

Review of Practice Run of October 19th, 2024

New Comment A	This was mentioned by two after the practice. I would like to suggest we cancel judging and just parade in front of the Vancouver Waterfront. If we must judge, then let's skip 2025 judging and focus on parading safely and engaging the public
New Comments B	In our opinion the route needs to guide us through the two fixed high lift spans. The southernmost headed West and northernmost headed East. Once the whole parade fleet returns East under the interstate, the sailboats too tall to make it under the fixed high spans can join their respective clubs headed East in front of Beaches waterfront area. Judging should be done in that area and the judges could be stationed on shore to allow the parade to stay snug to the Washington shoreline. This would make for a very cool and close display for those patrons.
New Comment C	Another thought for consideration is perhaps removing the competition completely thus strengthening participation, or at a minimum reducing the competition to seamanship alone. Again, we thank you for your volunteer efforts and for your thoughtful consideration.
Comment 0	I felt most of the boaters out there were probably those that are a bit more experienced.
Comment in agreement	<p>1 Agree</p> <p>2 agree</p> <p>3 Agree, we should also lay out some basic guidelines for captains if they get in trouble and need assistance.</p> <p>4 Agree. I doubt we will be able to get less experienced boaters to one of our practices.</p>
Comment in dissent	
Comment 1	When making the every other boat into two lines thing it was less than obvious how it was supposed to happen for some. if that is the way we go, that the group should have one lead boat like the paddlefish was for the Oregon group. It allows that boat to set the path and more obvious how much spacing width wise makes sense. We went Port Starboard of the paddlefish and it seemed to work well.

Comment in agreement	<p>1 Agree. Each group (club) may designate a lead and choose where their lead should allign (center, left or right).</p> <p>4 If we had problems understanding this, and we were all on one radio channel, different yacht clubs will be guaranteed to be confused.</p>
Comment in dissent	
Comment 2	<p>We need to clarify that there are 3 options for exit. Lift span (with no lift), Long span for bigger club boats but probably no sail boats, and the high span which can be only sailboats or the whole club based on user preferences. We always move sailboats away from the parade to get them safely through the high span. Might keep congestion down as well in that area if we limit that passage to tallest boats?</p>
Comment in agreement	<p>1 Somewhat agree. While emergency exit options can be designated, the actual parade route needs to be followed by all vessels until such point where there's enough water to maneuver as desired without infringing on other clubs/vessels.</p> <p>2 Whatever we do, it needs to be consistent. In my opinion, there's nothing worse than too many options. It will undoubtedly cause confusion.</p>
Comment in dissent	<p>4 I suggest we do not use the lift span at all. Boaters may not know their air draft, including antennas, and each club would need to announce the air height just to confirm everyone in their club heard/understood it. I suggest we use the long and high spans only.</p>
Comment 3	<p>Waypoints 2,3,4 seemed very well-placed making for a nice gradual downstream turn</p>
Comment in agreement	<p>1 Agree, 2 Agree</p> <p>4 Again, that works because we are more experienced boaters.</p>
Comment in dissent	

Comment 4	The plotted upstream turn seemed too close to the bridge in my opinion. Perhaps the beginning of that turn would be better if positioned at the downstream end the city dock to allow a better heading into the current toward the high span
Comment in agreement	1 Agree. Precise placement of upstream turn should be discussed. Least maneuverable vessels should be considered. 2 Downstream end of the city dock or further downstream seemed the safest option.
Comment in dissent	
Comment 5	We may also want to consider going back to single file prior to going under the bridge
Comment in agreement	1 Agree. To zip together is what I would call the optimal exit configuration. 2 Agree. I am concerned about the turbulence under the bridge being too abreast.
Comment in dissent	3 Can't disagree specifically as I wasn't there, but seems it will increase time and potential problems 4 No. I think that would slow the procession too much and stop the following boats.
Comment 6	Overall, I think it was a really good run but a little sloppy the first time through. That said the opening day fleet will be going through just once with no practice. To do parade two abreast our fleet captains will really need to make sure that everyone is well prepared. I think its possible to do it well however it would require at minimum each lead boat running along the Wa side have the course plotted and those that don't or cant plot it act as wingman since they can follow visual cues from the lead boat. If each wingman turns in unison with the lead boat as it passes the waypoint we should be good setting up side by side as we turn. My biggest concern is those less experienced who are not used to such close maneuvering.
Comment in agreement	1 It's all a concern. 2 I agree. I should have shortened that rant a little bit. If we go to a breast, the lead boat of each pair should have way points charted 3 Agree with the concern about less experienced and tight spaces.

