

**PORT METRO VANCOUVER  
ROBERTS BANK TERMINAL 2 PROJECT  
PRE-DESIGN CONSULTATION**

**Small Group Meeting 1  
October 8, 2013**

Notes from a small group meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 8, 5:00pm – 7:00pm, at the Coast Tsawwassen Inn, Delta, B.C.

**Stakeholders:**

Julie Hobart, Citizens Against Port Expansion  
Angela Emsley  
Anne Murray  
Barb Wallick, Reach Child and Youth Development Society  
Bob Miller  
Carol Vignale, Delta Environment Advisory Committee  
Cheryl Koskoski  
David Colledge, Colledge Transportation Consulting Inc.  
David Jones, Against Port Expansion  
Don Pateman  
Doug Massey  
Grant Dumbleton  
Farida Bishay  
Fred McCague  
Ian Robertson  
Jean Wightman  
Jim Ormesher  
Ken Koskoski  
Linda McKay  
Nav Brar  
Marty Rempel  
Patrick Thompson  
Peter Duffey  
Peter Miller  
Peter Szikai  
Philip Hochstein, Independent Contractors & Businesses Association  
Ralph Howey  
Ray Christopherson  
Renie D'Aquila, Reach Child and Youth Development Society  
Rob McGreen  
Rodney Asher, Citizens Against Port Expansion  
Roger Emsley, Against Port Expansion  
Susan Jones  
Sylvia Denz  
Ted Leake  
Vic Rivers

**Port Metro Vancouver:** Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator  
Rhona Hunter, Acting Director, Infrastructure Development  
Kyle Robertson, Manager, Environmental Assessment & Permitting  
Marcus Sui, Transportation Planner  
Michael Zachary, CCIP Project Manager  
Neil Turner, Senior Environmental Advisor, Container Capacity Improvement Program  
Stephanie Williamson, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd.  
Matt Skinner, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

*The record notes that the meeting commenced at 5:02pm*

---

## **KEY THEMES:**

- Participants asked for more information regarding Port Metro Vancouver's mandate and responsibilities to the Canadian public.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding the validity Port Metro Vancouver's container traffic forecast, and requested more information regarding container traffic and forecast data.
- Participants expressed concern that other alternatives to the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project have not been adequately considered, including Fraser Surrey Docks and the Port of Prince Rupert.
- Participants expressed concern regarding the scope and nature of the environmental assessment process, particularly as it relates to justification for the project.
- Some participants wanted more information regarding the consequences of not building the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project if the container traffic forecasts are accurate and the additional capacity is required.
- Participants questioned whether the road and rail network could handle the increased traffic anticipated as part of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

---

*(Abbreviations will be used and mean – Q: Question, A: Answer, C: Comment)*

### **1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk**

*Judy Kirk welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting, as well as introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Judy informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy, and outlined how participants could provide feedback.*

### **2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All**

*Rhona Hunter reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including ways to participate in the consultation and how this consultation feedback is considered by Port Metro Vancouver. She then gave an outline of the information presented in the consultation discussion guide.*

Q: *Paul Miller:* What does “sustainable development” mean to the port of Vancouver?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Port Metro Vancouver has undertaken to answer that question from a corporate standpoint. I’m not going to say that it’s a simple answer, because it’s a very complex question and we certainly don’t have five or six words that describe “sustainable development” for the port. But we are working on a number of sustainable development initiatives around the port business itself. We also have initiatives that we are working on as part of Port 2050, which looks towards what the port needs to be in order to be a viable entity and business going forward into 2050. We have other initiatives like shore power, which looks at how we can decrease the footprint of the port’s business itself.

There is a lot of information around sustainability that the port has sort of brought together under its sustainable development umbrella. And I think that probably the best thing to do would be to direct you to our website where we have some more details around that. I don’t have a lot of details right here to provide.

Q: *Judy Kirk:* Sarah, do you have any more information about sustainable development?

A: *Sarah McPherson:* To Rhona’s point, there are a number of things that we do corporately as a company. In addition to do that, we’re looking at things to do with air, land, and water. We have the Air Action Program where we look at different incentives for shipping lines in terms of using cleaner burning fuels with lower sulfur levels.

On the land side, we certainly look at working with our tenants and those who do lease property from the Port around their sustainability practices, including the type of equipment that they use on their properties, and how that might minimize emissions or other environmental impacts.

On the water side, we have things as diverse as a marine mammal program looking at some areas of the Georgia Strait, and the inlet in particular, trying to clean up water discharge from ships.

These are a number of the ways that we work with those who lease our lands, those who visit the port, and also ourselves from our own corporate footprint standpoint.

C: *Roger Emsley:* Let’s get down to specifics and basics. The generally accepted definition of sustainable development involves three things: economics, the environment, and socio-community. It then goes on to state that sustainable development means keeping those in balance. Port Metro Vancouver constantly skews their definition of sustainable development towards the economics. The environment and socio-community values come a poor second and third, and if there were another ten, they would be nine and ten.

Q: *Ray Christopherson:* Something caught my eye as I began to read the document here. On page 1 or 2, it says the intent of this discussion guide is to “Provide information about the importance and complexity of container trade through Metro Vancouver, and the reasons why Roberts Bank is well suited to accommodate future growth.” Are you going to talk to us tonight about T3 and T4 further down the road? Or is this just Terminal 2?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, we are just here tonight to talk about the Roberts Bank Terminal 2.

Q: *Ray Christopherson:* Who has provided your mandate for what is being proposed? The Minister of Transport in Ottawa? Mr. Silvester, the Chairman of Port Metro Vancouver?

