		How do the weightings vary if you rate this project on an industrial area exclusively as opposed to a project that has exposure to a large residential zone. What is the feedback from the City of North Vancouver and the Port of Vancouver regarding this self-noise assessment? How does Port Vancouver determine an objective way to score this Screening Worksheet? I can a
184	Participant 18	How can you not know how close the expanded dock will be to the Burrard Pier? Isn't this a safety concern?
185	Participant 6	Why can't Seaspan strengthen the pier on the east and extend further south to allow the docks to be placed on the east side of that pier and not block the w building?
186	Participant 13	Do we have access to this information? When is was taken? etc
187	Moderator	Thank you everyone for your feedback. We would like to remind everyone that we would like to maintain a respectful and safe space for all. Thank you.
188	Participant 9	It is easy to pick and choose a week that is more quiet than normal.
189	Participant 4	Interested to know more about ,Green Marine mentioned on the company website and how that impacts the environment positively ?
190	Participant 1	We were told that the existing Eastern pier does not meet load requirements. Was any serious consideration given to upgrading that pier.
191	Participant 20	Can we have an answer to the Environment Canada question, has a study been completed.
192	Participant 37	I believe you said that your emission testing site was Mahon park. Please explain as, if this is correct, it seems to far away to provide accurate results. Or please confirm where the emission testing site is.
193	Participant 21	Can we see the noise model for the Trophy?
194	Participant 10	It is moving 61 meters to the west of the blue Drydock. 20 meters west is the existing water lot and they are asking for another 40 meters. So give or take they are moving 61 meters closer or about 200ft.
195	Participant 13	Please answer Why can't Seaspan strengthen the pier on the east and extend further south to allow the docks to be placed on the east side of that pier and not block the w building?
196	Participant 5	Question9. There is a Noise Assessment Screening Worksheet. Please also comment who provided the weights when calculated the total Weighted Project Score? There is a category called: Population Exposed to Project Noise. It has more than 100 residents as indicated in the worksheet (which is the highest). Surprisingly, the weight in importance is only 1.0. This is lowest

		weight if compared to all the attribute criteria. The Reflections and Shading category has a weight of 1.8. So Reflections is more important than People based on your weighting?
197	Participant 32	We should get Environment Canada involved cause it had an effect on marine life as well as human life. Environment Canada will shut them down and do a major clean.
198	Participant 34	Question for D please: What qualifies a light fixture as dark sky compliant? Is it the reflector design, or the light source, presumably LEDs, or both?
199	Participant 4	Am curious to know with respect to environment about the GREEN MARINE mentioned on the company website
200	Participant 26	Is this an all or nothing proposal? For example will Seaspan consider reduced approval which are less intrusive?
201	Participant 10	The eastern pier is Strong enough to hold the 8 vehicles parked there in addition to a number of building structures.
202	Participant 3:	@KG. This is an unacceptable response given the amount of public opposition to this.
203	Participant 22	Does the Port Authority have an example where the Port Authority has granted an expansion of an existing industrial operation to expand into a residential community?
204	Participant 13	Is it possible to do a study of the emission and noise over the next 30 days?
205	Participant 21	The people are asking please go back to the drawing board. Thanks M
206	Participant 32	Its seems that Seaspan doesn't think about community charity about their health and welfare
207	Participant 5	Question10. Port of Vancouver: Regarding noise threshold. Can the port of Vancouver indicate how the threshold of 75 dBA for Post Project Noise Environment Parameter and the Low Frequency Noise Level of 70dB was determined? What was the basis for these numbers and the underlying assumptions and context (again it is different to site a project in an industrial zone and a project in an industrial an residential area). Can the Port of Vancouver also provide the Health Canada guideline regarding the Increased Community Noise Exposure whereby a threshold of 6.5% of % highly annoyed persons was determined? Also, can the consultant (BKL) walk us through the calculation determining the Post Project Noise Environment Parameter, and the %HA?
208	Participant 9	TESS just left recently
209	Participant 9	TESS is a Washington yacht
210	Participant 22	Can the lease boundary be moved east to allow the expansion.
211	Participant 9	KOGO was the yacht that Seaspan was refurbishing

212	Participant 22	St Eval is under the white floating dock
213	Participant 10	That eastern water lot would certainly be sufficient as it encompasses the eastern pier, barge to the east and enough space that previously held the KUGO yacht. If there is a will there is away.
214	Participant 28	Moving Careen 40 meters south will do little to mitigate water blasting/compressor sound that can be heard maybe 400 meters east to Lonsdale quay. What else can you do?
215	Participant 22	There is a significant negative impact to the views on the Spirit Trail, not what was intended for this unique location.
216	Participant 20	OK but you do know that people live here, come on you know the intent of the comment
217	Participant 14	The area that CB is mentioning must be rezoned from Industrial to residential.. Don't you see the residential towers there?
218	Participant 32	It seems that Seaspan has not done their home work
219	Participant 23	What type of ships does the drydock repair and will this change with the new docks?
220	Participant 28	You talk about bubble curtains to soften noise' why not use them now cut down noise during water blasting
221	Participant 2	Can Seaspan do the study to see what it would take to go east rather than West and what the cost would be?
222	Participant 26	Seaspan suggest that the existing dock to the East isn't strong enough, so isn't suitable. However, you are willing to build new structures and install pilings to the West. Is the decision to go West a financial decision?
223	Participant 32	omg Seaspan has not done their homework and trying to pass a project that is not thought out well.
224	Participant 33	Have you received the support of any north shore municipal, provincial and federal politicians? If so can you provide their names.
225	Participant 38	I support the idea of Seaspan expansion at the drydock; but I do not want any further noise increase. The new docks could be placed on the east; but that comes at a higher project cost and probably some increased operational cost. Mitigation of increased noise needs to be addressed. Lower allowed noise levels between 10 pm and 7 am would be acceptable mitigation.
226	Participant 31	To the Port, given you don't deal with residential area, if Seaspan meets all requirements for industrial area, do concerns of residents matter in your consideration of the application? Under what conditions would this application not be approved? Are we wasting our time?
227	Participant 5	Question11. Regarding the noise collection data recorded at the baseline location (Trophy at the Pier), what was the maximum

