

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

**Small Group Meeting 2
October 9, 2013**

Notes from a small group meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 9, 5:00pm-7:00pm, at the Coast Hotel and Langley Convention Centre, Langley, B.C.

Stakeholders: Nathan Pachal, Greater Langley Cycling Coalition
Ed Kolla, ISL
Bill Spearman
Steven Buckle, I.L.W.U.
Bob Bowles
John Milroy
George Anderson
Cliff Caprani, Against Port Expansion
Rudy Storteboom
Lee Lockwood
Roy Mufford
Cal Jeske
Terry Lyster, RTD
Dave Moffatt, Moffatt Management Services
Tony Bisig

Port Metro Vancouver: Chris Chok, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
Rhona Hunter, Acting Director, Infrastructure Development
Marcus Siu, Transportation Planner
Ian Ponsford, Hemmera, Senior Environmental Manager
Matt Skinner, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder
Natasha Sumera, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 5:05pm

KEY THEMES:

- Participants expressed concern regarding the local impacts of the growing volume of container trains travelling through Langley and requested that the effects of this increased rail traffic be properly considered in the environmental assessment.
- Participants were interested in understanding the scope of the project and the environmental assessment process.
- Participants questioned the relationship between the Port Metro Vancouver-led Pre-Design Consultation and the CEAA-led comment period for the Project Description.
- Participants expressed concerns that existing transportation infrastructure would not be able to accommodate an increase in traffic resulting from the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants said that Port Metro Vancouver, as a customer of the railways, should be able to do more to regulate or influence the railway's operational and environmental practices.
- Participants expressed concerns regarding the movement of containers loaded with hazardous goods through their communities.
- Participants expressed concern that the jobs and other economic benefits created during construction and operation of the project might go to workers and companies from outside British Columbia.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Chris Chok

Chris Chok welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting, and also introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Chris Chok informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

Rhona Hunter reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including ways to participate in the consultation, the list of information items and consultation topics.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom: What are we hoping to accomplish today?*

A: *Chris Chok: We are here to hear from you, Rudy. The purpose of the consultation is for the Port to present information regarding the proposed project and to get feedback from you in whatever form that is. Whether you have specific questions about the proposal, the consultation process, environmental assessment, or anything of that nature, we are certainly here to take your questions. We do have material that we'd like to get through, and Rhona Hunter will do that in a second.*

What is Port Metro Vancouver?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the importance of trade to British Columbians, container trade in the Asia- Pacific Gateway, the container supply chain, the use of containers and the movement of goods to and from Port facilities (pages 4 - 9 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Rudy Storteboom:* One question about those empty containers: are they simply stored at their destination when they are offloaded, or are they reintroduced into the network and shuttled off to some intermodal yard?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* They are re-introduced as they are needed. Export markets require containers, import markets produce surplus containers. Often what happens is that you have a container where it's not needed and it then has to be transported from one facility to another because that is where it needs to be. We will get into some of the initiatives Port Metro Vancouver is working on with the trucking companies, and logistic centres to try to optimize this so that containers are where they need to be on a more consistent basis to reduce the number of containers that are being stored, as well as trucked.
- Q: *Rudy Storteboom:* Are there a lot of empty containers rolling around in the system, or do they all have a purpose when they are on the line?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The containers are shuffled only when they have a specific location where they are required.
- C: *Lee Lockwood:* I think you should clarify the fact that most of Canadian exports such as potash and grain are actually all shipped bulk. They don't even go into containers.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* There has been a movement over the last ten years for specialty grains, and for both lumber and pulp to go into containers. The market for containers for bulk products is certainly something which is specialized and not all grains are put into containers.
- C: *Lee Lockwood:* That is why containers are so cheap here. You can get them because nobody wants them. It is not worth hauling them back across the water.
- Q: *Cal Jeske:* Do we make any containers in Canada?
- A: *Matt Skinner:* Cal, my understanding is that most of the containers are actually manufactured in Asia. I am sure you can find examples of them being manufactured all over, but the bulk of them are sourced over there.
- Q: *Ed Kolla:* What percentage of the containers coming and going, are for the Metro Vancouver area only?
- A: *Chris Chok:* On page 8, 10% is staying in B.C. So then the question becomes, what percentage stays in Metro Vancouver?
- Q: *Ed Kolla:* So the 90% is going out. Now is it going out on rail? Or is it going out on truck?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So, 70% goes directly out on rail. 30% would go to stuffing/ de-stuffing. Of the 30%, around 10% stays here, and another 20% goes out.
- A: *Marcus Siu:* To clarify-- the 70% that goes off the deep sea terminal, by rail, may go to a transload facility which then may introduce another trip. It might get out by truck, but a portion of that would still go out by rail.

- C: *Ed Kolla:* 70% of 90% is going by rail, and the balance is being moved by truck? I am just curious because of the additional rail traffic and truck traffic there is going to be.
- C: *Marcus Siu:* If you would like more specific information, I think we may actually have a diagram.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* We do have some information a little bit further on about some specifics around both rail and truck traffic.
- C: *Chris Chok:* Can I just clarify the question so that we have it for the record and we get back to Ed? You are asking: of all the containers that come in, how much of it is leaving by rail, how much is by truck, and of all the containers, what is staying in the Lower Mainland, and what is going elsewhere?
- C: *Ed Kolla:* I am more interested in how much is leaving the terminal on rail, and how much is leaving on truck.

Why Roberts Bank?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of why Roberts Bank is well positioned to accommodate future growth in trade activity. She discussed the two major infrastructure projects that link Roberts Bank with important port-related logistics facilities in the Lower Mainland (pages 10 and 11 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Rudy Storteboom:* The Premier's announcement about replacing the tunnel is good news, but I can't help but wonder, why is a bridge preferred to another tunnel? Is that just economics?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We have not been consulted to that level. We don't have any more information as to why a bridge as opposed to a tunnel at this point.
- C: *Chris Chok:* Rudy, we provide a link, on page 10, for the provincial government's website for that project. If that answer isn't on the website already, hopefully you can email someone there, and they could get that for you.
- C: *Rudy Storteboom:* Thanks Chris.
- Q: *Lee Lockwood:* When we had this first go around two years ago, the question of "why is Prince Rupert being given the short shift?" was tabled. We have three million people plus in the Lower Mainland, another half a million are going to be here over the next ten years, and the concept of Prince Rupert is completely being ignored as an alternate facility. It is a day closer on the great circle route to the orient, and you would diversify your facilities from a labour perspective. In other words, if there is a strike down here, up there they are ready to fly. There is also the seismic perspective, too.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We do actually speak a bit about that further on in the Discussion Guide, but I can address that right now. Prince Rupert has some planned growth on its books, and the planned growth that Prince Rupert has put forward and is in the planning stages for, has been included in our projections in terms of capacity. We still require additional capacity over and above what Prince Rupert is going to be providing. This is not either Prince Rupert or Vancouver, it is both.
- Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Which transportation corridors are key for you to move forward, or where do you expect the most traffic to go once it is expanded?

- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Well, as you can see on page 11, many of the logistics facilities are along the south side of the Fraser River, and the South Fraser Perimeter Road is leading in that direction, so that is the major corridor that will continue to be used for truck traffic. The rail corridor is established, and that would be the rail corridor that would be used.
- Q: *Nathan Pachal*: When we get the almost doubling of the container traffic, then that will be a doubling of traffic going on those tracks?
- A: *Marcus Siu*: I wouldn't go as far as to kind of relate the doubling to a direct correlation in terms of number of truck trips or rail trips. I think part of the Discussion Guide is looking at policy options that we can actually make sure that we are doing business more efficiently to ensure that we only have the number of trucks on the road that are required to service that amount of volume that is being proposed here in this case.
- Q: *Nathan Pachal*: Sure, and what about rail traffic though?
- A: *Marcus Siu*: Rail traffic likewise. We would have to work with the rail companies to determine that. Certainly a lot of the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor improvements have accounted for that growth.
- Q: *Dave Moffatt*: Considering the various ports you have throughout the Lower Mainland to service container traffic, do you see the expansion of Roberts Bank having an effect on Centerm, Vanterm, with respect to the volumes that are there?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Would the volumes there be affected by this? Our projections are full capacity at Centerm, full capacity at Vanterm.
- C: *Dave Moffatt*: There are major problems on Commissioner street, servicing of container traffic out of the Vancouver area. I represent a number of container hauling companies, and the frustration that we have in dealing not only with the concerns that these people have, but also concerns with getting in and out of the various terminals. It's a nightmare quite frankly.
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: And there are some improvements. The south shore trade areas are seeing some substantial improvements in both road and rail infrastructure that service all the terminals that exist on the south shore of Burrard Inlet. So, those are coming on-line next year, and we should see some improvements to the logistics and the movements of both rail and trucks in that area to address those congestions and those challenges.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani*: Can you tell me how many level crossings there are between Fort Langley and Deltaport?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: I can get that information for you, I don't have that information off the top of my head.
- Q: *Nathan Pachal*: So, did you say that later on we will be talking about how you plan on shipping the extra goods in this discussion today?
- A: *Marcus Siu*: I don't want to get ahead of myself. I think we are here today to understand what ideas are out there as to how we can achieve that. Certainly we are not suggesting that we have that answer right now, and we'll get into that.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Part of our Discussion Guide actually aims to get some feedback from you on specific options that we are looking at to mitigate road traffic for the most part.

- C: *Nathan Pachal:* You say that we are going to be talking about truck traffic, but one of the things I am sure people in this community are concerned about is also rail traffic.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* We will get a little bit into the scope of the assessment, where it lies and how it will be determined. Just for a clarification, the work that Marcus Siu's team leads, and the mitigation topics we are seeking some input on, are not specifically related to this particular project. Rather it is work that the Port has undertaken and continues to undertake Port-wide. Because it is not project specific, and because Port Metro Vancouver is not in the trucking business and we are not in the business of building railways, we work very collaboratively with those partners on an ongoing basis, to look at how we can address concerns around efficiencies and congestion. It is an ongoing program that we are seeking some input on now. It is not a requirement in terms of mitigation specifically for this project. This is not a predetermined mitigation or offsetting for our project impacts. Specific mitigation will be considered as we go through the environmental assessment and explore options that would reduce our impact. It is not a requirement in terms of mitigation specifically for this project, it will be considered as we go through the environmental assessment as options that are looking at reducing our impact and our footprint as a result of the project, but it certainly is not something that we want anybody to be misguided right now, that this is predetermined mitigation, or offsetting for our impacts.
- Q: *Ed Kolla:* Are you saying there will be road and rail improvements to mitigate the impact of Terminal 2?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* What I am saying is that in this Discussion Guide, we are seeking some feedback, on predominantly trucking issues that the Port is currently working on with various partners and entities within the logistics chain to address current and future increases to container shipment in the Lower Mainland. That conversation is not directly related to the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project. Any mitigation or offsetting that we are required to do as a result of this project will be determined through the environmental assessment process.
- C: *Ed Kolla:* I would like to just correct. I don't quite agree with what you have on page 10. The South Fraser Perimeter Road, and more importantly Roberts Bank Rail Corridor program, those two projects -- and I can't speak totally for South Fraser Perimeter Road, but Roberts Bank Rail Corridor program, all of that work came about when the Port was expanding broader. It was after consultation, out here in Langley where we were saying, what is going on here and at that time Port Metro Vancouver, or your predecessor, went back and worked with the different agencies to put those improvements in place. Those improvements were put in place for the expansion of the existing terminal. They were not put in place for Terminal 2. At that point in time there was no talk about a Terminal 2.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* They also addressed general increases and increases in traffic as a result of additional capacity at the terminal. It was not specifically Terminal 2 at that time, but there was an increase projected as a result of further growth at Roberts Bank. South Fraser Perimeter Road did contemplate Terminal 2.
- C: *Cliff Caprani:* Well, we don't even know whether that is going to be successful yet. I mean, South Fraser hasn't even been opened yet.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* Right. Perhaps what I can do is take a little bit of a step back to the environmental assessment process and that might sort of address some of the issues here.

Environmental Assessment Process

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the environmental assessment process and explained the role of the regulator in determining the scope of the project and the scope of assessment (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).

- C: *Ed Kolla:* But the last time around, the first assessment didn't take into consideration the impact. It was only after Langley, and I can't speak for Surrey, had numerous discussions that we got a public meeting out here. There was a presentation out here, grievances were put forward, and the traffic impacts associated with that expansion were then re-looked at as part of the project. All I am saying is, that those improvements that were done, satisfied an earlier expansion, and that depending on the amount of truck and train traffic, potentially there will be additional requirement for mitigation along the rail and on the roads, to compensate, appease, the community that is being affected.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* And that will be determined through the environmental impact assessment.
- C: *Ed Kolla:* Good.
- Q: *Roy Mufford:* Are we to understand that it hasn't been decided yet whether this is a linear or a non-linear project?
- C: *Chris Chok:* Is the question "What is the project?"
- Q: *Roy Mufford:* Well, this is what happened to us last time. It wasn't until we saw a little ad in the *Vancouver Sun* that said Deltaport was going to double in size. Langley wasn't notified, and the reason they weren't notified, according to the rules of engagement here, was that if it is a non-linear project they only had to address and discuss these things with the local township, which was Delta at the time. A linear project according to their definition, crossed municipal boundaries -- for instance, the Golden Ears Bridge and Sea-to-Sky Highway were linear projects, so they had to have a hearing in each municipality. They told Langley that Langley didn't count because the port expansion didn't affect them, so they didn't advertise in Langley that they were going to do this to the port. They classified it as a non-linear project. We raised hell and that is why we had the meeting in Newlands. We went to people like Rich Coleman, and said, "What the hell is going on here? We are tired of this nonsense, please do something about it." So he had a meeting convened in Newlands, it was a packed house, and the first thing that Jan Hagen from the environmental assessment office, said was, "Folks, it is nice that we are having this meeting, but it is going to have no effect on the outcome because this is a non-linear project. Langley isn't included in the study." And Langley never did get included in the study. What I would like to know is if it is going to be a non-linear project again, why are we all sitting here? Everything you are going to do has been predetermined.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Well, we have just entered the environmental assessment process. At this stage, the Project Description has been issued. The Project Description is available through a link on our website, as well as through the federal agency's website. You are welcome to take a look specifically at what we have submitted to the regulators. We are in a public comment period through the regulators until October 15th. The regulator is seeking input on the project from the public, so you are welcome to provide your feedback to the regulators if you have concerns. That is the regulator's domain.

