

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

**Multi-Stakeholder Meeting 1
June 8, 2011**

Notes from a Pre-Consultation multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, June 8, 2011, 2:00pm-4:00pm, at the Coast Tsawwassen Inn, Delta, BC.

Stakeholders: Ruth Adams, Tsawwassen First Nations
Leslie Abramson
Robert Butler, Delta Farmers Institute
Brad Cooper, Ladner Business Association
Rick Davies
Roger Emsley, Against Port Expansion
Julie Hobart
Susan Jones, Boundary Bay Conservation Committee & Against Port Expansion
Christine Lyon, South Delta Leader
Dave Melnychuk, Agricultural Liaison - SFPR
Bob Miller
Joyce Miller
Anne Murray
Jim Northey, Tsatsu Homeowners
Vic Rivers
Jim Ronback, Delta Naturalists
John Savage, Delta Farmers Institute
Carol Vignale, Environmental Advisory Committee Delta & Safe Route Tsawwassen
Don Watson

Port Metro Vancouver: Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development
Sarah McPherson, Senior Advisor, Communications and First Nations
Michelle Lachmann, Environmental Lead, Container Capacity Improvement Program
Chris Chok, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 2:00 pm

KEY THEMES:

- Participants requested additional information regarding Port Metro Vancouver's container traffic forecast.
 - Participants were interested in how goods in containers would be transported through Delta, Ladner and Tsawwassen by truck and train, and the impacts that these movements would have on the community.
 - Participants noted that they would like to be consulted about the potential impacts of the project on agriculture and agricultural land.
 - Participants were interested in discussing enhancements to local habitat and other potential benefits to the community as a result of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
 - Participants requested that Port Metro Vancouver provide more information about the economic impacts of the project, particularly in relation to benefits to small businesses and local jobs.
-

1. **Judy Kirk, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review**

Roundtable introductions were undertaken.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Thank you all for coming today. Let me tell you a little bit about the consultation process.

This is part of a pre-consultation process which is consulting you and others in seven face to face meetings about how you want to be consulted and what you want to be consulted about what. It is very early and consistent with consultation best practice to ask you and members of other communities such as Langley, Surrey and others, about how and what you want to be consulted on regarding the proposed Terminal 2 Project. We will be using this discussion guide in front of you which is available online. There is a feedback form attached to this which we would appreciate getting from you. Our experience is if we get them from you today, it's better than having you send them to us later. Right now there could be a postal strike, but also because people tend not to fill it out. I would certainly ask for you to fill it out today. If you don't, it is online and more and more people are filling them out online. The feedback we receive from you and others who attend the seven stakeholder meetings we are holding will be summarized in a Consultation Summary Report. Kirk & Co., which is an independent firm specializing in public consultation, will write that report for the consideration of Port Metro Vancouver. That will be written within a month of the end of the consultation. The deadline for this consultation will be June 30th. That just gives you a very quick run-down of the consultation at this stage. The reason we have asked you to fill out the tent cards, is that we will be attributing your comments. If you do not want your comments attributed please let me know after the meeting. We will be taping so that we can have a fact check and the ability to correct the notes.

Any questions before we get into the content? Please do feel free to ask questions or provide comments at any time. That's why we hold smaller sized meetings.

Just before we get started, I would like to do a round table introduction, starting with you, Cliff...

- C: *Cliff Stewart*: My name is Cliff Stewart, I am the Director of Infrastructure Development for Port Metro Vancouver and the program director for the Container Capacity Improvement Program, of which Roberts Bank Terminal 2 is a key element.
- C: *Michelle Lachmann*: My name is Michelle Lachmann. I am working with the Port Container Capacity Improvement Program and I am working on the environmental component of the program.
- C: *Sarah McPherson*: My name is Sarah McPherson from Port Metro Vancouver, and I'm part of the Communications and Consultation team.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Why don't we quickly go around the room, we only have 2 hours, so I hope you'll give me permission to move us along.
- C: *Rick Davies*: I am Rick Davies, live at Tsatsu Shores; I'm very concerned about the environment.
- C: *Judy Hobart*: Judy Hobart, Tsatsu Shores, same thing, environmental issues.
- C: *Vic Rivers*: Vic Rivers, Tsawwassen Beach.
- C: *Don Watson*: Don Watson, Tsatsu Shores.
- C: *Roger Emsley*: Roger Emsley, I live on [Beach Grove road], lived in the community for 40 something years. I'm the Executive Director of Against Port Expansion (APE) which is a community organization.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I think you're on an advisory committee to. Am I right?
- C: *Roger Emsley*: On the new advisory committee? Yes.
- C: *Leslie Abramson*: And the old.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: And the old, exactly.
- C: *Roger Emsley*: I was on the old advisory committee.
- C: *Jim Ronback*: Jim Ronback. I live in Beach Cove, also member of the Delta Naturalists and member of the Boundary Bay Conservation Committee.
- C: *Brad Cooper*: I'm Brad Cooper. I am with the Ladner Business Association and chairing the Ladner Business association.
- C: *Leslie Abramson*: I'm Leslie Abramson. I've lived here for 40 plus years, I've been a merchant in this community for 40 plus years. I live in Ladner; I was on the old and the new advisory committee.
- C: *John Savage*: John Savage, President of the Delta Farmers Institute, fourth generation farmer in Delta. I'm concerned about how this impacts agriculture and sustainability.
- C: *Robert Butler*: Robert Butler, I work for the Delta Farmers Institute in administration.
- C: *Joyce Miller*: Joyce Miller, Tsawwassen Beach.
- C: *Bob Miller*: Bob Miller, Tsawwassen Beach.

- C: *Susan Jones*: Susan Jones, Boundary Bay Conservation Committee and Against Port Expansion.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: If you don't mind my mentioning, she's hard of hearing so I'll ask everyone to speak up.
- C: *Carol Vignale*: I'm Carol Vignale. I am on the advisory committee for Delta and I'm the coordinator of something called Safe Route Tsawwassen about green transportation and respect for the land and respect for the Tsawwassen first nations, the keepers of this land. Thank you.
- C: *Ruth Adams*: I am a Tsawwassen First Nations Elder, and I also sit on the Delta heritage commission. So we're the heritage of everyone here. That's why I'm here to see what everyone is up to.
- C: *Anne Murray*: I'm Anne Murray I'm a writer and a naturalist. I'm with a number of different naturalist organizations in the province. I was thinking it was going to be an open house, so I'm not going to stay the whole time.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: No problem, and there certainly will be open houses as we proceed through consultation on this project. Before Cliff begins, in terms of going through the discussion guide I should say that this is the first of seven rounds, potentially, in this proposed project over multiple years, so there will be many opportunities for consultation including many opportunities for open houses.

2. Presentation of Pre-Consultation Discussion Guide and Feedback Form – Cliff Stewart

- C: *Cliff Stewart*: I'm going to start with this document. We are going to use this discussion guide to lead us through a conversation about the CCIP and Terminal 2, and what it is we are doing here today.

What is the Container Capacity Improvement Program?

It is our long-term strategy to reliably support growing international trade in an efficient and sustainable manner.

What is the Robert Bank Terminal 2 project?

It is a multi-berth marine container terminal that could provide additional capacity to service projected import and export demand in the Pacific Gateway.

Why are we here today? We want to hear from you. We are taking a staged approach to reviewing the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. As Judy mentioned, this is the first of seven meetings in this round, and this is the first round of seven rounds of consultation about this project and about the program.