		noise recorded (in decibels) at the base metering point located at Trophy at the Pier? (without doing any extrapolation, adjustments but direct recording).
228	Participant 32	So it seems that the east side is viable but the excuses that Seaspan has come up with is so lame. Environment Canada needs to get involved and will do testing
229	Participant 3:	160-200 dB.
230	Participant 5	Question 12. In the Noise Assessment Screening Worksheet, how would you describe the answers: very low, low, moderate, high or very high noise in terms of decibels?
231	Participant 37	Last night, I thought it was loud post 10:30pm....
232	Participant 18	The noise from the blasting bounces between the buildings along the sprit trail - will the port be willing to amend the water lines to take this into consideration since the City of North Vancouver allowed developers to build residences in a commercial water space?
233	Participant 17	If there is no work being done, why is there light on dawn to dusk
234	Participant 22	Mahon Park is over 20 blocks away. Air quality in that location would have no connection to issues at the Shipyards
235	Participant 9	lights are on all night. its like a stadium.
236	Participant 11	another question that's not being answer
237	Participant 11	to the point!
238	Participant 4	Am curious to know with respect to environment about the GREEN MARINE mentioned on the company website
239	Participant 15	Walking the area there are two air sampling stations that appear to be on Seaspan land area. Why have these stations not been used for sampling?
240	Participant 5	Question 14. Do the Port of Vancouver and/or the City of Vancouver has any Visual impact guidelines in terms of light pollution?
241	Participant 22	Noise needs to be measured in multiple locations and at multiple heights with a focus on the Shipyards residents and based on proximity to Season
242	Participant 36	Moderator, you just skipped over the question from Leo at 6:39 about Seaspan's response to oil spill recently. Please back up
243	Participant 26	The right now question was because we needed to shut our patio door in order to listen to the audio of this Zoom Call.
244	Participant 17	We recently experienced an oil spill on June 7th at 8:30pm.
245	Participant 20	how polluted are the waters around the docks
246	Participant 9	with respect to traffic, Seaspan employees should learn to stop at stop signs. Surprised no one has been killed yet.

247	Participant 11	you are moving it closer, not further!
248	Participant 11	directly in front!
249	Participant 21	what is the existing lease and water lot, the yellow lines on page 5 don't connect and are not showing the eastern border
250	Participant 20	Mitigating would be going the other side, EAST
251	Participant 18	I'm sorry but the is not a little project, it's a permanent expansion to cater to MORE ships
252	Participant 5	Question 17. The Port of Vancouver and Seaspan expressed that they are open to the idea of engaging a third-party consultant selected by the residents to undertake an environmental impact study. What would be the steps to do so (question for both Seaspan and Port of Vancouver)? A committee among residents, Seaspan, City of North Vancouver and Port of Vancouver would be a good path to start doing so. Who would the decision making for this proposal (question for Seaspan and Port of Vancouver?. I don't know if anyone from the City of North Vancouver is attending the meeting but same question for them).
253	Participant 9	noise monitor at St Georges and Esplanade https://seti-media.com/infopopulation/port_vancouver/
254	Participant 39	Perhaps a class action suit could be considered by the Trophy, Cascade E & W.
255	Participant 18	Right now tugs, both small and large tugs are docked at the Burrard Pier, with the new expansion that would mean the entire area from the current dock to the Burrard Pier would be Seaspan, correct?
256	Participant 5	Alternatively, you could move the proposed installation further south from the proposed 40m to say 60m or 80m, expand the work pontoon and add a section of large artificial trees. That would partially mitigate the visual impact, light pollution, and add a buffer for noise reduction. Again, we just need to work on something that works for everyone here.
257	Participant 5	We are residents at the Shipyards. Please email if you feel you are being affected/impacted: drydocknorthvan@gmail.com
258	Participant 8	your colleague just said none of the buildings have been used for filming in the last 8 years. why the lie?
259	Participant 8	by so many residents? stop the lie
260	Participant 9	no one in our building received the mailing
261	Participant 11	thousands of people are affected by this
262	Participant 11	they are not aware!
263	Participant 4	How many employees does Seaspan currently employ?

264	Participant 3:	55 out of 7000 possible notifications is indication that they were not received.
265	Participant 11	take them in consideration!
266	Participant 26	Can Seaspan comment on loss of property value - Seaspan dodged the initial question.
267	Participant 39	yes, two commercials at least in the last two years.
268	Participant 5	Please email if you feel you are being affected/impacted: drydocknorthvan@gmail.com
269	Participant 21	85 from 7000
270	Participant 30	Thank you, Jose! I emailed to note my interest :)
271	Participant 9	middle right on the dock
272	Participant 36	Canada Post has affirmed that the flyers were not sent as direct mail, and therefore Canada Post is required to send Seaspan a report on how many flyers were delivered, as part of the contractual agreement, We have been told 12 flyers were delivered to Trophy and 7 to Cascade. Seaspan would have received this information from Canada Post. The larger question is what else does the report indicate about distribution of the 7000 flyers?
273	Participant 22	So only 19 of almost 300 units received the Notice
274	Participant 18	I see seals daily swimming around the docks
275	Participant 14	Congratulations! Maine life is already destroyed by the industrial activities
276	Participant 22	We have seen eagles catching fish off the east side of the pier towards the Careen.
277	Participant 22	Two Seals and Otters swim to the east of the pier daily
278	Participant 5	The water goes to the beach area. There are dogs and pets on the beach that walk on the water
279	Participant 22	And Herrons fishing!!
280	Participant 5	The weight for people is 1. The weight for Reflections is 1.8. ??
281	Participant 30	Port of Vancouver said earlier that they do not consider Residential Zone levels/considerations in any of their approvals, as they only have jurisdiction over industrial areas.
282	Participant 26	Please check out Youtube "Dry Dock Vancouver - July 14, 2021" https://youtu.be/A2C8MYFEItQ
283	Participant 18	It's really clear how the community feels, it's time to put people before profits and to find a way to make it work with your current dock. We are in favour of more jobs and more business but not at the expense of thousands of visitors, residents and the community at large.