Let's go directly to page 15, and we can talk about what the project is, and that might give you some idea about where and how you might be fitting in to the process.

- Q: *Bob Bowles:* My name is Bob Bowles. If we may go back to page 10, I understand that 300 million dollars in total is being spent on the rail corridor project, of which 50 million dollars is being spent by Port Metro Vancouver, its tenants and stakeholders. So that is one-sixth of the project. So, am I to understand that the other five-sixths of the project is being funded by taxpayers and various others?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I believe the other funders included local, regional, provincial, and federal governments, as well as industry and railways. I would have to get a breakdown of exactly where the funding came from. I don't know that answer off the top of my head.
- Q: *Bob Bowles:* That is what I am asking. Local, regional, provincial, and federal governments, they all dip in to our pocket. Are railways not included as being tenants and stakeholders? I have asked this question before and the answers still have not been provided.
- C: *Chris Chok:* Okay. I would like to suggest we send out the answers to those questions to everyone's email addresses from the sign-in sheet, so that you all will have the same information.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Will those answers go out in a timely manner?
- A: *Chris Chok:* Well, we will do it within this consultation period, certainly before November 12th.
- Q: *Roy Mufford:* Can you find out as soon as possible if this is linear or non-linear, so we know whether we are wasting our time or not?
- A: *Chris Chok:* Rhona is going to talk about what the project is from the Port's perspective. Your question about linear or not is a question about the environmental assessment process and what is happening right now. So the Project Description is in, and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency is asking for comments on what you see as the effects of the project. If you want to say, "we want this to be defined as a linear project," your opportunity to do that is actually right now. The agencies have a public comment period until October 15th for you to submit comments saying "we want it studied out to Langley" or "we want the effects of rail and/or trucks studied out to whatever the distance is". You can do that right now but not through this process. The process that Port Metro Vancouver is here leading, is helping to determine mitigation measures that they would put forward in their application, later on down the road. There are two different things happening right now, but to your point about is it linear or not, Rhona will explain what the Port has proposed, and then you have an opportunity to tell the regulators what you think.
- C: *Roy Mufford:* Well, with all due respect, Rhona can explain to me what it is all about, but unless you guys take the message back that we are not going to sit by and wait for them to decide whether we count or not, that doesn't wash. We want you to go back to them and tell them point blank, we need to be involved with this because we have a mess here.
- Q: *Nathan Pachal:* I guess it is a bit tricky because in one regard we are here to solicit feedback on what we believe some mitigation measures should be, but it feels like, and maybe I am just hearing it wrong, we don't know the scope of where the mitigation measure should be. So, it is just the area around the Deltaport facility, that's a lot different, as far as what we can suggest here, than if it is mitigation measures that can include the health impacts of rail and truck traffic

throughout the region. For the sake of tonight, since we don't know the scope, you don't know the scope, and we are waiting for the regulator to define the scope, can we put feedback on what we think should be mitigation measures depending on the outcome?

A: *Chris Chok:* Absolutely, and regardless of the outcome, you can put forward what you think should be mitigation measures.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* We have tried to be quite defined about where we are talking about mitigation to get some meaningful impact but absolutely, please provide any other comments around the mitigation and the scope. That's why we are here.

Q: *Bob Bowles:* As part of the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program there will be a rail crossing information system. On my cell phone I can view road traffic flow densities simply with an app. Can we not get the same thing from the trains running through our town?

A: *Marcus Siu:* Certainly one of the projects as part of the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor is the implementation of intelligent information systems, i.e. messaging if you are on the road, when the train would cross to help you plan your routes. In terms of getting that on your phone, certainly it would not be something that the Port could do. But we are always working with other agencies to make sure that different types of roadway information are explored whether or not they can deliver that to the road users. For example Translink, is one of those agencies that we work with to coordinate planning in the region.

Q: *Bob Bowles:* There are two things that really are factors, first is how long the train is, and second is what speed it is going at. I have literally sat at a train crossing for ten full minutes because the train is going so slow. So, to tell me the train is allowed to be x amount of length is definitely information, but really it is how long does that train take to cross a single crossing, and how long is that train blocking, and what could be construed as a maximum time that the crossing can be congested?

C: *Chris Chok:* Do we have more information about the intelligent traffic information? Can we include that with the answers?

A: *Marcus Siu:* Yes.

C: *Rudy Storteboom:* Intelligent signage is part of the project, so we will see that on the side of the road. But not on your phone, you can't access your phone while you are driving.

C: *Bob Bowles:* So if you don't need to access your phone, it will be on your map. I should be able to know when I am leaving my house whether a train is coming through town or not.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom:* Bob brings up another good point. How long is a train allowed to block a level crossing? There are restrictions, federal regulations, and these long trains are taking longer than is allowed, that could be a potential for public safety to be compromised. If you can imagine a fire engine waiting for the train to cross, siren and lights on.

A: *Marcus Siu:* Yeah, so as you mentioned, those are federal regulations. So those regulations are out there, railways generally have to follow those rules.

C: *Rudy Storteboom:* But that's an environmental impact on us, the people, who are as important as any other environmental component you might be studying. You may be wanting to consider the scope of your environmental study, and the footprint around the terminal. To Roy's point-- there is a linear effect. The environment is being affected. It is not just coal dust either.

- A: *Rhona Hunter*: One of the things that comes out of the regulatory process is those things that the Port actually has the ability to control, and those that the Port does not have the ability to control, such as the speed that a train goes through. That may be identified as being an issue that other agencies have to manage.
- Q: *Rudy Storteboom*: But the Port is the customer, and their railway is a service provider, so you have input, right?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: We work with the railways yes, but we don't regulate them.
- C: *Cliff Caprani*: But I'm sorry, it is a bit disingenuous to suggest that the Port is not somehow tied in with the railway. This is kind of a Field of Dreams scenario. If you build it, they will come. If you double the size of the port, you know that train traffic is going to increase as a result. So you can't really honestly say to us that somehow the two are connected, but to say that you can't have a say, that's very convenient for you, I'm afraid to be able to say that, to sort of put that out to somebody else. But you're part of the problem if you are going to provide a situation that allows double the amount of stuff to come into the country or go out of the country.
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: And part of what we do is work with all of the logistic partners on providing solutions, but they don't work for us, we don't work for them. So, it is really just a partnership that we need to continue. The Roberts Bank Rail Corridor is an example of working with many, many partners to deliver a project.
- Q: *Roy Mufford*: Well, are we going to discuss safety later on as a specific issue? There are some very significant issues with the railroad and what is coming through that port from the safety point of view. My son lives on Crush Crescent, and recently, there has been several times where an ambulance has been stopped in the line, waiting for the train, and had to turn its lights off. How would you like to be in that ambulance? There is no provision for anything on Crush Crescent in terms of traffic mitigation one way or the other. There is a whole range of topics like that, that I would like to discuss with you after we have gone around this table, because there are some very serious things that are going to happen if we don't deal with it.
- C: *Chris Chok*: I have made a note of that Roy, and we'll come back to it.
- Q: *Terry Lyster*: In terms of the anticipated traffic coming out of the port, is it possible to provide at least the rail component of what the cross product would be for traffic crossing 200 Street in Langley?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: I think that at this point, that is part of our transportation study that would be part of the EA process, so, we don't have that information yet, but that will be part of the EA process.
- Q: *Nathan Pachal*: That will be coming in that document?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: The EA will have a transportation study in it, and the scope of the EA has yet to be determined by the regulators, so I don't have the EA or the documentation in front of me.
- Q: *Terry Lyster*: But in this process I'd like to make a formal request for those projections.
- A: *Chris Chok*: There is information in here, on page 24, about how many additional trains would come as a result of the project.
- Q: *Ed Kolla*: As part of this process, are you having separate meetings with the different municipal jurisdictions that trains are passing through?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes, we are.