What exactly is Pre-Consultation? As it says, pre-consultation is ahead of the consultation program. It is the first step in a best practice of consultation. The purpose of it is to ask two questions – how do you want to be consulted? Whether it's this type of meeting, whether it's an online meeting, whether it's webinars. And then on what issues you want to be consulted? We're here today, fundamentally to talk about those two questions. How you want to be

consulted and about what topics as we move into later rounds of the consultation process.

I probably don't need to ask this question in here, but the question is what is Port Metro Vancouver?

What is Port Metro Vancouver?

Port Metro Vancouver was formed by the merging of three legacy ports in the beginning of 2008. Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is the legal name and it is the port authority for the entire Lower Mainland in Canada's Pacific Gateway. It is the largest port in Canada and the most diversified port in North America. Importantly, it is the largest export port on the West Coast of North America. Our mandate as Port Metro Vancouver is to support the growth of Canadian trade.

Why is trade important?

The economic benefits of trade are felt not just in the Pacific Gateway itself, but across the entire country - creating jobs, increasing tax revenue for municipalities and producing economic benefits for Canadians.

How do we work together towards responsible growth?

With a shared commitment to sustainable solutions, we are striving to develop solid relationships at the local government level to help identify common values, determine sustainable legacies and mitigate potential community impacts. We are committed to sustainable development.

The question I hear most often is; why do we need to plan for growth of containerized trade?

C: *Judy Kirk:* Cliff is on page 6 and 7 now.

C: *Cliff Stewart:*

Why do we need to plan for the growth of containerized trade?

The graph at the bottom of the page shows the expected growth and container demand on the West Coast of Canada over the next 20 years. The left hand end is the actual container trade on the west coast of Canada last year. The green line is the existing installed capacity in Greater Vancouver and Prince Rupert. The slope of the line is fundamentally the growth we expect to see based on a fairly extensive investigation of the basis of trade including GDP growth and changes in both production and consumption habits. Container traffic predicts that the existing container capacity will soon be constrained. We expect that we would need additional container capacity as early as 2015 in the gateway, and we expect that the trade through the west coast will double over the next 10 - 15 years and could triple by 2030.

We project that over 4 million TEUs of additional container capacity will be needed to meet future West Coast container demand by 2030. That's Canadian West Coast.

What is the Container Capacity Improvement Program?

Fundamentally, the program is delivering the projects and the required infrastructure to meet that anticipated growth in the container sector. As an integral part of the program, we are assessing potential efficiency gains throughout Lower Mainland container facilities. This follows significant improvements at both Centerm and Vanterm in the inner harbour in 2005 and the completion of the Deltaport Third Berth Project in 2010. We are now evaluating additional terminal improvements as well as road and rail improvements at Roberts Bank. These are the most immediate and cost effective capacity increases that can achieve improvement and container capacity.

Roberts Bank is very well positioned to accommodate trade growth. It has well established international shipping routes and has excellent access to important Lower Mainland markets and major North American road and rail transportation corridors.

In addition to capacity improvements at the existing Deltaport terminal, we are also exploring an additional multi-berth container terminal at Roberts Bank that is Terminal 2.

Terminal 2 is expected to be a multi-berth terminal with additional capacity of more than 2 million TEUs and it is designed to meet forecast demand until the late 2020s. Although the scope, scale and location of the terminal have not been fully defined a preliminary vision includes multiple berths equipped with ship-shore cranes capable of handling, not only the latest generation of container ships, but those which we foresee as being likely the future.

Subject to environmental approvals, this project could be built adjacent to the Deltaport and Westshore terminals in phases, brought on based on market conditions.

The mid-term capacity requirements by 2020 can be met with development of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. There may also be an opportunity to reconfigure inner harbour terminals later in the 2020s to meet forecast demands beyond 2028. The progression of capacity developments, starting with the road and rail and efficiency improvements at Deltaport through T2 and into inner harbour corresponds with the lowest cost per TEU development option at each stage. Also, it reflects the realities at each stage of existing facilities with existing tenants and leases.

The question that you are probably asking how you can get involved. Firstly, the fact that you are all here speaks volumes to how you want to be involved and you've figured out how to be involved. Port Metro Vancouver is undertaking a comprehensive, multi-round community, stakeholder and public consultation process, which is occurring in several phases starting June 2011, regarding the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. It is anticipated that this consultation process will include seven rounds of substantive community, stakeholder and public consultation over several years, including Pre-Consultation, Project Definition, Pre-Design, Environmental Assessment public comment periods, Preliminary Design and Detailed Design Consultation.

Pre-Consultation, as I said earlier, is an opportunity to get your feedback regarding the design of the proposed consultation program. As we move through the different phases we ask how do you want to be consulted and what do you want to be consulted on?

How will that input be used?

At each stage, the feedback will help to shape the scope and content of subsequent consultation rounds.

It will help shape the specific information we are seeking at each stage, whether it is Project Definition, Pre-Design through the panel process and then finally to Detailed Design. There will be Consultation Summary Reports produced by Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., on behalf of the Port Metro Vancouver, following each consultation round, summarizing input received from participants. The Consultation Summary Reports will be considered, and in the process of the consideration of that in the terminal development, a consideration memo will be produced following each round which documents how that input was considered in refining.

In addition, there is a separate First Nations consultation process that runs parallel to the community, public and stakeholder consultations.

There will also be other community engagement and communications activities as mentioned here, building on the success of the Deltaport Third Berth Community Liaison Committee. A new Deltaport Community Liaison committee has just been formed and we expect that group to be an important stakeholder in this process.

Will there be an Environment Assessment?

The proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 will be subject to a thorough and independent environmental assessment. The scope and nature of that assessment has yet to be determined by the federal and provincial regulators, it is anticipated that it would be some form of panel review, which is the most rigorous type of environmental assessment. There will be opportunities for communities, stakeholders and the public to provide input on the scope and

nature of studies to be completed as part of the environmental assessment, as well as to review and comment on the results of those studies.

Environmental permits and approvals are required prior to construction of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

3. Q&A and Discussion

- C: *Judy Kirk:* Cliff before you go to the next page, are there any questions or comments so far before Cliff moves on with some of the topics that have been anticipated?
- Q: *Bob Miller:* You mentioned the liaison committee. Are there members from the previous liaison committee here today?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* Yes, Roger Emsley, Vic Rivers and Leslie Abramson.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Did those people on that committee feel that their input was considered and acted upon or was it some other outcome?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Considered or acted upon in relation to?
- Q: *Bob Miller:* In a positive way, to eliminate concerns that that group had?
- Q: *Judy Kirk:* For the committee or Deltaport Third Berth project?
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Was it effective, or was it a whitewash? You've highlighted the fact that you have this committee, and I wondered whether if it was effective.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Why don't we hear from the members who are here on that briefly.
- A: *Vic Rivers:* Generally, I was not particularly impressed with the results of the committee.
- A: *Roger Emsley:* Bear in mind, number one, that the committee was only formed after the approval to go ahead with the Deltaport Third Berth, so it was constrained from the get go. We had some successes in getting changes made, but, there are a number of significant issues on the table that the Port did not resolve satisfactorily.
- A: *Leslie Abramson:* But to be fair, there were a lot of strides that we took to hold the Port's feet to the fire. They did listen; they did act on a number of issues which were brought up. Don't forget that the same as around this table, everybody is here because everyone is either against the Port or getting something for their organization. We had the same format, nobody was all for, nobody was all against, and you will have this constantly, and you will have this no matter what committee comes to do this. There were some strides made.
- A: *Robert Butler:* You have to remember that it was after we started and we had people who came to the table perhaps totally opposed to it. What it did, is it brought the group together so that they get different positions. Whether they were satisfied or not, some of us were, some of us weren't, I think we got the issues out, we discussed it, and we had communications going out to the public.
- A: *Vic Rivers:* One of the main problems with the committee from my perspective is that it had no clout. It reported to nobody. If there was a disagreement between the committee and the Port was listening to, there was no third party we could go to for intervention or moderation. Who do you go to when the Port just listens and does exactly what it wants to do?