284	Participant 13	Back to the drawing board then, I'm sure it's feasible.
285	Participant 5	Would the Port of Vancouver entertain conversations to amend the lease? We want a win/win for everyone
286	Participant 22	What is the proposed future purpose of the east pier??
287	Participant 3:	Nobody here appears to be opposed to expansion of the dry-docks to the East. We are however opposed to expansion to the West. Go east and you have our support.
288	Participant 5	Please email if you feel you are being affected/impacted: drydocknorthvan@gmail.com
289	Participant 9	Well said G
290	Participant 18	There is page on NextDoor to share your concerns: https://ca.nextdoor.com/g/k68o939uh/
291	Participant 10	Acceptable solution to all is go east
292	Participant 36	We support eastern expansion. Work with your community and we can find a solution.
293	Participant 5	Please email if you feel you are being affected/impacted: drydocknorthvan@gmail.com

Responses to unanswered questions from community meetings



**Vancouver Drydock – Proposed Water Lot Project
Community Information Meeting
Response to questions not addressed during the meetings
(as of July 21, 2021)**

Thank you to all those who posted questions during the community information meetings.

While we did our best to respond to all questions, some were inadvertently missed, and we were unable to get to all questions during the available time. Responses to these questions are provided below.

Please note, where questions are on a similar topic, the related questions have been grouped and one response provided. Additionally, some questions were directed to the port authority. This document will be updated with that additional information once it is available.



Questions on **community notification**

1	You were supposed to inform 7000 households and no one at 172 and 162 victory shipyard were notified. Why is that?
---	--

258	Canada Post has affirmed that the flyers were not sent as direct mail, and therefore Canada Post is required to send Seaspan a report on how many flyers were delivered, as part of the contractual agreement. We have been told 12 flyers were delivered to Trophy and 7 to Cascade. Seaspan would have received this information from Canada Post. The larger question is what else does the report indicate about distribution of the 7000 flyers?
-----	---

122	Why no large billboard in the shipyards area like developers do. still time
-----	---

On June 23, 7,200 postcards were given to Canada Post for delivery via unaddressed ad mail to all addresses (single and multi-family homes and businesses) within a one-kilometre radius of Vancouver Drydock. This is above the minimum requirement of 500 metres.

Of note, unaddressed mail can be blocked – a resident may make that choice and tell Canada Post they don't want to receive neighbourhood mail. Those addresses that have opted out are not included in the Canada Post counts, so the quantity Seaspan mailed will be the actual number delivered which, in this case, 7,154 were delivered to homes and businesses, including the multi-family residences immediately adjacent to our operations.

In addition to the postcard, Vancouver Drydock ran two newspaper ads in the North Shore News announcing the public engagement period and community information meetings, had a Facebook ad for two weeks, and individually notified strata's via email and in person in the immediate vicinity of our operations. Billboards were not included as part of the public notification as these are typically posted on a perimeter fence and there is limited foot and vehicle traffic other than employees and suppliers at the Vancouver Drydock entrance.

Question on **notification and engagement with North Shore elected officials**

210	Have you received the support of any north shore municipal, provincial and federal politicians? If so can you provide their names.
-----	--

Vancouver Drydock has not requested support from any elected official; however, as part of our notification activities, we advised elected officials of our proposed project and port authority application and have subsequently responded to specific questions related to our project. Additionally, we have had communications with the City of North Vancouver with regards to emergency response protocols and processes.

Question on **Seaspan's local economic contributions.**

27	How much additional tax revenue will this generate for the City of North Vancouver? How will the significant loss in property taxes due to declining values be offset?
----	--

We are proud to be a fully contributing member of our local community. Vancouver Drydock alone contributes \$55 million in GDP annually and sustains close to 400 jobs annually, both direct jobs at its location and indirect jobs with suppliers, many of which are in North Vancouver and surrounding communities. With the additional proposed drydocks that will only increase, although the exact amount can only be determined, should the project be approved and once the drydocks are purchased, in place and operational.

In addition to tax payments and spending on goods and services in the local community, Seaspan is also proud to be long-time supporters of North Shore Neighbourhood House, Polygon Gallery, and during the COVID-19 pandemic funded three United Way Community Builder hubs in North Vancouver. Recently, we also donated \$2.65 million to Lions Gate Hospital, in addition to supporting many other worthwhile local organizations.

Question on **illustrative photos and renderings**

204	But why does the barge appear and disappear (in the renderings)
-----	---

The renderings on our website, in our community meeting presentation, and in our project information guide are illustrative of how the operations would appear, should the project be approved. We included a range of photos and vessels to show the variety that would likely be at the Vancouver Drydock for service and repair.

Question on **the normal operating hours**

62	We were told on Tuesday that work hours would be until 10pm. That same evening, work continued until at least midnight. Can you please clarify work hours for residents?
----	--

The day shift starts at 6:45am, with a safety toolbox talk, with actual work commencing at 7:00am. The evening shift concludes at 10:45pm. On occasion there is some additional, urgent work required outside these hours.

Question on **June 7 on-water incident**

69	Speaking of the Coast Guard Vessel, in terms of the environmental impact, why was there no spill response in front of the residential buildings when there was an oil spill on June 7, 2021 at 8:30pm? I have pictures. How can the community be assured of environmental protections?
----	--

On June 7, 2021, at approximately 5:30pm, the *Seaspan Commander* tugboat was assisting the Careen drydock at Vancouver Drydock when the tug had a diesel fuel tank overflow resulting in 20 to 30 litres of fuel being spilled on the tugboat deck and into water.

Authorities, including the Coast Guard, were advised of the incident and [Western Canada Marine Response Corporation](#) (WCMRC) responded to see if any of the fuel was recoverable. In line with incident response best practice, absorbent pads were used to mop up fuel on the deck of the tug, but fuel in the water quickly dissipated. The *Seaspan Commander* returned to the main tugboat dock for further investigation, inspection and clean up. Transport Canada subsequently cleared the *Seaspan Commander* to return to service.