- A: *Judy Kirk*: I think it would be fair to say it would be the board of Port Metro Vancouver.
- Q: *Ray Christopherson*: I see. Could we have the names of the people on this board?
- A: *Sarah McPherson*: The names of the Board of Directors for Port Metro Vancouver are available on the website ([www.portmetrovancover.com](http://www.portmetrovancover.com)).
- C: *Susan Jones*: Just a clarification. Terminal 2 is three new berths. Not one berth; it's three new berths. And that should be made clear and it's not in here. Its doubling what's already out there.
- Q: *Peter Duffey*: I don't see in this document any reference to planning for the inevitable and generally accepted sea level rise and possible earthquake. Would you like to tell me how this is being addressed in the design of the port?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: If I can ask you to hold onto that question, we are going to get into the design of the port itself, the actual land mass, and we can address that question at that time.
- Q: *Doug Massey*: I was wondering why you are proceeding at the moment without knowing the results of whether or not they're going to carry out a full environmental impact study on the proposal beforehand. I mean, is it a foregone conclusion? I mean, you're not even going to act on that? Because, you know, you are moving forward as if they've already approved it.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Again, we're getting a little bit ahead of ourselves. We'll get a little bit more into that when we describe where we are within the environmental assessment process. But in order to even initiate the application to the agencies to put forward this project, there is a certain amount of work that has to be done in order to develop what's called the Project Description, which is the formal document which has been submitted to both the federal and provincial agencies.
- Q: *Doug Massey*: Who's asking to provide feedback by October 15<sup>th</sup>, whether or not to proceed with a full environmental impact study? I don't understand why you haven't determined that first.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Good question. And it has to do with the fact that there are two separate consultation occurrences that are going on at the same time here. And I think that as we move through the discussion guide, we do actually have a section in there that we talk about what's happening within the Port Metro Vancouver-led consultation process, and what is being done through the regulator-led CEAA federal agency as well as the BCEAO, which is the provincial agency.
- Q: *Linda McKay*: My comment is very specific and it involves the environmental assessment process and what major categories would be included.

One of my major concerns is that the health assessment, where the impact of these operations and the growing container operations with Terminal 2, and possibly going on further to make a Roberts Bank port a major entity. I don't see any health assessment here, and I think that is a very major factor. I recognize all the rest of the stuff, which is biological, involves our environment in terms of our impact to wildlife, marine and the land. I don't see any assessment being mentioned here to assess the health impacts. And I really would like that addressed, because it certainly isn't flagged very clearly, and I think that's a very major element for us here.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Would you be okay if we wait until we get to that section of the discussion guide, to dive a little bit more deeply into that? We can provide some more information around that at that time.

***Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?***

*Rhona Hunter provided an overview of container handling at Port Metro Vancouver, and also described some of the different participants in the supply chain, including trucking companies (page 5-7 of the Discussion Guide).*

Q: *Susan Jones*: Imports by containers are a money-making venture all around. The export containers -- some of that material, am I correct, going out, doesn't need containers? It's just more convenient. There is not a lot of money particularly in the container business with exports, it's a good way to export, but isn't that a way of getting the extra containers used again? I'm asking about the value of exports in containers.

Q: *Judy Kirk*: I think you're asking why lumber, pulp, and wheat are put in containers?

Q: *Susan Jones*: Well, I know why it's in containers, because it's convenient. I'm just saying it's not particularly economical in terms of making money.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: So, I'm not a shipper, but I'm going to say that if it's not economical, they wouldn't be doing it.

Q: *Susan Jones*: Could you say how much you make on an export container versus an import container.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: I can't. I would say that if the port has a tariff on import and export containers, we can probably find that information for you. But I don't know what that tariff is on one or the other.

Q: *Roger Emsley*: You talk about 20-foot and 40-foot containers. I want to talk about 45s and 53s. There seem to be a growing number of 45s, and some 53s as well. Why haven't you covered that? And can we please get a breakdown of the number of 20s, 40s, 45s and 53s, empty and full? What is the trend? Because that impacts a whole number of things, including the productivity of the port terminals.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: We do actually talk a little bit further on about 53s when we talk about rail. Because 53-footers have to do with rail transportation. But we can certainly see if we can get some information regarding the breakdown of the container sizes that are going through the port.

Q: *David Jones*: I was interested in this data on the trucks. That's pretty interesting. I mean, 8% of the total articulated trucks are actually container trucks? That's 2,000 out of 24,000?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes.

Q: *David Jones*: But you know, the port's very quick to claim credit for almost all economic activity in Western Canada. I think they say 128,000 jobs, and there's really only a tiny fraction of those that are really port jobs. How many of these 22,000 trucks that are not licensed to carry containers would not be running if it wasn't for the port? Aren't you trying to have your cake and eat it too?

- Q: *Judy Kirk*: I think what you're saying is, look, if it wasn't for the port, and for trade, and perhaps trans-shipment and packing and unpacking, at least some of those other trucks wouldn't be on the road?
- Q: *David Jones*: Right. You like to claim the port indirectly provides some hundreds of thousands of jobs that are not directly connected to the port. Surely most of those trucks wouldn't be on the road if it wasn't for the port.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Fair comment. I'm not sure Rhona has got the answer.
- Q: *Linda McKay*: I'm not sure if I'm getting ahead of myself, but we have here a current operating statistic saying that there are currently, and I emphasize the word "currently", 2,000 trucks licensed in the Truck Licensing System. I'm wondering what the projections are with Terminal 2 being completed. How many licensed trucks are there going to be? I think on page 24 it talks about truck trips. But I'm looking for how many additional licensed trucks there would be?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: We have noted that for follow up.
- Q: *Ray Christopherson*: Related to this business of containers, unloading and loading and what-not, do you discuss elsewhere where that kind of activity is going to take place? Has that been planned for as part of the Terminal 2 project?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: We do get to that later in the guide.