- Q: *Susan Jones:* I have a question about the graph on page 6; the last sentence there is saying that we need over 4 million TEUs above what we have now to meet future West Coast container demand. I'm presuming that's B.C. not all of North America.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* That's just B.C.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* So I'm presuming that it includes Prince Rupert, so I don't understand this gap. Because with Prince Rupert and the plans they have, that gap is already filled up. I'm kind of curious where this need comes from?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* If I understand your question correctly, it is with additional capacity provided by Prince Rupert what is this gap? Or is there a gap?
- C: *Susan Jones:* There isn't a gap.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Ok, you're certain there is no gap. Alright.
- Q: *Vic Rivers:* Does that take into consideration the Panama Canal expansion?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Let's take the one question, and then I'll come to that.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Certainly if Prince Rupert builds everything they have said they are going to, then Terminal 2 would not be required until much later. But it takes about 10 years to develop and deliver a terminal, and if Prince Rupert doesn't build them, then we don't have the luxury of waiting until they don't build to start the process.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* But they are way further ahead with their container expansion then the Vancouver area. They've already got their Phase 2 lined up and their Terminal 2 lined up. They just signed an agreement with the First Nations, got the infrastructure. All I'm saying is that it is way further ahead, it's lined up and everything is there, so I don't understand the gap.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Fair enough. Vic, your question about the Panama Canal.
- Q: *Vic Rivers:* Just a question about if the Panama Canal expansion was considered in this straight line expansion?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes it was in fact. 95% of the container cargo that goes through Port Metro Vancouver, and about 60% or more of what goes through Prince Rupert, is primarily destined to Toronto and Montreal. And the Panama Canal doesn't have any significant impact on the economics of those containers going through the West Coast. In other words, it wouldn't make economic sense for a shipper going to Toronto or Montreal to go through the Panama Canal by sea and then by rail the other way.
- Q: *Vic Rivers:* Nothing coming through Vancouver goes into the US east?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* About 5%.
- Q: *Roger Emsley:* I'm also on page 6 and I would like to get a breakdown of the extreme left hand side 2010 in this gap of container capacity. The reality is, when the Port Metro Vancouver did the justification of Deltaport Third Berth, they lowballed the capacity in the documents that were put out without a justification of the expansion. They talked about a capacity of all three berths of 1.35 million. In fact, that was later up to 1.8 million, with TSI and Port operators on record of saying that they can handle at least 2.1 million. So I would like much more detail on that end of how these figures were determined.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Is that kind of detail available?

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* I can say that it would be a good piece of detailed discussion at the next round of consultation. It is an issue that has certainly caused significant concern within the community. It was a situation that when it was said in 2001 or 2002, it was absolutely true, because that was the state of the art in the world at the time. Unfortunately, as the project progressed over nine years, those numbers were never revisited and revised to reflect the changes that were taking place. The state of the art today is about 800,000 TEUs per berth in a multi-berth terminal. The state of the art ten years ago was about 400,000 to 500,000 TEUs. It is important, and in fact, you'll see that these numbers here were from a report done in May of this year. This is very different from the numbers we had even 12 months ago, because of what's happened in those 12 months. So yes, that changed over time, and the numbers were never revisited. I can guarantee that if you stay in this process over the next seven rounds these numbers will continue to change because that's the nature of this business. Hopefully that starts to answer it, and we can certainly talk much more about it in the next round.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Roger, is that an information request from you? I'm assuming it is. Or are you also saying that you would like to discuss that more as a consultation topic in the next round? In other words, because we're looking at what do you and others want to be consulted on. It's a forecast, so it's not something generally to be consulted on, but if it is something that you want to be part of discussion going on I encourage you to put that in your feedback form.
- A: *Roger Emsley:* Yes, and I would like to get whatever detail Port Metro Vancouver has.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* We'll make a note of that as a follow up.
- Q: *Leslie Abramson:* Along with that note can you make sure that the dates are on. I've heard them say that by the time they got to our consultation the numbers were six or seven years old. Can the date that these facts were acquired?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* This is May 2011.
- C: *Leslie Abramson:* I see that that's the date of the forecast, but when did you collect them from? How old are they?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* How old is the data?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* It is a forecast, so the data starting from 2010 is an actual. The forecast is developed based on information that is known that was acquired in the first quarter of 2011. The important point I wanted to make in that, is that what we tell you in today with respect to forecast for demand and forecast for capacity will almost certainly change during the process because the dynamic of the trade change and the technical innovation of the operators changes and improves over time.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* And that's the nature of forecasting.
- Q: *Robert Butler:* If I read this document, you're going we are going to have another 2 million for Roberts Banks, maybe 5 million right?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We are saying more than 2 million, yes.

- Q: *Robert Butler:* That is the target for this port. What is going to be the impact of the number of trucks, length of trains? What's going to happen to the railway and highways, etc.? It is important to know this information as early as possible.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* Right. Those are important aspects of consultation in the first round of the consultation process.
- Q: *Rick Davies:* Mine was on the transportation system also. Saying here that the most economical way to move one of these TEUs is by truck, do you know the difference...
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Sorry, no...
- Q: *Rick Davies:* That wasn't correct?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No.
- Q: *Rick Davies:* What was the most economical? I thought I heard you say most economical way of...
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Moving to Toronto or Montreal from Asia would be by vessel to the West Coast of Canada, then by train.
- Q: *Rick Davies:* From here to Toronto or Montreal would be by train?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, it would be by train.
- C: *Chris Chok:* But I think your question was around the most economical cost per TEU improvement.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That is for construction of capacity.
- Q: *Rick Davies:* Have they considered moving to electric train instead of diesel? They are spending \$1 billion for a new highway to move stuff around, and putting in an electric system would be a lot better for the environment in our area.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I would suggest that that might be a topic that you put down for the consultation. Not just the proposed Terminal 2, but what they call the "supply chain", how things move.
- C: *Rick Davies:* Ok, thank you.
- Q: *Dave Melnychuk:* I think the last two people hit on what I was going to ask. Looking at page 6 with the increased container movement through Delta, how are we going to move these containers through the community? Also what about the staging and storage of these containers? What are the implications to the agricultural land base in Delta? It's an issue to come forth in the analysis I guess. It is kind of scary that we are at 3,000 and we are going to go to 7,000 and we have traffic congestion.

I did have more of a specific question on page 8 where these phases of consultation – is there a time table for these various phases when you expect to launch them, how long they will take? That would give us a little better idea of where we are starting today.