Questions on **the proposed drydock siting and adjacent water lot to the east**

208	Seaspan suggest that the existing dock to the East isn't strong enough, so isn't suitable. However, you are willing to build new structures and install pilings to the West. Is the decision to go West a financial decision?
-----	---

235	what is the existing lease and water lot, the yellow lines on page 5 don't connect and are not showing the eastern border
-----	---

In our early planning, Vancouver Drydock's operations and project teams considered several potential locations for the proposed drydocks. This included the adjacent water lot directly to the east of our current operations. After careful consideration, siting the new proposed drydocks in this adjacent water lot was not an option, because:

- The pier to the east does not provide direct access to our main operations service pier for people or supplies.
- The pier to the east does not meet the structural requirements for our operations.
- The adjacent water lot to the east is actively in use and has operating requirements for direct water access to the white, on-land W building, which restrict how far east we can go.

Within our existing operations, we considered how to incorporate the additional drydocks into our existing water lot. As noted in our project information guide and during the recent community meetings, we looked at six potential locations and ruled out all except one, because of:

- Proximity to residential neighbours
- Minimum water depth requirements for drydock operations
- Distance from the navigation channel
- Direct access to our main operations service pier for people and supplies

We then looked at expanding our existing water lot, as within our lease with the port authority, we have an option to expand westward.

For all of these reasons combined, we have submitted an application to the port authority to expand our water lot west by 40 meters and to install two new smaller drydocks and a work pontoon in our water lot and the additional water lot area. We are not considering any other configuration or location at this time.

The eastern boundary of Vancouver Drydock's water lot extends approximately 30 meters east of the Panamax drydock.

Question on **siting locations within the existing Vancouver Drydock water lot**

45	Question4: The permit application indicates alternative sitting options, and it reaches a conclusion that option 3 NoGo is more expensive than Working Region 3. What is the basis for that conclusion? It doesn't provide any level of magnitude regarding capital costs for any of the options. Has an independent third-party engineer study been commissioned to quantify the capital cost assessment? If so, why this is not made publicly available?
----	--

In this area, the water depths are much greater than in the proposed siting location. The reason the greater water depths lead to higher costs is because the piling and support structures would need to be bigger to address the increased cantilever effect from mooring loads. Higher stresses in mooring structures directly translate to higher cost, further compounded by the fact that larger pilings are more complex and costlier to install.

Using the monopile design as the comparative at mean water level, a five-metre increase in water depth would lead to an approximately 20% increase in design stress for the same design load. A 10m increase in water depth would lead to a 40% increase, approximately for this location. Increased design loads resulting from increased exposure would further increase these differences to higher stress levels. As a result, this is why Vancouver Drydock indicated that the NoGo region 3 is the most expensive location for the proposed drydocks.

Questions on the **environmental noise assessment**

79	You sound slide gave 1-3 db increase shows the min. value increased by 3 and the highest value increased by 1db. Why have both values increased by the largest expected increase?
----	---

172	You said moving 40 meters south reduces noise. What decibel reduction would be achieved in moving 40 meters South? I presume you have an answer to this if you are making such a claim.
-----	---

179	Can we see the noise model for the Trophy?
-----	--

226	What is the noise impact of the acoustic effect between Cascade W and E in the beach area? It has a "U" shape if you add the Atrium buildings East and West at the back?
-----	--

231	Extrapolation of dB levels is not an accurate study. Will there be a more thorough independent study conducted?
-----	---

The Environmental Noise Assessment was conducted by BKL consultants, an independent engineering firm specializing in the field of acoustical consulting.

BKL generated a 3D computer model following the international recommended ISO 9613-2 (1996) standard for predicting exterior sound propagation. The study area included the area bounded by Burrard Dry Dock Pier, Esplanade E and St. Andrews Ave. The Environmental Noise Assessment is available on the Project and Environmental Review webpage.

The 3D model assessed noise levels at the Trophy, Cascade East and Cascade West developments. The model predicted that the L_{Rden} (rated day-evening-night equivalent sound level) would increase one dBa at the Trophy development and three dBa at both the Cascade East and Cascade West development. The maximum predicted L_{Rden} does not exceed the Port of Vancouver's criterion at any of the residences.

The assessment that was conducted was based on the proposed location , which is 40 metres south of current location of the Careen.

The Environmental Noise Assessment is available on the project website under Learn More.

Questions on the **noise screening assessment**

169	<p>Question9. There is a Noise Assessment Screening Worksheet. Why there is not any input from a third party? Please also comment who provided the weights when calculated the total Weighted Project Score? There is a category called: Population Exposed to Project Noise. It has more than 100 residents as indicated in the worksheet (which is the highest). Surprisingly, the weight in importance is only 1.0. This is lowest weight if compared to all the attribute criteria. The Reflections and Shading category has a weight of 1.8. So, Reflections is more important that People based on your assessment? There is a self-assessment bias here. How do the weightings vary if you rate this project on an industrial area exclusively as opposed to a project that has exposure to a large residential zone? What is the feedback from the City of North Vancouver and the Port of Vancouver regarding this self-noise assessment? How does Port Vancouver determine an objective way to score this Screening Worksheet? I can a</p>
-----	--

182	<p>Question9. There is a Noise Assessment Screening Worksheet. Please also comment who provided the weights when calculated the total Weighted Project Score? There is a category called: Population Exposed to Project Noise. It has more than 100 residents as indicated in the worksheet (which is the highest). Surprisingly, the weight in importance is only 1.0. This is lowest weight if compared to all the attribute criteria. The Reflections and Shading category has a weight of 1.8. So, Reflections is more important that People based on your weighting?</p>
-----	---

216	<p>Question 12. In the Noise Assessment Screening Worksheet, how would you describe the answers: very low, low, moderate, high or very high noise in terms of decibels?</p>
-----	---

266	<p>The weight for people is 1. The weight for Reflections is 1.8.?? (SOUND)</p>
-----	---

A requirement of the application is the completion of the Port of Vancouver's Noise Assessment Screening Worksheet. The worksheet is used to assess all Category C and D applications to ensure consistency between project applications. The worksheet was completed by BKL Consultants who are an independent engineering firm specializing in the field of acoustical consulting.