### ***Why Do We Need Trucks?***

*Rhona Hunter provided an overview of why trucks are used to transport containers to and from transload facilities in the Lower Mainland, and also described some of the reasons for transloading import and export cargo (page 8-9 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Doug Massey*: What difference would it make if you were to have an inland terminal as opposed to handling containers in Vancouver? Would that reduce the amount of handling they have in the port, as opposed to having a central distribution centre?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: So with the current businesses that we went through on page 6 and under the current logistics system, an inland container terminal would not be viable.
- Q: *Doug Massey*: Is there a study out showing that? Who decides that?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: I think it's something that has been a conversation that's going on. I think Ashcroft is what you're talking about, right? They're still trying to figure out how it might work themselves. My understanding is that they still don't have many answers around the logistics of containers. So I think they're the ones that probably would have the studies that would show that it either worked or didn't work.
- Q: *Doug Massey*: Why is everybody going in a different direction, and not combining all of their efforts on this issue?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: You should know, sir, that the Mayor of Delta did raise this issue with the Port today. I just think that's probably of interest to you.
- C: *Ray Christopherson*: I'd like to make one point clear, or at least have you make it clear. The Terminal 2 Project, or project which is described here and which we're talking about, is a *fait accompli*. All we're talking about are the bits and pieces around the edge.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: I think if you had the environmental assessment people here they would say “no, it’s not”.
- Q: *Ray Christopherson*: Are you meaning to tell me that there is a chance that Terminal 2 might not go ahead?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: Yes. I think there is absolutely a chance of that.
- C: *Susan Jones*: I think it’s erroneous to say that Ashcroft is not a viable business that would solve some of the problems of the trucks on the road. Ashcroft has presented a business case and Port Metro Vancouver should know more about it and should be working with them. I think you err greatly when you say it’s not viable.
- Q: *Peter Duffey*: Many people believe that the port, in its propaganda campaign to justify Terminal 2, the Port has overstepped the figures. And in particular they are confusing in the way they are produced. And I think we all are entitled to see a breakdown of each port, and what the growth rate is in Vancouver, Prince Rupert, elsewhere, and to see how that compares with the growth rate. The figures were wildly out in 2006 when you did an assessment, which quite clearly was completely wrong in terms of the growth rate. This whole project is based on need and I don’t think the need is necessarily demonstrated here.

#### ***Why Roberts Bank?***

*Rhona Hunter provided an overview of various geographic options for container terminals, and an overview of the existing and planned infrastructure at Roberts Bank (page 10-11 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Peter Szikai*: Are Prince Rupert and Squamish collaborators with Port Metro Vancouver, or are they competitors? Do you work in cooperation with them to solve the entire problem, or are you competing with them for business?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: They are not really competitors in that the markets are fairly delineated in terms of both who services the Port of Prince Rupert and who services Vancouver. We are two distinct port authorities. We do look towards Prince Rupert as being part of the success of trade on the West Coast and in the Pacific Gateway. Their capacity is required and we are looking to them to be able to bring forward and deliver the capacity that they have planned on their books, because that has been included in the projections and the forecasts that demonstrate a need for this capacity.
- Q: *Judy Kirk*: What about Squamish?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Squamish doesn’t have a container port. So they’re not in the container business.
- Q: *Peter Szikai*: So if Prince Rupert and Port Metro are separate authorities, who do these two authorities report to? Do they report to the same body?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes, they do. They report to the Minister of Transportation.
- Q: *Roger Emsley*: There is little mention in here – although there is some more information in the detailed project description – about possible expansion in the Inner Harbour. There is a rumour that at least one, if not both, of the current operators in the Inner Harbour want to expand, but Port Metro Vancouver keeps brushing them off. Can we get some commentary on that, please?

- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There was significant expansion of both Vanterm and Centerm in 2005. We continue to see, at their own initiative, operational efficiencies within their terminals. There are also some major road and rail infrastructure improvements taking place on the south shore of Burrard Inlet, which the Port is leading and which will again address efficiencies on those terminals themselves. There are no planned expansions on those terminals at this date. The primary restrictor is long-term leases of adjacent property and ownership of adjacent property in that area. But no, the Port is not discouraging development there.
- C: *Susan Jones:* You mentioned deep water. We don't have deep water there. We have to dredge, which is just drastic. We have Vancouver Harbour, which is deep. We have Prince Rupert, which is deep. We have no business dredging to create deep water where we don't have it. Vanterm and Centerm, they do have plans for expansion. DP World is doing a business report in the paper about wanting to do an expansion. They announced to their customers that they're planning to expand because these individual ports are in competition with each other. So yes, Port Metro Vancouver is squashing them, and not encouraging them, and not helping them. Then there is this cozy deal to try and develop Roberts Bank when it's not needed. We have plenty of capacity, and they have plenty of plans. Surrey Fraser Docks said with very little money they can take a lot more containers, too.
- Q: *Doug Massey:* Well, I guess my point is that it's quite clear over the last little while, and we've got in here, about moving the George Massey Tunnel. I'm trying to understand whether you are at the present time, as Port Metro Vancouver and for the Terminal 2 Project, doing all this in conjunction with the deepening of the Fraser River, so that they can export coal and oil out of Fraser Surrey Docks? That really bothers me here, because billions of dollars of taxpayers' money is being spent to do just that. If you're going to remove the tunnel, that's going to be millions of dollars, if you're going to dredge it, that's going to be millions of dollars annually. When does the point arise when it's uneconomical to have an inside port at the Fraser Surrey Docks when it's constantly going to require taxpayer's dollars to make it survive, to make it even exist?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Around your comments regarding the replacement of the tunnel announced by the provincial government, is part of your question "is that being done to allow for greater trade up and down the river"? Is that part of your question?
- C: *Doug Massey:* Yes.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I am here to talk about the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Q: *Doug Massey:* You can't talk about that and not talk about the Fraser Surrey Docks.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* In terms of additional container trade on the Fraser River to Fraser Surrey Docks, the removal of the tunnel will only address a draft issue. The limitation is actually the length of container ships. Container ships that are currently servicing Deltaport and certainly container ships that we see servicing the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project would not be able to turn in the river, and therefore, there is no growth potential for container traffic at Fraser Surrey Docks even with the tunnel being removed.
- Q: *Doug Massey:* Well, what about the coal ships or oil tankers? They wouldn't be able to turn around either. You're just talking about two seagoing ships going up that river. It doesn't make any sense here. You're promoting the fact you're going to remove the tunnel so you can deepen

it, and without an environmental study to be telling us what effects it's going to have on the poor old ecosystem of the Fraser River. That's wrong.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: I'm not familiar with what ships could service Fraser Surrey Docks if the tunnel were removed.

Q: *Peter Duffey*: Was Surrey Fraser Docks in fact part of your investigations into the growth rate and whether you forecast increasing container traffic coming by the Fraser Surrey Docks?

A: *Judy Kirk*: I believe Rhona said she didn't know that.

### ***Why Do We Need More Capacity for Containerized Trade***

*Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the container growth forecast (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).*

C: *Ian Robertson*: There doesn't seem to be any comment in this report about the Panama Canal expansion. And what little reading I have done suggests that better than one-third of the traffic along the west coast would be diverted through the Panama Canal and up to the various ports on the east coast of the U.S. and Canada, starting next year.