C: *Dave Moffatt*: I find it quite interesting that you are able to legislate and regulate the comings and goings of truck traffic in your various locations, but you can't make arrangements on a fairly concise basis as to train traffic, length of trains, and the volume during normal daytime work routines versus evening train movements. To me, that doesn't add. If you can regulate the trucks, you can surely impact on the train traffic to Roberts Bank, and the effect it would have on these folks that live out here in Langley.

Economic Benefits of the Project

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the proposed project including the economic forecasts that indicate growth through 2030 and the economic benefits of the project for British Columbians (pages 16 and 17 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Rudy*: How many terminals will there be in total? I suspect there will be 4.

A: *Rhona*: We are here to discuss Roberts Bank Terminal 2 and I don't know of any future plans beyond that at this point.

Q: *George Anderson*: How many of these proposed jobs come out of British Columbia because I remember hearing the same story when they opened Golden Ears Bridge, and I understand a good portion of those jobs went to workers from outside of British Columbia. If we are here talking about British Columbia, then let's at least talk about jobs because I think lots of times these jobs aren't created here. We are always talking about importing tradesman because we don't train tradesmen, and all these projects we've got, we don't have our local people on the good paying jobs, because we don't train them. So, part of this whole planning, pre-planning stage should be on how we are going to get skilled workers to do the jobs, so that we can have an economic benefit to this country. The economic benefit of the country is not going to the working people, but they are paying the taxes. The people that are making huge profits off of imports and exports are the owners of Deltaport and the rails and the people in the large trucking and shipping companies; the poor people that are making basic wage are paying the cost of these things.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Well, we do have time between now and the construction of the project that there certainly is an opportunity for training to occur.

C: *George Anderson*: Well, that is what we always hear, even Christy Clark is always talking about training our people, but it isn't happening. I sat in the same room here, when they inquired on the Port Mann Bridge, and the feedback I got was really relevant to anything that I see in here. I am not sure on the Port Mann Bridge how many workers -- British Columbia workers built that bridge. If we are going to talk about economic growth and all of this stuff in the country, we need to get it more than in the pockets of the investors and we need to get some in the people that live here.

C: *Rhona Hunter*: Well the people that will be operating it, will be living here, and that is 18,000 jobs a year.

C: *George Anderson*: Okay, if we accept that as being factual, just a couple of minutes ago you talked about 4,500 jobs on the construction. Whether it is to bridge over and replacing the Deas Island Tunnel, or any of these other infrastructures or railways, or anything else we are building

here if we are bringing workers in from outside we really are losing a big economic benefit to this province.

C: *Chris Chok*: Point taken.

C: *Matt Skinner*: George, if I might quickly respond to your question, there are job numbers in the Discussion Guide that relate to the jobs that will be created as a part of construction, and as a part of operations. In large part, those numbers were developed from information that comes from an economic impact report that was prepared for Port Metro Vancouver by InterVISTAS, and that was actually released this year. And there is a lot of relevant information in there, about what these jobs are, where these jobs are, how many are in British Columbia, and how many are in the Lower Mainland. That information is available on the Port Metro Vancouver website, and if any of you are interested in finding out more about the jobs that are existing right now, you will find a lot more information there. Some people can be pretty skeptical about it. But this work was done by professional third parties for the ports. So, you are welcome to take a look at it.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom*: Could you find that for us and email it? That would be great.

A: *Matt Skinner*: We can follow up and make that available to all of you.

Q: *Cliff Caprani*: Just wondering if you can tell me how many full time jobs will be on the new port? How many guys are we clocking on every shift to go and work on this facility? A hundred? A thousand?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: We don't have that number, that will be dependent upon the operator, and the operator obviously hasn't been selected. We've used a semi-automated terminal as the design criteria, but it will really depend on what the actual final operator chooses to implement.

C: *Cliff Caprani*: Okay, so you take my point then, that if you don't have any guys you are starting with, it makes it kind of hard to come up with a number of 18,200 jobs. One of the things I'm really interested in is understanding the methodology behind that. This is a great number, but I don't understand how you go to it, and I'd really like to be able to understand that.

C: *Rhona Hunter*: I would have to say that I don't know off the top of my head, but that InterVISTAS report will articulate fairly clearly exactly which of those jobs are where, and which of those jobs have been tied to the terminal.

Q: *Cliff Caprani*: I'd really like to understand the methodology. Is that also part of the report? Do you know, Matt?

A: *Matt Skinner*: The report does explain how they arrived at the numbers that they did.

Q: *Cliff Caprani*: So you will email that to us?

A: *Matt Skinner*: Yes.

Q: *Nathan Pachal*: Just a quick question. You said that there are 9,200 direct jobs here. What do you define as a direct job then?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Direct jobs are direct jobs that are actually attributed to the terminal and the operations of the project itself. It includes the trucking, it includes the rail, it includes everybody who has a direct contact, and those are all defined in the InterVISTAS report. Indirect being -- "indirect employment" refers to employment in industries supported by port business, "induced

employment” refers to jobs generated by expenditures by those employed directly or indirectly. Those are all fairly standard terms within these types of studies that are used to define the various types of employment and jobs.

Marine Terminal

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the proposed project including scope of the project and the construction of the marine terminal. She discussed the construction methodology that will create the berth face versus the terminal island itself (pages 18 and 19 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Cal Jeske:* Is part of the environmental assessment going to take a look into dredging or what they are doing with the waste water?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.
- Q: *Cal Jeske:* Where are they planning on dumping all the dredging?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The material used to create the land will be from a combination of the dredging that will occur in the berth face, as well as Fraser River sand dredgeate, to provide some stability at the berth face that needs to be there for the ship movement. Our current design has a portion of the dredged material, which is very fine particles that can't settle out once it is put into the island to settle out. That would be then disposed at sea at an approved disposal site.
- Q: *Cal Jeske:* So at sea versus land?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.
- C: *Lee Lockwood:* I know that one of the reasons they want to go for a bridge for the Deas Tunnel is so that they can get rid of the tunnel and dredge it 30 feet there, and bring in deep sea vessels to go to Port Metro Vancouver's Surrey Fraser Docks. I am sure it is no accident the timing for that for 2017 will have all that dredge material, ties in with this whole process.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* They are not connected.
- C: *Cliff Caprani:* Incredibly fortuitous.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I am not involved with the Surrey Fraser Docks, I am here talking about the Terminal 2 project and the removal of the tunnel does nothing for our project.
- Q: *Lee Lockwood:* So you are trying to tell me that in the back room, the master plan for 30 years down the pipe, none of this converges at some point?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I can't comment on that. I am not involved in it.
- C: *Cliff Caprani:* But you would take the point though that the reason for Terminal 2 could be challenged if significant traffic could be diverted up the Fraser to Surrey Fraser Docks. It would tie in.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* No. The limitations on the Fraser River are two-fold—the current draft because of the tunnel, and, of equal and going forward probably greater significance, the width of the river does not allow the size of ships currently servicing Deltaport to be able to turn around. The size of ships that we are actually going to see coming in the future, which are going to be larger and fewer ships, will absolutely not be able to turn in the Fraser River. For these reasons there is no long-term potential for Fraser Surrey Docks to be a container terminal.
- Q: *Bob Bowles:* Does it become an intermodal yard?