	4 I have zero confidence in the opening day fleet being able to turn in unison with a lead boat without practice.
Comment in dissent	
Comment 7	Institute communications protocol to fully utilize available channels. Channel 78 to be available for all boaters except for the time they have a dedicated channel. The front 3 clubs in parade order will each have a dedicated channel to use until the time they exit the review area. There is a dedicated channel for the fleet captains and parade marshal to use to assist choreographing of the event, i.e. NOTS is entering the review area, NOTS is exiting the review area surrendering this channel to xxxx, MCYC heading to the review area.
Comment in agreement	1 Yes! I love protocols! 2 I didn't completely follow this explanation, but I agree we need to define radio protocol and channels 3 Agree that someone needs to choreograph with fleet captains and channels should be defined.
Comment in dissent	4 We are asking the Fleet captains and their ducklings to follow a new course, keep from being pushed into the RR bridge, change channels and choreograph going from single file to double file all at the same time. The only favorable point is that we are doing this in daylight. 😊
Comment 8	Fleet captain to have either a radio assistant or dedicated driver to assure communication is a priority including broadcasting to the rest of the fleet their entrance and departure from the review area or other marks as needed.
Comment in agreement	Agree, Agree, Agree, Agree
Comment in dissent	
Comment 9	Request clubs provide the number of expected boats two weeks prior to the parade to allow for calculation of anticipated time for each club to enter and exit the review area. This combined with each club broadcasting entrance and exit times will allow each following club to position accordingly. Leeway will be granted for changes to the number of participants on the actual day of.
Comment in agreement	Agree, Agree, Agree

	4 Keep sailboats last.
Comment in dissent	
Comment 10	Fleet captains to be provided a choreography sequence of events to follow for simplicity, that they can check off as they go, including reminders to issue to their club members.
Comment in agreement	<p>1 Agree</p> <p>2 Agree, fleet captains, will need to provide good detail to their members. Any assistance CRYA can provide will be helpful.</p> <p>3 Agree that someone needs to choreograph with fleet captains and channels should be defined.</p> <p>4 Reminders are a good idea.</p>
Comment in dissent	
Comment 11	creating a rule similar to this “at no time should there be more than one club occupying the area between bridges
Comment in agreement	2 Agree, simple straightforward rules. We'll make this safer and smoother.
Comment in dissent	<p>1 I don't know that we need to completely clear the 2-bridge area. I think it would be wise to designate additional space between clubs. Buffer, but don't create a complete vacuum of space. Parades don't look good with too much space.</p> <p>3 This sounds reasonable but I'm also unsure of where and how this impacts staging.</p> <p>4 A general rule like this doesnt help. What part of 'between bridges" are being referred to? Upriver and downriver? Just upriver? I believe there will always be 3 clubs between the bridges. One leaving the judging area, one in and one approaching the judging area.</p>
Comment 12	establish a “transit only, no staging, no stopping zone” area upriver of the I-5 bridge
Comment in agreement	<p>1 Agree. An upriver traffic map should be devised.</p> <p>2 Agree</p>

	3 Agree
Comment in dissent	4 If the clubs are not upriver of the I-5 bridge, then where are they?
Comment 13	Start times should be considered the time when clubs would be expected pass through the “Transit Only Zone”
Comment in agreement	1 agree? 2 Agree. 3 Agree
Comment in dissent	4 Don’t understand this one
Comment 14	Consider the entire area between bridges as the “Judging Area”, meaning that the clubs are judged for their seamanship from the point they cross under the I-5 bridge until they cross back under the I-5 bridge
Comment in agreement	2 no comment
Comment in dissent	1 I will stay clear of this topic and leave it to the judges to designate their judging areas and criteria. 3 Unsure of the point of this. Agree that it should be one club at a time in there, but I don't know why we need to add additional judging criteria. 4 Would we double the number of judges?
Comment 15	Speed limit for both the “Judging Area” and the “Transit Only Zone” should be no more than 7 kts over ground
Comment in agreement	2 Agree 3 Agree 4 Agree