- A: *Judy Kirk:* I will answer this question. We are here in June with Pre-Consultation, and we are anticipating that Project Definition Consultation would take place in fall 2011. But there has to be some technical work done before you come out and we need to see the results of this consultation. The Pre-Design Consultation

would be anticipated sometime in the fall of 2012. I'm saying anticipate because again, the technical program has to provide some information. Then when you walk through the Panel Guidelines, and Preliminary Design Consultation and Environmental Assessment, that I really can't give you any sense of yet, because the Federal and Provincial regulators need to determine the scope and timing of those phases, particularly the draft panel and the public hearing process. The Preliminary Design Consultation will be determined by when those last two are. The last phase, Detailed Design Consultation will be based on when all of these others are undertaken or finished. So the thinking is that within approximately within 6 years, the 7 rounds would be done. But that's crystal ball gazing in a lot of ways, because the provincial and federal regulators will determine that.

- C: *Susan Jones:* That information that Roger was asking for that we don't seem to agree on is a big part of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*. The justification which they really skimmed over on the Deltaport Third Berth and there never was a proper report. So, it's not just what we want around the table want, it's also a legal requirement; that needs to be looked at very closely. And Mr. Stewart, could you repeat the numbers about where the containers from the one that comes into Vancouver and the ones coming into Prince Rupert.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* About 95% of the containers through Port Metro Vancouver are for Canadian destinations; for local and central and Eastern Canada.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* Can you be more specific. How many local? Do some of them have to go through the Rockies?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* The vast majority go through the Rockies.
- C: *Susan Jones:* Wow. And then for Prince Rupert you said about 60% goes back East?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* About 60% now, and about 40% goes to the United States.
- Q: *Dave Melnychuk:* A very specific question. In terms of the actual authority to build in the foreshore, that requires certain approvals and permits. Has that application for that site been put into the system?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* No, it hasn't. This is Pre-Consultation and this is very early in the process.
- Q: *Dave Melnychuk:* I remember seeing maps before with reservations by crown lands in the foreshore.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That is a different question, and I am going to be very careful because I don't know the specifics of that. I know as a general comment. On Sturgeon and Roberts Bank there are a number of reservations. The Vancouver Airport Authority has a reservation for a certain part of the bank. There are certain parts of the bank that the Port Metro Vancouver owns and or has long term interests in. And I can't tell you specifically whether there has been any for this project. But there has not been a permit application submitted at this point.
- C: *Susan Jones:* I can partially answer that question because there was protection around that area at Roberts Bank and the Deltaport. When they did the Deltaport Third Berth BC Crown Lands transferred 2,800 acres of foreshore land

to the Federal Government who handed it over to the Port for Terminal 2 and the Deltaport Third Berth. So the ducks are all lined up there.

Q: *Brad Cooper:* I will take on that other side of the question which is representing the business community. When you do Pre-Consultation of this nature, how is it, and is it possible to determine what the economic impact to the community where this...

C: *Judy Kirk:* By way of answering this question, you know, rather than moving that to Cliff. Pre-Consultation isn't always done, and I look around this room and see that people have been involved with consultation of various sizes and shapes, dealing with lots of projects over several years. This consultation precedes that kind of study. I just want to let people know where we are, and that's why we wanted to bring this graphic on page 8. The Environmental Assessment, which would include the socio-economic study, which includes as part of it the economic impact, which is something that the Federal and Provincial regulators will require. But it is probably a year or more away in terms of that kind of filing for a process.

C: *Brad Cooper:* Ok. Thanks, Judy.

Q: *Julie Hobart:* Back to page 6 again, and the gap in container capacity, Mr. Stewart has mentioned that there is a big effect on the global effect of the economy with buying and selling and delivering. I guess this is crystal ball gazing again, but it seems to me that the global economy is changed a lot in the last year, and if this continues, then surely, we won't be needing the same kind of products delivered in Canada that we have in the past if this economic levelling off.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Can I ask your question in another way and see if it makes sense to you? I think what you are saying is, if subsequent forecasts show demand falling, would the Port Metro Vancouver look at not doing this project?

Q: *Julie Hobart:* Yes, exactly. Thank you, Judy.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* I would suggest yes. I will go back to what I said before. It takes ten years to go through this process, from the first commitment to begin the process until you can tie up a ship, load it and unload it. At any point in this process you can stop, but if you aren't sure, and don't start now and you need it in ten years you can't come in later and speed up the process. The process is almost completely inelastic because it requires this sort of work, leading into a very structured environmental assessment process. Of the 10 years, probably 3 or 4 is construction. You can throw a lot of money at a construction project and speed it up a little bit. If in terms of being ready in 2020, if this is right, we don't have a choice but to start now, but if it is wrong, then we can easily slow or stop.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Can I ask a supplemental question, because I think it's important for people's understanding. Is there a multi-stage process where decisions are made various ways and times?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Absolutely.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Is there an opportunity to proceed or not proceed with the process?

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, absolutely. Certainly, within Port Metro Vancouver, definitely, and ultimately, within a proponent who would actually be coming in to build the facility, there are a whole lot of places where the process could be put on hold or stopped because it doesn't make sense for any number of reasons. It's a good question, it's important to understand it. I remember reading an article where somebody said "they don't need it for 10 years, why are they starting now?" We're starting now because if we need it in ten years we're on the critical path, if we don't need it then we can stop the process.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* This applies to determining the scope of the Environmental Assessment. At one point the initial construction of Deltaport Third Berth, and Roberts Bank Terminal 2 were coupled, then they were decoupled which precluded any cumulative effects being taken into account the effect of Third Berth. Do we have any input into determining the scope of the Environmental Assessment or it that takes into account the previous projects and their affects add up from one project to the next?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* I would like to split my answer into two pieces because you started with a statement. I hear it often. The Third Berth cumulative effects study included T2. In fact, it's required that any cumulative effects study included all projects that are reasonably foreseeable. So Terminal 2, as it was foreseen in 2002 was included in the Third Berth cumulative effects study. That wasn't why it was decoupled, and decoupling did not remove T2 from the cumulative effects study.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* I see no reference to T2 in the environmental assessment.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* If you look in the cumulative effects study, you'll see what the numbers are in there for.
- C: *Chris Chok:* If you would like a copy of that we can provide you with a link to read the report.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* This goes back to the numbers changing, it was Deltaport at 2 million, and T2 at 2 million. So nine years ago 2 million was a considered a high end of what a container could deliver with three Berths. So the cumulative effects for T2 will have higher numbers. But T2 was considered as part of Third Berth. What was the question after the statement?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* The question was about can people influence the scope and nature of studies including cumulative effects going into a regulatory process? That's not exactly what you said, but I think that's the gist of it.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* And the answer to that depends upon the panel. It would be expected that you could.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I'd like Michelle to add to that, since she brings the Environmental expertise.
- A: *Michelle Lachmann:* We are anticipating that this would be a panel process. As part of that, they set up a thing called panel guidelines which outline the scope to be considered in the Environmental Assessment. Those guidelines do get circulated for public consultation and will be mapped out as part of the panel process once it's fully understood.

