



SEASPAN VANCOUVER DRYDOCK WATER LOT PROJECT

Public Engagement Consideration Report
Appendix A – Part 1: 2021 Community Feedback

February 22, 2023



2021 COMMUNITY FEEDBACK – PART 1

This Appendix includes all electronic feedback received by Seaspan during the 2021 public engagement activities. Feedback provided during the 2022 public engagement activities can be found in Appendices B, C and D.

In 2021, feedback was provided directly to Seaspan via the feedback forms, emails and voicemails, and via emails forwarded from the port authority. Copies of letters and handwritten communications have also been included.

The feedback is listed chronologically, is verbatim and has not been corrected for punctuation and grammar. Feedback from voice mails have been transcribed.

Part One includes:

1. Comments received via email (body), online feedback form and phone, presented in a table.

Part Two (found in the companion document) includes:

2. Comments received by handwritten letter or handwritten feedback form
3. Comments received via email (as attachments)

Names and contact information for private individuals have been redacted for privacy.

Of note, where an individual submitted multiple, but similar, comments through two or more feedback channels (such as a feedback form, voicemail or email), comments were documented separately.

1. Comments Received via Email (Body), Online Feedback Form and Phone

Date	Feedback
23-Jun-21	Oh hi ____ this is ____ just returning your call and yes, I'd be a good contact for the Cascade building given that I'm on the strata council. And that what your application may immediately affect me but also a number of residents. I'd looked at the drawings and am trying to determine what impact it is gonna be, before everyone starts getting up in arms and, you know, immediately jumping to conclusions. Just to let you know I am supportive of Seaspan - one of the reasons is my son really likes the ferry system. One of our reasons we bought into here - one is the beautiful view of downtown, but two the fact that there is actually an active working shipyard here. So I'm trying to look at this in a positive light. But I think if you can give me a call back we can discuss what's the actual layout that's being applied for. And that way I can better communicate that to the rest of the 201 units in our building. Thanks.
25-Jun-21	More good-paying jobs on the North Shore are always a fantastic thing.
27-Jun-21	Expanding the docks will increase the water contamination, pollution and díctese the marine life. I oppose to any expansion in the Drydock.
27-Jun-21	Additional docks will severely impact the marine habitat, will be a huge eye sore to the water front view and it will increase the noise level to all the residents in the nearby area.
28-Jun-21	I'm a fourth-generation Drydock employee and my entire family lives in North Vancouver. This is an amazing opportunity for the yard to hire some local folks. High-paying jobs are hard to come by but especially in the city we live in North Vancouver. I think Seaspan did an amazing job with the research and it looks like this project will have a limited impact.
28-Jun-21	I live at ____ Victory Ship Way. My view won't be obstructed nor is it likely that I will get any light pollution. The only possible issue would be increased noise levels. If the Shipyard manages its noise level in the evening and throughout the night this project will have little negative impact on me.
29-Jun-21	I am opposed to Seaspan extending their water lot by 40m West as it will consume the water view for hundreds of property owners. It will also lower property values. It will increase noise and visual noise which should remain peaceful in a residential zoned area. It is very disappointing if this should be approved.
29-Jun-21	As residents of The Trophy we are concerned about an increase in noise, lights and air quality. We support the shipyard and the work it provides but...
29-Jun-21	I've been reading with interest the proposed expansion project. I currently live in the Trophy building and would like to know whether you considered expanding East rather than West. If this was considered why was it ruled out? The increase in noise and impact on views will have a detrimental effect on the residents and most likely business in the area.
29-Jun-21	> I've been reading with interest the proposed expansion project. > I currently live in the Trophy building and would like to know whether you considered expanding East rather than West. > If this was considered why was it ruled out? > The increase in noise and impact on views will have a detrimental effect on the residents and most likely business in the area.

Date	Feedback
29-Jun-21	We are the building at the foot of St George's Further to my comment I really don't understand why going East was not an option. There is space and it backs onto rail lines Trophy is particularly sensitive to further development East Noise, dirt continued to be a problem. Added to the fact the dry dock works 24 hours a day 7 days a week. I think I'm correct in adding that Seaspan also has operations further West. Have they already consider these options and rejected them. If so we would all want to know why.
29-Jun-21	The Shipyards is an important community gathering space. If the project doesn't enhance the Shipyards (e.g. sponsor additional features like a wading pool) to make up for the impact this extension will have I do not support it.
29-Jun-21	I am concerned about the additional pollution - especially noise and effects on air quality - that this project would introduce. Additionally, with the new dry docks planned further west of the existing location, this brings industry even closer to the residential shipyards area. Not only does the shipyards contain a large number of residences, but it is the cornerstone gathering place of Lower Lonsdale and North Vancouver, bringing culture and connection to the community. The additional industry in the area may also affect tourism as the shipyards could be seen as a less desirable destination.
30-Jun-21	I'm all in favour of expansion but concerned about blocked views from the lower waterfront area.
30-Jun-21	[Loud alarm in background] I don't know if you can barely here me but I'm phoning you back regarding the Seaspan proposal. That alarm that you're hearing right now is blasting from Seaspan. It appears every time they bring in a boat to anchor it - now it's the Atlantic Condor - they blast this huge alarm, and it goes on for I don't know how long it's going to be going for but that'll just be a number of other complaints that you're going to receive from tenants and owners of these buildings, saying the impact that Seaspan has had on the livability of these areas. I've been speaking to a lot of people and there's not going to be a lot of positive responses to the expansion of Seaspan into our view corridor. But just to let you know the response from the owners hasn't been on a positive note regarding the expansion of Seaspan into the view corridor or into the area. I don't know how long this alarm will be going on but it's an example of where Seaspan isn't looking at the interests of the ownership down here.
30-Jun-21	I want to attend the public meetings and the mailed notice indicates that to participate, go to "dry dock.link/meeting". Do you need to be on the drydockprojects.com website to sign in? The link you have provided does not seem like a complete address, or like a zoom meeting. When I entered "dry dock.link/meeting" as a google search I do not see anything related to Seaspan. Please advise.
30-Jun-21	I would like to obtain a printed version of your Project Information Package. My address is ____ Victory Ship Way, North Vancouver, B.C.
30-Jun-21	I'm a member of the community - in fact I recently moved to the Chadwick Court building which is essentially two blocks from your drydock and I look right on over your drydock and I love it. So I've gotten the card about your wishing to expand the drydock and I'm in favour of it, but also I would like to explore with you an idea - vague idea - about expanding your exposure in general in the community which I think would favour what you're trying to do and work all in your favour in terms of getting community support for what you're trying to do. - and I'd just like to explore an idea with you because I like what you're doing. You are the major entertainment from my new apartment window. So please give me a call. Thank you very much. Bye

Date	Feedback
30-Jun-21	Can you tell me why there is no image of the proposed expansion included in any of your materials or on the link provided through the QR code? How am I supposed to assess the proposal without seeing a visual?
01-Jul-21	<p>My particular interest is in major capital projects where the resulting operations expand the North Shore workforce with good paying marine industry jobs. Also, to see projects which can serve as attractions to residents and visitors to the Lower Lonsdale waterfront.</p> <p>Many people will oppose any business, residential or industrial initiative because they believe it may affect their quiet enjoyment of their home. They have no regard for the greater good that results from such projects. They're selfish. Here's my suggestion. Decorate the 2 small new dry docks with some great artwork that will make them attractions, not detractions from the great Shipyards public development</p> <p>Enhance the district with your dry docks. Look at the cement plant silos at Granville Island as example of how large unsightly structures can be turned into attractions. Also, repainting one of your old colourful cranes, including with Seaspan's name in a black section, has transformed them from somewhat of a dilapidated, yet functioning, eyesore, into a real attraction.</p> <p>Perhaps some indigenous art covering the dry docks would be particularly meaningful given the recent sad news on the residential schools matter. No, I am not employed with Seaspan, nor have any family or friend who are. Feel free to contact me if you would like more thoughts. I live 3 blocks away and can see the dry docks from my home. I'm a booster for this.</p>
01-Jul-21	Can you confirm why you are not considering the dock directly to the east as an alternative to the expansion to the west. I would assume that this is also a Seaspan Pier. Currently there just appears to be a Yacht moored their.
01-Jul-21	<p>Why not expand to the East, where there is no interference with the residents and public's waterfront enjoyment and views.</p> <p>The City of North Vancouver has created a wonderful family/public place for all to enjoy. Seaspan is definitely an interesting historical part of that but infringing to the west affects the existing beauty when expansion east would not.</p> <p>Definitely expansion should go east where noise, lights, activity and aesthetics would impact no one.</p>
01-Jul-21	<p>The shipyard area from Q market up to your existing dockyard became an iconic zone for visitors and resident of North Vancouver. By taking away another section of water front by your dry docks you are adding another black spots on the beauty of this small section of water front.</p> <p>Why you are not expanding your project in East of existing dry docks?</p>
02-Jul-21	I'm just looking at the participation link for the meeting and the "drydock.link/meeting" just doesn't seem like a complete address to me. I just want to make sure that that address is correct. I did send you an email on this as well. Can someone please call me just to confirm that you don't need to be in the Seaspan site or something to find this meeting link, because when I look at it online it seems to go to a rehab centre. Thank you so much - look forward to your call.
02-Jul-21	<p>It is sad to see the possibility of more open waterfront impacted by noise, bright lights, and structures. This space is enjoyed by residents, hotels, restaurants and the tax paying public.</p> <p>Expansion east is industrial and would not affect this open water space.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Why not expand to the East, where there is no interference with the residents and public's waterfront enjoyment and views.</p> <p>The City of North Vancouver has created a wonderful family/public place for all to enjoy. Seaspan is definitely an interesting historical part of that but infringing to the west affects the existing beauty when expansion east would not.</p> <p>Definitely expansion should go east where noise, lights, activity and aesthetics would impact no one.</p>
03-Jul-21	<p>Construction noise disrupts neighbours and area visitors temporarily. Operations noise should not increase permanently. Noise pollution is to be avoided for everyone's health sake.</p>
04-Jul-21	<p>_____, you are tremendous ambassadors for Seaspan and I consider you to be friends.</p> <p>Having said that I wish to share my thoughts with you both directly and not have you hear that I'm 'sneaking around' with comments behind your backs. I know you can appreciate that concerns have arisen regarding the expansion plans. Please accept mine as feedback that are in no way personal.</p> <hr/> <p>Hello and please allow us to introduce ourselves.</p> <p>My wife and I are homeowners in the Trophy at the Pier (____ Victory Ship Way), having taken occupancy in August, 2016. In those FIVE years, we have had a comfortable relationship with the Seaspan Corporation, but it has very recently come to our attention that Seaspan is proposing expansion plans that may test the relationship, not to mention the financial future of literally hundreds of residential owners in the Pinnacle at the Pier Development.</p> <p>Please understand that we are not against the addition of more drydock jobs..... Nothing could be further from the truth!</p> <p>However, we do feel that the planned expansion should not be pushed west at the peril of residents, small businesses and visitors to this amazing 'gathering area'. We are only now emerging from a 16-month inability to gather and enjoy this community jewel that the City of North Vancouver has created. We understand the future economic possibilities for Seaspan, but we wish to speak up about the potential economic hit that homeowners will take from this plan.</p> <p>It would seem that Seaspan does not feel they have the ability to easily manoeuvre barges into the area east of their current drydock operation with the added docks they wish to add. They also maintain that there is not enough available space at their Pemberton Avenue location. They, however, do seem to have adequate space over there to accommodate THREE huge antiquated timber barges that serve no purpose in the supply ship contract that recently has been awarded them by the Canadian Federal Government.</p> <p>We have been told that the additional noise will only be 1-3 db, but it also makes sense to assume that with additional drydock facilities right outside the residential community, air and water quality will suffer. Our plea is not just about the 500+ owners and residents within the proposed expansion neighbourhood, but also about the pedestrians, bikers and kids that have been encouraged to enjoy the Spirit Trail and the</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>children's play area right at the waterfront, a short stone throw from the 'upgraded' operation.</p> <p>With the recent collapse of a residential tower in Surfside Florida, the proposal of adding six new and permanent pylons via pile driving has us more than a little concerned about this planned operation's impact on building foundations in the area.. We ask you to please consider what will be experienced now and possibly for years to come for many that live, work and visit this area. I don't believe that a railyard on the east of the Seaspan Drydock would find this expansion quite so imposing.</p>
04-Jul-21	<p>As HomeOwners in Cascade at the Pier ____ Victory Ship Way North Vancouver we are very concerned by the proposed SEASPAN Vancouver Drydock Water Lot Project application submitted to the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority. As a Community Stakeholder we see nothing but downside to our healthy environment and quality of life if the proposed extension to the SEASPAN water lot west is approved. The business desires of SEASPAN to invest/develop and serve new customers by expanding the west side of their water operations should not be allowed since it comes with added risk to the other Stakeholders. We recognize SEASPAN business investment desires but we are, at least, equally invested in our collective Community... the needs of the one should not outweigh the needs of the many. SEASPAN's own review admits the proposed development will increase noise and light pollution, cause potential structural issues via rattling to our buildings and impact neighbouring views. If the aforementioned were not enough to turn down this application the proverbial last nail in the coffin is the negative impact on our Air Quality. Absent from the documents reviewed this needs to be fully explored and fully mitigated as part of this project review. I would encourage the Port Authority to require/have a full environmental assessment completed prior to proceeding for the sake of all the residents, tourists and other businesses in our North Vancouver Jewell. Thank you</p>
04-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to enquire why the Seaspan expansion would be proposed for the west side of their operations rather than the east side??? The Shipyards is a vibrant area where people gather and dine and enjoy walking and to add more noise from Seaspan operations seems ridiculous!!!! The community around the Shipyards does not want more industrial noise and dirt they want minimal disruption to the view as well!!!! Put their expansion to the east and it disturbs no one other than their personal yacht moorage! We as a community are extremely opposed to this expansion and request that it not proceed!</p>
04-Jul-21	<p>My wife and I are homeowners in the Trophy at the Pier (____ Victory Ship Way), having taken occupancy in August, 2016. In those FIVE years, we have had a comfortable relationship with the Seaspan Corporation, but it has very recently come to our attention that Seaspan is proposing expansion plans that may test the relationship, not to mention the financial future of literally hundreds of residential owners in the Pinnacle at the Pier Development.</p> <p>Please understand that we are not against the addition of more drydock jobs..... Nothing could be further from the truth!</p> <p>However, we do feel that the planned expansion should not be pushed west at the peril of residents, small businesses and visitors to this amazing 'gathering area'.</p> <p>We are only now emerging from a 16-month inability to gather and enjoy this community jewel that the City of North Vancouver has created. We understand the future economic possibilities for Seaspan, but we wish to speak up about the potential economic hit that homeowners will take from this plan.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>It would seem that Seaspan does not feel they have the ability to easily manoeuvre barges into the area east of their current drydock operation with the added docks they wish to add. They also maintain that there is not enough available space at their Pemberton Avenue location. They, however, do seem to have adequate space over there to accommodate THREE huge antiquated timber barges that serve no purpose in the supply ship contract that recently has been awarded them by the Canadian Federal Government.</p> <p>We have been told that the additional noise will only be 1-3 db, but it also makes sense to assume that with additional drydock facilities right outside the residential community, air and water quality will suffer. Our plea is not just about the 500+ owners and residents within the proposed expansion neighbourhood, but also about the pedestrians, bikers and kids that have been encouraged to enjoy the Spirit Trail and the children's play area right at the waterfront, a short stone throw from the 'upgraded' operation.</p> <p>With the recent collapse of a residential tower in Surfside Florida, the proposal of adding six new and permanent pylons via piledriving has us more than a little concerned about this planned operation's impact on building foundations in the area..</p> <p>We ask you to please consider what will be experienced now and possibly for years to come for many that live, work and visit this area. I don't believe that a railyard on the east of the Seaspan Drydock would find this expansion quite so imposing.</p>
04-Jul-21	<p>The Trophy building had been my home for 4½ years. I love my life here and the surroundings; it's a vibrant area with good energy. When I saw your pamphlet I was very disturbed. The photographs are misleading and it makes me very sad about your proposal. I understand that you like to expand Seaspan but I believe there is lots of room on the east side of the drydocks where no one lives and the noise won't be as bad. With your proposal the pollution would add a lot more. We love to have our meals on our balcony or have happy hour on the roof with friends. That all would end.</p>
4-Jul-21	<p>My condo is at ____ esplanade just north and a little west of the Seaspan dry dock in NVan. I walk almost daily on the pier beside Seaspan. There are hundreds of people who do the 211 meters pier walk. Seaspan is an excellent community business however I object to having encroachment west towards the pier reducing our feeling of space. Noise levels would likely occur as well. I would like them to expand east.and not west encroaching on a busy shipyard district.</p>
04-Jul-21	<p>I don't live there but the noise can be obtrusive when visiting the area. Why not include a sound baffle wall on north and west sides to modify the noise pollution into the shipyards public area.?</p>
04-Jul-21	<p>The Trophy building had been my home for 4½ years. I love my life here and the surroundings; it's a vibrant area with good energy. When I saw your pamphlet I was very disturbed. The photographs are misleading and it makes me very sad about your proposal. I understand that you like to expand Seaspan but I believe there is lots of room on the east side of the drydocks where no one lives and the noise won't be as bad. With your proposal the pollution would add a lot more. We love to have our meals on our balcony or have happy hour on the roof with friends. That all would end.</p>
05-Jul-21	<p>Thank you for your timely response. As you can appreciate, I continue to have significant concerns with respect to your proposal to expand to the west rather than</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>east.</p> <p>I know that the Western option was preferred by you but it might also have been appropriate to fully explore both an east and west option for public consideration. The comments provided in your detailed proposal only made a slight mention of the existing Drydock water lease limitations and did not fully explore the utilization of your adjoining water lease to the east.</p> <p>From what I have observed historically, there seemed to be minimal use of that Eastern pier other than to moor private yachts and barges that seem to be permanently affixed to that pier.</p> <p>I don't see why you couldn't expand that docking facility, if necessary, to the south to allow both Drydocks to occupy the eastern portion of that possible Expanded pier. This might then also negate the reason for the third working access dock that you had also proposed for the north side as the north east portion of that eastern pier could possibly fulfill that function as well.</p> <p>Lots of options that could more effectively use that eastern pier to its fullest potential. None of that seemed to have been discussed.</p> <p>As for the access to the W building there would appear to be lots of room to still have barge access since the new Drydocks would conceivably be to the east of that pier. You also have access to all sizes of barges that might then be appropriate for your shipbuilding component movement from the W. Building to your primary shipbuilding area to the west. Based on an eastern configuration you could still have lots of continued pier usage to the extent of moving fabricated ship components to a barge and then to your shipbuilding area.</p> <p>And let's not forget that the Seaspan tugs can move large ships and barges into and out of the confined spaces associated with the two existing Drydocks. Moving a barge in and out of the W building area would, to me, seem like a piece of cake. Keep in mind that there is currently a significant distance between the large Drydock and that eastern pier.</p> <p>I also note that there is a white oval floating garage located on the west side of that eastern pier and wonder why it is even there. It just seems to house boats. It obviously doesn't impact your W building access. Moving it might even give you more room.</p> <p>Also, as indicated above, why was there no specific more detailed mention of your additional water lot to the east that is occupied by that above mentioned eastern pier? You only made direct mention of that current Drydock water lease that just goes slightly east of the large Drydock.</p> <p>I do believe that an eastern solution would still be the most practical for all concerned.</p> <p>And as a final note, WHERE THERE IS A WILL THERE IS A WAY. look forward to your added comments.</p>

Date	Feedback
05-Jul-21	<p>space for community/culture</p> <p>is there proposed offsetting for space used in expanding seaspan dock? how will it impact experience of current resident use of the adjacent areas?</p>
05-Jul-21	<p>As an Owner/Resident of The Trophy building I am very concerned that this expansion project will have a negative effect on the value of our property and to the use and enjoyment thereof.</p> <p>We are already experiencing noise, dust and air quality issues and fear that this will only get worse.</p>
05-Jul-21	<p>Thank you for getting back to me.</p> <p>We have many questions with regard to the proposed expansion.</p> <p>As stakeholders in what is often termed as the "Jewel of North Vancouver" want to recognize the important role Seaspan plays in the prosperity of the area. However, this is also a residential community and an area well used and enjoyed by the whole North Shore. As we look for a compromise that satisfies the interest of all stakeholders, I reach to you and request that we "go for a walk" and have a further discussion</p>
05-Jul-21	<p>We've been emailing back and forth a little bit. Could you give me a call back please?</p>
06-Jul-21	<p>I am a resident at the Shipyards and we have been advised Seaspan has applied to the Port Authority to expand their existing operations. As neighbors of Seaspan we currently put up with the noise and lights from the shipyards 24/7, they have no rules or laws to abide by. Even if it affects their neighbors quality of living. We have bright lights, very loud sandblasting and painting fumes that they can do at anytime of the day or night and we have no say. I'm pleading with you all to help us save this little gem we call home. If this expansion is allowed to go forward it will be right in front of the children's playground. The dirt and dust and paint that will come off the ships will make that area toxic for our young children. The business owners will also be affected and I think we can all agree they've suffered enough through Covid. Can we not have them expand to the east or to the South where there is a personal yacht is currently moored.</p>
06-Jul-21	<p>We bought our current home at ____ Victory Ship Way in 2019. The prime reason we bought this place was for the view of the ocean. Having seen your mockup, the proposed construction will definitely obstruct a significant amount of our view which will obviously lower the value of our apartment. Additionally, it is already very noisy both day and night at certain times because of work being done at the current dry dock. With the addition the noise will no doubt increase both during the construction of the expansion and once it is fully operable.</p> <p>Can I receive updates on the status of the project?</p>
06-Jul-21	<p>We were talking about the Seaspan expansion project? Could you give me a call back</p>
07-Jul-21	<p>Water Lot details to the east</p> <p>Can you also provide info/diagram of what I assume is another Seaspan water lot that appears to be located east of this existing water lot in question. That's where the eastern pier would be located. Just wondering where your eastern water-lot ends and where Richardson's might then start. That would give me a better big picture of the total Seaspan water lots in the area.</p>

Date	Feedback
	Thanks again and I do appreciate being able to ask you these questions.
7-Jul-21	I am writing regarding Seaspan's request to move their shipyard operations in Lower Lonsdale, North Vancouver, a further 40 meters West in front of the residential buildings on the waterfront in North Vancouver. I wish to say that I feel this is a very bad idea for many reasons including; sound pollution, visual impact on owners homes, and potential environmental impact on the foreshore and wildlife and marine life in the area. We regularly see seals and herons in this area. Why not move further east where there is already industry and keep it contained in the already permitted areas. As a Realtor who specializes in the Lower Lonsdale area I am very much opposed to this change.
7-Jul-21	<p>I support the project: The BC Government and Premier John Horgan have stated that the Province is committed to a made-in-B.C. shipbuilding strategy to bring more good jobs to shipyards in coastal communities so with that in mind, supporting expansion of local shipbuilding operations is critical and helps ensure that we have a functioning and maintained ferry system, coast guard and military etc (not to mention important commercial shipping)! This project makes sense I hope this is approved and if a support letter to our local MLA, Mayor and MP would help, please let me know where to send! https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2021PREM0031-000861</p> <p>Thank you and keep up the great work of employing so many people with good jobs in North Van and beyond!</p>
7-Jul-21	As I live at ____ Victory Ship Way , this expansion will negatively effect my view, and property value. Not to mention the construction noise. As a resident of the neighborhood I am against this project.
07-Jul-21	<p>My name is ____ and I am an owner of a unit at ____ Victory Ship Way, which overlooks the drydock. I would like to voice my concerns regarding the proposed expansion of the drydock, as it will not only increase the noise pollution that I already suffer from, but also impede our peaceful view! Adding an extension would also decrease the air quality, as I have noticed on several occasions chemical smells in my unit which were originating from the drydock. Furthermore, the proposed construction timeframe, albeit temporary, will create more uncomfortable noise pollution, compounding the existing levels of noise.</p> <p>Therefore, I urge you to reconsider this invasive plan on our need for peace and quiet where we live. Perhaps it would be more convenient for everyone involved if this project was created to the East of the existing drydock, where there are no residential buildings!</p> <p>I hope that you take my concerns into consideration, as all my neighbours feel the same way.</p>
7-Jul-21	We have many questions about the proposed expansion. As concerned citizens and stakeholders we are writing to MLA's and our MP. Lower Lonsdale is the "Jewel of North Vancouver" and we appreciate the importance that the city places upon it. Many people use this area from visitors, businesses and residents. We want to ensure that Seaspan are listening and willing to resolve some of our issues. Many of us including local businesses are simply shaking our heads about the proposed expansion West. Even the North Shore News made that mistake ironically stating the development was going East

Date	Feedback
	<p>and later retracted the error. Seaspan have ample room on the East side. This is a more natural solution and takes into account the needs of us all.</p> <p>We ask the city to support this solution. We are all tax payers and deserve the same respect and understanding.</p> <p>We are fully aware that Seaspan is an important business but the proximity of people, the care of the environment and the sustainability of this vibrant community needs stewardship from all sectors of our precious North Shore.</p>
7-Jul-21	<p>The proposed construction will definitely affect our view, and create additional noise both during construction and when completed. While we greatly do care about the marine habitat, air quality and water quality, I presume you will have already addressed that to ensure the area is not further polluted.</p> <p>From what I see of the plans, I am also concerned about the construction and expansion possibly obstructing the children's playground. It is a very popular place for kids, let's not ruin it by adding an industrial area in front of their play area.</p>
8-Jul-21	<p>Having walked by very regularly I wonder why east expansion to yacht berth not an option</p>
08-Jul-21	<p>Thank you for your acknowledgement of receipt of our concerns regarding Seaspan's proposed Drydock Water Lot Expansion project (PER application No. 20-189). Would you be so kind as to advise us what PER category (A,B,C,D) does this project fall under and whether any or all of the Project Environment Reviews undertaken include Air Quality Reviews.</p> <p>Since this is really a floating Manufacturing/Fabrication facility there are toxic materials used onsite/on water and the very nature of the repairs and fabrications cause toxic particulates to be emitted into the air. Can you direct us to the fact finding in the review reports where this has been addressed?</p>
8-Jul-21	<p>Supervisor, Planning Vancouver Fraser Port Authority</p> <p>We are writing to express our strong objection to Seaspan's application to permanently expand its dry dock facilities in the proposed location.</p> <p>In 2016, we purchased our home at the Trophy building, ____ Victory Ship Way and have witnessed the transformation of the Shipyards over the past five years into a vibrant community hub. The additions during those years of restaurants, the Seaside Hotel, Polygon Gallery, summer food truck markets, skating rink, water park (and soon the Museum) attract thousands of people to the area.</p> <p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority must consider the negative impact that this proposed expansion will have on the community, the residents, and the commercial developments on the waterfront.</p> <p>After thoroughly reviewing the package, it seems that the proposed area is the most cost effective and easiest operationally for Seaspan, and that is why it is their preferred choice. Seaspan has provided some limited information on alternatives, but eliminated them for consideration.</p> <p>According to the package, the NoGo Region 2 presents "operational difficulties" in an</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>“already constrained area” but potentially could be a suitable location. The NoGo Region 3 is described as “costly” and “risky”, and yet the report acknowledges there is no public marine use or navigation within the VDC water lot other than Seaspan, and that significant marine traffic is not projected. The positives of locating the development east of the current dry dock has not been explored or explained in any detail based on the report, giving the impression that Seaspan is only interested in pursuing one option. If Seaspan had asked for community input prior to their application, we would have indicated our support for an eastern expansion. We are not opposed to job creation, or to an expansion to the east of the current drydock.</p> <p>Our two areas of primary concern with the planned expansion to the west are noise and air quality.</p> <p>Although the proposal states that the loudest noise from high pressure washing (UHP) usually occurs between 7 a.m and 6 p.m., our experience is that high noise levels regularly occur until 11 p.m. There have also been extended periods when Seaspan has operated an overnight shift. In addition to the UHP noise, there are intermittent bells, horns beeping, and metal clanging noises, sometimes at levels that impact the enjoyment of our patio to the point that we have to go inside and keep our windows shut.</p> <p>It is not realistic to expect that moving the current careen out an additional 40 meters will decrease noise when potentially there could be five vessels being serviced at one time instead of the current two or three, in closer proximity to residential buildings. Since the completion of the Cascade buildings, the noise along the Spirit Trail corridor has worsened, as the sound bounces off the buildings.</p> <p>There may be a false assumption that local residents are not unhappy about the noise, based on only eight complaints noted in the proposal package; that is because residents made an informed decision about purchasing next to an operating dry dock. To complain after making an informed choice is like buying next to a railway line and then expecting there will be no train activity. But now we are facing a situation that would be the equivalent of having the rail company decide to add two more tracks directly in front of our homes!</p> <p>The noise report acknowledges the design of the Trophy building was to protect against noise from the north and east. However now we are expected, according to the noise engineers, to be one of the “front row high rise buildings” intended to block the noise transmission for the residential buildings to the north. As homeowners, we did not purchase on the waterfront to become a sound barrier for other highrises. The noise, and the acknowledged blocking of water views at lower elevations will affect the enjoyment of our home and neighbourhood.</p> <p>For those of us who live in close proximity, our concern regarding air quality is based on our ongoing need to clean fine particulates off our patio furniture on almost a daily basis. The report indicates that VDC is working with Metro Vancouver to develop a permit for air emissions associated with the existing operations. We attended a meeting at the Pinnacle Hotel organized by Seaspan on April 24th, 2018 regarding</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Seaspan’s application for an air quality permit from Metro Vancouver. Was a permit ever granted, or is Seaspan now requesting a new permit to increase air emission maximums? Why would we agree to increased operations and increased air emissions directly in front of our homes when the permitted levels are not even stated? The report states that five vessels could be serviced at a time and that UHP activities could occur 104 days per year. This is a health concern not only for residents, but for everyone visiting the Shipyards. There is a playground directly in front of the proposed expansion that is used by local daycares and a popular destination for children in the area.</p> <p>We would ask the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority to reject this proposal, and request that Seaspan present a new proposal focused on developing to the east of the present operations. The issues of noise, air quality, and lights affect too many stakeholders to make the expansion to the west a viable option. Considering this is not a temporary request but would result in a permanent change to waterfront, more consultation is needed with residential, commercial and community interests to find an outcome that addresses more than Seaspan’s desire to accommodate operational expansion alone.</p>
8-Jul-21	<p>I just left you a voicemail regarding Seaspan's offer to set up a meeting with the Trophy building residents/strata council.</p> <p>If you could give me a call at your earliest convenience, I would be pleased to discuss a date and time with you, and help facilitate that notice of meeting to our strata community.</p>
08-Jul-21	<p>Thanks for your response.</p> <p>I agree, we enjoy the history and interest the Shipyard provides as it exists now. Expansion infringes too much on North Shores Shipyards District beauty and enjoyment for all North Shore residents.</p> <p>Expansion in other more industrial areas of the waterfront makes much more sense. As an added note, we as residents in the proposed impacted area never received any written information regarding your proposed plans. Friends blocks away gave us your notice.</p>
08-Jul-21	<p>> We have many questions about the proposed expansion. As concerned citizens and stakeholders we are writing to MLA’s and our MP. Lower Lonsdale is the “Jewel of North Vancouver” and we appreciate the importance that the city places upon it. Many people use this area from visitors, businesses and residents. We want to ensure that Seaspan are listening and willing to resolve some of our issues. Many of us including local businesses are simply shaking our heads about the proposed expansion West. Even the North Shore News made that mistake ironically stating the development was going East and later retracted the error. Seaspan have ample room on the East side. This is a more natural solution and takes into account the needs of us all.</p> <p>> We ask the city to support this solution. We are all tax payers and deserve the same respect and understanding.</p> <p>> We are fully aware that Seaspan is an important business but the proximity of people, the care of the environment and the sustainability of this vibrant community needs stewardship from all sectors of our precious North Shore.</p>
9-Jul-21	<p>I strongly support the drydock expansion project, particularly because it will mean the addition of over 100 skilled jobs to our local economy.</p>
9-Jul-21	<p>What is the proposed timeline?</p>

Date	Feedback
9-Jul-21	There have been times when the noise from work at the dry dock goes late into the night, bounces off buildings, and is loud. Air quality is also a concern as I do notice increased black particulate in my condo with an increase in ships coming and going into your dry dock. Might be better to move it to the east side of your facilities away from where people now live.
9-Jul-21	<p>A would normally not followup this quickly for a reply to the water lot issue to the east, but everything associated with this proposal West is very time sensitive. Having the second adjoining water lot details to the east will also give me a better picture of what the reasonable options might be BOTH from a Eastern and Western perspective.</p> <p>Interesting to see that the KUGO Yacht has now moved to the west side of the Drydock directly in front of the Trophy building.</p>
9-Jul-21	<p>Adjacent Water Lot To the East</p> <p>I had previously directed my request for details concerning this adjoining Water Lot to the Vancouver port authority. Kate Grossman, the public engagement advisor for this Vancouver Port Authority indicating that since there was a current Public Engagement Process underway, I should direct this question back to you via the infodrydock@seaspan.com.</p> <p>I do believe that this information is critical in determining whether that Eastern option was fully explored.</p> <p>So based on the Vancouver port Authority comments I again request that you provide me with the details associated with the eastern water lot in question as I assume that this was also a previous consideration for possible Drydock expansion to the EAST.</p>
9-Jul-21	I fully support Seaspan initiative for expansion, creating more jobs, supporting local businesses, strengthening our community and continuing our shipbuilding and repair leadership.
9-Jul-21	<p>Hello, While I am in support of the proposed project in principle I am not in favour of the suggested location to the west side of Seaspan's existing activities. When I bought into the Trophy building five years ago I was aware of the Shipyard operations on my doorstep but did not imagine they would be allowed to expand to the west and encroach on what has become a residential, recreational and commercial destination location for locals and others from further afield. Noise levels from existing activities are already intrusive and even a small increase of 1 to 3 dbs above an already high level of noise could intensify this issue especially along the spirit trail corridor between the Trophy building and Cascade east. The new facilities will be in front of this "noise tunnel" and are unlikely to be mitigated by the suggested noise abatement measures suggested in the BKL consultants report. (Page 21) Although the suggestion about replacing the dust curtains on the existing dry docks with a noise attenuation product as well as installing the same product on the proposed facilities could warrant further investigation. The ad hoc manoeuvring of ships and tugs etc on the west side of the careen drydock is interesting to watch but I did not imagine my patio view of the water and downtown could be impacted by a permanent fixture in this location. Having reviewed the alternative options for this expansion proposal in the Project and Environmental Review application document I am not satisfied that Seaspan undertook a review of all the options available to it on the east side of its operations. The options identified were confined to the location immediately abutting the Panamax dry dock and those options were summarily dismissed without much of an in depth analysis.</p>

Date	Feedback
	Further east there is an area with a dock that does not appear to have been studied at all. This area already contains a pier and looks as though it has sufficient space to accommodate the proposed project. It probably also has an existing water lot permit. In my view this location would make more sense on many different levels. The application for a permit to extend the water lot to the west should not be granted. Thank you for this opportunity to comment
9-Jul-21	I support this project 100%
9-Jul-21	You have not commented on this message
9-Jul-21	I wish to express my support for this project as resident of North Vancouver and frequent visitor to the Shipyards District. My family and I regularly enjoy meals or entertainment in the many restaurants and establishments at and around the Vancouver Drydock. We enjoy the fact that we watching a working harbour come to life with ships, tugs, seabuses, pleasure craft all transiting through as well as the activity at local terminals and of course the necessary work of repairing ships. We are actually currently looking to relocate our home to the area of Lower Lonsdale to be more central and closer to all that is happening in the City of North Vancouver and don't see the Vancouver Drydock operation as a negative or hinderance to enjoying all the City has to offer.
9-Jul-21	<p>I am vehemently opposed to the proposed water lot project. We already contend with more than enough noise(day and night), pollution, and obstructed views by the current operations of the drydock. Allowing them to expand operations to the west, DIRECTLY IN FRONT OF NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT would be tantamount to stealing property value from the residents who have purchased homes in this heavily developed area. This proposed development should never be allowed: why can't they expand to the east, where there is no new development on the shoreline? Seaspan should be thinking about being a good neighbor to the large residential community and consider other alternatives to the proposed project. They have a drydock on the west side of the Seabus terminal, why can't they consider expanding there?</p> <p>The shipyard work that goes on constantly leaves dust and debris on our decks, windows, railings, etc. Allowing them to expand right in front of a residential development will only make this issue much worse. Who knows if the debris is toxic or not?</p>
9-Jul-21	I support the proposed expansion of Vancouver Drydock
10-Jul-21	<p>This expansion will significantly impact our quality of life by severely restricting our views of the harbour and an increased assault on our senses from the increase in work at Seaspan. Not to mention the possible decrease in property values that will result. The 50% increase in the workforce is welcome and is good to the community. However, there is a significant risk to the safety of the area residents. At each shift start and end there is significant traffic and unfortunately most Seaspan employees are blind to the stop signs at the corner of St Georges and Victory Ship Way.</p> <p>You have an obvious alternative that will not impact the residents of the City of North Vancouver and that is to expand east instead of west. The only inconvenience in expanding east is that the space is used for storage of yachts. Surely the private marina that is next to the Lonsdale Quay could be used to store the yachts.</p>

Date	Feedback
10-Jul-21	<p>Thanks for getting back with a proposed date of July 27th. Is it possible to schedule the meeting during the week of July 19th? Late afternoon or early evening any day would be fine, and we would include Cascade residents so there would not be a need for a separate meeting with Cascade.</p> <p>The concern with the July 27th date is that it will only give residents a few days post meeting to send in their feedback, based on a July 30th deadline.</p> <p>Also, can you confirm that July 30th is the closing date, as there is some confusion based on the posted PER deadline of July 24th on line.</p>
10-Jul-21	<p>I've looked at the info, and it looks fine. The City needs real long term employment, so build this. It's inappropriate to develop residential towers etc right in and next to industrial areas. The people now moving into these places need to understand that real work happens here and need to adjust their ideas and expectations of living next to heavy industry.</p>
11-Jul-21	<p>This ruins the park. Blocks views and is going to just add more negativity to the area</p>
11-Jul-21	<p>As a resident owner at the Trophy building adjacent to your property I want to make my feelings known about your expansion.</p> <p>It's a simple short answer. Absolutely dead set against the expansion. It will ruin views, decrease property values and create an expanded eyesore. I have a fabulous view from my deck, I would lose it, I paid in excess of \$1,000,000 for my unit, I do not want the view destroyed. Build it on the east side of your property. That won't impact anyone as it's bare land. When the city developed the land and sold to the developers it was and is residential. Expanding your foot print to the west is unnecessary. This effects the property values of 500 people. It's just as easy for you to build on the other side of your property. I look at the eyesore to the east of our building and shake my head that this is being considered. You are the definition of industrial, you have enough land as is.</p> <p>Here is my current view from my balancing, there is nothing but a downside to your expansion, put it where it has no effect to people who have spent a great deal of monies on their view. It's totally disrespectful to the citizens who have poured their life savings into an unrestricted view.</p> <p>Stop the destruction of the views. I will not support any expansion to the west. East gets my support 100%</p> <p>How would I get compensated for losing my view? Also a simple answer... I wouldn't. So with that I am extremely opposed to any west expansion.</p> <p>Would you want an expansion of this sort in front of your house? We both know the answer to that, no would be your honest reply.</p> <p>Time to rethink what you are doing, a good neighbour treats his neighbours with respect..... this is not a respectful act in any way shape or form.</p>
11-Jul-21	<p>Unightly already, do not need an expansion. Parents enjoy the view while kids play at the park. Move to an industrial area.</p>
11-Jul-21	<p>Concerns about the initial disruption with the construction and increase in marine traffic on the marine and aviary wildlife.</p>
12-Jul-21	<p>My husband and I have been homeowners in the Trophy at the Pier (____ Victory Ship Way, North Vancouver) for more than five years and have seen the transformation of the Shipyards becoming a vibrant, welcoming area for many homeowners and visitors.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Including new restaurants, hotels, art gallery, summer fun food markets, music events, skating rink and water park.</p> <p>We feel that the planned expansion of the drydock will be at the detriment of the residents, visitors and many small businesses who are only just reestablishing themselves after the almost two year inability to function to the best of the capabilities.</p> <p>It would seem that the additional noise and light impact will be at almost unbearable levels at times. The health and well-being of the permanent residents in the area is in question. The air and water quality will have serious consequences also for the residents, pedestrians, bikers, and children who frequently use the Spirit Trail and play area at the waterfront daily. We wonder if Seaspan has taken into account the immediate and future impact this expansion will cost the City and how many sources of income will be affected. Or, are they just looking out for themselves on the next big buck project? One that could easily be located further east of the proposed site.</p> <p>If Seaspan hasn't taken the impact of their proposed expansion into consideration, we ask that you all consider saving the beautiful waterfront and Shipyards area for years to come.</p>
12-Jul-21	I'm interested in maintaining the ship repair and building industries in BC. I fully support the proposed water lot project. Awesome job on the responsible removal and disposal of hull paint BTW.
12-Jul-21	The Shipyards is the center of a vibrant community that is invaluable to the residents of North Vancouver. It has been our savior during the pandemic. We visit the area multiple times throughout the week and often gather there with friends. The calming, cheering effect it has is why we live close by and visit it often. It is an area that other communities envy and yearn to be able to replicate. In the multiple communities we have lived in and experienced, there is no other setup that comes close to the Shipyards. It should be protected from additional noise and pollution. I fully support the marine industry in North Vancouver and value its contribution BUT cannot support it encroaching on the Shipyards. I hope there is a way for them to expand East of their current position. I have been there when ship repairs are underway and the noise, air pollution, and light pollution are significant and disruptive. I live to the East of the shipyards but would rather deal with the problem that way than have the Shipyards community disturbed.,
12-Jul-21	The shipyards is the center of a vibrant community that is invaluable to the residents of North Vancouver. It has been our savior during the pandemic. We visit the area multiple times throughout the week and often gather there with friends. The calming, cheering effect it has is why we live close by and visit it often. It is an area that other communities envy and yearn to be able to replicate. In the multiple communities we have live in and experienced, there is no other setup that comes close to the Shipyards. It should be protected from additional noise and pollution. I fully support the marine industry in North Vancouver and value its contribution BUT cannot support it encroaching on the Shipyards. I hope there is a way for them to expand East of their current position. I have been there when ship repairs are underway and the noise, air pollution, and light pollution are significant and disruptive. I live to the East of the shipyards but would rather deal with the problem that way than have the Shipyards community disturbed.

Date	Feedback
12-Jul-21	<p>Please help residence of lower Lonsdale with moving this nonsense expansion to East. We are worried for our health and wellbeing and appreciate if you could help us to move this to East side of shipyard. Residents already talking about taking unnecessary measurements like closing the road to Shipyard during busy hours, etc. Please help us move this to a more appropriate East side location.</p>
12-Jul-21	<p>First off, thank you for informing us (the public) of your future plans.</p> <p>However, It truly saddens us that expansion and the profits that will come from it are being put before the safety and quality of life for those who invested their life savings to live in this prime waterfront location.</p> <p>As much as we appreciate the work you do, we already endure the poor air quality and noise that doesn't stop even during late evening and early morning hours.</p> <p>Now we learn that the safety of our building itself could be compromised by your expansion proposal by adding six new permanent pylons via pile-driving which is estimated to take six weeks!</p> <p>In light of recent Florida tragedy where a building collapsed and most of the occupants lost their lives, your proposal is very worrisome, possibly unsafe and perhaps not ethical.</p> <p>We are all at the mercy of the water which is so close to us and we remember that it was difficult to get our project to build our buildings off ground in the first place due to the vicinity which it occupies very close to the shore's edge.</p> <p>I am not sure if all of the environmental issues were considered while preparing this proposal.</p> <p>It is hard to believe that the effects of pile driving would not impact the structural integrity of our building.</p> <p>The thoughts of our building being compromised in ANY way is very stressful to think about and weighs heavy on my mind as well as many others who live in my building and the surrounding area.</p> <p>We urge all the authorities, especially the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority to consider this extension of the water lot into industrial Pemberton Avenue area as an alternative location.</p>
12-Jul-21	<p>My name is ____, I am one of the owners of residential towers in Shipyard district, Lower Lonsdale. I heard about the Seaspan's drydock expansion towards the west and in front of the residential towers.</p> <p>Our community is already exposed to the noises caused by Esplanade Industrial traffic, passing trains, Seaspan maintenance operations, restaurants and so on. The expansion of Seaspan's drydock towards the west will expose the residents to additional industrial noise, chemical odour, dust and light pollution which are not acceptable. The noise will certainly echo due to the walkway between Trophy and Cascade buildings (it will be doubled or tripled in magnitude) and it will also expose the Atrium Residents who are not even notified of this expansion by the SeaSpan.</p> <p>Please stop the expansion towards the west to avoid additional exposures to the residents of Shipyard district.</p>
12-Jul-21	<p>It appears that ____ is away from work on the weeks of July 12th and July 19th. Who in port Vancouver is responsible for receiving feedback about this expansion? Please provide a contact name and email address.</p>