- A: *Rhona Hunter*: It is not part of the Deltaport network. It's limited for containers because of the size of ships that can make it in there, and certainly that is not going to increase over time. So its future is not containers.
- Q: *George Anderson*: Can you help me understand the purpose for the Deltaport and the new Highway 17 perimeter road? It parallels the river and the tracks, right?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: It is to take traffic off local roads and to allow for traffic to service the logistics and industrial facilities that are adjacent to that road. The purpose of the road is to tie Highway 1, Highway 99, and Deltaport to each other.
- Q: *George Anderson*: So a lot of containers are going to be on that road. Are barges on the river an option?
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: I think you are referring to short-sea-shipping, where they would take the containers from an offload facility, put them onto a barge, and then offload them again at another facility.
- Q: *George Anderson*: From Deltaport to the CN station where there are a lot of containers at the end of 176 Street. That is about the same end of the Highway 17 other than going to Highway 1. Is that not an option to move containers by that?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: It is not within our current project scope. We are not looking at that as an option.
- C: *George Anderson*: For us in this room to come here because the purpose of this meeting again was for us to give input, it's pretty hard for us to give input on just one little island like Deltaport 2, when it interacts with everything else in the Lower Mainland. Half of our input and concerns here appear to be rail and trucks.
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: We are here to hear your input. Some of our discussion topics do address trucks and trucking initiatives.
- C: *Chris Chok*: So your question is why aren't containers put on barges sent up the Fraser River to the CN Intermodal yard?
- Q: *George Anderson*: I guess my thinking is Deltaport number 2, is probably going to double, or pretty close to double, depending on how much it is used and the increase traffic in rail and truck from what we have now. Even though Highway 17 or Perimeter Road, and the overpasses that are being built for the trains presumably to allow Deltaport 1 smooth running, is that not correct? So, what is coming next when Deltaport 2 becomes functional? How many more railways and bridges are we going to need?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: So, this goes back to Bob's question about the scope of the project. Both the South Fraser Perimeter Road, and the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program considered growth at Roberts Bank. Through the regulators' determination as part of the EA process, the scope of the assessment will identify the direction as to where and what we may be looking at providing for additional mitigation. Once we go outside of the scope of our project footprint, it is a different kind of assessment. We have direct control and direct responsibility for everything that is within our project itself. Once we move into the scope of the assessment which is a much broader geographical area, then we need to work much more closely with partners. The Port doesn't own, manage or run all of the various components of the logistics business, and that is where

we would be working with our partners to deliver any of those mitigations that the regulator determines are required.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom*: How big is that footprint?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: It is our project scope. It is the terminal and the causeway. That's the project; that's what we are building.

Q: *Nathan Pachal*: So basically is that where the red line ends here on page 21? Is that your project?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes. That is right.

Q: *Nathan Pachal*: And then it's up to the regulator to figure out what the impact is if there are three times as many trains once you get past that point. It might not really be the Port's responsibility?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: What we are saying is that there is scope of the assessment. That will look at impacts such as air, noise, congestion, safety, wildlife strikes, and those sorts of things. So that is the scope of the assessment, and that occurs outside of the footprint.

Q: *Nathan Pachal*: All of the work you have done so far has been focused on the Project Description-- because I read the executive summary. It was very focused on this area here, and when you were talking about pollution and air quality, it seemed like you were concerned about the air quality happening here and if it flew over to the United States or something like that, but it wasn't focused on other areas within the Lower Mainland.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: No, it does include other areas of the Lower Mainland.

C: *Ed Kolla*: I think you answered my question. The point I am going to make is that the scope of the project you are talking about is strictly the terminal and the roads leading out from the terminal to the end of the where you get back to land. And I guess we here, and I think I can speak for this group, are more concerned about the impact that this is going to have on the infrastructure that is out to Langley and beyond.

C: *Nathan Pachal*: But even the human health and all that and beyond.

Q: *Ed Kolla*: Who is going to be preparing the terms of what the Port's role and responsibility is and how far it is going to look? I come back to the previous expansion where the assessment was basically just focused on the Deltaport and Delta, and it was raised by a number here. We want to make sure that the assessment that is going to take place subsequent to what you are doing, is going to go out and take into consideration the impacts out in this area and beyond.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: The regulator, the federal regulator has a public comment period open until the 15th of October, and that is an opportunity for anybody who has a concern or issue to provide that input to the regulator. The regulator uses that and the project description to then develop the scope of the assessment.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom*: And we are providing that now, so that is being recorded now, is it not?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: What you are providing now is for the Port. So, it is a very important distinction.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom*: So all of our concerns associated with a linear scope of environmental impact study are not for the record?

- A: *Rhona Hunter*: It is for the record.
- C: *Chris Chok*: It's for the record and it will be reported in the consultation summary report that my firm will produce. But, I think the point that Rhona is making is that you also do need to tell the regulator directly.
- Q: *Nathan Pachal*: Will the regulator be reading the record of this meeting before they make a decision on the scope? Or will you be submitting it to them before the deadline?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: No. We don't submit this. This is a separate process.
- Q: *Nathan Pachal*: Okay, so if we were concerned about defining the scope, talking to you about it right now -- I don't want to use the word waste of time, but if we are saying we are concerned about the scope, you can say, "We understand, but we really need to actually be telling the regulator that we want the scope to be expanded?"
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: I think that if you have concerns around the project or you wish to express concerns, then absolutely the regulator is the place to do that. In the Project Description, you will notice that we provided all of our previous consultation summaries to the regulator. The information you provide today will eventually end up with the regulator as well. They are fully aware that we are doing this. They are very keen and interested to know what the community concerns are. We do provide that to the regulator; however, they have a federal process that requires them to operate within their federal process. If there are concerns that the communities have, they have been invited to provide that input until October 15th. There will be many opportunities to participate in both a provincial and federal process. This is just one of them.
- C: *Nathan Pachal*: I just sent them an email today.
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: It is 20 days total, so it has already been open for 10 days
- C: *Cliff Caprani*: Yeah, but that's been kind of moot in the sense that this stuff hasn't been available. I mean one needs to go with the other. But I just wanted to state in the strongest sense, that if anybody in this room is concerned about the issue, they need to go to the CEAA website and have a word with them, and ask for the strongest possible review. If you want Port Metro Vancouver's feet to be held somewhat to the fire, you need to ask for the strongest review. If we don't, they get an easy pass, and that is not what I am in favour of. So it is up to us. We have some ability to perhaps set the tone of that review. I'm not saying that we can decide, but we at least can influence it. So I would urge people, if they are serious about it, don't wait the long weekend, do it there tomorrow and right away.
- Q: *Terry Lyster*: I thought it was a heck of a great meeting, but then they told me about this. So, this regulator, the whole time I have been here, we've used the word "the regulator" in the abstract. Is it CEAA?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: So there are two regulators-- a federal regulator, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, CEAA, and the second agency is called the B.C. Environmental Assessment Office, BCEAO. They don't have a prescribed process, and so they don't have the same open period for consultation. The federal process is very prescribed in terms of "this is when we do this", "this is how long we do this, and then we do this and this is how long we do this". The BCEAO process is not as prescribed. So, currently there is no general invitation to the public for comment from the provincial government. They have been provided with the Project

Description at the same time on September 12th. Their process will unfold on its own timeline and there may be other opportunities within the provincial process, too.