C: *Rhona Hunter*: This is a very high-level synopsis of a detailed economic report.

Q: *Peter Duffey*: And when you forecast demand, you have to take into account all the factors. And one of the factors that I would have thought you would have taken in is the doubling of the Panama Canal. Does this economic forecast look at Panama?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes. It's in the detailed report that's on the Port's website.

Q: *Roger Emsley*: I'm looking at this graph on page 12. Port Metro Vancouver historically has underperformed against its forecasts. Its compound annual growth rate over the last five years is slightly less than 3 percent. Canada's GDP is forecast to expand around 2 percent. In order to meet even your low case throughput, you would need to be expanding at 4 percent per year. It ain't going to happen.

Your base case throughput is 5 percent. Your high case throughput is 7 percent. That's 7 percent each and every year from now through to 2030. It is not going to happen. How do you expect, with the GDP hovering around 2 percent, to see those kind of increases? What are you smoking? These projections are pure theory.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: So I just want to make one comment on that. In all of the past three years since we've undertaken these annual forecasts we have performed on our high case projections. You can see this in the reports themselves.

Q: *Ray Christopherson*: Can you elaborate on the idea that if container traffic does not meet the sort of projections we see on page 12 over the next 10 years, that Vanterm and Centerm downtown would be shut down, and all of the traffic currently scheduled through those terminals would come out here.

But more importantly, I'd like your comment on the idea that I've heard booted around recently, that this whole proposal is here in order to free up land on the south side of Burrard Inlet so the developers can build some nice condos. Do you have any comment on that?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Our projections require the full capacity and optimization of Vanterm and Centerm, and our current economic forecast shows that we need additional capacity in addition to what we already have. That's why we're proposing the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

Q: *David Jones*: Well, I'm having trouble with your previous statement about meeting your forecasts. That just doesn't tally with the numbers you published. I've got in front of me, last year was 2,713,160. I can't read off a bunch of numbers out here, but it works out to a compound annual growth rate of 2.15 percent.

C: *Judy Kirk*: Which is what Roger was saying.

C: *David Jones*: Absolutely. In fact he was being generous to you. It's not even as high as Roger was saying. He's a nice, kind guy, I'm not that kind. I think it's a blatant distortion. Don't take this personally. But this is what we've had trouble with the Port. It distorted the figures year after year, and they're continuing to distort the figures.

And I have a further problem with this characterization of this report by a so-called third party to assess the growth. Ocean Shipping Consultants are a captive organization. These guys get work from you by giving you forecasts that you want to hear. They tell you what you want to hear, so you can go ahead with it. I've worked in engineering most of my life, and I know exactly the situation. If you don't tell the client what he wants to hear, you don't get the next job. If you want a true forecast, you're going to have to let someone who is not paid by you, preferably paid by the Municipality of Delta, an uninterested party, pay the consultant to do a forecast. These forecasts are worthless, in fact, they're hazardous to our health.

C: *Judy Kirk*: Okay. This is an example of an area that could be included under additional comments or in a written submission. If you've got other calculations or your idea about an independent third party doing either an audit or a full-blown separate demand forecast, that's where we would like to see it. And I encourage you to do that.

C: *David Jones*: Okay. What we're thinking is that it's highly unlikely that you're going to meet the growth, as Roger says. In national or provincial GDP, which has been around 2.15 percent, it's uncannily similar to the growth in the containers. It correlates year after year and we can't expect that over the long term, that's going to happen.

C: *Susan Jones*: I don't think it's enough to tell us to make a submission, because we're being given the wrong information. And it's very serious. When they built the Deltaport Third Berth, they published some forecasts in 2006. We haven't even begun to reach the lowest case scenario. We're not even near what they predicted then. Those were published figures by Port Metro Vancouver. So no, they're not meeting those forecasts. They keep changing them as we don't meet those things. I would ask you to look at this graph on page 12 and you make a little dot at 2.5 million. That's where we're at 2011. And we go over to 2030, and you make a little dot between 4 and 5. And you draw a line from that 2.5 to that 4.5: that's the actual prediction for Port Metro Vancouver containers at a growth rate of 2.5 percent GDP annually. It's way below any of the rest of this crap. And we're not even reaching that on an average basis over the year. It's been the same since 2007 to 2011, 2.5 million TEUs in Vancouver. It's serious! You're giving us information that is wrong.

C: *Peter Duffey*: I think that if you are derelict in your duty as a Crown corporation, over not meeting normal business standards, I believe that if you're selling shares, or you're a publicly traded company, full disclosure is necessary so that we can understand the risks.

Now, the risk would be to those who are backing you, who provide your finances. It may be by bonds, it may be by loans from certain areas. You say that this spinoff may have to be publicly financed. But you're a Crown corporation, and you have public responsibilities to the Minister, and to the Government of Canada.

Now, I'm amazed that you have not put in here the worst-case forecast. I only give you an example. I was going to show you a book, about the Eden Company and how it came to its demise. Purely on that basis, it is not realistic. The shareholders dropped it and they put it out of business.

Now, you won't go out of business, because you're a Crown corporation. But you have a responsibility for not doing an adequate business case. So I ask you to make a proper business case. If the growth rate is not what you expect, what would happen? What would happen to the bonds, what would happen to the infrastructure, what would happen to the equipment and maintenance costs which were still there? It might turn out to be the biggest white elephant in Canadian history.