Date	Feedback
12-Jul-21	<p>As owner residents in the shipyard area, my family and I are definitely opposed to the proposed changes by seaspan. The noise pollution by seaspan is already intolerable as it is, we cannot even imagine how much worse it will get if the new drydocks get built. The proposed drydocks will also add to water and air pollution in the area. It will also negatively impact the view.</p> <p>Seaspan perhaps can relocate their W manufacturing building and build their proposed drydocks to the east of the existing one. Or perhaps they can build new drydocks in the pemberton area.</p> <p>We are absolutely against this proposal and we hope port of vancouver does not approve this project. If this project is executed the residents in the shipyard area will suffer from more noise, air and water pollutants and this is unfair and unethical and it should be illegal.</p>
12-Jul-21	<p>I am very opposed to this expansion west.</p> <p>Seaspan plans to double in size to the west in front of residents.</p> <p>At this time, some vessels tie up at Seaspan for ongoing work. These vessels run their engines 24/7. This will get worse with the proposed expansion and more vessels. Pollution becomes a factor, including noise, lights and exhaust fumes.</p> <p>I am a retired commercial fisherman and moored my boats at Allied Shipbuilders. Seaspan will drastically reduce the work that Allied now does on Seaspan's barges and tugs by expanding their facility. Seaspan's proposed new smallest lift is larger than the existing ones at Allied. Why not consider talking to Allied to expand and accommodate your plans, or expand east of your own facility.</p> <p>North Van waterfront is very industrial already with relatively few spaces for the public to enjoy. Seaspan should expand where it will not impact the Shipyards area created by the City of North Vancouver.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>Thanks for doing this ____!</p> <p>I will also send you my response which I sent to the North Shore News "Letters to the Editor" as well as the group you've notified.</p> <p>The NSN publisher ____, who owns the ground floor seems to not want to push back at Seaspan. He probably feels it will lead to a loss of advertising revenue, but I believe he's willing to gamble a more peaceful Cascade lifestyle for \$\$ 😬</p> <p>I don't like the odds!!</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>I am opposing this project. It is already very noisy and polluted as it is right now , imagine with extension of this project.</p> <p>This will ruin our community.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>I feel that I have to object to this expansion of the new dry dock going west. This was an industrial area that the city approved the building of residential condos and promoted the community shipyards neighbourhood. Going east is still mostly industrial and I believe that is the direction your expansion should go.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>I believe the water lot project is absolutely necessary. It will create more jobs, and support businesses in BC. It will be interesting to watch it closer, no concerns in regard to views at all.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>This additional commentary is for Seaspan but also appropriate for the Port Authority review.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>In all honesty I find it extremely disappointing that this Seaspan proposed Drydock expansion to the west did not fully consider the utilization of this BERTH1 water lot. From all the communications provided I don't think Seaspan even addressed this option.</p> <p>From my resident perspective this Eastern water lot would seem far more appropriate than the western expansion. This would address community concerns relating to noise, pollution, lighting, site lines and lower Lonsdale shipyards waterfront aesthetics.</p> <p>So WHY no detailed communication on this completely underutilized BERTH1 water lot and eastern functional pier that just seems to be used to moor private yachts. That in my mind is THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>This is in front of a residential area. I bring my nephew to the park every other day and it would be a shaming to add so much industrial activity to this area.</p> <p>We are already dealing with a lot of dust and noise from the shipyards. This would be an extension to that. Which is not right.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>Seaspan Marine is highly supportive of the proposal to add much needed dock capacity and size flexibility to the port of Vancouver. The proposed new docks fill a much needed gap in capacity in Vancouver, over the last 30 years barges, small ferries, and many ship docking tugs have become larger to match changes in the market place, but, shipyard maintenance facilities for these medium sized vessels has not. Many of these vessel types that were previously capable of being docked at Seaspan's Vancouver shipyards are now too heavy for its synchrolift. The situation is the same for other marine operators as well and the result has been delays and inefficiencies in our operations. The proposed addition of two dry docks, right sized for intermediate ferries, barges, and large tugs will go a long way to providing the capacity needed in the port. I strongly support this initiative.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>We attended the zoom meeting today and are wondering where we can read the questions asked by participants.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>It is already polluted and noisy. Extending will make things worse.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>It would be so detrimental to the area. Why can't it be built on the East side of Seaspan?</p> <p>As residents of the area, we already suffer from noise which extends sometimes beyond the allowable time. It would deteriorate the view which we pay a fortune. The Shipyards area and other residents and business owners would be impacted in a negative way.</p>
13-Jul-21	<p>[*NB no attachment or link included in email] Hello Seaspan, I would like to have the opportunity to share this video with you and the attendees at the meeting on July 15.</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>_____, there continues to be many unanswered questions following last night's meeting.</p> <p>We are told that 7000 notices were distributed in a one kilometre area surrounding the drydocks. However, in Trophy, Cascade and Atrium at the Pier, I've been unable to unearth more than a total of TWELVE residents that received one.... and I've been actively asking at every opportunity.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>If I understand correctly, if the expansion went east, Seaspan would be inconvenienced operationally TWO days a month or 24 days a year when the barge arrives to retrieve components / blocks for the shipbuilding activity at the Pemberton Avenue assembly location. In contrast, if the expansion comes west, residents in and visitors to this area would be significantly impacted THREE HUNDRED and SIXTY FIVE days a year. Please correct my math if it fails me.</p> <p>You stated that expansion to the west is "optimal" but never satisfactorily answered the questions asked about whether it is the ONLY option.</p> <p>You report an expected 1- 3db increase in noise as a result of the additional drydock activity. However, what has not been taken into account is the fact that with more facilities to repair, UHP blasting, welding, and so on there is very little chance of there ever being downtime. Moving the noise 40 metres farther offshore will do little to reduce that disturbance to the community despite your insistence that it is being done with our best interests at heart. The question was asked about how this promise of reduced noise was measured. Based on the response, it was clear that this was not part of the noise engineering report, and therefore is, at best an "assumption". Our own assumption is that Seaspan has some vision of using that additional water space created to 'house' ships awaiting access to the drydocks, perhaps even being worked on while waiting.</p> <p>Some of our neighbours have the sense that we might be less impacted by this project if we were 'marine wildlife'. Lots of study seems to have been conducted on their potential welfare and less on humans, including young children who reside and visit this area just adjacent to the proposed expansion.</p> <p>During last evening's meeting you responded that the area to the east of the Panamax is not currently a Seaspan assigned water lot.</p> <p>Paul, that's what this whole discussion is about!</p> <p>Your company is applying to expand into an area that Seaspan does not currently and completely have rights to! We are justifiably frustrated that Seaspan would not see the logic in an eastern expansion that would not negatively impact the community, even if that project would be more costly and operationally challenging. This is obviously planned as a PERMANENT decision, and Seaspan has acknowledged that the facility will be in "high demand". Your response to the question about the "boat shed" was unsatisfactory. It appears to be only for the use of the Washington Family for storage and repair of their ever-growing fleet of upscale craft.... St Eval and Tess to name only a couple. Oh, and I have on many occasions seen large trucks drive out onto the "unstable" pier beside the boat shed. How unstable can it really be, and what would it cost to upgrade it to the standard required for the project?</p> <p>Also no mention of or information about any geological investigation into the seabed where Seaspan plans to pile-drive. Is it silt or rock? That could make a big difference in the "6 week" disruption to be caused, should your expansion plan move forward. Also Seaspan should be communicating that based on the construction report, this pile driving is planned to go from 7 am - 8 pm every day but Sunday.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>By the way, after the meeting concluded at 8 pm the hydro blasting in the existing drydocks went on until 10:40 pm. Certainly doesn't build confidence in Seaspan's statement in the proposal that this type of activity "generally" ends at 6:00 pm! What assurances do we have that Seaspan won't move to a 24 hour operation if needed?</p> <p>See you online again tomorrow! Please allow for audible questions from the community if possible, or at least have the moderator respond to attendees who raise their hands seeking further clarification on items being discussed.</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>We are very troubled about this expansion being an owner of cascade west . Our views will be blocked , our Property value for a condo will decreased substantially, not to mention the noise the air pollution and the lighting. What is even more perplexing is the fact that there is room on the east side for the expansion where is non-residential so it's clear that is the best solution for all parties involved. This is a place for families kids and a community as a whole meet to get together and is the julep North Ban and we believe this expansion is going to greatly hinder the community feeling. Please go east for your expansion, we find this to be a great problem and deeply unsettling as residence and owners here at cascade west .</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>I'm concerned the expansion will increase noise levels, impact air quality, detract from the current beauty and water/city views, reduce marine habitat area, and negatively impact the current balance of industry and tourism that makes the Shipyards District so unique and such a draw to the tourism and the public.</p> <p>As a local, I frequent the Pier and new Shipyards District often and have a number of concerns about the expansion of the Drydocks. The current balance of industry and tourism is one I support, love and feel is a draw to the public. But expansion threatens this beautiful balance. The Pier and Shipyards District is a huge new draw for locals and tourists alike, bringing North Van to life and putting it on the map. All the things that draw the crowds now will be threatened. I'm concerned the expansion will increase noise levels, impact air quality, detract from the current beauty and water/city views, and also reduce marine habitat area. I often see seals and otters in the water around the Pier and feel it's important to support marine life habitat. I love living where there's an active Drydock and understand local industry is important, but feel this expansion will negatively impact the area in a vast number of ways, to the detriment of our city's quality of life, tourism and economy.</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>As a local stakeholder in our marine industry, I am writing to express our full support for the Vancouver Drydock Expansion Project.</p> <p>We currently own and operate a fleet of 6 tugs and 20 barges, hauling aggregates and miscellaneous cargo up and down the coast.</p> <p>As issues arise and vessels age the importance of reducing downtime while in the shipyard is key. We believe that this project will help by expanding the capacity to provide service to ourselves and the rest of the local maritime industry. We also believe it will be greatly beneficial for the local economy and workforce by creating 100 new jobs.</p> <p>We urge you to move forward with the decision to allow Seaspan the additional space for expansion.</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>The view is already compromised with the current dry dock. By adding in the extra 40m new dry dock will hinder views even more than it was before. Placing the largest one</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>farthest back and then the smaller one will do nothing to help alleviate this issue. Trophy and Cascades already have to deal with large ships docking in front of the current dry dock that is ruining our views. "The most notable sight from the shoreline will be the vessels that are on the drydocks for service and repair." That notable site is ruining the views that we have currently. We have to deal with boats on the side of the drydock waiting to get serviced. With more drydocks this is just going to increase the number of vessels waiting to get If you're walking and/or living in the area, you see the very bright lights currently happening with the old drydock that goes 24/7. Currently, we have to hear the noises coming from the work. By adding more drydocks it will only increase the noise and light pollution that we have to see and deal with. It seems that more than once a month, we have to hear emergency vehicles coming into Seaspan with their current operations. By increasing the workforce, increases the risk of more people being injured which means more emergency vehicles creating more disturbance for local residents. Trophy's views are already compromised and we have to deal with the current noise/light pollution. Now you want to takeaway Cascades views. This then affects the value of our properties.</p> <p>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? How is SeaSpan going to compensate Trophy/Cascade residents for the decrease in property value? What is stopping SeaSpan from trying to increase the of number drydocks if this gets approved? Are they planning on taking all the waterfront to the main pier?</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>We are told that 7000 notices were distributed in a one kilometre area surrounding the drydocks. However, in Trophy, Cascade and Atrium at the Pier, I've been unable to unearth more than a total of TWELVE residents that received one.... and I've been actively asking at every opportunity.</p> <p>We obtained the official brochure and are appalled by the many misleading statements and doctored up photos not representing the true before and after.</p> <p>If I understand correctly, if the expansion went east, Seaspan would be inconvenienced operationally TWO days a month or 24 days a year when the barge arrives to retrieve components / blocks for the shipbuilding activity at the Pemberton Avenue assembly location. In contrast, if the expansion comes west, residents in and visitors to this area would be significantly impacted THREE HUNDRED and SIXTY FIVE days a year. Please correct my math if it fails me.</p> <p>You stated that expansion to the west is "optimal" but never satisfactorily answered the questions asked about whether it is the ONLY option.</p> <p>You report an expected 1- 3db increase in noise as a result of the additional drydock activity. However, what has not been taken into account is the fact that with more facilities to repair, UHP blasting, welding, and so on there is very little chance of there ever being downtime. Moving the noise 40 metres farther offshore will do little to reduce that disturbance to the community despite your insistence that it is being done with our best interests at heart. The question was asked about how this promise of reduced noise was measured. Based on the response, it was clear that this was not part of the noise engineering report, and therefore is, at best an "assumption". Our own</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>assumption is that Seaspan has some vision of using that additional water space created to 'house' ships awaiting access to the drydocks, perhaps even being worked on while waiting.</p> <p>Some of our neighbours have the sense that we might be less impacted by this project if we were 'marine wildlife'. Lots of study seems to have been conducted on their potential welfare and less on humans, including young children who reside and visit this area just adjacent to the proposed expansion.</p> <p>During last evening's meeting you responded that the area to the east of the Panamax is not currently a Seaspan assigned water lot.</p> <p>Paul, that's what this whole discussion is about!</p> <p>Your company is applying to expand into an area that Seaspan does not currently and completely have rights to! We are justifiably frustrated that Seaspan would not see the logic in an eastern expansion that would not negatively impact the community, even if that project would be more costly and operationally challenging. This is obviously planned as a PERMANENT decision, and Seaspan has acknowledged that the facility will be in "high demand". Your response to the question about the "boat shed" was unsatisfactory. It appears to be only for the use of the Washington Family for storage and repair of their ever-growing fleet of upscale craft.... St Eval and Tess to name only a couple. Oh, and I have on many occasions seen large trucks drive out onto the "unstable" pier beside the boat shed. How unstable can it really be, and what would it cost to upgrade it to the standard required for the project?</p> <p>Also no mention of or information about any geological investigation into the seabed where Seaspan plans to pile-drive. Is it silt or rock? That could make a big difference in the "6 week" disruption to be caused, should your expansion plan move forward. Also Seaspan should be communicating that based on the construction report, this pile driving is planned to go from 7 am - 8 pm every day but Sunday.</p> <p>By the way, after the meeting concluded at 8 pm the hydro blasting in the existing drydocks went on until 10:40 pm. Certainly doesn't build confidence in Seaspan's statement in the proposal that this type of activity "generally" ends at 6:00 pm! What assurances do we have that Seaspan won't move to a 24 hour operation if needed? What is the criteria to allow extended hours of noise? What is the penalty if the predicted noise levels are exceeded?</p> <p>See you online again tomorrow! Please allow for audible questions from the community if possible, or at least have the moderator respond to attendees who raise their hands seeking further clarification on items being discussed.</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>There continues to be many unanswered questions following last night's meeting.</p> <p>We are told that 7000 notices were distributed in a one kilometre area surrounding the drydocks. However, in Trophy, Cascade and Atrium at the Pier, I've been unable to unearth more than a total of TWELVE residents that received one.... and I've been actively asking at every opportunity.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>If I understand correctly, if the expansion went east, Seaspan would be inconvenienced operationally TWO days a month or 24 days a year when the barge arrives to retrieve components / blocks for the shipbuilding activity at the Pemberton Avenue assembly location. In contrast, if the expansion comes west, residents in and visitors to this area would be significantly impacted THREE HUNDRED and SIXTY FIVE days a year. Please correct my math if it fails me.</p> <p>You stated that expansion to the west is "optimal" but never satisfactorily answered the questions asked about whether it is the ONLY option.</p> <p>You report an expected 1- 3db increase in noise as a result of the additional drydock activity. However, what has not been taken into account is the fact that with more facilities to repair, UHP blasting, welding, and so on there is very little chance of there ever being downtime. Moving the noise 40 metres farther offshore will do little to reduce that disturbance to the community despite your insistence that it is being done with our best interests at heart. The question was asked about how this promise of reduced noise was measured. Based on the response, it was clear that this was not part of the noise engineering report, and therefore is, at best an "assumption". Our own assumption is that Seaspan has some vision of using that additional water space created to 'house' ships awaiting access to the drydocks, perhaps even being worked on while waiting.</p> <p>Some of our neighbours have the sense that we might be less impacted by this project if we were 'marine wildlife'. Lots of study seems to have been conducted on their potential welfare and less on humans, including young children who reside and visit this area just adjacent to the proposed expansion.</p> <p>During last evening's meeting you responded that the area to the east of the Panamax is not currently a Seaspan assigned water lot.</p> <p>That's what this whole discussion is about!</p> <p>Your company is applying to expand into an area that Seaspan does not currently and completely have rights to! We are justifiably frustrated that Seaspan would not see the logic in an eastern expansion that would not negatively impact the community, even if that project would be more costly and operationally challenging. This is obviously planned as a PERMANENT decision, and Seaspan has acknowledged that the facility will be in "high demand". Your response to the question about the "boat shed" was unsatisfactory. It appears to be only for the use of the Washington Family for storage and repair of their ever-growing fleet of upscale craft.... St Eval and Tess to name only a couple. Oh, and I have on many occasions seen large trucks drive out onto the "unstable" pier beside the boat shed. How unstable can it really be, and what would it cost to upgrade it to the standard required for the project?</p> <p>Also no mention of or information about any geological investigation into the seabed where Seaspan plans to pile-drive. Is it silt or rock? That could make a big difference in the "6 week" disruption to be caused, should your expansion plan move forward. Also</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Seaspan should be communicating that based on the construction report, this pile driving is planned to go from 7 am - 8 pm every day but Sunday.</p> <p>By the way, after the meeting concluded at 8 pm the hydro blasting in the existing drydocks went on until 10:40 pm. Certainly doesn't build confidence in Seaspan's statement in the proposal that this type of activity "generally" ends at 6:00 pm! What assurances do we have that Seaspan won't move to a 24 hour operation if needed?</p> <p>See you online again tomorrow! Please allow for audible questions from the community if possible, or at least have the moderator respond to attendees who raise their hands seeking further clarification on items being discussed.</p>
14-Jul-21	Excited for additional North Vancouver based construction jobs.
14-Jul-21	<p>I am an owner at the cascade west . It has come to our attention about your proposed expansion . The community as a large , is really perplexed at why your not going east where there is clearly room , instead of west where it is residential. Not only are we concerned about the added noise , the air pollution , and the possible loss of our views which is why we bought here , but what about our massively reduced price value of our place . I believe it is the best of everyone's interest that you please expand to the east side of sea span. The community here is extremely concerned about this, and we see multi fasceted problems with this expansion.</p> <p>I hope we can come to a more suitable resolution in this manner . The pier is the jewel of north van and we believe this expansion will greatly hinder this destination and make the residence here very uneasy .</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>Please see below my message to our Mayor.</p> <p>For the record I want to express my extreme disappointment with the meeting that took place last night. How the presentation was controlled, conducted and orchestrated leaves one believing that the decision had already been made. The inability to respond to answers given by Seaspan through locking everyone's mic is deeply disturbing. At one point I even raised my hand but was totally ignored.</p> <p>I could say a great deal more but as a polite and thoughtful tax payer I will maintain my dignity and take the high road</p> <p>Good morning Mayor Buchanan My name is ____ and I am a resident in the Trophy building situated in the Quay. You may be aware of Seaspan's application to expand their operation further west of their current location. As residents of this unique area we are strongly against this project for many reasons. We have only recently been given information that clearly lays out the gravity and footprint of this proposal. Much to our surprise they have decided to move their operation further west. This would result in adding further dry docks that will be closer to the foreshore, children's playground and the pier that as you know is enjoyed by the general public on a regular basis.</p> <p>Seaspan do have space East of their site that for the most part is unused. Even though we are led to believe that some dredging would be required we feel that this is far more preferable than the intrusion on residential and business usage.</p> <p>We could give many more reasons why we disagree with this project for example noise, pollution both light and to marine life to name but a few.</p> <p>Finally, in the very short time we have been given to respond to this expansion attempts</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>are being made to reach out to the Port Authority, Seaspan, our local MLA and MP. We politely ask you to help maintain the beauty and unique environment you have helped to create and continue to ensure that the Quay remains the jewel we all wish it to be</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>I am a marine industry professional with specific interest in the continued availability of suitable modern and safe facilities for maritime industries in Vancouver harbour.</p> <p>The availability of additional drydock facilities at Seaspan Shipyards will be a valuable addition to the Port of Vancouver's commercial waterfront facilities. As a member of the SS Master Society we also are extremely appreciative of the support that Seaspan Shipyards have provided to our Society for many years in the care of the historic steam tug Master. The availability of the proposed additional facilities will provide more flexibility in such dockings and inspections for what is now the World's oldest wooden-hulled, steam-powered tugboat. Without such facilities and support iconic vessels like Master would not be able to survive.</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>I just moved here from Edmonton, I picked this spot to retire enjoy my life I do not want to see cranes noise in front of me , I enjoy the pier it's why I am here</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>Yesterday I was present at a Zoom call where Seaspan presented details of their expansion project.</p> <p>I'm an owner of a condo in the Shipyards area.</p> <p>This letter is addressed to you to understand how approval could be granted for this expansion with serious consequences to the neighbourhood.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why can't Seaspan give clear answers on having the expansion go east instead of going west impacting residences, businesses and the community visiting the area? Seaspan only seems to be concerned what is cost effective to them and not the impact in areas such as environment, light and noise, residents in the area, businesses. 2. They indicated the noise will slightly increase. How can that be the case when we already have to endure noise that extends way beyond 10:30pm at night. A report had indicated that 5 vessels could be serviced at a time compared to 2 vessels at present. That won't impact sound? Lighting? Air quality? Marine life? 3. As residents, we have hardly been given any notice. A month. Is that sufficient to consult with community? They indicated a mailing was done to residents in the area. Asking my neighbours and residents in the area, only 12 received a notice. The rest never got any information including myself. 4. There is a lot of information and facts that are misleading. We want to hear from people with authority that have the concerns of the citizens they represent attend and explain why this expansion is approved. <p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority must reject this proposal. Request Seaspan to submit a new proposal on developing the east side of their operations.</p> <p>As a caring citizen of this valued community, we hope to get a supportive response to</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>our serious concerns. What is promoted as an exemplary community, could drastically change in a short period of time.</p> <p>Your care to this matter is valued.</p>
14-Jul-21	<p>Last night meeting was very disappointing for me, it's like you want to pull one over on us.</p> <p>It was said that 7000 residents received notices for the drydock expansions but we didn't get one.</p> <p>I wonder how many other residents didn't get one as well.</p> <p>With all your explanation I still don't see why the expansions could not go east. With some adjustment and willingness there is room on the east side</p> <p>. The pollution and noise would be a lot less and remember our lives and all the other condo living people and all the visitors that come here to enjoy our area matter and our health is very important.</p> <p>We live here, this is our homes.</p> <p>With your proposal the new drydock would pollute our balcony, rooftop and not to forget the children's play area to a degree that we could not use those areas anymore.</p> <p>The noise would be so loud it would damage our ears over time.</p> <p>Paul you mention that the east pier is unstable well than why is it in use?</p> <p>Maybe it just needs upgrading?</p> <p>The pile driving worries me as all our cars are below sea level and having the pile driving done so close to the Trophy building. I don't believe there is no vibration with this job.</p> <p>You talk about the work would go from 7 am – 8 pm so last night after our meeting the work at the existing drydocks went to 10:40 pm. I have a hard time to believe the work would stop at 8 pm. We can hear the noise many nights till late.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>This email is with regard to your (Seaspan) submitted application to the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority to extend the Vancouver Drydock water lot west by approximately 40m to accommodate the installation of two smaller floating drydocks. Please consider this as formal feedback to this request.</p> <p>As a waterfront condo owner at ____ Victory Shipway I am a stakeholder in this conversation. There is no question that your request is not unreasonable; you are a huge contributor to the community with regard to jobs, events, and taxes and as such have the right to ask. These contributions are certainly appreciated and cannot be understated. This being said, the major issue about this expansion request from my perspective is the direction of the expansion and its impact on the Shipyards district. The city, local businesses, and residents (even Seaspan) has invested a lot of time and energy into developing the Shipyards district into a local and tourist destination and it is paying dividends. Given what I have seen in almost two years of ownership directly adjacent to the drydock, however, I believe that expansion westward would be a detriment to the district and negatively impact the city, local businesses, and its residents. Especially given that there is an alternative solution.</p> <p>Here is my rationale.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The drydock is dirty and dirtier than you (Seaspan) would care to admit. Every weekend we clean a coating of dust off of our lawn furniture. It is a small price to pay for waterfront ownership BUT further expansion west would no doubt further impact the residents, the playgrounds, restaurants, and areas tourists and residents sit, eat and

Date	Feedback
	<p>play. At a minimum we need more study on this topic before expansion is allowed.</p> <p>2. The drydock is noisier than Seaspan would care to admit. Their noise sensors are not near where residents and children play, eat, and live. At a minimum we need more study on this topic before expansion is allowed.</p> <p>3. Expansion eastward is possible, just more expensive for Seaspan. In the public meeting on Tuesday, Seaspan officials repeatedly (and suspiciously vaguely) said that the reason that they could not expand eastward, which all residents and businesses of the Shipyards would likely support, was not possible because of the in and out requirements of barges twice annually to a white work yard building to the east of the drydock. This white building was described as supporting the work of the Pemberton street Seaspan work site, not the dry dock. If some capital expenditure was made to relocate the white building, improve the dock, expansion eastward would be possible. The question is how to enable and support this possible alternative.</p> <p>Seaspan is an important stakeholder in the community and in the shipyards district. Please work with the city, province and residents to find an alternative solution in good faith. The community has changed in the last few years and children are playing right outside the dry dock. The conversation we are all having today is much different than a few years ago as this is as much a residential neighbourhood as it is an industrial neighbourhood. Let us work to make the area safer, cleaner, and better for all stakeholders.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>Hi my name is ____, I live on ____, East Esplanade in townhouse __, and I got a beautiful view - there is a corridor in between the two buildings and I just heard that this idiotic proposed water lot project that would cause view, shading, light, noises, air quality, construction and other and etc etc. etc. So I would like to know, somebody call me and explain what they gonna do, cause I know you got a computer, you gotta talk to me and let me know what's happening. And also I'm considering, I don't know if a petition started already or not but definitely I'm going to spread around. There is a lot of people that's gonna suffer through the, through the views.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>Just wondering if any of the question and answers have been posted and where.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>Is there a location where people can listen to the previous meeting?</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>Attended the first meeting and still require more detailed clarification on the questions below. Can they be added to the questions list on this second meeting</p> <p>Questions 1- why is Seaspan not providing more specific details on the second Adjoining water lot they have to the east. In particular: - why no clear identification of the SECOND existing Seaspan Water Lot location where the pier is located? Just how Far East does it go? - why was more detailed information not provided with the specific limitations of that existing eastern pier? How about an engineering report on its perceived limitations? Was that even ever done? -can you again clarify why this pier would not be suitable since all the new Drydocks and possible pontoon would still be detached and moored with piling and only walkways to the physical pier as was also envisioned in that western proposal. So can't really perceive a heavy load requirement on that pier since the ships in those new Drydocks would be smaller in nature when considering some of the possible weight issues on refits. ie fishing boats. - based on this perceived pier limitation why are you then not upgrading it to working standards? After</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>all would this not be a future consideration anyway in order to maximize the future efficient use of this Water lot/pier beyond moorage of private yachts. - Let's see what that possible configuration around that pier would have looked like. We don't want to hear about this existing two drydock water lot deficiency and access to that W building since the second eastern Water Lot consideration would solve all those concerns. - Why was the Eastern location into the Adjoining water lot then not your First most viable option. As I have previously stated, "where there is a will there is a way" 2 why are we not considering active air quality monitoring particularly when we are proposing further shipyard expansion adjacent to the high density residential and pedestrian oriented shipyards recreational area? An existing air quality monitor in Mahon park is just not close enough to where these pollutants originate. 3 Noise, pollution, light, view obstruction and general shoreline view aesthetics would all be either eliminated or greatly reduced by relocating this proposed expansion to the EAST. And based on the above questions WHY NOT?</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>This project should be moved to the east into seaspans adjoining water lot</p> <p>Question 1 IMPACT ON CAREEN DRYDOCK MOVING IN AND OUT OF DOCKING POSITION WHEN BEING BLOCKED ON 3 SIDES Will the blue Drydock (careen) still occasionally be required to move from its location to either bring ships into it and then move them out? Will it also continue to physically move from its location to carry on its duties? The reason I ask is that will it not be a concern to then get it back into its location when you are now permanently placing the pontoon to the north and the new Drydocks to the west with the larger Drydock permanently located to its east side. You then only have the southern what I would call a pigeon hole opening for movement in and out. Does this then not create all kinds of issues for the Tugs? ie safety, time, efficiency. Currently there are at least 3 to 4 Tugs involved in this in and out operation. AND HENCE MY CONTINUED SUGGESTION TO MOVE THE NEW DRYDOCKS TO THE EAST AND INTO THAT ADJACENT SECOND UNDERUTILIZED WATER WATER LOT WITH THE PIER. Question 2 WHY DID SEASPAN NOT PUT UP A LARGE BILLBOARD NOTICE, similar what developers do, in advertising the proposal to add the two Drydocks and pontoon right in the shipyards area, for ALL TO SEE. You could then also provide the before and after pictures. Can this still be done as the communication/flyer for the proposal was not very effective. In light of this deficiency in community consultation, is it possible to extend the hearing feedback period. Question 3 As a supplement to my earlier question (previously sent) relating to that UNDERUTILIZED PIER TO THE EAST, if there is currently such concerns for load capacity relating to support transfer of equipment or component parts to the dry docks if located EAST, then WHY ARE THERE CURRENTLY 8 SEASPAN VEHICLES PARKED ON THAT PIER? Obviously it seem to meet those safety standards. And again the two new Drydocks are floating so they don't create any load on that pier. Question 4 Based on what in my mind appears to be a current lack of Seaspans effective utilization of that adjoining Seaspans water lot and pier, WHY WOULD THE VANCOUVER PORT AUTHORITY EVEN CONSIDER THIS PROPOSAL, TO INCREASE THE WATER LOT SIZE AND EXPANSION WEST, BEFORE REQUIRING SEASPAN TO FULLY EXHAUST ALL EASTERN WATER LOT OPTIONS? Based on what has been presented to date, Seaspans has not exhausted all options to the EAST. They certainly have not incorporated the adjoining water lot and pier into the detailed analysis. It appears to me that Seaspans wants to "have its cake and eat it to".</p>

Date	Feedback
15-Jul-21	<p>NEW DRYDOCK CONFIGURATION USING THE EAST PIER As a suggestion, why not put the smaller Drydock on the south west side of that pier which still allows lots of room for barges to get in and out of the the W building area. Then put the larger Drydock on the south eastern side of that pier. Again they both float so no load on the pier. As both Drydocks are on the most southern side of that pier, you could then use the northern east portion of the pier with the existing floating barge as your pontoon area. This is where the private yachts usually moor. You might then only need two cranes on the larger Drydock next to the pier. Both Drydocks could then also be serviced by mobile portable cranes moving up and down the pier. Keep in mind that these Drydocks are servicing smaller ships so mobile crane capacity should not be that great a concern. There would always be flexibility based on all that other equipment you have at your disposal in the area. That potential configuration would probably also save you a lot of money. And as previously noted you have 8 vehicles currently parked on that pier so I do question your statement that this pier does not have load capacity. You could set up that eastern portion land area as your new satellite small working Drydock area. That's food for thought. And as I also say, IF THERE IS A WILL THERE IS A WAY.</p> <p>Feedback entered in the concerns above. Use the eastern pier for your expansion.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>North Vancouver and many other governments have spent years and a great deal of taxpayer money developing a beautiful spot for EVERYONE to enjoy. This will ruin those efforts.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>Thank you for getting back to me, however. I am not convinced in anyway that this is a good thing for all of the reasons previously mentioned.</p> <p>I feel your letter has a "this is no big deal " tone and I'm sure that's what you believe and are trying to convey as a Seaspan employee. It also sounds like you are certain that this is a done deal for your company.</p> <p>You are not being very good corporate citizens of this beautiful Lower Lonsdale community.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>A note to let you know that as the owner of a unit at The Atrium I AM OPPOSED to the expansion plans of Seaspan as expressed in its drydock project. Said project will affect the community in the area and all the visitors to the Shipyards. Pollution in terms of noise, light, view and debris is clear and unbearable already. A permit of said expansion is not only a crime but will make clear to everyone that the government works for the interests of the wealthy few at the expense of the rest of the citizens; some will call that outright corruption. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THE EXPANSION PROPOSED.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>I OPPOSE THE EXPANSION PROPOSED DUE TO THE EFFECTS IT WILL HAVE IN THE COMMUNITY. LIGHT, NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION ARE ALREADY UNBEARABLE. YOUR PROPOSED EXPANSION WILL AFFECT THOUSANDS OF COMMUNITY MEMBERS, INVESTORS AND VISITORS TO THE SHIPYARDS. IT IS A CRIME.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>I OPPOSE THE EXPANSION PROPOSED THIS WILL HAVE A TERRIBLE IMPACT IN THE COMMUNITY IN TERMS OF LIGHT, NOISE AND AIR POLLUTION . YOUR EXPANSION WILL AFFECT THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE LIVING IN THAT AREA IN NORTH VANCOUVER, INVESTORS OF REAL ESTATE AND VISITORS TO THE AMENITIES IN THE SHIPYARDS. IT WOULD BE A CRIME IF SEASPAN GOES AHEAD WITH THE PLAN.</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>My name is ____ and I live in the Trophy building adjacent to the Vancouver Drydock. Although I've been in touch with Tim Blair I believe you are the point person for this</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>project. Please find below "some" of the communication with have had with various stakeholders. On behalf of all concerned please add all these comments to the response file. Thank you.</p> <p>_____, there continues to be many unanswered questions following last night's meeting.</p> <p>We are told that 7000 notices were distributed in a one kilometre area surrounding the drydocks. However, in Trophy, Cascade and Atrium at the Pier, I've been unable to unearth more than a total of TWELVE residents that received one.... and I've been actively asking at every opportunity.</p> <p>If I understand correctly, if the expansion went east, Seaspan would be inconvenienced operationally TWO days a month or 24 days a year when the barge arrives to retrieve components / blocks for the shipbuilding activity at the Pemberton Avenue assembly location. In contrast, if the expansion comes west, residents in and visitors to this area would be significantly impacted THREE HUNDRED and SIXTY FIVE days a year. Please correct my math if it fails me.</p> <p>You stated that expansion to the west is "optimal" but never satisfactorily answered the questions asked about whether it is the ONLY option.</p> <p>You report an expected 1- 3db increase in noise as a result of the additional drydock activity. However, what has not been taken into account is the fact that with more facilities to repair, UHP blasting, welding, and so on there is very little chance of there ever being downtime. Moving the noise 40 metres farther offshore will do little to reduce that disturbance to the community despite your insistence that it is being done with our best interests at heart. The question was asked about how this promise of reduced noise was measured. Based on the response, it was clear that this was not part of the noise engineering report, and therefore is, at best an "assumption". Our own assumption is that Seaspan has some vision of using that additional water space created to 'house' ships awaiting access to the drydocks, perhaps even being worked on while waiting.</p> <p>Some of our neighbours have the sense that we might be less impacted by this project if we were 'marine wildlife'. Lots of study seems to have been conducted on their potential welfare and less on humans, including young children who reside and visit this area just adjacent to the proposed expansion.</p> <p>During last evening's meeting you responded that the area to the east of the Panamax is not currently a Seaspan assigned water lot.</p> <p>_____, that's what this whole discussion is about!</p> <p>Your company is applying to expand into an area that Seaspan does not currently and completely have rights to! We are justifiably frustrated that Seaspan would not see the logic in an eastern expansion that would not negatively impact the community, even if</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>that project would be more costly and operationally challenging. This is obviously planned as a PERMANENT decision, and Seaspan has acknowledged that the facility will be in "high demand". Your response to the question about the "boat shed" was unsatisfactory. It appears to be only for the use of the Washington Family for storage and repair of their ever-growing fleet of upscale craft.... St Eval and Tess to name only a couple. Oh, and I have on many occasions seen large trucks drive out onto the "unstable" pier beside the boat shed. How unstable can it really be, and what would it cost to upgrade it to the standard required for the project?</p> <p>Also no mention of or information about any geological investigation into the seabed where Seaspan plans to pile-drive. Is it silt or rock? That could make a big difference in the "6 week" disruption to be caused, should your expansion plan move forward. Also Seaspan should be communicating that based on the construction report, this pile driving is planned to go from 7 am - 8 pm every day but Sunday.</p> <p>By the way, after the meeting concluded at 8 pm the hydro blasting in the existing drydocks went on until 10:40 pm. Certainly doesn't build confidence in Seaspan's statement in the proposal that this type of activity "generally" ends at 6:00 pm! What assurances do we have that Seaspan won't move to a 24 hour operation if needed?</p> <p>See you online again tomorrow! Please allow for audible questions from the community if possible, or at least have the moderator respond to attendees who raise their hands seeking further clarification on items being discussed.</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Please see below my message to our Mayor. For the record I want to express my extreme disappointment with the meeting that took place last night. How the presentation was controlled, conducted and orchestrated leaves one believing that the decision had already been made. The inability to respond to answers given by Seaspan through locking everyone's mic is deeply disturbing. At one point I even raised my hand but was totally ignored. I could say a great deal more but as a polite and thoughtful tax payer I will maintain my dignity and take the high road</p> <p>Good morning Mayor Buchanan My name is _____ and I am a resident in the Trophy building situated in the Quay. You may be aware of Seaspan's application to expand their operation further west of their current location. As residents of this unique area we are strongly against this project for many reasons. We have only recently been given information that clearly lays out the gravity and footprint of this proposal. Much to our surprise they have decided to move their operation further west. This would result in adding further dry docks that will be closer to the foreshore, children's playground and the pier that as you know is enjoyed by the general public on a regular basis. Seaspan do have space East of their site that for the most part is unused. Even though we are led to believe that some dredging would be required we feel that this is far more preferable than the intrusion on residential and business usage.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>We could give many more reasons why we disagree with this project for example noise, pollution both light and to marine life to name but a few.</p> <p>Finally, in the very short time we have been given to respond to this expansion attempts are being made to reach out to the Port Authority, Seaspan, our local MLA and MP. We politely ask you to help maintain the beauty and unique environment you have helped to create and continue to ensure that the Quay remains the jewel we all wish it to be</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>Seaspan's expansion west affects residents and the public's use of the City of North Vancouver's beautiful Shipyards District. A large part of vessel maintenance is water blasting with compressors. Both very noisy. Seaspan will have two more lifts that will do much more of this type of work creating an unpleasant noise level year round and possibly 24/7</p> <p>Expanding west will forever impact this water front area. Seaspan should be a good neighbour and expand to the east</p>
15-Jul-21	<p>My wife and I are lifetime residents of North Vancouver, (her grandfather even worked at the shipyards in WW2 as a medic) and are very opposed to the expansion of the Seaspan drydock area for a vast array of reasons, admittedly some of self interest since I live in the buildings that will hugely impacted from any expansion. That said, in addition to the substantial impact on my property value, the impaired view and unsightly view I have other reasons this should not be allowed to proceed in the proposed area. To state just a few...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The noise is not only currently disturbing to residents, but also domestic & wild animals See this video from June 29/21 as an example: https://vimeo.com/575331940 • There is a children's park at the water where marine paint and metals would be would be blasted during drydock repairs and as you can see in the attached photo, Seaspan has a permanent Pire to the east of Trophy Building. The decrepit dock in front of Trophy is part of the original Shipyards and west of what Seaspan owns. The decrepit pier is at the end of its useful life and should revert to open shore as it has with the pilings to the west where seals, birds, otters and Crows feed. A new lease of this area that has been refurbished for residents, visitors and wild life to return to should not have some new lease renewal that will set a president ongoing into the future. Nothing should be allowed to be west of that modern dock. (see the attached photo) • All homeowners impacted by this want the enjoyment of their decks overlooking the area. The dirt that comes off of the current docks makes it difficult to enjoy already. The cleaning required to just maintain our living spaces is over the top and expensive. Adding more working structures and activity in front of these residential homes will make this worse. Also, this is already a potential health risk and adding more painting, sanding and grinding of marine paints and metals will only make this worse as well. • Dennis Washington currently has his personal yacht moored on the east side of the dry-docks and we see regular helicopters flying in and out of the east side area. It makes no sense that he can park his yacht there, rather than expand his business in that direction. I'd rather see his yacht back at the old Carrie Cates, lower Lonsdale dock. • On the Eco side of things, it will affect the growing numbers or wildlife in the area. We have Eagles fishing in this specific area. Seals funnel fish into that area of the harbour for fishing in front of the small beach that is there. I've seen several new species of birds in the area I haven't seen before. (there's much more) • Regarding the eagles: the pair lives in Stanley Park & perches on the dormant

Date	Feedback
	<p>yellow crane near the Public Skating Rink to fish in the exact area proposed for additional expanded development for Seaspan. The pair has been fishing & perching there for at least a decade and I see them often and usually daily in the winter. (We personally have photos of them from 2010)</p> <p>I could and likely should go on, but I'm short of time. Unfortunately I'm not able to attend either of the meetings. But to summarize, this expansion must not take place in this location or will have a massive negative impact on everyone that lives in the area and the thousands of people that visit and enjoy the area each week. This is additionally a very bad precedent for the area that could go on into perpetuity. Keep the industry in the industrial areas and on the industrial side, meaning east of the pier and drydocks, away from the public and western residential side containing wildlife.</p>
16-Jul-21	<p>Last evening I attended the 2nd online meeting to address Seaspan's Expansion Project, having already been part of Tuesday's discussion.</p> <p>As you may have noted, the participants numbered 84 last night, with 66 in attendance on Tuesday.</p> <p>Thanks for being present to hear / read the questions of concern from this North Vancouver Community. We appreciate your involvement! Unfortunately, nearly an hour of those concerns / questions remained unanswered at the conclusion of the 'call'. This might suggest to you the amount of engagement in this community.</p> <p>I'll resist rehashing my previous comments that I'm sure have been brought to your attention following the Tuesday presentation and other earlier feedback I've sent, but I do wish to emphasize our complete astonishment that this is all being proposed with the resulting, negative impact on so many residents, visitors and particularly youth and young children that have been seeking a return to the enjoyment of this space over the lengthy course of Covid-19. Also, I was very concerned that there currently exists no monitoring station for air pollution and noise in the immediate area. Pop-up monitoring of both was done in a Trophy unit occupied by a Seaspan employee. Not sure what drydock activity was being carried out during that monitoring period or the results from that monitoring, or how long the period of monitoring was! As you may not know, a play area with seating and picnic benches was provided five years ago just adjacent to this proposed expansion. Groups of preschoolers are brought here by their caregivers regularly, and the sounds of their joyous laughter will be drowned out by the work in the additional drydocks, not to mention the potential risk to their health from the extra air pollution. While Seaspan is claiming how effective their system is in capturing the dust and debris from the work they are doing, it is not consistent with what the residents are experiencing. Residents in the adjacent condos have had significant accumulation of particulates on their balconies that are no doubt coming from Seaspan's ongoing power washing of the structures and vessels they have been working on. These particulates are also landing on the playground area and it is not known what health issues they may present to the children using the area on a regular basis. Seaspan has repeatedly referred to "40 metres expansion to the west". As Dan pointed out, the development will, in fact, spread 61.6 metres closer to the Burrard Dock, almost crossing that play area just north of it!</p> <p>Another misrepresentation is that Seaspan has been operating here for over 100 years.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>It has been repeated frequently, but is untrue. They are only the most recent operator of this facility! There have been other companies in the period of time Seaspan is claiming ownership of it.</p> <p>Seaspan refers to their support of the Lions Gate Hospital Foundation, the Covid-19 relief efforts, the music festivals, the Friday Night Markets, the festive December lighting, and so on.... We know how tax breaks work! The 800+ owners in the area provide TWO MILLION annually in taxes alone to the CNV coffers.</p> <p>The City of North Vancouver has spent millions to make this a 'destination' for all and created the Spirit Trail running directly beside the water, now to have it all negatively impacted by this project. Seaspan's own image of the "after view" clearly shows how this area will be negatively impacted by this project.</p> <p>I took great interest when Chris Bishop confirmed in his response that Seaspan could expand east. You may wish to replay his response to that (near the conclusion of last evening's meeting). There were in excess of 100 comments in the CHAT room and, as many participants noted, NONE oppose this expansion, BUT it must be done in the area least affecting residents, and others who've watched with concern and dismay at the expansion proposal being considered.</p> <p>With any additional proposed drydocks there will be a significant increase in the use of diesel powered tugs that will be coming and going, loading and unloading the existing AND new docks. This is not acceptable to any who take pride in our attractive 'jewel' in the Lower Lonsdale area.</p> <p>I urge the Port Authority team to deny this expansion request and give the community the opportunity to work collaboratively with Seaspan to find a solution. If Seaspan had approached the community PRIOR to developing the proposal it would have been clear that this community is not taking an anti-development, anti-jobs creation stance, and additionally would have provided valuable insights regarding expansion.</p>
16-Jul-21	<p>Considering the overwhelming support by the attendees of the two information meetings held that the new docks be located on the eastern side of the shipyard, why can the port authority not consider rezoning a 40 meter strip of the water lot east and adjacent to the eastern most boundary of the current Seaspan boundary? This area has a designated use for a Terminal, but the Western portion of this water lot is not used and has not been in use for a long time. Cities and Municipalities constantly change land use designations if it favours the communities best interests. Why can the Port Authority not allow a small strip of this Terminal designated water lot be rezoned to Industrial use?</p>
16-Jul-21	<p>PLEASE do not allow this project to move forward.</p>
16-Jul-21	<p>Please be Aware: Quite simply, this expansion will impact the Shipyard District and local residents with not only loud but continual noise with 4 dry docks working! Move East, be a good neighbour.</p>
16-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to you in opposition of the permit application referenced above. Specifically, the Western location chosen for the water lot expansion.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>The Seaspan application references an “Environmental Noise Assessment” report completed by BKL Consultants Ltd. In describing the impact on near-by stakeholders to the Western expansion of the existing water lot, BKL states: “The front row high-rise buildings within this development will also block noise transmission from the new drydocks to residential buildings to the north.” Their implied inference, using existing residential buildings to screen noise from the proposed expanded operations, is unacceptable as a resident of “The front row high-rise buildings”. Our building was constructed in a specific design to shield the industrial operations of the port area to the East from the residential and community destination area to the West. Owners of our building knew of the industrial ship repair/service operations existing. They are also tolerant of the noise associated with the operations, primarily because Seaspan operations were there first. In reading the BKL report there are significant omissions. For example: the air space between our building [Trophy] and the closest parallel building [Cascade East] acts as an amplifying corridor. No observations/measurements were completed other than one southern most suite. This single point measurement is inadequate for predicting the true nature of noise affecting “The front row high-rise buildings”. New western expansion of the water lot places operations directly in line with the air space corridor between these Trophy and Cascade buildings. Frustratingly, the BKL report goes on to state “The nearest buildings to the Northeast and East of the Project are commercial or industrial.” Why has the Seaspan application been made exclusively for a Western expansion? It is clear from the BKL report that expansion to the East would eliminate increased noise to existing residential and community event areas to the West.</p> <p>In reviewing the entire report to determine why the eastern area was not selected, I find the information within PER-Section 4.0 “Alternative Siting Options” significantly undervalued. Seaspan Marine Group has designated the Eastern area to their existing water lot as “NoGo #2”. This area East of the existing large Panamax drydock aligns with the Seaspan Marine Group land property boundaries as outlined in “appendix 1, Engineering drawings”. Their supporting explanations for this “NoGo #2” designation are weak and do not represent a truthful value to our community and their own operations.</p> <p>The proposed Western expansion to the existing Seaspan water lot does not align with their existing land-based operations and encroaches on a major residential community area. Where as, an Eastern expansion alignment would include the existing “PCL F and PCL A” parcels as outlined on their site plan reference “CNV044-04452F-001”. Expansion to the East will not impede operations of their existing large Panamax drydock. Seaspan utilizes “PCL A”, the “W” building and former Fast Cat construction building, for their new constructions division and claim they require marine access to this site. However, marine traffic would not be further impeded as structures such as a pier, pilons and floating boat house already exist in this area. Removing and replacing the existing floating boat house with one of the two new drydocks would retain the marine access to “PCL A” the “W” building. The remaining new drydock could be placed on the eastern side of the existing “PCL F” pier.</p> <p>The Seaspan application proposal further argues that the two new drydocks have a</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>draft of 8m/6m and would have insufficient water depth to the East of the Panamax drydock. However, their "PER document, page 8, figure 1", "Bathymetry" and their "Bathymetry & Depth Data drawing" shows the same general depth for both the proposed Western area as well as the alternative Eastern area. In actuality, the Northwestern area of their proposed siting has less overall depth than the excluded "NoGo #2" Eastern area and adjoining Eastern pier. Seaspan's proposal confirms this as it states that possible minor dredging would be required for their proposed Western siting. A parallel assumption can be made for the Eastern expansion option based on the Bathymetry depths.</p> <p>Within the "Section 4.0 – Alternative siting options", Seaspan states the new structures will need to be fixed in position with pilons. The report continues with the inference that piles driven into the seabed to the West will be less intrusive to than on the East. This is a claim that can not be substantiated.</p> <p>The Seaspan application states servicing of the two new drydocks would be from a new permanently moored work pontoon, and that this pontoon requires land access. Utilization of the existing pier "PCL F" provides this land access from their existing land operations. The application report contains no information on the integrity of the existing pier "PCL F". The pier is also shown as East of the designated "NoGo #2" providing the assumption this has not fully been considered.</p> <p>The existing Eastern portion of the water lot boundary sits directly adjacent to the existing Panamax drydock and is listed as "NoGo Region 2" by Seaspan. The assumption for this NoGo status is to allow the unimpeded operation of the Panamex drydock. However, slightly further East of this NoGo area exists an existing pier facility currently being used by Seaspan. This "PCL F" pier and area forms part of their land operations labeled "PCL F" and "PCL A" as referenced on their site plan reference "CNV044-04452F-001". The existing "PCL F" pier structure and proposed two drydocks would exist well within the Southern limit of the Panamax drydock. The new drydocks and pontoon would also be East of the Panamax and not impede its operations. Eastern expansion of the water lot area will not impede Marine traffic operations to the "W" building. The pier structure already exists and the new drydocks would be adjacent to the east and west sides of the Pier. The Seaspan application further states that servicing of the two new drydocks would be from the permanently moored work pontoon and that this pontoon requires land access. Utilization of the existing pier "PCL F" provides this land access from their existing land operations "PCL A."</p> <p>Along with the Seaspan application, two, possibly a maximum of four, new cranes are to be mounted onto the new drydocks. They are to be of sufficient size to provide lifting access "over the existing Careen[blue] drydock to the pier". Utilizing the Eastern location "PCL F and PCL A" eliminates the presence of the Careen[blue] drydock. The existing pier "PCL F" was historically used with pier mounted cranes and could conceivably be used again, potentially eliminating two of four new cranes. As a minimum, the intrusive height of new cranes would not be visible from the West residential structures.</p> <p>Taking all the above into consideration and acknowledging the negative impact on our 'Pier' residential and community focused areas, the proposed Western water lot expansion should be rejected.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>It is an Eastern water lot expansion that Seaspan should be applying for not a Western expansion. The Eastern lands are existing industrial-use areas and impact no residential or community use areas.</p> <p>Thank-you for considering the impact this application would have on our residential neighbourhood.</p>
16-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to you in opposition of the permit application referenced above. Specifically, the Western location chosen for the water lot expansion.</p> <p>The Seaspan application references an “Environmental Noise Assessment” report completed by BKL Consultants Ltd. In describing the impact on near-by stakeholders to the Western expansion of the existing water lot, BKL states: “The front row high-rise buildings within this development will also block noise transmission from the new drydocks to residential buildings to the north.” Their implied inference, using existing residential buildings to screen noise from the proposed expanded operations, is unacceptable as a resident of “The front row high-rise buildings”. Our building was constructed in a specific design to shield the industrial operations of the port area to the East from the residential and community destination area to the West. Owners of our building knew of the industrial ship repair/service operations existing. They are also tolerant of the noise associated with the operations, primarily because Seaspan operations were there first. In reading the BKL report there are significant omissions. For example: the air space between our building [Trophy] and the closest parallel building [Cascade East] acts as an amplifying corridor. No observations/measurements were completed other than one southern most suite. This single point measurement is inadequate for predicting the true nature of noise affecting “The front row high-rise buildings”. New western expansion of the water lot places operations directly in line with the air space corridor between these Trophy and Cascade buildings. Frustratingly, the BKL report goes on to state “The nearest buildings to the Northeast and East of the Project are commercial or industrial.” Why has the Seaspan application been made exclusively for a Western expansion? It is clear from the BKL report that expansion to the East would eliminate increased noise to existing residential and community event areas to the West.</p> <p>In reviewing the entire report to determine why the eastern area was not selected, I find the information within PER-Section 4.0 “Alternative Siting Options” significantly under valued. Seaspan Marine Group has designated the Eastern area to their existing water lot as “NoGo #2”. This area East of the existing large Panamax drydock aligns with the Seaspan Marine Group land property boundaries as outlined in “appendix 1, Engineering drawings”. Their supporting explanations for this “NoGo #2” designation are weak and do not represent a truthful value to our community and their own operations.</p> <p>The proposed Western expansion to the existing Seaspan water lot does not align with their existing land-based operations and encroaches on a major residential community area. Where as, an Eastern expansion alignment would include the existing “PCL F and PCL A” parcels as outlined on their site plan reference “CNV044-04452F-001”. Expansion to the East will not impede operations of their existing large Panamax drydock. Seaspan utilizes “PCL A”, the “W” building and former Fast Cat construction building, for their new constructions division and claim they require marine access to this site. However,</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>marine traffic would not be further impeded as structures such as a pier, pilons and floating boat house already exist in this area. Removing and replacing the existing floating boat house with one of the two new drydocks would retain the marine access to “PCL A” the “W” building. The remaining new drydock could be placed on the eastern side of the existing “PCL F” pier.</p> <p>The Seaspan application proposal further argues that the two new drydocks have a draft of 8m/6m and would have insufficient water depth to the East of the Panamax drydock. However, their “PER document, page 8, figure 1”, “Bathymetry” and their “Bathymetry & Depth Data drawing” shows the same general depth for both the proposed Western area as well as the alternative Eastern area. In actuality, the Northwestern area of their proposed siting has less overall depth than the excluded “NoGo #2” Eastern area and adjoining Eastern pier. Seaspan’s proposal confirms this as it states that possible minor dredging would be required for their proposed Western siting. A parallel assumption can be made for the Eastern expansion option based on the Bathymetry depths.</p> <p>Within the “Section 4.0 – Alternative siting options”, Seaspan states the new structures will need to be fixed in position with pilons. The report continues with the inference that piles driven into the seabed to the West will be less intrusive to than on the East. This is a claim that can not be substantiated.</p> <p>The Seaspan application states servicing of the two new drydocks would be from a new permanently moored work pontoon, and that this pontoon requires land access. Utilization of the existing pier “PCL F” provides this land access from their existing land operations. The application report contains no information on the integrity of the existing pier “PCL F”. The pier is also shown as East of the designated “NoGo #2” providing the assumption this has not fully been considered.</p> <p>The existing Eastern portion of the water lot boundary sits directly adjacent to the existing Panamax drydock and is listed as “NoGo Region 2” by Seaspan. The assumption for this NoGo status is to allow the unimpeded operation of the Panamax drydock. However, slightly further East of this NoGo area exists an existing pier facility currently being used by Seaspan. This “PCL F” pier and area forms part of their land operations labeled “PCL F” and “PCL A” as referenced on their site plan reference “CNV044-04452F-001”. The existing “PCL F” pier structure and proposed two drydocks would exist well within the Southern limit of the Panamax drydock. The new drydocks and pontoon would also be East of the Panamax and not impede its operations. Eastern expansion of the water lot area will not impede Marine traffic operations to the “W” building. The pier structure already exists and the new drydocks would be adjacent to the east and west sides of the Pier. The Seaspan application further states that servicing of the two new drydocks would be from the permanently moored work pontoon and that this pontoon requires land access. Utilization of the existing pier “PCL F” provides this land access from their existing land operations “PCL A.”</p> <p>Along with the Seaspan application, two, possibly a maximum of four, new cranes are to be mounted onto the new drydocks. They are to be of sufficient size to provide lifting access “over the existing Careen[blue] drydock to the pier”. Utilizing the Eastern location “PCL F and PCL A” eliminates the presence of the Careen[blue] drydock. The existing</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>pier "PCL F" was historically used with pier mounted cranes and could conceivably be used again, potentially eliminating two of four new cranes. As a minimum, the intrusive height of new cranes would not be visible from the West residential structures.</p> <p>Taking all the above into consideration and acknowledging the negative impact on our 'Pier' residential and community focused areas, the proposed Western water lot expansion should be rejected.</p> <p>It is an Eastern water lot expansion that Seaspan should be applying for not a Western expansion. The Eastern lands are existing industrial-use areas and impact no residential or community use areas.</p> <p>Thank-you for considering the impact this application would have on our residential neighbourhood.</p>
16-Jul-21	<p>We are in opposition to the proposed drydock expansion at your shipyards for the following reasons: 1. More noise - day or night; 2. More dust; 3. More bright lights ['bright lights' underlined for emphasis]; 4. More parking problems in the area.</p>
16-Jul-21	<p>Seaspan's expansion west will have a Hugh impact on this vibrant Shipyard District. Water blasting and compressor noise is very invasive. This noise is now produced at the Careen and Panamax Dry Docks. This is a very common maintenance issue for all vessels. How will noise levels be controlled when 2 new dry docks will add this noisy procedure. Be a good neighbour Seaspan, expand to the east where these and other forms of pollution will not impact the area.</p>
16-Jul-21	<p>Listening to the second meeting I still don't have answers to the proposal.</p> <p>I ask you if you lived and owned in the Trophy or Cascade building would you be so eager to have the Seaspan Expansion go west. Also have you ever been here in person to check the area to see how this would affect us so greatly. I get the feeling you just don't want to budge even though there is room on the east side with some maneuvering of the floating boat shed and reinforcing the east pier. The boat shed could be moved west, this would be a buffer for the noise and pollution.</p> <p>I always thought that the reason the Trophy (half) building is a buffer for the noise from the Shipyard for the condos and the people that walk around in this area, including the Spirit trail. If Seaspan will go ahead with their proposal this will defeat the buffer of the Trophy building.</p> <p>Yesterday I asked twice about the yellow line on the water lot layout. The yellow line is not completely connected and I don't see how far it goes to the east.</p> <p>I ask you please consider all the people you will affect in a negative way forever.</p>
17-Jul-21	<p>I am concerned about increased noise levels directly in front of our housing, impacts on views, traffic and access rights to the waterfront.</p> <p>The proposal expands and intrudes visually and acoustically into our residential complexes properties. The current shipyard is very noisy at all hours while the new proposal will add to that while diminishing views and property values.</p>
17-Jul-21	<p>The excessive noise 7 days a week at all hours making the enjoyment of my balcony impossible, bright lights all night, loss of views, loss of property value, integrity of our foundations as we are on reclaimed land, air quality, Further to the comment that you found no marine life in this area is just not right, I see seals, otters and fish on a regular basis, as well as the Eagles and Cranes fishing there must be marine life, these animals are not fishing for nothing</p>

Date	Feedback
	Please reconsider and make your expansion east, you are going to spend big dollars to pile drive and add pier and dry docks --- why not invest in the east with the same dollars and not invade on our residential area
17-Jul-21	Can't seem to locate the questions and answers. I do see the two videos.
17-Jul-21	I locate the videos but not all the questions and answers Have they been loaded yet? Also I did use your site email to ask this question but it does not show up as sent on my Ipad so I am sending it to you direct.
17-Jul-21	Where can we find the questions posted during the two Zoom meetings July 13 and 15 ? What are the dimensions of the existing Lease and water lot on page 5 of the Seaspan brochure. Please show east and west. The yellow line is discontinued. What is the current status of lease/ownership in all directions from the proposal?
17-Jul-21	Please understand residential units are here and how can you have for project to put a rust removal yard ship facilities in front of residences. Nothing in this project is good for health or visual comfort and noise as this area is already noisy. Why are you not doing that in places far from residential area?
17-Jul-21	I have recently viewed the recorded info session on July 15 hosted by Seaspan and accompanied by Port Authority. Seaspan's application to expand its growing business & physical activity WEST, instead of EAST, in Lower Lonsdale shows a lack of respect and disregard for its recent residential neighbours, and efforts by the City of North Vancouver to invest & promote this area as family friendly and desired tourist destination. Condo buyers in the area were not informed at time of condo purchase of Seaspan's unimaginable expansion plans westward, with full awareness of residential construction taking place at premium prices. This demonstrates a lack of business planning for alternatives, or relevant communication by Seaspan for several years. My family is most concerned about the increased traffic danger (during construction, ongoing supply delivery & 50% increase in number of employees) travelling south on St. Georges' unto Victory Ship way, the entrance for ALL 500 waterfront condo units & Seaspan parking lot. We are concerned about Liveability issues caused by increased traffic, noise levels, and air pollution in our immediate residential area. If this expansion cannot take place at the Pemberton location (to accommodate growing government contracts), then we ask for the Port Authority to be helpful in mandating that Seaspan spend necessary funds to expand its industry EASTWARD on their leased land instead of WEST. Any small vessel work can be undertaken by competitors elsewhere, even in the USA, if foresight lacking.
17-Jul-21	Very concerned about Seaspan applying to Port Authority for expansion WEST while being fully aware of new residential neighbours that have been enticed to move to this location by City of North Vancouver's attempt to create family friendly & tourist environment. No prior communication or notice of Seaspan expansion intentions