Q: *Terry Lyster:* Have they been open for business regarding this since the 12th of September?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah. Our hope and our goal with the agencies is that there is one process for the public. When that actually happens, when those two federal and provincial processes converge and align then the public will have just one process. This is probably still a few months away. We don't have a definitive timeline when that happens, but we have been advocating for that to be the case to remove some of this uncertainty and confusion.

C: *Terry Lyster:* For a little context, you're touching a nerve that was first exposed in the mid-60s here, before the rail was actually here. When there was another railway, it wasn't dedicated for freight to the port. And on an ongoing basis there is an issue that has come up, and we sort of see some reaction to the issue, but it's been pointed out what is down the line from the port has kind of been ignored. And you are dealing here with really the only urban centre that is traversed by the rail. I can tell you that it has really skewed the way this community has developed and grown, and what opportunities are available. I think if I really believe in the Port, about half of what I am wearing probably came in on a container one way or another, so thank you very much, but it really has to operate well, and it has to operate well in the context of this whole region. And it has got to be a good steady firm part of the region and well designed and integrated. I appreciate that you have a limited scope and it is a fairly well defined project, but it is very complicated out here, so be patient with us.

C: *Chris Chok:* The point is well taken.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom:* Thanks Chris. I want more information about the regulators as well. You've identified the two agencies involved. Are there a certain number of people who are specially assigned to this task, or those entire agencies are involved? Would those individuals be interested in meeting with us to hear first-hand our passion about our concerns?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* There will be opportunities. I am not the regulator, so I don't want to commit them to anything, but as part of the regulatory process, there are working groups with municipalities, public engagement opportunities, and I am certain that if you put that request in it would certainly be heard, whether they respond to it or not. I think this public comment also is a very valuable opportunity for the public to provide their concerns and feedback to them, and they do use that. That's why it is there. They give people a set amount of time to provide their comments so they can then move on and make a decision and start rolling out the process.

C: *Rudy Storteboom:* Now, we are running out of time here and I know Roy wanted to touch on safety, is that available to give him some time to talk about that? Because I have that concern as well.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* Okay, we don't have specifically a safety part in the Discussion Guide, but if you would like to speak about safety, we certainly can.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom:* Is there any point if it's not part of the scope of the project.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It's part of the scope, it is just not part of the Discussion Guide. The Project Description's executive summary is 30 or 40 pages. The entire document is a binder and a half. It provides a lot more information than we can't possibly put in the Discussion Guide or talk

about in a two-hour period. This Discussion Guide is by no attempts or intention to summarize the Project Description.

- C: *Rudy Storteboom*: I am okay with the expansion, but I am not okay with how it is impacting me and mine. And I think with good communication we can fix it. But it is a two-way street, it is not just them telling us what is going to happen, it is them listening to what our concerns are.
- C: *Chris Chok*: Roy, you brought up safety. I had in my note regarding safety the example you raised was first responders being stuck behind trains, waiting behind trains as they pass by. Are there other examples that you wanted to provide?
- C: *Roy Mufford*: Yes.
- C: *Terry Lyster*: Here is a picture of an ambulance which has just turned its lights off. The photo is taken from Kwantlen.
- Q: *Roy Mufford*: I was just going to follow up with what Terry asked-- who is this regulator? Does this guy live in Langley? I wish he did. It would sure be nice to talk to these people that are the regulators, because what concerns me is that they are going to look into these issues, and a lot of them have predetermined outcomes, and we experienced this after this last roll around. They realized they hadn't looked at Langley, and then they decided that they'd hire somebody to do a Roberts Bank rail corridor study. We were told that we'd have some input into this.

Well, the first I heard about it was at a CPR meeting I was at. The engineer for Langley City mentioned that the tender had been called for the company to do the study for the Roberts Bank rail corridor situation. And I said, "Well, can I have a look at that tender call?" I said I didn't understand how this process worked. And he said certainly. He went into his office after the meeting and photocopied the tender call. It was a fairly thick document. What really upset me was that on the third page, it said it had to be understood that the consultant who was going to do this study into the Roberts Bank rail corridor was not allowed to look at alternate routing as one of the options. We've always said, back in 1968 when the port was built, Bennett found the cheapest way to get to the port was to go through Langley, and the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board, which predated the GVRD in the central Fraser Valley, took him on and said no, go down the CN mainline, and out the industrial corridor to the port. I've got the maps. They had beautiful colour maps of what they proposed and everything. Bennett fired the entire board just because they opposed him on how they should get to the port in the first place. Well, we found this document hidden in the special collections library in UBC and we brought it out and said, "Well why can't we look at this now?" And they said no. Whoever set the parameters said the consultant is not allowed to look at that. Right off the bat we knew we were had.

There is no good reason why Surreyport and Deltaport shouldn't be tied together. There is traffic coming from Surrey that has to go to Delta at some point or another, or they are going to put that 'Y' in at Fort Langley, and then we are going to really see some traffic. And don't tell me you haven't heard about that. Now, the point is, why aren't they taking that new bridge there, instead of the Massey Tunnel for instance, and putting a new rail bridge into New Westminster? Then they could drill it right around the port, down the Burlington Northern, across that bridge and all the way to Kamloops on the north side, without ever coming near Langley. That is because all the outbound trains go on the north side from Mission, all inbound trains come to Mission on the CN main line, and then they come down through Langley. Well, if they went straight out to CN Mainline to Delta, and out to the port, Langley wouldn't have this

problem. Well, this study that was commissioned, nobody got any input from Langley at all, and the next thing we know there was an announcement made that in the Township of Langley Council that there was going to be a signing of a document that dealt with a Roberts Bank rail corridor and all the brass and the Minister from Ottawa showed up. Kevin Falcon showed up, too. All the partners showed up to sign this document. So we are going to go and watch this. You know they wouldn't let us in the council chambers? They came out and said, "No, you can't go in." So, a couple of people that I was associated with started raising their voice, and finally they opened the doors and somebody came out and said, "You are welcome to come and watch the formalities, but you have to give us an undertaking that you will ask no questions." That is the gospel truth; that is exactly what happened. The mayor at the time was Kurt Alberts and Kevin Falcon and the fellow who used to look after one of the big lumber companies. The Minister at the time, he was there. They all signed this document, and what we called for ended up being all these overpasses on all the roads that nobody was travelling on. There was no overpass on the bypass, Langley Bypass, no overpass on 200th Street, no overpass on Fraser Highway. No overpass where the traffic existed, and still exists today. They were all put in obscure locations like Mufford Crescent and 192nd, and they were wonderful -- the brand new one just going up here, the overpass to the White Spot we call it. Why weren't they prepared to listen to the public? And it would be really nice for a change to have you folks go back and tell them that they have really screwed up. Because it doesn't matter where you live now in Langley, you are living on the wrong side of the tracks. I just wish somebody could take that message back to them and say, "Look it, maybe it is time you did listen to us."