***Are There Other Options for Creating Container Capacity?***

*Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the various options for creating additional container capacity within Port Metro Vancouver's jurisdiction (page 14 of the Discussion Guide).*

- C: *Roger Emsley:* I just wanted to make it clear, because earlier on I asked for some detail. What we need is your actual container count for Deltaport and its three berths, Fraser Surrey Docks, Vanterm, Centerm, Prince Rupert, and then we need forecasts going out. Because as with any business case, whether it's done by businesses or by governments, that kind of detail is what is required as a minimum. So we need to see where that expansion is going, and the percentages, and then relate it to things like GDP, export/import, and so on. We need a lot more detail. This one page draft on page 12 is useless.
- C: *Ian Robertson:* At a macro level, Port Metro Vancouver exists as an agency of the federal government, and some of the politicians say it's in the national interest to allow trade to occur internationally. In that context, it's a day shorter from Southeast Asia to Prince Rupert than it is to Vancouver. It's a shorter distance by rail from Prince Rupert to Chicago. That route doesn't have anywhere near the obstacles that are encountered in the southern route on the CPR. And we are talking about congestion in one of the most congested parts of Canada, being the Lower Mainland. And surely to goodness the cost-effectiveness of expanding Prince Rupert, TEU by TEU, is less than it is to expand it down here.
- Q: *Phil Hochstein:* What are the implications if your forecasts are accurate, and we don't do the expansion? How will we feel the impact of that?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We're only sort of just beginning to look at that as an exploration of what that might mean. I don't have specifics yet, because it hasn't been a business case that we've looked at in any detail. But it certainly would be some shifts in how cargo is transported, and there would be a movement to the United States of certain cargos.
- C: *Phil Hochstein:* And it would take us longer to get our goods.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* It would be more expensive. It would also take us longer to get our goods. We may even see additional truck traffic here, because that's the logistics hub. We don't have a lot of detail, but it's something that we are looking at.

Q: *Ray Christopherson:* If indeed, for whatever reason, Terminal 2 does not go ahead, what thought has been given to where else, a la Prince Rupert, that expansion could go? How much would it cost relative to the proposed Terminal 2?

One of the things that bothers me is that if your projections shown on page 12 really were to come to pass and Terminal 2 went ahead, you'd probably have to double-track CPR all the way through the Rockies. And guess who'd pay for that? All of us around this table. Billions would be required for that kind of activity. Has that been taken into account in your general assessment or planning?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* There were two questions there. What would happen at Prince Rupert if we didn't go ahead? Everything that we know of and that Prince Rupert knows of has been included in our projections, so to our knowledge, there is no additional capacity that's going to come on line in Prince Rupert.

Q: *Ray Christopherson:* If Terminal 2 doesn't go ahead and your projections of potential traffic continue?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Prince Rupert has limitations, too. They are limited in what they can do there.

Q: *Ray Christopherson:* It's just gantry cranes and dock facilities, or is there a seaward limitation or something of that nature?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So, I can't speak for the Port of Prince Rupert. But I can certainly put some information forward on how we can get some more information from the Port of Prince Rupert. We know what the Port of Prince Rupert has on their books in terms of planned expansion, and we have included Port of Prince Rupert's planned and proposed expansions in our forecasts. So whether they have capacity that we don't know of probably means they don't know of it either.

Q: *Ray Christopherson:* Oh, for goodness' sakes. Judy, I'd like it recorded that your group, and with all due respect, the Port people themselves apparently do not have any real understanding of what the capacity could be in Prince Rupert if Terminal 2 were not to go ahead.

A: *Judy Kirk:* But I just want to be clear. Kirk & Co. is here to facilitate. We're not here to provide information.

Q: *Bob Miller:* I just wonder whether Port Metro Vancouver would be willing to give an undertaking to generate numbers at a 2.5 percent GDP growth rate, and what impact that would have on these numbers.

Because when I hear at this table, and I'm not an engineer, thankfully, okay? A bunch of people who have spent a lot of time thinking about this, and researching it, at absolute variance to the numbers that have been thrown at the wall by Port Metro Vancouver. And it seems to me that it would be a responsible thing for Port Metro Vancouver to run the numbers and make it available to the public, as to if Port Metro Vancouver grows at the rate of the GDP, what impact that has on Terminal 2? And I don't think I'm asking for a really complicated thing for you folks to crank out.

A: *Judy Kirk:* I'm not sure Rhona can make that undertaking on behalf of the Port, but I'll ensure that it is on the record.

Q: *David Jones:* So, just picking up on the previous point about the traffic, especially the rail traffic that would result from this Terminal 2 if it's built and if these growth projections actually did

come true. As I understand it, about 70 percent of the containers coming into the port now leave the Lower Mainland and progress further east. Most of which presumably has to go through the Fraser Canyon on the CP or CN tracks. Correct? So, that's been a bottleneck for years. They have already doubled wherever they can. I can't imagine that we can double it again, as it's a horrendous problem already. Is it even technically feasible to double the track through the canyon and Rogers Pass and the whole southern route? What would be required in terms of an expansion to rail if Terminal 2 were to go forward?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We work with the railways to identify infrastructure that's going to be required. If any improvements are required by the railways as a result of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, these will be determined and brought forward by the railways under their own auspices and their own delivery and programming. We do not have any indication from them at this point that any improvements east of the Lower Mainland would be required in order to address the additional traffic from Terminal 2.

Q: *Jim Ormesher:* It's to do with the agricultural land. There is no mention of agricultural land. I have a perception that agricultural land is under threat from the Port and its activities, and even the railroads. Is the Port interested in preserving agricultural land? Where do we stand with regard to the Port and agricultural land?

A: *Sarah McPherson:* I think some of your concern might come from some recent conversations going around land use, and more planned uses. The Port is not interested in pursuing agricultural land for industrial purposes. I think there is some confusion out there about that. I think more recently there have been conversations around preserving industrial land for industrial use and looking at ways to ensure that industrial land is used for those purposes and that we have enough industrial land for current and future use. That's the Port's position.

Q: *Susan Jones:* The Port is very interested in the ALR. They've got great swaths of it in Richmond. They bought the Gilmour farm, so they're very interested. They've made a deal with Tsawwassen First Nations, and that was ALR. And that's right beside the port. So, they're very interested in the ALR.

There is an aspect here that worries me, that it isn't economically feasible or correct to think that all this projection is going to happen. But the Port is going to go ahead because it's a Crown corporation and it's accountable to nobody. But if this thing gets built, it could be used for something else other than containers. It could become a port of call for oil, or for coal, or for other commodities. And that might even be a possible agenda behind the scenes. Because I have no trust that the Port and federal government will act in the best interests of the people. So there's an aspect here that we may be looking at something else in the future. And we have no control over that.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* I think your question is "what will the permitted uses of this terminal be if it is approved"? The environmental assessment process, which we have recently entered, has very specific conditions, and those conditions will dictate what can be built.