Date	Feedback
	<p>during condo sales. Negative economic & liveability impact on residential neighbours seem subordinate to higher Seaspan cost if business activity shifted EAST instead of Westward. How about Seaspan use/acquire some of the waterfront land at Pemberton location to expand at that site?</p> <p>A respectful neighbour considers impact on others not just own economic interests. Smaller boats/vessels can be serviced elsewhere, including USA. 100 new employees is not seen as significant based on number of condo families negatively impacted. Construction materials & new employees will commute south on St. George's to Victory Ship Way which is entrance for all waterfront condos & Seaspan. Traffic congestion & danger!</p>
18-Jul-21	<p>I go walking in the neighborhood and I feel that makes no sense to expand a business which lowers the quality life of people, all leaving things in terms of debris, air, water, land pollution.</p>
18-Jul-21	<p>Hello, I live on St. Georges Avenue between 1st & 2nd St. Already I am often disturbed by night noise from the shipyards and bright lights. I understand that you will be adding to the noise volume, and although you say that you have light protection plans, I am leary of them. Any fish and sea wildlife that remain are sure to be impacted by both additional noise, light and more water disturbance as you move more boats in and out of the dry docks for service under this expanded model. Plus already seems to be a regular occurrence that your work extends late into the evening and I am sure this practise will continue under the guise of some deadline or project or another. I do not support this expansion even though I understand the significance of shipbuilding in North Vancouver. I am sorry I missed the community input meetings. Your current operations, with those bright lights at night and grinding and hammering noises is already quite a disturbance.</p>
18-Jul-21	<p>After our conversation Friday evening, I reviewed our email exchange regarding a proposed meeting with Trophy and Cascade residents. You indicated in your email of July 9th that Seaspan ""would be happy to meet virtually with the Trophy residents/owners and those of other neighbouring buildings"". In your email of July 14th you advised ""that representatives from the port authority have availability July 27 onwards for a meeting with the neighbouring stratas."" You also communicated during the public meeting of July 15th that you had contacted me at the Trophy building ""to arrange a meeting in later July"".</p> <p>My understanding based on these exchanges was that Seaspan and the Port Authority were prepared to meet virtually with concerned residents of Trophy, Cascade, and any other neighbouring stratas interested in participating.</p> <p>During our Friday evening call, you advised that after being contacted by Holly Back, who is a Councillor in the City of North Vancouver and a member of Atrium Council, that the previously agreed meeting date of July 27th was now arbitrarily being moved to July 28th (presumably to accommodate the conflict of the July 27th Atrium AGM), AND that the meeting was now only open to Council members.</p> <p>In further reviewing this requested change to hold a meeting that does not include an open invitation to all strata residents, both myself as Trophy council president, and _____, the president of Cascade council are not able to support this suggested format.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>As I indicated on our call, the Strata Councils are not authorized to represent the strata corporations in this matter.</p> <p>We would therefore request that Seaspan honour their original offer to hold an online meeting with the Trophy and Cascade residents on July 27th, at a mutually convenient time. As the buildings in closest proximity to this proposal, (acknowledged by the noise engineering report as ""sound barriers"" for other buildings), this expansion is a matter of great concern and importance to many residents. The Trophy and Cascade Councils would certainly be prepared to consolidate the major issues from residents in advance to help facilitate an efficient meeting, but all residents should be invited to attend.</p> <p>Please advise if Seaspan is prepared to proceed, as originally agreed upon, with a virtual meeting with residents of Trophy and Cascade on July 27th. In terms of other strata complexes, we trust that Seaspan is working with the relevant property managers/councils to arrange any additional requests for meetings.</p>
19-Jul-21	<p>We live in the Drydock area, at ____ Victory Ship Way, North Vancouver, BC. The recent announcement regarding the changes proposed to expand Seaspan operations is not acceptable. Their current operations, with those bright lights at night and grinding and hammering noises is already quite a disturbance. We understood however, that it is necessary for the business and we have to accept the way it is. This expansion however, will affect those of us who live in the area even more so.</p> <p>We therefore hope that they could find other avenues to expand their business. We object therefore to the proposed expansion..</p>
19-Jul-21	<p>We live in the Drydock area, at ____ Victory Ship Way, North Vancouver, BC. Your recent announcement regarding the changes proposed to expand your operations is not acceptable. Your current operations, with those bright lights at night and grinding and hammering noises is already quite a disturbance. We understood however, that it is necessary for your business and we have to accept the way it is. This expansion however, will affect those of us who live in the area.</p> <p>We therefore hope that you could find other avenues to expand your business. We object therefore to the proposed expansion.</p>
19-Jul-21	<p>PONTOON UTILIZATION</p> <p>It is interesting to note that Mr Washington's mega yacht ATTESSA has just returned to Vancouver and is now moored on that barge attached to the eastern pier. (See picture below). Let's call this barge the PONTOON. This barge/pontoon could probably be moved further to the north as will be clarified below. Also of note is that a portion of this eastern pier is used as a parking lot for cars and trucks. I counted 8 there the others day. It also has a number of buildings/sheds on it. Picture below indicates how much strictly industrial land is to the west. NORTH OF THE PIER LAND ACCESS AVAILABILITY</p> <p>The picture below is taken from the north side and indicates just how much space there is for access in and out of that adjacent eastern location. There certainly does not appear to be any operational concerns associated with that eastern working pier. Keep in mind again that both new Drydocks would be floating which adds no load on this pier. The only load issue would appear to be associated with movement of any heavy parts. I would assume that this could very easily be undertaken by portable cranes moving up and down that pier.</p> <p>And if there were any possible structural deficiencies in this eastern water lot pier, I would then assume that this could be easily rectified. Making this a STRUCTURALLY</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>SAFE PIER would be essential for both current and future efficient, effective and safe utilization of this eastern water lot.</p> <p>And let's not forget that these two new Drydocks would only be catering to the maintenance of SMALLER VESSELS. SMALL DRYDOCK PLACEMENT TO THAT EASTERN PIER</p> <p>Let's now remove that barge on the west side north of the Washington floating boat garage and move that smaller proposed Drydock to the south west side. (See photo at the end) A smaller work barge could still be placed between the Drydock and the floating boat house to the extent required.</p> <p>FINAL DRYDOCK EASTERN PLACEMENT</p> <p>And as a final elementary analysis, in my efforts to bring this all to a conclusion, let's now move that larger proposed Drydock onto the south eastern edge of that pier. It would then be located next to the smaller Drydock with only the southern portion of the pier separating them. (Easy work access) And as previously indicated, that would then entail moving in a smaller barge on that west side to the extent that it is even needed. The Washington floating boat garage even gets to stay.</p> <p>And as previously indicated, that barge on the east side, where the ATTESSA is currently moored, would be our Pontoon. It would just move as far north as required to accommodate the larger Drydock right next to the south eastern part of the pier.</p> <p>This should then eliminate the need to have an extra pontoon, for access to the Drydocks, since the existing pier should work. You then still have the two barges on the north sides of the Drydocks should that be necessary.</p> <p>So this consideration to move EAST rather than west, in my mind, is the most effective way of getting better efficient utilization of the eastern Seaspan adjoining water lot while at the same time eliminating most if not all of the negative community outrage and concerns raised to date.</p> <p>Below is the adjoining Seaspan water lot that they did not wish to include in their analysis. (BERTH1). And as the suspense mounts</p> <p>HERE IS MY PROPOSAL</p> <p>A PICTURE SPEAKS A THOUSAND WORDS (even if I already used up most of them). So let's tick off the boxes to my eastern Drydock proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - continued barge access to the W building <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - water depth same as in the west. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - access to the new Drydocks. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - sheltered area. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - underutilized industrial pier now more effectively used. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - could reduce the pilings to 4 if you just used the existing pontoon barges attached to the pier. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - does not restrict harbour traffic. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - removed most if not all of the noise, lighting, pollution, sight views and aesthetics associated with the other western option into our shipyards district. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - easier ability to move the Careen Drydock in and out as you will continue to have 3 open sides rather than trying to squeeze it into the only southern open area left. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Date	Feedback
	<p>- allow for easier tug access for the movement of ships in and out of the new Drydocks. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>- less disruption to sea/water-life in and around the Burrard pier, our pedestrian park extension into the inner harbour. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>-based on the existing adjacent large Drydocks land location, it would be very easy to set up a satellite small ship maintenance area to that eastern location. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The only possible negative might be the requirement to upgrade the eastern pier, but that should be done anyway as previously indicated.</p> <p>And finally my only other issue is why Seaspan chose NOT TO EVEN PRESENT THIS OPTION.</p> <p>But as the saying goes "IF THERE IS A WILL THERE IS A WAY".</p>
19-Jul-21	<p>I have a concern regarding the drydock project coming west towards the Shipyards pier. I enjoy seeing the floating drydock work being done on my daily walks. Sometimes it is pretty noisy but I appreciate that work is being done and am grateful to be able to watch. Is it possible to increase the drydock capacity by going 40M east instead of west? Some days there are thousands of people enjoying the view, the walk, the restaurants and the children's waterpark. A 40 m incursion into this view would be not only much more noise but would be a great imposition onto the view of what has become THE go to place in the North Shore. I am sure the residents in both the condo's and the hotel would feel betrayed that their view was so compromised. This has the potential to reduce property values and, accordingly, taxes.</p> <p>Please consider this suggestion.</p>
19-Jul-21	<p>I would like to register my opposition to the proposed expansion of the dry dock on Lower Lonsdale. This is both a dense residential neighbourhood, and a vital outdoor meeting place for families, locals, and tourists. The proposed site for the new dry dock is much much too close to the Shipyards area. Just because it shares a name, it doesn't mean it's currently suited to large scale dock expansion.</p> <p>Servicing ships is not a quiet business. To ruin both this vital community space and residents' right to enjoy their homes without continual noise pollution is outrageous.</p> <p>Yes the area has been home to a shipyards for many years, but that was before the decision was made to regenerate the shoreline to provide vital homes and community space. The decision needs to be made what is the purpose of this piece of shoreline today -- is it a massive ship yard, or is it homes and community space. It can't be both.</p> <p>A better question for SeaSpan would be how do they intend to reduce the levels of noise pollution from their current operation.</p>
20-Jul-21	<p>I'm very concerned about the new proposed dry dock. There is already soo much noise, pollution and light pollution by the current docks. I believe it would Be best if the new dry dock be further east away from the community than further west disrupting the large population in Lower Lonsdale.</p>
20-Jul-21	<p>We are aware of the proposed plan for Vancouver Dry Dock to extend their water lot and increase its docking capacity by adding two new floating dry docks. We are in full support of the extension and increased docking capacity.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Vancouver Dry Dock provides critical service to the BC coast and the entire North American West coast with its world class repair facilities and people. The dry-docking service and increased docking capacity are needed now and will be in even greater need as local coastal projects like CanadaLNG, Woodfibre, Kitimat LNG, BHP, DP World etc. take shape. The local tug and barge fleet will continue to grow, and foreign tug operators will increasingly be working in our waters. All to support those projects and the future day to day operations at those facilities. We need the docking capacity to follow suit. Without the increased ability to dock and maintain the local and foreign vessels working in our waters, we risk losing those dockings to Alaska and Washington State. That would be a significant loss of economic activity and stimulus.</p> <p>An increase in dry-dock capacity equates to more employment and development of skilled workers here in BC and importantly here in the Metro Vancouver region. It is not only skilled workers at Vancouver Dry Dock, this increased capacity means all the suppliers, vendors, and partners (including academic institutions and trade schools) will have a need for increasing employment. Shipyards, especially repair yards, require large local supply networks of both materials and human capital for them to be successful. As one of those suppliers in the network our local team directly sees the benefits of increased investment in the local ship repair and building infrastructure. We added two new full-time staff and made the commitment to keep our local distribution center open when NSPS was confirmed and will continue to right size and support the marine industry here in BC as it grows. Canada, BC, and Vancouver are in the middle of a resurgence of marine investment in new construction, but the heart of the industry has always been the repair and maintenance business.</p> <p>This pillar of the marine business is even more critical now as new vessels and tonnage comes online; we need new and more local capacity to maintain and repair it. Losing out on maintenance of vessels built in Canada and/or working in Canada would be a real shame. Not only does the increased capacity support the domestic customers it opens doors to competing for more foreign flag dockings and building our marine industry even stronger. North Vancouver is the epicenter of shipbuilding and ship repair in BC and it only makes sense to continue to grow it there. Vancouver Dry Dock in our experience has always been respectful to the neighboring areas and works hard with its suppliers and network to invest in ways to be more efficient and sustainable. The proposal reads to be well thought-out and it makes sense for the industry, the region, and the province for it to be approved. We are always excited to see companies invest in the local marine industry and continue to support generations of workers for BC and Canada.</p>
20-Jul-21	<p>Several questions were asked on the chat at the public meetings about the distribution of the Seaspan flyers by Canada Post but the moderator skipped over the questions. Given the concern raised that many residents living in close proximity to the Shipyards did not receive the flyer, I am requesting some details from Seaspan's communications team directly.</p> <p>In the PER document, Seaspan states that it will "provide notification to residents and businesses within a 1 km radius from the site." You confirmed that over 7000 flyers were sent as "neighbourhood mail" by Canada Post.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>I have confirmed with Canada Post that the flyers sent as "neighbourhood mail" would not be delivered by the carrier to letter boxes tagged to refuse junk mail. Had Seaspan chosen a more expensive method of personalized mail, all the residences in the 1 kilometer radius would have received the flyer about this very important proposal.</p> <p>Canada Post also confirmed that those undeliverable flyers would have been returned by the carrier to the depot, where a supervisor tallies the number. That number of "non receipts" is communicated back to the client, in this case Seaspan. The client is also asked what Canada Post should do with the leftover flyers.</p> <p>I would appreciate a response to the following:</p> <p>What did Canada Post report back as the total of non-receipts for this mail out?</p> <p>What did Seaspan communicate to Canada Post to do with the remaining flyers?</p> <p>Why did Seaspan select the least expensive mailing option that would bypass those "no junk mail" residences rather than an option that would have ensured delivery of information on this very impactful proposal?</p>
20-Jul-21	<p>I am writing on behalf of a large group of concerned citizens who live in the Shipyards community who have organized to oppose the western expansion proposal by Seaspan. As I was not able to find individual email addresses for many members of your committee, I would ask that you pass this letter along to all members.</p> <p>From your website, it appears that the NSWLC is intended to be a communication mechanism for the North Shore community on port related matters. This proposed expansion would have a permanent and negative impact on the community.</p> <p>Many of us have written directly to Seaspan, the Port Authority, our mayor and city councillors, our MLA and MP to express our concerns, but we would be interested to understand how your committee could help. The majority of us are not opposed to the expansion if it goes east into an industrial area rather than west. Many residents attended the two online public meetings, but were frustrated by the lack of a specific rationale as to why Seaspan cannot expand eastward. Our questions posed during the July 13th and 15th sessions remain unanswered, despite Seaspan's commitment at those meetings to post answers online. The PER reports also lack specifics as to why eastern locations were dismissed from an environmental, community and economic perspective.</p> <p>To date, has the NSWLC provided feedback regarding this proposed expansion to the Port Authority or Seaspan?</p> <p>What liaison assistance can your committee provide to community residents to ensure our concerns are heard?</p> <p>The Shipyard Commons and the residential neighbourhood that has been developed in the past five years should be protected from noise pollution, air emissions and a</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>permanent alteration to the beautiful waterfront that many North Shore visitors enjoy.</p> <p>Please contact me via email at your earliest convenience. The public engagement period for PER ends July 30th, and public participation in the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada process deadline is August 12th, so our timelines are tight. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>
20-Jul-21	<p>Dear Mayor and Councillors,</p> <p>Please read the enclosed letter with our position regarding the Seaspan Application #8173. We are not in favor of this expansion.</p> <p>The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority has initiated a Project and Environment Review which is closing to the public on July 24,2021.</p> <p>Seaspan is accepting public input up to July31st, 2021.</p> <p>The Transport Canada is accepting communication until August 14, 2021,</p> <p>The Impact Assessment Act Category 'C requires input from the Communities, Indigenous and Environment.</p> <p>We hope as our city representatives you are aware of this expansion project and will address on the behalf of your constituents.</p> <p>Seaspan Paul Hebson VP & GM Vancouver Drydock</p> <p>Subject: File ft 81743 Seaspan Vancouver Drydock Waterlot Expansion - North Vancouver</p> <p>I am writing to inform you that we are not in support of the proposed westerly expansion of the Seaspan Vancouver Drydock Waterlot Expansion in North Vancouver.</p> <p>Community and Lifestyle We feel the Seaspan westerly expansion will negatively impact our community and our lifestyle. 'The Shipyards' is a unique waterfront community that has become an urban destination. The city planned, invested and created a beautiful environment for the residents, larger community and its visitors. We enjoy countless year round community events, concerts, markets, outdoor church gatherings, waterpark, skating rink and more. It is a family, arts and entertainment focused area.</p> <p>Noise/Marine Life/Lighting/Extra Boat Activity/Motor Vehicle Traffic/ two working shifts At present the waterfront is a pleasure to appreciate and experience. It is quiet and peaceful. The Seaspan westerly expansion as presented with its increased activities through construction, operations two working shifts now in front of our resident), road and water traffic, noise, lights, etc. will upset the idyllic balance that presently exists. We fear the proposed changes will harm our community, environment, and marine life drastically changing the quality of life for all. As a resident I do not want to experience any of these disturbances, not even if presented as minimal by the Seaspan team. Any increase is too much.</p> <p>Property Depreciation We the Pier residents will have a depreciation of our property value from the proposed westerly expansion. We will lose our view and now have to experience a working environment (two shifts 7am-10:30pm with lighting, ship traffic,</p>

Date	Feedback
	work noises, etc.). A financial loss is a reality for the Pier residents. Please note, I am not a wealthy man, I worked all my life to save enough to buy and enjoy my dream North Shore waterfront condo at the Cascade East.
21-Jul-21	Thank you for acknowledging my comment. We live at ____ Esplanade and enjoy the view across the harbour and all the ships in this active working port. Owners of units on the waterfront adjacent to Seaspan dry dock installation are very concerned. We are interested but less concerned.noise and lights are intrusive but not unexpected. The drawings provided of proposed expansion do not seem to demonstrate the sight lines nor light impact nor do they allow for interpreting noise levels.
21-Jul-21	Please do not expand to the west of your existing water lot. The Shipyards District was created for the people of North Vancouver. It is not fair for your company to go ahead with this project. The impact on all of above and will be felt for years. I am sure you can find another property with your vast holdings that will not impact this district. Go east. The mailout did not reach us. I live in one of the buildings and no one received the mailout from Canada Post. I was given the postcard while enjoying a peaceful dinner by the pier. Your website was incorrect and by the time I saw this is was middle of July. It seems that this is a very sneaky way of not informing the public.
21-Jul-21	Propose to move the construction east. The shipyards community is becoming a great hub for businesses and families. No need to ruin that with more dry docks.
21-Jul-21	I am an owner of the ____strata unit at the Promenade, which I also live in. It was an expensive purchase, but we were sold on the area and the improvements that were promised which came to fruition. Never once we're we advised about potential expansion of the Dry Dock to the West, which will obviously impact our everyday lives with noise, light, and, environmental pollution. We are terrified to think this actually might happen and I would like to register my strong objection to the proposed development. The City of North Vancouver has worked hard to create a sensational mix use residential area which has quickly become a tourist attraction, yet is such a pleasure to live in. Any further development by Seaspan West of the Dry Dock should not be allowed as it will impact the value of our investments and the quality of so many lives.
21-Jul-21	I live at the Quay and I am very unhappy with the proposed development. I vote NO. We live here and enjoy the waterfront and cannot imagine the increase noise, pollution, light pollution and construction that will definitely impact our lifestyle. We paid a lot of money for this location and do not want this development to go through.
21-Jul-21	Good evening I am a stakeholder at the Cascade West at the waterfront in North Vancouver and I'm writing to express my deep concern about the proposed C-SPAN expansion of three dry dock's right in front of the residential condos. Noise pollution air pollution loss of view substantial property value decrease for stakeholders are all issues that are causing great dismay to the residence here at the waterfront. Frankly we are dumbfounded that C-SPAN has decided to go west where there is clearly room on the east for the expansion. The waterfront community is the jewel of North Bend families children of all sorts of nationalities and races meet here spend time together and enjoy each other's company in this waterfront community but we believe that this expansion will greatly hinder north Vancouver community as a whole one of the reasons I've said

Date	Feedback
	before. We are not opposed to the C-SPAN expect expansion but we just ask for all parties involved that they expand east instead of West which makes absolutely no logical sense and will affect many many families both financially and emotionally.
21-Jul-21	I just moved into a brand new townhome, and paid extra for the view. I am very concerned to hear of this possible expansion.
21-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to you to express my deep concern over the proposed Seaspan shipyard expansion I realize we live in an industrial setting and the value of the shipyard in jobs and business If they expand as planned, going west we who live on the Spirit Trail will be deeply impacted, with further noise, poor air quality, and bright lights, all this aside from impeding our views and devalue our properties Could we request that they expand to the east?, or at very least amend the current plan to not go so far to the west?</p> <p>I am also concerned about the pile driving they wish to do, since we are living in towers on reclaimed land, what will that do to the foundations and integrity of our building I live at ____ Victory Ship Way.</p>
21-Jul-21	<p>Hello my name is ____ I live in the Trophy building at the shipyards in North Vancouver. This email is in regards to the expansion of seaspan's dry docks. While I support the need for seaspan to expand I feel that if they could find a way to move all the dry docks east then it could be a win win situation for both seaspan and area residents and businesses as it would reduce noise and allow seaspan to expand. I'm also worried about possible spills as there was an incident around a month ago where there was a very bad fumes i could smell in my condo. I later learned this was from a oil spill. These are my concerns and feedback. Thank you</p>
21-Jul-21	<p>I would like to share a letter I recently wrote to MLA Bowinn Ma explaining my concerns with the Vancouver Drydock proposed water lot project.</p> <p>Date: July 19, 2021 at 11:20:29 AM PDT To: Bowinn.Ma.MLA@leg.bc.ca</p> <p>Hello Bowinn Ma,</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to arrange to meet with SeaSpan to speak with them directly about the concerns our community has regarding the drydock expansion proposal.</p> <p>As an owner in Cascades East, I am very much against this industrial growth in what is now a North shore neighbourhood with families living adjacent to it. The entire community will be loosing here, it is not a time to be increasing drydock space to the West, taking away fresh clean air space.</p> <p>This link https://drydockprojects.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/2-Site-plan-S2020-073.pdf shows the project overview.</p> <p>If you look for #8 you are looking at the placement of a current playground for toddlers. This is a very popular place for daycares to visit with groups of children, as well as many families that come every day to enjoy this space. I expect that this is an area that the City of North Vancouver is trying to promote outdoor playing for children and dining for all to enjoy. I can tell you that there are many times when the noise is so loud that you</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>can't carry on a conversation with the person next to you. This can happen at any given time, one never know for how long or at what time the noise will be happening. This makes it very difficult to plan any outdoor meals with friends and family because you could easily be disrupted with horrible noise, forcing you to move everyone inside. I can recall that over the spring and summer months of 2020 (during Covid), I had to pack up and get out of my condo to get away from the constant noise (even with closing my windows and doors and trying to avoid going on my balcony). These were days when this noise went on sporadically during the day and for several days in a row.</p> <p>The following video was taken on April 20, 2021 from my south facing balcony on the first floor of the Cascades E building. Major sound pollution!</p> <p>Again, if you look at the project overview above, you will notice that the "Noise Monitor" is at the top of the diagram just South of Esplanade. It seems that this monitor was positioned here many years ago, before it became a residential area. The placement of this is much too far away in relation to where several brand new apartment buildings by Pinnacle (Trophy and Cascades E & W) and more now sit. How can a measure of sound be taken from such a far distance from the drydock work, when all of these residents are directly in front of said drydock?</p> <p>Noise is a big concern for sure but so too is the dust that is created. Depending on which way the wind is blowing that day, this is what you can expect to see on your balcony after just one day of what I am assuming is sand blasting the hulls of the ships? Along with this dust, one will often encounter some pretty awful smells, again depending on the direction of the wind on that day.</p> <p>There is also the bright lights. The very first thing that we had installed in our condo was black out blinds. Seaspan will often have very large ships in for repairs which can remain lit up the entire time that they are in dock (I assume that there are crew who remain living on these larger ships while repairs are being made). I have also had sleepless nights due to the continual running of the ships that sit directly in front of the #8 playground area. It seems that it is the Coast Guard ships (I believe that one is shown in the above project overview) that keep engines running all night long which causes noise vibrations that can be heard when one is trying to get to sleep. I have had to move from my master bedroom to the farthest room from the docks just to try and get some sleep.</p> <p>Buyers understood that Seaspan was a working shipyard and that there would be noise, obstruction of views from time to time, that we would have to endure. However, this does make it difficult to plan ahead for a dinner party outside on your balcony, as you may not be able to carry on a conversation as noises can begin at any moment. It would be wonderful if there were some sort of guidelines for residents in the area to peruse ahead of sending invitations for such a lunch or dinner party??</p> <p>I don't understand how having 2 more births for additional work on ship repairs is in any way something any of the purchasers could have ever imagined or foreseen? To choose this location, West of the current Seaspan drydock, creating more noise, dust, light pollution for the residents is completely disgraceful. This is no longer an area that</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>should be increasing its industrial business when the CNV has now allowed the development of homes in the shipyards!! This project would without doubt, severely downgrade the property values of these apartments.</p> <p>In closing, I'd like to quote the television ad by the Vancouver Port Authorities in saying they are proud of how they have "quieter oceans creating healthier whales". What about us humans that are living on land??</p> <p>Thanks for listening and conveying my message to Seaspan that I am very much opposed to this proposal.</p> <p>PS. Please note that I included port of Vancouver in this email but it may not be a valid email address?</p>
21-Jul-21	<p>My name is ____ -- I live in Lynn Valley with my family. I want to express my concern about the proposed expansion of the dry dock westwards in Lower Lonsdale, by SeaSpan.</p> <p>Lower Lonsdale is a dense residential community and a major centre on the North Shore for tourism and leisure. The meeting places and many stores in and around the Shipyards area are a wonderful addition to the city and have provided much needed outdoor and indoor space for community building.</p> <p>The proposed site for the new dry dock is much much too close to the Shipyards area. Just because it shares a name, it doesn't mean it's currently suited to large scale dock expansion.</p> <p>Servicing ships is not a quiet business. To ruin both this vital community space and residents' right to enjoy their homes without continual noise pollution is outrageous.</p> <p>Yes the area has been home to a shipyards for many years, but that was before the decision was made to regenerate the shoreline to provide vital homes and community space. The decision needs to be made what is the purpose of this piece of shoreline today -- is it a massive ship yard, or is it homes and community space. It can't be both.</p> <p>A better question for SeaSpan would be how do they intend to reduce the levels of noise pollution from their current operation.</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>With reference to above mentioned subject, and as an employee of Vancouver Drydock Company Ltd. since 2015, I am writing to you express my support for this project.</p> <p>Being in the marine industry globally for over 30 years, and always in the field of providing services to sea-going vessels, I know firsthand how important it for ship owners that when they reach an international port they have all the necessary services available for their vessels. My role within Seaspan Shipyards is Director, Business Development and I am meeting and greeting ship owners and operators locally (North West Pacific) and internationally. Especially, within the North West Pacific there is need for additional drydock capacity as historically over the years the capacity was reduced due to economic factors. You must be fully aware that Seaspan Shipyards is playing a major role within BC to bring back these historical times and has (and is still) investing a</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>lot of private funds to increase the marine services industry in BC.</p> <p>Vancouver Drydock Company Ltd., as part of Seaspan Shipyards, has played an important role in providing services to marine customers in the Port of Vancouver and over the last 6 years since I have been employed in the company, there has been a steady and very stable growth in the occupation and use of our drydocks. We currently operate with a dock occupancy above 90%, which means the yard in its current capacity is fully utilized. Knowing the fact that the existing drydocks are fully utilized, we still must turn down customers because of non-availability of drydock space.</p> <p>Based on the historical information in combination with the market development over the last 6 years, we have developed and expanded as a team and the water lot extension project is now with the Port of Vancouver to decide upon. Based on solid market conditions we strongly believe we will utilize the two (2) proposed smaller drydocks easily and increase the reputation of the Port of Vancouver as having a full-fledged ship repair yard available for all sizes of vessels.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to highlight the enormous investments and efforts we have implemented from an environmental point of view to support the marine growth but also the wellbeing of the homeowners close to our boundaries. State of the art water blasting technologies to reduce the blast dust to zero, environmental hoarding of all vessels in our drydocks while painting and collection and treatment of all wastewater on drydocks has resulted in the fact that the seals are swimming around our drydocks and otters inhabit the shoreline next to the docks and are even walking around our ship yard.</p> <p>I personally believe that the management of Vancouver Drydock Company Ltd. has done extra ordinary efforts to be a good and environmentally responsible neighbour and sincerely hope that the Port of Vancouver will approve the plans as presented. The future of a lot of families is at stake with this decision and future generations will benefit from this extension as it will create at least over 100 sound and solid jobs. Trust to have informed you sufficiently and hoping for your positive consideration.</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>I am a resident of and business owner in North Vancouver.</p> <p>I fully support the proposed Seaspan expansion.</p> <p>North Vancouver is or should be a place to live, work and enjoy. Seaspan is proposing exactly what we want. To create and expand a viable business that offers real jobs with living wages for people in North Vancouver. Moreover they are bending over backwards to be a good corporate citizen, spending and investing to reduce the impact on their neighbours,of their vital drydock business.</p> <p>Creating jobs, reducing traffic and increasing the efficiency of the Port are all positives for our community.</p> <p>Seaspan has a long history of representing BC and its communities. The braying of a few should not be considered the voice of the many.</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>Lower Lonsdale is finally being cleaned up. I see families, children and the whole community promoting the area and enjoying the life style that it has brought. The pier has become so Vibrant and I see so many smiling faces. Ive never seen such an area</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>that is so beautiful and getting more cleaner. It has become the talk of the town. Unfortunately Seaspan has decided to ruin the vibrancy of the community to expand its operations to the West without thinking what impacts it will have on the community and marine life.</p> <p>I attended the Seapan Zoom meetings and the following information was brought out by Seaspan employees</p> <p>1) East side expansion was not analyzed thoroughly and in the end Seaspan employee stated that it was just maybe a cost decision not to expand to the east side. In the beginning of the Zoom meeting it was stated that it was not feasible to expand to the east but as time went on during the zoom meeting the employee finally stated it was due to no analysis was done and maybe the cost was more to expand to the East than expanding to the West. If cost is an issue then Seaspan generates alot of business from British Columbia and it should take into account the community throughput that would be effected by the increase in noise, water pollution and air pollution. The cost of pollution to the community and surrounding areas is a huge cost to the community that Seaspan has not thoroughly analyzed.</p> <p>2) Expansion of to the West without community input. Seaspan did not consult with the community prior to its engagement with the Port of Vancouver as to the community impact in regards to noise, pollution, surrounding wellbeing, and marine life protection. It did not do the mailouts to the neighboring community until the very last minute. It seems that Seaspan does not want to have cooperation with the Community input as Seaspan knew that their would be a huge protest against such expansion.</p> <p>3) Environment Canada was not brought in to take into account the air and water pollution to be effected in the surrounding area. Fisheries and Environment Canada can shut down any polluting force if it effects marine life. Seaspan employee said there is no marine life in the area. This I would disagree with as Ive seen orcas, and seals, and fish around the pier. I wonder why Environment Canada and Fisheries were not brought in to do any analysis. Port of Vancouver employee did say that no analysis has been done in records to environment pollutions to the area.</p> <p>In the end Seaspan expansion has not been accepted by the community. Thus Seapan studies done are very lacking, ill gotten, and unprofessional. If Seaspan wants to be part of the community and sustain good environment it should consider spending time and monies doing a thoroughly analysis with community input.</p> <p>Residences and marine life have moved to the lower lonsdale area and Seaspan has a responsibility to the community and marine life ,and none of these are taken into account when they decided to expand to the west.</p> <p>Please note that Seaspan noise, light and air pollution in the area is so bad and this expansion will make it worse.</p>

Date	Feedback
	thank you for taking time and I hope you make the right decision which is to stop Seaspan expansion in the lower lonsdale area.
22-Jul-21	Please dont allow this expansion by Seaspan So much money and effort has been put into finally making the pier area vibrant and attractive to residents and visitors. Seaspan or any other business should not be allowed to disregard and minimize their effect on this fabulous area. The lower lonsdale quay area has become the beating heart of the city and any expansion around it should be community based not that of private enterprise
22-Jul-21	Thanks ____ for your response.
22-Jul-21	The proposed areas seem to be coming into the vibrant area of the shipyards waterfront. Is there anyway for the new areas to be placed east of the existing structures.
22-Jul-21	I'm worried about excess noise especially on weekends and evenings I love the aspect of watching the boats going on and off the drydock with the Seaspan tugs. My kids use to love looking at the Seaspan tugs tied up at Burrard pier, as noticed so did many others. It's one of the highlights of walking by the working harbour. We've been sad not to see the tugs there much lately. Only other company tugs come for us to look at, but Seaspan has a history in the harbour which is sort of being less visible when we cant see the tugs up close like we use to.
22-Jul-21	<p>We are HomeOwners in Cascade at the Pier ____ Victory Ship Way North Vancouver and are very concerned by the proposed SEASPAN Vancouver Drydock Water Lot Project application submitted to the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority. As a Community Stakeholder we see nothing but downside to a healthy environment and our quality of life if the proposed extension to the SEASPAN water lot west is approved.</p> <p>As a "for profit" publicly traded International Corporation the business desires of SEASPAN to expand the west side of their water operations should not be allowed because it comes with added risk to the other local Stakeholders. We are, at least, equally invested in our collective Community and the desires of SEASPAN should not outweigh the needs of so many others.</p> <p>SEASPAN's own review submission to the Port Authority admits the proposed development will increase noise and light pollution, cause long term potential structural issues via rattling to our buildings and impact neighbouring views. Lets not forget that the SEASPAN operation is an industrial fabrication/manufacturing facility that has well known noise, light and air quality concerns.</p> <p>If the aforementioned were not enough to turn down this application the proverbial last nail in the coffin is they are now requesting to expand even closer to large gatherings of families and visitors to an area with children parks, restaurants and residential housing. So why would we allow a large international corporation to make a few more revenue dollars while local families, tourists and the other retail businesses in our North Vancouver Jewel pay the price.</p> <p>We have reviewed all the information "provided" and participated in the Q&A's but remain convinced the proposed expansion carries many risks and no benefit for our</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>collective community.</p> <p>We request the Port Authority turn down this application.</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>My main concern is the air quality. My understanding is that the only time that will come into question will be during UHP and then painting of the vessels. As the new docks move west towards the residential sector, ensuring that the paint and spray overruns can be directed towards the south or west will be important.</p> <p>I am a staff member with Seaspan and I am in support of the drydock expansion initiate. My main reason for support (other than working here) is that a large part of income earned here is from US corporations who find it cheaper to dock at Vancouver Drydock than say at Portland or Seattle. In addition, most of the costs associated with earning this revenue goes directly back to the Greater Vancouver community in the form of wages/salaries to staff, materials/services to local contractors and small businesses, and the eventual spending or savings of those payments to other local businesses and banks. As Canada has a lack in terms of services and goods that we can "export" out (with the exception of natural resources), supporting a business that earns money from international customers and brings more money into the Canadian ecosystem should be a priority.</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>I am interested in seeing more jobs and revenue coming to the city from this project, also seeing all the precautions in place to protect the water front and with minimal impact on noise pollution.</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>Build them! fuck the haters</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>Build the other way</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>I believe that VDC is of great importance in contributing to the community of North Vancouver, in the way of employment and continuing a history built long ago. The further development of VDC creates opportunities for our youth and opportunities to introduce more environmentally sustainable practices. It can also lead to better mitigation of construction concerns in having the ability to restructure the current layout of the working environment.</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>Waterfront of concern has children's play ground, picnic area and spirit trail - a ' people place' for us and our visitors NOT a commercial enterprise providing worse air quality (please come to my balcony and view the dust), noise pollution and water contamination</p> <p>Where is our 'good neighbour Sam' attitude? We have also paid our dues through taxes, and deserve to live in the neighborhood the City of North Vancouver has planned for and we bought into.</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>The shipyards area is the main community gathering place for City of North Vancouver residents and it took years to get this special place off the ground. I visit the shipyards waterfront several days a week with my children, my dog and my family. Many people call this area home. I understand the need for commercial development but we already have a large portion of the North Vancouver waterfront that has been taken over by industrial development. It makes no sense to expand Seaspan to the West when it is</p>

Date	Feedback
	possible to do so to the east with far less community impact. Preserving the waterfront around the shipyards should be a priority.
22-Jul-21	I'm highly in favour of expansion of the ship yard. Industrial waterfront usage is of the utmost importance to our region's economy. We've lost a lot of those uses in the past several years throughout the Lower Mainland, so I'm happy to see expansion. While the expansion of residential uses next to the shipyards has really created a great community, expansion of the industrial use should take precedence. I used to live a block north of the proposed expansion, and I would have supported it then too. The shipyards district should have shipyards!
22-Jul-21	<p>Dear Ms. Ma</p> <p>Thank you for finding the time to speak with representatives of Seaspan and for providing an update on those talks.</p> <p>However, there was part of me that naively felt that it would have a greater impact upon their response and possible mitigation.</p> <p>There is a word and a statement that resonate with me.</p> <p>"They" and "It is not an option for us."</p> <p>Fortunately, we do not live in a bubble. For every action there is a cause and consequence. "They" may have decided. But as I was cycling along the road towards the silos I was instantly struck by how much land and water is available to them. "They" may have decided but it does not take into account that we all live in this neighbourhood and many families and visitors enjoy this unique area. "It is not an option for us." Why is it not an option. You and I have not had a satisfactory answer to that question. Why was not a study made and shared with the community? Do they have alternate plans for that area?</p> <p>Have we had a satisfactory answer to that question?</p> <p>For the record I'm delighted that more jobs may become available however, that cannot be the only reason to expand west.</p> <p>I respectfully ask that you have a further meeting with Seaspan Maybe our Federal Minister could join you!</p> <p>Provincial and Federal agents need to work together to support ALL tax payers and their interests whether they are supporting local business, providing jobs or simply enjoying the view of our beautiful city.</p>
22-Jul-21	<p>I would like to lend my support to Seaspan's water lot expansion and the addition of new drydocks, it will provide employment to the local area.</p> <p>Having worked in the Marine industry for the past 40 years primarily in the Vancouver area, I have seen the slow decline of the old Burrard yarrows site, which had provided employment to many local people and business. It is nice now to see that Vancouver Dry-dock is considering expanding to again help invigorate the local economy.</p> <p>Dry-docks and ship repairs are always interesting to watch, as they bring in so many different types of vessels, preform many different tasks during the repairs.</p> <p>I have watched many visitors to the Shipyards waterfront area, stop and watch the work taking place, pointing fingers and discussing what type of repairs could they be doing, or look at that big piece of equipment hanging from the cranes.</p> <p>Again I would like to support the expansion.</p>

Date	Feedback
22-Jul-21	We love you to go forward but not next to the pier. Go East. all these expensive apt. Buildings don't want that in front of their nose.
22-Jul-21	There is too much noise, air pollution, view obstruction, excessive lighting at night, as the dry docks currently exist. Any and all expansion is not welcome and should be relocated further away from residential.
23-Jul-21	<p>I would like to add my voice to my friends, neighbours & others who are opposed and disappointed with Seaspan's current proposal to expand drydock facilities to the west! I have attended several zoom discussions recently, and have yet to hear a clear, full explanation as to why this expansion cannot move to the east side of the 2 existing drydocks.</p> <p>My primary concerns are the extra noise, as well as air, water & light pollution that 2 new drydocks will bring to the area.</p> <p>I feel that the City of North Vancouver has worked very hard & spent considerable tax dollars to make this Shipyards area a wonderful gathering space & family friendly environment.</p> <p>I am aware that we share this space with important industrial activities, and welcome new jobs, however we do not want this extra industrial activity diminishing the public's enjoyment of this wonderful meeting space.</p> <p>The noise from hydroblasting is already very disruptive, and I can only imagine how loud it will be with 2 additional drydocks. I am convinced it will definitely be in excess of the 3 db (as claimed).</p> <p>As a retired health care professional, I have concerns for the children playing in the little playground which is directly in line with this proposed expansion. Also I worry about the impact for families taking advantage of the picnic benches & adjacent Burrard pier to stroll, linger and visit. The increase in diesel tug traffic alone is a concern for air pollution along our very busy Spirit trail.</p> <p>I will conclude by asking the Port of Vancouver to reject this request for an increase to the Seaspan western water lot. I would also request that Seaspan reconsider this proposed expansion, and review the possibility of expanding to the east and away from so many who WILL be impacted!</p>
23-Jul-21	<p>Seaspan is a fine company and put a lot of meals on the tables of many North Vancouver Families,the Washington family are tremendous.</p> <p>However,I don't think you have a chance of getting this project approved, to many views blocked, (including mine) to much disruption to the Shipyards community. The politicians and beaurocrats know this , and will not want to face the rath of the voters in the next election if they were to give the project the green light.</p>
23-Jul-21	<p>This project would seriously affect property values in the vicinity.. the noise level is high right now. The extra noise level is unacceptable for a residential area.</p> <p>Seaspan needs to look at moving east. All presentations and consultations are ones done by Seaspan, paid for by Seaspan, with a strong bias to their interest and profit. The Port Authority needs to have an independent assessment done.</p>
23-Jul-21	<p>Is it possible to get copies of current plans for the dry dock expansion project and any supporting documents on impacts? I am also interested in any information on what the plans are if this project was relocated farther east.</p>

Date	Feedback
23-Jul-21	<p>Granted all the extensive planning and development accompanying Quayside it is almost obscene for the Port Authority at this time to entertain further commercial development that will encroach upon a prime residential commercial undertaking! The Port must also be mindful of accommodating construction needed in terms of North shore density and that will only be hampered by Vancouver Harbour encroachment. Already prime land is allocated to the Harbour and the pittance of dwindling realty afforded commercialresidential waterfront is already miniscule. Perhaps it is time for the people to rally and muscle into the beast that has become Vancouver Harbour in North Vancouver?</p>
23-Jul-21	<p>This area has emerged as a hub for community of the North Shore to gather. After Covid, having these outdoor, social areas for residents to bike, walk, sit on benches and enjoy the view and the quiet is VITAL to our mental and physical and psychological health! Humanity does not need more construction and industry, we need people. We need spaces to just be.</p>
23-Jul-21	<p>This expansion of the Vancouver Dry Dock will lead to more skilled trades people being able to return to the lower mainland and work fulfilling jobs for years to come. Along with this is the resurgence of our ship building/repair capabilities which is vital to our sovereignty.</p>
24-Jul-21	<p>I just purchased a million dollar condo with a view. This will destroy my view. I will never support the expansion as is. You are ruining the experience by expanding, go east instead.</p> <p>Enough industrial noise, poor air quality. Keep the shipyards area as is, it's wonderful. This will cost me \$100,000's of thousand in lower value. Not fair to the existing residents.</p>
24-Jul-21	<p>I do not want the proposed water project to go forward, I strongly object</p>
24-Jul-21	<p>This letter is in response to the proposed expansion of the Seaspan Dry Docks at the Shipyards in North Vancouver. As a resident in the Trophy building, I strongly oppose to this venture due to the impacts on the community, environment, and implications that this expansion would have on the thriving neighbourhood and people residing within it.</p> <p>COMMUNICATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, the communication on this matter was poorly executed. Even though it is claimed Seaspan followed all requirements, it is my understanding many people in both Trophy and Cascade buildings were not notified of the proposed changes. These are the most affected in this project, yet Canada Post has reaffirmed that 7000 postcard information hand-outs were sent to much less than the intended recipients. • This due process is done at a time when many are out of town allowing for less people to be able to voice their concerns. It feels underhanded and there should, at the very least, be an extension to the review and input by the community. • While the dry docks have been operating here for over 100 years (and Seaspan from 1970), the recent developments and rezoning has created a thriving residential area in conjunction with the commercial industry. We need to work together to build a plan that benefits both sides and not just Seaspan with their impartial studies as reference. • Highlighting Seaspan's generous donations while admirable, does not negate the tax benefits obtained through these and should not discredit the contributions made by the nearby residents and businesses through substantial property taxes that we

Date	Feedback
	<p>provide.</p> <p>HEALTH IMPACT- Noise and Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quoted decibels for the construction of the proposed dry dock, with the pile driving, is 160dB- this is equivalent to the sound of a gun shot, but constantly! Furthermore, the quoted decibels of the dry dock (now located in the open with no sound barriers) in operation were 75dB. If you refer to HealthLinkBC, it is stated that sounds above 85 dB are harmful!!! The predicted noise levels are only an estimate, so who knows how loud they will be in situ and the potential harm to the residents hearing • There is a playground situated in front of the waterfront there and children are even more sensitive to sound at their young and developing age. Many preschoolers are taken here daily to enjoy the activities mid-week and many families enjoy the facilities after school, at the weekend, and in the summer months. • Working is supposed to be 7-10:30pm; however, even as recent as July 14th noise levels were existing well after this timeframe affecting the sleep and well-being of residents • The Port of Vancouver noise monitor is located at the foot of St. George's Street. This seems ridiculous when you consider Trophy is positioned in front, creating a sound barrier and the ones most effected will be the residents in Trophy and Cascade who are exposed to much more! What are the sound barrier options? The Port Authority should in turn amend the location of these indicators to have a better assessed value of how detrimental these noises will actually be! Not only for our day to day lives but also as many are now working from home and it can be challenging to do so. • It is bizarre that there is no monitoring station for air pollution (and noise as mentioned above) that currently exists in the immediate area. How does a pollution indicator positioned in Mahon Park- over 2km away- in any way register the volatile organic compound levels for the residents who are in the vicinity? I understand there is another indicator at Neptune; however, it is again further removed and likely a poor representation of the immediate impact of the particulates. With the new proposed dock further out and in the open, what will that particulate matter increase to? As a resident, I feel it does not reflect what we are or will be experiencing with the accumulation of particulate matter settling on balconies, windows, and the building itself. What is the health impact to the people in the surrounding area and particularly the children visiting the playground, and more especially the residents who reside here 24/7? • 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. These are figures from 2 years ago where I am positive emissions must have increased with their increased business and even more so with an expansion. What are the estimates then and how negatively impacted is our health going forward? <p>EXPANSION ALTERNATIVES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seaspan has provided limited explanation and exploration to alternative options. It still seems an eastern expansion is a viable option, if not a potentially more expensive and time-consuming resolution, with the west being the quick fix for Seaspan. Furthermore, Seaspan has themselves said they are a multigenerational operation. Why not build it up now east for that future? The Port Authority could look at the possibilities

Date	Feedback
	<p>of amending the leased boarders in that direction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While I appreciate the increased job opportunities estimated at 100 people, what about the over 100 residents and businesses in the surrounding area who have invested in this neighbourhood, what of Trophy and Cascade residents, and the effect it will have on their work environment due to the increased work from home. <p>INVESTMENT IN THE AREA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My investment into the Trophy building will be greatly impacted due to the loss of outstanding views of the water and downtown Vancouver- a big selling feature of this condo. • Moreover, I have my doubts that the pile driving will not have any impact to the integrity of our building and surrounding area. Is Seaspan prepared to compensate the surrounding owners on the potential damage or loss of their property value? Is the City of North Vancouver prepared to receive decreased property taxes from this depreciation? <p>In closing, I am not opposed to Seaspan expanding; however, exploration on the negative environmental impacts still needs further investigation. It also feels like this is the cheapest and fastest option that is being proposed as opposed to finding out the best solution that works with the multi-generational infrastructure that Seaspan would like to build upon as well as the surrounding community that has chosen to invest, live, play, work and hopefully thrive in this area.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your consideration into looking for alternative options and an objection to the western expansion.</p>
24-Jul-21	<p>I live in the Cascade West condo. I have heard you say time and time again you can't go east because as it stands right now it doesn't work for Seaspan, well it doesn't work for all the public and owners coming west as well. This looks to me like you gave up even trying, primarily because of the increased expense. You have a boat house that stores a yacht on your valuable piece of east property and if you go a few hundred meters west, Seaspan has a lot more space to tie up yachts. You are a very large company and it appears cost would be the biggest negative to moving East.</p> <p>I doubt these expansion plans are recent, we moved here two years ago and certainly would have appreciated any information regarding Seaspan's future plans.</p>
24-Jul-21	<p>As a resident of the Lonsdale neighbourhood of the city of North Vancouver, I want to express my support for Seaspan's expansion plans for their Vancouver Dry Dock facility.</p> <p>These facilities have existed on the north shore for a long time, and they are part of the industrial heart of our city. Seaspan contributes both economically and socially to our community and they deserve our support in return.</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>The north shore has been my home for more than 50 years. An unattractive view of the waterfront has always been a downside to living here during this time. In contrast West Van is delightful with an extensive seawall and parks for residents' enjoyment. Why is North Van the brunt of the ugly coastline? The erosion of our coastline has been discovered and is now being publicized. The sea life and humans need no more pollution added to the north shore coast line. Sulphur, coal, wheat pools, longshoring docks, Neptune Terminals and more are already causing health issues to locals. I moved to 3rd and Lonsdale and lost 10% of my lung function in 3 months according to my</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Respirologist. I moved to West Van and regained that 10% lost function in 3 months. People's plants on lower Lonsdale become covered in all manner of pollution blowing on the wind and begin to die around August. Their feet get dirty walking in their homes on lower Lonsdale from the doors/windows being open and pollutants blowing in. Some residents sold and moved away from the waterfront to escape those pollutants. Honestly, isn't it time to begin considering the ocean and the residents rather than the dollars?</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>I'm writing as a local resident at Cascade at the Pier. Since learning of the proposal for Seaspan to expand its current dry dock operations, I feel the need to register my strong opposition to this proposal.</p> <p>With its current operations at the Seaspan shipyard, it is already producing noise that cause disturbance to nearby residences day and night. Despite its proposal to push dry docks further away from the shore, the noise that goes 24/7 will still destroy the enjoyment of the waterfront for both the residents and the public. The play areas and boardwalk along the waterfront are recreational facilities that are well liked and well used by everyone at the moment. Instead of looking at the nice views we currently have, people will be looking at the shipyard operations. The open view will be obstructed partially by the cranes and dry docks put in place.</p> <p>The current Seaspan Operations has been at its current location for decades and we have accepted that as a part of the neighborhood. However, it is going to cause even more noise, pollution and disturbance to everyone by expanding to the west of its current location. This will also affect the enjoyment of the nice waterfront view to everyone who wants to see the unobstructed view of Vancouver from the north shore.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that the opinions of the residents and the public will be given serious considerations. Instead of expanding to the west, I urge Seaspan to look for other alternatives by expanding to the east where the lands are zone for industrial use.</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>As a North Vancouver resident, and former resident of Lower Lonsdale (St Davids Ave), I am well aware of the need for continued commercial and industrial businesses in the Lower Mainland, and specifically within North Vancouver. If there is not these elements to a municipality the capability to create a diverse community that represents ALL elements can not be attainable.</p> <p>Being in favour of the expansion is not necessarily the only element to consider, but also what is / could be the detriment of the expansion? Those who currently have the benefits from the shipyards (not only their waterfront views but also the convenience of commercial storefronts), are now in essence, screaming "NOT IN MY BACKYARD", complaining of their potential loss of view, "the potential additional noise and pollution", and "the bustling commercial district and public space with its waterfront trail and a playground."</p> <p>I understand their concern for the loss of "their little piece of heaven", but as they readily acknowledge, they were well aware of their neighbours long before they moved in (having previously also lived on 2nd Street in the 1970's, we are very much aware of the longevity of the Shipyards). Perhaps the consideration of the betterment for the WHOLE community and municipality should be something they also consider?</p>

