

**PORT METRO VANCOUVER
ROBERTS BANK TERMINAL 2 PROJECT
PROJECT DEFINITION CONSULTATION**

**Multi-Stakeholder Meeting 1
October 23, 2012**

Notes from a multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 23, 1:30pm – 3:30pm, at the Coast Tsawwassen Inn, Delta, BC.

Stakeholders:

- Arno Schortinghuis, HUB: Your Cycling Connection
- Bernadette Kudzin, Vicki Huntington's Office, MLA South Delta
- Bernita Iversen, Corporation of Delta
- Bonnie Gee
- Brian Yamaguchi, Harbour Link Container Services
- Carole Vignale, Safe Route Tsawwassen
- Dave Moffat
- Ed Ries
- Jean Wightman, Go Green Delta
- Jim Northey, Tsatsu Shores Homeowners
- Jim Ronback, Delta Naturalists
- John Bourbonniere, Harbour Link Container Services
- Josh Jensen
- Julie Hobart, Against Port Expansion
- Peter Duffey
- Peter Holt, Praxispoint Consulting Group
- Richard Swanston, Burns Bog Conservation Coalition
- Roger Emsley, Against Port Expansion
- Ruth Adams, Tsawwassen First Nation
- Terry Bogyo
- Walt Zmud

Port Metro Vancouver:

- Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
- Cliff Stewart, Acting Vice-President, Infrastructure Delivery
- Rhona Hunter, Acting Director, Infrastructure Development
- Neil Turner, Senior Environmental Advisor, Container Capacity Improvement Program
- Matt Skinner, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 1:32

KEY THEMES:

- Participants expressed interest in having access to various project documents and records, as well as records of consultation with various parties, including First Nations.
- Some participants thought the demand for additional container capacity was overstated and the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project would therefore exceed demand.
- Participants asked if there were other efficiencies that could be undertaken, such as introducing more shifts at Deltaport Terminal, prior to building more capacity.
- Participants expressed concern regarding potential project effects, including impacts to biofilm, wildlife and agricultural land.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding environmental compensation and mitigation and said that commitments made as part of the Deltaport Third Berth Project were not adequately fulfilled.
- Participants expressed interest in potential social benefits of the project, including a cyclist and pedestrian overpass on Deltaport Way and improvements to transit.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

Judy Kirk welcomed participants to the multi-stakeholder 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. Roundtable introductions followed.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

Cliff Stewart reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including ways to participate in the consultation, as well as the list of information items and consultation topics.

Q: *Bernadette Kudzin:* I just wanted to clarify that we're here to be consulted about the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes.

Q: *Bernadette Kudzin:* What does that actually mean?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So there are a number of steps in the process where we plan to be back in the community having conversation. This is the first session where we actually have something specific to talk about with respect to Terminal 2. So if you remember when we were out last year, in Pre-Consultation we were talking about the consultation process itself: How do people want to be consulted; what forms of communication work for them.

This is the first one where we're actually out with something specific that says “here's what T2 generally looks like”. You can see on the front cover. We've shown you where it is and approximately how big it is. So it is very conceptual at this point but our commitment is to be out early and often so that people have an opportunity to A) ask questions and B) to express their thoughts about the information that we're providing and also give us the opportunity for

things where there's issues identified as a result of the consultation to refine the design of the facility over what we expect will be probably about a five year definition and approval process.

So it is very early days and so there may well be things that you like to talk about that we are happy to hear but we may not have answers yet, depending on what exactly it is.

Q: *Roger Emsley*: I'm confused. Certainly since Bill C38 the whole of the regulatory process and legislation has been totally revamped, though I don't claim to understand the current regulatory process, so to an extent I'll have to draw back to the previous one. Under the previous one there was a requirement to file terms of reference and then you proceeded from there. I don't yet fully understand what Bill C38 did in terms of this process. But my understanding is that there is still a place in that legislation that talks about an independent panel. Certainly I have assurances from some people, who would be influential in this, that this is likely to go the independent panel route.

So with that preamble, where does this sit? What is your understanding of current Federal legislation in terms of environmental assessments? Will there be terms of reference formally put out, or is this just some kind of informal process that sits off in the side?

A: *Judy Kirk*: Roger, in answer to your question, at the open houses we're going to actually going to have one board that shows where we are in the process of the environmental assessment at the top and where we are in terms of the consultation process right underneath it so that you can see how the two relate. And I think that's important because these processes are complex, particularly the environmental assessment.

So if you look on page 20, the first box, "Pre-Environmental Assessment Phase" is where we are now. In fact we're even ahead of that. The terms of reference which you've just referred to which deals with the scope and nature of studies to be looked at in the environmental review, is now called the "Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines". It's the third bullet down on the second box on page 20. As for consultation, we're doing this phase of consultation to define issues and to talk about features of the proposed T2 project.

The development of Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines includes public comment periods that are run by the provincial and federal agencies. It is anticipated that there would be a joint review panel here. I'll perhaps leave it to Rhona or to Cliff to add anything further but that gives you a sense of where we are.

Q: *Terry Bogyo*: Okay, it also says on page 22 you have a separate parallel process with the First Nations group and yet that seems a little odd because I certainly was very interested in knowing what their positions would be and how it impacts the project. That would, to a certain extent, have a bearing and perhaps could influence how I feel about the process, some of the issues that they raise or some of the issues that I would perhaps be concerned about. Will there be a way on integrating those? At the moment it says it's separate.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Well, certainly First Nations are welcome at and invited to participate in this public process but they also have a separate, constitutionally mandated process. They are, as First Nations under Article 35 of the Constitution, entitled to a separate process.

C: *Terry Bogyo*: But "separate" does not mean "secret".

A: *Judy Kirk*: There actually is confidentiality around the process. But Terry, in terms of integration, one of the really great things about the environmental review process is that it does bring them

together. They are in a working group. First Nations are invited to the working group, and so are local government and so are some other groups. So that's where the integration generally occurs.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: There are separate consultations with each First Nation, and it's up to them who else they'd like to invite but it's not up to us to tell them who they should be inviting.

Q: *Terry Bogyo*: So we won't know what their input is until the joint phase?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Generally that's correct.

Q: *Walt Zmud*: The assumption I'm making is that because they are in fact another level of government, they will be treated as another level of government?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: I would not deign to speak for First Nations but I think if you were to say that to them they would have a very different explanation.

Q: *Walt Zmud*: Okay. Second, to that point, can we, the rest of the public, determine or refine the means by which we may be able to determine what those conversations are? Will the conversation with the band be public or private?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: It would be private.

A: *Judy Kirk*: But you know, that said, I mean if the others are concerned about that, we can certainly get that in the record. Cliff,

C: *Walt Zmud*: Then it should be noted.

A: *Judy Kirk*: I would ask as a facilitator that perhaps the question be posed to some of the First Nations, because there are usually consultation agreements that are struck and so this could be noted or at least asked.

Q: *Walt Zmud*: But you're obviously aware of the appearance?

A: *Judy Kirk*: Yes, and you know others have made that observation before but I think the point that Cliff has clearly made is that they are bound by a legal framework.

C: *Walt Zmud*: I realize that, but I think the public has a right, if I'm not mistaken, to be able to share in that kind of information.