- Q: *Jim Ronback:* And is it by definition that the panel will not have conflicts of interest?
- A: *Michelle Lachmann:* Yes, it will be set up as an independent review panel.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* The only thing I would point out is that you just asked a question of representatives of the Port Metro Vancouver and a consultant in environment, not the regulators themselves. There is information on the web about the Canadian Environmental Assessment Review process and the BC EAO process.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* And will it be harmonized?
- Q: *Susan Jones:* The scoping document is the most important document of the whole process and that happens before the panel set up. It's a federal process and doesn't even go on the provincial website. You get 30 days to respond to the scoping document, and for the Deltaport Third Berth Project it came out at the end of July, and was due at the end of August when everyone was on vacation. So there was not proper input to the scoping document, and once that's done it's over. That is a very key question.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* And I would encourage you not to limit your comments in this feedback form. Anything you would like to say about that in this feedback form because we are going to make this available to the regulators.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* The message from me and Jim is that this scoping document needs to be out there to the public, what it is and what it stands for. That's what you're working for. That limits what happens after if it's not in that scoping document, it's dog meat.
- C: *Chris Chok:* Jim had a question about whether the environmental assessment would be harmonized.
- C: *Jim Ronback:* Will it be harmonized? Will the Federal and Provincial join their assessment to avoid having two separate reviews? Will this forthcoming one for Terminal 2 be harmonized?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* They can't answer that question because that is a question for the regulators. They will decide.
- A: *Michelle Lachmann:* Susan, I agree with you, absolutely, the scoping document, from an environmental practitioner's point of view, is a key resource. The Terminal 2 project will go through a very different EA process. It will have a much different way of engaging with the public and so it is important that we carry on with the consultation so everyone is educated on that ahead of the game so we know timing wise and expectations for when there's feedback.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* Is it decided that there will be a panel process?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* No, it has not been decided.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* If I could explain that – it is the Federal Minister of Environment who makes that decision.

- Q: *Joyce Miller:* Will the scope extend beyond what the parameter of the Ferry terminal to the Ports are? Because there is a lot of stuff happening southeast of the Port that previously we were concerned about, and it wasn't part of the consideration before. Is it going to be part of consideration now?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Would the Environmental Review look at developments east of the ferry terminal?
- Q: *Bob Miller:* The impact of the current developments, and Terminal 2, east of the ferry terminal. When I talked to the environmental folks at the Port, they said no once you get to the Ferry Terminal we have no interest in anything beyond that. As we sit and go to the park, once you get to the park you'll notice that Tsawwassen Bay is filling in. The Port of Vancouver, in all previous conversations, has denied any interest, or responsibility, in monitoring or being concerned about what happens east of the ferry terminal. Will it include anything down to, and including, Point Roberts?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I don't think that Michelle or Cliff could answer that question, because they are not the regulators. That said, I encourage you to put that in your feedback form, as something that you are interested in being consulted on. It will be both the Port and the regulators who will decide what the scope of the consultation is.
- C: *Susan Jones:* I can answer that because it's a requirement of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, Sec. 16., that they do include these associated developments. They are supposed to include all of these associated. They pay lip service to it, but legally, it's supposed to be in there.

Page 10 – On What Topics Do You Want to Be Consulted?

- C: *Cliff Stewart:* What we are here to talk to you about today are about what topics you would want to be consulted on and how you want to be consulted. A lot of these things were brought up through the Deltaport Third Berth Project. This is a list of things we would expect to consult on, but want you to use this as a starting point, rather than the ultimate list.

Project Design Elements could include topics such as layout of the proposed terminal, marine traffic, land reclamation, roads, rail and other related topics.

Culture and Heritage could include topics such as maritime heritage and marine archaeology.

Socio-Economic could include topics such as road, rail and marine traffic, potential economic benefits and costs, construction and operational activities, business opportunities and effects, and creation of direct and indirect jobs.

Wildlife and Habitats could explore potential habitat preservation and enhancement, potential habitat compensation, and potential impacts on endangered species/species at risk.

Water Quality and Marine Species could focus on water and sediment characteristics and the marine species that inhabit Roberts Bank.

Infrastructure could examine proposed port facilities including the berth,

terminal, shore protection, road and rail access, industry and municipal services.

Local Benefits and Opportunities could include options for contributions to community amenities such as parks or other recreation opportunities, facilities or infrastructure.

Local and Regional Area could consider topics such as air quality, safety, greenhouse gases, land use, noise and light.

- Q: *Carol Vignale*: It struck me that what we talk about is the economic benefit for our country of Canada, the province of British Columbia and Metro Vancouver. It seems to me that this benefit needs to be coupled with a local benefit. What I have heard in the past, groups that are against development, is about mitigation, reducing the impact on the habitat and the community, with increased traffic and poorer air quality. So I guess the challenge, it would seem to me, is how can a project like this, not only talk about – the purpose is to enhance this trade and economic – could we think about enhancing the local habitat? I had a tour with the environmental advisory for Delta of the Port, and saw how various marine life were being brought back or improved around the Port, and some land quality at the edges. So I wonder if we can think about enhancing our local human as well as our local natural environment with this project. Right now, I've lived here for 30 years, and that edge, that Salish Sea/Georgia Sea is almost invisible to the community of Tsawwassen and Delta, and they have bared with the traffic and bother, and nothing has been part of our community, including the Tsawwassen First Nation and their traditional territory there, and their community. And so I really look forward to a project like this to bring a positive energy to both the natural and human environment and would like to see that as our core aim in this kind of project.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: I encourage you to put that in your feedback form as something that should be discussed in length. I can tell you that discussion of benefits is not usually very well done. I think you raise a very good point. It's something I've recommended that the Port look at this and they have indicated a real interest.
- C: *Roger Emsley*: I think something that needs to be on this list is how the environmental review is going to be carried out. A key question that I would like answered quite early in the piece because then we could save a lot of time and effort. If, as it did, last independent review panel, recommended against development in exactly the area that the Port is now proposing to put Terminal 2. What has changed that makes it acceptable now, that made it unacceptable then? The project was an expansion of the Port facilities, the federal environmental assessment review panel reported in 1979 and it said, at the time, the Port wanted to go ahead with a number of pods, and it said, this was what was proposed, out here – east side of where the coal terminal is now, they recommended against any development because of the significant environmental impacts. I think that has to be answered right off the bat. Nothing has changed in terms of the environment except we know more about

the importance of Roberts Bank and the whole area. Unless we answer that, there is no point in doing anything else.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* That's a well-articulated question, and putting that in the feedback form as well as noting it in the notes, is very important. I say that without knowing what the regulators would bring to the table with that report.
- Q: *Roger Emsley:* I suspect that report is difficult to find.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* But you have it.
- Q: *Roger Emsley:* I have it, but I've asked Environment Canada about that report and another one and gotten no answer.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* 1979 isn't that long ago, in terms of records.
- C: *Michelle Lachmann:* We have records.
- Q: *Ruth Adams:* Thank you so much for this, because I wondered when I sat down that everyone was against it, I'm in the wrong room. But I'm in the right room, and I'm in the right place to speak like this. What I want in this, and I think it should be told, because everyone here talks about the east of the Port, and I they are going right over us – Tsawwassen First Nation. What I want to be told is that under the Indian Act, we weren't mentioned at all, and we didn't have any say. So now that Tsawwassen First Nation is under the treaty, I think it is very important that all Canadians know it means a lot to the First Nations – being participant in all that's going on around us. And I'm here to hear what the people of Delta are saying. I've been in a lot of places where people are against everything. But I say I'm really happy that you are here, Port Metro Vancouver. I think that everyone needs to get the education of how the governments work and how it all comes together, because you will be surprised what you're wanting for and going to all the different governments. I think you are getting a good education because these are things for the good of our country. This is for Canada, and if you can't see... I watch everything that is going on because of the economic development so I'm one of those crazy First Nations people who wants to know what's going on. And you'll be surprised; all First Nations are watching what's going on globally. Because globally, we are a country that can give a lot of this earth. We can do it in a good way without fighting with each other. I loved what Carol said, and I've got this hidden agenda. Yeah, it's a hidden agenda, and it's about working with the community and be participants with communities. And I can't kick all of you out of my territory. Together we can be strong for Canada. This is about Canada; this is about local to global. And if you think that Canada has this book that says this is how it's going to be done? No – we're going to work it out. Ok? There's work to be done. The work has to be done together. So I just wanted everyone here to know that it wasn't a hidden agenda. I'm not against the Port. I'm very happy to be working with everyone along with First Nations. A lot of First Nations are, they're just not at these tables. My hands go up to you. Thank you so much. This is so grand for you to do this. No one can say they haven't been involved. You do put out everything and I know that everyone doesn't read everything. But if you want to be involved, you have to read everything.