Date	Feedback
25-Jul-21	If Canada is to maintain its standard of living we need to grow our industrial base. The people who moved into the area knew that there was industrial activity in the area and should have expected it would change in level of activity over time.
25-Jul-21	Good for Seaspan. Go for it.
25-Jul-21	<p>[What is the effective use of this Seaspan eastern water lot with accompanying pier</p> <p>A picture speaks a thousand words.</p> <p>Below, moored to the eastern side of the pier is the Washington owned Attesa IV that just arrived today (July 25th). It's about 101 meters long and 13 meters wide. In the background is the Washington owned Attesa 3 that has recently moved from the eastern pier location and is now on the west side and partially in that oval floating boat garage. Obviously all of it couldn't fit in. It is 69 meters long and 11 meters wide. You will also note that cars are parked on that pier.</p> <p>The below picture again shows the Washington owned Attesa 3 partially in the oval floating boat garage with the Washington owned St Eval now moored on the west side of that floating boat garage.</p> <p>There also appears to be another small boat attached to it. This would all be right next to that W building water access entrance we have all heard so much about. So at this point we need to ask ourselves just what the industrial purpose of that Seaspan eastern water lot is, not only for today, but for the future.</p> <p>Below is the View of the Seaspan eastern water lot (so much potential). And note all that Seaspan land mass to the north with those two large rounded buildings. WHY IS A WESTERN OPTION EVEN ON THE TABLE?</p> <p>And based on that obvious conclusion, why would the Vancouver port authority even consider this application, for the western water lot expansion, when all that appears to be happening to the east is that Private Washington yachts are using this eastern water lot and pier space as their private mooring area.</p> <p>And if that eastern water lot is actually being used to service such floating Yachts, as was envisioned with the pontoon placement to the west, then even more of a reason to upgrade/modernize this eastern water lot/pier for what I consider to be a more effective complimentary small vessel Drydock strategy that THEN GOES EAST RATHER THAN WEST. (Now that's a very long and strong message)</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to provide another perspective on this Drydock proposal. I have sent previous correspondence that continues to support my assertion that this Drydock expansion proposal should be going east and not west.</p> <p>I trust that this again provides you with additional food for thought as we labour through this review process.</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>Here are my specific comments addressed towards the Seaspan on line answers relating to why they feel they can't go east into the adjoining water lot.</p> <p>See questions and seaspan's answers below and then my direct comments. My</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>comment to the first Seaspan answer</p> <p>- the pier to the east is within easy access to their main working area. There are NO impediments in movement between these areas. They are adjoining. What prevents Seaspan from just setting up a satellite area to the EAST for most activities and then just bring in or move EAST whatever is needed. They have lots of space to the east. Just walk there for that visual experience. Once again it's right next door.</p> <p>Answer two</p> <p>-if this waterlot is industrial as we have confirmed, then when would Seaspan ever upgrade this essential pier so that it is safely functional for both current and future needs. Obviously future Drydock locations would be a major consideration since their other western pier is used for the two larger Drydocks. And most importantly this Drydock expansion would probably have a 40 to 50 year lifespan. So we better get it right the first time.</p> <p>And let's not forget that the Burrard pier, in our shipyards area, WAS BUILT IN 1925. Yes it had some upgrades but look at it now. Almost 100 years old.</p> <p>It would be a given that any future Drydock expansion should then move east to take FULL advantage of that existing water lot and pier structure.</p> <p>And why is there no engineering report on the status of this pier and what might be needed to bring it up to Drydock SUPPORT code. And again, these Drydocks are floating so they add NO STRESS to the pier itself. How much can the workers and equipment weigh. And for heavy materials, portable moving cranes could be used. As for the comments on current deficiencies it certainly seems strong enough to hold at least 8 vehicles that drive down to at least half of that pier. Why are they even there? Do they have anything to do with the private yachts usually moored there.</p> <p>And I have used this phase before, if there is a will there is a way.</p> <p>Below you can see a few of the cars in the picture I took July 24th. The Attesa is now on the west side of the pier partially in the floating boat house. Obviously still lots of room for W Building access. So let's see the engineering report to back up seaspan's statement on the pier deficiencies and then get them to confirm upgrade costs to the extent that there are even necessary. And let's not lose sight of the fact that these Drydocks will cater to the smaller vessels.</p> <p>Seaspan should put in a 40 to 50 year plan now to effectively use that eastern waterlot and pier for this Drydock expansion.</p> <p>Question 3</p> <p>We continue to hear Seaspan talk about this W building water access requirement. I have previously provided my Eastern option which continues to allow adequate space for barges coming in and out. Certainly my option provides as much space as they currently have. I am unaware of what industrial activity takes place on the eastern side of that pier other than moorage of the mega private yachts. Even the Pier 94 project never really indicated any industrial activity other than the storage of barges in the area. Even those floating barges could probably be moved further east and still not interfere with freighter movement to the gain terminals.</p> <p>I also believe that there is no other water lot immediately to the east so it might even be preferable to extend that eastern water lot a little for the additional barge moorings.</p> <p>Seaspan always wants to restrict the discussion to just their one western water lot with</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>then their obvious resulting limitations in going east. This same lack of transparency is also reflected in the fact that they never felt it necessary to bring up that pier 94 project which also affects that adjoining water lot. That project was just recently presented to the Vancouver port authority.</p> <p>Next section question/answer/ -In the next question answer area I'm not sure of what seaspan was talking about with reference to proximity to residential neighbours. There are obviously no residential neighbours in close proximity to the eastern water lot. As for water depths, the eastern water lot area water depth, around the pier, is similar to that in the west. So should not be an issue. This water depth info was provided by the port authority. - I again don't know what seaspan would be referring to when they state distance to the navigation channel. The eastern option would still be optimal when considering all navigational issues. -and direct access to the main operations. This was previously discussed. It is just literally NEXT DOOR with plenty of land and pier space to effectively support the smaller ship Drydock servicing.</p> <p>So all my responses to Seaspan's answers would conclude that THE EASTERN DIRECTION, WITH USE OF THIS PIER, WOULD BE THE BEST WAY TO GO.</p> <p>MY SUGGESTION FOR NEW DRYDOCK LOCATIONS (BELOW) Thanks again for allowing me the opportunity to provide my feedback.</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>The Shipyards are now a wonderful addition to the City and are visited by many residents and visitors. The proposed extension would change the area from a delightful leisure destination into an industrial area.</p> <p>Why can't the proposed extension be sited to the east? Is it due to cost?</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>The City has created such a wonderful, people friendly place to gather and enjoy the waterfront. This expansion to the west will significantly destroy the beauty of the area, making it even more industrial. I live in a waterfront condo to the west of this development and it's already noisy from the work there, and the dirt level that comes from the sanding. My deck needs to be vacuumed every day due to black particles. I have to cover my outdoor furniture every night. And if I leave my windows open my house gets all the particles of black dust in it. It's bad enough, don't make it worse. We are your neighbours, please respect that this is our home.</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>Damages the unencroached free space in front of newly constructed apartments. I've heard clanging and banging from Seaspan when residents were entitled to peace and quiet.</p> <p>If at all possible, please reconsider the east side of the current structures or farther east where there are industrial areas anyway</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>Please don't expand Seaspan west of its already large footprint on the waterfront!</p> <p>It's beautiful already at the shipyards... please do not expand west...</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>Good evening. I am a resident at ____ Victory ship Way, North Vancouver.</p> <p>I would like to express my views and input into the Seaspan proposal to expand the</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>dry dock footprint west from the current location.</p> <p>I moved into this neighborhood 5 years ago, and understood that I was going to be living in a hybrid community of industry and residential. I thought , and still do, that Lower Lonsdanle is a model for other urban communities to adopt to be creative and incorporate residential communities with park space with industry along the sea shore.</p> <p>I also support and agree that industry needs to invest in infrastruc and modernization to grow and be competitive for a lot of good economic considerations.</p> <p>However, with the City of North Vancouver and the Port of Vancouver's decision to build Lolo, and embrace residential construction in an industry backdrop, I find it hard to fathom that the port of Vancouver would not seriously factorin the concerns of residents and if approved support the dry dock expansion, that would negatively impact the community and residents alike.I find this proposal in direct conflict with the vision of Lolo</p> <p>I am sure many have mentioned the negative financial impacts this would have to many residents, as we have all invested heavily to live here. And our ability to economically recover is very limited.</p> <p>Other considerations and impacts would be the "wellness" and "soul" of the community where the park, seawall and pier host families , couples, artists, musicians that makeup the fabric of this community. I see it every day as I look at this amazing environment.</p> <p>Again, I am not opposed to the development of Seaspan dry docks, but struggled to understand why an "east " of current footprint option be better considered when you look this in a more comprehensive and broader context. An "east" option would have minimal impact to Seaspan' s neighords and strengthen their relationship with the community.</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>[NB photo attached in email] Good evening</p> <p>The date stamp on this photo is Saturday 24th July at 5:48 pm</p> <p>As I walked down the pedestrian passage between Cascade and Trophy I immediately reflected on the before and after photos provided by Seaspan in their recent brochure. Neither of the photos were a reliable portrayal of what is really happening.</p> <p>As you can all see the view for all people visiting the area is completely blocked by a large barge that extends well into the public area. A family sitting having a picnic and young children in the playground are faced with a wall of black metal.</p> <p>I respectfully ask if this is allowable and does it take into account the shared vision that we would all like to be part of in lower Lonsdale</p>
25-Jul-21	<p>Isn't the noise currently coming from deadpan enough? Do we really need to increase the noise and move it closer to everyone living in the area?</p> <p>Come on, this is common sense. Build EAST away from the people. Who makes these decisions? Hire me, I have half a brain.</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>I don't see enough focus on the environmental impact that this expansion will have on our neighbourhood. I don't support this project because of the lack of awareness and</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>lack of engagement with local residents. I live in Lower Lonsdale and the existing Shipbuilders' area (not shipyards) is already dirty, decrepit, and unkempt. Clean that up first before you ask to take over another area.</p> <p>How are you planning to clean up the existing Shipbuilder's/Seaspan area? Why does seaspan have to have the ugliest worksite conditions on display for the entire inlet? Noise is already too loud. Do better.</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>I live at the Pinnacle and already have to tolerate constant hum (noise) and black dust on my balcony.</p> <p>Do not destroy a prime residential area as well as a gathering place for people not only from the North Shore but surrounding cities</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>[*NB two photos attached] The one option approach by Seaspan needs to be rejected for a number of reasons and not just for the fact that no other options were presented. Seaspan has made a conscious and deliberate decision to only put forward a "go West" approach as it does not meet with their operational goals.</p> <p>If they were proposing a temporary change to the area it would be a different discussion but as the approach is for a permanent change other viable options must be presented and not just a solution that Seaspan arrived at.</p> <p>Residents are not experts in the many areas that are covered off by experts in Seaspan's submission. We are left with a very short window to object to a proposal that clearly has been planned for many months.</p> <p>Going East is an option that Seaspan must entertain. There are no doubt costs to go East that may be different from the costs to go West but again we are looking at a long-term investment that significantly impacts the community. From what residents have observed over the past week it appears that Seaspan is wanting to create an additional boat building/repair area for luxury yachts as Attesa IV, Attesa, St Eval and Kogo have all been moored on the east side of their water lease.</p> <p>Simply repositioning some of these yachts can result in being able to accommodate the two new drydocks. In fact, they may end up using these drydocks for work on any of those yachts.</p> <p>We do not appreciate the fact that the photos of the full area were never provided. Each time we have had to ask for clarity on where the water lease currently extends to as almost all photos end at the east side of the Panamax. The photos that are now available suggest that there is sufficient space to go East. There is a pier in that location that is currently strong enough to support numerous vehicles so having it used for the two smaller drydocks is possible. We understand that Seaspan has already applied for and is waiting for approval to add additional piers on the East location. That was never mentioned by Seaspan during either of the two previous meetings. Over the past two days a large barge was moored close to the shoreline directly in front of both Cascade and Trophy. It extended well beyond even their proposed drydock space (photo attached)</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>The report on Noise suggests that adding two additional drydocks would have minimal impact on noise. The "test" they used was from a Seaspan Sr mgrs rental unit in the Trophy building. It was not a proper impartial sound test. The lighting is also a concern as many nights have had the lights on well beyond 10:30PM . Only in the past few days has the noise level decreased and the assumption would be that they are concerned about the negative feed-back they are getting and are wanting to minimize noise levels until after the public feed-back period is over.</p> <p>Before even considering additional water leases, the Port Authority needs to make sure that Seaspan is fully and efficiently using the space they have been allowed. From looking at the full area Seaspan occupies near the foot of St Georges it appears that they hare a lot of work to do to make the area run efficiently. The fact that the location they are using to build the ships approved by the Canadian Gov't does not also have the machine shop is their issue to resolve and should not be one of the reasons to give them more space.</p> <p>The Port Authority needs to be looking out for what the communities want and not just adding to the bottom line. The priority should be the completion of the gov't contracts and not small jobs and personal pet projects to work on his many luxury yachts.</p> <p>There is nothing wrong with saying NO to this proposal and simply asking them to come back with a proposal that is more in line with what the feedback has been telling them. Go East.</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Sorry for the late response. I must be writing to many emails.</p> <p>Yes I am in the Premiere building but not on strata.</p> <p>I understand that some of our strata members have already been in contact with you. I have also shared some of my concerns with them.</p> <p>We also have the same property manager as the Atrium, ____.</p> <p>At this point our strata feels they have enough council voices to express our community concerns.</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>I'm messaging you as to the Dry-dock expansion proposal by Seaspan. As a condo owner in the Trophy and a resident of North Vancouver for over 25 years, I'd ask that you do not support this Initiative. As the city has spent years planning the "Shipyards" and lower Lonsdale community and spent millions of tax payers money to rejuvenate and "beautify" the waterfront, it's absolutely unacceptable that this proposal be supported in any way imaginable. It makes absolutely no sense to clutter up the water front with more industrial "eyesores", noise and pollution. As conscientious neighbor, Seaspan should working with the residents of lower Lonsdale and not arrogantly assume they can expand without consultation of all stakeholders.</p> <p>I understand that a formal alternative to the east of the existing Seaspan facility has been proposed and is viable option with limited to no disruption to the water front.</p> <p>I's ask that you turn down the west side expansion and if additional dry docks are needed, consider the east side proposal.</p>

Date	Feedback
26-Jul-21	<p>Concern: Project Mitigation</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the noise assessment and the elements that have been missing and/or inaccurate. Consequently, the request is to engage an “INDEPENDENT” third party assessment to conduct an objective an unbiased analysis regarding the noise impact using more accurate models and include a proper consultation process with the community as Suggested by the Guidelines for Evaluating Human Health Impact in Environmental Assessment, suggested by Health Canada.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the Vancouver Dry dock - Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment by BKL Consultants (the “BKL report”)</p> <p>Finding: The BKL report states: “Both existing and future drydock operations generally require lightweight curtains to be strung across the open ends of the drydocks to contain dust and paint spray. The curtains presently in use are porous and have some openings so that they can withstand light to moderate wind pressure and so that they permit some degree of ventilation...”</p> <p>The image below shows clearly that there are no curtains in any of the unobstructed noise transmission paths. Lack of compliance with existing mitigation strategies? What is the compliance process? Is it a self-compliance process? Will we have more of this? Evidently, a larger operation will stress this situation.</p> <p>What are the mitigation actions for examples as shown in the image attached?</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Concern: Periodic Sound Level Monitoring</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the noise assessment and the elements that have been missing and/or inaccurate. Consequently, the request is to engage an “INDEPENDENT” third party assessment to conduct an objective an unbiased analysis regarding the noise impact using more accurate models and include a proper consultation process with the community as Suggested by the Guidelines for Evaluating Human Health Impact in Environmental Assessment, suggested by Health Canada.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the Vancouver Dry dock - Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment by BKL Consultants (the “BKL report”).</p> <p>Findings: Seaspan application doesn’t propose the implementation of periodic monitoring of sound levels at high impact receptor locations; namely: Cascade West, Cascade East and Atrium. Seaspan did not provide mitigation measures if the noise produced is higher than predicted. Attachment: Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessment by Health Canada, indicates (Page 23) that this monitoring is particularly important when predicted noise levels approach the level where adverse human health effects are considered likely and mitigation measures</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>become necessary. If the uncertainty related to predicted sound levels is large and the resulting impacts are more severe than expected, monitoring is considered particularly useful. It is also helpful to describe in the EA any commitments to evaluate the need for additional mitigation measures, if actual project-related noise levels are higher than predicted or if community reaction is stronger than expected.” The Port of Vancouver CNV St Georges noise monitoring station is not relevant to monitor the activities at the Dry Docks given that the relative location to the “Project Noise Sources” is further away if compared to the “Residential Receptors”</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Concern: Guidelines for Community Noise by World Health Organization indicates a lower noise threshold</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the noise assessment and the elements that have been missing and/or inaccurate. Consequently, the request is to revisit the PER thresholds as suggested in the Guidelines provided by the World Health Organization.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the file: Vancouver Dry dock - Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment by BKL Consultants (the “BKL report”):</p> <p>BKL report provides the PER thresholds on page 17.</p> <p>Attached Guidelines for Community Noise by WHO report indicates an energy average equivalent of the A-weighted (LAeq, T) for industrial of 70 LAeq dBA which is below the threshold 75 LRden dBA indicated in the PER threshold. What are the implications of using a higher threshold? Why was a higher threshold chosen?</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Concern : Noise Modelling Accuracy</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the noise assessment and the elements that have been missing and/or inaccurate. Consequently, the request is to engage an “INDEPENDENT” third party assessment to conduct an objective an unbiased analysis regarding the noise impact using more accurate models and include a proper consultation process with the community as Suggested by the Guidelines for Evaluating Human Health Impact in Environmental Assessment, suggested by Health Canada.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the file: Vancouver Dry dock - Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment by BKL Consultants (the “BKL report”):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Noise Modelling used for the assessment (page 60) is the ISO 9613-2 (1996) standard. It is highlighted in the BKL report that “this is the current best practice to obtain accurate prediction results”.

Date	Feedback
	<p>Finding: Research that is available to the public shows that this type of modelling has limitations on its accuracy. For example: The study done by Panos Economou from PE. Mediterranean Acoustics Research and Development and Frank Brittain from Brittain Noise Control has the following arguments about the limitation of using the ISO9613-2 (1996) modelling (see attachment A- Accuracy of Web based Calculation Method):</p> <p>i) Page 4 of Attachment - Accuracy of Web based Calculation Method: “Ray-tracing software, which uses ISO 9613-2 to compute outdoor propagation, is practical, and has been used successfully for design. However, serious doubts exist regarding the accuracy of some of the various empirical algorithms used, such as algorithms for ground effects and reflections, source height, reflections by objects, and ground cover.</p> <p>ii) Page 5 of Attachment - Accuracy of Web based Calculation Method: “In the authors’ opinion, the weakest parts of this method are its vagueness, and doubts about its accuracy. A lot of modelling input parameters is based on the user’s judgment rather than a standardized procedure.... The other weakest part of 9613-2 is doubts about its accuracy”</p> <p>iii) Page 15 of Attachment - Accuracy of Web based Calculation Method: “As expected, the 9613-2 does not provide interference (constructive and destructive) effects, therefore, the SPL spectrum at the receiver lacks information about interference effects from barrier and ground due to sound diffraction and reflection”</p> <p>iv) Page 16 of Attachment - Accuracy of Web based Calculation Method: “Even though usually the effect of noise on humans is rated using A-weighted values, the effects of sound on building elements and habitable spaces depend on incident sound spectra. Usually low frequency sounds excite building facades resonances, which in turn excite room modes in habitable spaces with adverse effects on humans, especially low frequency sounds from road and air traffic noise. Therefore, there is value in assessing noise effects by the use of accurately calculated spectra rather than approximations.” v) Page 16 of Attachment - Accuracy of Web based Calculation Method : “ISO 9613-2 fails to imitate hard and porous ground excess attenuation due to interference.”</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Concern: Missing Community Consultation</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the noise assessment and the elements that have been missing. Consequently, the request is to engage an “INDEPENDENT” third party assessment to conduct an objective an unbiased analysis regarding the noise impact using more accurate models and include a proper consultation process with the community as Suggested by the Guidelines for Evaluating Human Health Impact in Environmental Assessment, suggested by Health Canada.</p> <p>Findings: Seaspan didn’t do a Community Consultation with the Residential Receptors as defined and identified in the BKL report. Attachment: Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessment by Health Canada (Page 18), indicates Developing a community consultation plan can be helpful when projects</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>propose noisy work occurring outside of normal working hours or extended work that produces high levels of noise (such as rock hammering or pile driving). The consultation process may assist in establishing feasible mitigation measures by targeting receptors that have the greatest potential for human health-related effects resulting from noise disturbance. Previous experience in assessing community reaction to noise impacts following community consultation has demonstrated that in these cases, a community is more likely to be understanding and accepting of noise, and more likely to make appropriate adjustments to limit noise exposure. This has been noted particularly when the information provided during the consultation process is accurate and does not attempt to understate the likely noise level, and when commitments made by the proponent to limit noise during specific hours are respected.</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Concern: Empirical data vs modelling</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the noise assessment and the elements that have been missing and/or inaccurate. Consequently, the request is to engage an “INDEPENDENT” third party assessment to conduct an objective and unbiased analysis regarding the noise impact using more accurate models and to collect data from different locations at different heights.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the Vancouver Dry dock - Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment by BKL Consultants (the “BKL report”)</p> <p>Findings: The BKL report states a difference between Trophy05 and Cascade West A01 of 5 dB if you compare the LRden (65dB vs 60dB). Visually this is shown on the chart on Page 29 of the BKL report. The BKL report shows in the histograms, the maximum noise levels recorded in the measure device in Trophy were the following:</p> <p>Feb 26th: 75 dB Feb 27th: 75 dB Feb 28th: 90 dB March 1st: 95 dB March 1st: 90 dB March 3rd: 93 dB March 4th: 92 dB</p> <p>For points of reference, I measured Noise from the balcony on the ____ floor in Cascade West. I recorded the max noise during the following days:</p> <p>July 13th: 82.7 dB July 14th: 94.4 dB July 15th: 92.6 dB July 16th: 91.1 dB July 21st: 78.4 dB July 22nd: 80.5 dB July 23rd: 90.1 dB</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>July 24th: 82.7 dB If the BKL model results would hold true, then you would expect that the empirical data recorded at Cascade West to show lower noise levels (5dB) compared to levels at Trophy. This empirical evidence shows that the maximum noise levels are equal in Cascade West and Trophy (95 dB). Even more, based on the noise assessment model prepared by BKL, you would expect lower noise levels in Cascade West if compared to Trophy. The empirical data show that the minimum of maximums recorded during this period is 78.4 dB in Cascade West which is higher than the minimum of the maximum recorded at Trophy. Thereby, the noise modeling results shown in the BKL report don't hold true.</p> <p>Attachment shows the evidence of noise measured at Cascada West</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Concern: Baseline Noise Monitoring Correlation with Seaspan Operations</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the noise assessment and the elements that have been missing and/or inaccurate. Consequently, the request is to engage an “INDEPENDENT” third party assessment to conduct an objective and unbiased analysis regarding the noise impact using more accurate models and include a proper consultation process with the community as Suggested by the Guidelines for Evaluating Human Health Impact in Environmental Assessment, suggested by Health Canada.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the file: Vancouver Dry dock - Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment by BKL Consultants (the “BKL report”):</p> <p>i) The BKL report states that the baseline noise measurements were carried out for one week beginning on Friday, February 26th, 2021 with a sound level meter located on a 5th floor residence.</p> <p>Finding: The BKL report lists the noise sources when the audio recording was made. The noise sources description is a high-level summary and does not detail operation activities on the dry docks. A detailed log of operations and its correlation with the audio recording should have been analyzed to determine a proper baseline. By doing a correlation you could determine ranges (rather than averages) which is a more accurate analysis and determine a post-expansion impact on noise based on a future operations schedule.</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Concern: Assessment of Construction Noise</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the noise assessment and the elements that have been missing and/or inaccurate. Consequently, the request is to engage an “INDEPENDENT” third party assessment to conduct an objective and unbiased analysis regarding the noise impact using more accurate models and include a proper consultation process with the community as Suggested by the Guidelines for Evaluating Human Health Impact in</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Environmental Assessment, suggested by Health Canada.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the file: Vancouver Dry dock - Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment by BKL Consultants (the "BKL report").</p> <p>Findings: Seaspan didn't undertake a Construction Noise Assessment. Attachment: Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessment, suggest (Page 19) mitigation measures to the authority conducting the EA, when the predicted construction noise level (construction less than one year) exceed the suggested mitigation noise level. To avoid widespread complaints regarding construction noise at receptor sites, where the exposure duration is less than one year at any given representative receptor site, the basic suggested MNL is 47 dBA (US EPA 1974). Seaspan provided random numbers in the information session about noise impact during construction, but a study was not conducted for this purpose, neither mitigation measures were provided.</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Writing fancy Letters is not my favourite Thing. I just wanted to show our Support from the Soupmeister for this new Project. In our Opinion it is very important to have a strong Infrastructure on the Northshore. As we have seen over the last two Years the Dependency on Tourism and Travel related Ventures Are not a reliable Source of Income. The new Drydock provides secure and sustainable and professional Jobs. The trickle down Effect supports the whole Community. The City can not provide the Services we have become accustomed to without a solid Tax base.</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Please do NOT approve the Westward expansion of Seaspan!</p> <p>Eastward or elsewhere should be the only options. Hardworking people have paid a lot of money to have condos on the water and they shouldn't be subjected to a westward expansion and the impact it would have on their day-to-day lives and resale values (which will undoubtedly be reduced).</p> <p>And why should all the folks who just walk there in the day and the evening have to put up with more activity and noise (and in front of a playground).</p> <p>The 1% (we see the Seaspan owners' giant yacht parked at the bottom of Lonsdale) shouldn't always get their way at the expense of the everyday working individual.</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>We are the strata agents for the owners located at both Strata Plan ____ (Atrium) and Strata Plan ____ (Premier).</p> <p>The details related to the information session scheduled for the evening of Wednesday, July 28th have been forwarded to and received by both Strata Councils and they are currently working to establish which members of the council will attend.</p> <p>With respect to the common interests within the neighborhood, can you confirm that the link would be accessible for myself to attend online as well?</p>
26-Jul-21	<p>Thanks _____. I'll try to log on.</p>

Date	Feedback
26-Jul-21	Done and I have my ticket. Appreciated.
26-Jul-21	The expansion of the dry dock facilities should be to the east which area is already industrialized. I am confident that you can find a solution for dealing with the manufacturing activities now undertaken in the existing warehouse. A responsible neighbour who is interested in maintaining a positive relationship with the residents living in the City of North Vancouver would not site this expansion by expanding the dry dock facilities to the west.
27-Jul-21	I strongly oppose the expansion of Seaspan to the West in North Vancouver. Our family spends a lot of quality time at the Shipyards enjoying the beautiful views and the fresh air that this waterfront area provides. That along with the waterparks, entertainment, festivals, music, the many restaurants with their patios looking out onto the ocean. The idea that Seaspan is trying to expand to the West infringing on this wonderful area to create 100 more jobs will not only affect the views but will decrease the air quality and increase the noise coming from the Shipyards for the many thousands of people, both local and tourists that use this area regularly. There are groups of preschool and school-aged children that use the park regularly directly behind where Seaspan is planning to expand which will affect their lungs negatively from the air pollutants that Seaspan creates. Also, the Spirit Trail runs right through this area with runners, bikers, skateboarders who will also be affected. I strongly urge you do all in your power to reject this expansion. I understand that they could move the project to the East side, or if that's not feasible move somewhere else completely without affecting so many people. Once it is done, there will be no turning back, so this is our only opportunity to stop this from going forward.
27-Jul-21	<p>Subject: Destruction of the Ports!!!! Seaspan's foolish proposal! Hi,</p> <p>I am an avid VOTER!!!! I strongly oppose the expansion of Seaspan to the West in North Vancouver. Our family spends a lot of quality time at the Shipyards enjoying the beautiful views and the fresh air that this waterfront area provides. That along with the waterparks, entertainment, festivals, music, the many restaurants with their patios looking out onto the ocean. The idea that Seaspan is trying to expand to the West infringing on this wonderful area to create 100 more jobs will not only affect the views but will decrease the air quality and increase the noise coming from the Shipyards for the many thousands of people, both local and tourists that use this area regularly. There are groups of preschool and school-aged children that use the park regularly directly behind where Seaspan is planning to expand which will affect their lungs negatively from the air pollutants that Seaspan creates. Also, the Spirit Trail runs right through this area with runners, bikers, skateboarders who will also be affected. I strongly urge you do all in your power to reject this expansion. I understand that they could move the project to the East side, or if that's not feasible move somewhere else completely without affecting so many people. Once it is done, there will be no turning back, so this is our only opportunity to stop this from going forward. DON'T MAKE THIS MISTAKE HAPPEN TO OUR LOVELY ENVIRONMENT!</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>I strongly oppose the expansion of Seaspan to the West in North Vancouver.</p> <p>The idea that Seaspan is trying to expand to the West infringing on this wonderful area to create 100 more jobs will not only affect the views but will decrease the air quality and increase the noise coming from the Shipyards for the many thousands of people, both local and tourists that use this area regularly.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Our family spends quality time at the Shipyards enjoying the views and the fresh air that this waterfront area provides. Additionally, there are groups of preschool and school-aged children that use the park regularly directly behind where Seaspan is planning to expand which will affect their lungs negatively from the air pollutants that Seaspan creates.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to do all in your power to reject this expansion or move the project to a non-residential adjacent area that would have less of an impact on the community.</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>Concern : Lighting</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding lighting impact. Consequently, the request is to confirm the upgrade of the existing lighting on the existing docks but also to implement operating procedures in the lighting practices in the current operations as well as in any proposed expansion.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the file: Seaspan Vancouver Drydock Water Lot Expansion – Lighting Design & Report by RFT Engineering (the “RFT report”):</p> <p>Findings 1:</p> <p>The RFT report states on Page 4 that “There will be no changes or additions to the existing floodlighting installation on shore...”. During the information session, Seaspan indicated that they will upgrade the lighting on the existing drydocks to the same lighting included in the proposed drydock expansion. The latter contradicts the report. This should be clarified.</p> <p>Finding 2:</p> <p>RFT report states on page 3: “Poorly designed shipyard lighting can provide an unsafe work environment for employee’s and a source of irritation to adjacent property owners”.</p> <p>Attached is a photo taken on Monday Sep 21, 2020 at 12:27am from Cascade West. What operating procedures does Seaspan have in place to mitigate light pollution from ships to residential neighbors? As you can appreciate, the ship is less than 50 meters away and has very strong lights pointing directly to the Cascade West building.</p> <p>Would the space between the dry dock and the residential buildings will be used to moor additional ships? I am afraid that an expansion of the drydock to the west would increase ship moorage and consequently light pollution to residential buildings. What guidelines is Port of Vancouver providing regarding lighting?</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>Concern : Wastewater, metals contamination and birds.</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the potential environmental from the drydocks. Consequently, the request is to engage an "INDEPENDENT" third party assessment to conduct an environmental impact assessment not only in the expansion but also in the existing operations and to include mitigation actions. This environmental impact should not only be conducted within the Study Area but also includes a buffer that includes the immediate land mass. As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the file: Seaspan Vancouver Drydock Water Lot Project – Habitat Assessment by Hatfield Consultants (the "Hatfield report"):</p> <p>Findings 1:</p> <p>Page 19 of the Supplemental Report states: "following potential effect were also specifically raised in the PER checklist: contamination from spills, hazardous material, or stormwater pollution"</p> <p>On the other hand, the Hatfield reports states that Page 22 also states that "No wastewater will be generated on these structures..."</p> <p>Question: Attached is a photo taken on July 8th. How do we explain the following spots of waste next to the Careen? A leakage?</p> <p>Note: that this is not the only time I have seen this.</p> <p>Findings 2:</p> <p>Page 17 of Hatfield report states that "Although the Study Area is located within the IBA, and marine birds have the potential to pass through or feed in the area, there is no land in the Study Area..."</p> <p>Question: there is immediate access to the beach area where you will find Birds very often. Attached is a photo taken on July 16th that shows the Larus Glaucescens on the beach area between Cascade West and Cascade East. Even though the beach is not part of the Study Area per se and not Part of Port of Vancouver, waste from the Drydock as seen on the pictures can reach the beach area (land mass). Has this been taken into consideration in the statement aforementioned? If there is potential exposure should this be taken into consideration? What are the mitigation strategies?</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to register with you my objection to the Seaspan expansion into the waters west of their present location in the Shipyards in North Vancouver.</p> <p>My concerns are the effect on air quality, the increase in noise and to a lesser extent the impact on the view from the waterfront.</p> <p>My family and I reside in North Vancouver and frequently visit the Shipyards area. Our children enjoy playing in the small park, the waterpark in the summer, and skating rink in the winter. My husband and I enjoy the restaurants, outdoor concerts and beer gardens. There is something here for all age groups and families to participate in all year round.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>As a Canadian citizen I have a fundamental right to breathe clean air and to enjoy an outdoor space with as little noise pollution as possible.</p> <p>We accept the present level of air emissions and noise as the Seaspan operation was in place prior to the development of the Shipyard community.</p> <p>Seaspan has a viable alternative to expand east and I fully support this option as I realize this is a shared residential/industrial community.</p> <p>The City of North Vancouver has made a substantial financial investment using taxpayers money to develop a beautiful destination location for both locals and tourists of all ages to enjoy year round. Let's not tarnish this unique waterfront community by allowing Seaspan to expand west and thus increase air and noise pollution turning it into an unhealthy environment for all who live in and enjoy this space.</p> <p>I implore you to deny the Seaspan application to expand west.</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>Hello I am a concerned resident from the Atrium east building. I am strongly against the proposed expansion. The shipyards is serving as the epicentre for North Vancouver and beyond. We already some much extra noise and congestion down here but feel the energy and beauty of looking out our windows or walking around makes it a fair trade. But please. No more noise congestion construction etc down here. Everyone deserves a vibrant beautiful place to hang out. This expansion would clearly wipe out a lot of it. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to register with you my objection to the Seaspan expansion into the waters west of their present location in the Shipyards in North Vancouver.</p> <p>My concerns are the effect on air quality, the increase in noise and to a lesser extent the view, and loss of property value.</p> <p>My husband and I reside in the front condominium facing the water on the second floor on ____ Victory Ship Way.</p> <p>As a Canadian citizen I have a fundamental right to breathe clean air and to enjoy an outdoor space with as little noise pollution as possible.</p> <p>We accept the present level of air emissions and noise and purchased our home with full knowledge of this.</p> <p>Seaspan has a viable alternative to expand east and I fully support this option as I realize this is a shared residential/industrial community.</p> <p>The City of North Vancouver has made a substantial financial investment using taxpayers money to develop a beautiful destination location for both locals and tourists of all ages to enjoy year round. Let's not tarnish this unique waterfront community by allowing Seaspan to expand west and thus increase air and noise pollution turning it into an unhealthy environment for all who live in and enjoy this space.</p> <p>I implore you to pursue an expansion east of the present Seaspan operations.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Regardless of the expense and disruption, if as you declare, you are truly a community based company, it is the ethical choice for the present and future of North Vancouver's waterfront.</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to register with you my objection to the Seaspan expansion into the waters west of their present location in the Shipyards in North Vancouver.</p> <p>My concerns are the effect on air quality, the increase in noise and to a lesser extent the view, and loss of property value.</p> <p>My husband and I reside in the front condominium facing the water on the second floor on ____ Victory Ship Way.</p> <p>As a Canadian citizen I have a fundamental right to breathe clean air and to enjoy an outdoor space with as little noise pollution as possible.</p> <p>We accept the present level of air emissions and noise and purchased our home with full knowledge of this.</p> <p>Seaspan has a viable alternative to expand east and I fully support this option as I realize this is a shared residential/industrial community.</p> <p>The City of North Vancouver has made a substantial financial investment using taxpayers money to develop a beautiful destination location for both locals and tourists of all ages to enjoy year round. Let's not tarnish this unique waterfront community by allowing Seaspan to expand west and thus increase air and noise pollution turning it into an unhealthy environment for all who live in and enjoy this space.</p> <p>Please deny the Seaspan application to expand west.</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>Please stop the Seaspan Expansion Westside (Project) in Shipyards, North Vancouver</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>Please do not expand the dry dock West of it's current location in North Vancouver. Please go East.</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to register with you my objection to the Seaspan expansion into the waters west of their present location in the Shipyards in North Vancouver.</p> <p>My concerns are the effect on air quality, the increase in noise and to a lesser extent the impact on the view from the waterfront.</p> <p>My family and will be moving to North Vancouver in the Fall and frequently visit the Shipyards area. Our children enjoy playing in the small park, the waterpark in the summer, and skating rink in the winter. My husband and I enjoy the restaurants, outdoor concerts and beer gardens. There is something here for all age groups and families to participate in all year round.</p> <p>As a Canadian citizen I have a fundamental right to breathe clean air and to enjoy an outdoor space with as little noise pollution as possible.</p> <p>We accept the present level of air emissions and noise as the Seaspan operation was in</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>place prior to the development of the Shipyard community. Seaspan has a viable alternative to expand east and I fully support this option as I realize this is a shared residential/industrial community.</p> <p>The City of North Vancouver has made a substantial financial investment using taxpayers money to develop a beautiful destination location for both locals and tourists of all ages to enjoy year round. Let's not tarnish this unique waterfront community by allowing Seaspan to expand west and thus increase air and noise pollution turning it into an unhealthy environment for all who live in and enjoy this space.</p> <p>I implore you to deny the Seaspan application to expand west.</p>
27-Jul-21	<p>I purchased the condominium at _____ Vitory Ship Way because it is ocen front and has a direct view of the ocean and the cityscape. I believe the extension of the ship yard will directly impact my view and block the sight of the water and city. Instaed of the open feeling of the unit, the ship yard will become a barrier and gives a choking feeling. Also, the noise generated from the new ship yard will be very unpleasant.</p> <p>i would like to know if the extension of the ship yard and be stopped, and if I can help in this regard.</p>
28-Jul-21	<p>So are you effectively stating that because Seaspan has just restricted their proposal to only their western water lot, which thereby resulted in NO reasonable alternative option but to go WEST, you are not even looking at what could/should then have been another very feasible option by going EAST into their own adjoining water lot??</p> <p>Obviously ALL seaspan's NO GO areas in their western water lot would not be feasible which would then default to their only other reasonable option which is the western extension.</p> <p>So was there METHOD IN THE MADNESS by never even giving the Vancouver Port Authority the option to look east into that adjoining underutilized water lot?</p> <p>By closing the door to even considering this eastern water lot, has Seaspan then DELIBERATELY prevented you from looking at what would be a broader overview considering ALL REASONABLE OPTIONS THAT SHOULD THEN HAVE INCLUDED BOTH ADJOINING WATER LOTS IN THAT ANALYSIS? That, in my mind, is what you should be forcing Seaspan to do.</p> <p>I would hate to think that the Vancouver port authority would actually consider extending the western water lot further west while at the same time allowing Seaspan to just ignore that it even had that adjoining eastern water lot. That is certainly what they have been doing from day one. In Seaspan's mind it's as if it didn't exist.</p> <p>If that's the case, I would again be very disappointed with the port authority in not seeing through Seaspan's attempt at pushing west under the guise that they didn't have room to their industrial east as all their analysis was restricted to just that western water lot. Please tell me that this is not the case.</p>
28-Jul-21	<p>I would like to express my concerns on Seaspan's plan to expand drydock operations in the Shipyards District in North Vancouver.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>I understand economic gains from the expansion in the proposed area. However, I would like to note that the gains would be at the expenses the community pays, for residents including myself need to suffer from the losses of sightlines and views, property values, increased noise and dust, increased traffic and parking.</p> <p>I would like to also note that Seaspan operates three shifts a day including weekends. Current noise level is already very stressful at levels of 69 to 70db, but an increased noise level of 75db for 24 hours a day for 365 days would not be tolerable for people who live here. I am wondering if the estimated noise level includes the noise from railways adjacent to Seaspan and noise from increased traffic.</p> <p>According to Statistics Canada, the community consists of 25% senior and 36% families with children. These are the people who spend most of their time at home. Therefore, the increased noise and traffic and obstructed view from Seaspan's expansion will certainly have negative impacts to daily life of these people.</p> <p>Please help us to keep our beautiful community as much as possible by considering other options instead of choosing the currently proposed area.</p>
28-Jul-21	<p>Concern: Measured data vs Modelled Data</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the noise assessment and the elements that have been missing and/or inaccurate. Consequently, the request is to engage an “INDEPENDENT” third party assessment to conduct an objective and unbiased analysis regarding the noise impact using more accurate models and to collect data from different locations at different heights.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the Vancouver Dry dock - Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment by BKL Consultants (the “BKL report”)</p> <p>The BKL report states on Page 23 that: "The noise model accounts for the following factors:... The general geography of the area including relevant buildings, terrain, etc." Findings:</p> <p>On July 28th, I measured the noise level from two locations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) On the playground in front of the dry docks measured at 8:20pm - (~60-~62 dB) 2) On the 8th floor on the Cascade West measure at 8:27pm (~63-~64 dB) <p>Evidently, the noise measure and recorded on the 8th floor is higher than the noise measured on the playground as shown in the videos by ~2dB.</p> <p>Why this is not property address in the BKL report? Building design, surfaces, water, etc play a crucial role the impact of noise on the residential receptors. The model that BKL produced reflects user-based assumptions. Given the immediate location of the project</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>noise sources to the residential receptors, having less assumptions and more measured data would produce an objective, independent and unbiased results. This will provide the foundations and basis for proper mitigation strategies, if necessary.</p> <p>Evidently this shows that the results shown on the map on Page 20 of the BKL report don't hold true. There isn't any reduction of noise between the red and pink zone if you consider different heights.</p> <p>I am attaching the videos that shows the data points. It is relevant to measure noise and collect data at different height levels at different points to do a proper assessment.</p>
28-Jul-21	<p>I have concern for the negative impact construction to the west of Seaspan will have on the residents, visitors and families that use the Spirit Trail particularly for the noise & air pollution to the children's play area & family picnic area. Seaspan claim to be capturing dust, etc. from their work - but particles show on my fruit & veggies I grow on my balcony and when I sweep! The added transportation on the water will have an effect on the marine wildlife - which I see finally returning since the construction of the lower levels. The Shipyard business community has supported us through the pandemic and we have supported them. A dry dock to the EAST of Seaspan could also so support to their neighbours and community and also provide needed jobs and assist in their expansion that they want. ____ Trophy @ the Pier</p>
28-Jul-21	<p>This would be an absolute disaster to our community. Now it is like a park here for everyone's enjoyment. The lights now are on all night long. There is welding and other noise continually. The seals and otters, & seagulls enjoy that area too. It also blocks the view for everyone that walks in this area and for the condos in this area. I do not understand why they do not expand EAST where they are not blocking everyone's view and enjoyment of walking the beautiful trail. This is a very popular area for North Vancouver residents. It would be an absolute shame to spoil it with expansion to the west. Shame on seaspan for not thinking of the community and their enjoyment of the views. Obviously I am totally against the expansion as are everyone I talk to in the area. This should absolutely not happen! Also this area has become a major tourist attraction for other communities in BC and a must see for tourists out of Canada.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>We are writing to express our opposition to Seaspan's proposed expansion of two additional dry docks. We have lived in the area directly adjacent to the existing dry dock for a number of years. Already, the air, light and noise pollution emitted from the facility are significant, and we fear that adding additional dry dock capacity would only exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>We appreciate that this project is expected to add up to 100 new jobs for people and add to North Vancouver's economic growth. However, the health and quality of life of residents who have built their lives here should not be ignored, indeed it must be considered.</p> <p>We would welcome Seaspan to consider an alternate proposal that takes into account the existing challenges of residents in the area when it comes to air, noise and light pollution.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our perspective.</p>

Date	Feedback
29-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to you today to share my opinion on your proposed dock expansion in front of our neighbourhood in the Shipyards area. Here are my primary concerns:</p> <p>1) I have been a resident for 3 years now and during this time the immediate area surrounding my building has become busier and, unfortunately, noisier. I believe that the planned dock expansion will inevitably bring more employees to work leading to increased traffic on Victory Ship Way. In addition, your existing dock is already currently active, at times, many hours of the day and night. The increased traffic and dock noise will undoubtedly lead to a less enjoyable place to live.</p> <p>2)The Shipyards neighbourhood has many pathways that are used by pedestrians and cycle traffic exclusively. Increased employee traffic will have an impact on pedestrian safety moving through the area. The traffic will have an impact on the environment as well.</p> <p>3) The Shipyards project was developed to be residences for some and a gathering place for many for some time now. People from all over the lower mainland visit this area for recreation, dining, shopping, entertainment, etc. I realize that you are requesting this expansion to address future business and profitability but I think your goals will have a negative impact on all of the businesses that have already invested in the Shipyards area.</p> <p>4) I sat in on one of your town hall meetings online. I listened to your reasoning as to why expansion to the east is unattainable but I was not necessarily convinced. I believe that an eastern expansion could be possible with the right investment. Also, you spent most of the meeting talking about the western expansion as if it is the only option. I am certain that other locations have been considered and energy should be focused on looking at these at this time.</p> <p>I share my comments with the confidence that you will consider them.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>After listening to yesterday's call with strata councils, I keep coming back to the same question as to WHY Seaspan has not been required to take into consideration BOTH the EAST and WEST Water lots when presenting their realistic proposal options for the new Drydocks and pontoon.</p> <p>ARE THE TWO SEASPAN ADJOINING WATER LOTS, FOR ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, REALLY ONE WATER LOT?</p> <p>Seaspan argues that utilization of the eastern portion (No Go2) of that western water lot would prevent access to the W Building. This W Building would then appear to be the separate shipbuilding entity that I assume would be tied to that Eastern Water Lot that also encompasses pier 94. (see photo below)</p> <p>The point here is that the eastern water lot, associated with the shipbuilding component of Seaspan and the W Building access, would not be functionally utilizable without the encroachment into the eastern portion of that western Drydock entity water lot.</p> <p>So on a stand alone basis, the eastern water lot would not in itself be sufficient to allow for the easy movement of W building barges in and out of that space.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>On the one hand Seaspan argues that any movement east to the edges of that western water lot would restrict access to the W building while on the other hand the eastern water lot would then require encroachment into that western water lot in order to have easy access to that W Building. SEASPAN CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS</p> <p>So the point here is that it appears Seaspan has always intermingled both water lots in their efforts to maximize the Drydock and the shipbuilding businesses. And that only makes sense. The actual legal entity of each water lot is therefore really a mute point. So let's not hide behind the corporate veil when it suits us.</p> <p>VANCOUVER PORT AUTHORITY PROJECT ANALYSIS SHOULD THEREFORE REQUIRE INCLUSION OF OPTIONS INTO THAT EASTERN WATER LOT</p> <p>Based on my reasoning above, the Vancouver port authority should be looking at both water lots as APPLES TO APPLES.</p> <p>As such Seaspan should be REQUIRED to come back to the port authority with other Drydock options, with analysis, that ALSO includes that interchangeable eastern water lot. Then we can see just how utilizable pier 94 actually is today and into the future.</p> <p>ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM And I trust we are aware of the elephant in the room. And just to be clear, we all know how extensively that eastern water lot area and pier 94 are used by Denise Washington and other Private yacht owners for moorage. ie Assessa 4, Attesa 3, kogo, St Eval, Tess</p> <p>So Vancouver port authority please do the right thing and require Seaspan to present ALL viable options encompassing BOTH inseparable WATER LOTS.</p> <p>SEASPAN WATER LOTS No go 2 area restricts both ways Thanks again and I do look forward to your specific comments.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>I am writing to you in the hope that you will partner with the North Vancouver community and respond in a socially responsible way.</p> <p>We are not against development and have coexisted with industrial expansion for many years on the North Shore. The North Vancouver waterfront has been dominated by industry for many years and will continue to do so for many more. A waterfront residential / commercial community has also developed over the years to allow residents and tourists alike to enjoy the appreciation of the sustainability of our oceans.</p> <p>It is an awe inspiring block to walk or cycle from Esplanade Avenue to the waterfront, allowing the public their first truly waterfront view from the Spirit Trail. It has been many years in the making and the introduction of the eastern dry dock would truly spoil this first impression for everyone. The view alone inspires people to be socially responsible and environmentally friendly towards our precious resource, the ocean.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>I would hope this is as important to you as this is to us. Please encourage Seaspan to give serious consideration to expanding towards the west industrial area.</p> <p>*July 30 Email response to VFPA:</p> <p>I made a mistake in my note below. I meant to say "Please encourage Seaspan to give serious consideration to expanding towards the EAST industrial area.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>The water lot project will interfere with the residential / commercial waterfront enjoyment for all people. The Lower Lonsdale area has been developed for recreational use with the Spirit Trail. If this project goes ahead it will block the spectacular ocean view you get when you turn down St Georges and walk towards the water. This is the first unobstructed view you get when you come from the east.</p> <p>Work on a plan to expand on the east side where the industry already dominates the waterfront.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>property values, increased noise, dust, traffic and parking</p> <p>If the estimated noise includes noise from railways and current traffic. Existing noises are not only from Seaspan operations but also from railways whenever trains pass and traffic from cars, motorcycles and semi trucks.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>Please consider an alternative configuration for adding 2 floating dry docks, where all of the 3 dry docks can be moored to the existing pier and serviced by the existing gantry crane.</p> <p>The current Seaspan proposal is very troublesome for waterfront owners in the vicinity and especially for the lower condo owners in ____ and ____ Victory Ship Way.</p> <p>Please open attachment.</p> <p>If a design is recommended where the Caren dry dock has to be moved/rotated a few degrees to capture vessels (fig. A – 102) it should not be a game changer. Currently, on many occasions, tugs are utilized to take the dry dock to deeper water when necessary (i.e. for vessels such as B.C. Ferries). The tugs can berth the dry dock very precisely. This would eliminate the piling, pontoon and side-mounted cranes and precipitate a better result for the condo owners.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>support for local industry</p> <p>this project will be good for the community and will help sustain an important local industry that provides good jobs and revenue for this area.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>I have read the application and attended both virtual meetings regarding Seaspan's request for building west of their present area.</p> <p>While I understand the need for expansion, I strongly object to their ask to expand west. Seaspan was unable to satisfy the community as to why they could not go east. The reasons were vague - does not work for them. I am not an engineer but the explanations were all from consultants who have been hired by Seaspan - strong bias of course.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>The Vancouver Port Authority needs to take into account the Impact Assessment on the residents.</p> <p>During the community meeting, Seaspan indicated that they would be unable to fulfill the recently awarded contract to build coast guard vessels without this expansion. They are now proposing to expand at the expense of the residents in the area - this is not acceptable- my tax money going to lower my own property value, increase noise pollution and impact the environment.</p> <p>It is feasible to go east and that's what Seaspan needs to do. Alternatively, the federal contract should go to another company.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>When I decided to purchase a condominium in the Shipyards area, I went to the City's overall Community Vision and the development plans allowed for the Lower Lonsdale/Shipyards area. As new development occurs in the Lower Lonsdale area, the presence of small-scale commercial spaces and established light-industrial/mixed employment uses are expected to be maintained." Seaspan's proposal is in direct opposition to our (yours and the residents') plan for the Shipyards area. It is by no means light industrial. Their proposal also presents an environmental hazard, noise pollution, as well as a strong negative economic effect for both the residents of that area and the City of North Vancouver. While I understand the need for expansion, I strongly object to their ask to expand west of their present area. Seaspan was unable to satisfy the community as to why they could not go east. Their reasons were vague - does not work for them. All presentations were made by consultants hired by Seaspan with obviously the company bias and no regard for the residents of North Vancouver. The City of North Vancouver has made this area a destination place and we are so proud of our Shipyards area and the ambiance. Thank you. I hope I can rely on my Mayor and the Council members to stop this expansion to the west and ask Seaspan to either expand east or look at other alternatives. I strongly urge you to ask the Port Authority to reject this proposal.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>I am a resident of North Vancouver and my mom recently invested her life savings in a condo on Lower Lonsdale. She's recently recovered from both cancer and COVID and we're extremely worried about the air pollution that she will now have to contend with on the balcony of the condo which faces the shipyards, as well as the substantial decrease in property value before she has even moved in. We feel there should have been more real consultation with the community before such a major proposal that clearly impacts the residents and community.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>We live at the bottom of St. Georges by Seaspan in the front of the Trophy building on the ground floor. Our condo is our dream retirement home that we purchased when we downsized from our house. Before purchasing six years ago we thought we did our research on the area and were very impressed by what we saw. We were told that there would not be any more growth by Seaspan towards the west.</p> <p>Now our dream home is threatened as Seaspan has applied to the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority to expand westward which takes it in directly in front of our building and unit. This act is going to take away our view and decrease the value of our unit.</p> <p>Another reason we moved here was so my husband could enjoy the waterfront views from his chair as he has mobility issues. I always get a thrill when I round the corner at St Georges and Victory Ship Way and see the magnificent view from the Spirit Trail.</p> <p>Over the five years that we have lived here the noise level from Seaspan has increased</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>every year. As it is now there are days we cannot sit on our balcony and talk due to the noise from Seaspan and we cannot leave our windows open due to the noise. Our outdoor furniture is constantly covered in dust from all the sanding. In addition to the noise we frequently can smell paint and turpentine fumes which scares us as we are breathing that in. With the expansion we can only see these getting worse in the future. Right in front of the proposed expansion is a children's playground. How safe is it for them to be breathing in that air? The park is also frequented by many people throughout the day and evening. They come to the park to picnic with friends and family and enjoy the view. It is a popular spot for taking pictures and filming. Seaspan does not keep their buildings and grounds looking good and what we have right now is quite an eyesore. There is a chain fence and lean-to with a rusting roof that looks like it could fall over and 'plastic buildings'. Do we really want the many visitors and tourists to see this more of this when they come to the waterfront? The city has done such a wonderful job of making the Shipyards as a happening and gathering place and it is about to become very unattractive.</p> <p>The deadline for feedback from the public should be extended as not all the stakeholders have been notified of the expansion and in an appropriate manner. A mass mail out was done by Seaspan to the buildings in the area only for Canada Post to deliver. Many of the people at the 2nd meeting claimed not to receive it and no wonder as it looked like junk mail without any address on. Why wasn't an address included on each pamphlet ensuring that everyone got it? It would be impractical to put a name on but not an address. Also why only the buildings in this area? People up higher in the city will be losing some of their view so they should have a say as should all taxpayers in North Vancouver City as this area is for them too.</p> <p>Seaspan and Vancouver Fraser Port Authority tried to get our feedback via zoom meetings but when they were asked difficult questions they avoided answering them! We really wonder how much of our written feedback will be read as we don't think that we can trust them. After saying that the neighbouring buildings would have a zoom meeting with Seaspan on July 27th, they have since arbitrarily cancelled that meeting and instead invited 1-2 council members from the neighbouring buildings to another meeting. The Councils have repeatedly reminded Seaspan that they do not have the authority to represent the strata corporation in this matter. Why does Seaspan get to set the rules? Is this already a done deal as it sure sounds like it?</p> <p>What are the benefits to the City of North Vancouver?? They say 100 jobs but how many of those workers can afford to live here? Instead we will have 100 more vehicles clogging our roads and bridges. What is the value of this expansion to the residents and businesses of North Vancouver?</p> <p>This is like David fighting Goliath. This cannot be allowed to proceed and infringe on the lives of the many people, like us, who call this area home as well as the many who come from near and far to enjoy this vibrant area. The Shipyards, Spirit Trail and Lower Lonsdale area are a jewel in the city of North Vancouver and it would be a shame to take some of this view away and make it uncomfortable for them to be here with the fumes, dust and noise. This expansion belongs in a more industrial area, perhaps eastward, and not near a densely populated area of North Vancouver City.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>We live at the bottom of St. Georges by Seaspan in the front of the Trophy building on the ground floor by the water. Our condo is our dream retirement home that we purchased when we downsized from our house. Before purchasing six years ago we thought we did our research on the area and were very impressed by what we saw. We</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>were told that there would not be any more growth by Seaspan towards the west. Now our dream home is threatened as Seaspan has applied to the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority to expand westward which takes it in directly in front of our building and unit. This act is going to take away our view and decrease the value of our unit. Another reason we moved here was so my husband could enjoy the waterfront views from his chair as he has mobility issues. I always get a thrill when I round the corner at St Georges and Victory Ship Way and see the magnificent view from the Spirit Trail. Over the five years that we have lived here the noise level from Seaspan has increased every year. As it is now there are days we cannot sit on our balcony and talk due to the noise from Seaspan and we cannot leave our windows open due to the noise. Our outdoor furniture is constantly covered in dust from all the sanding. In addition to the noise we frequently can smell paint and turpentine fumes which scares us as we are breathing that in. With the expansion we can only see these getting worse in the future. Right in front of the proposed expansion is a children's playground. How safe is it for them to be breathing in that air? The park is also frequented by many people throughout the day and evening. They come to the park to picnic with friends and family and enjoy the view. It is a popular spot for taking pictures and filming. Seaspan does not keep their buildings and grounds looking good and what we have right now is quite an eyesore. There is a chain fence and lean-to with a rusting roof that looks like it could fall over and 'plastic buildings'. Do we really want the many visitors and tourists to see this more of this when they come to the waterfront? The city has done such a wonderful job of making the Shipyards as a happening and gathering place and it is about to become very unattractive.</p> <p>The deadline for feedback from the public should be extended as not all the stakeholders have been notified of the expansion and in an appropriate manner. A mass mail out was done by Seaspan to the buildings in the area only for Canada Post to deliver. Many of the people at the 2nd meeting claimed not to receive it and no wonder as it looked like junk mail without any address on. Why wasn't an address included on each pamphlet ensuring that everyone got it? It would be impractical to put a name on but not an address. Also why only the buildings in this area? People up higher in the city will be losing some of their view so they should have a say as should all taxpayers in North Vancouver City as this area is for them too.</p> <p>Seaspan and Vancouver Fraser Port Authority tried to get our feedback via zoom meetings but when they were asked difficult questions they avoided answering them! We really wonder how much of our written feedback will be read as we don't think that we can trust them. After saying that the neighbouring buildings would have a zoom meeting with Seaspan on July 28th, they have since arbitrarily cancelled that meeting and instead invited 1-2 council members from the neighbouring buildings to the meeting. The Councils have repeatedly reminded Seaspan that they do not have the authority to represent the strata corporation in this matter. Why does Seaspan get to set the rules? Is this already a done deal as it sure sounds like it?</p> <p>What are the benefits to the City of North Vancouver?? They say 100 jobs but how many of those workers can afford to live here? Instead we will have 100 more vehicles clogging our roads and bridges. What is the value of this expansion to the residents and businesses of North Vancouver?</p> <p>We need help as this is like David fighting Goliath. This cannot be allowed to proceed and infringe on the lives of the many people, like us, who call this area home as well as the many who come from near and far to enjoy this vibrant area. The Shipyards, Spirit</p>

