

Schellenberg, Jim

From: Prud'homme, Robert
Sent: December 4, 2007 11:27 AM
To: Schellenberg, Jim
Subject: FW: Review of McNeal and Assoc report dated Sept 06 sub-titled Victoria International Marina Port Victoria Yacht Club Seaplane Operations

—Original Message—

From: Featherby, David
Sent: November 28, 2007 3:55 PM
To: Ogden, Rob; Prud'homme, Robert
Cc: Cox, Chris
Subject: RE: Review of McNeal and Assoc report dated Sept 06 sub-titled Victoria International Marina Port Victoria Yacht Club Seaplane Operations

Thanks Rob...just to clarify it is the PVTS not the VHTS....here are a few points to be considered:

Facts:

- . the historical inaccuracies referred to brings into question the accuracy of the entire document
- . the forecast of 5 vessel movements per day I feel is far too low (reality is they will want to fill ALL of the berths and a large percentage will be transient coming and going daily)
- . the reality is that to fill the marina the fees will have to be in line with other marinas to be viable
- . the target is for 50ft and over but may not be reality
- . need specific details how they propose PPR/reservations etc.
- . agree the vessel operators need to be advised of correct procedures to enter marina
- . may require more TC harbour patrol staff on duty
- . need details how the sign at the hbr. entrance would work
- . not realistic to expect vessels to hold outside of hbr. waiting for a berth (need better plan)
- . concierge would help alleviate issues when vessels are departing
- . concierge monitoring marine radio may be of benefit/ questionable if monitoring a/c would help
- . can't comment on how Customs would service the marina (presently will only provide service in secure location at Broughton St. floats)
- . need more details as to best location and number for entrance/exit

Facts relating to Aerodrome Safety:

- . the present three options for a/c transiting to "B" help to keep traffic moving and reduce congestion
- . the closure of the taxiway would not create significant problems (manageable)
- . the taxiway would have to be closed to make room for the non powered vessels
- . vessels over 65ft. would create minimal impact on a/c ops provided they limit time spent on the runways
- . smaller vessel operators would be drawn to the north side to check out the marina/ visit the restaurant etc. (need remediation plan to deal with this issue)
- . having an entrance at the east end may alleviate the issue of vessels returning to the marina after Customs
- . communication is critical

Summary:

- . agree with Rob assessment

Conclusion: Advise proponent that;

2007/12/04

- . Specific regulations have been put in place to safely manage the diverse mix of floatplanes, powered vessels and non power driven vessels. These are referred to as the Port of Victoria Traffic Scheme (PVTS) and are contained in the Practices and Procedures for Public Ports, promulgated under Section 76 and Sections 56 and 58 of the Canada Marine Act.
- . The north shore area is restricted to non-power driven vessels. Operation of power driven vessels in this area is not consistent with the PVTS.
- . The potential crossing of the runways and taxiways by itinerant vessels would introduce additional risk to port operations.

[Featherby, David] -----Original Message-----

From: Ogden, Rob

Sent: November 28, 2007 2:17 PM

To: Prud'homme, Robert; Featherby, David

Cc: Cox, Chris

Subject: Review of McNeal and Assoc report dated Sept 06 sub-titled Victoria International Marina Port Victoria Yacht Club Seaplane Operations

Dave: please add your comments;

Robert: I read the report and then spoke with Mr. McNeal to clarify information and to establish the facts regarding the operation of the proposed marina from which specific safety issues can and have been identified.

Facts:

- there are several historical and regulatory inaccuracies in this document, most of which can be ignored for this purpose
- the forecast increase of 1800 vessel movements is very subjective
- this will be a high end facility, that will pose economic limitation on possible users. \$\$\$\$ birthing fees
- the target market is vessels great than 50ft
- the intent is to require some form of PPR, membership or communication requirement (i.e. call ahead) for any potential user
- having called ahead the vessel would be provided with info on how to proceed to the marina
- during the summer months vessels that did not call ahead would be intercepted by the hbr patrols
- during the off season vessel would be directed by new signage at the hbr entrance to "hold here and call ahead"
- vessels having made contact before entering the Hbr would hold outside the Hbr if a birth was not available.
- a marine concierge would be on duty to advise any departing vessel on current harbour activity
- the concierge would be monitoring marine and aviation frequencies (no direct radio contact with the FSS)
- no customs office, but hopefully customs will be able to provide a "call out/over" service
- moving the marine entrance to the east side or providing both an east and west entrance would be feasible

Facts relating to Aerodrome Safety:

- there are currently three options for A/C going to and from area B, #1 taxi channel but only at high (er) tide, #2 taxi down area A, #3 use outbound boat lane along the south shore.

- this proposal would reduce the north side taxi channel to 120', the standards require a 150' wide channel therefore the taxi channel would be closed (no more option A)
- even if the taxi channel was widened to 150' it would likely be closed to provide a channel for "non-powered boats".
- vessels greater than 65ft could use the existing procedures in the VHTS with little impact on seaplane activity
- **HOWEVER** vessels less than 65' using the inbound traffic lanes would have to cross area A and some of area B to enter the marina. **THIS IS THE NUMBER ONE ISSUE.** Currently the VHTS does not allow uncontrolled crossing of area A or B except for water taxis that are equipped with aviation and marine radios, special lighting and trained operators familiar with the Hbr. **THERE IS NO MITIGATION OR AMELIORATION FACTORS IN THIS REPORT TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE BECAUSE THIS REPORT HAD ALL VESSELS GOING AROUND THE TAKEOFF AND LANDING AREAS.** This is contrary to the VHTS, not practical and may not be physically possible (see pg 6 of the report).
- the report does not address the need for many of the vessels to first proceed to the customs dock and then return to the marina.
- Regardless of the final plan and access routes an extensive communication plan would be required.

Summary: The McNeal report has a suggested routing that is not currently in the VHTS. The proposed routing suggest that the mixing of A/C, powered and none powered boats on the north side of the Hbr and power boats and rowers beyond Colville island east of area B is OK because the "no power boats restriction is not a regulation". This is wrong, it is a regulation pursuant to the Hbr masters authority under the CMA and is contrary to the VHTS. The report identifies the risk of collision of taxiing AC and power boats in this area as the only new risk being introduced to the Hbr because of the marina. This is wrong because there is no mention of rowers. Further the risk analysis in the report is not a risk analysis by industry standards nor does not follow the TC model. Lastly the key concept that has led to the success of the VHTS is the procedural separation of the different activities in the HBR. The routing in the McNeal report contravenes this concept and is therefore unacceptable. The alternative of having vessels less than 65' conform to the current VHTS would introduce a significant new risk of uncontrolled vessel crossing of area A and B and this too would be unacceptable.

Conclusion; Advise proponent that;

The routing for vessels in the McNeal report (under 65') will not work as it is contrary to our safety concept of procedural separation of activities.

Any new proposal must address rowers and can not contain uncontrolled crossing of area A and B for vessels less than 65'. Note: The current VHTS is acceptable for vessels over 65'.

We would be happy to meet with them to discuss the issues.

Rob Ogden
Senior Inspector
Aerodromes and Air Navigation
Transport Canada, Pacific Region
(604) 666-5536 fax 604 666-8877