C: *Carol Vignale*: Seems to me that if you can note to the First Nations that there is real interest in the community about their positions and it seems to me the reason that so much is confidential discussion is because of the lack of trust that has generally existed between the First Nation and the non-First Nation community. You know, that Terry and Walt were genuinely interested. I think what I get is there's a real interest in our community to be a community that is together, that has some coordination, that has some sense of team, of some sense of a circle in the aboriginal sense. We want to be in the circle with them in our dealings with the Port. We want the Port, First Nations and the Delta community to be in the same circle. And we really look to them for some leadership in this because we certainly want them to prosper in this circle the way Delta has prospered. And you know, the Port is about prospering and helping us all to prosper as a country and so we all have the same basic agenda and so I think that's the strong message that I'd like you to convey.

C: *Ruth Adams*: Yeah just listening to everyone. What you are asking for is new, so I don't see anything wrong with that. I would say that to the Tsawwassen First Nation government and see

what they would feel about that, putting it up at these proposed open houses for everyone to come to and we have had good turnouts for those. But I think we can figure out something, but like I say, this would be a first. Okay? There hasn't been anything that would put a municipality in with a First Nation to be together to question the Port or any other kind of business that we're going to be doing. So I don't see anything wrong with that. That there's an interest there and I think you have to know that, yes, there has been quite a big confrontation between Delta and Tsawwassen First Nation as of lately, so that would be something that maybe could pull it together. I wouldn't want something coming in to bash Tsawwassen First Nation and the Port. Nobody wants to see that. So as an elder, I wouldn't want to put our people through that. So if we could do this in a respectful way, then I think we would have to get in touch with Tsawwassen First Nations.

Q: *Jim Ronback:* I notice that the project includes both federal and province environmental acts and they also have another harmonization agreement between the province and the federal government. Will this be a harmonized study, and if so, will the terms of reference indicate who's going to do what with which and to whom? In looking at another study that came down on the transportation and the jet fuel project out to the airport, there was no statement from the federal agency, which was Port Metro Vancouver and was independent of any decision that the province would make. I'm curious as to how you arrive at a unified decision, if any? One could disagree and another could agree and is one over the other?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So the decision on all of that stuff you just talked about would be the decisions jointly of the Federal and Provincial Ministers of Environment. It is probably the biggest change with respect to what Roger mentioned with the new act. But for this one thing the process looks and acts very, very similar for a project of this magnitude in the new system as it did in the old system.

The one difference is that in the old system the port had the ability as a regulated authority to request a panel. In the new system, we no longer have that ability. We simply apply, we commence the process and within the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency there is a side process which decides whether there is to be a panel and whether it's to be joint or whether it's to be federal or provincial and that whole mechanism now resides with the senior levels of government.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* And if I'm not mistaken, the biggest change is that I think the process itself is limited to 12 months, is it not?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well it's similar to a chess clock. Its 24 months in total from the time the process is kicked off, which happens with the submission of a document called the Project Description. I tell people that's like the key to the lock. The lock is the environmental assessment process. You put the submission in, the chess clock starts. But that two-year chess clock, we expect, will take probably about 4 years in total to actually wind its way through the process.

Q: *Jim Ronback:* What stops the clock?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Whenever the process comes back to the proponent and says "go and do this thing" or "go and do that thing" or "we need this information" or "we need that information". So whenever there's a request for information or a request for further work, the clock stops until that work's completed. Have I got that right, Neil?

A: *Neil Turner:* Yes.

Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?

Cliff Stewart provided an overview on the need for container capacity, including the forecast demand and planned capacity increases on the West Coast of Canada (page 4 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Jim Ronback:* Does this include the Terminal 1 capacity in the total estimate?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* You mean the existing container terminal at Roberts Bank?
- C: *Jim Ronback:* Yeah.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yeah, so this includes the two terminals in the inner harbour. It includes currently Fraser Surrey Docks. It includes the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project as well as the existing third berth capacity at Delta Port.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* Is this for the entire west coast?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, the entire west coast of Canada.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* Prince Rupert currently has one berth?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's right.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* Through Phase 2, how many berths would they have?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Stage 1 gives them another berth and Stage 2 gives them significantly more terminal capacity.
- Q: *Peter Holt:* Have previous forecasts been accurate going back 10 - 15 years to 1980. Have they depicted that level of growth, minus 20 percent? How confident are you in these figures?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, it is interesting, because we've had two forecasts done by two separate companies, one last year, a different one this year. The one that did this year's forecast we actually went back to a forecast they did in 2002, and the same sort of a cone you see here, with the base low and high, and their low actually encompassed the world economic crisis of 2008. They were still within that cone even with something as dramatic as that going on. I think this is pretty good accuracy, recognizing it is a significant band as you move further out.
- C: *Roger Emsley:* Just several comments. First of all, we disagree with the capacity that is shown here, we believe it is significantly more, or could be, with expansions that are out there. Second of all, just to note, since 2007, and including up to an estimate of what 2012 would be, the growth in Vancouver has been cumulatively 2.38 percent. That shows you the kind of differences that we are looking at in terms of these forecasts, which we certainly regard as optimistic to the point of we are out there building another Mirabel which for those of who may remember, was the Feds putting in a huge airport outside of Montreal, which subsequently was closed.
- Q: *Terry Bogyo:* That actually raises a little bit of a concern. There doesn't seem to be any discussion about the possible reuse or repurposing of any of the existing terminals in decline, or closing off or segregation of any imports out there that currently exists. We know that there has been a lot of pressure to release some of those other lands for other purposes, and also for things like security and clearance and for transport that would reduce capacity. Does this forecast take into account any of those possible contingencies?