Question on **current noise levels**

76	We live in the trophy on front unit and need to shut the patio door due to current noise from the ongoing work. What is the current noise level right now?
----	--

The Port of Vancouver operates a network of noise monitors to understand and track the source and intensity of port and urban noise. Locations of the noise monitors were chosen based on community feedback in collaboration with noise experts and municipal partners. The closest Port of Vancouver noise monitor to Vancouver Drydock is located at the foot of St. Georges street.

Real-time data, which includes noise levels, temperature, pressure, wind speed & direction and humidity is accessible through the Port of Vancouver noise monitoring web portal.

Question on **air quality**

222	The 2017 estimated emissions were 77 tonnes/year of volatile organic compound, 22 tones/year of particulates and 3 tonnes/year of metals. Will these numbers change with the expansion? What were your last actual reported emissions results? How do we know this estimate is still valid?
-----	---

As part of the Metro Vancouver permit application process, an engineering consultant estimated annual emissions for volatile organic compounds (VOC's), particulate and metals. The Water Lot Project will not require an amendment to the estimated emissions in the Metro Vancouver permit application.

Vancouver Drydock reports annual emissions to the National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI). The most recent publicly available information is from 2019 and the reported emissions were 30.5 T of VOC's and 7.6 T of particulate.

Question on **sampling stations**

225	Walking the area there are two air sampling stations that appear to be on Seaspan land area. Why have these stations not been used for sampling?
-----	--

There are two sampling stations within the Vancouver Drydock site. The station on the western edge of the wharf is a meteorological station measuring windspeed and direction and the station in the north parking lot is the Port of Vancouver noise monitor.

Question on **access to the navigation channel**

251	When a ship is anchored in Bravo and laying stern to the north it is very tight and sometimes dangerous for an inbound ship to get up the North Shore to berths on the North Shore. Will Moving Careen 40 meter south impact this situation more?
-----	---

The Careen would continue to be within the southern boundary of our water lot and would not extend as far south as our Panamax drydock, nor would it interfere with the navigation channel.

Question on **water quality**

231	how polluted are the waters around the docks
-----	--

Burrard Inlet is a dynamic body of water with a very high mixing rate (this is evident when looking at the water near the first and second narrows). Thus, the water around the drydocks is likely similar to the water in the rest of the central harbour.

As with the existing drydocks, the new structures will be self-contained, with any collected water from all (existing and new) drydocks discharged to the sewer when vessels are onboard. Existing Seaspan stormwater management procedures will be followed during the operation of the drydock. Stormwater will be treated as follows:

- While a vessel is dry docked on the new structures, stormwater and vessel washwater will flow north into a collection tank and will be pumped into a holding tank. The water is then processed through a two-step treatment plant where particulates are first filtered out using sand then metals are filtered using activated charcoal. The water is then pumped to the sewer under a Metro Vancouver permit.
- Once work is completed on a vessel, the vessel and drydock are washed down (wash water flows to the sewer, as described above), and the uncontaminated vessel and drydock are lowered into the sea to allow the vessel to depart.

Question on **bubble curtain technology**

206	You talk about bubble curtains to soften noise' why not use them now cut down noise during water blasting
-----	---

Bubble curtains are used to dampen underwater noise during very noisy activities like impact pile driving, and are not used above water. The way they work is to sink a hose (like a garden hose) with tiny holes, on the seabed, and pump air through it. The air escapes through the tiny holes creating a curtain of bubbles that rises to the surface of the water. When you say 'water blasting' - I assume you are referring to the ultra high pressure washing of ships that takes place above water. This technology would not work above water.

Question on **lighting**

219	If there is no work being done, why is there light on dawn to dusk.
-----	---

Our operating practice is to turn off the lights when work finishes for the shift; however, there are occasions when a crew may be on board the vessels and some lighting is required for safe access. As noted in our application, the new drydocks will use dark sky certified lighting and we are currently in the process of beginning a retrofit of our full operations.

Questions on **additional technical studies**

238	Question 17. The Port of Vancouver and Seaspan expressed that they are open to the idea of engaging a third-party consultant selected by the residents to undertake an environmental impact study. What would be the steps to do so (question for both Seaspan and Port of Vancouver)? A committee among residents, Seaspan, City of North Vancouver and Port of Vancouver would be a good path to start doing so. Who would the decision making for this proposal (question for Seaspan and Port of Vancouver)? I don't know if anyone from the City of North Vancouver is attending the meeting but same question for them).
190	Is it possible to do a study of the emission and noise over the next 30 days?
215	Noise measurements taken from Esplanade near the rail yards has nothing to do with dB measurements taken in the community, and at the location of the residences. Will new studies be done (paid for by the Port / Seaspan) and conducted by independent consultants chosen by the community?

As part of the port authority's project and environmental review (PER) application process for a category C project, Vancouver Drydock was required to complete a number of technical studies and assessments. These are available on our project website under Learn More - www.drydockprojects.com. At this point, Vancouver Drydock is not undertaking any additional technical studies.

As Vancouver Drydock operates within the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, they are responsible for review and consideration of our permit application.

Responses to unanswered questions from both community meetings – port authority supplement

**Vancouver Drydock – Proposed Water Lot Project
Community Information Meeting
Responses from the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority
Questions not addressed during the meetings – SUPPLEMENT
(as of , 2021)**

Thank you to all those who posted questions during the community information meetings.

While we did our best to respond to all questions, we were unable to get to all questions during the available time. Responses to these questions are provided below.