Date	Feedback
	Trail and Lower Lonsdale area are a jewel in the city of North Vancouver and it would be a shame to take some of this view away and make it uncomfortable for them to be here with the fumes, dust and noise. This expansion belongs in a more industrial area, perhaps eastward, and not near a densely populated area of North Vancouver City.
29-Jul-21	<p>We live at the bottom of St. Georges by Seaspan in the front of the Trophy building on the ground floor by the water. Our condo is our dream retirement home that we purchased when we downsized from our house. Before purchasing six years ago we thought we did our research on the area and were very impressed by what we saw. We were told that there would not be any more growth by Seaspan towards the west. Now our dream home is threatened as Seaspan has applied to the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority to expand westward which takes it in directly in front of our building and unit. This act is going to take away our view and decrease the value of our unit. Another reason we moved here was so my husband could enjoy the waterfront views from his chair as he has mobility issues. I always get a thrill when I round the corner at St Georges and Victory Ship Way and see the magnificent view from the Spirit Trail. Over the five years that we have lived here the noise level from Seaspan has increased every year. As it is now there are days we cannot sit on our balcony and talk due to the noise from Seaspan and we cannot leave our windows open due to the noise. Our outdoor furniture is constantly covered in dust from all the sanding. In addition to the noise we frequently can smell paint and turpentine fumes which scares us as we are breathing that in. With the expansion we can only see these getting worse in the future. Right in front of the proposed expansion is a children's playground. How safe is it for them to be breathing in that air? The park is also frequented by many people throughout the day and evening. They come to the park to picnic with friends and family and enjoy the view. It is a popular spot for taking pictures and filming. Seaspan does not keep their buildings and grounds looking good and what we have right now is quite an eyesore. There is a chain fence and lean-to with a rusting roof that looks like it could fall over and 'plastic buildings'. Do we really want the many visitors and tourists to see this more of this when they come to the waterfront? The city has done such a wonderful job of making the Shipyards as a happening and gathering place and it is about to become very unattractive. The deadline for feedback from the public should be extended as not all the stakeholders have been notified of the expansion and in an appropriate manner. A mass mail out was done by Seaspan to the buildings in the area only for Canada Post to deliver. Many of the people at the 2nd meeting claimed not to receive it and no wonder as it looked like junk mail without any address on. Why wasn't an address included on each pamphlet ensuring that everyone got it? It would be impractical to put a name on but not an address. Also why only the buildings in this area? People up higher in the city will be losing some of their view so they should have a say as should all taxpayers in North Vancouver City as this area is for them too. Seaspan and Vancouver Fraser Port Authority tried to get our feedback via zoom meetings but when they were asked difficult questions they avoided answering them! We really wonder how much of our written feedback will be read as we don't think that we can trust them. After saying that the neighbouring buildings would have a zoom meeting with Seaspan on July 28th, they have since arbitrarily cancelled that meeting and instead invited 1-2 council members from the neighbouring buildings to the meeting. The Councils have repeatedly reminded Seaspan that they do not have the authority to represent the strata corporation in this matter. Why does Seaspan get to set the rules? Is this already a done deal as it sure sounds like it? What are the benefits to the City of North</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Vancouver?? They say 100 jobs but how many of those workers can afford to live here? Instead we will have 100 more vehicles clogging our roads and bridges. What is the value of this expansion to the residents and businesses of North Vancouver? We need help as this is like David fighting Goliath. This cannot be allowed to proceed and infringe on the lives of the many people, like us, who call this area home as well as the many who come from near and far to enjoy this vibrant area. The Shipyards, Spirit Trail and Lower Lonsdale area are a jewel in the city of North Vancouver and it would be a shame to take some of this view away and make it uncomfortable for them to be here with the fumes, dust and noise. This expansion belongs in a more industrial area, perhaps eastward, and not near a densely populated area of North Vancouver City.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>I am a resident in Shipyards District in North Vancouver. I would like to express my concerns on Seaspan's plan to expand drydock operations in Shipyards District.</p> <p>First, noise from Seapan's current operation is already stressful level at 69 to 74db. Please note additional noises in the area: constant noise from traffic including railways, located right next to Seaspan, and semi trucks to Seaspan. It is estimated that noise level will increase above 75db, which is just from their operation. Factoring noise from current and increased traffic, the increased noise level will be too high for residents in the community.</p> <p>The project will also take away view, not only from our home but also from the trail in the community. Given the view is the key attraction in the community, Seapan's expansion will have a negative impact to this key attraction in the community.</p> <p>I understand the project has economic value but the proposed area for expansion is right in front of the residential area where people made their home, therefore not suitable for the expansion. It is clear that the expansion in the proposed area will have multiple negative impact to residents and community. I would like to ask consider other areas for the project instead of the currently proposed.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>property values, increased noise, dust, traffic, parking</p> <p>If the estimated noise includes noise from railways and current traffic. Existing noises are not only from Seaspan operations but also from railways whenever trains pass and traffic from cars, motorcycles and semi trucks.</p>
29-Jul-21	<p>Please don't expand to the west!!!</p> <p>Why don't you follow ____ 's very detailed proposal to go east?</p> <p>Every day we walk on the pier to enjoy this vibrant area that the City of North Vancouver has created for all to enjoy. We see the people having fun, sitting at a bench eating their lunch or dinner there.</p> <p>We get lots of weddings at the shipyard, photos taken with the view from the city of Vancouver.</p> <p>Folks from far and near come here to enjoy this area.</p> <p>When I look down from our balcony in the Trophy building I can see families using the picnic tables having lovely meals there, laughing, having fun, watching the children playing at the play area.</p> <p>Remember the Friday night market with the food trucks and so many people enjoying the shipyard meeting up with friends eating good food and listening to a band playing rather than listening to the noise of the proposed drydocks.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>With your proposal the new drydocks would pollute the whole neighbourhood, all the people that come here to visit; the whole area would be affected in a great negative way.</p> <p>The noise would be so loud we couldn't sit outside anymore. It would be a lot noisier than you are claiming to be. The noise would be so loud it would damage our ears over time.</p> <p>Do you really want to destroy this whole area and don't care about all the people that come here to the shipyard?</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>We have a son who lives at the Shipyards and we spend many hours there enjoying the wonderful facilities the City of North Vancouver have developed over the years. To me it's the number one [tourist] destination in Vancouver. In the past we've organized for all our out of town guests including family to stay at the hotels in the Shipyards. Any industrial development in the water outside the residential & commercial area will have a negative impact on this unique location.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>I'm for the new docks as they will provide more work and more money for the small business for North Vancouver</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>Noise level of 160dB during construction (hearing damage occurs after 85dB); air quality - VOCs in the area/home; noise from 7am-10:30pm now in front where the Trophy building acted as a barrier before; light - while it sounds like the features are trying to be less impactful-still concerned; impact to property value & view (2-4 cranes on top of the dry dock) as well as integrity of the building with 6 pile driving nearby; vicinity of the Spirit trail/playground; seals in the area with their pups. Inadequate air & noise impact studies conducted.</p> <p>If Seaspan is looking for multi-generational planning than they should look to reinforce the east pier to be utilized & lease the water space in that direction.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>Putting the docks west of the current location will cause noise pollution, bad air quality (i.e. industrial dust, paint fumes, etc.) and disturb the local marine life. This area has been developed for residential and commercial use. Put the proposed dock construction to the east of the current Seaspan works which is the proper place for industrial development.</p> <p>Seaspan is looking to push forward the cheapest and fastest additional docks. They are showing no consideration for local residents and businesses. They can show consideration for the neighbourhood and marine habitat by developing east, and in an industrial area, not west, where the community has developed playgrounds, shops, restaurants and hotels for the betterment of the community of City of North Vancouver. This is meant to be a destination for tourists and locals alike. The noise and pollution is going to stifle the Quay and detract from people visiting and enjoying what has been a very exciting and attractive area. Shame on Seaspan for even thinking of doing this when they can easily go east!</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>I am a resident of the Cascade building in North Vancouver and have significant concerns regarding Seaspan's application to expand westward.</p> <p>I have concern that Seaspan has not been forthcoming in its communications with the public with regard to their expansion plans.</p> <p>Seaspan notification of the public forums may have met requirements, but it was not</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>effective. I am a resident in Cascade building and I received no notice of the meeting in my mail. My mother in law is also a resident and received no notice of the forum. I follow Seaspan Shipyards on Twitter and despite frequent tweets from Seaspan, there was only one tweet about this project referring to the NS New article, and no notification about the public forums being held. I have not seen any signs posted in the neighborhood announcing this proposed development.</p> <p>I also feel I was misled in the public forum with regard to Seaspan's intention to move the Careen and new docks 40m south to reduce the impact of noise and views on our residence. My impression from the public forum was that this 40m area would be open space. However, I subsequently learned that Seaspan plans to moor and repair ships on the north side of a new pontoon within this 40m area, effectively filling up this 40m area. This was not only a surprise to me, but apparently it was a surprise to the BKL acoustical consultants who did not include this in their noise modelling. I also note that none of the View and Shade renderings reflect a ship moored on the new pontoon (albeit they do show a low-lying barge in one or two renderings). Surely a ship under repair being moored to this new pontoon will impact the noise and view studies. It appears that Seaspan has been downplaying this aspect of their expansion plans.</p> <p>I also have significant concern with what appears to be a lack of independence in several of the expert reports provided by Seaspan in support of their application to the Vancouver Port Authority.</p> <p>Noise assessment report Assumptions have been made by BKL in predicting future noise. Information was compiled by BKL from documents and data provided by Seaspan and the assumptions, data, and information supplied by Seaspan has not been verified by BKL. BKL made no representation to the accuracy of the information and the assumptions that Seaspan provided. In fact, as noted in my earlier submission (below), many assumptions are not correct. I would respectfully ask that the Port require a new noise assessment study be done by an independent acoustical consultant, and that the consultant not rely on Seaspan for any assumptions or information unless such information is verified.</p> <p>Habitat assessment The author of the report Rebecca Kordas attended the zoom public forums and the strata zoom meeting. I believe that Ms. Kordas is a consultant with Hatfield Consultants, although she was presented as a member of the Seaspan "team" in the zoom calls. Ms Korda's report concludes that if the proposed mitigation measures outlined in this document and the CEMP are followed, adverse impacts to wildlife, including fish and fish habitat, are not expected to occur as a result of the expansion Project In 3.1.4 of the Habitat Assessment report Ms. Kordas states that harbor seals are common in Burrard Inlet and "have potential to occur" in the Study Area. Later in the report Ms. Korda notes that two Pacific harbour seals were observed in the Study Area during the dive surveys (one each of the two days). As residents we see seals in the Study Area almost daily. The choice of wording "have potential to occur" seems to be an attempt to downplay the existence of these animals. This raises the question whether other aspects which would be detrimental to Seaspan's application have been</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>similarly downplayed.</p> <p>As noted by residents in the zoom call, we witnessed a small diesel spill in June from the current operations of Seaspan. The diesel washed up on our beach.</p> <p>I would respectfully ask the Port or CNV commission another assessment from an independent source, and require that the environmental impact of the current Seaspan operations be considered as a baseline in predicting future environmental impacts from the expansion.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>I have reviewed the Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment report by BKL Consultants (the “BKL report”) provided by Seaspan Vancouver Drydock Co., in support of their application to the Vancouver Port Authority to expand their operations westward. I am not an acoustical expert but I do have significant concerns regarding the methodology and assumptions used in the assessment. BKL predicts that post project low frequency noise will be at 66db vs the Port guideline of 70db, and the post project noise environment will be 74db versus the Port guideline of 75db. The report also predicts the increase in the percentage of highly annoyed persons (%HA) to be 3.8% as compared to the 6.5% increase threshold of Health Canada and the Port. BKL calculated %HA increase based on its prediction that the increase in the annual average Rated Noise Level due to the Project would be no more than 3dB. So in summary, BKL predicts that future noise after the westward expansion will be at levels just below the Port’s Guideline for project noise environment and community noise exposure. BKL indicates their modelling has an accuracy of +/- 3db, so it seems it is entirely possible that actual post project noise levels will exceed the Port’s guidelines. The report suggests some mitigation strategies that may or may not work, however Seaspan has not committed to undertake those mitigation strategies, nor have those strategies been tested to confirm they will be effective.</p> <p>MY CONCERNS WITH THE METHODOLOGY 1. The BKL report states that “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”. So in other words, the Cascade buildings where I live will be the most impacted by additional noise from the project. Yet, BKL chose to only take one baseline noise measurement, and this was at another building. BKL chose to instead estimate the base line sound levels at Cascade. They estimated the noise would be 3 and 5 db less than at the building where noise was actually measured. It appears to me that the impact of a mistake in this estimate would be significant to the predicted noise level predictions and the approval of the project by the Port. Surely BKL noise predictions would have been more reliable if it used actual baseline readings at the buildings that were shown to be the most impacted by the project. This appears to be a very significant flaw in the study methodology. 2. Our residents perceive that noise from Seaspan’s operation is amplified between our buildings. As noted above, BKL took one baseline noise measurement and then used modelling to predict the impact of building reverberations, etc. to determine noise level reception at other locations. Once again, surely the study predictions of future noise levels would have been more reliable if BKL chose to take baseline measurements at the reception locations it is predicting. 3. The BKL report notes that the most prevalent source of high noise levels is Ultra High Pressure Washing (UHP). BKL reported that Ultra High Pressure washing noise levels at our residences ranged from 65 to 85db, but the report uses an average to assess the impact. It seems to me that if noise reaches a max of 85db, that this should be the number that is of concern from a health and annoyance perspective. I note that</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Worksafe BC mandates hearing protection is required for noise levels at 85db. 4. The BKL reports states that Noise Modelling used for the BKL assessment is the ISO 9613-2 (1996) standard and the report notes that “this is the current best practice to obtain accurate prediction results”. However, one resident provided a research paper that shows that this type of modelling has significant limitations on its accuracy and one of the reasons is that a lot of the modelling input parameters are based on the user’s judgment rather than standardized procedures. As noted, the report indicates the modelling has an accuracy of +/- 3db but did not state a statistical confidence level in its assessment. Given the possible inherent weaknesses of the modelling method, and the acknowledged error in accuracy, I’m wondering what the probability is that the increase in noise level will actually be higher than BKL predicted, and higher than the Port Guidelines?</p> <p>MY CONCERNS WITH THE ASSUMPTIONS I note that BKL states in their opening Notice to the report that the information provided in their report was compiled from documents and data provided by Seaspan and that the assumptions, data, and information supplied by Seaspan has not been verified by BKL. BKL makes no representation to the accuracy of the information and assumptions that Seaspan provided. Questionable Assumption That the week when noise was measured, represents the noise usually experienced in Seaspan’s operations The BKL study was done for one week in February. We were advised that Seaspan helped choose the week to be tested. Seaspan advised BKL that this represented a usual week. BKL did not verify this representation. While the BKL report describes the general activities that Seaspan advised occurred in the operations that week, it is not clear whether BKL verified that these activities took place, nor whether they compared the level of that week’s activities with other weeks by looking at operational logs etc. In developing their predictions of future noise levels BKL made assumptions that are not correct. The following incorrect assumptions are likely to have a material impact on BKL’s future Project Noise predictions. Incorrect Assumption 1 That UHP will occur every 4 days, every two weeks, which is 104 days per year. The BKL report states under “Existing Drydock Operations” that UHP occurs approximately 104 days per year. So, it seems that BKL is assuming no increase in the number of days UHP will occur, even though the Seaspan expansion will double the locations that Seaspan will be power washing vessels. Incorrect Assumption 2 That UHP (high pressure power washing) activities will take place between 07:00 and 18:00. Seaspan confirmed that this assumption is not correct as UHP will occur outside of the 7:00 to 18:00 hours on an exception basis. So, if the BKL report assumed UHP would only occur between 7am and 6pm, but Seaspan acknowledges there are exceptions that haven’t been considered in the BKL report, then the future Noise predictions are not accurate. . Incorrect Assumption 3 That there would be no ship repair activities taking place in the 40m area north of the new docks In the public forums Seaspan assured residents that noise levels will be reduced by moving the existing Careen 40m south away from the impacted residences. However, we learned that the 40m space will not be left open and will actually be used to install a new pontoon to moor and repair ships, effectively filling in that 40m of area. Seaspan acknowledged this wasn’t considered by BKL in its noise study, but contended that the mooring and work on a ship in this location will dampen the impact of noise on the residents. However, this has not been confirmed by an independent acoustic expert. Incorrect Assumption 4 Few residents will be annoyed by an increase in noise levels because so far there has been few complaints from residents about current noise</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>levels. The BKL report predicted low frequency (average) noise level from UHP activities is slightly above the 70 dB threshold with a range of 65 to 85 db, where there is a likelihood of noise-induced rattles; however, the report states that there have not been any reported complaints about rattles. BKL assumes the annoyance level of residents from future noise increases can be discounted because residents haven't complained about the current noise levels. BKL doesn't seem to consider that residents moved into the Shipyards starting in January 2019 knowing there would be noise from Seaspan operations and it would be unfair for them to now complain about status quo noise. This however does not mean residents would be less annoyed about an increase in noise from the expanded operations</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>This expansion project greatly concerns me, and i know many others on the North Shore. While I am not against economic growth and job creation, it should not come with such huge detriments to the local community. Immediately, what resonates, is why the need to expand West and not a single study on development to the East. To many people, the logistics look bad and we see very large beautiful vessels belonging to the owner of SeaSpan to the East and wonder, why can't this expansion be moved there and put your beautiful vessels to the East so at least the community can look upon those while also limiting the increased particulate in that direction where there is much less residential buildings and access for expansion. We see nothing that was done to move this East and it is a huge concern. There is no resistance to the expansion itself, but how and where it is done is of great importance. We feel that there is little care and concern on the community affects. Where are the studies done for noise, light and air that were done? There is already a huge particulate falling issue on the many residences balconies not to mention the light and noise all night long. Increasing this to the West will only increase the frustration and anger. After millions of dollars have been invested by the City of North Vancouver to beautify our waterfront at the Shipyards areas locals are finally able to enjoy it and are now coming outside after 1.5 years of Covid, only now to be hit with this expansion proposal and it is enraging to hear this and wonder, what is SeaSpan thinking? I personally have not run into a single person, who agrees with this expansion. For an owner who now brags how they have helped our community in various, this is a very strange move. In any case, SeaSpan should be supporting the local community. We all pay taxes as well adn hope that planning and environment decisions are carefully done with people in mind, not just profits. If it costs more to build East, so be it. The company has obviously lots of funds to propose this project and the owner is very wealthy with his many mega yachts. To people of the North Shore, this is careless and inconsiderate. it does not sit well at all. The submission and consultation process seems very invomplete. Technical studies on air quality assessment were not provided to us. We would like to have this information. How will air quality be changed, what increase in contaminants are going to be released and in what form? What kind of monitoring will be done in the residential areas? These are questions even if expansion were to be proposed to the East! There is a very large and beautiful children's playground right in front of the proposed expansion. How the heck did SeaSpan miss that? Kids play on the equipment which will be covered with particulate during the overnight work. Then they put thir hands in their mouths. Was this even talked about? In June, 7th to be precise, there was an oil spill believed to be by one of the tugs pushing in a ship to be worked on. How this spill was handled was very concerning. I say this, because it brings into question how SeaSpan dealt with issues affecting our environment. The oil spill protocols were not used. It seems, that the tugs swished the</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>water around to disperse it. If the oil recovery methods were used, residents would have seen that. There were many witnesses to this event. Not only that, but red colored matter was spotted and was quite prevalent in the water going right to the shore with no one knowing what it was. If SeaSpan operates like this, their transparency is suspect and make us not trust future issues that arise. We have way too many concerns to be positive about this expansion and need/demand to be heard and our questions answered. Meetings thus far has been less than satisfactory. I have lived on the North Shore most of my life. I have never, ever, encountered this kind of blatant disregard to what we are as a community, trying to achieve at the Shipyards area. It is quite heartbreaking.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>By building to the west will impact on the residents in the buildings next to you. Immediately to your West. I suggest you develop to the east with minimal impact on the port</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>I am a resident of the apartment building - Trophy at the Pier – that lies in immediate proximity to Seaspan’s Vancouver Drydock’s proposed water lot expansion project (“the project”). In general, I endorse, without reiterating them, the various criticisms that were made by my neighbours of the project in the online meetings held on July 15 and 17, 2021. But I would like additionally to emphasize a few points.</p> <p>The location of the children’s park, being the nearest point affected by the project other than, possibly, people enjoying the peace and serenity of a walk along the pier, is crucial. I doubt if there is a single soul, despite any claim made by “experts”, who can truthfully and with certainty say that the health of at least some of the children who play there in all innocence will not be affected in the long term – potentially decades. My own grandchildren use the park to play occasionally. Likewise, I am in the habit of enjoying the pier regularly, as are many others. One just has to view the temporary population of the pier on almost any summer evening when the sun is out. Many I suspect, like myself, go to view the glorious settings of the sun in the evening.</p> <p>A lot of dust settles in, and particularly on the balcony of, my apartment. It is fair to assume that much or almost all of it arises from the present operation at Vancouver Drydock’s repair and maintenance site. The dust caused by the operation must be breathed in by inhabitants of the building. Presumably it is to be expected that this problem will be exacerbated by the increased closeness of the new drydocks.</p> <p>Another aspect is the vibration from the present operation, which again may be so exacerbated. One day, a few weeks ago, I heard a rattling sound in my apartment. I had no idea at first what it was or whence it came. Then I determined that it was in my living room, but didn’t know where. I gradually moved closer and closer to where the source of the noise seemed to be. This took me to my display cabinet in which I kept non-used crockery and such like. I opened the door of the cabinet, felt around the various items and then finally settled on a plate that was seated on its edge along the back wall of the cabinet. As soon as I barely touched the plate, the noise immediately stopped. Vibration had caused this (till then) non-ending rattling. I can think of no cause for the vibration other than the current drydock operation – whatever was then going on. How much worse could the vibration to the Trophy building be if the project is approved?</p> <p>In the opening statement in its literature announcing the project, Vancouver Drydock refers to efficiently serving its “customers”. But it says nothing about maintaining good relations with its neighbours - a claim that it conventionally boasts or projects in its publications (with some justification in times prior to the announcement of the project). In knowingly damaging the neighbourhood, that boast must now be seen as hollow.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>This (Trophy) building is well named with its reference to the pier, as it offers the superb prospect of the pier and the stretch of water between the pier and the current ship repair and maintenance operation. Marine life prospers there - including seals occasionally. Bird life is abundant. Birds appear to like being close to the shoreline rather than further out: where they might be pushed as a result of the project. If they could vote on it, there is little doubt where their votes would go. I take great pleasure in seeing the ships and smaller craft passing by. The project, placed in the proposed location, will seriously impair, if not destroy, the prospect viewed both from within, and from the balconies of, the Trophy (and no doubt the adjoining Cascade) apartments. Others have mentioned the increased noise element, and I will not elaborate on that. My understanding is that the rationale for the project bears a direct relationship with Seaspan's shipbuilding operation at the Pemberton shipbuilding site. I have also been told that the need for the project infrastructure is temporary only, whereas the infrastructure itself will be permanent and will "outlive" every individual resident today in the Trophy building. (I withdraw that inclusion if that is not so.) I also understand that there are viable alternatives to the proposed location including, at minimum, the eastern (rather than the western) side of the present operation and parts of the inlet adjoining or close to the Pemberton site. These alternative areas are all heavily industrial. The relocation to any of them would injure no resident communities. It is unfathomable why Seaspan wants to do serious damage to a neighbouring community with whom it constantly boasts its good relationship. That boast must now be seen for what it's worth. It is difficult to imagine that the motivation for choosing the proposed location is other than greed, and putting yet more money in the hands of other corporations and individuals that benefit from the (Washington?) group structure. Of course I am unaware of the real reasons why this location has been chosen to the exclusion of the other potential locations. If one reason is to consolidate all the Seaspan operations into two stand-alone locations, being shipbuilding on the one hand and maintenance and repair on the other, then, that is entirely an internal decision of the Seaspan group itself - for its own convenience. This self-serving decision needs to be weighed against the interests of whole communities, including the vast population of non-resident visitors who merely wish to enjoy the wonderful attractions that the new Shipyards site has to offer. And this too includes the hordes of children of all ages who use the waterpark cum skating rink area, all year through. The serious impact the decision would have on the neighbourhood surely outweighs the narrow interest of the behemoth. Is it because the planned location involves less expense? If so, I would suggest that this is an insufficient reason for destroying the claimed good relations with Vancouver Drydock's immediate neighbours. And, if financial considerations are at play, then, an equally cogent consideration is the considerable deterioration in the value of the neighbouring apartments that will be occasioned by the project.</p> <p>It should be noted, in reading the Appendix, that each reference in the Appendix to "environment" in particular but also to any other term that is defined in the applicable legislation (including subordinate legislation) or failing that the Interpretation Act (if applicable) is to be treated as taking its meaning from the relevant definition, whether mention of that treatment is stated or not (and many instances are).</p> <p>If it does become a question of health effects in future years, and assuming that the causation factor becomes provable, then the whole question of tort liability could arise, subject to any exculpation provisions provided for in legislation or by common law. This would be potentially on a personal and at a corporate level, and could involve the</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>federal Crown, each decision-making entity, Vancouver Drydock, its parent(s), other corporations in the group, their owners and, potentially, other individuals who act behind the corporate veils. Note also, in addition to the potential civil liability, that the Impact Assessment Act speaks to the liabilities of senior officers of corporate bodies on a criminal or quasi-criminal basis. And the judiciary does not always take exculpation provisions or due diligence defences at their face value, preferring, on occasion, to render justice rather than (at least literal) law. So, the exculpation clauses in particular could well transpire to be found illusory. Sections 147 and 148 of the Impact Assessment Act have relevance in this context and there is an abundance of common law on the liabilities of related individuals and corporations.</p> <p>The great Romantic poet, John Keats, wrote in Endymion: A thing of beauty is a joy forever; Its loveliness increases; it will never Pass into nothingness;</p> <p>That was how I thought of the view from my apartment. Unfortunately, had Keats lived here and now, it would appear that he would have to amend his beautiful poem to make a major qualification to his poetic musing: to take into account what major industrial behemoths, like Seaspan, do to “things of beauty”.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to add some comments about my interpretation of how the Impact Assessment Act (“the Act”) provides for the various rights and obligations of the proponent (as defined therein) and the deciding authorities in the initial stages (and only the initial stages) of the impact assessment process. These comments are set out in the Appendix below. Further commentary on the later stages may or may not be forthcoming at the appropriate times. The approach taken is that of a (now former) legislative drafter, working in the tradition of the great Francis Bennion[1].</p> <p>Interpretation of legislation is the other side of the legislative drafting coin. The art of legislative drafting entails almost word by word interpretation or construction of the words currently being, and that already have been, written in the drafting process. This work is limited to resources that are generally available to anyone. I have no access to any of the sophisticated legal resources available to law firms, not even to a law library. Also the work is completely unfunded and is limited to an examination of the legislation. There is neither time nor the facility for examining potentially relevant common law. So anything I say stands to be potentially limited or restricted by any judicial decisions pointing to a different construction. All legislation cited is federal jurisdiction based. Notations related to the text appear at the end of the Appendix. And I apologize for the less than good standard of my inputting.</p> <p>.</p> <p>APPENDIX</p> <p>Preamble and purpose clauses</p> <p>The Act contains both a Preamble and a purpose clause. The purpose of having both escapes me. As stated by F.A.R. Bennion[1] in Statutory Interpretation[2]: “The preamble states the reason for passing the Act. It may include a recital of the mischief to which the Act is directed. When present, it is thus a useful guide to the legislative intention.” And[3], “A purpose clause is an express statement of the legislative intention Instead of a preamble, an Act may contain one or more purpose clauses in the body of it.” Bennion also says in his book Statute Law[4], “the preamble may be resorted to for interpretation, though it cannot contradict the plain words of a section)” He also quoted[5] Renton with obvious approval[5]: “Purpose clauses The Renton Committee</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>found that ‘statements of purpose can be useful, both at the Parliamentary stage and thereafter, for the better understanding of the legislative intention and for the resolution of doubts and ambiguities.’ The preamble once served this purpose.” This is the only statute I know of that contains both a preamble and a general purpose clause. An analysis of the various recitals of the Preamble and of the provisions of the purpose clause (section 6), and any linkage between them, whether consistent or inconsistent, therefore serve as a valuable guide to the legislative intent underlying the statute and, a fortiori, its regulations.</p> <p>Interpretation Approach</p> <p>The question arises: what line of approach should any interpreter take in construing the masses of legislation involved in the impact assessment process? In a highly generalized way, interpreters are given the answer to the question by statute. They are bound, in general, to apply the Interpretation Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. I-21) and, more particularly, section 12. This provides that each legislative provision construed is to be regarded as “remedial” (curing what Bennion and earlier jurists call the “mischief” in the previous law) and is to be “given such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as best ensures the attainment of its objects”. This purposive approach, as opposed to the literalist one, is strongly recommended as the better way to go. Generally, the judiciary at least pay lip service to that approach as being the more legally correct mode, although in any given case the approach they actually take may be in an entirely different direction in order to achieve the result they desire. As seen immediately below (if my analysis is correct), an “and” must be read as an “or” to make the project even feasible. And I suggest that this be done. As Bennion says[6]:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“A purposive construction of an enactment is one which gives effect to the legislative purpose by –</p> <p>(a) following literal meaning of the enactment where that meaning is in accordance with legislative purpose, or</p> <p>(b) applying a strained meaning where the literal meaning is not in accordance with the legislative purpose”</p> <p>A “strained meaning” should be applied here, to the proponent’s benefit.</p> <p>Designated Project</p> <p>It is assumed that the project proposed by Seaspan’s Vancouver Drydock (“the proponent”) is a “designated project” falling within the statutory definition. I assume that it is “one or more physical activities that (a) are carried out in Canada and on federal lands”[6.1] (ie. in both, although either suffices). Both the “federal lands” definition in the Act and the definition of “Canada” in the Interpretation Act (subsection 35(1)) include, at minimum, the territorial sea and the internal waters of Canada. The definitions of both “territorial sea” and “internal waters” defer to the Oceans Act[6.2]. And the Oceans Act provides that both of these form part of Canada and that the seabed and subsoil beneath them belong to the federal Crown. Para.(b) provides for regulations or a (not necessarily regulation) order. There are no regulations that I see that could even potentially cover the project and I know of no such order. But it is assumed that no further regulation or order is needed under para. (b) of the definition of “designated project” to include the project. This despite the use of the cumulative “and” at the end of para. (a). It seems to me that the cumulative does not work in the context of the project and that the project might be a non-starter if literally construed. A literal construction would scupper the project. (But I make no such claim since any</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>reasonable court would surely apply the purposive approach.) It seems that it should read the alternative “or”.</p> <p>Furthermore, the definition of “designated project” also includes physical activities that are incidental to the primary one. In certain contexts, if approval is given, this portion of the definition could have major implications and decision-making authorities need to be aware of this potential.</p> <p>Sustainability Both the Preamble (first recital) and the general purpose clause of the Act (para. 6(1)(a)) cite as an object of the legislation the fostering of sustainability - that is (by definition - section 2) the fostering of “the ability to protect the environment (as defined, infra), contribute to the social and economic well-being of the people of Canada and preserve their health in a manner that benefits present and future generations”. The reference to “the ability” to do these things presupposes that the making of all decisions by the authorities needs to reflect well into the future as to their potential effects - what will result from each decision, what could or could not result, what possibilities and likelihoods (or lack of them) there are and other similar considerations. It also invokes the potential or lack of potential for future protective actions going well beyond the completion of the designated project. The ability to protect, contribute and preserve should be seen as continuing potentially for decades and even “generations”. If, for example, a designated project were actually to destroy “the environment” which, by definition, includes any specific “component” of the Earth or aspects of it specifically mentioned in the definition, then the “ability” to secure the continued protection, contribute to social and economic well-being and preserve health would be lost forever immediately the project were completed. The authorities are legislatively committed, at minimum, to ensure that all aspects of the designated project are subjectively calculated towards ensuring that the protections, contributions and preservations referred to in the definition are permanent. Also, the proponent maintains that the project is consistent with its lease. This may or may not be so. But, if it is, then the lease would have been entered into at a time when everything mentioned in the sustainability definition would have been of little or no consequence. Times have changed. And in any case, as a general principle, contract must entirely defer to applicable legislation, unless the legislation itself reverses that deference.</p> <p>Public participation The third recital of the Preamble refers to public participation “in the impact assessment process, including the planning phase”. It is clear that the planning phase is only a part, one phase, of the overall impact assessment process. Those “inclusive” words mean that the required public participation is not limited to the planning phase, but applies throughout the assessment process. Emphasis is put on this continuing requirement. Otherwise, only the planning phase would need mentioning. So, public participation should be allowed well beyond the planning phase. Para. 6(1)(h) supports this. This is despite the timing restriction placed under section 11, which provision applies only to the “planning phase” of the overall process.</p> <p>Access to reasons for decisions Referring to the fourth recital in the Preamble, the reasons given by the authorities for decisions must, by inference, have substance, be complete and genuinely inform about</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>the true rationale of the decision. The authorities lack the general power that the judiciary has to eschew reasons or to render them minimal.</p> <p>Innovative approaches and innovation With respect to the fifth recital of the Preamble, the “innovative approaches and technologies” would include examination of all the alternative sites available to the proponent. Or, equally, they might be the project itself and all its component parts. But the project, located where it is proposed but not if located elsewhere, can hardly be claimed to be designed to “reduce adverse changes to the environment (as so defined – supra) and to health, social or economic conditions”. Rather, the project is calculated to increase considerably all these adverse changes. Para.6(1)(b.1) also cites as an object of the legislation the encouragement of innovation, which term would imply the inclusion of innovative approaches and, if necessary, innovative technologies that could render any alternative location viable. The application of the legally required principles set out in section 6(3) would be key in the enforcement of this provision.</p> <p>Fundamental protection Para. 6(1)(b) cites as an object the protection of the components of the environment (as defined). That is, the protection of the components (of the components) of the Earth, specifically including (a) land, water and air (sub-including all layers of the atmosphere), (b) all organic and inorganic matter and living organisms and (c) the interacting natural systems that include components referred to immediately above in (a) and (b). Also to be protected are health, social and economic conditions from adverse “effects” potentially resulting from the project. Those “effects” are, by definition, changes to the environment (as defined) or health ,social or economic conditions. Not only those but, further down the line, the consequences, whether positive or negative, of those changes. So there has to be protection from such adverse changes. Also, it is to be noted that this definition (environment) is of the non-exhaustive type. It is only a partial definition. Whatever would normally be regarded as “environment” and that is outside the wording of the definition is also to be regarded as within the definition. Here, standard dictionaries come into play.</p> <p>The “environment” definition includes all organic matter and living organisms. People fall within both. They are not excluded. So people are part of the definition of environment, and any rule or definition within the legislation - principle or subordinate - that refers to “environment” should be treated as including people. And that applies regardless of whether the people are on federal or provincial/territorial lands except where a specific statement to the opposite effect exists. Federal legislation applies, on a jurisdictional basis, to everyone affected by the federal activity that is controlled by the federal legislation. Ie., the people at any time present in the apartment blocks, the pier, the Shipyards and other areas close to the project are to be protected in accordance with this legislation. Also, any interaction between any such people on the one hand and land, water, air, the atmosphere or any other living organisms on the other, these all fall within the definition. The definition also includes inorganic matter, such as the pier and buildings, including the apartment blocks along the proximate shoreline .</p> <p>“Effects” Para.6(1)(c) deals with the responsibility of the authorities to ensure that the</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>assessment process takes into account all the both positive and negative changes to the environment (as defined) or to health, social or economic conditions and the positive and negative consequences of those changes that may be caused by the carrying out of the project (see the definition of “effects”.) Subsection 7(1) sets out “effects” or results that the proponent must avoid in the carrying out of the project. (See “prohibitions and restrictions below.) It should also be noted that what an impact assessment is, by definition, is an assessment of the “effects’ (as so defined) of the project – being those changes.</p> <p>Community knowledge Para.6(1)(j) reflects the authorities’ requirement to take into account community knowledge. That would include relevant and informed comments made by the public in all the public participation sessions, regardless of at what stage the assessment process is. See the comments under “Public participation” (supra). It would also include any input submitted by relevant jurisdictions such as any adjoining or proximate municipality, elected politicians and so forth. This, of course, (as for all submissions), whether the input is pro or anti the project.</p> <p>Alternative means Para.6(1)(k) envisages the taking into account in the assessment of alternative means of carrying out the project, including through the use of the best available technologies. The alternative means would include alternative locations for placing the project, including those mentioned by the public. This would include east of the present maintenance and repair operation and at or close to the Pemberton site where the shipbuilding is carried out. There may be other places. Submissions by others on this topic will be more informed than this Appendix can be. Alternative technologies could include, for example, deeper level support pilings equipment and such like that could enable placing the new drydocks in alternative locations, perhaps in deeper waters, away from residential areas.</p> <p>Powers and principles Subsection 6(3) enjoins the federal Crown, the Minister of the Environment, the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada and “federal authorities” (as defined) to exercise their powers in a manner that adheres to the principles of scientific integrity, honesty, objectivity, thoroughness and accuracy. For the purposes of subsection 6(3), the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is assumed to be a “federal authority” by virtue of para. (d) of the definition of “federal authority” and item 1 of Schedule 1, an analysis of which would require significant research into whatever documentation there is that underlies subsection 2(1) of the Canada Marine Act. That is an exercise too large for this work. Thus, that port authority is assumed to be subject to subsection 6(3). This subsection does not bind the proponent. These concepts are chosen with care and are not mutually exclusive. Scientific integrity presumably would include at least a thorough analysis of every conceivable alternative location for the drydock extensions. With respect to scientific integrity, the Office of the federal Chief Science Advisor has put out a “Model Policy on Scientific Integrity” (in the website ic.gc.ca) which contains, at item 6, the “Scientific integrity principles”. This is a lengthy document and will not be reproduced here. But, presumably, all the entities mentioned are aware of the document and will treat it as, perhaps, quasi-law. Honesty probably invokes the duty of good faith as an organizing principle[7]. Objectivity (if attainable in pure form) probably</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>includes such principles as impartiality, neutrality, honesty, lack of bias and prejudice and seeing and giving due attention to the positions of each side. Thoroughness includes the quality of completeness, and probably seeing and deciding on the basis of the whole picture without giving undue weight to one side against the other. Accuracy broadly means correctness and absence of mistakes. These principles are not defined terms. Therefore, standard dictionary definitions are usable in determining their meanings. They are all justiciable: even honesty, which is the closest any of them come to being subjective.</p> <p>Proponent prohibitions and restrictions Subsection 7(1) requires the proponent to avoid doing anything respecting the carrying out of the whole or any part of the project that “may” cause any (presumably negative - although a “strained meaning” is needed to make that assumption) change to any of the following components of the environment (as defined) or health social or economic conditions (definition of “effects”). These aspects are (a) fish, including inter alia shellfish, crustaceans, marine animals, and their eggs, sperm, spawn, larvae, spat and juvenile stages [8] or (b) water frequented by any such fish and any other areas on which such fish depend directly or indirectly to carry out their life processes, including spawning grounds and nursery, rearing, food supply and migration areas [9]; or aquatic species meaning a wildlife species that is such a “fish” or a marine plant, including all benthic and detached algae, marine flowering plants, brown algae, red algae, green algae and phytoplankton[10]. The word “may”, as used in subsection 7(1), invokes the notion of the expression of possibility, as a matter of ordinary English usage. So, if it is possible for any of the “effects” cited in subsection 7(1) to occur, the proponent is acting in breach of the subsection unless excused under subsection 7(3). There is no need for any “strained meaning” here. Furthermore, the reference to “or in part”, which is totally unnecessary unless it is to be given force of meaning (which is clearly intended), imposes a much heavier burden on the proponent than if only the whole activity were referenced. At its lowest level, subsection 7(1) speaks to prohibiting, prima facie, any “act or thing” in connection with carrying out any part of the project if it has any potential to cause any change to any one of the “effects” covered in paras. 7(1)(a) to (e). A Bennion “strained meaning” may be conceded to indicate that the change has to be negative or harmful as opposed to positive or beneficial. One has to wonder if there is any conceivable possibility that this potential will not be realized. Subsection 7(3), which enables the overriding of subsection 7(1), applies only in the later stages of the assessment process and therefore is not relevant to this early-stage analysis.</p> <p>Proponent’s initial description of project The proponent’s initial description of the project to be provided under subsection 10(1) will presumably be closely vetted by, and subject to the subsequent dictates of, the Agency. This is in a later stage of the assessment process and is therefore irrelevant to this analysis: as are subsequent sections dealing only with process.</p> <p>NOTATIONS [1] Francis Bennion: Almost certainly the world’s greatest ever expert, and certainly the most prodigious jurist, on the subjects of legislative drafting and interpretation (see website worldcat.org under his name); drafter of two Commonwealth Constitutions (Pakistan, 1957 and Ghana, 1962); founder of the Statute Law Society; etc.; also former employer, colleague and mentor of the writer.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>[2] 2nd edition, Section 246 "The preamble", p. 499. This work is now in its 6th edition. But I use the text of the only edition (2nd) I own and that is available to me.</p> <p>[3] Ibid Section 247 "The purpose clause", p. 501.</p> <p>[4] Oyez Publishing Limited 1980 at p. 40.</p> <p>[5] Statute Law (p. 86). The Preparation of Legislation: report of a committee appointed by the Lord President of the Council under the chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. Sir David Renton: 1975: UK.: para.11.8. Cmnd. 6053.</p> <p>[6] "Statutory Interpretation" Section 304 "Nature of purposive construction", p. 659.</p> <p>[6.1] RSC 1985, c I-21, subsection 32(2).</p> <p>[6.2] S.C. 1996, c.31, sections 7 and 8.</p> <p>[7] Bhasin v. Hrynew (Bhasin) [2014] 3 S.C.R. 494, although the case involved contract rather than public law.</p> <p>[8] Parts of the definition of "fish" in subsection 2(1) of the Fisheries Act R.S.C., 1985, c. F-14.</p> <p>[9] Definition of "fish habitat" in subsection 2(1) of the Fisheries Act.</p> <p>[10] Marine plant, as defined in section 47 of the Fisheries Act.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>Everybody in the neighbourhood is very much disappointed about this project and it would definitely have negative impact on mental health of individuals living in close proximity especially those residing in the Trophy complex.</p> <p>The project doesn't seem to be of outmost importance to Seaspan but at the same time it is very concerning to the people in the hood and basic social licensing principles indicate removal of the project would be in the best interest of both parties.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>barge to east side of present barge put somewhere else</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>Further comments on eastern and western waterlot project integration and TRANSPARENCY</p> <p>I spoke with _____ with the Vancouver port authority as he is the lead in this other project review. I was trying to understand just what the scope of the work was. What were they trying to achieve?</p> <p>So in a nutshell they are removing 3 mooring posts that were next to the pier. Currently those mooring posts are holding or supposed to hold the floating barge that the Attesa 4 is moored against. They will temporarily move the barge, pull out the 3 posts and then add 7 new ones along that eastern side of the pier. Again nothing is actually going to be attached to that pier.</p> <p>So why are they doing this? Your guess is as good as mine.</p> <p>PIER 94 NOTICE You can actually see the 3 large pilings that they will be removing The problem with this upgrade is that the Seaspan's eastern water lot only goes about another 47 METERS to the east of that pier. Not from the barge, but again from the pier. So they would basically only get one barge on that side before running out of water lot. It might squeeze in two (North to south) but not enough room to have them side by side.</p> <p>Adjoining Seaspan eastern water lot _____ indicates there is actually NO other water lot next to this Seaspan eastern water lot.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>The point is why go through all the trouble in adding the 7 new mooring posts when you only have room for ONE BARGE against that pier.</p> <p>So much for Seaspans argument that “they are creating more moorage there as a result of loss of moorage space in the Pemberton shipbuilding water lot”. (See the last paragraph in the public notice above.</p> <p>So here are my thoughts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They don’t want to have their mega yachts moored against that old floating barge. So by adding the 7 new posts they can modernize the floating replacement barge so that the mega yachts can moor on the entire eastern length of that pier. - They may even use it for other vessels that previously might have used the ship building area. Possibly tug boats. <p>And god forbid, they may even want one of those logging barges to move there. Not likely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - and yes maybe even the odd barge but that’s probably not before they have maximized the moored barges in the harbourside park area. At least 10 there today. <p>The speculation continues as Seaspan refuses to integrate and fully communicate their intentions. So why all the secrecy. WHAT HAPPENED TO FULL TRANSPARENCY.</p> <p>CURRENT EASTERN WATER LOT RESTRICTIONS ON THAT EASTERN SIDE OF THE PIER</p> <p>Again Seaspan can’t really do much in this eastern location due to the approx 47 meter water lot restriction to the east as previously mentioned. And they have not, as yet, requested an extension to that eastern water lot.</p> <p>Obviously now would not have been the time to ask for that extension. Better to try to go west first and see what happens which is exactly what Seaspan has done.</p> <p>So the mystery continues.</p> <p>And once again MY EASTERN DRYDOCK PROPOSAL</p> <p>I do like my eastern Drydock proposal as it also supports the pontoon type barge (that was contemplated by Seaspan on that west side) while at the same time meeting the objectives of both the pier 94 project and my version of the Drydocks going east. (See below)</p> <p>My version (note the pontoon pier now on the east side) Seaspan’s western expansion proposal for comparisons. I’ll take my version down.</p> <p>I have also previously commented on the importance of integrating both water lots in the Drydock expansion proposal. So again why would they then not have been fully transparent in integrating both adjoining water lot proposals into one. I trust you are aware of that OBVIOUS ANSWER.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>I again do look forward to your responses and trust that all my historical communication is put on record as it relates to the Drydock expansion public communication comments.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>Concern : Pile Driving Impact on Marine Life</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the impact derived from the pile driving during construction on Marine life</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the file:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Seaspan Vancouver Drydock Water Lot Expansion- HABITAT ASSESSMENT by Hatfield ("Hatfield report") * Construction Environmental Management Plan ("CEMP") <p>Findings:</p> <p>Section 4.3 indicates of the Hatfield report indicates that 23 fish were observed in the study area.</p> <p>Section 4.7 of the CEMP indicates that" Visual and hydrophone monitoring will be conducted during pile driving activities, as described in Section 8.1.2. If sound pressures exceeding DFO thresholds are measured, or distressed, injured, or dead fish are observed following the initiation of pile driving, work will be halted immediately and measures (i.e., bubble curtain) to reduce the sound pressure waves will be implemented before the work is resumed. The bubble curtain shall be deployed adjacent to the pile base as close as practical and shall be installed in a way that bubbles successfully encircle the entire pile to achieve maximum effectiveness. The exact style of bubble curtain will be contingent upon construction activities and localized site conditions (e.g., tides, current).</p> <p>I am attaching a report: "On the Impact of Underwater Pile-Driving Noise on Marine Life" ("Pile Driving report") by Svein Vagle from Ocean Science and Productivity Division Institute of Ocean Sciences DFO/Pacific. This report indicates "that minimal advantages to the use of a bubble screen" (section 4.3.4 (c)). Bubble screen need to be carefully designed (Page 34).</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <p>The Pile Driving report indicates that there is minimal advantages of using bubble screen. What other alternatives that are out there are more effective for containing the underwater pile driving noise than the bubble curtain?</p> <p>The CEMP report indicates that measures will be implement after the fact there is evidence of impact on fish after the initiation of pile driving work. The request is that this measures should be put in place and implemented before the pile-driving work starts. This should be a "preventive" action rather than post-fact.</p>

Date	Feedback
	Page 16 of Attachment - Accuracy of Web based Calculation Method: "ISO 9613-2 fails to imitate hard and porous ground excess attenuation due to interference."
30-Jul-21	<p>I have been a resident of North Vancouver for many years and thoroughly enjoy the Shipyard neighbourhood and what it offers to residents and tourists alike. I was shocked and saddened to learn very recently of the proposal captioned above. So many prime waterfront locations on the North shore these days are being altered for development, and the above proposal is no exception.</p> <p>My question, why can't these new drydocks be located to the east side of the pier? I believe it would make so much more sense and be far less intrusive for residents, restaurants, hotels, etc. in the adjacent and neighbouring areas.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>I am writing on behalf of Neptune Terminals to provide input regarding Seaspan's proposed drydock expansion project.</p> <p>As a member of the North Shore Waterfront Liaison Committee (NSWLC), I attended Kris Neely's presentation to the NSWLC on the proposed project. I found the information presented to be very thorough and the project design to be well-conceived in terms of minimizing impact on residents and businesses in the area.</p> <p>Although Neptune is not directly impacted by the dry docks expansion, we understand that Seaspan has had to turn away ships and work as a result of limitations on its existing facilities. In an urgent situation, a delay to repairing a ship due to lack of availability of the dry dock would have the potential to disrupt critical supply chains.</p> <p>Beyond this, we are supportive of initiatives like this that will have positive economic implications for the North Shore, BC and Canada. We also value Seaspan's role as an engaged member of the waterfront community. They partner with us as a founding sponsor of our longstanding charitable event, the North Shore Waterfront Gala, and are active and generous supporters of the United Way and many other smaller non-profits in their operating area.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>Concern : Correct Noise Model - Best Practice</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the correct model to be used for noise modeling as best practice. Consequently, the request is to engage an "INDEPENDENT" third party assessment to conduct an objective and unbiased analysis regarding the noise impact using more accurate models; specifically the CNOSSOS-EU mandated in Europe.</p> <p>As part of the application package, Seaspan provided the file: Vancouver Dry dock - Water Lot Project Environmental Noise Assessment by BKL Consultants (the "BKL report"):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix F of BKL report makes the following statement regarding the ISO 9613 (1996)-2 standard model used for the Noise Study: "The Good Practice Guide for Strategic Noise Mapping (EC WG-AEN 2007) points out that this standard is recommended by the European Commission (EC) as current best practice to obtain accurate prediction results..."