- C: *Judy Kirk*: So the repurposing of other port land that isn't used?
- Q: *Terry Bogyo*: Well, somebody might suggest that what we -- that what in some cases might be happening, is we might be in fact moving capacity from very valuable inshore container terminal land within the Port of Vancouver which would make fabulous condo land, and moving the containers and less desirable use out into the middle of the straight. And what we would be concerned over that time frame is that indeed, that may be what this extra capacity is perhaps being used for.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: No, in fact, you'll notice there is in the late 2020s additional capacity intended to be added in the inner harbour, not taken away from the inner harbour.
- Q: *Terry Bogyo*: So there are no other port facilities in this timeframe that are slated or optioned to be repurposed or decline in capacity? Only increased?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: There may be conversions from one product to another or changes in use, but there is nothing that is coming available that could otherwise be purposed to contain er capacity.
- Q: *Terry Bogyo*: And nothing that would be reducing current container capacity?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: The only one where current container capacity is expected to be reduced is Fraser Surrey Docks, and that is fundamentally a function of ship size. The ships are getting bigger and bigger. It is partly a draft issue, but at a certain point it becomes a length issue as well. We simply can't move the longer ships safely up the river, turn them around, and bring them back down again. In theory, Fraser Surrey Docks probably currently has about 400,000 TEUs of capacity, but in practice it is handling less than 100,000 TEUs a year, and that is simply the market speaking about its ability to put the ships up the river.
- Q: *Terry Bogyo*: And this is about capacity? At least two of the lines are?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: Yes, that is right. So, by 2020 or thereabouts, if we were looking at the underlying data, Fraser Surrey Docks capacity would fall to zero
- Q: *Terry Bogyo*: And there is nothing else like that in any of the other port container areas?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: No.
- Q: *Walt Zmud*: I think that the notion of capacity on what is required is going to be something of a sticking point, and I am wondering who the consultants were that provided the reports? Is it possible to secure those reports to see what kind of a methodology was used? Because I think there are a number of people in this community that might be convinced that the capacity argument necessarily washes.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: Can I just address that for a moment? Because we recognize it is a concern we've heard every time we are out here. As I mentioned, we are in the beginning of what we think will be a five- year consultation and permitting process. So what is currently forecast in five years will be realized then. So, to a large degree, much of that concern will be self-managing, because if the demand isn't there, then the volume won't be there. And it will largely become a moot point.
- C: *Walt Zmud*: Except that sometimes these projects get a life of their own, okay? And once they get started, it is awfully hard at some future date to get them to stop. We've seen that all over the place.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: Let's answer that other question though, which is, is the study available?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: Parts of it can be made available. One of the things that we heard when we were out in the public about a year ago, talking about this project was a request -- there are a lot of studies available and many of them were publically available or had been at various points in the past. And the request was made, and I think it was actually Roger that made the request, or certainly somebody that was in one of these sessions that we make these available, all in one place and easily accessible. So, we spent the better part of the last year doing that, and those are now all available. There are well over 100 studies of various types, whether they be environmental, economic, engineering, that are all now available. If you go to the project website, there is a library so those studies are there, and the parts of the forecast studies that are available public- -- or can be made available publically, I know that the 2011 one is there. I don't think the 2012 one is yet, but certainly we can make a commitment to get the non-sensitive parts of that on there.
- Q: *Walt Zmud*: Okay, another point pertains to the notion of terminal capacity is the operation of the terminal itself. You already suggested this is going forward and there have been improvements made in the operation of terminal that have resulted in increased capacity. I am assuming that might apply in the future as well. Has that been taken into consideration when it comes to determining the eventual capacity? I don't know what the procedure is currently, but at one time, it was a one-shift operation at the terminal. I don't know if it is any different than that today. I know there have been improvements, although I don't know for sure if it is a two-shift or a three-shift operation. If it isn't then it represents a different way of doing business at marine terminals, if you follow the example of what is being done in Long Beach for example. So, maybe there should be more emphasis put on improvements, as opposed to the requirement to build another facility?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: For over a decade Port Metro Vancouver has been working on what has been called a three-legged stool of capacity. The first leg of that stool is exactly what you're talking about, operational efficiency. If you looked underneath the numbers here for a terminal like Deltaport, existing Deltaport Third Berth, and post-DTRRIP, we are claiming about 800,000 TEUs of capacity per berth. That number is up from something in the neighbourhood of about 300,000 to 400,000 a decade ago, which is a significant increase. We haven't actually reached that by the way. The numbers that we put in here, that horizontal line, those are numbers that are notionally possible to reach, not numbers we have actually achieved. They are not numbers that have ever been achieved anywhere in North America or in Europe, frankly. There are some terminals in Asia with very different business and labour practices that have achieved that or slightly higher, but they are very much at the top end of what current capacity or current practice can achieve. Do I think that in the 50 year life of a project like Terminal 2 that there will be no increase? Absolutely not, I think you will see continuing increases. But for the purposes of this conversation, all of that latent capacity has been assumed to have been found. I can't tell you specifically how it will all be found yet, because it is an industry that changes by the month. But yes, all of those obvious low-hanging fruits have been plucked.
- Q: *Jim Ronback*: Can you make available the link to those studies to the group here before we leave?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: You can go to the website on the back and click right to it.

- Q: *Jim Ronback:* For example there was a biofilm study that was done for the jet fuel transportation and made use of experts from many sources. Would you be using that as an input to your studies?
- A: *Neil Turner:* Yes, that information has been obtained by our group, and will be used in going forward with our biofilm studies for this proposed project as well.
- C: *Peter Holt:* Looking at this page for the graphs, I think there is one thing that is properly missing and that is potential capacity. You've got planned capacity, but I believe potential capacity is an essential item for you to understand. I believe for instance that Centerm has offered to double their capacity. That is not a planned capacity. It is not shown here. I think that if you want to think of an overall capacity on the west coast you should show potential here as well, and there should be a study to show that, so. And the economic benefits and the cost of doing so. I think that is a major omission.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* It is actually shown in the inner harbour capacity in the late 2020s. I am happy to have a conversation offline about that, but it is all in there.

Containerized Trade On The Canadian West Coast

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding existing containerized trade on the West Coast of Canada (page 5 of the Discussion Guide), as well as an overview of opportunities for creating additional container capacity (page 6 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Peter Holt:* Could I ask you, what is the size of the ships and the depth needed? Is it always the largest ship you are considering? Or is it also a combination of the smaller ships that would go through a particular area where you don't have to put so much infrastructure in and so much dredging?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes. It is a combination. The Port Metro Vancouver land use plan is currently being updated, and there is a public process underway as we speak, so for those of you who have more general land use questions, that process exists, and I would happily point you towards it. I just wanted you to know about that.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* Ports are very much constrained by their ability to move things from the port inland to their eventual destinations just the same as bringing them across the dock. And so when you have your capacity figures, a part of that becomes your ability to move by rail and also by road. My understanding would be that there is enormous stress on the rail across the Rockies to cope with such a major increase in the port's capacity. And we can obviously see the new sidings going in and taking account of that, but it seems whenever I speak to senior people at the railroads they say they have not got the capacity to get over the Rockies with the amount of containers that you might bringing in to the Deltaport. Is it only going to grow to this capacity with the provision that the linear impact of the rail moving up the valley and rail going over the Rockies is also improved significantly from where it is today? I'm pretty sure it is, but the question is, is the whole transportation system growing together? Are we leaving it just to the port? Or is the port growing together with rail? And I don't see that in here. I know it is a bigger issue.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* So, we've done detailed modeling for what we call the Vancouver terminal, which is from Mission west. We have done what I would call high-level modeling of the joint running section which is where the CN and CP share each other's infrastructure between Mission and

just west of Kamloops, and we've also solicited their opinions about that section and we have sort of checked those against other authorities and then we've said, "And what about east of there?" And their assertions between here and Kamloops are that there is lots of capacity for the kind of volumes that we are talking about, and the other organic growth that will happen over the next 25 plus years. And beyond there, both railroads have said, "That is not the problem, that is just a matter of putting more track in. And that is what we do, we are railroads, we build track, and capacity isn't an issue." So, they are the ones that have to be able to move the cargo. Obviously as we get further into this, there will probably be a requirement for more concrete commitments, but at this point, they have said it is not an issue, and when you compare it to the other authorities that are out there that say you can assume this type of capacity on this type of infrastructure, that supports their position.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* So the length of the train is obviously one thing we'd have to increase as well?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Length of trains obviously increases capacity, but that given, there is sufficient capacity. Certainly we have thought about that and thought that through because if you build a port and you can't get to and from it, then you have a pretty significant problem.

Q: *Jim Ronback:* What is the split between trains and trucks?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* On the import side, about 70 percent goes by rail, 60 to 70 percent goes by rail directly, and about a further 10 to 20 percent indirectly, and I can talk about that now or some other time, but -- it is mostly rail. And then on the export side, although it arrives here by rail, it doesn't get into a container until it is here. So most of it comes in by rail and then it gets to the dock by truck.

Why Roberts Bank?

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding other related transportation infrastructure to support growth at Roberts Bank (page 7 of the Discussion Guide).

C: *Roger Emsley:* The George Massey Tunnel announcement was nothing but public relations. There is no money, there is no plan, it shouldn't even be mentioned here.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, I can tell you this: that before that announcement, the Ministry of Transportation were not doing any work to look at the George Massey Tunnel. There was nothing within their organization to even have a conversation about it. And there absolutely is an ongoing conversation about it now, so I respectfully disagree.

C: *Walt Zmud:* Is that because there is an election coming up?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It may well be, but you know, if you look at something like the Port Mann/Highway 1 Project, it takes about 10 years from the time you actually make a commitment to start talking about it, until you can deliver something.