1

Questions on **Land Use**

<p>Question3. Has the Port of Vancouver evaluated the economic impact of this expansion? Has the Port of Vancouver evaluated other options west of the Drydocks that could represent economic value add to the community? From an urban development perspective, could the Port of Vancouver consider other type of projects in the area west from the Drydocks and east from the Seabus terminal. For example, could a Marina be developed in this area? This would represent a terrific economic value added for local businesses, the City of North Vancouver, Seaspan and residents if done properly. By expanding the drydock to the west of the pier, you limit the development of projects of any land/water uses.</p>	<p>The proposed project site is designated for industrial use under the port authority's Land Use Plan. More information about the land use plan, and land use designations, is available on the port authority website at: https://www.portvancouver.com/land/land-use-planning/</p> <p>The port authority has not received applications for other options west of the dry-docks/east of the Seabus terminal and any application within this area (and within the port's jurisdiction) would be required to go through the PER process. However, large parts of this area is not within the jurisdiction of the port.</p>
<p>Yes or no question for the Port: Can the Seaspan lease of the water lot be modified to move to the project to the east?</p>	<p>The water lot to the east of this proposed application is designated for Industrial use under the port authority's land use plan. It is the responsibility of applicants to determine where their proposed project is located or if they want to modify an application that is currently underway Questions about the applicant's lease can be directed to Seaspan: https://drydockprojects.com/contact/</p>

Can the zoning be changed?	The water lot is not 'zoned' as in a municipal context but rather 'designated' under the Canada Marine Act. There is a process for redesignating areas within the jurisdiction of the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, under the Land Use Plan. The port authority recently completed an update to the Land Use Plan (2020) and this area was reviewed in that process. The industrial designation was determined as appropriate in this location through a public engagement process. Visit our website for more information: https://www.portvancouver.com/land/land-use-planning/
Can you apply for a zoning change?	There is a process for redesignating areas within the land managed by the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, under the Land Use Plan. The port authority recently completed an update to the Land Use Plan (2020) and this area was reviewed in that process. The industrial designation was determined as appropriate in this location through a public engagement process. Visit our website for more information: https://www.portvancouver.com/land/land-use-planning/
Can the designation of the Water lot to the east be re-designated, similar to how a land lot can be rezoned?	There is a process for redesignating areas within the jurisdiction of the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, under the Land Use Plan. However, the port authority recently completed an update to the Land Use Plan (2020) and this area was reviewed in that process. The industrial designation was determined as appropriate in this location through a public engagement process. Visit our website for more information: https://www.portvancouver.com/land/land-use-planning/
What is the proposed future purpose of the east pier??	The use of the east pier now and into the future is best directed to the lease holder (Seaspan ULC). As identified in the port authority land use plan, the land use designation for this area is 'Industrial' and as such, any application to use this area must conform to that use/designation.

<p>Who promised the owners of these waterfront condos that their views would never change? Was that the Port of Vancouver?</p>	<p>The upland area where the waterfront condos are located is not within the jurisdiction of the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority. The City of North Vancouver would be best to address this issue.</p>
<p>Would the Port of Vancouver entertain conversations to amend the lease? We want a win/win for everyone</p>	<p>The port authority considers applications for proposed projects within the scope identified in the PER application. Should an applicant wish to amend lease boundaries, it is the applicants responsibility to propose these changes through the PER application or a subsequent amendment.</p>

Questions on **Noise**

<p>City of North Vancouver bylaws indicate that in an activity continuous sound (sound occurring for a duration of more than three minutes, or occurring continually, sporadically or erratically, but totalling more than three minutes in any fifteen minute period of time) should not exceed 60dBA in the daytime (07:00 20:00), or 55dBA at night time (20:00 7:00). Based on the environmental noise assessment provided, predicted future dB ratings are expected to be 71-75 dB of continuous sound (which is 11-15 dB above bylaw levels). Current activity already exceeds the levels residents have a right to. How do you explain this breach of resident' rights to quiet enjoyment in their homes? Please explain in detail.</p>	<p>All projects proposed on federal lands within the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority jurisdiction must undergo the Project and Environmental Review (PER) process. Under our PER process we have now commenced the technical review phase, which can be up to 120 business days for a Category C project. During technical review, the port authority will consider all submitted studies, technical information, and mitigation measures proposed, prior to making a project decision. We have not yet reviewed the environmental noise assessment for the proposed project. The Port Authority will conduct a thorough review of the submitted noise assessment in accordance with our Environmental Noise Assessment guideline available here: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/guidelines/</p>
--	---

<p>Question9. There is a Noise Assessment Screening Worksheet. Why there is not any input from a third party? Please also comment who provided the weights when calculated the total Weighted Project Score? There is a category called: Population Exposed to Project Noise. It has more than 100 residents as indicated in the worksheet (which is the highest). Surprisingly, the weight in importance is only 1.0. This is lowest weight if compared to all the attribute criteria. The Reflections and Shading category has a weight of 1.8. So, Reflections is more important than People based on your assessment? There is a self-assessment bias here. How do the weightings vary if you rate this project on an industrial area exclusively as opposed to a project that has exposure to a large residential zone? What is the feedback from the City of North Vancouver and the Port of Vancouver regarding this self-noise assessment? How does Port Vancouver determine an objective way to score this Screening Worksheet?</p>	<p>If the total weighted project score is 30 or greater in the noise assessment screening worksheet a full noise impact assessment is required. A full noise impact assessment was prepared for this project and is posted to our website. The Port Authority will conduct a thorough review of the submitted noise assessment in accordance with our Environmental Noise Assessment guideline available here: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/guidelines/</p>
--	--

<p>Question10. Port of Vancouver: Regarding noise threshold. Can the port of Vancouver indicate how the threshold of 75 dBA for Post Project Noise Environment Parameter and the Low Frequency Noise Level of 70dB was determined? What was the basis for these numbers and the underlying assumptions and context (again it is different to site a project in an industrial zone and a project in an industrial an residential area). Can the Port of Vancouver also provide the Health Canada guideline regarding the Increased Community Noise Exposure whereby a threshold of 6.5% of % highly annoyed persons was determined? Also, can the consultant (BKL) walk us through the calculation determining the Post Project Noise Environment Parameter, LRden and the %HA?</p>	<p>Please refer to our Environmental Noise Assessment Guideline for more details. The guideline is available here: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/guidelines/ Environmental Noise Assessment guideline includes references to resource documents, namely ISO 1996 -1 (2003), ANSI S 12.9 2005/ Part 4 and Michaud, D.s., Bly, S.H.P & Keith, S. E. (2008). Page 10 of the guideline has more detailed references and page 15 of the guideline outlines the methodology for community noise exposure and thresholds.</p>
<p>The weight for people is 1. The weight for Reflections is 1.8. ??</p>	<p>If the total weighted project score is 30 or greater in the noise assessment screening worksheet a full noise impact assessment is required. A full noise impact assessment was prepared for this project and is posted to our website. The Port Authority will conduct a thorough review of the submitted noise assessment in accordance with our Environmental Noise Assessment guideline available here: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/guidelines/</p>