- Q: *Dave Melnychuk:* In regard to what topics, I come from an agricultural background, and I have all my life. I work in the community, and am trying to mitigate for South Fraser Perimeter Road and its impact. In view of the fact that most containers are going to be travelling through farm community and expanded roads and railways; I think it's very important as a separate item – all these are important, I'm not discounting them – but what I don't really see here – and I think after all experiences we have had in Delta over the last 50 years, no one has really grappled with what is the cumulative impact on agriculture, land loss, traffic patterns, drainage, air quality for example. So what I'm asking is that the Port supports a very focused analysis of your impact to agriculture short term and long term. I would like to see it come out in the page that they recognize that the bulk of the land outside the estuary is farmland. It's taken a really big hit in the last few decades. And I think it needs to be recognized and we need to develop mitigation strategies to minimize impacts.
- Q: *Don Watson:* Every morning I wake up and look out my window and there is the Port – I have no problems whatsoever. But, my concern is, I was on the Delta advisory planning commission on the area plan for a year or so. Tsawwassen is a beautiful town surrounded by farmland but it's a bedroom community. What we need here is jobs, and I was wondering, how many jobs are going to be produced – I understand that they are going to be well paying jobs – how many are going to be available for the people in Tsawwassen? I heard once that all the hiring was all done down in Burrard Inlet. Is that still the case or would they be able to be hired out of Tsawwassen?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* I have to be careful because I spent ten years operating a terminal and my immediate thoughts were to the collective agreement, and thought about that. The analysis on jobs isn't done. If your question is, jobs on the terminal – and I can speak about today at Deltaport – the local is called the New Westminster Local. But the vast employment of that local is out here at Roberts Bank. It's not Burrard Inlet, it's on this side of the Fraser River. One would assume that it would be something similar for any new developments at Roberts Bank.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Do we have any estimated job numbers for this proposed project?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Today, and it gets more efficient every year, it's about an hour of employment for every TEU. So 2.5 million on the terminal, 2.5 million hours a year for a 2.4 million TEU terminal.
- Q: *Don Watson:* My concern is how many of those jobs are going to be in Tsawwassen and Lader, local jobs?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* I think that's a very interesting topic – I think what you're saying, and we don't have all the answers, because it's so early in the process so we don't have all the answers. But it seems that you would like to talk about what is the potential for local employment out of this proposed project.
- C: *Don Watson:* Yes, that's right.
- Q: *Leslie Abramson:* My other hat was the president of Chamber of Commerce. One thing I haven't heard or seen a lot of is the impact on business and what it

does for this business community. We talk about the impact on the environment, truck traffic, the air quality – we have the new air quality station up here, that’s one thing the committee did. But what is the impact on the business community? How many rooms this hotel sells? How many pizzas does a pizza company sell because they have a late shift at the Port? How many tires the tire company sells? I think this is important because we are becoming a brown paper community. And it could get worse if the Tsawwassen First Nations big shopping centre goes in. I think they should be pushing the economic impact that it has in this village in Tsawwassen and Ladner.

- Q: *Robert Butler:* One of the comments you got is page 4, and it’s talking about “a shared commitment to sustainable solutions, we are striving to further develop solid relationships at the local government level to help identify common values, determine sustainable legacies and mitigate potential community impacts.” When you look at the work sustainable, and it is mentioned in this discussion guide four or five times, I would like to know how the Port defines that word. Because I think it’s important to understand what it means for this community and groups around here. Sustainable to some groups means to some “my business only”, but in reality is that sustainability should be sustainability of everyone involved around what’s going on so no one is any worse than when the project started. I would like to find out whether that’s the Port’s interpretation.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* Good topic and having done this for many years, the definition of sustainability has evolved over time.
- C: *Robert Butler:* Evolved if you mean almost nothing today because it only means what we each want it to mean. So what does it mean in terms of the Port.
- Q: *Brad Cooper:* That actually was the question that I was asking regarding the economic impact – I’m asking about the small businesses of Delta. I represent a business association in Ladner that is going through a pretty frightening change in transportation. The thought that potentially the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which is being built to take on the capacity of the Port as it exists today that there is a chance that we will start looking like some of the communities on Vancouver Island where they put on the Sea Island Highway and eventually some of the small communities, which used to have traffic directed through it, now you have to know you want to be in that place or you miss it.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So creating a bypass.
- Q: *Brad Cooper:* Highway 17 will probably stop being a provincial highway probably, and become a municipal road and the business community in Ladner is concerned about that and the impact on the small business. We have had the pleasure of having representatives from the Port come in and share with us and many of our members come and share how much business they do get from the port. It is not small by any means, but it is something that should be expanded upon to let them know. There are a lot of issues from this from an environmental side, and I think we have to look at them very carefully, but we

don't want to sideline the communities, they need to see that this is a positive all the way around. That's just the big fear right now.

- Q: *Jim Ronback:* My background is as a system safety engineer. I don't see any indication about establishing a safety management system, which identifies all the potential hazards which can take place during the construction and operation of Terminal 2. It's not clear to me how hazardous goods would be handled, what could be contained in these containers that are brought through here, or could they bring flammable liquid like jet fuel or gasoline?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* It's something called a "tanktainer", and it's not inside a box, you can see it, it's got square ends on it and it's a tank and marked.
- Q: *Jim Roback:* So conceivably we could have jet fuel coming through these ports?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Conceivably jet fuel isn't something you'd find moving that way.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* What other flammable liquids and chemicals. What I see missing is the safety management system.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Michelle, is that something that would generally be part of the environmental scope?
- C: *Jim Ronback:* Not necessarily.
- A: *Michelle Lachmann:* It should be, it's not, but defiantly we'll take that down.
- Q: *Ruth Adams:* Just listening because I'm part of Safe Route and we just got our little bus going from First Nations up here to this town centre. But I think what the Port Metro Vancouver can really look into and put into their plan is this transportation plan – the bus system and the bike system – I said that because my daughter was working down there and taking her bicycle and I hear that a lot of people take a cab. If we had a transportation system that could bring us around to those work areas, people around here seem to think that there could be some work to be done here around the Port and at the ferries. There is work there to be done, but I think to have them, if we had a good transportation plan with a bus system. Also, to put it in a plan, some people were asking what the benefits would be. Maybe the benefit would be that because this is a no growth area in Delta, we don't get the bus system, because you don't have the numbers, can't get the numbers because we don't want growth. Since we are within Metro I would love to put this big bang on the table, and say let's get this transportation system. It would be a good benefit for Ladner and Tsawwassen and for us too– if there was a good transportation system for all those new roads going in, I think it could be put with transportation.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* Referring to page 10, where you have these topics that we want to be consulted on think we should add a number of topics – as discussed here the impacts to agriculture. When they did the Deltaport Third Berth assessment at public meetings, when asked about agricultural land the answer the Port gave was that the scope here, the Terms of Reference stopped at the land, they were only looking at the Port area. There again, the scoping document, Terms of reference are key, impact on agriculture, impact on local business with numbers. They say we will do this many jobs, it's all glossed over, it needs to be