Q: *Brian Yamaguchi:* But with the inception of the South Fraser Perimeter Roadway, how does that affect the business that is going on Highway 17 now? Does everything go out onto the South Perimeter Roadway, coming back? So going into Richmond, they'll have to go back, go out east and then come back? Can they still utilize highway 17?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* This is a Ministry of Transportation and Corporation of Delta question, but our understanding is that trucks will be moved off of Highway 17, onto Highway 99, SFPR and Highway 99 primarily, so it will have a significant reduction on traffic impact in the Ladner area.

To answer your question, no, they don't have to go east to the Alex Fraser, they can still go through the Massey Tunnel, but they get there on SFPR and Highway 99, not Highway 17 to Highway 99.

Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including estimated economic impact (page 10 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Ed Ries:* I guess this is a naive but obvious question. You have done a lot of thinking and you are spending a lot of money to make the movement of containers efficient. Why not go the next step and move the coal terminal somewhere else so that there is only container traffic going out there and then instead of building a new pod here, expand where the coal terminal was?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* I guess there are a couple of answers to that. The first and most obvious one is that there is somebody who has a lease on the coal terminal, they are running a business and they are quite happily running that business.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* I thought that was a PMV operation? Don't you own it?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, it is leased. We own the land, but the terminal has a long term lease to Westshore Terminals. So that is the first answer. Second answer is even if that wasn't the case, you know, even if there was an opportunity to move it out of there, and if we had to pay to put it somewhere else, it is not economically sensible.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* Oh it would have to show up somewhere else, but the overall efficiency of goods movement seems to me would be improved if you didn't have two different types of goods competing for the same rail line to serve that port.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* The very, very simple question of would the rail line operate better if it had no coal trains and just had container trains? It probably wouldn't make that much of a difference and the cost of achieving that would be in the billions of dollars.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* Have you tried to negotiate with Westshore Terminals?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* There is no business case for moving that. It doesn't make economic sense when you look at what you get as a result of moving it, and what it would cost you to move it, there is absolutely no business case to do it.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* I'm very interested in how this is all going to be financed. I notice on page 10 that you have had consultation with the province communities, British Columbia Railway Corporation, local governments, user railways industry, regulators and First Nations. Now, there are a lot of jobs here, and a lot of income, and a lot of benefits. But it has to be paid for. Where are you getting your money? Who owns the Port Metro Vancouver, who is the major shareholder, and what risks financially are you going to undertake when you get committed to this project?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Okay, that was several questions, let me start with Port Metro Vancouver. It is a non-shareholder corporation whose owner is the federal government. And the question of where does the money come from, the money comes from really probably two places: one is from Port Metro Vancouver itself, and we manage federal lands, so all of what you call Port lands, belong to the federal Crown. And we manage those on behalf of the federal government, and the money that is generated from that is reinvested in infrastructure. So that is one place

that money would come from. And the other is it would come from some form of private sector investors who would be looking to either run the business or to invest in the business.

- Q: *Peter Duffey:* I may be completely wrong here, but I have information that Port Metro Vancouver in fact is capitalized with investors at the moment, and there are many foreign holders.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, I'm sorry, your information is not correct. We are wholly owned by the federal government.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* So is the federal government the chief financial holder of the project?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* You said you were going to finance this and borrow money?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* In fact, Port Metro Vancouver actually pays money to the federal government. We pay a stipend as a percentage of our revenues every year to the federal government.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* So the taxpayers of Canada will be building this port?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, the taxpayers of Canada will actually make money off this port. Unlike the American ports that we compete with who have the ability to issue bonds and tax residents, we are entirely self-financed.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* So, if you want a multiple million dollar injection to start this project, you go to the market to get the funds?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We would have to go to the market in some form.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* So you are vulnerable to the vagaries of the economic situation?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, a project like this is certainly vulnerable to the vagaries of the economic situation.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* A huge project of this nature is a tremendously risky project in today's economic times. What certainty have you got that your plan is going to be carried through in these times?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Absolutely none at this point, because we don't even have permits yet. And frankly, until you have permits, you can't really get investors interested, so this five year process that we are undertaking to get the project approved, in essence the port is taking the risk on that.
- Q: *Peter Duffey:* So many assumptions would be made, at the moment, based on prorated information about a market situation or an economic situation which may not exist when the final decision to proceed is made in five years time?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Absolutely, that is right.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Peter, you sound really very informed so you probably know that large complex infrastructure projects like this have multiple stages, and usually multiple decision points. So I would assume, for the benefit of others, that it is important for you to know that whether it's a financial situation that Peter describes or the environmental permitting or perhaps something that the Board of Port Metro Vancouver would want.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* No, that's a very good point and I think it is often, and I heard it said earlier that a project like this gets its own momentum, but the reality is that at the point where the really serious investment need to be made, if the project doesn't make sense to those who need to invest in it, they are simply not going to invest, in which case there won't be a project. The project could be stopped for any number of reasons before that point, if the decision was that it didn't make sense to continue, but, you know, there are, as Judy knows, multiple stages where our board or others could say "We don't think that it's appropriate to proceed, we are not prepared to make the investment."

And the investment to get through to the point where you can actually ask somebody to invest their money in building it is in the tens of millions, if not hundreds of million dollars.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* Have you any idea of what committal point along in the five-year period you might reach a no-go situation?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We can reach a no-go at any point in the process.

Marine Terminal

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the proposed marine terminal design and orientation (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Will Terminal 2 require the creation of turning basins?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No. There is a dredge in the deep water, you can't tell here, and there's a fairly distinct line where the water starts to get deeper quite quickly. Tends to be shallow out to just beyond the edge of the terminal and back sort of in this area here, it's approximately a few hundred metres from the deep water. I think the edge of the terminal now is at about the 10 metre natural draft and the berth pocket needs to be 18 metres. There's about 8 metres of dredging in that area. And very quickly you're out into water that's naturally deeper than that.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Another question, if I may, this time referring to page 14. This shows the effect and the proposed expansion the other components? What I don't suppose it does show, and you've had difficulty doing it, is what some of that land might look like, okay, if some of the other kinds of support services are going to be required will be placed on the land proper.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Which land are you talking about now, Walt?

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Okay, well if you look at page 14. I can understand where the transportation corridor is going to go. But one assumes that as part of the port expansion that there will be other kind of support services, support buildings, structures going to be required. And I'm assuming that's going on some piece of land somewhere? And that's, of course, what's got a lot of people in this room quite exercised, because we see that that will probably go on what today is farm land. So I'm not suggesting that you're doing anything improper. I'm just suggesting that what you're displaying and exhibiting as what it may look like. It's not properly what it's going to look like. There's not going to be too many ports in the world, okay, where they don't look like ports.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So I think what you're talking about is what we would call off-dock container support facilities. So that would be empty container yards, warehouses and that sort of thing. There is sufficient unused industrial land in Metro Vancouver today to support the growth of this business without the need to -- and I think you're probably speaking of non-TFN agricultural lands in this area. Call them the Emerson lands, if you like. I'll use that term. I think most people

here know what that means. No, there is no requirement for that land to be used to support Terminal 2. There are no plans for that land and we're not part of that conversation.

Q: *Bernita Iversen:* Just a quick question about the proposed locations on the terminal. Has Environment Canada had an involvement in the decision making process?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* What Environment Canada did the last time we went through the T2 process a decade or so ago was they told us where it couldn't go.

Q: *Bernita Iversen:* And that looks like where they say it couldn't go.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, it's not. Where they said it couldn't go was either south of the causeway or inland, further inland and north of the causeway.

Q: *Bernita Iversen:* So Environment Canada is okay with its location?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We haven't begun that process of conversation with them yet.