C: *Susan Jones:* I beg to differ with you. We went through a whole process for a wheat terminal out there. And we did the whole environmental thing. And you know what we ended up with? A container terminal and that didn't go through any process.

Q: *Doug Massey:* I'm just wondering about rail capacity in the sense that you're entertaining additional coal from the United States to Roberts Bank. I think we have about four trains a day

coming in, or maybe it's two trains a day. They've got 50 million metric tonnes of coal down in the Wyoming area, and they want to get up here. They want to get it exported and not one port in Washington state wants to do it. All that coal that they've got in Wyoming is going to find its way here, right through White Rock and our designated wetland area. So I'm saying, that will use up a lot of your rail capacity, will it not? And what are you going to do? You're going to have big marking yards to take care of that? And where are they going to be? On agricultural land?

If you really want to develop the port, why are you entertaining bringing in a commodity that you really don't need to bring in to Canada? It just doesn't make any sense to me. I mean you're basing your whole project on having all this need for more container rail. And I don't understand why you are using up your rail capacity by bringing in U.S. coal, when you're saying you need it for containers.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: I'm not sure that Rhona can answer that, since this project doesn't involve any coal handling.
- Q: *Linda McKay*: I wonder if there is a report that sort of throws everything together. Like we have the proposed Terminal 2, and I'm wondering whether there is a report that gives us a picture of what rail capacity and road capacity and electricity and all that kind of stuff that's needed for Terminal 2? Because frankly I see bits and pieces and pretty pictures, but I don't understand the rail component and the roadway structure which obviously is required to feed this beast. And frankly, we've got a Terminal 1 where there is a road and rail capacity which appears to be at its peak. What is Terminal 2 going to look like as a total global project? I just don't see it.
- Q: *Judy Kirk*: So, I want to make sure that everyone hears that. It's a very good question. What you're saying is look, if the proposed Terminal 2 were to go ahead, we're not seeing what would be potentially the additional roads that might be required, the additional rail service to be required, and other infrastructure to handle things like electricity.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: We are at the early stages of a complex project, and that is part of what the environmental assessment does, is that it puts all of those pieces together and it looks at it from a standpoint of all of the components and how that is going to service the potential port.
- Q: *Linda McKay*: I mean questions are being raised about rail capacity and the infrastructure that's required to support Terminal 2. We don't have the total picture. I'd like to see that total picture before we even go to environmental assessment.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: I think what Rhona is saying is that it's actually the act of the assessment to determine those things in addition to impacts. There is more information on page 28 about the environmental assessment.
- Q: *Linda McKay*: But all those components would have had to be considered in the business case?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: So, the RBT2 Project Description is a much more detailed document than what you have in front of you, and probably contains a lot more of what you're looking for. And it is that document that the regulators use to make their determination of how they proceed through the environmental impact assessment. So there is a great more detail in there, and there is a link available on our website. So I encourage you, if you do want to know more about the details of the project.

Q: *Linda McKay:* Those details? Do they include the railway infrastructure, and the hydro infrastructure, the road infrastructure that's required to support Terminal 2? I don't think so.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I think that's a fabulous segue into the next part of this, because we're going to talk about what the project is.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I think the fuller answer is that in the process of the environmental review, many of those questions will be answered.

C: *Peter Duffey:* We've got until October the 15<sup>th</sup> to present our views as to whether there should be a major environmental assessment, a full panel review. I think most people here would say there should be. It appears to be in the balance. And we're talking about minutiae here, as opposed to that decision.

And I would like to make the point that you should zero in on that now. You've only got another half an hour, and you need to go away from here knowing that everybody here -- well, maybe there are some people who dissent -- want that review to take place, and a full panel review at that.

And one of the reasons I want it is that there is a possibility of taking in natural gas, of coal, of oil, as well as containers. And there is also the sea-level rise risk. I want those things to be talked about.

I'm fed up with talking about whether or not where this container or that container, or what length of container it is. Let's get on with the vital decision we have to make.

C: *Judy Kirk:* With the greatest of respect Peter, and I hope you know me well enough to believe when I say that Rhona does not represent the Environmental Assessment Office. And no one here does, at least not to my knowledge. Many of the questions and issues that you raise will be properly dealt with by the Environmental Assessment Office, both provincial and federal.

So I'm going to ask Rhona to continue here. We do make sure that people know that if they do feel as you do, or have other comments and questions with respect to the environmental assessment, that there is very good information and places for them to go to provide that. But Rhona simply cannot speak to that process.

Q: *Susan Jones:* Just what is the deadline to the Canadian Environmental Assessment office to ask for a joint panel review? What's the deadline?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* The public comment period ends on October 15<sup>th</sup>. It's a 20-working-day period. There are no parameters around what the regulator are looking for with comments. It's simply a comment period for the public.

Q: *Ian Robertson:* I've got in front of me a fact sheet that comes from the Ministry of Environment of British Columbia and there's a series of points on two pages. One of the points is that in total there was -- this is referring to the old federal government process.

"In total, there were 512 projects in B.C. for which the federal government had originally intended to undertake screening assessment. Of the 512, 492 projects will no longer receive a federal environmental assessment under the screening category."

All 492 of those former screenings fall below the B.C. *Environmental Assessment Act* threshold for environmental review. And there are only 19 of the original 512 that are going to be subject to the joint process. So, one of the real questions for all of us to struggle with is that under the

new *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, the federal government can choose not to do an assessment of this particular project. And it cannot be appealed.

And if it decides not to do it, it is unknown by me as to whether or not the provincial government will mount its own environmental assessment. When you go and look at the categories under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* that require an environmental assessment, such a project as what we're talking about today doesn't seem to come in any of the six categories. Now, I may be wrong on that. I've asked for clarification.

A: *Judy Kirk*: I think you should definitely get that from them. And if there are other questions on the environmental assessment process, I'm going to ask you to hold them and ask them of the correct agency.

C: *Ian Robertson*: Just as a comment if I may. The difficulty that I'm against, and everybody else here is against, is that when asking those questions, there is a long time lag before you get the answers.

Q: *Bob Miller*: This has to do with the veracity of the numbers that are generated by Port Metro Vancouver. It says on page 17 that once operating at capacity, there would be direct employment of roughly 10,000 jobs, \$440 million in wages annually, which comes out to \$44,000 a year.

