

Prepared for MMM Group

**JOHNSON STREET BRIDGE:**

**MARINE USESRS GROUP MEETING NOVEMBER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 2012**

**RE: RETENTION OF THE EXISTING BRIDGE PIERS**

---

**Meeting Minutes**

**Topic:** Johnson Street Bridge Replacement: Retention of Existing Piers

**Date:** November 14<sup>th</sup> 2012

**Prepared For:** City of Victoria, Steering Committee, Meeting Room #1

**Prepared By:** Russ Tyson, M.Pl. MCIP, RPP, PLE: TyPlan Planning and Management

---

**Attendees**

Hank Bekkering: Point Hope Shipyard

Kevin Ashley: Superintendent Seaspan Operations, Marine Victoria

Captain Scotty McTier: Seaspan Marine Victoria

Dave Featherby: Harbour Master, Port of Victoria, Transport Canada

Mike Graham: Chief of Operations, Greater Victoria Harbour Commission

Dwayne Kalynchuk: Director Johnson Street Bridge Project ;City of Victoria

Ken Jarvela: Senior Project Manager; Johnson Street Bridge Project; City of Victoria

Laura Baker; City of Victoria

---

Prepared for MMM Group Ltd.

Prepared by: TyPlan Planning and Management: November 7<sup>th</sup> 2012

Page 1

## **Meeting Overview**

Dwayne Kalynchuk/Russ Tyson provided a context regarding the meeting objectives.

The original navigational assessment undertaken for the project considered removal of the existing piers. Detailed engineering studies undertaken identified the following benefits would be derived from both an environmental and navigational perspective, with retaining the existing bridge piers:

1. Avoids habitat disruption
2. Provides for pier protection for the new bridge foundations
3. Provides the opportunity to establish a fendering system to protect commercial vessels when transiting the channel /bridge

## **Discussion**

As the retention of the existing piers was not originally considered by the commercial and recreational marine operators, both the Navigable Waters Protection Program (NWPP) and Transport Canada (TC), Harbour Masters Office of the Port of Victoria, requested that marine users and operators be consulted to ascertain if retention of the existing bridge piers would create an issue from a navigation/operational perspective.

While the proposed 41 metre navigational channel is maintained (representing a wider navigational channel than what is currently in place) concern regarding the increased length of restricted vessel manoeuvrability area via the bridge channel was identified as one potential issue to discuss. Secondly, consideration of the potential increase in magnitude of the ebb and flood tides via the channel was identified.

Seaspan, responsible for approximately 80% of all commercial marine transits via the channel (and provider of tug assist services to industry in the harbour) indicated that although they would prefer the piers removed they confirmed that the retention of the existing piers would not pose an issue to their on-going operations.

Mike Graham from the Greater Victoria Harbour Commission indicated that consideration of the design of the fendering system should also consider the potential protection requirements for smaller vessels (other than the Class C BC Ferries vessel which was utilized as the design vessel) transiting the channel.

**Follow Up Telephone conversations with other Commercial and Recreational Maritime Users**

Rocki Collins (Supervisor, Ocean Cement, a Division of Lehigh Cement) was contacted via telephone on November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2012, and confirmed that retention of the existing piers would not affect operations.

Ian Sutherland (COO of Butler Brothers) was contacted via telephone on November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2012 and confirmed his operations would not be effected. He suggested that we contact the Ledcor Group as they provide barge services to Butler Brothers.

Ledcor (Lauren Donnelly, Vessel Operations Coordinator, Ledcor Group of Companies, Resources & Transportation) was contacted via telephone and email November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2012 and confirmed via email that operations would not be effected.<sup>1</sup>

From a recreational use perspective SALTS, operators of two tall ships that moor in proximity to and transit the bridge, were also contacted and confirmed by email that the retention of the piers would not affect operations.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Email (Nov 7<sup>th</sup>, 2012) from Lauren Donnelly:

Afternoon Russ,

After reviewing your email below and our discussion earlier today, we feel that this will not affect or operations.

Thank you for taking the time to contact us and confirm.

Regards,

Lauren Donnelly, Vessel Operations Coordinator, Ledcor Group of Companies, Resources & Transportation

<sup>2</sup> Email (Nov 7<sup>th</sup>, 2011) from Loren Hagerty

SALTS is not concerned about having the old bridge foundations left in place for the long-term. They were not in our way before so they should not be in our way in the future. Thanks for asking.

Loren Hagerty, MBA, CFRE, Executive Director, SALTS Sail and Life Training Society

### **Conclusions**

Consultation with the recreational and commercial marine operators within the harbor identified above, confirmed that the retention of the existing piers would not effect either recreational or commercial marine operations.