Q: *Judy Kirk:* In other words, is it true that the environmental assessment process will be part of Environment Canada weighing in on that?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Absolutely. And it goes back to a question somebody asked earlier: "where are we at in this process?" We are very early in this process. In fact, we believe this is best practice to be out this early, but it causes a bit of confusion because we're out before we've actually sat down with regulators. We're out before we sat down in the environmental process. We're out saying "okay, we've done the preliminary sort of environmental and engineering work and based on the work that we've done, this is what we think is the best way to do this". But we haven't even done the formal project description, which kicks off the EA process. We're actually coming out and asking for input now, to enable that work to be informed by public input.

Q: *Roger Emsley:* One question, one comment. I'm looking at page 11. Would you please tell me on the north side of the causeway, all the way back to the mainland, how much you are adding on the north side of the causeway in terms of the width of expansion?

And my comment is that the location that you have chosen, this one here, according to some environmental experts and experts that have knowledge about the tidal flows and the topography, the impact of that is enough to destroy the biofilm that exists on the north side of the causeway closer into the shore, and it will decimate that area, possibly cause the population-level negative consequences to shore birds and in particular to the Western Sandpiper migration.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, I think it's great to share that with us, Roger. The nice thing about going through an EA panel process is that we have to get our experts up on the stand under cross-examination and the people who want to offer contrary opinions also have to get up on the stand under cross-examination and that all will come out in the process that we're entering into.

Certainly the work that we've done to date doesn't indicate that, and obviously if it did indicate that we wouldn't be proposing this as the solution that we think is.

Q: *Roger Emsley:* Oh, the work you've done, but what other people have done who are very knowledgeable about this area going as far back as the last time there was an independent panel review, which was 1979, and DFO and Environment Canada as we went through the third berth exercise all expressed those kinds of concerns. And it's fine to zero in on studies that are favourable to you, but I would suggest to you since 1979 there hasn't been any change in the

environment when the panel turned it down, and therefore we know much more now about the environment and about its value in terms of the whole ecosystem in this area, which is regarded as the most important bird area in Canada. And to propose this in light of all that, just seems to me to be irresponsible.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* So Roger, we've got that comment, but I want to make sure your other question is answered, which is how much would be added to the causeway.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* And it's varying, varying widths up and down. I don't have the number exactly. I think it's about 150 metres? 150 metres give or take, wider in some places, narrow in others. And it's shaped specifically to avoid bio-film for example. It's narrower at the base than it is further out.
- C: *John Bourbonniere:* Just a comment back to the land footprint on page 15 of the land use footprint, and the complimentary services that would be required. I just want to point out that when Deltaport was built, the footprint in this picture looked no different than it does today. There was no additional land-used off dock. So in terms of commercial land viability and what is currently available today, in terms of being used today and wasn't used back then, this is still your primary result, but that doesn't take away from the fact that TFN might have a different thought of what they might want to do. But in essence there's been no developmental plans around Deltaport to support off-dock services or anything else.
- C: *Peter Holt:* Yeah, and the point I was going to make about off-dock services, and the linear aspect of this, and I know you're going out to Langley and Surrey, so you are going to get a little more obvious. The significant impacts on that the rail in here, whether it's TFN and things like that. Is that part of this study, or is that going to be a different thing because I know that in the Roberts Bank rail corridor as part of the assessment, because I don't think it was. Is this environmental assessment going to cover the railcar traffic out to Mission, particularly the rail lengths?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* So the work that we've done to date says that the only place that there may be a requirement for rail improvements beyond the immediate vicinity is in the area between Mission and a place called Hydro. And Hydro is the place on the CN mainline where the Roberts Bank rail corridor separates and comes down south into Langley. We haven't yet sat down with CN to see whether they agree with the work that we've done.
- Q: *Peter Holt:* By Trinity Western? Is that where Hydro is?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, Hydro is right up on the river. It's on the CN mainline, so between there and Mission there may be some works required. But between there and the actual terminal at Roberts Bank, there's no additional works required that we're aware of on the actual Roberts Bank Rail Corridor itself, with the possible exception of a siding, as you say, near Trinity Western around the north side of the highway. It's an extension of existing siding. But there's no other works required.
- C: *Peter Holt:* Because I would like to make a point that the fact that you're not seeing any of this offsite sort of development around Deltaport and the Tsawwassen First Nations doesn't mean it's not happening in a profound way elsewhere along the corridor. And I do have a concern that we are not, in the process of the port expansion, addressing adequately what's going to happen along the rail line. The number of crossings and overpasses and things like that.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Okay. The Roberts Bank Rail Corridor is intended to address that. The Roberts Bank Rail Corridor project is building a series of overpasses. And as I say, apart from one siding extension there is no other rail work on the corridor as a result of this project. The capacity already exists.

Marine Terminal

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the terminal orientation and structure options (page 13 of the Discussion Guide), as well as the tradeoffs between potential locations of the terminal intermodal yard (page 15 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Peter Duffey:* There's general concern about the loss of agricultural land, which may come from Alternative 2. Could you say how much of that land might be needed?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We haven't done a detailed design of that. I think the question really is, it's a hectare of agricultural land or a hectare in the marine environment. That's really the conversation that we're engaging in.

C: *Peter Duffey:* Perhaps an open question, but I think the community would be very concerned to see a large amount of agricultural land, and I believe that some quantity in your planning should be reviewed.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Say less than a hundred hectares in total is what would be shifted from one to the other. The total footprint would likely be about the same, but the question is, would you be more concerned about the loss of agricultural land or would you be more concerned about the loss of the marine environment? That's really the trade-off question.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* At the same time, you've increased the rail sidings in your present upgrade, which is going ahead, and is that not sufficient for the handling?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* You're talking about the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project? The works that are being done there are only what's required for current operations.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* So you will have another area for loading and unloading apart from that.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* Two areas?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, the work that's being done now is not for loading and unloading. It's for arriving and departing trains.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* For splitting the trains up?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes. And so what is designed here and what we have shown here on page 11 is the same principle. That the actual loading and unloading goes ahead on the terminal, and that the land that's required in the upland area, and I think in this design it's about 10 hectares. It's essentially the remainder of the option lands. They're just under 20 hectares and I think 8 or 9 hectares are going to DTRRIP and the other 10 would be required for Alternative 1A. The other 10 would be required for trains in the T2 timeframe.

What we're saying is, there is a completely different alternative which is take all of your rail operation and put it on the uplands, don't do any of it on the marine terminal.

- Q: *Ed Ries:* Further to Peter's question, on page 17 you talk about upland rail and road infrastructure and the rail is stated to be 60 metres wide. Is this possible alternative to 100 hectares or less included within that 60 metre wide strip?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No. All I can tell you is that if there was an interest in it, we would be prepared to do some work to understand it better, but it would likely be more than. How much more than? We really don't know at this point.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* Okay, let me ask you this question differently then. You said that the Emerson lands, which I understand are the ones that Vicki Huntington brought to our attention, the purchase option. You said that there's no plan to use those.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* There is currently no plan to use those, that's right.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* Okay. If you opted for Alternative 2 would you use them?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We would have to look and see what the lands are and whose lands they are and whether they're even available.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* So you're saying you wouldn't use it?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well no, let me be really clear here. We're asking you a very, very direct question. A land or marine environment trade-off -- an acre of marine environment or an acre of farmland. That's the question. So if you came back and said "No, we really would prefer that you do it on agricultural land", then we would have to go and see what that looks like.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* You don't want to do it on agricultural land. Your CEO has told us that within the week. Now, could you instead employ TFN lands for this hundred hectares. They've got 300 plus acres that they'd just love to lease to you, and it's already zoned industrial, and out of the ALR.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Unfortunately, we probably couldn't.
- Q: *Ed Ries:* Why? It's right at the end of your causeway?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Because it's not in the right place and it's not the right shape. I'm happy to explain what I mean by that, but it's not a quick answer.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* What you're saying is, you haven't done the technical work.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, we haven't designed an upland terminal.
- Q: *Carol Vignale:* Okay. Continuing the question is, 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 ask that question in a gut sort of way.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's really what it is.
- Q: *Carol Vignale:* Yeah. But, you know, if you wanted to have a positive impact in the community, and the community wants a positive impact, then we want to have all of the data in front of us.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* You know what, Carol, that's a fair comment, and we left room for comments in the feedback form on this, and if your view was "It's too soon to give you my view on this, we would

need to see the environmental assessment of both options,” then I think that’s what you would want to put down.