Now, if you look at indirect and induced employment, there is \$180 million, or say roughly 10,000 jobs, which is about \$20,000 a year. Then if you look at total direct and indirect, you get \$620 million by roughly 20,000, and you get \$30,000 a year.

So what you have is such a wide range -- from \$20,000 to \$40,000. It's like they couldn't get their shit together even on such a fundamental thing as price per hour. They're projecting roughly \$10 an hour as the wage. And you know, I don't know about most people around this table, but I think \$10 an hour as an objective to try to work with for wages for people is sadly lacking. The last one you've got here is \$20 an hour.

I'm using the numbers right here, on page 17. Just run the numbers. The gross payables, divided by the number of employees, it gets you earnings per year. It's not a really complicated concept to get across.

Q: *David Jones*: But I think they're assuming it's a full-time job, and that may not be true. So you should have full-time equivalents. So you should have full-time equivalents. Can you not restate this as full-time employment?

A: *Judy Kirk*: Possibly, I really don't know.

Q: *Nav Brar*: How does your job count here with Terminal 2 compare with the current jobs at Deltaport right now?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: I think your question is around how many more additional on-terminal jobs there would be with Terminal 2. We don't have them broken out specifically for the terminal itself. That's going to depend on the operator and what kind of technology is available at the time.

Q: *Nav Brar*: So it's an automated terminal?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Our numbers are based upon a semi-automated system. So it's sort of middle of the road depending on what the final terminal operator determines they want to put on the

terminal there. My understanding of terminal operations in an automated environment is that it's not necessarily less jobs, it's just different types of jobs. They're more IT and technology jobs, because you're operating IT systems. But that is something that would be determined by the terminal operator.

### **Marine Terminal**

*Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the terminal design and orientation (page 18 and 19 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Carol Vignale:* Earlier tonight a gentleman asked what would be the result if Terminal 2 did not go ahead, and what could we see as the potential outcomes. And I think that's a really central question, because as you come before us to talk about the forecast and the necessity for Terminal 2 based on the import and exports currently and projection of growth, I'd like you to clarify what we can expect if this Terminal 2 doesn't go ahead? What are the consequences to our economy, as well as the socio-economic consequences?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* As I indicated to Philip here, we're only just starting to look at the details of that. We've looked at it with an economic forecast to see we would be out of capacity. But if we do not actually have Terminal 2 developed to address that capacity when it comes on -- we're only beginning to get an understanding there, so I don't have that information right now.
- Q: *Carol Vignale:* This is one of the missing links for me. There is a stronger case in terms of the present economic and community benefits of the port. You have one short paragraph on page 16 about the general economic benefits. But I don't think many of us realize, and certainly I don't, what role the port plays in our lives in terms of that economic development, especially in terms of our lifestyle today in the Lower Mainland. I'd like to see more evidence of that, because if it is a clear, strong argument, then it sort of would put a very different spin on all of these concerns people have. All of us are wearing clothes. And what is the port doing for our lives? Can we do without it, or is it a huge benefit for our lifestyle and for the livability of Metro Vancouver?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* All right. Just one comment before I go to you, Ian. My economics degree is pretty old, but with that caveat, I would assume that the consequences of not doing Terminal 2 would be to not realize the jobs in construction and benefits that are noted on page 17. Carol, I know that doesn't address everything you're saying, but at least that would be one assumption.
- C: *Carol Vignale:* Okay, I just wanted to raise that all of us don't have the same point of view that many people here have voiced.
- Q: *Ian Robertson:* I'm going to ask a question, and I ask for indulgence, because I'm not an expert in this. My understanding is that at about the middle of the coal port, or maybe at the tip of the coal port, the underwater ground changes its complexity significantly. And from the shoreline out to about where the coal port sits is fill from the Fraser River. A report about ten years ago suggested that beyond that there is a fairly steep precipice which during an earthquake would be quite unstable and could cause things that were above it to slide into a much deeper channel in the Salish Sea. I'm wondering if you folks have done any studies of that?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* In 2010 we did an extensive drilling program in the area to get some hard, concrete information around the quality of the soil and the subsoil in that area. And it was through that information and looking at the seismic requirements that the engineers were

confident that this proposed location would provide a balance between allowing the terminal to be as far off-shore from that intertidal zone, which is far more sensitive, and into the deeper water, while still maintaining seismic stability and reducing the amount of dredging that would be required in the pocket. There is a trade-off study on the website that provides an overview of this process.

### **Consultation Topics**

*Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the Pre-Design Consultation topics that Port Metro Vancouver is looking for feedback on, including: habitat mitigation, road and rail traffic considerations and community legacy benefits (page 22-29 of the Discussion Guide). She then provided information regarding the environmental assessment process (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Peter Duffey:* I'd just like to know whether Port Metro Vancouver is on record through the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency recommending that a full panel review is undertaken. I think they should be on record asking for that. Has the port asked for a joint review panel? And if not, why not?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The Port has not requested a joint panel review. The Port is not, under CEAA 2012, able to make that request. We have asked that the agencies make their determination, and we are here to manage whichever process the agencies have determined is best to put forward for the project.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* I would ask you to go on record about this subject in your public documents and further consultation. I think you will look very badly in the public view unless you come out and say that there should be an assessment on a joint panel basis. That will leave everybody feeling that you are not in support of examining all the possible ecological and environmental problems.
- C: *Roger Emsley:* It is my understanding, under the new federal regulations, there is a section on Canada port authorities, that such authority can request a review panel. I stand to be corrected but I would like a response similar to Peter's. If you haven't done so, why not? Because I have looked at the new regulations within the last few days and from my reading, a port authority can ask for a review panel.
- Q: *Nav Brar:* In your previous materials, you also mentioned a separate or parallel consultation going on with the TFN. Are First Nations going through the same process? And how come we don't see those materials on your website?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We do have a separate and parallel process with the First Nations communities.
- A: *Sarah McPherson:* The materials are the same. We use the same materials in both processes. They're just separate processes meaning that they're invited to participate in these processes should they want, but in addition, there is a separate process, and we have a legal obligation to have that with them. So they see and use the same materials, the same media related documents.
- Q: *Nav Brar:* So now the feedback, the summary reports from those consultations, how come we're not seeing those?
- A: *Sarah McPherson:* So, we don't necessarily produce a summary report of consultation in the same style. The meetings don't necessarily happen in the same way. And sometimes some of the material that they might share -- they might prefer to share as part of the EA process, where

they have a very designated role. And so you can actually see that in the EA process, documented with other feedback from other stakeholders.