very specific. I would also like a credible feasibility study done and I'd like that early in the game.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: Feasibility for the proposed T2 Project?
- Q: *Susan Jones*: For the whole proposal and a credible cost benefit analysis. I would also like to see habitat compensation and mitigation plans on the table early. These happen probably about two years after approval so the public has no input to that whatsoever. That's what happened before. They go on that table of commitments and assurances, and that is way too late for the public. That should be right at the second meeting.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I'm just going to ask Michelle, since I'm not an expert in Environment, but those which I've observed and have been part of, the mitigation plans have been part of the application for environmental certification which does have a process around it. Michelle, am I right on that?
- A: *Michelle Lachmann*: Yes, generally. For DP3, the mitigation plans that were in the application, and there is a general tie back to the commitments table. Susan's right, there was probably a one or two year process after the approval where there was a refinement.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: But that's generally not the way it is.
- Q: *Susan Jones*: Excuse me, if you read the table of commitments and assurances, "management plan to be drawn up". This is all future stuff and it's very general like she said, there's just general "yes we'll replace the fish habitat", but no numbers, no specifics, nothing that anyone can provide input.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I'm not questioning DP3. My question to Michelle was, generally in Environmental Assessment processes, are draft mitigation plans part of the application?
- A: *Michelle Lachmann*: Yes
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Yes, so if that's the case this time, again we're in the territory that it's up to regulators.
- Q: *Susan Jones*: My request here is more specific. It's way too general.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: That's something we'd need to pass onto the regulators.
- A: *Michelle Lachmann*: I would agree with you, Susan.
- Q: *Anne Murray*: I have a comment about wildlife and habitats too. Compensation on mitigation has been a big problem, not just with DP3 but also with South Fraser Perimeter Road. They are still working on habitat mitigation. It's one of those adaptive management things that you never get to comment and never see a proper plan. It's a real failure in terms of follow up and accountability. Actually, it's a real opportunity missed to get input from the public who often know these areas more than some of the people handling it. Also, I would like to comment on "potential impacts on endangered specials/species at risk." on page 10. I just want to reiterate that this area – Roberts Bank, part of the Fraser River Estuary is considered to be one of the most important areas in the whole of Canada for migratory birds. Now, a lot of those birds are not species at risk, but are migratory bird that depends on this area specifically. They are not red listed as species at risk – there are lots of them. If you take out this habitat, you are going to make a hole in the Pacific Flyway and it could have a huge impact. Last time, for the DP3, they said no problem, anything is mitigatable, and they

didn't really look at species – the overall impact on the flyway, the huge number of shore birds that come through. They are common birds, but they are important for this area. If we are just going to carry on with the same thing and I almost didn't even comment on it. Like most people at this table, I have seen many of these and I wonder we go there and we spend months and months, giving up our time for a corporation that's going to make money out of this and we get nothing. It's just community involvement giving up afternoons on a sunny day, evenings. I feel we get nowhere; I'm really frustrated with these processes. I appreciate that we are being pre-consulted here, I shall fill out my feedback form, I shall send it in, I shall attend all of the meetings and everything, but at the end, what we are seeing is that our community is just being destroyed piecemeal, bit by bit. I really didn't feel much like commenting and I'm going to have to leave in a minute anyway.

- Q: *Bob Miller:* I agree with your comments. I'm interested in knowing what base level documentation that the Port has with regard to flow of water and the use of Roberts Bank incubator space for young salmon in be integrated into salt water. And how important it was for the Ferry terminals and how much of the degradation of that area has occurred because of the original port and the additional construction that has gone on so that we can try to figure out... One of the things that's running through my mind is sustainable, the word that was mentioned several times, but the key word that was mentioned only once is at the lowest cost. It's almost unstated, but it seems to me that a key part in here is sustainable at the lowest cost – so that if it costs more not to bugger up the environment, they could do it the cheaper way, then I perceive that as our community is providing a subsidy to the Port of Vancouver for their lowest cost. When perhaps their threshold of investment, which we never get to discuss, the threshold of investment is always underlined at the lowest cost. If it should foul up the community for example, this very small thing, before Roberts Bank went in, you could go and crab, with your family, out on Roberts Bank. From the time they started putting these facilities in, it's basically a quagmire out there. You can barely walk out there with your grandchildren because it's unsafe. It's working for lowest cost and their threshold of sustainability appears to be low enough. It's sustainable at the level they are doing it because it affects their lowest cost. It's not sustainable of what the environment was capable to do before they went in to do their work. If it's not able to do that work then somehow that's a subsidy that this community is providing the Port of Vancouver and I think it's wrong.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I appreciate that explanation, especially that notion of subsidy is important to understand. Are you saying that you would like to discuss the relationship between environmental, economic and social, in terms of sustainability and the relative trade-offs between them and the levels.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* In addition to that, the base information of the 1979 report that Roger has, what information was available then or is it now been run through the trashing machine.

- Q: *Ruth Adams:* The crab part, that was before anyone came, that's not the Port's fault. It was the farmers, and then the tunnel came and the ferry came. So I wouldn't blame the crabs on the Port because it was the farmers who came.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* There is a process going on there, called eutrophication where we are raising, with the habitat and fish. I'm following up on what Roger said about the 1979 report, there were letters from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in 2003 saying you cannot build here you should not build here. And the scientists that wrote that were moved sideways and the rubber stamp came in and they were ignored.
- Q: *Vic Rivers:* We have talked about mitigating the wildlife and the agricultural land. We also need to talk about how you are going to mitigate to the people who live on the west side of Tsawwassen. Following on what Bob said it seems to me that we are subsidizing the Port by putting up with the increased activity going on out there; the noise pollution that's getting bigger and bigger as time goes on, the problems with light pollution that never got resolved with DP3. We just have this insidious creep that's getting bigger and bigger, it's a significant impact. I've lived on Tsawwassen Beach 34 years and I've lived in Tsawwassen 42 years. When I first came there was a ferry at 7 in the morning and it quit at 10:35 at night and it was quiet. Now we have Roberts Bank, and the conveyors for the coal, DP2, DP1 now we have DP3 and I presume you're going right to DP6 I presume. And it's a very increasing and increasing, and it's an insidious thing, and it's getting worse and worse as time goes on. We aren't getting anything back from it, but we are contributing in a subsidy to the Port. Someone has to address that as we go forward. We should, for instance, be going to shore power that would get rid of so much noise out there. But the Port is hiding behind the IMO and we can't do anything until IMO decides and it goes for years and years. These things have got to be addressed because the people on the west side are having to put up with this gradual, insidious noise, and light pollution and all the rest of the stuff that goes on.