- Q: *Carol Vignale:* But my question is, will that be possible? Will it be possible for the public to see Environment Canada’s impact assessment at a stage where the public can still have some, you know, some input?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* I think that’s a fair question. I don’t know. I think that some of you are going to have to plan for, if you’re looking at Environment Canada to make comments specifically on agricultural land versus marine land. I mean, they’ll make comments on the proposal as provided in the project description. So I think you’d have to make some sort of allowance or some sort of request of Environment Canada to answer that question directly. But I don’t think it’s impossible.
- Q: *Carol Vignale:* What is the impact on the marine life? Because contrary to what Roger has said, I read the preliminary studies about the birds populations at the port presently and have done a visit to the port with the environment advisory committee which I am of member and I was really heartened to read the results and to see all the shore birds that around the facility. And I thought it was a rather independent study from the professors at universities in our neighbourhood who were given the assessment of the increase of bird populations around the port. So it would seem to me from the studies I’ve seen and from the work that’s been done, and the work that you are planning to do, one wonders how serious the marine impact is.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* But I think in essence, Carol, what you’re saying is you, before answering this question, would like to have more information about environmental impacts.
- C: *Carol Vignale:* Yes.
- Q: *Jim Northey:* Are there any facilities at all for custom inspection in any of your alternatives here?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We expect that the customs facility issue will have to have been dealt with well before T2 comes along. It’s an issue that’s being addressed currently.
- Q: *Jim Northey:* We could still expect the trucks to go Burnaby and come back and go back and forth?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, if that’s the decision that’s made as to how that’s to be addressed. I think there is a proposal out right now to try and have one much closer than Burnaby.
- Q: *Jim Northey:* Are the customs people participating in these round of talks at all?
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* You actually are the very first people of any type outside the port team to participate in these talks. This is very, very early days. But we can take note of that question.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* A free trade zone might be in the works?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, I think he’s talking about the customs inspection facility that currently is in Burnaby, so if Customs says that container needs to be destuffed and inspected, it’s put on a truck, driven to Burnaby, it gets destuffed, it gets inspected, it gets restuffed and brought back to the terminal.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* I have a question that has to do with the transmission lines improvement. Can’t the port demand that any ships that come to the port, either the existing one or Terminal 2 that they get shore power to reduce pollution?

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We're assuming that by the mid-2020s that ships that are coming here will have shore power capability. We're assuming that shore power would be a component of this facility and we're assuming that given that it's available and that the ships are ready to use it, that they would be using it.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* Can you require the ships to have it?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Can you require it? I don't know at this point. We certainly couldn't today since the ships don't have it and we don't have the power.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* Don't they require it at Long Beach?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, they don't really because they don't have the supply and the ships don't have the capability, but certainly we would be moving in that direction.
- Q: *Peter Holt:* Yeah, it's probably for Neil and it's just possible I missed it in just the way potential effects and things are put here. And it's to do with full cost accounting and raise with customs and inefficient movement, in addition to additional greenhouse gasses and all that. Also the selection of the three sites. If you take a whole bunch of million containers of TEU a year a thousand five hundred a day and you're moving down an extra, you know, 5 kilometres or something like that, that's probably needs to be accounted for.
- A: *Neil Turner:* And it's part of the process, the whole sustainability. It's in the sustainability report and components of the EIS itself. There will be some consideration given for improvement, greenhouse gas emissions and how that plays into it.
- Q: *Peter Holt:* I'm not sure that's true, because that's a component.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Those are parts of the trade-off for sure.
- Q: *Walt Zmud:* It should be noted that at this point in time, we don't have a project, okay? There won't be a project until you actually submit an application. And we don't really have a design at this point in time. We have a possible design.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, I would say we have what we are proposing currently, and we are proposing some alternatives.
- Q: *Walt Zmud:* Yeah, but we don't have a project as such, okay, that has been identified to the government.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's correct.
- Q: *Walt Zmud:* There will be a lot of questions raised about the environmental impacts. There is a process that's identified here and I'm assuming will be undergone, and could follow this, which is that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Office will be performing such an assessment. But that won't happen until we actually have a project.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's right.
- Q: *Walt Zmud:* So what we're dealing with right now, okay, is very much in the becoming stage. We haven't yet got to a point, okay, where the proponent has been able to identify it. So questions relating to what will be the environmental impacts really won't be addressed, I don't believe, until such time as the assessment actually takes place.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's totally correct.

Q: *Terry Bogyo:* How far upland is upland? What is the minimum and maximum upland?

C: *Cliff Stewart:* So for the purposes of road, it's as far as the SFPR on and off ramps. In other words, Deltaport Way, our initial studies suggest that Deltaport Way would need to be widened to four lanes to accommodate the fact that there are stop lights on it. It's that simple. Two lanes on the causeway is sufficient because it's free flow. When you get on the uplands, to get to the SFPR and back from it, you need to go to four lanes or you need some sort of grade separation for the existing overpasses, which since we're assuming intersections with stop lights that would be Deltaport Way is widened to four lanes. So for the road that's as far as it is. SFPR and whatever other projects are out there handle the road traffic beyond there.

For rail, it's as far as 72nd Street. So the Fisher Siding which is the northbound leg of B.C. Rail, there would probably need to be an additional track in there. If you look on page 14 you will see where it says "Fisher Yard Rail Improvements" on the right-hand side right under the Boundary Bay Airport logo. And the only thing beyond that that might be considered upland is what CN might need to do to deal with the area between Mission west to Hydro that I mentioned earlier.

C: *Terry Bogyo:* An important fact I need to know in making my decision.

Q: *Roger Emsley:* Just so we're all clear, can you please tell us with DTRRIP and with what's here, first of all, how many tracks there will be in Fisher and how many tracks minimum/maximum there will be in Gulf. Without answering that, there is nothing in here about the lighting and lighting impacts of a rail yard. So what are the lighting impacts not so much in Fisher but in Gulf?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So Fisher is one new siding and I believe DTRRIP is one siding, so there would be three tracks in total at Fisher. So that would be between 72nd and 64th give or take.

I think that over the broad length of Gulf, I think the DTRRIP project adds four, and then this would add a further six as designed today. So that would be about 12 or 13 in that area. As far as lighting is concerned, the only lighting that I am aware of would be workplace lighting at switches, and that would be very -- that would be cut-off lighting that's shining down for worker safety.

Now, that's with this design. If you suggested that you liked Alternative 2, that would be a completely different conversation. We haven't done the work on that so I wouldn't even begin to guess what that might look like.