- C: *Chris Chok:* We've got it on the record. The Port can certainly pass on the message to the 12 partners of the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program.
- C: *Roy Mufford:* Well there is still time to, for instance, replace the New West bridge which has to be replaced. They could put in a high lift rail bridge and replace the Patullo Bridge at the same time. They did a study about 10 years ago into replacing that bridge, and it was peanuts compared to this \$300 million dollars that they ended up spending on the overpasses. And if they put it in at that time, they could have pulled the trains out of Deltaport, either going down the Burlington Northern, or the map the Lower Mainland Climbing Board proposed, going across that bridge, and never, ever come through Langley with the outbound trains. The inbound trains could still go down the CN mainline and out through Delta. Nobody is listening, because it is just destroying this community. You get 38 trains, some of them 12,000 feet long, going through this town, and nobody is going to want to live here. What do you think is going to happen on that blasted bypass? You know, when you get a 12,000 foot train going through? It's like ten minutes.
- C: *Terry Lyster:* I am making the assumption that you guys really want the Port to work and to work well. I think that's got to be somewhere in your mandate. That means it has to be plugged into a really robust transportation system which is really multi-modal. I think there is capacity on the Fraser River that is really being wasted, not just for freight, but for a bunch of other stuff. But I was excited to see this map here, which isn't my map, it is your map, because you've got all of these dots and they are running along the little flat bit of the landscape which is the Fraser, and I was also excited by what we used to call the North Perimeter Road in Surrey, now it is the South Perimeter Road, but it's the same road. It is doing that thing that the map Roy is talking about was proposing, back in 1968, which was to have an industrial corridor along the river, on both sides of the river, and then you only have to worry about the little community of Fort Langley,

which is already under the oppression of rail. I don't think any of it is headed toward Deltaport. And there is a solution, which I will not show you now, as to how you deal with that, which would have been a lot cheaper than putting a lot of concrete down in Langley, and I think just for contingency, the Port really should have more than one rail route for people to get at it.

C: *Chris Chok:* Is there something you could submit to this consultation process that is written up?

C: *Roy Mufford:* This is the map he is talking about that was in the actual brief done in 1968, showing the rail corridor going down to the port along an industrial corridor. Believe it or not, the railways also provided a map in that brief incorporating the BNSF. They recommended this line. There was two options and the government didn't take either one of them.

Q: *Terry Lyster:* But in the event of a problem in Langley that lasts for a while, it is going to be pretty awkward keeping the same volumes and associated stuff getting around trucks. It is going to potentially impede the operation of the port, and that's clearly within your mandate.

C: *Chris Chok:* I would encourage you to write it up and submit that into this process.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Is Langley the only way out for Deltaport for rail traffic?

A: *Terry Lyster:* It is my understanding that an alternative is to head down into the States and then try to get back up through Abbotsford.

A: *Marcus Siu:* So generally that's our understanding. That is the way the current railway companies do business at Deltaport, but we work with the railways all the time to see if there is possible optimization. We can't say at this point what changes might be.

Q: *Tony Bisig:* While there have been some concerns regarding safety, one thing I haven't heard yet is what the effect these long trains are going to have on businesses in Langley City, and the people sitting there in traffic. People are going to think twice about doing business in Langley if they can go elsewhere to do business. I am sure that there are going to be effects and people just decide that they will pack it in and not do business here. So, while, Port Metro Vancouver is making these great decisions, it's going to have quite a negative effect on some of the communities along the railroad tracks.

C: *Rudy Storteboom:* In light of Lac-Mégantic and the fact that we've had train derailments here in the city before, I think it would be appropriate for us to discuss safety issues, especially with the recent evidence about the Chinese shipping fireworks through our community, with the sign on the side of the container that says "Kaboom." That is not what we want to see. That's not safety at all.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* I was with your engineering staff last week and they brought up the same concerns around that particular container, and I think the general consensus was the railroad said that there is no such container. Containers have shipping lines on them, they don't have private facilities. I believe there is a photo.

C: *Roy Mufford:* This picture shows what was on the train. There were 10 containers in close proximity, some of them double stacked. And if you've got WiFi in here, I'd like you to go on your computer and type in "container fireworks test." It will scare the daylight out of you. What they did was they took 20 foot containers of fireworks and they set them out, went back a couple miles and they just hit them with one spark and it would make what happened in Quebec look like a picnic.

- C: *Rhona Hunter*: I think that what you are talking about is the transportation of dangerous goods in containers. The transportation of dangerous goods is not regulated by the Port but it is regulated by Transport Canada and other provincial agencies. There are certain requirements that all of those goods have to adhere to. I am not speaking specifically to this because I have no knowledge first hand of this, and I only became aware of it in the last week.
- C: *Roy Mufford*: Well, people in the municipality were denying it happened. They tried to say these pictures were photoshopped. It would have been much safer for them to have shipped dynamite through town, because dynamite requires a blasting cap. This is what is called a primary explosive. It only requires a spark. So we now have Fraser Highway, 200 Street, and the Langley Bypass, with hundreds of thousands of cars going across there. Anyone could hit that train and cause a fire. And you know, Langley used to be called Langley Prairie before it was a city. We'll be able to call it Langley Prairie again if this happens.
- C: *Rudy Storteboom*: When it comes to public safety, we should all be on the same page.
- C: *Marcus Siu*: Obviously this is a safety concern. We have received this for our information and can work with the railways and the regulator.
- C: *Lee Lockwood*: This brings us to a similar topic- the transportation of crude oil by rail. This is a huge concern for people out here. With speculation that oil could be transported by rail if the proposed pipeline is not approved, I think we have good cause to worry about safety. You are probably hearing a fair amount of cynicism and criticism here in this room but I think you are reaping what you have sown.
- C: *Terry Lyster*: Around Langley, there are big safety practice operations that take place annually with local government and first responders. Of these, 4 to 6 of these scenarios are around rail emergencies. Any problem that comes up here will seriously affect the Port's ability to efficiently do their business.
- C: *Nathan Pachal*: We've talked a little about the studies that Port Metro Vancouver is undertaking for the project that must be completed; however, I think that the Port has a moral obligation to do mitigation and studies that reach farther than the minimum required by the regulator. This would really show the public that the Port is serious about exceeding basic requirements.
- C: *Chris Chok*: Noted
- Q: *Nathan Pachal*: Again, how is it that you can do more about trucks than you can about trains?
- A: *Marcus Siu*: We regulate the trucks that are allowed to do business with the Port. They must meet our regulations in order to access the Port property. On the rail side, I don't know the answer but it is a larger commercial operation which requires us to work with our partners.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: The railway companies themselves are regulated by the *Canadian Railway Act*, so we don't get to regulate them. We work with them as partners that interface with each other. We certainly love to have them at the table but they are not always at the table with us. They don't have any obligation to be at the table with us. From a business perspective, we do understand that we are symbiotic and their business thrives if our business thrives. But they are not subservient to us, and they have a lot of regulations that they themselves adhere to.
- Q: *Dave Moffatt*: The size of the trains, the length and the speed all relates to service at the ports? If you were to say to the railway, "We can only accept X number of trains of certain length over this period of time," are they going to say, "No" and then you're going to take them all anyway?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I'm not sure whether we have that authority, so I'd have to say that I can't really comment on that.

C: *Dave Moffatt:* Well, you do with the trucking industry.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* I understand. Trucks and rails are different. So if there is a need for greater understanding about the interface between the Port and rail, we can certainly try and get that information to you.