Questions on **Past Permits**

<p>Question2: I can appreciate that the Shipyards have been involved in the community for more than 100 years. Communities evolve and standards change over time. Can the Port of Vancouver list any examples of Permit Applications submitted to the Port Authority within the last 5 years for new or expansion projects of an industrial facility immediately adjacent to a Residential community (less than 200m). You can appreciate that the permit approval process and quality of living has changed from last century even decades ago. If there are not any precedent projects, who do we ensure that the permitting and approval guidelines and threshold are appropriate and applicable for this project expansion? If there are precedent cases, how many of them were approved or rejected and the reasons to do so?</p>	<p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority interfaces with 16 municipalities and many more Coast Salish First Nations. Accordingly, we have multiple instances where port activities and applications for changes to port lands are adjacent to residential areas.</p> <p>All projects proposed on federal lands within the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority jurisdiction must undergo the Project and Environmental Review (PER) process. Through this process, the port authority fulfills its 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>Please visit the port authority website for more information about the PER process, and past project permit decisions: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/status-of-permit-applications/</p>
--	---

<p>Has the Port of Vancouver evaluated and approved similar projects whereby there is a residential community immediately adjacent to a proposed new or expansion industrial facility? If so, what is the distance to the residential communities? What precedents to we have regarding any permitted approval process in this regard?</p>	<p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority interfaces with 16 municipalities and many more Coast Salish First Nations. Accordingly, we have multiple instances where port activities and applications for changes to port lands are adjacent to residential areas. Our land use plan provides maps that that outline adjacent communities to a variety of port land use designations. You can find more information relating to our land use plan here: https://www.portvancouver.com/land/land-use-planning/</p> <p>All projects proposed on federal lands within Vancouver Fraser Port Authority jurisdiction must undergo the Project and Environmental Review (PER) process. Through this process, the port authority fulfills its 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. Past determinations on projects that may have been adjacent to residential communities would be posted on our website.</p> <p>Please visit the port authority website for more information about the PER process, and past project permit decisions: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/status-of-permit-applications/</p>
--	---

Questions on the **PER Process**

<p>In speaking with several residents since Tuesday's meeting, we felt that many of our questions and concerns were not answered or addressed directly, and that insufficient study has been completed on the impact to our community. Based on our questions and concerns, what additional study and additional community engagement will be conducted prior to a decision being made to ensure the quiet and peaceful enjoyment of our residences? Additionally, what compensation to the community will Seaspan and the Port of Vancouver impart to residents due to frequent and ongoing interference or unreasonable disturbances to that peaceful enjoyment?</p>	<p>The applicant was required to undertake a 25-business day public engagement period (June 25 - July 30). This engagement period has now been extended until Thursday, August 12, 2021. The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is required to make a determination on the proposed project under the Canadian Impact Assessment Act. The project was posted to the IAA registry on June 25 with a 30 calendar comment period (June 25 - July 24). The comment period has now been extended to August 12 as Transport Canada and the port authority are required to make determinations on the proposed project.</p> <p>Both the applicant and the Port Authority are working to respond to all questions that were not addressed in the two information session hosted by the applicant. The reports and studies that have been included by the applicant as part of their submission are compiled by subject matter experts and certified professionals. Through the PER process, the review team will assess these reports and will request additional information as needed to administer the process and to allow for a recommendation and determination to be made.</p> <p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority does not provide compensation but works through the PER process to mitigate any significant impacts identified.</p>
--	---

<p>Question8. Port of Vancouver: Please indicate if this approval decision is made by a committee or by a single individual? Can the Port of Vancouver make the approval guidelines public available?</p>	<p>All projects proposed on federal lands managed by the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority must undergo the Project and Environmental Review (PER) process. Through this process, the port authority fulfills its 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. Decisions on category C applications such as this are made by the Director of Planning and Development based on a summary report and recommendation from a team of professionals and subject matter experts. Information about the PER process is publicly available on the port authority website at: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/</p>
<p>Hi Chris Bishop it seems that Environment Canada should be involved in this too to see the environmental impact to marine life on this expansion. It seems that this expansion will exponentially effect air and water quality and thus community and marine life</p>	<p>Through the PER process (and as required by our responsibilities under the Impact Assessment Act) the port authority undertakes a review of impacts to the environment. Depending on the scope of the proposed project and the review undertaken, the port authority's team can include planners, environmental scientists, engineers, consultation professionals and independent consultants as needed.</p>
<p>To the Port, given you don't deal with residential area, if Seaspan meets all requirements for industrial area, do concerns of residents matter in your consideration of the application? Under what conditions would this application not be approved? Are we wasting our time?</p>	<p>As part of the Project and Environmental Review process for the proposed project, the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority will consider all feedback received prior to making a determination on the proposed project.</p>

<p>Question 14. Do the Port of Vancouver and/or the City of Vancouver has any Visual impact guidelines in terms of light pollution?</p>	<p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority has prepared guidelines to assist applicants of projects on federal lands and waters under its jurisdiction. These include guidelines when considering view and shade impacts of proposed new buildings and structures, as well as guidelines when determining outdoor lighting requirements and/or preparing outdoor Lighting Plans for proposed projects. These guidelines are available on the port authority website at: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/guidelines/</p>
<p>Question 17. The Port of Vancouver and Seaspan expressed that they are open to the idea of engaging a third-party consultant selected by the residents to undertake an environmental impact study. What would be the steps to do so (question for both Seaspan and Port of Vancouver? A committee among residents, Seaspan, City of North Vancouver and Port of Vancouver would be a good path to start doing so. Who would the decision making for this proposal (question for Seaspan and Port of Vancouver? I don't know if anyone from the City of North Vancouver is attending the meeting but same question for them).</p>	<p>The port authority uses the PER process to fulfill its federal responsibilities under the Canada Marine Act and the Impact Assessment Act, carefully reviewing and considering potential effects from all proposed project developments on federal lands and waters before determining if a project should proceed. Depending on the project and scope of the review, the port authority's team of experts can include, but is not limited to, planners, environmental scientists, engineers, and consultation professionals.</p> <p>Should an individual or group wish to submit an environmental impact study for consideration in the PER process, the report would need to be received by the port authority in a timely manner to align with the category C timeline.</p>