Habitat Replacement

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding environmental impacts and habitat replacement (page 17 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Terry Bogyo:* You clearly mentioned electrical in Jim's question. That means of course there's got to be electrical power of sufficient quality to be brought out there. But it also begs the question regarding sewer, bilge, ballast, water, all of that infrastructure that I assume will be going up the causeway.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Water would be coming down the causeway. Sewer, the existing facilities out there have their own sewage treatment plant.

Q: *Terry Bogyo:* So this one has its own?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* The assumption is it would have its own sanitary sewage treatment plant. That's built into the plan. Ballast water and bilge water are managed under federal legislation. Bilges

are actually locked and sealed. They're not allowed to be pumped out. And as far as ballast water, the way that's managed now, ballast water has to be exchanged hundreds of kilometres offshore. So there's no impact from that. That's an ongoing operational issue that's been addressed a number of years back.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* Will you be burying the power lines?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* At this point we don't believe that it's required. We are doing additional studies to confirm or refute the findings of the studies that have been done over the last several decades that say that the work that's been done with bird diverters has addressed the bird mortality concern. Whether or not the panel shares that view is another issue. But at this point we're not recommending burying power lines.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* The Alternative 1A, 1B and Alternative 2 all have a statement in here which says that the birds are going to be affected in a general way. Is this because of the power lines?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, certainly any time you build something in an area where animals are, there is a potential effect.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* What is it? Is it explicitly for power lines, just for power lines? We know birds get killed by power lines all the time.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yeah, so seabirds and waterfowl. Well, lighting potentially, human activity potentially. Those are all things that need to be considered.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* It is the change of land use.

A: *Neil Turner:* You're replacing the current land use with, obviously, operations, so that would have an impact on the seabirds and seabird use of that area.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* So the power lines if they were buried would reduce bird mortality.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, we're looking to see whether or not there is a significant bird mortality or not.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* Thank you. The second part of my question is that I have information that the DFO has said to you that there's no possible amount of mitigation projects DFO could envisage that would compensate for the environmental damage that the Terminal 2 would cause. Have you had that communication with DFO?

C: *Cliff Stewart:* We have not had such a conversation.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* I don't where this has come from then. I'm pleased to hear that it hasn't happened.

C: *Bernita Iversen:* That statement was made in 2004 when Terminal 2 was brought forward DB3 as a joint project. At that time Environment Canada said it wouldn't consider the project because of the environmental damage.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* I was wondering if their views have changed in the interim.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's why we have a process. We'll find out.

Environmental Assessment Process

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding compensation for agricultural land (page 19 of the Discussion Guide) as well as an overview of the environmental assessment process (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Peter Duffey:* You've got consultative topics listed, and it's not limited to the following. So when you add topics, will that go on the website? Can we add topics or will you add topics?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No. We have identified some specific topics that we're asking for feedback on. That's the consultation topics. We encourage you and you are more than welcome to comment on anything.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I just want to clarify for people. There are stages of consultation and there are defined periods. And so when we next come out, if the port felt that was a study area -- for example when you look on page 21 under Agriculture, Lighting, Marine Fish, Terrestrial, etc., which I think Cliff will go over very briefly in a moment, but if there were things in addition to that, it would be brought out for public comment in the phases that Cliff has just described. At least it's anticipated that because the regulators will ultimately determine that.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* And that's a really important point. And I was just about to go to topic number 4 which in many ways is the one that probably many of you are most interested in, and these are the things that we think need to be studied. Obviously we're very interested in what you think needs to be studied. And then collectively we all will hear what the regulators think needs to be studied.
- C: *Bernita Iversen:* I just wanted to make sure that the consultation looks backwards as well in that we look at the impacts of DP3 and the Adaptive Management Strategy that's still going on. I think it's important that we look at that development and see what the impacts of that development were, if any, and learn from that development and take that forward to this development and that's part of the cumulative effects assessment. And I just wanted to say that we need to be looking back, not just using today as a baseline.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* No, it was a very important to be looking back and looking forward at cumulative effects session. Hopefully we'll address those issues then.
- C: *Jim Ronback:* As part of the review process it often has a technical working group or advisory group established. I'm concerned that is there only one window at the panel review stage for public comment. I think it's highly important to have during working group discussions, during public comments on the detailed studies as they are evolving and arising out of it. But if you ask for additional information from the proponent -- you know, a study is initiated but it's important to have for that study public input as well.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So, Jim, I'm going to answer that question because, you know, the Port can't really say what the regulators will determine. Part of determining what the scope and nature of studies will include that Cliff was talking about in the pre-panel review stage, so the second gray box on page 20. Part of determining those guidelines is the regulators will determine how much public comment there should be, how many public comment periods, how many open houses, where and when they should be, when the working group should be struck and who should be in it.

- C: *Jim Ronback:* My particular example is we just finished the proponents for the jet fuel transportation project on the Fraser so that their study on the biofilm but there was no opportunity for public comment on that study. And I think that's wrong.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Well, and those are things that the regulators will indeed take under consideration. It will be up to them to determine these things, not the Port in that kind of review.
- C: *Rick Swanson:* Yeah, I'm going on to page 22. We're progressing into legacies. We are going through a legacy process with DP3 currently, where we are faced with a legacy of poor planning and coordination of truck traffic causing total bedlam in our community. And the two major links that we have because the community of South Delta is an island - the Alex Fraser bridge and the Massey tunnel. Last month we were monitoring truck traffic and every morning we were dealing with the legacy of up to and over 150 trucks lining up along Deltaport Way. Yesterday there were 86 trucks lined along the causeway. And as part of the legacy of the environmental review process, we were supposed to have a reservation system. We were supposed to have openings of the gates of the port at alternate hours to sort of smooth out the traffic over a long way, over a 24-hour period possibly rather than have it all concentrated to the morning rush hour, all concentrated to the afternoon rush hour. This is the legacy that we've been left with by DP3.
- And I just want to know, what is going to be done when we review this, and are we going to have anything done prior to the inception of the improved so-called rail and road improvement program that's going to hamper us with even more trucks?
- Another legacy we were left with was a complete distrust of the whole environmental review system, because we were told in these glossy brochures that we get in the prelude of this process about all the great things that the port was going to do for us. And a lot of these things were washed away in what was called the Table of Commitments. So we were told things like they wouldn't be refueling trains on the causeway, and this was always accepted by the community that they're accepting the fact that this is a very environmentally sensitive habitat and we don't want to have diesel oil spilled on the rock ballast of a railway track where it can't be confined, contained and removed. This was great.
- But then the Table of Commitments wrote the whole thing away. So, in this process where we thought you had the same thing, where we're getting all these glossy little statements produced by Port Metro Vancouver, the proponent, about what great things they're going to do for the people of Delta and the environment, the sensitive environmental nature that they are working in, and then all of a sudden after the process is started we come up with a Table of Commitments and these things are washed away like sands.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* In simple terms, the process that is followed is not something that we manage or control. So the Table of Commitments is the critically important document because the Table of Commitments is what we are required to do. So I'm not sure if that answers your question.
- C: *Rick Swanson:* No, it doesn't, because we're told something in these documents and we comment on them, and then the Table of Commitments comes after the comments and after the process and we don't get a chance to see these Table of Commitments. All of a sudden we see something being conducted that was adverse to what was said on this document or these documents, the PR. And then we start complaining about this process and it's either, well, they're contractors, they're rail people. We have nothing to do with rail. We're Port Metro Vancouver. That's the rail companies. Not us.