Date	Feedback
	<p>Findings</p> <p>* The EC WG-AEN 2007 is a "2007" Guide. Further methodologies have been done in Europe. Consequently, this statement is not accurate based on the following findings.</p> <p>* I am attaching two reports:</p> <p>1) Directive 2002/49/EC of The European Parliament and of the Council which states that the ISO 9613-2 is a recommended "INTERIM" computational method. It states (page 20- section 2.2)"For Member States that have no national computation methods or Member States that wish to change computation method, the following methods are recommended:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">* For INDUSTRIAL NOISE: ISO 9613-2:</p> <p>2) Common Noise Assessment Methods in Europe (CNOSSOS-EU) to be used by EU member states dated 2012. This methodology has an application for Industrial Noise Source Emission (Chapter V) and Propagation (Chapter VI). In 2009, the European Commission decided to develop CNOSSOS-EU (Common NOise aSSessment MethOdS) for noise mapping of road traffic, railway traffic, aircraft and industrial noise.</p> <p>Consequently, the statement indicated by BKL is not accurate and misleads the reader.</p> <p>Concern1: How will the Port of Vancouver make an independent judgment and assessment of the type of Noise model that should have been used? Will the Port of Vancouver have an independent consultant that advises on Best Practices and the implications and limitations of the ISO 9613-2 (1996) versus other models; specifically the CNOSSOS-EU which is the common methodological framework for strategic noise mapping...?"</p> <p>Concern2: I understand that BKL is Port of Vancouver's approved consultant. What parameters does Port of Vancouver have in place to monitor the pool of approved consultants so that the consultants update their methodologies to "Best Practices" on an ongoing basis. Canada can't fall behind what other countries are doing. It is the best for the environment.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>Concern : Alternative Siting Options - highest and best use of land (water)</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding alternative sitting options. For obvious reasons, the expansion to the West of the Caren is the most unfavorable to the community</p> <p>Findings:</p> <p>1) Seaspan stated on page 23 of the Supplemental Report : " NoGo Region 2: There is a strip of water lot on the east side of the Panamax measuring approximately 30 m in width, which is used on occasion to moor vessels against the Panamax. This region is not considered suitable for the new infrastructure for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The adjacent W-Building (immediately east of the VDC site) is a working shop creating blocks (major structural steel hull components) for shipbuilding. These blocks are loaded and off-loaded regularly thereby creating vessel traffic within that region. A

Date	Feedback
	<p>permanently moored drydock in that zone would lead to operational difficulties in an already constrained area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Access between land and a new drydock would be required and therefore additional marine structure would need to be provided from the shoreline. This structure would also get in the way of existing operations. o When the Panamax submerges to pick up its cargo, the adjacent drydock would need to be moved out of the way. o The new drydock would need its own pilings. The water in the area is shallow (< 5 m CD), so there is more potential to affect fish and fish habitat. Such pilings would also get in the way of traffic operations in the area. <p>This NoGo Region 2 is shown in figure attached (Figure 3 of Permit Application).</p> <p>2) Seaspan submitted an application regarding Pier94. This application shows a map of Pier94 as indicated on the Port of Vancouver website. This figure has a Dry Dock on the eastern side of the Panamax and in front of the W-Building. Exactly in the same location as the NoGo2 Region aforementioned.</p> <p>Concern: Why is Seaspan contradicting itself on both applications regarding the location of the Dry Dock? Evidently, a dry dock to the east of the Panamax is possible based on the figure provided by Seaspan. The statements provided in the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021 don't hold true any longer.</p> <p>Other than self assessment by Seaspan, what mechanism does Port of Vancouver have in place to make sure that the highest and best use of land (water) is applied when granting a permit to Vancouver DryDock</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>Concern : Cumulative Effects Concern</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seaspan Vancouver Drydock Water Lot Expansion - Mooring Piles at Pier 94 <p>What type of analysis and assessment will the Port of Vancouver undertake to evaluate the cumulative effects from both projects on Human Health as per the Guidance of Health Canada regarding Noise, Light, Air quality?</p> <p>Also what would be the combined effect of both projects on marine habitat and water?</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>*NB also attached is Health Canada Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessment: Air Quality* Concern : Air Quality Concerns</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations should be highlighted regarding the potential Air Quality concern. Consequently, the request is to work with Metro Vancouver in advance of granting any permits to the Drydock expansion project.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Findings 1: The requirement of the Port of Vancouver regarding Air Assessment is the following (page 13 of Supplemental report):</p> <p>Confirmation of air emission sources on site. While a full air assessment may not be required, please confirm what air emission sources are on site and whether a management plan to minimize emissions for existing drydock operations will be updated.</p> <p>Concern (a) : Seaspan answers: "VDC is working to develop a permit for the air emissions associated with the existing operations...". Seaspan doesn't respond to the explicit question if whether a management plan to minimize emissions for existing dry dock operations will be updated.</p> <p>Concern (b): Seaspan answers: "If the Water Lot Project is approved, the permit will be amended to include the new drydocks." Seaspan doesn't provide an alternative scenario if Metro Vancouver doesn't grant a permit and/or restrict Drydock operations in any capacity. If this occurs after Drydock project expansion is approved by Port of Vancouver and constructed then the process is inefficient from an environmental and resource allocation. Would the Port of Vancouver be in a position to ask Seaspan to remove the infrastructure, or will it be sitting there indefinitely?</p> <p>Concern (c): Has the Port of Vancouver received a detailed schedule of operations of activities that will be performed on the proposed DryDocks? Will more painting occur in the proposed Drydocks than in the existing ones? How can we quantify that? Given the closeness to the pier to the west owned by the City of North Vancouver which is always busy and occupied by pedestrians, cumulative and added effect constitute a risk to human health from air quality perspective. You can smell the toxics when walking on the pier if there is painting been done on the existing Drydocks. Has a cumulative effect assessment been done in this respect as per the attached Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impact in Environmental Assessment - Air Quality ?</p>
30-Jul-21	Why is Seaspan not proposing to extend to the east rather than west? Perhaps you should explain on the website/survey.
30-Jul-21	I live in the community immediately west of the Seaspan Drydock in lower Lonsdale. I ask that you please consider the citizens living in this great area and deny Seaspan approval to expand western into our living community. The noise from adding several additional dry docks will make the area unliveable. Please - it took me all my working life to arrive in this otherwise great location. Please don't allow it to be so severely compromised when eastward development alternatives exist. Thank you.
30-Jul-21	This proposal is against The City North Vancouver motive to create communities and activate spaces. This construction will potentially destory the North Van community.
30-Jul-21	Seaspan is not working with the community- their proposal is all in favour of the Company and reports of noise, pollution, adverse effects on the residents are hugely

Date	Feedback
	<p>minimized. This is unethical and the Port Authority needs to reject this proposal and ask Seaspan to work with the community for alternative solutions. Anyone can make a presentation with pictures look community favoured- let's not be fooled by Seaspan's bias.</p> <p>Why was Seaspan awarded the federal contract for building coast guard vessels if they did not have the facilities? If they are going to fulfill the contract by jeopardizing the quality of life for tax paying residents of the area, the contract should be rescinded.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>I have been reviewing the information for my submission and see information presented in the appendices on construction monitoring plan, habitat assessments, assessment of impacts of lighting, noise, and shade. Where is the appendix on the assessment of air quality impacts? I see brief mention of this in the overview document but where are the detailed studies that were used to determine potential impacts?</p> <p>Referencing: https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/status-of-permit-applications/seaspan-vancouver-drydock-water-lot-expansion/</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>We are owner in the Trophy _____ south facing with fantastic views overlooks Vancouver Harbour and the City with existing Shipyard facilities not obstructing views too significantly. Our purchase price was in excess of \$2M (in large part due to the view), but the proposed expansion of the Drydock to the West will have a serious impact on Views, Noise, and Air Quality which will all impact the desirability and ultimately will be reflected in the value. We purchased with the knowledge that there was the existing facilities, but wouldn't have done so if we were aware of the Drydock expansion plans. Apart from the views, at times we are unable to sit on our deck (or even have the patio door open) due to the noise. Again, we purchased with the knowledge that the existing repair facility would create noise, but extending it West will significantly increase the noise - further impacting the attractiveness of our condo and our ability/desire to remain at this location. I understand that the noise monitoring station is near Esplanade Street (over 250m from the source of the noise), however, our condo is less than half of that distance and if this project is approved the problem gets worst. Can Vancouver Fraser Port Authority agree to monitor noise levels nearer to the work sites to more accurately control this issue? Air quality and dust/dirt on our deck is an ongoing issue. With the proposed expansion of activity and it being nearer to our condo, this will become a bigger concern.</p> <p>We understand that the option to expand to the East is less desirable to SeaSpan as it would be more costly to SeaSpan, without due consideration to the financial impact to the condo owners (due to reduced value). We asked question during Community Information Meeting on July 15th, but SeaSpan didn't address the matter. Will SeaSpan compensate Condo Owners for the reduced property value due to the proposed Drydock Expansion? Finally, we note with interest that the area to the East is being used for "parking" of SeaSpan Owner's two yachts. To what degree does this "convenience" influence SeaSpan's Owners unwillingness to consider expanding to the East. We request that SeaSpan undertake a study to more thoroughly investigate the Eastern Option - rather than simply stating they prefer the West as East is difficult.</p>

Date	Feedback
30-Jul-21	<p>I am mostly concerned with the noise and air quality during construction (mentioned at 165dB) as well as from the work at the dry docks post construction (around 75dB). Hearing has detrimental effects around 85dB! There is no sound barrier and residents in the area will be greatly effected. Furthermore, recently testing is likely not an accurate assessment of how detrimental the air quality will be. I imagine it will only get worse! I understand lighting has been addressed but I am still concerned with the work being done late at night. Seaspan is often working beyond the 10:30pm shift. As a resident of Trophy, I'm also very concerned about the loss of property value from this projects implementation and potential impacts to the integrity of the building (with the 6 pile driving). It will destroy what is being built up as a community area with the Spirit Trail and playground out front. In turn, I'm concerned about the well-being of those children (even more sensitive to sounds) and families using the playground (what will their exposures be?!). A more comprehensive assessment of the VOC and particulate matter that residents and the community will be exposed to needs to be conducted and harm prevented as current studies are inadequate and not within the proximity of the actual site.</p> <p>I am dissatisfied with the lack of exploration to potential expansion to the east. I think Seaspan can look to leasing water to the East via rezoning by the Port Authority if necessary and create a more structurally sound Pier to accommodate the Dry dock expansion to the East.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>The Shipyards area has gone from a backlot to a vibrant, lively community space. This would be a disaster.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>I believe the extension of the existing shipyard to the west will impact the community with view and noise pollution. The air quality will deteriorate and the marine habitat disturbed. I strongly oppose the extension. The equilibrium established at the present moment is fragile and should not be disturbed.</p> <p>The city of North Vancouver has become a vibrant, visually pleasing place that people enjoy. I don't think an industrial project that create noise, air and view pollution has its place in this well established environment.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>We live at ____ Victory Ship Way of the Trophy condo building at the front - overlooking Burrard Inlet and Vancouver. The noise from the current drydock is very concerning and I believe it is far above the allowable threshold, however the monitoring site far away with many buildings and a hedge which dampen the noise and doesn't provide an accurate reading. I recorded a video from July 14th (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A2C8MYFEItQ) which might give you an idea of the concern. The proposed expansion will likely cause more noise and the reduce the times which we can use and enjoy or deck. I would like to see a permanent noise monitoring station be installed at the corner of the Spirit Trail (perhaps at/near the Shipyard Playground) to provide a more accurate measure of the noise level being experienced by residence of the Trophy and Cascade buildings. It sounds like the lighting might be resolved with new lighting, but the air quality (dust/dirt) is currently an issue and I expect it will get worst if the expansion proceeds.</p> <p>We were unsatisfied with the explanation which SeaSpan provided regarding why an expansion to the East wasn't viable and request that before any approvals are granted that SeaSpan be required to fully research the option of moving East before asking the</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>residence of the Shipyard District to accept their encroachment and severe impact on our quality of living and enjoyment plus the negative impact to local housing values. If the primary rationale is financial in nature, we would be seeking some sort of financial compensation from SeaSpan and/or Vancouver Port Authority to compensate existing owners/residence which are being impacted by this proposed change.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>I strongly object to the potential encroachment on the public enjoyment of the waterfront area immediately East of the public pier and West of the existing Seaspan facility at the foot of Lonsdale in North Vancouver. This would result from westward extension of the existing legal water access enjoyed by Seaspan. As a resident of Cascades East, ____ Victory Ship Way since December 2018, I also object as a private citizen who will be directly affected.</p> <p>Seaspan is currently the source of significant air and noise pollution but the levels are acceptable and have not increased to the extent they are objectionable to me and my wife at this point in time. I personally have witnessed paint and chemical smells, one occasion when rust appeared to be dumped untreated into the water and occasional loud industrial noise, but, to date, all at tolerable levels. Our unit faces West and is two units from the front of the building and thus somewhat sheltered from Seaspan activity. When we purchased our unit we did so in the full knowledge of the proximity to the Seaspan facility. I wish, however, at this time to register in the strongest terms my opposition to the significant increase in air and noise pollution and most important, the negative aesthetic impact of an industrial operation replacing the current beautiful view of the harbour and the city of Vancouver, which would result from the Vancouver Drydock proposed Water Lot Project. The City of North Vancouver City Planning has developed in collaboration with its partners, a beautiful vibrant community which owes its success in large measure to the beauty of the existent environment. The proposed venture, in addition to environmental and aesthetic concerns, would have an immediate serious negative impact on real estate values, and retail and tourism activities in the immediate and surrounding areas.</p> <p>I fully support the recommendation that any expansion to Seaspan's operations be added to the East side of its facility where the environmental, aesthetic and other impacts on the residential and business communities would be mitigated significantly.</p>
30-Jul-21	<p>I am writing on behalf of Neptune Terminals to provide input regarding Seaspan's proposed drydock expansion project.</p> <p>As a member of the North Shore Waterfront Liaison Committee (NSWLC), I attended Kris Neely's presentation to the NSWLC on the proposed project. I found the information presented to be very thorough and the project design to be well-conceived in terms of minimizing impact on residents and businesses in the area.</p> <p>Although Neptune is not directly impacted by the dry docks expansion, we understand that Seaspan has had to turn away ships and work as a result of limitations on its existing facilities. In an urgent situation, a delay to repairing a ship due to lack of availability of the dry dock would have the potential to disrupt critical supply chains.</p> <p>Beyond this, we are supportive of initiatives like this that will have positive economic implications for the North Shore, BC and Canada. We also value Seaspan's role as an</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>engaged member of the waterfront community. They partner with us as a founding sponsor of our longstanding charitable event, the North Shore Waterfront Gala, and are active and generous supporters of the United Way and many other smaller non-profits in their operating area.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>Noise and air/water quality are my biggest concerns. There have been several oil leaks visible from the Shipyards Pier, and while there is a reporting process in place, I have yet to ever see a clean-up response. This oil visible on the water may not always be from Seaspan operations, but increased industry and ship traffic certainly increases risk. Also, is the expansion viable long term once the Canadian Government contract is fulfilled and the Seaspan shipbuilding at the foot of Pemberton is available again for other work?</p> <p>The community seems opposed to a western expansion, but expanding east appears to be of less concern. I think Seaspan needs to explore the possibility of expanding to the east. The current proposal is singular and provides no options to the proposed design. Both the CNV and it's residents have built a vibrant community amenity directly west of the current operations. The CNV Shipyards was planned based on current Seaspan operations and will not coexist with an expanded dry dock very well. Seaspan needs to explain to the City and residents why expanding to the east of the current facilities isn't viable.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>Registering my opposition to this project This area has been zoned residential, I have paid in excess of \$1,000,000.00 for my condo unit. The view I have is superb. How will I be compensated for my loss of view? I won't be. Have Seaspan expand to the east instead, it won't affect anyone. It's beyond me why we cater to a Billionaire that doesn't care about his neighbours. Who wants a ship yard to expand in front of their home? Would you? No question you would not. My view will be ruined as well as a decrease in property value. A firm no. We can not sell out our pristine view. No reason that I can imagine that this can not be done to the east side of his property. The current shipyard district is successful, why ruin the concept? If multi million dollar condos were not already in place, perhaps that's different. They are and it isnt fair that this would even be considered. Do the right thing, strike the idea down. It's flawed and 500 people will suffer for the benefit of one. Have home go east I. Front of the empty Richardson property.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>I am sending this feedback to you by request from another concerned citizen about the impact this expansion will have on the local community. We appreciate the extension as we struggle as a group to get some answers to our questions and have our voices heard. It is literally unanimous amongst the community that I have either spoken to or read feedback from, that the community is very worried and concerned about this expansion to the East. [attached Word doc] This expansion project greatly concerns me, and I know many others on the North Shore. While I am not against economic growth and job creation, it should not come with such huge detriments to the local community. Immediately, what resonates, is why the need to expand West and not a single study on development to the East. To many people, the logistics looks bad and we see very large beautiful vessels belonging to the owner of SeaSpan to the East and wonder, why can't this expansion be moved there and put your beautiful vessels to the East so at least the community can look upon those while also limiting the increased particulate in that direction where there is much less residential buildings and access for expansion. We see nothing that was done to move this East and it is a huge concern. There is no</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>resistance to the expansion itself, but how and where it is done is of great importance. We feel that there is little care and concern on the community affects. Where are the studies done for noise, light and air that were done? There is already a huge particulate falling issue on many residences balconies not to mention the light and noise all night long. Increasing this to the West will only increase the frustration and anger. After millions of dollars have been invested by the City of North Vancouver to beautify our waterfront at the Shipyards area locals are finally able to enjoy it and are now coming outside after 1.5 years of Covid, only now to be hit with this expansion proposal and it is enraging to hear this and wonder, what is SeaSpan thinking? I personally have not run into a single person, who agrees with this expansion. For an owner who now brags how they have helped our community in various, this is a very strange move. In any case, SeaSpan should be supporting the local community. We all pay taxes as well and hope that planning and environment decisions are carefully done with people in mind, not just profits. If it costs more to build East, so be it. This company has obviously lots of funds to propose this project and the owner is very wealthy with his many mega yachts. To people of the North Shore, this is careless and inconsiderate. It does not sit well at all.</p> <p>The submission and consultation process seems very incomplete. Technical studies on air quality assessment were not provided to us. We would like to have this information. How will air quality be changed, what increase in contaminants are going to be released and in what form? What kind of monitoring will be done in the residential areas? These are questions even if expansion were to be proposed to the East!</p> <p>There is a very large and beautiful children's playground right in front of the proposed expansion. How the heck did SeaSpan miss that? Kids play on the equipment which will be covered with particulate during the overnight work. Then they put their hands in their mouths. Was this even talked about?</p> <p>In June, 7th to be precise, there was an oil spill believed to be by one of the tugs pushing in a ship to be worked on. How this spill was handled was very concerning. I say this, because it brings into question how SeaSpan dealt with issues affecting our environment. The oil spill protocols were not used. It seems, that the tugs swished the water around to disperse it. If the oil recovery methods were used, residents would have seen that. There were many witnesses to this event. Not only that, but red colored matter was spotted and was quite prevalent in the water going right to the shore with no one knowing what it was. If SeaSpan operates like this, their transparency is suspect and make us not trust future issues that arise.</p> <p>We have way too many concerns to be positive about this expansion and need/demand to be heard and our questions answered. Meetings thus far has been less then satisfactory. I have lived on the North Shore most of my life. I have never, ever, encountered this kind of blatant disregard to what we are as a community, trying to achieve at the Shipyards area. It is quite heartbreaking.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>We have only lived at Cascades East for two years and have enjoyed the vibrant community life here on the waterfront. It would be unfair of Seaspan to ruin this active area full of restaurants, water parks, entertainment with the addition of construction and demolition of ships. This would be noisy, dirty, ugly and impinge on the beauty of the waterfront. This will also lower the value of our new homes.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>I am a resident of Atrium at ____ Victory Ship Way, and none of the residents at our buildings were informed about the West side expansion of Seaspan. We already are suffering of industrial dust from sanding, noise, chemical smell, light pollution, and</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>there is no justification to this expansion to West side, towards the pier which many North Shore residents enjoy the walk, and the nice restaurant patios. The only reason behind not going to the East, is to make more money for the US Billionaire, owner of the Seaspan. There are talks among neighbors to arrange a few protests and block the road to the Shipyard parking at busy hours. PLEASE HELP US TO MOVE THIS EXPANSION TO EAST.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>I am neighbour of the shipyards. I live on the Trophy building and I am really concerned about the expansion. I want to express my opposition to the drydock project. I have thoroughly read the document and studies of the project. I am concerned about the increase of noise, it is already many times above 75 dBa during the day and evenings and the assessment states that sound will increase by an average of 3dB. This means that there will be even higher peaks of noise. The assessment states that a noise study was done on a day where there was no UHP, however the main operations of the proposed project are going to be UHP. The assessment can not taken as representative. During the informative sessions with the residents they said construction noises will get up to 200dB during pile driving. This number is beyond safe for people. Many lives of the residents in the area are going to get affected, businesses and wildlife. We can often see seals around the area the project is proposed to be built. So saying that wildlife won't get impacted doesn't seem realistic. Our patio furniture usually get dust and rests of paint sprays of the ships from the work that is being done in the shipyards, if Seaspan comes even closer and in front of our street on the spirit trail this damage will increase significantly.</p> <p>From our conversations with the neighbors , friends and family who usually enjoy walking around lower Lonsdale or sitting in our patio facing the water, we all want to show our opposition to the project which does not take on account the residents needs for a quiet neighbourhood and the civil right of enjoyment.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>Hello, Our family would like to shine a light on a project that Seaspan is attempting to push through quickly and quietly by the end of this month that will impact thousands of residents in the rezoned Shipyards area of lower Lonsdale. The first of two public consultations took place via zoom on Tuesday evening, with the second meeting to take place tomorrow - July 15, at 6pm (also via zoom). The residents and public attending these meetings are not given an opportunity to speak. Many of the questions asked in the conference chat were selectively answered or not addressed at all. The community's concerns were not directly addressed. Most in attendance voiced their objection (in the chat) to the lack of study and lack of impartial research done on the impacts this project will have on the neighborhood including construction, pile driving for months, increased noise, air quality, environmental impacts, and devaluation of everyone's real estate investment (not to mention quality of living). The weblink in the flyer Seaspan mailed to residents inviting them to public consultations was incorrect; and the July 7th article in the North Shore News states that the expansion will take place to the East; however, the project will be expanding to the West - impacting every resident in the shipyards development. The artistic renderings Seaspan presented to the group also understated the level of impact it will have on the area. I'd implore you to personally attend the consultation and see how this project will negatively affect thousands of North Shore residents who don't even know this is happening. The project webpage and meeting pages are here: https://drydockprojects.com/ https://drydockprojects.com/community-meetings/</p>

Date	Feedback
31-Jul-21	<p>Noise levels currently already exceed North Vancouver bylaws, and this expansion will exasperate the problem. The noise assessment was based on assumptions and not indicative of actual noise measurement at various residences in the community.</p> <p>This area was rezoned as a community. Woefully insufficient public consultation, notification, and engagement have occurred during this expansion proposal. Seaspan has failed to study the possibility of expanding east as everyone in this community has requested.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>Please ask our Council President ____ to inform all the owners of our building “The Premier” of the request by Seaspan Shipyards of the expansion to their Vancouver Dry Dock to the West in close proximity to our beloved North Van Pier. My wife and I are deeply upset about the invasion by private big business into the serenity of our retired life. The City of North Vancouver built this marvel of a “City within a City” and we hope that City Council will not let this happen!</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>Like all of our neighbours we are very concerned what negative impact adding two additional drydocks would have on the area of lower Lonsdale and the Shipyard district and playgrounds.</p> <p>Here are some questions:</p> <p>Was an air quality assessment done and provided to the affected community? How much will the emissions increase with two more dry-docks added? Is there any relevant monitoring for airborne pollution and noise near the children's play area? Who is monitoring the quality of the marine environment? Neighbours observed an oil spill June 7, which was just dispersed by two tugboats. Is this how our environment is protected? How often have the generally limited daytime hours between 7:00 am and 6:00 pm, been exceeded? What is the criteria to allow noisy work until later or even around the clock? When was permission given to switch to the much louder Ultra High Pressure (UHP) washing? Is there a graph showing historical noise d Bell vs. time for the immediate area of public spaces?</p> <p>Does the Port Authority have an example granting an expansion of an existing industrial operation to expand into a residential area?</p> <p>Is Environment Canada involved in this to see the environmental impact to marine life on this expansion? Is Environment Canada involved in this to see the environmental impact on the neighbourhood?</p> <p>Moving the planned addition to the east would significantly reduce the concern of everyone enjoying the wonderful Shipyard amenities.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>Was an air quality assessment done and provided to the affected community? How much will the emissions increase with two more dry-docks added? Is there any relevant monitoring for airborne pollution and noise near the children's</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>play area? Who is monitoring the quality of the marine environment? Neighbours observed an oil spill June 7, which was just dispersed by two tugboats. Is this how our environment is protected? How often have the generally limited daytime hours between 7:00 am and 6:00 pm, been exceeded? What is the criteria to allow noisy work until later or even around the clock? When was permission given to switch to the much louder Ultra High Pressure (UHP) washing? Is there a graph showing historical noise d Bell vs. time for the immediate area of public spaces?</p> <p>Does the Port Authority have an example granting an expansion of an existing industrial operation to expand into a residential area?</p> <p>Is Environment Canada involved in this to see the environmental impact to marine life on this expansion? Is Environment Canada involved in this to see the environmental impact on the neighbourhood?</p> <p>Moving the planned addition to the east would significantly reduce the concern of everyone enjoying the wonderful Shipyard amenities.</p>
31-Jul-21	Increased traffic and noise pollution. Blocking the views from the quay
31-Jul-21	<p>I'm sure by now you have heard of the proposed expansion of Seaspan shipyard operations, as reported in yesterday's North Shore News. As a resident in Lower Lonsdale I object to this proposal for several reasons. While the City of North Vancouver has promoted the redevelopment of the Lower Lonsdale area into a vibrant neighborhood, the idea of further expanded shipyard operations, which would be directly in front of newly built condominium developments would drastically affect the neighbors closest to the shipyard, through increased noise(which occurs day and night, by the way), pollution(dust, dirt & debris Staff from the City of North Vancouver have discussed preliminary information about the project with Seaspan over the past several months but have only recently received detailed project information and are in the process of reviewing that, according to _____, director of community and partner engagement for the city. The city anticipates providing comment to both Seaspan and the port prior to the July 30 deadline. constantly dirtying residents exterior living space, windows, outdoor furniture, etc.). Expansion of the shipyard would obstruct views of residents, some of which have paid a fortune for, not to mention reduced property values. I encourage the Mayor and Council to oppose this proposed shipyard expansion for the sake of hundreds of taxpaying citizens of this city. Hopefully many people won't move away from the area if this proposed expansion goes ahead, which would be a shame. Lower Lonsdale was once a rundown, neglected, crime filled area of North Vancouver: don't let it return that way in the future. We sold our house on the North Shore to downsize and live in this area, which we enjoy very much, and hope to stay here as long as we are able.</p>

Date	Feedback
31-Jul-21	<p>I enjoy coming to the newly developed Shipyard's District and frequent the outdoor patios and walk along the Burrard Pier many times a week. I know the city of NV has spent time and money in developing a beautiful and community-oriented space for families. With this, it's really surprising that you, Seaspan, can even consider proposing and infringing further into this space. What it shows is that Seaspan is completely out of touch with the community's needs, even though Seaspan has been part of the community for decades. The proposal to expand closer to the Pier is purely self-serving. It's selfish and doesn't benefit the community at large in any way. There is NO mention that the new jobs that will be created will be given to Canadians which is also disturbing. I know that with other projects Seaspan has done, foreign expertise was brought in to assist since we do not have people with those skill sets. I notice that the feedback forms that are being collected are being submitted directly from you to the Port Authority. That in itself is a biased method of submitting public input. The method in which this proposal has been submitted and handled has been very sneaky and strategic. The amount of time given for public input has been minimal, the error in the North Shore News stating that the project was moving east, the fact that the City of NV is in summer recess so public opinion could not be heard, the woman at the port going on holiday for two weeks just as your deadline for feedback was concluding etc etc etc. This behaviour is despicable and pathetic. The hydroblasting times are also an issue and with the expansion this will only get worse and louder. Right now Seaspan doesn't adhere to any timelines. Who polices that and who fines you when you continue blasting until 1:00 am? Nobody! I've personally seen the run-off turning the ocean in a murky brown or deep red color which indicates all kinds of pollutants are being dumped into the ocean where marine life exists. This happens weekly and yet the Port doesn't hold Seaspan accountable for this environmental abuse. More docks, more dumping, more toxicity, more pollutants, more damage. The tugs that come in and out with the barges and boats add more pollutants in the air. Some times, the bright lights on the tugs are lit the entire night so even though your proposal talks about LED lights, that's only on the dock, not on the boats, tugs and cranes that will be lit up so that's extremely misleading. The particulate dust is another major issue. The air quality is awful since you can see not only a yellow film of sulphur in the neighbourhood but a black film of dust from the Drydock. This naturally and obviously will increase and worsen. Donating funds to support the community and buying elected officials is no longer a way to be in business. Times are changing, people are seeing through lies and deceit. Transparency and truth is what's expected. Please raise the bar in how Seaspan is operating and you'll have the support of the entire community.</p> <p>Since this is a Category C project no air quality testing is required. There should be an AIR QUALITY assessment done by a 3rd party since there is a ton of particulate dust that comes from the current dry dock. It's baffling and highly suspicious that the PORT is looking the other way. What's also suspicious is that Seaspan has already accepted the contact for the Navy without having approval for the expansion. All of this information does not help Seaspan look favourable in the community's eyes. Finally, NO satisfactory information has been given as to why the expansion can't go eastward. The lame reasons that have been given don't hold water. But for this feedback, the proposed expansion going west will be the worst business move Seaspan could ever consider doing and the permanent distaste and lack of consideration will not be forgotten.</p>

Date	Feedback
31-Jul-21	<p>Seaspan plans to move the Careen Dry Dock 40 meters south to pacify residents, public and local businesses. This will do nothing to alleviate noise.</p> <p>It appears this will also create a larger boat basin for Seaspan. More Vessels and barges moving in and out, noise, pollution etc.</p> <p>This Shipyards District is very heavily used by North Shore residents and tourists. Our harbour is a working harbour and expanding east will allow this to continue and not affect this relatively small area enjoyed by the public and residents.</p> <p>I would also like clarification of the expansion distance to the west. I have seen 40 meters and 55 meters.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>I strongly object to the potential encroachment on the public enjoyment of the waterfront area immediately East of the public pier and West of the existing Seaspan facility at the foot of Lonsdale in North Vancouver. This would result from westward extension of the existing legal water access enjoyed by Seaspan. As a resident of Cascades East, ____ Victory Ship Way since December 2018, I also object as a private citizen who will be directly affected. Seaspan is currently the source of significant air and noise pollution but the levels are acceptable and have not increased to the extent they are objectionable to me and my wife at this point in time. I personally have witnessed paint and chemical smells, one occasion when rust appeared to be dumped untreated into the water and occasional loud industrial noise, but, to date, all at tolerable levels. Our unit faces West and is two units from the front of the building and thus somewhat sheltered from Seaspan activity. When we purchased our unit we did so in the full knowledge of the proximity to the Seaspan facility. I wish, however, at this time to register in the strongest terms my opposition to the significant increase in air and noise pollution and most important, the negative aesthetic impact of an industrial operation replacing the current beautiful view of the harbour and the city of Vancouver, which would result from the Vancouver Drydock proposed Water Lot Project. The City of North Vancouver City Planning has developed in collaboration with its partners, a beautiful vibrant community which owes its success in large measure to the beauty of the existent environment. The proposed venture, in addition to environmental and aesthetic concerns, would have an immediate serious negative impact on real estate values, and retail and tourism activities in the immediate and surrounding areas. I fully support the recommendation that any expansion to Seaspan's operations be added to the East side of its facility where the environmental, aesthetic and other impacts on the residential and business communities would be mitigated significantly.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>I am in favor of building this industry up. I have no concerns because Seaspan is the kind of company Canada needs.</p>
31-Jul-21	<p>Why don't you follow ____ 's detailed proposal to go east?</p> <p>" Let me take this opportunity to acknowledge Seaspan's significant economic and social contribution to our North Shore community. It goes without saying that it's a vital and essential component of the efficient and effective operation of our entire Vancouver port authority environment.</p> <p>In all the Seaspan information presented they deliberately failed to mention that they also had the Adjoining Water Lot Lease to the EAST that also incorporated the pier that everyone was also talking about. The port authority finally did provide the information."</p>

Date	Feedback
1-Aug-21	<p>Latest online info regarding Seaspan's Drydock Expansion Proposal.</p> <p>Now they are calling it a 'work ' pontoon but no mention of cranes in the description...</p> <p>Are the cranes going to move on the work pontoon from east to west?</p> <p>It says they have to now engage</p> <p>The port authority will conduct formal consultation activities with stakeholders and Indigenous groups as part of the permitting process.</p> <p>Have you actually contacting Indigenous groups?</p>
1-Aug-21	BC's ship building capacity and expertise.
1-Aug-21	<p>I am a supporter of the expansion plans. I have no financial or personal interest in whether the project gets the green light or not.</p> <p>The community has branded the area as the Shipyard District. Seaspan has by what I see, has always been a good neighbour. Part of what we enjoy when we visit that area, is the coexistence between Marine Industry and an entertainment district. The residential component came after everything else. Fun to watch.</p> <p>Our son and daughter in law were married at the south end of the refurbished main public dock, in 2008. Memory has me thinking that the residential developer contributed to that wharf restoration. Anybody who purchased in the onshore buildings were 100% aware of the drydock industry.</p> <p>Vancouver is a port. So many great jobs exists because of the commerce around the entire harbour. More ships being repaired in this facility is good for the overall community.</p>
1-Aug-21	Main concerns are the air quality which is spreading over all are furniture daily as we live in area; have to wipe find dust particles off all deck furniture daily and breathing this into our lungs especially the many young children visiting the small park every day and to increase this would be a tragedy
1-Aug-21	<p>I live on Upper Keith and Lonsdale and a LOT of my original views have been taken away by new apartments etc. I have friends who live on the water front and will lose what they have enjoyed so much recently and now it may be taken away. I have lived here for many years.</p> <p>I just hope the 'port authority' will make every effort to reconsider their plan.</p>
1-Aug-21	I support more employment. Hope you're not taking the work from the yard beside the 2nd narrows though.
1-Aug-21	<p>Some days a heavy ship oil exhaust smell hangs over the area, so my thoughts are towards the potential impact to the air quality with an increase in activities. But I'm sure that can be mitigated</p> <p>I support the expansion to help strengthen the local economy with jobs and revenue</p>

Date	Feedback
2-Aug-21	Hello, I am an owner on the ____ floor ____ Victory Ship Way (Atrium at the Pier) From the diagram I have seen it appears that the expansion will affect my site line between the two buildings in front of us. Please reply with the overall height of the project including cranes that will be on the docks or call me. Thank you.
2-Aug-21	<p>I have been requested by ____, a member of the Trophy at the Pier apartment building condominium Council, to send you the following, which I submitted to Seaspan this afternoon. This is especially for the attention of the following: Kate Grossman and Tim Blair.</p> <p>></p> <p>> I am a resident of the apartment building - Trophy at the Pier - that lies in immediate proximity to Seaspan's Vancouver Drydock's proposed water lot expansion project ("the project"). In general, I endorse, without reiterating them, the various criticisms that were made by my neighbours of the project in the online meetings held on July 15 and 17, 2021. But I would like additionally to emphasize a few points.</p> <p>> The location of the children's park, being the nearest point affected by the project other than, possibly, people enjoying the peace and serenity of a walk along the pier, is crucial. I doubt if there is a single soul, despite any claim made by "experts", who can truthfully and with certainty say that the health of at least some of the children who play there in all innocence will not be affected in the long term - potentially decades. My own grandchildren use the park to play occasionally. Likewise, I am in the habit of enjoying the pier regularly, as are many others. One just has to view the temporary population of the pier on almost any summer evening when the sun is out. Many I suspect, like myself, go to view the glorious settings of the sun in the evening.</p> <p>> A lot of dust settles in, and particularly on the balcony of, my apartment. It is fair to assume that much or almost all of it arises from the present operation at Vancouver Drydock's repair and maintenance site. The dust caused by the operation must be breathed in by inhabitants of the building. Presumably it is to be expected that this problem will be exacerbated by the increased closeness of the new drydocks.</p> <p>> Another aspect is the vibration from the present operation, which again may be so exacerbated. One day, a few weeks ago, I heard a rattling sound in my apartment. I had no idea at first what it was or whence it came. Then I determined that it was in my living room, but didn't know where. I gradually moved closer and closer to where the source of the noise seemed to be. This took me to my display cabinet in which I kept non-used crockery and such like. I opened the door of the cabinet, felt around the various items and then finally settled on a plate that was seated on its edge along the back wall of the cabinet. As soon as I barely touched the plate, the noise immediately stopped. Vibration had caused this (till then) non-ending rattling. I can think of no cause for the vibration other than the current drydock operation - whatever was then going on. How much worse could the vibration to the Trophy building be if the project is approved?</p> <p>> In the opening statement in its literature announcing the project, Vancouver Drydock refers to efficiently serving its "customers". But it says nothing about maintaining good relations with its neighbours - a claim that it conventionally boasts or projects in its publications (with some justification in times prior to the announcement of the project). In knowingly damaging the neighbourhood, that boast must now be seen as hollow.</p> <p>> This (Trophy) building is well named with its reference to the pier, as it offers the superb prospect of the pier and the stretch of water between the pier and the current ship repair and maintenance operation. Marine life prospers there - including seals occasionally. Bird life is abundant. Birds appear to like being close to the shoreline</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>rather than further out: where they might be pushed as a result of the project. If they could vote on it, there is little doubt where their votes would go. I take great pleasure in seeing the ships and smaller craft passing by. The project, placed in the proposed location, will seriously impair, if not destroy, the prospect viewed both from within, and from the balconies of, the Trophy (and no doubt the adjoining Cascade) apartments. Others have mentioned the increased noise element, and I will not elaborate on that.</p> <p>> My understanding is that the rationale for the project bears a direct relationship with Seaspan's shipbuilding operation at the Pemberton shipbuilding site. I have also been told that the need for the project infrastructure is temporary only, whereas the infrastructure itself will be permanent and will "outlive" every individual resident today in the Trophy building. (I withdraw that inclusion if that is not so.) I also understand that there are viable alternatives to the proposed location including, at minimum, the eastern (rather than the western) side of the present operation and parts of the inlet adjoining or close to the Pemberton site. These alternative areas are all heavily industrial. The relocation to any of them would injure no resident communities. It is unfathomable why Seaspan wants to do serious damage to a neighbouring community with whom it constantly boasts its good relationship. That boast must now be seen for what it's worth. It is difficult to imagine that the motivation for choosing the proposed location is other than greed, and putting yet more money in the hands of other corporations and individuals that benefit from the (Washington?) group structure. Of course I am unaware of the real reasons why this location has been chosen to the exclusion of the other potential locations. If one reason is to consolidate all the Seaspan operations into two stand-alone locations, being shipbuilding on the one hand and maintenance and repair on the other, then, that is entirely an internal decision of the Seaspan group itself – for its own convenience. This self-serving decision needs to be weighed against the interests of whole communities, including the vast population of non-resident visitors who merely wish to enjoy the wonderful attractions that the new Shipyards site has to offer. And this too includes the hordes of children of all ages who use the waterpark cum skating rink area, all year through. The serious impact the decision would have on the neighbourhood surely outweighs the narrow interest of the behemoth. Is it because the planned location involves less expense? If so, I would suggest that this is an insufficient reason for destroying the claimed good relations with Vancouver Drydock's immediate neighbours. And, if financial considerations are at play, then, an equally cogent consideration is the considerable deterioration in the value of the neighbouring apartments that will be occasioned by the project.</p> <p>> It should be noted, in reading the Appendix, that each reference in the Appendix to "environment" in particular but also to any other term that is defined in the applicable legislation (including subordinate legislation) or failing that the Interpretation Act (if applicable) is to be treated as taking its meaning from the relevant definition, whether mention of that treatment is stated or not (and many instances are).</p> <p>> If it does become a question of health effects in future years, and assuming that the causation factor becomes provable, then the whole question of tort liability could arise, subject to any exculpation provisions provided for in legislation or by common law. This would be potentially on a personal and at a corporate level, and could involve the federal Crown, each decision-making entity, Vancouver Drydock, its parent(s), other corporations in the group, their owners and, potentially, other individuals who act behind the corporate veils. Note also, in addition to the potential civil liability, that the Impact Assessment Act speaks to the liabilities of senior officers of corporate bodies on</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>a criminal or quasi-criminal basis. And the judiciary does not always take exculpation provisions or due diligence defences at their face value, preferring, on occasion, to render justice rather than (at least literal) law. So, the exculpation clauses in particular could well transpire to be found illusory. Sections 147 and 148 of the Impact Assessment Act have relevance in this context and there is an abundance of common law on the liabilities of related individuals and corporations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The great Romantic poet, John Keats, wrote in Endymion: > A thing of beauty is a joy forever; > Its loveliness increases; it will never > Pass into nothingness; > That was how I thought of the view from my apartment. Unfortunately, had Keats lived here and now, it would appear that he would have to amend his beautiful poem to make a major qualification to his poetic musing: to take into account what major industrial behemoths, like Seaspan, do to "things of beauty". > Finally, I would like to add some comments about my interpretation of how the Impact Assessment Act ("the Act") provides for the various rights and obligations of the proponent (as defined therein) and the deciding authorities in the initial stages (and only the initial stages) of the impact assessment process. These comments are set out in the Appendix below. Further commentary on the later stages may or may not be forthcoming at the appropriate times. The approach taken is that of a (now former) legislative drafter, working in the tradition of the great Francis Bennion[1]. Interpretation of legislation is the other side of the legislative drafting coin. The art of legislative drafting entails almost word by word interpretation or construction of the words currently being, and that already have been, written in the drafting process. This work is limited to resources that are generally available to anyone. I have no access to any of the sophisticated legal resources available to law firms, not even to a law library. Also the work is completely unfunded and is limited to an examination of the legislation. There is neither time nor the facility for examining potentially relevant common law. So anything I say stands to be potentially limited or restricted by any judicial decisions pointing to a different construction. All legislation cited is federal jurisdiction based. Notations related to the text appear at the end of the Appendix. And I apologize for the less than good standard of my inputting. > . > APPENDIX > Preamble and purpose clauses > The Act contains both a Preamble and a purpose clause. The purpose of having both escapes me. As stated by F.A.R. Bennion[1] in Statutory Interpretation[2]: "The preamble states the reason for passing the Act. It may include a recital of the mischief to which the Act is directed. When present, it is thus a useful guide to the legislative intention." And[3], "A purpose clause is an express statement of the legislative intention Instead of a preamble, an Act may contain one or more purpose clauses in the body of it." Bennion also says in his book Statute Law[4], "the preamble may be resorted to for interpretation, though it cannot contradict the plain words of a section" He also quoted[5] Renton with obvious approval[5]: "Purpose clauses The Renton Committee found that 'statements of purpose can be useful, both at the Parliamentary stage and thereafter, for the better understanding of the legislative intention and for the resolution of doubts and ambiguities.' The preamble once served this purpose." This is the only statute I know of that contains both a preamble and a general purpose clause.