<p>Port of Vancouver said earlier that they do not consider Residential Zone levels/considerations in any of their approvals, as they only have jurisdiction over industrial areas.</p>	<p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority Land Use Plan does not have a residential designation; rather, the land use designations found in the land use plan align with the port authority's mandate under Transport Canada and the Canada Marine Act. For more information on the land use plan, please see https://www.portvancouver.com/land/land-use-planning/. However, through the port's Project and Environmental Review process, submitted information, studies, reports, feedback and perspectives are considered in any recommendations or decisions on an application.</p>
<p>Can you please provide the contact information for the developer a the Port who will be looking at this application</p>	<p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is not the developer pursuing the proposed project. The role of the port authority is to review Seaspan's application under the Project and Environmental Review (PER) process. The port authority uses the PER process to fulfill its federal responsibilities under the Canada Marine Act and the Impact Assessment Act, carefully reviewing and considering potential effects from all proposed project developments on federal lands and waters before determining if a project should proceed. Depending on the project and scope of the review, the port authority's team of experts can include, but is not limited to, planners, environmental scientists, engineers, and consultation professionals.</p> <p>For questions regarding the Project and Environmental Review of the proposed project, please contact Tim Blair, Supervisor, Planning, by email at Tim.Blair@portvancouver.com, or phone at 604.665.9378.</p>

<p>No commitment to neighbors, no monitoring of environmental issues, dumping of sewage issues into the water, noise pollutions (inadequate testing and totally biased, Air and Water quality issues disregarded. No proper independent testing nor professionally done. Chris from all of this you can see this is not passable. The federal govt needs to be involved.</p>	<p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is the federal body responsible for the stewardship of lands and waters that make up the Port of Vancouver. The port authority is accountable to the federal minister of transport and operates under the Canada Marine Act with a mandate to facilitate trade while protecting the environment and considering local communities.</p> <p>All projects proposed on federal lands within the port authority's jurisdiction must undergo the Project and Environmental Review (PER) process. Through this process, the port authority fulfills its 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>For more information about the PER process, visit the port authority website at: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/</p>
--	---

<p>When will the decision be made? And how will the community be apprised of updates throughout the process?</p>	<p>This project is designated as a category C review under the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority's Project and Environmental Review (PER) process. The anticipated review timeline for a category C project is 60 to 120 business days. A decision has not been made and is anticipated in winter 2021.</p> <p>Visit the port authority's project website for updates: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/status-of-permit-applications/seaspan-vancouver-drydock-water-lot-expansion/</p> <p>Should a project be approved, conditions are included in the permit to avoid or mitigate significant adverse environmental and other effects. These conditions may outline requirements for applicants to communicate with the community during construction.</p>
<p>Why no billboard in the area like developers do</p>	<p>The port authority reviewed the level of participation thus far and determined that the notification activities Seaspan has implemented satisfy the requirements for notification under the port authority's Project and Environmental Review process.</p>

Questions on **Public Engagement**

<p>Will all feedback be given to the Port Authority? I believe that there is a conflict of interest if Seaspan collates and edits the feedback.</p>	<p>Under the port authority's Project and Environmental Review (PER) process, all applicants conducting public engagement are required to develop a public engagement plan for review and approval by the port authority. This plan must describe, among other aspects, the applicant's process to notify the public about public engagement opportunities, how the applicant will engage with the public, and how the feedback will be collected, summarized, considered, and communicated to those who participated. The port authority reviewed Seaspan's public engagement plan and found that it satisfied the requirements of the PER process. The applicant will provide details as part of the public engagement summary and consideration report, which will be available on the applicant and port authority websites after the public comment timelines close and prior to determination. For more information on public engagement requirements during PER, please see: https://www.portvancouver.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/2018-09-05-PER-Guideline-Public-Engagement.pdf and https://www.portvancouver.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/2020-04-29-Guidelines-Public-Engagement-during-COVID-19-1-1.pdf</p>
<p>Comments should be submitted before July 24th</p>	<p>The public engagement period, led by the applicant, has been extended until Thursday, August 12, 2021. In addition to the public engagement process led by the applicant, the Project and Environmental Review process includes requirements under the Impact Assessment Act for public comment via the Canadian Impact Assessment Registry. This application has been posted on the Canadian Impact Assessment Registry with public comment period spanning July 14, 2021 to August 12, 2021.</p>

Questions on **Richardson**

<p>The area in front of the rail yard is fully utilized? It appears to be empty space.</p>	<p>The area adjacent to the rail yard to the east is designated as 'port terminal' and must be used in a manner consistent with the designation (i.e. terminal use). For more information on potential uses under the land use designation 'port terminal' please see the port authority land use plan. https://www.portvancouver.com/land/land-use-planning/</p>
--	--

Questions on the **Project Scope**

<p>Main concern is why the applicant is not expanding on the east. Seaspan wants to emphasize the scope of engagement does not include consulting on alternative sites.</p>	<p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is currently reviewing Seaspan's application for expansion on the west side of their current operations. Alternative locations are not part of the scope of the application or review. The port authority will consider all feedback received prior to making a determination on the proposed project.</p> <p>This project is designated as a category C review under the port authority's Project and Environmental Review (PER) process. The anticipated review timeline for a category C project is 60 to 120 business days. A decision has not been made and is anticipated in winter 2021. For more information about the PER process, visit the port authority website at: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/</p>
---	--

Questions on **Swimming**

<p>I've seen people swimming in the area. Have you evaluated any hazard to humans?</p>	<p>The area of the inner harbour is not promoted as suitable for active recreation including swimming or paddling.</p>
--	--