- C: *Roger Emsley*: I want to come back to 21 and these baseline studies. I just want to make sure that when we talk about baseline we do indeed go back far enough to get a proper picture, because, contrary to perhaps something that was said here earlier, western sandpipers are in a period of decline. They may have flattened out, but if you go back and look at the Western Sandpiper population, it has come down significantly. And that is important in doing any kind of baseline study, aside from which and what some people will perhaps realize and recognize, counting Western Sandpipers is a very difficult proposition. There have been a number of studies that have identified the issues and problems with counting that particular sandpiper population because of the way that they operate.
- Q: *Arno Schortinghuis*: My question relates to community legacies and also improvements on the Deltaport Way. And I represent HUB: Your Cycling Connection and we are working with numerous groups including Tsawwassen First Nations, BC Ferries, and an experienced appraiser, and our vision, which we call the Great Blue Heron Way, is to develop a cycling and pedestrian path between North Vancouver and the BC Ferries terminal, and it would extend along the shoreline. And one of the big barriers is the Deltaport Way, and I'm wondering if the Port would consider as one of their community improvements to have a safe and convenient pedestrian cycling crossing of the Deltaport Way at the shoreline, and would they also consider funding a portion of the path as well?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: So thank you for taking the consultation topic number 5. We are in the process of initiating discussions with both local and regional governments regarding what community legacy benefits would be appropriate. That certainly is the type of thing that could and should be considered, but it would be a multi-party consultation, ultimately a decision as to what the benefits might be. I would not even begin to speculate at this point. Suffice to say that the likely investment would be significant, so what you're describing is certainly the type of thing that could be envisaged within the scope of a community benefits program along with a number of other types of things from unrelated transportation improvements. And by that I mean not as transportation mitigation but as other transportation improvements and community well-being. You know, we've heard people saying "well, we'd like improvements for the hospital or we'd like improvements to this facility or that facility, arts, sports fields". Those are the sorts of things that this conversation is about, and we would encourage you to fill out on page 30 the consultation topic number 5 about what you would like to see, and I think we know what you'd like to see because you just told us, but that is exactly what community legacy benefits is about. It's about those things. What's in it for us? Over and above, you know, don't screw up our traffic, don't damage the environment. Those are baselines. What else? What else is in it for us?
- Q: *Bernadette Kudzin*: So are you including that community legacy, then, something like dredging the Ladner Reaches in the harbour which we've been begging for and which some would argue is the port's responsibility to do it, but it's been abandoned for the last ten years?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: Well, I know that there is money waiting for other parts in the local channel dredging program. I would say probably not, simply because that is an ongoing operational requirement. This type of benefit tends to be the provision of some kind of capital asset.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I would urge you to put it down as one or more ideas.
- C: *Terry Bogoyo*: That's because in the drawings I didn't see anything that showed public space for viewing of the terminal or picnic area or park. I don't know if it's just because it's a small drawing.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Unfortunately it's not consistent with the security requirements of terminals in a post-9/11 world, unfortunately.

C: *Judy Kirk:* But again, Terry, that's an idea you think would be a benefit?

C: *Terry Bogyo:* Yes, if it didn't compromise safety and security. I ride the Superport Road quite often and Highway 17, and the detritus from the trucks, from the containers themselves, the lock pins, the pin connectors that are off, and the belts, reflector tape, the amounts of that are just huge that really are a problem that's just from the amount of truck traffic you've got. The blown tires that come off in these areas. And they stay there for ages because Mainland just doesn't clean it that often. And so it's bad for everybody looking at it and driving by on their bicycles. So it isn't a good situation but we could expect more of that.

But I do appreciate the opportunity to be involved at this early stage. Clearly there are some big issues that are out there, but at least you're talking to us about it. I think having Tsawwassen First Nations involved and knowing where they are, I think is really important to this process.

C: *Ruth Adams:* Just to add a little bit to what Arno was saying. That was my thing about the Great Blue Heron Way coming out to Tsawwassen First Nation and to our neighbours, so it's a social activity, that instead of having the roads and railroads and everything divide us because we've been divided with Delta for a long, long time and there has not been any good feelings. So going along on the bicycles or even walking along that shoreline would make a lot of difference for us getting together as neighbours and enjoying the beauty of the land.

I go over the overpasses and you can see the farmland, you can see Tsawwassen First Nation. Those are all so beautiful. So I'm very for overpasses. I see a lot of us, we just sit on top of the overpass and look out. What a great tourist thing that is. It's a social thing they are asking for, and I think it's the first time that this would be done. It's the first time and this would be under Truth and Reconciliation between all of Canadians and First Nations. This would be the first step in this on First Nation land. I want that put in there that it comes out of the Tsawwassen First Nation, going out to the neighbours with a good feeling. I really wanted that to be put into there because I don't think -- I think all of that that we do is for the environment and I'm talking about us as a people. We need a good environment to each other as well as the birds. The birds can do it, they can fly but we need to be on the land. We can't fly like birds yet.

C: *Ed Ries:* I think perhaps quite a few of us are here because of the good work that Vicki Huntington did in bringing to us information about some 600 acres with the financial option on it to use for port support facilities. And I read in your literature that Port Metro Vancouver will present information regarding the conceptual project design. That's why I'm here. I wanted to hear that. And you have told us, Cliff, that "no plan for Emerson lands to be used". That's what you said. And then when we started talking about the Alternate 2, it turns out it could use Emerson lands, but you don't know whether they're appropriate because you don't know where they are. Yet Vicki had published that, it's been in all the local newspapers, all the drawings showing which plots of land and so on.

It's my recommendation, Madam Chairman, that you abandon these meetings until you have something substantive for us to talk about.

C: *Carol Vignale:* Well, in contrast to the last speaker and with others, I very much appreciate being here, hearing what the plans are to date, and I think especially to listen to my neighbors to find

out what they're thinking and their good questions and comments and build on the work that's been done by our MLA.

I think, for me, there is some exciting opportunities to really nag some environmental shifts that I hear from the Port. So for example we hear on and on people say they're unhappy with the trucks because it interferes with their access with their vehicle. Now, because I take the bus everywhere I've never felt inconvenienced over the last ten years I have missed traffic because the bus has its own lane, and more and more the buses have a design so that they move independently and quite well. So if the Port could work with TransLink, for example, and with the Metro Vancouver Regional District to really look at very seriously making a big shift in transportation in our region so that we would have – and I think it was mentioned at Delta Council where Mr. Silvester was last Monday – to look at some kind of public transit improvement that might involve a rail or, you know, those kinds of things that are really revolutionary, that we can really start to move people from our community to the places they need to go, to Richmond, to Vancouver, Surrey, without having to rely only on their private vehicle. I mean many people need their private vehicle for the kinds of work they do, and I don't dispute that of course, and we all like to go places in a vehicle often. But we don't need it all the time for the kind of commuting that I see lined up at that tunnel, with one person in his vehicle. And it's kind of bizarre. And I think that because of the level that the Port is at in terms of our federal government, we have a real opportunity for the court to work with the other players in the region, to be a real leader in making a shift for transportation. And I do think that Arno's point of how it would be for cyclists, and actually I have also worked with that project, the Great Blue Heron Way because I'm in a group Safe Route Tsawwassen here in Tsawwassen.

Another component of that is the TransCanada Highway. I mean the TransCanada Trail. It goes to Horseshoe Bay but it doesn't go to the Tsawwassen Terminal because the Delta farmers in the past have not been comfortable with the trail going through Delta land, and so it's been frustrated. So the TransCanada Trail is really looking forward as one of our partners in Blue Heron Way.

So there are just so many components of changing, making a shift to a green transportation strategy in Metro Vancouver, and I think the Port can be a big player. Thank you very much.

Cliff Stewart wrapped up the meeting and encouraged participants to complete the feedback form and encourage their friends and others to participate.

The meeting ended at 3:38pm.