Page 12

- C: *Judy Kirk:* Just like Cliff did, I want to go through these consultation methods those listed here: attending a small-group meeting like this, attending an open house in your community or neighbourhood, participating in an online video open house, and I'll explain that in a minute if you have questions about it, completing an online feedback form, attending a webinar, providing a written submission or other methods of consultation. These are not meant to limit, only to provide ideas. We would like to know whether you are more interested in face to face meetings, or online, or a combination. At the risk of offending those in the room who are over 40 – and there are a few of us – I just want to remind us that if you do prefer face to face we need to remember that the younger generation, who need to be involved in these processes, very much prefer, or are starting to tell us, that they want online opportunities as well. I want to ask about your ideas as to how you want to be consulted and make sure that you fill out your feedback form regarding that.

- Q: *John Savage:* Just a comment on Bob's comment about the crabs. I was up there Saturday and had four traps out there with eight guys, got one hundred and fourteen crabs.
- C: *Bob Miller:* But John, my comment wasn't the fact that the crabs aren't there, my comment was that you can't walk out there. You can go on your boat and drop the trap.
- Q: *John Savage:* I walked.
- C: *Bob Miller:* No kidding. You can't from our side.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Methods of consultation are changing. We want to hear from you about how you want to be consulted. Please take us seriously and answer how you want to be consulted about this over time.
- Q: *John Savage:* And all due respect to everyone here, we all have concerns in specific areas, and I respect that fully as well. I think Ruth made a pretty good statement about coming to a resolve; you can only do that by consultation. And the real task in front of all of us here, no matter what the interest is to make sure we get the points across and they are clearly understood even when it gets to a panel. There is no sense just having the consultation and get into the point of presentation and it's disregarded. It has to be really forthright and understood by all, and given the proper time that is required, so that those processes can take place.
- Q: *Roger Emsley:* I believe under point 3 that should be an additional aspect that should be considered, and that is the Port making available, online, a number of background documents and statistics so we have the opportunity to review them and not go hunting for them to find them. I would like to see the Port being proactive putting those out there. And one of the specifics I would like to see – up until 2006, we knew what the actual volumes were going through Deltaport. Since roughly 2006 – 2007 we've had to guess because the Port has refused to provide that information.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* I remember with the Deltaport Third Berth that the public got upset and they held one or two public meetings with microphones, because there was an outcry and there was a response. So you never know when you're going to get people out to a big meeting, they had a panel with people at the front and many people got up and asked a lot of questions. Sometimes you do that, and nobody shows up. I think you need to do all of these options here, and as Roger suggests. The one problem I have is I like to hear what other people are saying and so with all these meetings, these Pre-Consultation meetings, and open houses; I never got to hear what people said. I would like the whole community to know what people around this room are saying in all of these consultations. I would like to know how you do that. All we had with the last two processes we've had for the South Fraser Perimeter Road and Deltaport Third Berth was people who went to a lot of trouble to write submissions and a lot of people aren't going to do that. There's an incredible record there, but

nobody ever listened to it, and so it's like Anne said, you don't want to sit down and write a 10 page report that was ignored. I spend the whole of August writing a report in response to the comprehensive study – totally ignored. There was no acknowledgement, no response, nothing. So there is no feedback from peoples input, but on the other hand I still want to be able to access that. The people are not being listened to. You can go to both processes, you can go to the website, submit wonderful comments, and incredible information and absolutely nothing happened. It's not consultation, it's just back and forth.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* So Susan, with respect to what you were saying regarding the ability of people to look at submissions and feedback forms and that sort of thing.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* I don't know how you document a meeting like the one today, so that somebody who can't be here today can hear. There's some expectation around that.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* Let me answer this question, very specific to this process. There will be a Consultation Summary Report which will be written by Kirk & Co. independently. Cliff said earlier on behalf of the Port earlier today. Actually to be absolutely correct, it is an independent report which be filed with the Port. That report has as appendices these meeting notes, written submissions and feedback forms. With British Columbia's protection of privacy and access to information and with the Port as a federally regulated agency the federal requirements for privacy and access to information, you can look at your own feedback form and your own written submission. If someone gives permission with respect to their written submission and feedback form you can look at others. But there are caveats around that. All the information is there, and attached, but the access to individuals with their names etc. is something that needs permission.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* Another comment regarding questionnaires. I find 99% of them biased and I hate answering because my answer is none of the above and I never have that option. Any questionnaire should be fair and not stupid and not a waste of time. With this one today, a lot of these questions are going to have to be in the Environmental Assessment act. They are going to have to be there anyways, whether or not you like it, it is important to the act, so they have to be there, they are kind of redundant.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* I just want to say to you on that – if we hadn't noted them... and there's an agree scale on there, in other words, we're saying to people how important to you. There's no question that in the Environmental Review, all if not more, of these topics will need to be looked at. But the Port is saying to you, that they are doing consultation over and above the Environmental Review. This Pre-Consultation, the Project Definition and the Preliminary Design Consultation are all over and above Environmental Review. If all of these are extremely important to you, and that's fair enough, but some of them might have a higher important to you; certainly no desire to be redundant.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* We had an overabundance too in the South Fraser Perimeter Road. We had meetings up the ying yang, and none of it was listened too.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* That's a different point and I respect that point.

- Q: *Jim Ronback:* One thing you don't have here is asking whether the writer has made given permission to make it public, you should add that. We need to have meetings where the proponent of the project is there to answer questions from the public and that there should be someone there representing from the regulators. So that they can also be asked questions.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* We will put that down. We can only ask. Generally they only attend the processes over which they are overseeing.
- Q: *Jim Ronback:* Quite often it's a process question that we've got in mind.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Yes, fair enough.
- C: *Susan Jones:* It's not easy to get the money
- C: *Judy Kirk:* No it isn't, but I hear you. They are under resourced in a lot of ways aren't they.
- Q: *Carol Vignale:* A small group meeting like this is very useful. In the past when other projects have been in this community often, this is not done. I'm just really surprised and pleased about this round table. I think it's really helpful because it's often not been done. When you have these open houses, and the project is shown off, or people speak privately to the consultants for the project it's not so helpful. We come from a lot of different perspectives in one community and often people don't get to hear these different perspectives. It's kind of cool that we have a First Nations person; Ruth is here to cross over. We have the business community and they all meet together and we have the Against Port guys and they meet together. Very seldom in our community in Delta do we have an opportunity really to be neighbours to one another. Not everyone may agree. But I for one really think what you have done today is extraordinary for our community and I am pleased to be here. I would like to see more of these small group meetings so that neighbours can get to know each other. There are perspectives that aren't loud voices and that don't belong to a group like Against Port Expansion or the business community or the Farmer's Institute, like the voice that I have. There are lots of people with voices like mine and lots of other voices. I agree with Susan, it's really important for us to get to know each other as neighbours. And it would seem to me that as a cohesive community group, we looked at our not at self-interest, but community interest, national interest, provincial interest, regional interest, and, then we could actually propose certain elements of the project that we all agree on and not fighting against each other. I want to look at the whole benefit for the whole community, including all of these voices we heard today. And I think we can find that if we all continue to work together in small groups.
- Q: *Susan Jones:* I would like to see something specific about employment opportunities. But I would like specific information – are they temporary, part-time, permanent, construction are they at the terminal. How many of it is on borrowed tax payer's money, how much is going to be paid out by the Port? I've never seen that.

C: *Judy Kirk*: I would like to ask you to fill out your feedback form here today before you leave and leave it with either Chris or myself. Thank you in advance for participating in such a very meaningful way in terms of speaking up and saying what was on your mind.

Q: *Unknown*: You said online as well?

A: *Judy Kirk*: Yes it is. You can do it online, I'm saying please send it in if you do that. We really want to get it from you.

The meeting ended at 3:30pm.