But in the process that we have with them, in the same outreach that we do with you, we don't necessarily complete it in the same way or have the same number of meetings. The feedback from First Nations from our process has not been published to date.

- A: *Judy Kirk*: There are different legal requirements with respect to confidentiality with First Nations' discussions. So, you know, really it's not up to the Port. There are legal requirements and there are things that First Nations can ask for vis-à-vis confidentiality that are completely separate from this.
- C: *Peter Miller*: What I've heard at this meeting revolves around that people here and the people in the community don't believe the forecast that Port Metro Vancouver is putting forth. Whether the forecast for the GDP, the forecast that the consultants use, the forecast relative to limiting or capacity of New Westminster, Vanterm or Centerm, or the maximum potential of Prince Rupert, or the rail capacity outside the metro area, or the integration of the total infrastructure required. They don't believe that you've done the work. They don't believe that you've done a solid approach. And my recommendation would be for you people to listen. To listen what people are saying. Go back and answer those questions in a public and forthright manner so the people believe what you're saying. Because right now, what I'm hearing around here is they have no confidence in what you're saying.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: Thank you
- Q: *David Jones*: This suspicion that this Terminal 2 isn't being done on a purely business basis, since at the third berth hearing of this kind, about six or seven years ago, it appeared they had never done a feasibility study, from what we can make out. There was no justification for it from the straight economic grounds like a normal business would. And it would appear that this is the same thing happening here. There's no mention of a business case. Like, you're going to invest a bunch of money, going to be spending money during this operation. Is there any case that's been made, and if so, can we see it, as to whether or not this project is economical, as opposed to being just a good thing for Canada.
- Q: *Vic Rivers*: On the assumption that Terminal 2 goes ahead, is there any plans to put shore power in for the three dock positions? And I ask that on the basis that when Terminal 1, DP3 was built, the cable troughs and everything were put in. It was five, six years ago. And at this point we still don't have any shore power going to the vessels that are tied up at that dock.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes. You will see within probably the next year or two, DP3 being serviced by shore power, and the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 has also shore power in. The holdup has not been on the Port's side, it's been on the ship side, and the number of ships that actually have the capability to plug into shore power.
- Q: *Rod Asher*: If the project goes ahead, what would be the estimated cost to build the island, as well as all the related infrastructure? Who's going to fund it?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Project cost currently now is just over two billion dollars. We're going through a process to determine the financial structure, but it will be a combination of private investor and the Port will put some money in, and it will be a terminal operator, more than likely. But that's to be determined. But mostly it will be private money.

- C: *Bob Miller:* You didn't answer the question. The question was broader than that. If you're talking about the Fraser road being a billion dollars, you're talking about the cost of the new bridge being 1.4 billion dollars. His question, that I heard, was the overall cost.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I heard 'project', sir, but fair enough, in terms of the other aspects as well.
- Q: *Marty Rempel:* Continuing the question, you're asking the public an acre of marine or an acre of farm land for this purpose. It seems to me that it's very important to know what the environmental impact of that decision is. And I, as a member of the public, who care actually about the environment, cannot make that decision without knowing what Environment Canada would say to that and would have some kind of a professional assessment of that, and I think that's extraordinarily important and I think it's very strange to ask sort of in a general way the public. I guess it's okay just to sort of ask that question in a gut sort of way. It's not about having more containers in, because that would be about a 10, 12 percent increase in productivity. So, you don't even need a new port.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Marty, were you here when Rhona said they're assuming a semi-automated?
- Q: *Marty Rempel:* Yeah, but they can't automate the port and everything else, and the new port is being pushed to be completely automated with about ten operators. And there are probably about 250 on a shift there right now.
- Q: *Ray Christopherson:* . Can you tell me if the Abu Dhabi Investment Authority has been brought into the picture on providing finance, since they already are involved in port developments and operations, in a number of places around the world?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, nobody has been brought in.
- Q: *Doug Massey:* Well, I mean, the studies that have been done in the past by an independent body and another one in 1979, and another one in 2011 by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans all say that the Terminal 2 Project was really very dangerous to the Fraser River estuary. And yet, in that period of time, the federal government has pulled all the teeth out of the Department of Fisheries. Pulled all the teeth out of the Department of the Environment, too. Because they were standing in the way of these major projects such as this one. And I just wonder with any environmental review now, would it really have any teeth that would really do environmental studies, when the federal government has done this to two departments. But it's very critical of this proposal. I really am concerned about this. There was to be some current flows and patterns, that they should have breached the causeway. So that there was a current flow there. There is no suggestion in this project that there's a breach between the two parts. At least I don't see any. And if there is a problem with currents, why isn't this on a dock, as opposed to a land bridge so that a dock, a cement pile dock, would in fact give that flow.
- Because it's going to cost you two billion dollars to build this, and I suppose if it had been built that way, it would have cost you three billion dollars. But in one sense of the word, this would in fact solve that problem, would it not?
- Q: *Judy Kirk:* Why not a dock? Do we have an answer to that?
- A: *Mike Zachary:* It could be.
- C: *Doug Massey:* At least that answers part of the flow, but there's more for clarification. Open up the causeways and breach them a bit, too. And put in the overhead lines that come in there, so that a lot of big birds don't hit them. Why aren't you doing these types of things?

C: *Susan Jones*: Just a point of information. The *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, in terms of the question about First Nations, has a separate area where we have separate consultation with First Nations. However, Tsawwassen First Nations, nine or ten years ago, signed an agreement with Port Metro Vancouver, that they would not use that special dispensation. They can consult just like I can. And they have a business agreement for Terminal 2, and they will receive, I think it's a million dollars if Terminal 2 is approved. It's a Memorandum of Understanding that they have. Just so you know.

*Judy Kirk wrapped up the meeting and encouraged participants to complete the feedback form and encourage their friends and others to participate.*

*The meeting ended at 7:03pm.*