Date	Feedback
	<p>An analysis of the various recitals of the Preamble and of the provisions of the purpose clause (section 6), and any linkage between them, whether consistent or inconsistent, therefore serve as a valuable guide to the legislative intent underlying the statute and, a fortiori, its regulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Interpretation Approach > The question arises: what line of approach should any interpreter take in construing the masses of legislation involved in the impact assessment process? In a highly generalized way, interpreters are given the answer to the question by statute. They are bound, in general, to apply the Interpretation Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. I-21) and, more particularly, section 12. This provides that each legislative provision construed is to be regarded as “remedial” (curing what Bennion and earlier jurists call the “mischief” in the previous law) and is to be “given such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as best ensures the attainment of its objects”. This purposive approach, as opposed to the literalist one, is strongly recommended as the better way to go. Generally, the judiciary at least pay lip service to that approach as being the more legally correct mode, although in any given case the approach they actually take may be in an entirely different direction in order to achieve the result they desire. As seen immediately below (if my analysis is correct), an “and” must be read as an “or” to make the project even feasible. And I suggest that this be done. As Bennion says[6]: > “A purposive construction of an enactment is one which gives effect to the legislative purpose by – > (a) following literal meaning of the enactment where that meaning is in accordance with legislative purpose, or > (b) applying a strained meaning where the literal meaning is not in accordance with the legislative purpose” > A “strained meaning” should be applied here, to the proponent’s benefit. > Designated Project > It is assumed that the project proposed by Seaspan’s Vancouver Drydock (“the proponent”) is a “designated project” falling within the statutory definition. I assume that it is “one or more physical activities that (a) are carried out in Canada and on federal lands”[6.1] (ie. in both, although either suffices). Both the “federal lands” definition in the Act and the definition of “Canada” in the Interpretation Act(subsection 35(1)) include, at minimum, the territorial sea and the internal waters of Canada. The definitions of both “territorial sea” and “internal waters” defer to the Oceans Act[6.2]. And the Oceans Act provides that both of these form part of Canada and that the seabed and subsoil beneath them belong to the federal Crown. Para.(b) provides for regulations or a (not necessarily regulation) order. There are no regulations that I see that could even potentially cover the project and I know of no such order. But it is assumed that no further regulation or order is needed under para. (b) of the definition of “designated project” to include the project. This despite the use of the cumulative “and” at the end of para. (a). It seems to me that the cumulative does not work in the context of the project and that the project might be a non-starter if literally construed. A literal construction would scupper the project. (But I make no such claim since any reasonable court would surely apply the purposive approach.) It seems that it should read the alternative “or”. > Furthermore, the definition of “designated project” also includes physical activities that are incidental to the primary one. In certain contexts, if approval is given, this portion of the definition could have major implications and decision-making authorities

Date	Feedback
	<p>need to be aware of this potential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Sustainability > Both the Preamble (first recital) and the general purpose clause of the Act (para. 6(1)(a)) cite as an object of the legislation the fostering of sustainability - that is (by definition – section 2) the fostering of “the ability to protect the environment (as defined, infra), contribute to the social and economic well-being of the people of Canada and preserve their health in a manner that benefits present and future generations”. The reference to “the ability” to do these things presupposes that the making of all decisions by the authorities needs to reflect well into the future as to their potential effects – what will result from each decision, what could or could not result, what possibilities and likelihoods (or lack of them) there are and other similar considerations. It also invokes the potential or lack of potential for future protective actions going well beyond the completion of the designated project. The ability to protect, contribute and preserve should be seen as continuing potentially for decades and even “generations”. If, for example, a designated project were actually to destroy “the environment” which, by definition, includes any specific “component” of the Earth or aspects of it specifically mentioned in the definition, then the “ability” to secure the continued protection, contribute to social and economic well-being and preserve health would be lost forever immediately the project were completed. The authorities are legislatively committed, at minimum, to ensure that all aspects of the designated project are subjectively calculated towards ensuring that the protections, contributions and preservations referred to in the definition are permanent. Also, the proponent maintains that the project is consistent with its lease. This may or may not be so. But, if it is, then the lease would have been entered into at a time when everything mentioned in the sustainability definition would have been of little or no consequence. Times have changed. And in any case, as a general principle, contract must entirely defer to applicable legislation, unless the legislation itself reverses that deference. > > Public participation > The third recital of the Preamble refers to public participation “in the impact assessment process, including the planning phase”. It is clear that the planning phase is only a part, one phase, of the overall impact assessment process. Those “inclusive” words mean that the required public participation is not limited to the planning phase, but applies throughout the assessment process. Emphasis is put on this continuing requirement. Otherwise, only the planning phase would need mentioning. So, public participation should be allowed well beyond the planning phase. Para. 6(1)(h) supports this. This is despite the timing restriction placed under section 11, which provision applies only to the “planning phase” of the overall process. > > Access to reasons for decisions > Referring to the fourth recital in the Preamble, the reasons given by the authorities for decisions must, by inference, have substance, be complete and genuinely inform about the true rationale of the decision. The authorities lack the general power that the judiciary has to eschew reasons or to render them minimal. > > Innovative approaches and innovation > With respect to the fifth recital of the Preamble, the “innovative approaches and technologies” would include examination of all the alternative sites available to the

Date	Feedback
	<p>proponent. Or, equally, they might be the project itself and all its component parts. But the project, located where it is proposed but not if located elsewhere, can hardly be claimed to be designed to “reduce adverse changes to the environment (as so defined – supra) and to health, social or economic conditions”. Rather, the project is calculated to increase considerably all these adverse changes. Para.6(1)(b.1) also cites as an object of the legislation the encouragement of innovation, which term would imply the inclusion of innovative approaches and, if necessary, innovative technologies that could render any alternative location viable. The application of the legally required principles set out in section 6(3) would be key in the enforcement of this provision.</p> <p>> Fundamental protection</p> <p>> Para. 6(1)(b) cites as an object the protection of the components of the environment (as defined). That is, the protection of the components (of the components) of the Earth, specifically including (a) land, water and air (sub-including all layers of the atmosphere), (b) all organic and inorganic matter and living organisms and (c) the interacting natural systems that include components referred to immediately above in (a) and (b). Also to be protected are health, social and economic conditions from adverse “effects” potentially resulting from the project. Those “effects” are, by definition, changes to the environment (as defined) or health ,social or economic conditions. Not only those but, further down the line, the consequences, whether positive or negative, of those changes. So there has to be protection from such adverse changes. Also, it is to be noted that this definition (environment) is of the non-exhaustive type. It is only a partial definition. Whatever would normally be regarded as “environment” and that is outside the wording of the definition is also to be regarded as within the definition. Here, standard dictionaries come into play.</p> <p>></p> <p>> The “environment” definition includes all organic matter and living organisms. People fall within both. They are not excluded. So people are part of the definition of environment, and any rule or definition within the legislation - principle or subordinate - that refers to “environment” should be treated as including people. And that applies regardless of whether the people are on federal or provincial/territorial lands except where a specific statement to the opposite effect exists. Federal legislation applies, on a jurisdictional basis, to everyone affected by the federal activity that is controlled by the federal legislation. Ie., the people at any time present in the apartment blocks, the pier, the Shipyards and other areas close to the project are to be protected in accordance with this legislation. Also, any interaction between any such people on the one hand and land, water, air, the atmosphere or any other living organisms on the other, these all fall within the definition. The definition also includes inorganic matter, such as the pier and buildings, including the apartment blocks along the proximate shoreline .</p> <p>> “Effects”</p> <p>> Para.6(1)(c) deals with the responsibility of the authorities to ensure that the assessment process takes into account all the both positive and negative changes to the environment (as defined) or to health, social or economic conditions and the positive and negative consequences of those changes that may be caused by the carrying out of the project (see the definition of “effects”). Subsection 7(1) sets out “effects” or results that the proponent must avoid in the carrying out of the project. (See “prohibitions and restrictions below.) It should also be noted that what an impact assessment is, by</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>definition, is an assessment of the “effects’ (as so defined) of the project – being those changes.</p> <p>></p> <p>> Community knowledge</p> <p>> Para.6(1)(j) reflects the authorities’ requirement to take into account community knowledge. That would include relevant and informed comments made by the public in all the public participation sessions, regardless of at what stage the assessment process is. See the comments under “Public participation” (supra). It would also include any input submitted by relevant jurisdictions such as any adjoining or proximate municipality, elected politicians and so forth. This, of course, (as for all submissions), whether the input is pro or anti the project.</p> <p>> Alternative means</p> <p>> Para.6(1)(k) envisages the taking into account in the assessment of alternative means of carrying out the project, including through the use of the best available technologies. The alternative means would include alternative locations for placing the project, including those mentioned by the public. This would include east of the present maintenance and repair operation and at or close to the Pemberton site where the shipbuilding is carried out. There may be other places. Submissions by others on this topic will be more informed than this Appendix can be. Alternative technologies could include, for example, deeper level support pilings equipment and such like that could enable placing the new drydocks in alternative locations, perhaps in deeper waters, away from residential areas.</p> <p>> Powers and principles</p> <p>> Subsection 6(3) enjoins the federal Crown, the Minister of the Environment, the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada and “federal authorities” (as defined) to exercise their powers in a manner that adheres to the principles of scientific integrity, honesty, objectivity, thoroughness and accuracy. For the purposes of subsection 6(3), the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is assumed to be a “federal authority” by virtue of para. (d) of the definition of “federal authority” and item 1 of Schedule 1, an analysis of which would require significant research into whatever documentation there is that underlies subsection 2(1) of the Canada Marine Act. That is an exercise too large for this work. Thus, that port authority is assumed to be subject to subsection 6(3). This subsection does not bind the proponent. These concepts are chosen with care and are not mutually exclusive. Scientific integrity presumably would include at least a thorough analysis of every conceivable alternative location for the drydock extensions. With respect to scientific integrity, the Office of the federal Chief Science Advisor has put out a “Model Policy on Scientific Integrity” (in the website ic.gc.ca<http://ic.gc.ca/>) which contains, at item 6, the “Scientific integrity principles”. This is a lengthy document and will not be reproduced here. But, presumably, all the entities mentioned are aware of the document and will treat it as, perhaps, quasi-law. Honesty probably invokes the duty of good faith as an organizing principle[7]. Objectivity (if attainable in pure form) probably includes such principles as impartiality, neutrality, honesty, lack of bias and prejudgment and seeing and giving due attention to the positions of each side. Thoroughness includes the quality of completeness, and probably seeing and deciding on the basis of the whole picture without giving undue weight to one side against the other. Accuracy broadly means correctness and absence of mistakes. These principles</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>are not defined terms. Therefore, standard dictionary definitions are usable in determining their meanings. They are all justiciable: even honesty, which is the closest any of them come to being subjective.</p> <p>> Proponent prohibitions and restrictions</p> <p>> Subsection 7(1) requires the proponent to avoid doing anything respecting the carrying out of the whole or any part of the project that “may” cause any (presumably negative - although a “strained meaning” is needed to make that assumption) change to any of the following components of the environment (as defined) or health social or economic conditions (definition of “effects”). These aspects are (a) fish, including inter alia shellfish, crustaceans, marine animals, and their eggs, sperm, spawn, larvae, spat and juvenile stages [8] or (b) water frequented by any such fish and any other areas on which such fish depend directly or indirectly to carry out their life processes, including spawning grounds and nursery, rearing, food supply and migration areas [9]; or aquatic species meaning a wildlife species that is such a “fish” or a marine plant, including all benthic and detached algae, marine flowering plants, brown algae, red algae, green algae and phytoplankton[10]. The word “may”, as used in subsection 7(1), invokes the notion of the expression of possibility, as a matter of ordinary English usage. So, if it is possible for any of the “effects” cited in subsection 7(1) to occur, the proponent is acting in breach of the subsection unless excused under subsection 7(3). There is no need for any “strained meaning” here. Furthermore, the reference to “or in part”, which is totally unnecessary unless it is to be given force of meaning (which is clearly intended), imposes a much heavier burden on the proponent than if only the whole activity were referenced. At its lowest level, subsection 7(1) speaks to prohibiting, prima facie, any “act or thing” in connection with carrying out any part of the project if it has any potential to cause any change to any one of the “effects” covered in paras. 7(1)(a) to (e). A Bennion “strained meaning” may be conceded to indicate that the change has to be negative or harmful as opposed to positive or beneficial. One has to wonder if there is any conceivable possibility that this potential will not be realized.</p> <p>> Subsection 7(3), which enables the overriding of subsection 7(1), applies only in the later stages of the assessment process and therefore is not relevant to this early-stage analysis.</p> <p>> Proponent’s initial description of project</p> <p>> The proponent’s initial description of the project to be provided under subsection 10(1) will presumably be closely vetted by, and subject to the subsequent dictates of, the Agency. This is in a later stage of the assessment process and is therefore irrelevant to this analysis: as are subsequent sections dealing only with process.</p> <p>> NOTATIONS</p> <p>> [1] Francis Bennion: Almost certainly the world’s greatest ever expert, and certainly the most prodigious jurist, on the subjects of legislative drafting and interpretation (see website worldcat.org<http://worldcat.org/> under his name); drafter of two Commonwealth Constitutions (Pakistan,1957 and Ghana, 1962); founder of the Statute Law Society; etc.; also former employer, colleague and mentor of the writer.</p> <p>> [2] 2nd edition, Section 246 “The preamble”, p. 499. This work is now in its 6th edition. But I use the text of the only edition (2nd) I own and that is available to me.</p> <p>> [3] Ibid Section 247 “The purpose clause”, p. 501.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > [4] Oyez Publishing Limited 1980 at p. 40. > [5] Statute Law (p. 86). The Preparation of Legislation: report of a committee appointed by the Lord President of the Council under the chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. Sir David Renton: 1975: UK.: para.11.8. Cmnd. 6053. > [6] "Statutory Interpretation" Section 304 "Nature of purposive construction", p. 659. > [6.1] RSC 1985, c I-21, subsection 32(2). > [6.2] S.C. 1996, c.31, sections 7 and 8. > [7] Bhasin v. Hrynew (Bhasin) [2014] 3 S.C.R. 494, although the case involved contract rather than public law. > [8] Parts of the definition of "fish" in subsection 2(1) of the Fisheries Act R.S.C., 1985, c. F-14. > [9] Definition of "fish habitat" in subsection 2(1) of the Fisheries Act. > [10] Marine plant, as defined in section 47<https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/laws/stat/sc-2002-c-29/latest/sc-2002-c-29.html#sec47_smooth> of the Fisheries Act.
2-Aug-21	Noise and air quality as well as the impact on a very well used public space. Why can't you develop on the east side of the current site?
2-Aug-21	I can't believe you are putting those big blue monstrosity at the bottom of Lonsdale shipyards area where all the community comes to enjoy the outdoor life of North Van . I would eve. More upset if I lived right at the pier ... Is this a blantant obnoxious use of power and or perhaps greed as it appears ...by city officials with no concern for residents of the North Shore. How did this happen?? Please Consider moving these obstructions eastward if needed past the condominiums so that we the people can enjoy this area without destruction of the view .
2-Aug-21	I can't believe you are putting those big blue monstrosity at the bottom of Lonsdale shipyards area where all the community comes to enjoy the outdoor life of North Van . I would eve. More upset if I lived right at the pier ... Is this a blantant obnoxious use of power and or perhaps greed as it appears ...by city officials with no concern for residents of the North Shore. How did this happen?? Please Consider moving these obstructions eastward if needed past the condominiums so that we the people can enjoy this area without destruction of the view . Concerned North Vancouver city citizen
2-Aug-21	<p>Attached are our concerns related to the proposal from Seaspan.</p> <p>We are long-time North Shore residents and want this particular unique area preserved for future generations. We are clearly not alone in that view. The Port Authority needs to look at areas like this to preserve them and not simply as a way to generate income. Seaspan has other options that can still produce the same financial results if they simply looked at it in a way that is best for the community and not taking the "simple" approach.</p> <p>To be clear, like many residents in the area, we are not opposed to an expansion of Seaspan. We are opposed to a one and only one approach suggesting they were never asked to present other options. Go EAST and you likely have little objection from the community!!</p> <p>PS: We were on the call for both community zoom meetings as well as the limited meeting on July 28th.</p> <p>Attached Letter [Note: Letter included photos]</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>It was very clear from the July 28th zoom call hosted by Seaspan and the Port Authority that Seaspan is not willing to consider realigning/reallocation or even reorganizing any of their existing operation to accommodate the two new drydocks. Their comment that the space in the area for Pier 94/96 was both “occupied and fully utilized” is disingenuous as the area has had a number of Mr. Washington’s private yachts (St Eval, Tess, Attesa and Attesa IV) moored in the area. Seaspan has also moored a private boathouse in this area. Beyond just Mr. Washington’s private yachts another private yacht KOGO was moored there until it was mentioned in a recent public zoom meeting. Shortly after that meeting it was moved to the private yacht space beside the Quay.</p> <p>Their version of “Fully Utilized”!! [Photo] Their version of “Occupied” [Photo] Proposed Option to go east that has so far been ignored. [Photo]</p> <p>With or without any of these yachts in the East water lease area there is sufficient space for the two drydocks to be placed. The drydocks could be moored alongside a long pier in that area that clearly can accommodate sufficient equipment to provide proposed services. Seaspan failed to bring forward the fact that they had already applied for permits for changes to pier 94, yet they have not disclosed what the intended use is for that area.</p> <p>Another example of their comment of the “Occupied and Utilized” East side. The white structure in the background is the private boathouse used by Mr Washington. There is clearly space to put the drydocks in this area or to be moving other structures into this location to free up other space east. This is the area (Pier 94 or 96) where Seaspan has recently asked the Port Authority to install additional pilings. [Photo]</p> <p>The comments from the Port Authority that they have no interest in whether or not an applicant with existing water leases is fully or efficiently utilizing the valuable space they have is of significant concern to the residents in the area. The Port Authority is supposed to be managing the area with consideration of the best interests of the community. It was even acknowledged by the Port Authority on the call how unusual it is to deal with industrial activity in what has now become a residential area.</p> <p>As one resident pointed out, the area has a historical reference to shipbuilding in the area but that was 70 years ago. That function is now taking place in the North Harbour as part of the contract Seaspan received from the Canadian Government. We are left with repairs and maintenance of existing ships in this area. Those functions have specific environmental issues, as mentioned at the end of the call when Seaspan had to answer why there was a spill and how it appeared that they were trying to “hide” the spill using the wash from three Seaspan tugs before the Port Authority arrived.</p> <p>The reports from experts supporting this proposal have some noted flaws or bias in their reports. The fact that a noise analysis was done from a single unit that just happened to be occupied by a Seaspan employee in a nearby condo, without approval from that strata, is clearly not an unbiased review. Adding to that, it was only done in</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>one location, during COVID, at a time known to Seaspan, for a very limited period does not support the conclusions made.</p> <p>The very fact that the proposed drydocks and the latest mooring of a very large barge in close proximity to a playground should be of concern to everyone and a further reason that this proposal should go East [Photo]</p> <p>Oil spill arriving on the beach area that was questioned at the last Zoom meeting. Clearly it was not contained as it arrived on the beach area that residents and their children use. [Photo]</p> <p>The Seaspan representative is somehow claiming a viable business use for the “log” barges (photo below) that are usually moored in North Harbour. We are not aware that Seaspan is in the log hauling business and question the true reason why these barges are being kept. Those large barges are approximately 30M x 135M meaning two of the three of these non-revenue creating, rusting environmental hazards are taking up the space needed for the proposed drydocks. It is unacceptable that Seaspan is still proposing an expansion to their water lease and the Port Authority is looking into this when there are many other logical options to consider. If Seaspan is actually intending to somehow miraculously rebuild or repurpose these rusting barges they should indicate that. To do that also supports that these structures are not intended to be long-term “residents” of the area and therefore further support that they have sufficient space if they were to efficiently use it.</p> <p>The City may also recall the damage that the one on the east side did to the pier when it was not properly secured! [Photo]</p> <p>The Port Authority has made a recent decision to limit industrial activity in this general area when they approved the changes for Kings Mill to not allow industrial activity in front of the Automall. This confirms that the Port Authority is prepared to support environmental protection over industrial expansion. Are the stakeholders in the Kings Mill development aware that Seaspan is storing these rusting vessels under 200M away and what the long-term environmental impacts could be?</p> <p>https://www.portvancouver.com/permitting-and-reviews/per/project-and-environment-review-applicant/status-of-permit-applications/kings-mill-park-shoreline-and-habitat-work/</p> <p>No one is suggesting that Seaspan should not be allowed to bring in these drydocks but we are suggesting that any changes in this very sensitive area needs to be made to minimize the impacts it will have. Seaspan is making a very simple business decision believing that the Port Authority will approve the proposal without questioning why other options were not presented.</p> <p>If the Port Authority is not willing to challenge how Seaspan is using their existing leases, how can the community at large trust any decision being made has truly assessed the impacts a proposal will have on them?</p> <p>This proposal needs to be rejected, and the City of North Vancouver should approach the Port Authority to secure any and all water leases that could allow for industrial activity in this very sensitive area. The Port Authority has a perfect example from what</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>took place at the Vancouver Convention Centre where an environmental decision was made to improve the marine habitat in the area. A decision that was well received by everyone</p> <p>https://www.vancouverconventioncentre.com/about-us/sustainability</p> <p>We represent the words of a few but the voices of many.</p>
3-Aug-21	<p>This letter is in support against the expansion of the Seaspan dry dock. My main concerns are the marine habitat, views, and noise.</p> <p>Seaspan occupies enough of the Port of Vancouver and this expansion west is unnecessary.</p>
3-Aug-21	<p>Why put this expansion on the Shipyards/Quay side of the current dry docks? Have you thought about putting it on the other side?</p> <p>I just went for a walk down there and thought of this while I was there. Please put it on the the other (East) side.</p>
3-Aug-21	<p>I am a resident of The Squamish Nation's Mosquito Creek Marina, and live in a float home & long time City of North Van resident. I appreciate the water quality, marine wild/life & air quality living in a busy harbour. I appreciated the well thought out plan for future expansion, considerations for wildlife disruption such construction & ongoing work will have on marine life, and your change to use hydro blasting to remove paint/rust etc from vessels instead, reducing toxic waste & dust & all waste water treated before release. The new dark sky lighting will be a vast improvement & is very innovative & considerate. Someone mentioned the idea of native art on the dry dock(s) and I think it is a great idea! Visually appealing and a nod to the various Nations. I can put you in touch with a few artists here & have Squamish Nation resident contact that knows various artists :) _____ designed and carved the Spirit Trail Archway here in Mosquito Creek "The Gateway to Wisdom." I think the project has been well thought out, explained in great detail the impact of the project and supported with visuals. I grew up in North Vancouver and remember the industrial ship building history and all the industrial buildings long before any residential buildings and what the Shipyards is now. I believe this project is keeping with it's heritage & current operations, will not be a further disruption with all the considerations proposed and implemented. Further more their contribution to The City of North Vancouver's & Federal Govt economies will be a great boost & much needed at this time. As a suggestion it would be beneficial for residents to know how SeaSpan contributes to the local economy and supports the community, so people are aware the level of commitment & support you have to the local economy & the benefits to residents & tourists :) Thank You.</p>
4-Aug-21	<p>Grandiose plans of Lonsdale Water Front out with the tide? To my dismay, I read that Seaspan is planning to expand their operation toward the west side. As I see, it would encroach and ruin the vision of North Vancouver city of creating a waterfront that can be enjoyed by all, not only by the residents but also Vancouverites and future tourists. Just looking at the waterfront, I cannot comprehend why Seaspan is proposing west expansion, instead of going toward the east. It seems that there is plenty of room to create in that direction. As a sideline observation, I lived in San Francisco during the Loma Prieta earthquake that ruined very ugly elevated highway in front of the City by the Bay. In their wisdom, the city demolished the remains and created a beautiful water front that is now enjoyable by all. Similarly, Chicago created also a beautiful waterfront by the lake. In my humble opinion, the City planners should go back to their envision</p>

Date	Feedback
	that was started by the previous city visionaries and suggest (politely, of course) that Seaspan abandon the west expansion and build toward east direction.
4-Aug-21	Hi, I am a long time north van resident and was interested in reviewing the proposed Habitat Compensation Plan for the project. I was unable to easily identify/find it in the materials provided and was wondering if could send me a copy or direct me to where it is located in the online materials.
4-Aug-21	I don't believe this expansion fits well with the city's vision of the lower lonsdale neighborhood. The waterfront area should remain as is with no further development to the west!
4-Aug-21	I'm 93 year, retired ships Master. Over my years I spent many hours and days at Burrard while my ship was docked there. I knew many of the employees as well. That area had always been a shipyard and we all know how not having a yard over the years has deleted an industry which the West Coast badly needs. What North Van have done with that site over passed years is a shame. I know what its like to loose a view but any complaints should have known what could/may happen. As I said originally, "go for it and good luck".
4-Aug-21	As HomeOwners in Cascade at the Pier ____ Victory Ship Way North Vancouver we are very concerned by the proposed SEASPAN Vancouver Drydock Water Lot Project application submitted to the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority. As a Community Stakeholder we see nothing but downside to our healthy environment and quality of life if the proposed extension to the SEASPAN water lot west is approved. The business desires of SEASPAN to invest/develop and serve new customers by expanding the west side of their water operations should not be allowed since it comes with added risk to the other Stakeholders. We recognize SEASPAN business investment desires but we are, at least, equally invested in our collective Community... the needs of the one should not outweigh the needs of the many. SEASPAN's own review admits the proposed development will increase noise and light pollution, cause potential structural issues via rattling to our buildings and impact neighbouring views. If the aforementioned were not enough to turn down this application the proverbial last nail in the coffin is the negative impact on our Air Quality. Absent from the documents reviewed this needs to be fully explored and fully mitigated as part of this project review. I would encourage the Port Authority to require/have a full environmental assessment completed prior to proceeding for the sake of all the residents, tourists and other businesses in our North Vancouver Jewell.
4-Aug-21	1. Either the area is designated as residential, OR industrial, not both. As it is, the beautiful new condo buildings at the waterfront are very close to the existing dock. The chemicals and pollutants used are harmful to people living in, playing in, and enjoying the area. 2. Touting the economic and job advantages is being overplayed. If this project goes ahead, we'll have to stay away from the Night Market, the LoLo restaurants and shops, because of the inevitable air pollution. You'll be sacrificing one economy for another. 3. We wonder if there is any coordination between the different municipalities. CNV made the area residential. That should be the end if it.
4-Aug-21	I am writing to enquire why the Seaspan expansion would be proposed for the west side of their operations rather than the east side??? The Shipyards is a vibrant area where people gather and dine and enjoy walking and to add more noise from Seaspan operations seems ridiculous!!!! The community around the Shipyards does not want more industrial noise and dirt they want minimal disruption to the view as well!!!! Put their expansion to the east and it disturbs no one other than their personal yacht

Date	Feedback
	moorage! We as a community are extremely opposed to this expansion and request that it not proceed!
4-Aug-21	I am writing to express my concern over the Seaspan expansion on the Shipyards waterfront resident of the shipyards I feel this is unacceptable. The noise and lights from these new docks will ruin this neighbourhood. The fact that seaspan has announced this just a few weeks ago and closing dates for discussion is the end July is another bullying tactic from Seaspan. Apparently your office has been very non committal in voicing any reservations about this project. This is also very disappointing. We would ask that you stand up for this neighbourhood and say no to this project. If seaspan wants the new docks they should put them to the East of their existing docks. No matter what they say about it. I'm sure they could find a solution.
4-Aug-21	I live at the shipyards and am so worried about noise and lights if you develop west. Why can't you develop to the east. It may be a more lengthy process but you would have the respect of the neighbours you live by.
4-Aug-21	<p>I have lived in North Vancouver since 1985 and I have seen a lot of changes. My late husband's father went to school in North Vancouver and have a long history of the community, 4 generations.</p> <p>Seaspan is doing a good job as a working harbour. I have lived by the harbour for almost a year and it is a real pleasure to see a clean, healthy and working Seaspan. It gives jobs to many men and women during a very trying time of covid. Canada is suffering in every province and Vancouver need its port to come back in so many ways.</p> <p>If there is anybody saying that there is noise, well, two days ago came to the harbour a small, boat with terrible noise. We thought it was a group of motor cycles that came into the plaza,</p> <p>no, it was one little Italien cigar boat. So for noise issue, there is no issues!</p> <p>If people are talking about environment, I am 100% for keeping environment clean and we can still do it. Look how Norway or other Scandinavian or Northern Europeans are doing it.</p> <p>We need to go forward and also bring jobs.</p>
4-Aug-21	The health of the waterfront shipbuilding/ maintenance industries are critical to the economic well being of BC and Canada
5-Aug-21	Please do it. We need to revitalize our industry and industrial waterfronts are working waterfronts and not just for the elites. I find it more interesting watching something coming together than water lapping at a seawall.
5-Aug-21	Boo! Expand to the east instead. And give back to the community by building a pedestrian overpass over your former Cates Tug property and waterlot to allow a direct link between the Shipyard and Lonsdale Quay. Boo to billionaires tying up their "toys" on our waterfront.
5-Aug-21	I believe that the marine industry provides good jobs, plus revenues for the city. They are an established corporate citizen and we need more like them. Keep up the good work.

Date	Feedback
5-Aug-21	<p>Concern : Professional Opinion</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, an important concern should be highlighted regarding the model to be used for noise modeling as "Best Practice" compared to the ISO 9613 (1996)-2 standard model used by BKL Consultants.</p> <p>Please see it attached a professional opinion from Mediterranean Acoustics Research & Development Ltd.</p> <p>This professional opinion suggest: "to run the same calculations but using either Cnossos or Nord Method (see https://www.datakustik.com/fileadmin/user_upload/CadnaA/New-Versions-Features/Update_history/New_Features_CadnaA_Version_2020_01.pdf and below)</p> <p>CNOSSOS: calculations selectable according to CNOSSOS-EU, CNOSSOS-DE (Germany) or CNOSSOS-AT (Austria), (see tabs „Industry“, „Road“, „Railroad“)</p> <p>Nord2000 (Industry): now also available with CadnaA 64-bit</p> <p>Both methods are more accurate than ISO and can be carried out by the software BKL are using called CadnaA"</p> <p>Mediterranean Acoustics' contact information is below, should you wish to contact this firm directly.</p>
5-Aug-21	<p>Someone posted this video today. Can you tell me what aquatic monitoring you are conducting at at what frequency to assess impacts of operations on water quality, sediment quality, and biota in Inlet for both the existing operation and for the proposed expansion? What aquatic monitoring is conducted when an incident like this occurs and to which regulatory agencies is it reported to?</p>
5-Aug-21	<p>There was an oil spill not long ago that sent noxious fumes into my home. Also concerned about noise and air quilty affecting local businesses. I notice a lot of black dust on my patio table is that coming from the hull blasting?</p>
6-Aug-21	<p>[VFPA's Community Feedback form] Nature of feedback/inquiry = Noise, Port expansion Seaspan should only be allowed to expand east because anything west would downgrade the area and spoil the ambience of the quay and condos.</p>
6-Aug-21	<p>Concern : Community Monitor</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations regarding the community involvement as part of the monitoring plan in line with the Policy Directions stated in the Port of Vancouver Land Use Plan (Dec 8, 2020)</p> <p>Land Use Plan, Policy Directions</p> <p>2.1.5 Work with customers, stakeholders, local governments, Indigenous groups, and appropriate agencies to identify and monitor operational improvements to minimize</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>and mitigate potential noise, congestion, air emissions, and other impacts arising from port related activities.</p> <p>3.1.4 Collaborate with environmental agencies, local governments, Indigenous groups, and stakeholders on environmental initiatives and in the monitoring, protection, and enhancement of critical terrestrial, marine, and estuarine environments.</p> <p>3.1.5 Assess, mitigate, and monitor environmental impacts on land, air, and water from port operations and developments.</p> <p>3.2.3 Explore opportunities with stakeholders and partner agencies to collaborate on initiatives that reduce greenhouse gases and other air emissions, and monitor and report on port-related air emissions and air quality.</p> <p>3.3.2 Work with agencies, port customers, Indigenous groups, and stakeholders to monitor and assess port uses to prevent contamination from port-related activities, and periodically review monitoring and assessment practices to ensure they reflect best practice.</p> <p>4.3.1 Ensure potential impacts from new and expanded development and transportation infrastructure—such as noise, lighting glare, dust, views, emissions, and traffic congestion—are identified and appropriately avoided, minimized, and/or mitigated by administering a comprehensive and thorough project and environmental review process that solicits and incorporates input from potentially affected communities, stakeholders, and Indigenous groups, and requires appropriate actions and monitoring by project proponents.</p> <p>Request:</p> <p>Amend the Permit Application submitted by Dry Dock in a way that Seaspan and Port of Vancouver implement an email and phone contact information where local community can communicate directly to the Port of Vancouver regarding any observations related to environmental impact not limited to marine habitat, water, views & shading, light, noise, air quality, constructions and operations related to the activities carried out at the Vancouver Dry Docks (existing and future operations). This contact information should be made public available (both physically and online) and kept permanent as part of the monitoring plan in line with the Policy Directions stated in the Port of Vancouver, Vancouver Fraser Port Authority Land Use Plan Dated Dec.2020. Observations made by the community should be made public available in a website.</p>
6-Aug-21	<p>Concern : Communication Process</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations regarding communication processed carried out by Seaspan regarding this project expansion.</p> <p>Findings:</p> <p>A. Seaspan indicated that the 7,200 postcards were given to Canada Post for delivery within a one kilometer radius which is above the minimum requirement of 500 meters. By increasing the radius, the probability of a postcard reaching an address close in the Residential Receptors is lower. Was Seaspan trying to minimize its exposure in the most affected community?</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>B. In the information session, Seaspan indicated that the proposed expansion were posted on their websites/pages while in the Unanswered questions document, Seaspan is indicating that this was a facebook ad. Please clarify as it is not the same.</p> <p>1) Please indicate on which websites/pages these postings were made. 2) Provide an evidence of the Facebook ad campaign detailing the campaign objective, category, daily budget, # people reached, age groups targeted, geography, # impressions. Please add all demographics as detailed in the facebook ad campaign. You can export export this data directly from Facebook ad campaign manager.</p>
6-Aug-21	<p>No matter what Seaspan says, there will be an impact if the move west, why can't they move east? It's a better solution. The city has worked so hard to revitalize the shipyards district and it would be a shame to allow this level of activity so close (encroaching) on residential and the vibrant business community now established.</p>
7-Aug-21	<p>Hello.</p> <p>I would like to let you know that I find it very difficult to accept even the notion that you plan to expand your dry dock facilities to the West.</p> <p>You had sold your ground, buildings and access to the water to developers and collected most likely a huge amount money for that.</p> <p>Now, that thousands of people live there you want t o spoil their -our- life quality with noisy, dirty and ugly industrial facilities.</p> <p>How dare you!</p> <p>Can you please, for once, not think about the money you can earn but about the people who you will be affecting negatively. Just because it is the easiest solution for you to grow your business does not mean it is the best.</p> <p>There is so much untouched coast line in BC... Go somewhere else where you do not disturb these 1000s of people.</p>
7-Aug-21	<p>The City has been working for years to make the Shipyards area attractive for tourists and inhabitable for locals, please don't ruin it by adding an urban eyesore as well as visual and audial pollution, taking away enjoyment for all.</p>
7-Aug-21	<p>Thanks for the reply and info. At the heights you mention I do believe the view from my unit would be significantly compromised; which of course translates to decreased value.</p>
7-Aug-21	<p>I don't have any. It sounds as though it had been well thought out.</p>
7-Aug-21	<p>Will my concern impact the residents. What is the build date</p>
8-Aug-21	<p>I have just been informed that Seaspan has applied for an expansion west ward closer to the Shipyard entertainment area. It makes no sense that you all would consider this application from Seaspan, when it could result in more noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Will there be a public consultation with local residents before moving ahead with this decision?</p> <p>I for one is against it, the Shipyard area is a fantastic development for its community, and those visiting from other municipalities and countries, let's keep it industry as far away from it as possible to preserve the desirability of the area.</p>

Date	Feedback
8-Aug-21	No to call expansion
8-Aug-21	<p>As you can appreciate, I am very concerned about the level of noise and pollution associated with the Drydock activities in our lower Lonsdale shipyards area. Listen to the noise and check out what is spewing out of the Drydock area. And this is all a stones throw away from this city's children's park and our waterfront residential towers.</p> <p>It does concern me when the nearest air pollution monitor is in Mahon park. Does that really make any sense?</p> <p>Seaspan recent drydock expansion proposal</p> <p>And let's not forget about the new Drydock expansion proposal that Seaspan has recently announced.</p> <p>There is certainly reason to be concerned.</p> <p>And hence our continued strong recommendation that Seaspan moves this Drydock expansion to their EASTERN WATER LOT.</p> <p>[VIDEO FILE ATTACHED]</p>
8-Aug-21	<p>It's bad enough that seaspan tugs idle at the public dock for a hour while they have lunch on the weekends. Let alone having the sand blasting on Sundays closer to the public dock, restaurants etc...</p> <p>I can't believe you are even entertaining this idea! Goes to show you what money can buy. Shame on you!</p>
8-Aug-21	<p>It is Sunday Aug. 8th/21 and just a small note.</p> <p>This is my opinion. To make a success story for us all, Seaspan should NOT work on Saturday and Sundays. Work days are Monday to Friday. I really feel it would mean a lot to people.</p>
8-Aug-21	<p>Jobs & the loss of industrial work sites. The lower Lonsdale has even an marine repair /shipyard for over 100 years. The residents moved in and bought there condos with full knowledge of the ship repair facility. To bad for the residents. Protect the workers and the industrial need on the water front.</p>
8-Aug-21	<p>This industry built the North Shore. It is the heart of the community and should remain providing good jobs and continued growth.</p>
8-Aug-21	<p>Please accept my objection to Seaspan's planned dry dock expansion to the west of the current operation. I have lived in the area for over 25 years and have always enjoyed watching our active port at work, including the goings on at the Seaspan facility. Over the past 10 years the city has done a great job turning the long abandoned and contaminated former industrial site into a place where people can enjoy the port, the ocean and the industrial activity. The planned expansion, however, will dramatically alter the views at the eastern end of the public space. From the much loved pier the buffer zone between it and the industrial activity will be reduced. Walking there today while a crew was pressure washing a barge I tried to imagine the somewhat high</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>pitched noise if two more dry docks were in place, closer to the public space, and all three were being used to pressure wash vessels. Very little has been said as to why Seaspan can't or won't expand eastward instead. One has to presume it is simply because it is cheaper to go west. That tells me that Seaspan is not terribly concerned with being a good neighbour. I am sure the company knew this would not go over well but chose to proceed regardless. I want to see the company do well, to provide stable, well paying employment, and to grow the ship building industry but I cannot support the proposed expansion as presented. The westward expansion should be denied by the Port and the company should reconsider expanding eastward. Thank you.</p>
9-Aug-21	<p>I support this project as proposed for the new jobs it will create.</p> <p>The people who are concerned about their views have already blocked the views of those of us behind them and this project will have minimal impact anyway</p>
9-Aug-21	<p>I can only hope that your Company will make adequate arrangements with the City planners regarding the congestion that will be caused as a result of the Seaspan expansion. I am happy to see that jobs will be created as a result of this expansion but nevertheless it must take into account the effect it will have from an increased traffic point of view. One has to think outside the circle and come up with a plan to reduce the congestion. Some examples could be park and ride or providing busses to bus in workers to the job site. We are told that City Employees are well paid so that the City can attract the "best" and the "brightest". Therefore we should have these folks work on solutions.</p>
9-Aug-21	<p>I am a resident of the apartment building - Trophy at the Pier - that lies in immediate proximity to Seaspan's Vancouver Drydock's proposed water lot expansion project ("the project"). In general, I endorse, without reiterating them, the various criticisms that were made by my neighbours of the project in the online meetings held on July 15 and 17, 2021. But I would like additionally to emphasize a few points.</p> <p>The location of the children's park, being the nearest point affected by the project other than, possibly, people enjoying the peace and serenity of a walk along the pier, is crucial. I doubt if there is a single soul, despite any claim made by "experts", who can truthfully and with certainty say that the health of at least some of the children who play there in all innocence will not be affected in the long term - potentially decades. My own grandchildren use the park to play occasionally. Likewise, I am in the habit of enjoying the pier regularly, as are many others. One just has to view the temporary population of the pier on almost any summer evening when the sun is out. Many I suspect, like myself, go to view the glorious settings of the sun in the evening.</p> <p>A lot of dust settles in, and particularly on the balcony of, my apartment. It is fair to assume that much or almost all of it arises from the present operation at Vancouver Drydock's repair and maintenance site. The dust caused by the operation must be breathed in by inhabitants of the building. Presumably it is to be expected that this problem will be exacerbated by the increased closeness of the new drydocks.</p> <p>Another aspect is the vibration from the present operation, which again may be so exacerbated. One day, a few weeks ago, I heard a rattling sound in my apartment. I had no idea at first what it was or whence it came. Then I determined that it was in my living room, but didn't know where. I gradually moved closer and closer to where the source of the noise seemed to be. This took me to my display cabinet in which I kept non-used crockery and such like. I opened the door of the cabinet, felt around the various items and then finally settled on a plate that was seated on its edge along the back wall of the</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>cabinet. As soon as I barely touched the plate, the noise immediately stopped. Vibration had caused this (till then) non-ending rattling. I can think of no cause for the vibration other than the current drydock operation – whatever was then going on. How much worse could the vibration to the Trophy building be if the project is approved?</p> <p>In the opening statement in its literature announcing the project, Vancouver Drydock refers to efficiently serving its “customers”. But it says nothing about maintaining good relations with its neighbours - a claim that it conventionally boasts or projects in its publications (with some justification in times prior to the announcement of the project). In knowingly damaging the neighbourhood, that boast must now be seen as hollow. This (Trophy) building is well named with its reference to the pier, as it offers the superb prospect of the pier and the stretch of water between the pier and the current ship repair and maintenance operation. Marine life prospers there - including seals occasionally. Bird life is abundant. Birds appear to like being close to the shoreline rather than further out: where they might be pushed as a result of the project. If they could vote on it, there is little doubt where their votes would go. I take great pleasure in seeing the ships and smaller craft passing by. The project, placed in the proposed location, will seriously impair, if not destroy, the prospect viewed both from within, and from the balconies of, the Trophy (and no doubt the adjoining Cascade) apartments. Others have mentioned the increased noise element, and I will not elaborate on that. My understanding is that the rationale for the project bears a direct relationship with Seaspan’s shipbuilding operation at the Pemberton shipbuilding site. I have also been told that the need for the project infrastructure is temporary only, whereas the infrastructure itself will be permanent and will “outlive” every individual resident today in the Trophy building. (I withdraw that inclusion if that is not so.) I also understand that there are viable alternatives to the proposed location including, at minimum, the eastern (rather than the western) side of the present operation and parts of the inlet adjoining or close to the Pemberton site. These alternative areas are all heavily industrial. The relocation to any of them would injure no resident communities. It is unfathomable why Seaspan wants to do serious damage to a neighbouring community with whom it constantly boasts its good relationship. That boast must now be seen for what it’s worth. It is difficult to imagine that the motivation for choosing the proposed location is other than greed, and putting yet more money in the hands of other corporations and individuals that benefit from the (Washington?) group structure. Of course I am unaware of the real reasons why this location has been chosen to the exclusion of the other potential locations. If one reason is to consolidate all the Seaspan operations into two stand-alone locations, being shipbuilding on the one hand and maintenance and repair on the other, then, that is entirely an internal decision of the Seaspan group itself – for its own convenience. This self-serving decision needs to be weighed against the interests of whole communities, including the vast population of non-resident visitors who merely wish to enjoy the wonderful attractions that the new Shipyards site has to offer. And this too includes the hordes of children of all ages who use the waterpark cum skating rink area, all year through. The serious impact the decision would have on the neighbourhood surely outweighs the narrow interest of the behemoth. Is it because the planned location involves less expense? If so, I would suggest that this is an insufficient reason for destroying the claimed good relations with Vancouver Drydock’s immediate neighbours. And, if financial considerations are at play, then, an equally cogent consideration is the considerable deterioration in the value of the neighbouring apartments that will be occasioned by the project.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>It should be noted, in reading the Appendix, that each reference in the Appendix to “environment” in particular but also to any other term that is defined in the applicable legislation (including subordinate legislation) or failing that the Interpretation Act (if applicable) is to be treated as taking its meaning from the relevant definition, whether mention of that treatment is stated or not (and many instances are).</p> <p>If it does become a question of health effects in future years, and assuming that the causation factor becomes provable, then the whole question of tort liability could arise, subject to any exculpation provisions provided for in legislation or by common law. This would be potentially on a personal and at a corporate level, and could involve the federal Crown, each decision-making entity, Vancouver Drydock, its parent(s), other corporations in the group, their owners and, potentially, other individuals who act behind the corporate veils. Note also, in addition to the potential civil liability, that the Impact Assessment Act speaks to the liabilities of senior officers of corporate bodies on a criminal or quasi-criminal basis. And the judiciary does not always take exculpation provisions or due diligence defences at their face value, preferring, on occasion, to render justice rather than (at least literal) law. So, the exculpation clauses in particular could well transpire to be found illusory. Sections 147 and 148 of the Impact Assessment Act have relevance in this context and there is an abundance of common law on the liabilities of related individuals and corporations.</p> <p>The great Romantic poet, John Keats, wrote in Endymion: A thing of beauty is a joy forever; Its loveliness increases; it will never Pass into nothingness;</p> <p>That was how I thought of the view from my apartment. Unfortunately, had Keats lived here and now, it would appear that he would have to amend his beautiful poem to make a major qualification to his poetic musing: to take into account what major industrial behemoths, like Seaspan, do to “things of beauty”.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to add some comments about my interpretation of how the Impact Assessment Act (“the Act”) provides for the various rights and obligations of the proponent (as defined therein) and the deciding authorities in the initial stages (and only the initial stages) of the impact assessment process. These comments are set out in the Appendix below. Further commentary on the later stages may or may not be forthcoming at the appropriate times. The approach taken is that of a (now former) legislative drafter, working in the tradition of the great Francis Bennion[1].</p> <p>Interpretation of legislation is the other side of the legislative drafting coin. The art of legislative drafting entails almost word by word interpretation or construction of the words currently being, and that already have been, written in the drafting process. This work is limited to resources that are generally available to anyone. I have no access to any of the sophisticated legal resources available to law firms, not even to a law library. Also the work is completely unfunded and is limited to an examination of the legislation. There is neither time nor the facility for examining potentially relevant common law. So anything I say stands to be potentially limited or restricted by any judicial decisions pointing to a different construction. All legislation cited is federal jurisdiction based. Notations related to the text appear at the end of the Appendix. And I apologize for the less than good standard of my inputting.</p> <p>.</p> <p>APPENDIX Preamble and purpose clauses</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>The Act contains both a Preamble and a purpose clause. The purpose of having both escapes me. As stated by F.A.R. Bennion[1] in Statutory Interpretation[2]: “The preamble states the reason for passing the Act. It may include a recital of the mischief to which the Act is directed. When present, it is thus a useful guide to the legislative intention.” And[3], “A purpose clause is an express statement of the legislative intention Instead of a preamble, an Act may contain one or more purpose clauses in the body of it.” Bennion also says in his book Statute Law[4], “the preamble may be resorted to for interpretation, though it cannot contradict the plain words of a section” He also quoted[5] Renton with obvious approval[5]: “Purpose clauses The Renton Committee found that ‘statements of purpose can be useful, both at the Parliamentary stage and thereafter, for the better understanding of the legislative intention and for the resolution of doubts and ambiguities.’ The preamble once served this purpose.” This is the only statute I know of that contains both a preamble and a general purpose clause. An analysis of the various recitals of the Preamble and of the provisions of the purpose clause (section 6), and any linkage between them, whether consistent or inconsistent, therefore serve as a valuable guide to the legislative intent underlying the statute and, a fortiori, its regulations.</p> <p>Interpretation Approach</p> <p>The question arises: what line of approach should any interpreter take in construing the masses of legislation involved in the impact assessment process? In a highly generalized way, interpreters are given the answer to the question by statute. They are bound, in general, to apply the Interpretation Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. I-21) and, more particularly, section 12. This provides that each legislative provision construed is to be regarded as “remedial” (curing what Bennion and earlier jurists call the “mischief” in the previous law) and is to be “given such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as best ensures the attainment of its objects”. This purposive approach, as opposed to the literalist one, is strongly recommended as the better way to go. Generally, the judiciary at least pay lip service to that approach as being the more legally correct mode, although in any given case the approach they actually take may be in an entirely different direction in order to achieve the result they desire. As seen immediately below (if my analysis is correct), an “and” must be read as an “or” to make the project even feasible. And I suggest that this be done. As Bennion says[6]:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“A purposive construction of an enactment is one which gives effect to the legislative purpose by –</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) following literal meaning of the enactment where that meaning is in accordance with legislative purpose, or</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(b) applying a strained meaning where the literal meaning is not in accordance with the legislative purpose”</p> <p>A “strained meaning” should be applied here, to the proponent’s benefit.</p> <p>Designated Project</p> <p>It is assumed that the project proposed by Seaspan’s Vancouver Drydock (“the proponent”) is a “designated project” falling within the statutory definition. I assume that it is “one or more physical activities that (a) are carried out in Canada and on federal lands”[6.1] (ie. in both, although either suffices). Both the “federal lands” definition in the Act and the definition of “Canada” in the Interpretation Act (subsection 35(1)) include, at minimum, the territorial sea and the internal waters of Canada. The definitions of both “territorial sea” and “internal waters” defer to the Oceans Act[6.2]. And the Oceans Act provides that both of these form part of Canada and that the</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>seabed and subsoil beneath them belong to the federal Crown. Para.(b) provides for regulations or a (not necessarily regulation) order. There are no regulations that I see that could even potentially cover the project and I know of no such order. But it is assumed that no further regulation or order is needed under para. (b) of the definition of “designated project” to include the project. This despite the use of the cumulative “and” at the end of para. (a). It seems to me that the cumulative does not work in the context of the project and that the project might be a non-starter if literally construed. A literal construction would scupper the project. (But I make no such claim since any reasonable court would surely apply the purposive approach.) It seems that it should read the alternative “or”.</p> <p>Furthermore, the definition of “designated project” also includes physical activities that are incidental to the primary one. In certain contexts, if approval is given, this portion of the definition could have major implications and decision-making authorities need to be aware of this potential.</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>Both the Preamble (first recital) and the general purpose clause of the Act (para. 6(1)(a)) cite as an object of the legislation the fostering of sustainability - that is (by definition - section 2) the fostering of “the ability to protect the environment (as defined, infra), contribute to the social and economic well-being of the people of Canada and preserve their health in a manner that benefits present and future generations”. The reference to “the ability” to do these things presupposes that the making of all decisions by the authorities needs to reflect well into the future as to their potential effects - what will result from each decision, what could or could not result, what possibilities and likelihoods (or lack of them) there are and other similar considerations. It also invokes the potential or lack of potential for future protective actions going well beyond the completion of the designated project. The ability to protect, contribute and preserve should be seen as continuing potentially for decades and even “generations”. If, for example, a designated project were actually to destroy “the environment” which, by definition, includes any specific “component” of the Earth or aspects of it specifically mentioned in the definition, then the “ability” to secure the continued protection, contribute to social and economic well-being and preserve health would be lost forever immediately the project were completed. The authorities are legislatively committed, at minimum, to ensure that all aspects of the designated project are subjectively calculated towards ensuring that the protections, contributions and preservations referred to in the definition are permanent. Also, the proponent maintains that the project is consistent with its lease. This may or may not be so. But, if it is, then the lease would have been entered into at a time when everything mentioned in the sustainability definition would have been of little or no consequence. Times have changed. And in any case, as a general principle, contract must entirely defer to applicable legislation, unless the legislation itself reverses that deference.</p> <p>Public participation</p> <p>The third recital of the Preamble refers to public participation “in the impact assessment process, including the planning phase”. It is clear that the planning phase is only a part, one phase, of the overall impact assessment process. Those “inclusive” words mean that the required public participation is not limited to the planning phase, but applies throughout the assessment process. Emphasis is put on this continuing requirement. Otherwise, only the planning phase would need mentioning. So, public</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>participation should be allowed well beyond the planning phase. Para. 6(1)(h) supports this. This is despite the timing restriction placed under section 11, which provision applies only to the “planning phase” of the overall process.</p> <p>Access to reasons for decisions Referring to the fourth recital in the Preamble, the reasons given by the authorities for decisions must, by inference, have substance, be complete and genuinely inform about the true rationale of the decision. The authorities lack the general power that the judiciary has to eschew reasons or to render them minimal.</p> <p>Innovative approaches and innovation With respect to the fifth recital of the Preamble, the “innovative approaches and technologies” would include examination of all the alternative sites available to the proponent. Or, equally, they might be the project itself and all its component parts. But the project, located where it is proposed but not if located elsewhere, can hardly be claimed to be designed to “reduce adverse changes to the environment (as so defined – supra) and to health, social or economic conditions”. Rather, the project is calculated to increase considerably all these adverse changes. Para.6(1)(b.1) also cites as an object of the legislation the encouragement of innovation, which term would imply the inclusion of innovative approaches and, if necessary, innovative technologies that could render any alternative location viable. The application of the legally required principles set out in section 6(3) would be key in the enforcement of this provision.</p> <p>Fundamental protection Para. 6(1)(b) cites as an object the protection of the components of the environment (as defined). That is, the protection of the components (of the components) of the Earth, specifically including (a) land, water and air (sub-including all layers of the atmosphere), (b) all organic and inorganic matter and living organisms and (c) the interacting natural systems that include components referred to immediately above in (a) and (b). Also to be protected are health, social and economic conditions from adverse “effects” potentially resulting from the project. Those “effects” are, by definition, changes to the environment (as defined) or health ,social or economic conditions. Not only those but, further down the line, the consequences, whether positive or negative, of those changes. So there has to be protection from such adverse changes. Also, it is to be noted that this definition (environment) is of the non-exhaustive type. It is only a partial definition. Whatever would normally be regarded as “environment” and that is outside the wording of the definition is also to be regarded as within the definition. Here, standard dictionaries come into play.</p> <p>The “environment” definition includes all organic matter and living organisms. People fall within both. They are not excluded. So people are part of the definition of environment, and any rule or definition within the legislation - principle or subordinate - that refers to “environment” should be treated as including people. And that applies regardless of whether the people are on federal or provincial/territorial lands except where a specific statement to the opposite effect exists. Federal legislation applies, on a jurisdictional basis, to everyone affected by the federal activity that is controlled by the federal legislation. I.e., the people at any time present in the apartment blocks, the pier, the Shipyards and other areas close to the project are to be protected in accordance with this legislation. Also, any interaction between any such people on the one hand</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>and land, water, air, the atmosphere or any other living organisms on the other, these all fall within the definition. The definition also includes inorganic matter, such as the pier and buildings, including the apartment blocks along the proximate shoreline . “Effects”</p> <p>Para.6(1)(c) deals with the responsibility of the authorities to ensure that the assessment process takes into account all the both positive and negative changes to the environment (as defined) or to health, social or economic conditions and the positive and negative consequences of those changes that may be caused by the carrying out of the project (see the definition of “effects”). Subsection 7(1) sets out “effects” or results that the proponent must avoid in the carrying out of the project. (See “prohibitions and restrictions below.) It should also be noted that what an impact assessment is, by definition, is an assessment of the “effects’ (as so defined) of the project – being those changes.</p> <p>Community knowledge</p> <p>Para.6(1)(j) reflects the authorities’ requirement to take into account community knowledge. That would include relevant and informed comments made by the public in all the public participation sessions, regardless of at what stage the assessment process is. See the comments under “Public participation” (supra). It would also include any input submitted by relevant jurisdictions such as any adjoining or proximate municipality, elected politicians and so forth. This, of course, (as for all submissions), whether the input is pro or anti the project.</p> <p>Alternative means</p> <p>Para.6(1)(k) envisages the taking into account in the assessment of alternative means of carrying out the project, including through the use of the best available technologies. The alternative means would include alternative locations for placing the project, including those mentioned by the public. This would include east of the present maintenance and repair operation and at or close to the Pemberton site where the shipbuilding is carried out. There may be other places. Submissions by others on this topic will be more informed than this Appendix can be. Alternative technologies could include, for example, deeper level support pilings equipment and such like that could enable placing the new drydocks in alternative locations, perhaps in deeper waters, away from residential areas.</p> <p>Powers and principles</p> <p>Subsection 6(3) enjoins the federal Crown, the Minister of the Environment, the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada and “federal authorities” (as defined) to exercise their powers in a manner that adheres to the principles of scientific integrity, honesty, objectivity, thoroughness and accuracy. For the purposes of subsection 6(3), the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is assumed to be a “federal authority” by virtue of para. (d) of the definition of “federal authority” and item 1 of Schedule 1, an analysis of which would require significant research into whatever documentation there is that underlies subsection 2(1) of the Canada Marine Act. That is an exercise too large for this work. Thus, that port authority is assumed to be subject to subsection 6(3). This subsection does not bind the proponent. These concepts are chosen with care and are not mutually exclusive. Scientific integrity presumably would include at least a thorough</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>analysis of every conceivable alternative location for the drydock extensions. With respect to scientific integrity, the Office of the federal Chief Science Advisor has put out a “Model Policy on Scientific Integrity” (in the website ic.gc.ca) which contains, at item 6, the “Scientific integrity principles”. This is a lengthy document and will not be reproduced here. But, presumably, all the entities mentioned are aware of the document and will treat it as, perhaps, quasi-law. Honesty probably invokes the duty of good faith as an organizing principle[7]. Objectivity (if attainable in pure form) probably includes such principles as impartiality, neutrality, honesty, lack of bias and prejudgment and seeing and giving due attention to the positions of each side. Thoroughness includes the quality of completeness, and probably seeing and deciding on the basis of the whole picture without giving undue weight to one side against the other. Accuracy broadly means correctness and absence of mistakes. These principles are not defined terms. Therefore, standard dictionary definitions are usable in determining their meanings. They are all justiciable: even honesty, which is the closest any of them come to being subjective.</p> <p>Proponent prohibitions and restrictions</p> <p>Subsection 7(1) requires the proponent to avoid doing anything respecting the carrying out of the whole or any part of the project that “may” cause any (presumably negative - although a “strained meaning” is needed to make that assumption) change to any of the following components of the environment (as defined) or health social or economic conditions (definition of “effects”). These aspects are (a) fish, including inter alia shellfish, crustaceans, marine animals, and their eggs, sperm, spawn, larvae, spat and juvenile stages [8] or (b) water frequented by any such fish and any other areas on which such fish depend directly or indirectly to carry out their life processes, including spawning grounds and nursery, rearing, food supply and migration areas [9]; or aquatic species meaning a wildlife species that is such a “fish” or a marine plant, including all benthic and detached algae, marine flowering plants, brown algae, red algae, green algae and phytoplankton[10]. The word “may”, as used in subsection 7(1), invokes the notion of the expression of possibility, as a matter of ordinary English usage. So, if it is possible for any of the “effects” cited in subsection 7(1) to occur, the proponent is acting in breach of the subsection unless excused under subsection 7(3). There is no need for any “strained meaning” here. Furthermore, the reference to “or in part”, which is totally unnecessary unless it is to be given force of meaning (which is clearly intended), imposes a much heavier burden on the proponent than if only the whole activity were referenced. At its lowest level, subsection 7(1) speaks to prohibiting, prima facie, any “act or thing” in connection with carrying out any part of the project if it has any potential to cause any change to any one of the “effects” covered in paras. 7(1)(a) to (e). A Bennion “strained meaning” may be conceded to indicate that the change has to be negative or harmful as opposed to positive or beneficial. One has to wonder if there is any conceivable possibility that this potential will not be realized.</p> <p>Subsection 7(3), which enables the overriding of subsection 7(1), applies only in the later stages of the assessment process and therefore is not relevant to this early-stage analysis.</p> <p>Proponent’s initial description of project</p> <p>The proponent’s initial description of the project to be provided under subsection 10(1) will presumably be closely vetted by, and subject to the subsequent dictates of, the Agency. This is in a later stage of the assessment process and is therefore irrelevant to this analysis: as are subsequent sections dealing only with process.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>NOTATIONS</p> <p>[1] Francis Bennion: Almost certainly the world's greatest ever expert, and certainly the most prodigious jurist, on the subjects of legislative drafting and interpretation (see website worldcat.org under his name); drafter of two Commonwealth Constitutions (Pakistan,1957 and Ghana, 1962); founder of the Statute Law Society; etc.; also former employer, colleague and mentor of the writer.</p> <p>[2] 2nd edition, Section 246 "The preamble", p. 499. This work is now in its 6th edition. But I use the text of the only edition (2nd) I own and that is available to me.</p> <p>[3] Ibid Section 247 "The purpose clause", p. 501.</p> <p>[4] Oyez Publishing Limited 1980 at p. 40.</p> <p>[5] Statute Law (p. 86). The Preparation of Legislation: report of a committee appointed by the Lord President of the Council under the chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. Sir David Renton: 1975: UK.: para.11.8. Cmnd. 6053.</p> <p>[6] "Statutory Interpretation" Section 304 "Nature of purposive construction", p. 659.</p> <p>[6.1] RSC 1985, c I-21, subsection 32(2).</p> <p>[6.2] S.C. 1996, c.31, sections 7 and 8.</p> <p>[7] Bhasin v. Hrynew (Bhasin) [2014] 3 S.C.R. 494, although the case involved contract rather than public law.</p> <p>[8] Parts of the definition of "fish" in subsection 2(1) of the Fisheries Act R.S.C., 1985, c. F-14.</p> <p>[9] Definition of "fish habitat" in subsection 2(1) of the Fisheries Act.</p> <p>[10] Marine plant, as defined in section 47 of the Fisheries Act.</p>
9-Aug-21	We are recommending that you MOVE West of your current Seaspan Building where this would be less intrusive, if it has to be built (at all) or elsewhere. Delta?
9-Aug-21	<p>IMPORTANT FEEDBACK re SEASPAN VANCOUVER DRYDOCK PROPOSED WATER LOT PROJECT - I need to say that I am shocked to learn of Seaspan's plan to Build TWO New Drydocks on already developed waterfront property which is Residential (overdeveloped residential highrises) and a small recreational space consisting of a concrete WALK AREA towards a public pier, which is heavily utilized. Your Project plans will NO longer be a healthy welcoming space for walking by the limited access to water space. When I moved here 25 years ago, the water & City of Vancouver could be seen while walking along Esplanade. This project will likely create a mass exodus from this beautiful area. I live within 2 Blocks of the project and will be seriously affected by the Noise particularly PILE DRIVING and CONSTANT NOISE Pollution.</p>
9-Aug-21	<p>My elderly parents live at the Trophy and we are very concerned that the expansion will worsen the noise and light pollution coming from the dry dock. Presently, loud noise and bright lights often go well into the night, past midnight (with windows and balcony door closed). Having the docks expanded closer will only worsen this issue. Also, the only non-building view we have will be permanently affected. Our primary view is the side of the Cascade building, and our only escape from that is the small side view of the water, and this proposal would take that away, unjustly devaluing many of the residents' property. 55m is a LOT. Furthermore, there is a playground and picnic tables right there, where lots of people enjoy the view of the water and downtown city line. My parents bought this place at the Trophy in anticipation of the area's development plans by the City to make it into what it is today; a vibrant, family friendly, recreational space, with nice restaurants.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>This proposal does not take into consideration the residents and businesses of the Shipyards, and the community of North Vancouver. This is very disappointing and this proposal shows no corporate social responsibility. Why not expand eastward?? I hope that Seaspan will care for its neighbours and also be a better neighbour.</p>
9-Aug-21	<p>Lower lonsdale (The Shipyards) is a "jewel of the crown" for North Vancouver now and for generations to come. The incredible economic, visual and environmental benefits are exceptional and extremely rare. The area is a musical, arts, educational and recreational paradise of restaurants, hotels and music. It has become a major travel destination.</p> <p>I urge you to use every influence you have to ensure this is not destroyed by permitting the expansion of the Seaspan operations West. Seaspan's current location next to the Shipyards is a major noise and environmentally damaging business. We do not need more industrial action westward, we need less.</p> <p>If allowed further West, this area will be further corroded and the immense tragedy is that such a massive mistake is non reversible.</p> <p>Seaspan can easily expand East and this is appropriate and has had an engineer design that route. This is completely the right decision, West is clearly not.</p> <p>Please think long term. Represent the citizens of the North shore now and for future generations to come. Protect the views and the vibrancy of what this area was planned for. Do not allow the expansion West. Say No. Thats the right thing to do. Expansion west is just plain wrong.</p>
9-Aug-21	<p>I'm concerned for the residences that are located adjacent to the this site and will be impacted by the increased noise and light pollution.</p> <p>What other configuration has deadpan considered? Why not buoy this to the east of the existing facility so it is father away from residential neighbourhood?</p>
10-Aug-21	<p>My wife and I have been long-standing Vancouver / Lower Mainland residents. Although we are currently living in Kamloops, we visit frequently and are considering purchasing a condo in the LoLo area for our retirement. This proposed expansion of the Seaspan Drydock would not only stop us from buying near the Shipyard / Lonsdale area, but it will have an adverse and negative effect on the current "community" and "tourist friendly" atmosphere.</p> <p>I am shocked by a quote from ____, VP of Seaspan Vancouver, who states in the North Shore News: "according to a noise study done by Seaspan, the extra noise from an expanded operation is expected to be between one and three decibels, "which is something that most folks can't actually discern." (https://www.nsnews.com/local-business/seaspans-vancouver-drydock-seeks-to-expand-operations-3934914)</p> <p>Not only is the above quote from ____ misleading, it is completely void of the very real, loud and disruptive noise my wife and I experienced when recently staying at the Seaside Hotel at the Shipyard tourist area, Aug 4-8. Not only was the pressure washing and repair of a large barge annoying and loud through the day, but it continued into the evening well past Seaspan's stated 6pm work hours.</p> <p>I can't imagine being a resident of a beautiful and expensive waterfront condo (a visitor</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>/ tourist) and having to listen to constant noise and have my million-dollar view obstructed by Seaspan's drydocks. This is especially true by the fact that although current residents "made an informed decision about purchasing next to an operating dry dock," they surely did not buy their condo expecting that this industrial Drydock would be expanded in front of them. As one resident states: "To complain after making an informed choice is like buying next to a railway line and then expecting there will be no train activity. But now the situation is changing which would be the equivalent of having a train going through your front yard!" (https://www.change.org/p/the-vancouver-fraser-port-authority-object-to-seaspan-extension-project?redirect=false)</p> <p>We therefore strongly oppose any westward expansion of Seaspan Drydocks.</p>
10-Aug-21	<p>[*NB includes photo] This photo shows the clear area East that Seaspan can easily expand to. It is already Industrial, does not interfere with views, restaurants, hotels and tourism. Plenty of room to go East, not West. It seems to only be used as a boathouse for a personal yacht which could be easily relocated.</p> <p>Please do not allow expansion West. It is unnecessary to destroy that area and completely inappropriate.</p>
10-Aug-21	<p>Once again we have a significant volume of noise coming from the Seaspan Drydock, today up to 80 decibels as measured and shown in the linked video. Yesterday it got up as high as 87 decibels.</p> <p>Adding ANY additional drydocks to the west of the current facilities would significantly increase the noise and be a disaster for the residents of the area and the community as a whole.</p> <p>I've sat through two of the video meeting with different groups and came away with zero feeling you and your team have any understanding of the significance of what is being proposed and how detrimental this expansion will be for the area.</p> <p>Seaspan has said they can't go east because they have "plans" for the area. What are those plans? Would they be better somewhere else? My understanding is that the plans are to put in a marina for large expensive yachts, such as the ones the Seaspan ownership owns. I have no issue with large yachts and enjoy seeing them. But this reasoning or any other for that matter must not dissuade the Port from requiring Seaspan to disallow the proposed expansion as it is. A yacht marina can be put elsewhere and would not have the detrimental impact to the community.</p> <p>Noise is only one of the many considerations the Port must consider as has been pointed out in previous communications by many parties. The waterfront area has changed and although technically, the expansion may be "allowable" in some form, the substantial change to the area MUST be paramount in the consideration by the Port. Not to mention the likely destruction of tens of millions of dollars in real estate values of the very directly affected owners and residents. As well as a working-port, this is also a residential community of significance.</p> <p>After looking at the reports supplied to the Port by Seaspan, I would strongly suggest that these "expert reports" were done in a manner that lends itself solely to benefit Seaspan and do NOT come close to being fully encompassing or even accurate. There</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>are far too many variables and assumptions made to come to the conclusions as stated. I do not believe the Port can rely on these reports as accurate and I further know that any expansion west will have a hugely negative impact on the whole area of the Shipyards, the community and the residents.</p> <p>Here is the video link I mentioned above. https://youtu.be/JeJyIXNBD7U</p> <p>Thank you and I look forward to hearing the denial of the western expansion project. The expansion west must not happen.</p>
10-Aug-21	<p>Please don't let Seaspan destroy our beautiful Shipyard. Thousands of visitors are enjoying this wonderful lively area every week.</p> <p>We all would suffer with Seaspan Expanding West.</p> <p>The City of North Vancouver made this vibrant area a pleasure to visit, so please move your Drydocks to the East.</p>
11-Aug-21	<p>I am a proud Owner of the ____ Cascade East since Feb 2019 I have invested a very high amount of kapital in that unit. That proposed Drydock is going to have a very substantial impact of devalueing the 3 waterfront Buildings. If the very good and respektfoll Seaspan Shipjards Company has a good conscience towards teh people in the Buildings and to the City of North vancouver, proposed project can never get a go ahead. July 30th 2021 respectfully [_____</p>
11-Aug-21	<p>Although I appreciate being informed of any expansion plans a head of time, I am very concerned about what you are proposing. I fully understand and support business growth, but not when it comes at the expense of ruining an area of North Vancouver that is visited and loved by thousands of individuals both locally and abroad. This waterfront has become a key landmark of North Vancouver and North Vancouverites are proud of this area.</p> <p>Despite what is being proposed, this expansion project will negatively impact this beautiful area. Not to mention the noise level situation, which is already problematic and a major reason so many of us that live on Victory Ship Way have to shut our patio doors to sleep. This and the extra problems that will ensue with poor air quality created from the extra projects should be reason enough to instantly halt this project.</p> <p>I can assure you that no one that presently lives on Victory Ship Way would have ever purchased a property here if they were aware of such an expansion. Aside from the reasons stated above, property value will assuredly depreciate with this expansion.</p> <p>There are so many other reasons an expansion like this, in the current location you are proposing, is just plain wrong. This area of North Vancouver is loved and appreciated by all who visit it. There are people from all over who are shocked at this proposed expansion.</p> <p>If you are truly sincere in wanting to hear about North Vancouverites concerns for this project, you will find an alternative solution that does not hinder this area in so many ways.</p>
11-Aug-21	<p>I am writing to contribute my feedback to Seaspan Vancouver's application for Drydock Water Lot Expansion.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>First of all, you must understand how offended the local community is by the roughshod way in which Seaspan is pushing this expansion proposal through. The public "consultation" period was designed purposely to be (insultingly) short. During the summertime when many people who had waited over a year due to Covid, could finally leave home for vacation, making the audience to this consultation much, much smaller. Seaspan made it VERY clear to the residents, visitors, and workers of the Lower Lonsdale community that they absolutely do not care about their wellbeing. It is all about money and profits and nothing else. The attitudes of the representatives of Seaspan and the Port of Vancouver on the public consultation calls in July were dismissive and insulting. Many, many questions were ignored or answered in roundabout ways so as to avoid properly and truthfully answering.</p> <p>Many residents on the public zoom calls asked why Seaspan insists that they "cannot" expand eastward, instead of westward into the vibrant and very population-dense Lower Lonsdale side. Paul Hebson admitted on the July 15 public zoom call that Seaspan had not even bothered to do an economic impact study looking at locating the expansion to the east. Which indicates that Seaspan puts priority of its billionaire owner, and his yacht collection parked on the east side, over the many environment concerns of all who live in and visit the Shipyards neighbourhood. The "investigations" Seaspan claims they made into situating the expansion eastward are flimsy at best and outright fake at worst. There is plenty of space to locate the expansion to the east, to preserve the positive quality of life that visitors and residents of the Shipyard district deserve and must protect.</p> <p>Speaking as someone who has lived here for years, my concerns with the westward expansion proposal include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air pollution. Current particulate matter levels are extremely high, and that is without being directly in front of the dry dock at present. The wind off the water carries the particulate matter further afield, but buildings in the immediate vicinity must wipe dirt and dust off their balconies every day, sometimes multiple times a day, to avoid filth building up in their homes. The exterior of buildings are coated with grime. And that's just at current work levels. With an additional two dry-docks and work pontoon the air pollution will increase exponentially. Fumes from paints and other chemical supplies in addition to the dirt and debris will be directly flung into the homes, businesses and recreational areas that thousands of people live in and visit. Please note the playground already next to the existing dry dock and think of the increase in pollution the children and all who enjoy the green space here will endure if even more industry is built just meters away. People will stop coming to this beautiful area, in which so much time, money, energy, and community effort has been invested. • Noise pollution. The current dry dock works operate 24 hours a day, with extremely loud tools. Currently the Trophy building at ____ Victory Ship way acts as somewhat of a sound barrier (it was built there specifically for such purpose). If the dry dock expands to the west there will be zero barriers and the noise will carry across the water in all directions, impacting all residents and visitors who live in and enjoy the beautiful seaside neighbourhoods of Lower Lonsdale, Coal Harbour, CRAB Park and many others.