Comment in dissent	<p>1 I agree, although I also dissent. This will likely confuse things but... 7 kts sog downstream (5 kts sow plus current of ~2 kts {adjust current to actual}). I would propose an upstream speed of 4 kts sog. This will reduce wake, there will end up being less throttle adjustments. Splitting into twin lines would increase navigation space ONLY if we were in still water (theoretically 2 lines with double the forward/aft space). Transitioning from traveling with the current to against the current will decrease that space significantly, we don't want boats trying to make 9 kts over water in tight quarters. Current predictions are available in the days prior to the parade. Final speeds should be designated per those predictions. I believe 7 down and 4 up are reasonable. Zipping together while crabbing diagonal at 4 is much safer too.</p>
Comment 16	<p>We should consider the Oregon side high span as the dedicated judging area entry span and leave all other spans open for clubs to choose as their exit span.</p>
Comment in agreement	<p>2 Agree with the dedicated entry on the oregon side. Would also like to add, we should have a defined exit the high span on the washington side. I would say the only exception to use anothr span would be for safety reasons</p> <p>4 I am actually agree with this comment. Have the judging totally separate from the public viewing by the Vancouver waterfront. That way the clubs could focus on judging, then focus on engaging with the public</p>
Comment in dissent	<p>1 I believe the parade would be safer to mandate a specific bridge exit span before breaking formation. All others would be emergency use only. This would keep people from throttling up and disrupting clubs entering the 2-bridge zone. Maintain a traffic pattern well upriver of I-5.</p> <p>2 I don't agree with the "everyone can choose what they want to do" plan. It sounds additionally chaotic</p>
Comment 17	<p>Clubs should be limited to single file when entering into the judging area (judging area being between bridges) and encouraged, but not required, to split into two lines within the judging area prior to motoring upriver along the Vancouver Waterfront</p>
Comment in agreement	<p>2 Agree</p>
Comment in dissent	<p>1 To maintain distance transitioning against the current, it is safer to form 2 lines. It should absolutely be required. Those not comfortable performing this split maneuver, unfortunately should exclude themselves from the parade.</p>

	4 We would need to select if everyone is single file or double file. It would look weird to be both.
Comment 18	The method that the clubs use for staging themselves should not be dictated by CYRA, rather left up to the individual clubs to decide their own staging method within certain guidelines.
Comment in agreement	1 no comment 2 Agree clubs can set their own staging parameters. within a basic set of parameters set by CRYA
Comment in dissent	3 Depending on those certain guidelines, this sounds chaotic. If clubs decide to stage elsewhere how will anyone know where they should/shouldn't stage and who is going next. 4 Depends on where the "staging" area is.
Comment 19	After staging is complete, clubs making way to their parade start time should have right of way vs. clubs exiting the parade and making their way back to their moorage.
Comment in agreement	1 Agree. An upriver zone map should be able to accomodate all river traffic. Means for traffic entering and exiting Hayden bay, CRYC and all other Hayden Island traffic should be considered and worked out. 2 Agree clubs making their way back to moorage should be required to go upstream past the last boats staging for entry before making their turn into morages on the Oregon side. 4 Agree
Comment in dissent	
Comment 20	Extend the down stream length to at least Maryhill and make the turn more abrupt to get bows against the current sooner. Re aim for the draw bridge section of the bridge to prevent crabbing.
Comment in agreement	4 I agree with the concept. Perhaps have an anchored buoy at the turn points
Comment in dissent	1 I don't know the reference Maryhill. I liked the plotted points. 2 Disagree I don't think we should move the downstream. Turn any farther downstream. 3 I don't know what this means. Maryhill?

	4 Without an anchored buoy, I think fleets will turn too early, then try to go to port to get in closer to the shore. That also bunches to fleet up, and forces everyone to slow down.
Comment 21	After leaving the parade field and while passing the waterfront tie up for small craft, begin your turn to the southeast to go under the long span BUT as soon as you pass under, correct to Beaches and do not slow or disband until you are above CRYC. The formation area is contiguous to the parade route just under the bridge.(May need a sentry or two directing traffic in this area).
Comment in agreement	1 Agree. Maintain a mandatory Parade route upriver of I-5 Bridge on Washington side. 2 Agree, adding that boats returning to the Oregon side should do so above those still staged to enter the parade. 4 Agreed. And that provides additional public viewing area.
Comment in dissent	
Comment 22	On the first downstream straight I was maintaining idle, showing 6.2 knots sog. This kinda confirmed in my mind that the current was running 1.2 knots. I had the route downloaded and on the chart and hit the downstream turn plotted points and feel those were very well placed and easy to use. The upstream leg also seemed well placed for shore viewing. Since we didn't follow the re-zip jog back to the high span, I can only guess that it would work.
Comment in agreement	1 My comment, so I still agree. 2 I agree, and believe we should zip back into one line. Prior to going under the high span 4 Agree
Comment in dissent	
Comment 23	Move your plotted point #5 downriver about 300ft to where navionics shows the cable crossing, which is like 100ft upriver of the Vancouver landing. At the cable crossing, the 2 lines could break formation and head (relatively) straight to point #11 and zip together. I would expect in the resulting zip that the pair of boats would swap such that the downstream leader is now the follower. Depending on where the red can is floating, the two lines may have to round that on opposite sides before zipping. (Maybe the red can is a good target for vessels without the route).