Date	Feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light pollution. The dry dock operations, again, happening 24/7, use extremely bright spotlights which already reflect off the buildings in the area and impact people and residents not even directly nearby. Even with allegedly “night sky-friendly” lights for the proposed westward expansion, the Vancouver Harbour will be lit up with disruptive lighting round the clock which is harmful to residents who wish to turn off the lights and sleep in peace at regular hours. • Construction. All the concerns for air, noise, light and water pollution as well as innocent marine life, will be further felt with the massive construction project so close to the residential area. • Views. Lower Lonsdale offers one of the best views of the City of Vancouver and countless visitors come here to view the landscape. Why blight it with a massive new industrial construction when there is perfectly useable and good industrial land ALREADY available to the east, which impacts zero views. <p>Please commit to reading all of the comments on the petition created by locals who object to the westward expansion, when perfectly reasonable eastward real estate exists for this project. As of my writing this there are over 1,700 signatures of concerned residents and visitors: https://www.change.org/p/the-vancouver-fraser-port-authority-object-to-seaspan-extension-project?redirect=false.</p>
11-Aug-21	<p>Thank you for informing the public of your future plans.</p> <p>It is very disappointing that this expansion, and the profits that will come from it, are being put before the safety and quality of life for those who call the Shipyards home.</p> <p>As much as we were all aware of an active Shipyard when we moved here, we were not informed about the possibility of expansion.</p> <p>And, until you actually live here, you do not realize how much your quality of life is impacted by a 24 hr shipyard next door.</p> <p>Often having to endure poor air quality(very strong chemical smells), and noise that can be 24hrs a day, any day.</p> <p>Then there is the questions of the impact to the foundations of the buildings and the impact to the local environment/ocean.</p> <p>Are you not already at a capacity in this area for the ppms that can be emitted?</p> <p>Our buildings and parkade are built into the ocean beyond the actual shoreline. It is hard to believe that the effects of pile driving will not impact the foundations of our structures.</p> <p>As well as the disruption to the ocean floor, changing it from when the design of the buildings was approved?</p> <p>We all witnessed recently in the Florida tragedy what can happen when foundation issues effect buildings.</p> <p>Why doesn't the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority consider this extension of the water</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>lot into the Industrial Pemberton Avenue area instead? A location that is not going to impact people's homes and lives.</p> <p>We all want to enjoy and use the ocean, hopefully we can find a better compromise than what you have proposed.</p>
11-Aug-21	<p>Many letters have been sent to you regarding the Shipyard expansion. I too do not want to add barge space to the West . I am not against your expansion but to the East would save a lot of heartache for many who live in the area. Most of your staff do not live here to realize the damage this extension would bring to this space shared by not just us but to many who come here to walk the Spirit Trail and enjoy the many festivities that go on here. The Shipyards would lose a lot of it's personality and beauty. We were built as an attraction for every hour of the day.</p> <p>Please consider this idea of expanding to the East. We put up with a lot of noise and pollution already, we don't need any more.</p>
11-Aug-21	<p>Concern : Optimal uses of Water Leases</p> <p>This communication is in reference to the Permit Application – Seaspan Vancouver Dry dock Water Lot Project as Described in the Supplemental Report dated April 14, 2021. As you will see below, important concern considerations regarding the optimization of the use of existing port lands and water in line with the Policy Directions stated in the Port of Vancouver Land Use Plan (Dec 8, 2020)</p> <p>Land Use Plan, Policy Directions</p> <p>1.2.1 Intensify the use and development of port lands to achieve the highest feasible operational capacities within the existing land base, considering the impacts that intensified use may have on adjacent communities, transportation networks, and the environment, and mitigating resulting impacts where appropriate.</p> <p>1.2.3 Manage new port development to create synergies and efficiencies between adjacent activities and uses.</p> <p>1.2.5 Consider the co-location of industrial and supportive uses that integrate multimodal supply-chain logistics.</p> <p>1.2.6 Encourage compatible uses and development adjacent to port lands and waters to minimize potential conflicts with port activity, including appropriate site and building design measures to minimize impacts.</p> <p>In addition, the land use plan indicates the designation for industrial uses (attached: Industrial areas are primarily designated for light to heavy industrial activities in support of port operations and marine support services, including goods shipping, transportation, handling, and, in some cases, manufacturing. Primary uses may include intermodal yards, warehouses, container storage facilities, transloading facilities, ship repair, and barge moorage activities. Ancillary uses may include offices, storage areas, caretaker facilities, and other uses required to support the primary use.</p> <p>Findings: Pier 94 is used for mooring Mega Yachts and boats (see pictures attached) for a large amount of time. As per the land use plan boat moorage is a conditional use and not a primary use. Consequently, the current use in Pier 94 is not the highest and best use of the industrial zones designation. Industrial zone space is limited across the region as</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>stated in the Land Use Plan. We need to insure that limited industrial zone space is used in the most efficient way with the least impact to local communities. More so, Mega Yachts are sources of great pollution. Are we choosing Mega Yachts over Environment? There is a platform for heliport too. How is this application in line with the optimization of water uses owned by the Port of Vancouver. Are we considering the pollution externalities of Mega Yachts. Why haven't Seaspan combined the water leases (Pier94 and Vancouver Dry Docks) for a more optimal water use that is also in alignment with the Land Use Plan goals?</p> <p>The request:</p> <p>1) Seaspan to optimize the operations and eliminate redundancy and inefficiencies in existing water licenses where the existing Drydocks and Pier 94 are located. Seaspan to present a consolidated plan on both water license applications (namely: SEaspan ULC CNV 044-04452F-001 VFPA PLAN 2016-165 and REM C Plan 11879 008-998-477 VFPA Plan 2016-164 as per the water lease plan attached) that includes an expansion option of the drydocks on the Pier94. The proposed dry dock expansion shall be made in consultation with the most impacted communities.</p> <p>2) Create a conservation zone water use between the Careen Dry dock and the Burrard Dry Dock Pier. Effectively, to rezone it from industrial to conservation designation to this particular use.</p>
11-Aug-21	<p>I enjoy coming to the newly developed Shipyard's District and frequent the outdoor patios and walk along the Burrard Pier many times a week. I know the city of NV has spent time and money in developing a beautiful and community-oriented space for families. With this, it's really surprising that you, Seaspan, can even consider proposing and infringing further into this space. What is shows is that Seaspan is completely out of touch with the community's needs, even though Seaspan has been part of the community for decades. The proposal to expand closer to the Pier is purely self serving. It's selfish and doesn't benefit the community at large in any way. There is NO mention that the new jobs that will be created will be given to Canadians which is also disturbing. I know that with other projects Seaspan has done. foreign expertise was brought in to assist since we do not have people with those skill sets.</p> <p>I notice that the feedback forms that are being collected are being submitted directly from you to the Port Authority. That in itself is a biased method of submitting public input.</p> <p>The method in which this proposal has been submitted and handled has been very sneaky and strategic. The amount of time given for public input has been minimal, the error in the North Shore News stating that the project was moving east, the fact that the City of NV is in summer recess so public opinion could not be heard, the woman at the port going on holiday for two weeks just as your deadline for feedback was concluding etc etc etc. This behaviour is despicable and pathetic.</p> <p>The hydroblasting times are also an issue and with the expansion this will only get worse and louder. Right now Seaspan doesn't adhere to any timelines. Who polices that and who fines you when you continue blasting until 1:00 am? Nobody!</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>I've personally see the run-off turning the ocean in a murky brown or deep red color which indicates all kinds of pollutants are being dumped into the ocean where marine life exists. This happens weekly and yet the Port doesn't hold Seaspan accountable for this environmental abuse. Recently two dead seals pups have shown up near the dry dock and the beach between the two buildings in front of the children's playground next to the proposed expansion site. More docks, more dumping, more toxicity, more pollutants, more damage, more deaths.</p> <p>The tugs that come in and out with the barges and boats add more pollutants in the air. Some times, the bright lights on the tugs are lit the entire night so even though your proposal talks about LED lights, that's only on the dock, not on the boats, tugs and cranes that will be lit up so that's extremely misleading.</p> <p>The particulate dust is another major issue. The air quality is awful since you can see not only yellow film of sulphur in the neighbourhood but a black film of dust from the Drydock. This naturally and obviously with increase and worsen.</p> <p>Donating funds to support the community and buying elected officials is no longer a way to be in business. Times are changing, people are seeing through lies and deceit. Transparency and truth is what's expected. Please raise the bar in how Seaspan is operating and you'll have the support of the entire community.</p> <p>Since this is a Category C project no air quality testing is required. There should be an AIR QUALITY assessment done by a 3rd party since there is a ton of particulate dust that comes from the current dry dock. It's baffling and highly suspicious that the PORT is looking the other way. Over exposure to dust and pollutants long-term is not only hazardous to our health as we walk on the pier but to your employees as well. Various cancers are typically associated with air-born pollutants. Are these law suits something Seaspan wants to deal with in the future?</p> <p>What's also suspicious is that Seaspan has already accepted the contract for the Naval ships without having approval for the expansion. All of this information does not help Seaspan look favourable in the community's eyes.</p> <p>Finally, NO satisfactory information has been given as to why the expansion can't go eastward. The lame reasons that have been given don't hold water. But for this feedback, the proposed expansion going west will be the worst business move Seaspan could ever consider doing and the permanent distaste and lack of consideration will not be forgotten. Not only that, the eyesore of have an industrial site right next to a beautiful and amazing location where thousands of residents enjoy will be ruined. The sulphur piles and silos are ugly enough!</p> <p>Lastly, a petition has been created by concerned members of the community which show a significant number of people that oppose this proposal. The advocates have spent their time and money to inform people about this expansion, most people are outraged and angry and don't even know this is taking place!</p> <p>Is Seaspan a true community neighbour or a bully down the street? Think about how</p>

Date	Feedback
	this is really going to affect any future decisions because there won't be a community to support you. Please make the right choice and halt this proposal from happening in such a precious and valued location in this area.
11-Aug-21	<p>I enjoy coming to the newly developed Shipyard's District and frequent the outdoor patios and walk along the Burrard Pier many times a week. I know the city of NV has spent time and money in developing a beautiful and community-oriented space for families. With this, it's really surprising that you, Seaspan, can even consider proposing and infringing further into this space. What is shown is that Seaspan is completely out of touch with the community's needs, even though Seaspan has been part of the community for decades. The proposal to expand closer to the Pier is purely self-serving. It's selfish and doesn't benefit the community at large in any way. There is NO mention that the new jobs that will be created will be given to Canadians which is also disturbing. I know that with other projects Seaspan has done, foreign expertise was brought in to assist since we do not have people with those skill sets. I notice that the feedback forms that are being collected are being submitted directly from you to the Port Authority. That in itself is a biased method of submitting public input. The method in which this proposal has been submitted and handled has been very sneaky and strategic. The amount of time given for public input has been minimal, the error in the North Shore News stating that the project was moving east, the fact that the City of NV is in summer recess so public opinion could not be heard, the woman at the port going on holiday for two weeks just as your deadline for feedback was concluding etc etc etc. This behaviour is despicable and pathetic. The hydroblasting times are also an issue and with the expansion this will only get worse and louder. Right now Seaspan doesn't adhere to any timelines. Who polices that and who fines you when you continue blasting until 1:00 am? Nobody! I've personally seen the run-off turning the ocean in a murky brown or deep red color which indicates all kinds of pollutants are being dumped into the ocean where marine life exists. This happens weekly and yet the Port doesn't hold Seaspan accountable for this environmental abuse. Recently two dead seals pups have shown up near the dry dock and the beach between the two buildings in front of the children's playground next to the proposed expansion site. More docks, more dumping, more toxicity, more pollutants, more damage, more deaths. The tugs that come in and out with the barges and boats add more pollutants in the air. Some times, the bright lights on the tugs are lit the entire night so even though your proposal talks about LED lights, that's only on the dock, not the boats, tugs and cranes that will be lit up so that's extremely misleading. The particulate dust is another major issue. The air quality is awful since you can see not only a yellow film of sulphur in the neighbourhood but a black film of dust from the Drydock. This naturally and obviously increases and worsens. Donating funds to support the community and buying elected officials is no longer a way to be in business. Times are changing, people are seeing through lies and deceit. Transparency and truth is what's expected. Please raise the bar in how Seaspan is operating and you'll have the support of the entire community. Since this is a Category C project no air quality testing is required. There should be an AIR QUALITY assessment done by a 3rd party since there is a ton of particulate dust that comes from the current dry dock. It's baffling and highly suspicious that the PORT is looking the other way. Over exposure to dust and pollutants long-term is not only hazardous to our health as we walk on the pier but to your employees as well. Various cancers are typically associated with air-borne pollutants. Are these law suits something Seaspan wants to deal with in the future? What's also suspicious is that Seaspan has already</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>accepted the contact for the Naval ships without having approval for the expansion. All of this information does not help Seaspan look favourable in the community's eyes. Finally, NO satisfactory information has been given as to why the expansion can't go eastward. The lame reasons that have been given don't hold water. But for this feedback, the proposed expansion going west will be the worst business move Seaspan could ever consider doing and the permanent distaste and lack of consideration will not be forgotten. Not only that, the eyesore of have an industrial site right next to a beautiful and amazing location where thousands of residents enjoy will be ruined. The sulphur piles and silos are ugly enough! Lastly, a petition has been created by concerned members of the community which show a significant number of people that oppose this proposal. The advocates have spent their time and money to inform people about this expansion, most people are outraged and angry and don't even know this is taking place! Is Seaspan a true community neighbour or a bully down the street? Think about how this is really going to affect any future decisions because there won't be a community to support you. Please make the right choice and halt this proposal from happening in such a precious and valued location in this area.</p>
<p>11-Aug-21</p>	<p>Almost 1,700 and still counting, concerned citizens have signed this petition on Change.org</p> <p>I attach with this email, the names and comments that these people have expressed. The alarm to this expansion is great and growing by the hour.</p> <p>I only represent a small group of concerned citizens who care about our beautiful city, all the hard work and efforts by the City to give us something nice to enjoy on our waterfront. This expansion isn't something ANYONE wants to see happen, expressly the way it is proposed to be directly in front of the most developed area that has made being down in the area a pleasure. Yes, the people who bought down there knew SeaSpan existed and have lived with what it produces which is more than they were told. However, adding onto this is inexcusable. It's already hurting our waters.</p> <p>I'm particularly disenchanted to read all the nonsense that this expansion won't cause more harm, pollution, noise or light, hurt animals etc etc. Yes, it will and it should not happen. Very least, a new proposal to the East should be considered and no one has even given credence to it.</p> <p>This is another ugly expansion that should not be considered EXISTING....because none of the residential buildings were there when Seaspan's lease was first signed. Much has changed and as a small organized group in the community I speak for, we do not want it here. It's unanimous pretty much for all the almost 1,700 signatures on the list.</p> <p>We are upset and angry. We are not tree huggers, mass protestors or right fighters. We are people who live here on the North Shore who care, who don't want this and demand to be heard.</p> <p>The people should count. Last time I checked, this Country was still a democracy!</p> <p>With all due respect, we want to be heard, not shuffled away, swept under a carpet or put aside as so often happens.</p>

Date	Feedback
12-Aug-21	<p>I am 100% in favour of Seaspan’s project going ahead.</p> <p>I am a North Vancouver resident and many times a week I come to the Shipyards to walk or cycle along the Spirit Trail. At the drydock there is always something interesting to see – I love it. Vancouver is a working port and the fact that there is a working shipyard right here makes it a lot more interesting, and a lot more real.</p> <p>I have read the news about nearby residents being opposed to this project and complaining about living next to a shipyard. Their residences are literally right next to the drydock – it’s not like the drydock sprang up out of nowhere. It was here for years before this land was developed. These people should have given more thought to what it means to live next door to an industrial zoned property before they chose their condos.</p> <p>What I can’t understand is when the lands to the west of the drydock were being rezoned and developed into what we know as “the Shipyards” today, why there was no buffer zone created between the drydock (heavy industrial activity!) and the luxury residences. It seems ludicrous - and a recipe for conflict. Why was the land developer not obligated to provide any kind of buffer? Which land use planner thought that not having a buffer zone was a good idea?</p> <p>North Vancouver has a rich history of shipbuilding and repair. But this is not just in our past. We have these activities today in North Vancouver and they continue to contribute to our local, regional and national economies. Especially after what we’ve seen during Covid with many retail and hospitality-based business shutter their doors, our economy needs the type of stable, well-paying jobs that Seaspan and other port businesses provide. We are a port city and part of what a port city needs is drydocking space.</p> <p>I hope Seaspan is successful in getting this project done. As a North Vancouver resident, you have my full support.</p>
12-Aug-21	<p>I am 100% in favour of Seaspan’s project going ahead. I am a North Vancouver resident and many times a week I come to the Shipyards to walk or cycle along the Spirit Trail. At the drydock there is always something interesting to see – I love it. Vancouver is a working port and the fact that there is a working shipyard right here makes it a lot more interesting, and a lot more real. I have read the news about nearby residents being opposed to this project and complaining about living next to a shipyard. Their residences are literally right next to the drydock – it’s not like the drydock sprang up out of nowhere. It was here for years before this land was developed. These people should have given more thought to what it means to live next door to an industrial zoned property before they chose their condos. What I can’t understand is when the lands to the west of the drydock were being rezoned and developed into what we know as “the Shipyards” today, why there was no buffer zone created between the drydock (heavy industrial activity!) and the luxury residences. It seems ludicrous - and a recipe for conflict. Why was the land developer not obligated to provide any kind of buffer? Which land use planner thought that not having a buffer zone was a good idea? North Vancouver has a rich history of shipbuilding and repair. But this is not just in our past. We have these activities today in North Vancouver and they continue to contribute to our local, regional and national economies. Especially after what we’ve seen during Covid with many retail and hospitality-based business shutter their doors, our economy needs the type of stable, well-paying jobs that Seaspan and other port businesses provide. We are a port city and part of what a port city needs is drydocking space. I hope Seaspan is successful in getting this project done. As a North Vancouver resident, you have my full support.</p>

Date	Feedback
12-Aug-21	<p>So many concerns. Where to begin? First of all, you must understand how offended the local community is by the roughshod way in which Seaspan is pushing this expansion proposal through. The public "consultation" period was designed purposely to be (insultingly) short. During the summertime when many people who had waited over a year due to Covid, could finally leave home for vacation, making the audience to this consultation much, much smaller. Seaspan made it VERY clear to the residents, visitors, and workers of the Lower Lonsdale community that they absolutely do not care about their wellbeing. It is all about money and profits and nothing else. The attitudes of the representatives of Seaspan and the Port of Vancouver on the public consultation calls in July were dismissive and insulting. Many, many questions were ignored or answered in roundabout ways so as to avoid properly and truthfully answering. Many residents on the public zoom calls asked why Seaspan insists that they "cannot" expand eastward, instead of westward into the vibrant and very population-dense Lower Lonsdale side. Paul Hebson admitted on the July 15 public zoom call that Seaspan had not even bothered to do an economic impact study looking at locating the expansion to the east. Which indicates that Seaspan puts priority of its billionaire owner, and his yacht collection parked on the east side, over the many environment concerns of all who live in and visit the Shipyards neighbourhood. The "investigations" Seaspan claims they made into situating the expansion eastward are flimsy at best and outright fake at worst. There is plenty of space to locate the expansion to the east, to preserve the positive quality of life that visitors and residents of the Shipyard district deserve and must protect. Speaking as someone who has lived here for years, my concerns with the westward expansion proposal include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air pollution. Current particulate matter levels are extremely high, and that is without being directly in front of the dry dock at present. The wind off the water carries the particulate matter further afield, but buildings in the immediate vicinity must wipe dirt and dust off their balconies every day, sometimes multiple times a day, to avoid filth building up in their homes. The exterior of buildings are coated with grime. And that's just at current work levels. With an additional two dry-docks and work pontoon the air pollution will increase exponentially. Fumes from paints and other chemical supplies in addition to the dirt and debris will be directly flung into the homes, businesses and recreational areas that thousands of people live in and visit. Please note the playground already next to the existing dry dock and think of the increase in pollution the children and all who enjoy the green space here will endure if even more industry is built just meters away. People will stop coming to this beautiful area, in which so much time, money, energy, and community effort has been invested. - Noise pollution. The current dry dock works operate 24 hours a day, with extremely loud tools. Currently the Trophy building at _____ Victory Ship way acts as somewhat of a sound barrier (it was built there specifically for such purpose). If the dry dock expands to the west there will be zero barriers and the noise will carry across the water in all directions, impacting all residents and visitors who live in and enjoy the beautiful seaside neighbourhoods of Lower Lonsdale, Coal Harbour, CRAB Park and many others. - Light pollution. The dry dock operations, again, happening 24/7, use extremely bright spotlights which already reflect off the buildings in the area and impact people and residents not even directly nearby. Even with allegedly "night sky-friendly" lights for the proposed westward expansion, the Vancouver Harbour will be lit up with disruptive lighting round the clock which is harmful to residents who wish to turn off the lights and sleep in peace at regular hours. - Construction. All the concerns for air, noise, light and water pollution as well as

Date	Feedback
	<p>innocent marine life, will be further felt with the massive construction project so close to the residential area. - Views. Lower Lonsdale offers one of the best views of the City of Vancouver and countless visitors come here to view the landscape. Why blight it with a massive new industrial construction when there is perfectly useable and good industrial land ALREADY available to the east, which impacts zero views. Please commit to reading all of the comments on the petition created by locals who object to the westward expansion, when perfectly reasonable eastward real estate exists for this project. As of my writing this there are over 1,700 signatures of concerned residents and visitors: https://www.change.org/p/the-vancouver-fraser-port-authority-object-to-seaspan-extension-project?redirect=false.</p>
12-Aug-21	<p>I am writing to state my strong opposition to the proposed Seaspan dry dock expansion to the west towards Burrard Pier. I am a resident of Trophy at the Pier in Lower Lonsdale. I do not support the westward expansion and also have issues with an eastward expansion. The noise levels in the evenings now (up to 10pm on many nights) are already very impactful. I can't imagine how much more noise will result from the proposed expansion.</p> <p>I bought a home in the Shipyards area over five years ago before the Trophy building was completed. I moved to the north shore into the Shipyards area based on the fabulous location and knowing of the CNV's development of restaurants, community facilities, tourism venues etc. This is a wonderful residential area now being threatened by industrial expansion that would collectively reduce property values in the millions of dollars (and likely property tax revenue as well).</p> <p>Is industrial expansion in front of the Shipyards part of the City of North Vancouver's Official Community Plan? If I had known about this I would not have moved here.</p> <p>The views, noise levels, air quality and water quality will all be impacted. Marine mammals including federally at risk species (Orca are listed under SARA the Species At Risk Act) are known to use these waters. Every day I can see Harbour Seals, otters and marine birds in the waters exactly where the expansion is proposed. Have in depth Environmental Impact Assessments been done? I have not seen any.</p> <p>Seaspan has revenue in the multi millions. If they must expand can they not expand eastward? I believe they can afford it. This would alleviate some, but not all, of the issues.</p> <p>There is so much more I can say but I will keep this concise. Any support that you can provide to me and all North Van residents is very much appreciated.</p>
12-Aug-21	<p>Thank you for your letter of Friday, August 6th. I note that the "project" is not a "designated project" (as I "assumed"). So I now assume that that the port authority's deliberations are to be performed under section 82 and subsections 84(1) and 90(1), applying all relevant interpretation provisions (including section 81) of the Impact Assessment Act. Not, as you say, section 81 itself, which is purely a definition section which, by definition, should not, and does not, contain any rule of conduct. Nevertheless, most of what I did say in my earlier analysis of the provisions of the statute dealing with the "initial stages" of the review process for a designated project (contained in the Appendix to my earlier submission on July 30) does apply. And one</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>would also hope that many of the initial stages rules strictly applicable to designated projects would be applied, as a matter of principle and of respecting the overall legislative intent, even if they are not strict legislative requirements (this not being a “designated project”).</p> <p>Since the abovementioned provisions (section 82 etc.) are in the self-same statute as the designated project provisions, comments in the earlier analysis (Appendix) about the preamble and purpose clauses are generally applicable. And comments generally that cite the preamble and purpose clauses, unless they apply strictly to designated projects, are equally applicable. Especially important is what I said under “Powers and principles” with respect to scientific integrity, honesty, objectivity, thoroughness and accuracy. This includes impartiality and lack of prejudice (and therefore prejudgment). The port authority is bound not only by the legislative but also by the common law principles of procedural fairness and is therefore bound, in effect, to act judicially. (Anecdotally, I just asked a lady how she thought the process was going to go. The response was that she considered the matter already decided. I hope and trust she was wrong.</p> <p>Can I so assure her? This means that all who are in the decision making process will be looking at the total picture with fresh eyes after all submissions have been made, and throwing out any preconceived opinions or premature decisions: ie beginning the actual decision making at the very earliest after today, when submissions from either side are potentially still flowing in).</p> <p>What I said about the meaning of the term “environment” (under “Fundamental protection”), and especially its inclusion of human beings, based on the statutory definition, applies to what the port authority would be doing under section 82 etc. So the definition of “environmental effects” in section 81 includes changes to “organic matter and living organisms” – see para. (b) of the definition of “environment” - (including us, our children and our grandchildren) and the impact of the changes on the health or social or economic conditions of everyone (not only those people) who could potentially be impacted by the project effects, whether directly or indirectly.</p> <p>Naturally, you will attach significant importance to the word “significant” in section 82 and subsection 84(1) of the Act. What is significant, and what is not? As one would expect, the term is not defined by the legislation and is therefore left to the adjudicators using other interpretational aids (eg. standard dictionaries).</p> <p>“sufficiently great or important to be worthy of attention; noteworthy” is one example (from “Oxford Languages”). Again, I would consider the factors advanced by the community here to be “significant”. No doubt there is common law on the subject. I am unqualified to perform any analysis on that through lack of time and resources. But I would have thought, not to mention the many other matters raised by community members, that any possible impact on the health in particular of children regularly playing in the children’s park would be a matter of extreme “significance” to anyone other than Seaspan. One wonders if Seaspan executives living in the immediate proximity of the project effects, if any remain or move in, will allow their children and grandchildren to play regularly in the children’s park. The question could potentially involve not only law, but also individual consciences.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>Another thing that is relevant from the opinion I gave earlier is the potential mitigation measures that are feasible. Paragraph 84)(1)(e) requires the authority to consider the measures that are technically and economically feasible and that would effectuate mitigation. This would, in my opinion, include the feasibility of alternative locations for the project, looking at the whole picture anew with effect from after today.</p> <p>I assume that the reference in section 82 to a statute “other than this Act” would, so far as the port authority is concerned, be the Canada Marine Act. Whether or to what extent there is relevance in that particular statute to this project, I do not know as I have not had time to analyse it. Suffice it to say (while acknowledging that a statute must be “read as a whole” as a basic legislative interpretation principle) that section 4 of that Act, the “Purpose of the Act” provisions, includes as purposes “effective support for the achievement of ... local social and economic objectives” (para. (a)), providing “for a high level of safety and environmental protection” (para. (d)) (“environmental protection” not being defined), being “responsive to local needs and priorities” (para. (e)) and encouraging and taking into account the local community (para.(f)). You say that the port authority’s mandate includes (only) “considering local communities” while facilitating trade. Judging only by the purposes provisions just cited and subject to the qualification mentioned, I would think that you understate your legislative mandate requirement in respect of local communities. That is, merely “considering” us and, by implication, unjustifiably dismissing things relevant to our situation after that “consideration” has been performed would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Canada Marine Act. However, in your website, you say that your view of “sustainability” includes “thriving communities”, a view with which I concur. I am sure I can speak for almost all members of the local community in saying that we wish to continue to “thrive” and especially wish all the local children to “thrive” for decades to come, without ill effects.</p> <p>I note also that the proposed project is a category C one, suggesting that it is not regarded by the port authority as worthy of the highest classification. This is somewhat troubling, unless there is something somewhere that legally dictates the lower one. Does that mean that it is not regarded as “complex”, unlike a new warehouse? I would think that, in any given situation, the latter could be way less “complex” than what is proposed – especially if constructed in a heavily industrial area. A category D classification would have required an air assessment. The port authority, by implication it seems, has decided that it is not one of the “very large scale projects which are usually introducing a new operation or activity into an area”. This is not a very large scale project? Or is it not introducing a new operation? Or a new activity? Which of these applies, if not all? I think that if you asked almost everyone around here if those tests, or some at least, were met, they would almost unanimously disagree with the port authority’s decision on it.</p> <p>Another assumption that I make is that the Minister has not made an order under section 87 of the Act. Is that correct? I.e. that the justification for the port authority’s treatment of the process as claimed arises from the interpretation of para. (a) of the definition of “project” in section 81? I.e., that the “project” is a “physical activity that is carried out on federal lands ... in relation to a physical work and that is not a designated project”. Is that correct?</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>(I am confused as to the necessity, meaning and relevance of “physical work” [an undefined term] in that provision and in section 87. What physical activity could be other than in relation to physical work, both terms being undefined? Do I miss something, or are not the words nugatory?).</p>
12-Aug-21	<p>I am writing to express our family's fervent opposition to the proposed Seaspan Drydocks expansion project.</p> <p>We have been residents of Lower Lonsdale for over a decade. We moved into one of the first new buildings developed in the Shipyards community as renters. In the time we've lived here we have saved enough to purchase our own home in North Vancouver. Our goal has always been to purchase in the Shipyards development; however, we are reconsidering whether that would be a wise investment for our family if this expansion proceeds. The impact on the community will be drastic and detract from the living conditions for the residents here.</p> <p>We feel there has been insufficient public consultation conducted by Seaspan and the Port of Vancouver in this expansion process. Our family attended both of Seaspan's community meetings via zoom. The community was not allowed to speak, and questions were selectively answered from the platform's chat. Many questions and concerns have still gone unanswered in the subsequent postings by Seaspan on the project website. Community notifications have been insufficient: even the ads taken out in the local newspaper failed to mention anywhere in them that this project is happening in North Vancouver. Many residents are still completely unaware of this proposal.</p> <p>This area was re-zoned into a master planned community and is thriving as a hub of business, residential, and recreation. This expansion of industry into this space is in any way unacceptable – as demonstrated by the significant public opposition to this project.</p> <p>Our family's main concerns revolve around increased noise pollution and the detrimental environmental impact on the people living here. We feel that insufficient direct study has been conducted on the impacts to people living in the area. For example – noise monitoring stations and air quality observations are not located in the community (in fact they are nowhere near the residences here), and results in the reports presented by Seaspan have been extrapolated based on assumptions rather than direct study. In one of the community meetings – Seaspan stated that during the construction period (months), noise levels of approximately 200dB would occur during pile driving. This is well beyond acceptable limits for the community to endure on an ongoing basis. Routine work and Ultra High Pressure Washing (UHP) decibel levels in the drydocks already exceed North Vancouver bylaws for prolonged sound exposure, and this work regularly extends past Seaspan's standard operating hours and bylaw stated quiet hours (work continues past 10pm and occasionally past midnight). Seaspan's Environmental Noise Assessment states that the expansion of the drydocks will increase noise levels the community will be subjected to by 3dB. While this doesn't sound like much, to the human ear 3dB is an effective doubling of the sound pressure levels (ie: 2x volume). The noise from the drydocks is already unbearable at times, and subjecting the community to double the levels is absolutely unacceptable.</p>

Date	Feedback
	<p>The Trophy building at ____ Victory Ship Way, immediately next to the drydock, was specially engineered on one side to act as a noise protection barrier for the community. By moving operations to the West – this protective barrier will become useless and expose those living in the area to unacceptable levels of noise pollution.</p> <p>There are many other locations that are industrial zones operated by the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority that may be suitable for this expansion. We are not opposed to expansion of the drydock to the East of the current location in the industrial area; however, we are opposed to an expansion West into an area that has become a thriving master planned community where North Vancouver lives, works, and plays.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in protecting North Vancouver resident's health and wellbeing over a private company's profits.</p>
12-Aug-21	<p>Why expansion towards residential area? East side is more industrial and have more room for expansion.</p> <p>This project got approval without hearing from residents. Why such a huge impact on marine life and expansion were proposed without consultation with residents?</p>
12-Aug-21	<p>We are residents of ____ Victory Ship Way. After viewing the two presentations, as well as attending the meeting arranged for the Strata members of neighboring buildings we are still extremely concerned that this expansion will pose serious harm to our neighborhood. Additionally, we are of the opinion that this expansion is contrary to the ethos that the City of North Vancouver has proposed for this location. Here is a summary of our major concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Impact of traffic: It is absurd that neither Seaspan nor the Port has requested a traffic study. As a resident we frequently use the intersection of Victory Ship Way and St Georges. This intersection is extremely busy, and forms part of the Spirit Trail (an extremely popular walking and biking trail). In the past 5 years the stress on this intersection has been tremendous. It is an intersection that has a three way stop sign. However, most workers heading east on VSW, do not obey the stop signs, and rarely care about the speed limits. By adding more construction traffic, as well as adding additional staff, the area will just be too dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. A complete traffic study needs to be completed. 2) Impact of noise: Even though we live next to a train track, the major noise pollution in this area emanates from Seaspan. Many times during the day, and sometimes during the middle of the night, loud banging noise is heard from their facility. This is in complete disregard for the neighborhood as well as the City of North Vancouver bylaws, of which we are subject to. After reviewing the Q&A it is pretty obvious that Seaspan has only provided "lip service" and no real mitigation towards future increase in noise level. Foreseeably, as the project expands west, and closer to the residential areas, the noise level can only be expected to increase. 3) Environmental and Air quality issues: Again, a lot of "lip service" was paid to this issue. However, the Port admitted that they do not "typically" have to worry about environment issues as most of their projects are not adjacent to a large residential base. However, this not being a "typical" project; it is imperative that more stringent criteria be used to ensure that the residents of the area can enjoy peaceful existence. 4) Last, but not least, the City of North Vancouver has promoted the Shipyards District as one as a vibrant hub for the City of North Vancouver. Tremendous amount

Date	Feedback
	<p>of resources are spent to promote music, food and culture in the area. Furthermore, significant tax dollars have been spent to promote activities for kids. Several thousand people make this Lower Lonsdale area their home, place of work, or place to gather. This type of industrial expansion is completely incongruous with the ethos of the surrounding. While it is a bit too much to expect all arms of various governments to work in-sync, but when different arms of government take actions that undermine the efforts of other ones it almost always leads to chaos.</p> <p>Based on these concerns, and after spending hours with our neighbours, we highly urge Seaspan to reconsider this expansion. We also urge that if Seaspan does that voluntarily remove their expansion request that the Port authority recognize the consequences for the neighbourhood and reject the request.</p>
12-Aug-21	<p>We are residents of ____ Victory Ship Way. After viewing the two presentations, as well as attending the meeting arranged for the Strata members of neighboring buildings we are still extremely concerned that this expansion will pose serious harm to our neighborhood. Additionally, we are of the opinion that this expansion is contrary to the ethos that the City of North Vancouver has proposed for this location. Here is a summary of our major concerns: 1) Impact of traffic: It is absurd that neither Seaspan nor the Port has requested a traffic study. As a resident we frequently use the intersection of Victory Ship Way and St Georges. This intersection is extremely busy, and forms part of the Spirit Trail (an extremely popular walking and biking trail). In the past 5 years the stress on this intersection has been tremendous. It is an intersection that has a three way stop sign. However, most workers heading east on VSW, do not obey the stop signs, and rarely care about the speed limits. By adding more construction traffic, as well as adding additional staff, the area will just be too dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. A complete traffic study needs to be completed. 2) Impact of noise: Even though we live next to a train track, the major noise pollution in this area emanates from Seaspan. Many times during the day, and sometimes during the middle of the night, loud banging noise is heard from their facility. This is in complete disregard for the neighborhood as well as the City of North Vancouver bylaws, of which we are subject to. After reviewing the Q&A it is pretty obvious that Seaspan has only provided "lip service" and no real mitigation towards future increase in noise level. Foreseeably, as the project expands west, and closer to the residential areas, the noise level can only be expected to increase. 3) Environmental and Air quality issues: Again, a lot of "lip service" was paid to this issue. However, the Port admitted that they do not "typically" have to worry about environment issues as most of their projects are not adjacent to a large residential base. However, this not being a "typical" project; it is imperative that more stringent criteria be used to ensure that the residents of the area can enjoy peaceful existence. 4) Last, but not least, the City of North Vancouver has promoted the Shipyards District as one as a vibrant hub for the City of North Vancouver. Tremendous amount of resources are spent to promote music, food and culture in the area. Furthermore, significant tax dollars have been spent to promote activities for kids. Several thousand people make this Lower Lonsdale area their home, place of work, or place to gather. This type of industrial expansion is completely incongruous with the ethos of the surrounding. While it is a bit too much to expect all arms of various governments to work in-sync, but when different arms of government take actions that undermine the efforts of other ones it almost always leads to chaos. Based on these concerns, and after spending hours with our neighbours, we highly urge Seaspan to reconsider this expansion. We also urge that if Seaspan does that voluntarily remove</p>

Date	Feedback
	their expansion request that the Port authority recognize the consequences for the neighbourhood and reject the request.
12-Aug-21	I am concerned about the marine lives as there was a dead seal being washed up on the beach between the two Cascade buildings next to the existing dry dock. The expansion of the dry dock would further damage the environment in the surrounding water. Noise and light from the dry dock is another issue that concerns the residents nearby.
12-Aug-21	<p>Please accept this email as my formal opposition to the Seaspan Drydock proposal to expand West – into the newly created residential sphere at Lonsdale Quay.</p> <p>I am fortunate to have grown up in North Vancouver. After many years living downtown, I moved back to the North Shore to live in this amazing complex known as “The Shipyards”. To me, it is a credit to the City of North Vancouver that it has successfully designed an amazing mixture of residential and industrial, married together in this wonderful city we call Vancouver.</p> <p>I understood and accepted there would be both noise and construction as part of my home. This was part of the charm of living in the Shipyards. What I did not expect that there would be any consideration that industrial development through Seaspan would move west, encroaching back onto the residential sphere.</p> <p>To my mind, this is going “backwards. Presently, the noise is, at times excessive. In fact, I cannot use my patio on many days as it is prohibitively loud. I cannot imagine what the sound will be like with 2 additional docks added to the West.</p> <p>Please note that I am not opposed to Seaspan’s expansion in principal. In fact, as a business person myself, I appreciate the contributions Seaspan is making to the community, through jobs and charitable endeavors. However, I am strongly opposed to any expansion “West” (i.e.. moving into the newly created residential area of the Quay) I would respectfully ask that you more carefully consider other expansion options that are more suitable to the neighbors. With some additional costs, it appears expanding east is a viable option to be explored further.</p>
12-Aug-21	<p>I Hope this is my last letter and this expansion ideas can be improved to accommodate everyone.</p> <p>August 10th, 11th and 12th work from the Caren dock has been extremely noisy resulting in many complaints with noise likely exceeding allowed decibels. If the Caren dock was moved east, noise would not bother residents and visitors. The Caren could be moved on occasion to access the W Building. At the very least, better noise shields should be implemented.</p> <p>I appreciate Seaspan Shipyard is a necessary and productive business and any expansion should evolve but be compatible with North Shore residents.</p> <p>It appears Seaspan, with the expansion, would soon become a monopoly.</p>
12-Aug-21	<p>I am resident of North Vancouver and writing to express my serious concerns about the environmental impacts of Seaspan drydock waterlot expansion projects as following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- what are the gas, liquid and solid wastes (effluents) of this facility? 2- How are these wastes/effluents getting collected, disposed of or treated now? 3- What are the flow rates and chemical compositions of these effluents/wastes? 4- How much emissions from this facility are getting into water or released into the atmosphere? 5- Any tests have been performed for the level of pollutants in the neighboring air, water and soil?

Date	Feedback
	6- Can we have access to the technical documents showing the details of drydock activity, the chemicals and materials that are used for their procedures and processes?