Comment in agreement	<p>1 My comment, so I agree. Exact placement for turn is up for discussion.</p> <p>2 Agree, or maybe even move further than 300 feet downstream.</p>
Comment in dissent	4 Sounds too complicated
Comment 24	I really loved having a downloaded route. I had never considered or knew that was possible
Comment in agreement	<p>1 I Love waypoint navigation. I knew that was possible, I just didn't know sharing routes as a downloaded file was a thing.</p> <p>2I knew it was possible. Still, not sure how I would do it with my built in plotters. This might be. Over the technical abilities of most. It was super simple to import in navionics, and I certainly could have manually entered the points in my plotter. To import to my system would probably take more time, than I would be willing spend learning</p> <p>4 Routes are definitely a keeper!</p>
Comment in dissent	
Comment 25	How to make it visually apparent which club is which for the pre-stage? Pre-stage will be in reverse order so we will not be able to rely on the sign affixed to the stern of the last vessel. Maybe assigned color streamers flying in a visible location such as VHF antennae or shrouds.
Comment in agreement	<p>1 I believe this comment is that due to the fact that many vessels will be pointing up river while station keeping, it will be difficult to "find your club". I</p> <p>2 Agree, ribbons could work. Or we could move the stern sign to the lead boat since we will be staged in reverse order</p> <p>4 Thats a good idea. Visual identification</p>
Comment in dissent	3 I'm not understanding this but I think it's because I'm not following how/where staging will work. Doug V mentioned staging upriver and turning which is another added element that makes this more complex for boaters.
Comment 26	Allow for clubs to elect a speed over ground that better suits their participants this side of causing uncomfortable or dangerous wake.

Comment in agreement	2 Agree, this is how we have always done it in the past.
Comment in dissent	1 Parade speed(s) should be universal to all, already accounting for wake. 3 There should still be a max restriction. Slower should be fine. 4 There is something to be said for seamanship and boat handling in the judging criteria. Speed over ground would be changed due to water velocity.
Comment 27	Look into permits or permission, if needed, for clubs to set up recruitment booths along the Vancouver Waterfront and we should encourage clubs to do so.
Comment in agreement	1 OK 2 No opinion, either way. 3 Yes, but least of my concerns at the moment 4 Sounds like a good idea. Not sure most clubs have enough volunteers for these events as it is, however, perhaps some members would like to be ambassadors.
Comment in dissent	
Comment 28	Consider having an MC using a PA system to announced the clubs to the crowd. The clubs could script their own introduction to be read by the MC as they enter the Judging Area...as they start coming under the bridge.
Comment in agreement	1 OK 2 No opinion sounds fine to me with or without. 3 Yes, but least of my concerns at the moment 4 Agreed, but depending on where the judging area is. Do we really need to be judged? Perhaps a format like the Starlight parade would be better, more engaging, and definitely more entertaining!
Comment in dissent	

Comment 29	ditch zooming
Comment in agreement	2 Don't understand the question at all.
Comment in dissent	1 Zoom is fine 3 Is this in regards to meetings? Zoom is fine.
Comment 30	If you read this far, CRYA applauds you! Mention that here if you have not commented above and you want your lack of comment to be noted or would like to make a general comment.
Comment in agreement	1 If you read this far in my responses, I commend you as well. 2 This is complicated Tony. Hope you still love opening day after organizing this 😊
Comment in dissent	3 While I'm in favor of trying to work this out and like the idea of having the Vancouver waterfront participation, safety and risk assessment need to come first. This is a riskier route and we need to consider worse case scenarios. I also haven't seen the proposal for sailboats that don't fit under the high span. Participation from all clubs and all boats should also be prioritized.
Comment 31	Provide professional rescue boats stationed near the RR bridge. This will ensure prompt attention in what may be swift current should a boat lose maneuverability.
Comment in agreement	1 Wise. Individual clubs should have a captains safety meeting. Power loss scenarios should be discussed. Have lines available to assist your fellow boater. Parade route, zones and emergency exits. 2 Agree, we should also lay out some basic guidelines for captains if they get in trouble and need assistance. 3 Agree 4 Yes? USCG Aux? Sheriff Marine Patrol? USCG? Boats US? How do they get paid for their time?
Comment in dissent	