C: *Nathan Pachal:* Well, that relationship would be something really interesting to understand. It seems like with trucks you have a position of authority over them, or rather you can put incentives in place to make work toward the goals you'd like them to meet, where you might not be able to use incentives with the railways.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* And I don't have enough of a sense and understanding from the legal standpoint what the Port's interface is with railways to comment on that.

C: *George Anderson:* I'm not sure if we've satisfied what we come here for but from what I've heard around the table here -- I'm not saying they are incorrect, I'm saying they aren't really satisfying me. I don't know if they are satisfying anybody else.

The fact is that the federal government looks after the railways and we can't control them. But through my life I've always heard that if I'm the customer, which the rail company should be for Deltaport, it's now the client. They are hauling Deltaport's goods. So if they can't stipulate where the trains are going to be going or what they are going to be hauling, or Deltaport can't be responsible enough not to ship that stuff through Langley, if that's what the rules are, somebody needs to enforce them.

We got the same problem in this town with bicycles and helmets for a very simple reason: there's no enforcement. Talking on cell phones is a major issue in this province. I think it's the third cause of fatalities now, and not because the rule isn't there, it's because we don't enforce the rules. My vote on this whole project is -- I'd love to see Deltaport expand and create a lot of good paying jobs, but if we can't meet the safety standards and if we can't control how the railways or the trucks are doing their business, then let's put the project in Prince Rupert.

Feedback Form

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the three feedback discussion topics- Habitat Mitigation, Port-Related Truck Traffic Improvement and Community Legacy Benefits (pages 31-37 of the Discussion Guide).

C: *Lee Lockwood:* I've heard the Port refer to the railroads are your customers in the past. You so get a chance to dictate that relationship. For example, there are many airlines like, the Boeing Corporation, who will not sell aircraft to some operators because they are incapable of operating safely, and I think that you are in a position to buck up and reinforce a few things a little bit more bluntly than you say you can do.

I mean, in a previous lifetime, Canadian Pacific owned their own port because they had their own fleet of ships. They didn't care. They are out of the ship business. There is no railroad business. They are in the hotel business and all that stuff. So I think that your ability to deal with the railroad is a little more than you are letting on here.

Q: *Bob Bowles:* The Port Metro Vancouver project that we're looking at now is actually part of a larger project called the Gateway Project. My late grandfather was all about the integrated traffic and transportation planning and model. I see on page 24, on the 4th paragraph it is talking about developing the transportation plan for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. He was calling for that very information at the beginning of this, from the Minister of Transportation. I got the email, after my grandfather's passing, that they could not provide that information because it was too complex. Until you can provide a comprehensive traffic and transportation plan, then all of these overpasses that you've built on what is being called the Port Metro Rail Corridor here in Langley, you're not even going in the right direction. You're trying to approve plans that are not in the right direction.

And Roy has brought that to light from the 1960s, and I've heard this all around the table. You're talking about the future without regard to the true meaning of what we are doing here. It's part of the Gateway Project. This isn't just Port Metro Vancouver or Roberts Bank. This is the Gateway Project. If we're here and we need to be in a different meeting, at a different location, with a broader context, then we need to know about it as citizens. To read it in a trade magazine, that if you don't happen to get, you won't know about, that is not serving the general public. And if you're looking for feedback from the general public, you need to address the general public rather than just a little trade magazine ad for the entire Gateway Project. As citizens -- these folks here take a lot of time out and we end up at the same meetings, never talking to each other, and then here we are again. So are we at the wrong meeting?

A: *Chris Chok:* Well, this meeting is for this project, Port Metro Vancouver's project and this process certainly was advertised quite heavily. With respect to what I think you are referring to as the whole notion that the federal government has the Asian Pacific Gateway Corridor strategy, that's not this project.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom:* Has this meeting lived up to your expectations?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Our only expectation is that you participate. That's what we come here for.

C: *Rudy Storteboom:* Well, I think I can speak for the group when I say we were expecting something more. And if you can take that feedback that we provided you today back to the regulator, we'd sincerely appreciate it. Some follow up would be nice. You've got our contact information. We've provided you with input and we've provided you with some questions that we'd like answers to. And we trust that that information is going to be passed along to the regulator, and we're hoping that we're going to get some more opportunity to get information and possibly communicate directly with the regulator.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* So I need to be clear again. This process is not part of the regulator's public consultation process. The regulator's consultation process is a federal process. So I ask that you provide that feedback to the regulator. This overall, multi-phased, consultation process that Port Metro Vancouver has undertaken is a separate process and outside of the environmental assessment process, both federal and provincial. We provide this feedback to the regulators, but it is not a requirement of the EA process that we do this, or that we provide that information to them.

C: *Rudy Storteboom:* I understand. You don't want to be part of the process.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* No. The regulator has a prescribed process. The public comment period started September 23rd and it will finish October 15th. There is a 20-day regulated process that the

federal agency, CEAA, has opened up the Project Description, which is online and available to anybody who wishes to look at it to comment. They will receive public comments into the formal environmental assessment process for twenty days at this stage. There will be subsequent stages for public comment as they go forward as well.

This meeting that we are having here today is a Port Metro Vancouver led multi-phased public consultation process to do specifically with gathering feedback from communities about how we can develop this project going forward. It is not an integral part of the EA process. It's sort of like a feed into the EA process because we share this information with the regulator. But we are not using this venue here to provide formal comment to the regulatory process in this 20-day window. This meeting is not a feed into that public comment process. This meeting is a separate and distinct Port Metro Vancouver led public engagement over multiple years as this project proceeds.

Q: *Terry Lyster:* You have our emails. Can you email us contact information?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* All of that is in the Discussion Guide.

C: *Rudy Storteboom:* It's about people and the environment being protected and it seems like it's so chopped up that it's not people-friendly at all.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* It's actually a simple process to provide feedback to the regulator. You click on the link and you can fill in a form online directly and provide feedback to the regulator.

C: *Rudy Storteboom:* Okay, I'd like to say thank you but I'm not happy with the process.

C: *Terry Lyster:* Well, I'll say thank you for coming all the way out to Langley.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Yes, we haven't talked about the environment or habitat at all, so there's one very quick question. Figure 13 in the Project Description, a lovely map about what all is going on. I just want ask a quick question around habitat and scouring. There's a real concern that with the building of the new port that a significant amount of scouring is going to take place in the causeway and on the area west of that. Someone was very concerned about the Western Sandpiper. It's all a bit touchy feely. But if the scouring occurs there's a bit of biofilm that is there which is absolutely essential to it. If scouring occurs to the degree that the Western Sandpiper significantly drops off or disappears, what's the Port going to do about something like that?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We're not in a position to say what our project would impact. We are still doing baseline studies. We are doing baseline studies to determine what the current situation is, from an environmental perspective, in all of the environmental components. Then the project is placed into that baseline and its impact is determined. We then modify the project to minimize those impacts as much as possible and the process then puts forward mitigation to offset the remaining residual impact. If the remaining impact after mitigation is done is insufficient to satisfy the regulator, the project would not be approved.

C: *Cliff Caprani:* Okay, you talk about not knowing the effects of certain things. The log removal at Boundary Bay recently... I've got some friends who walk there every day. They haven't seen a raptor there since. Normally there would be. So clearly there has been some effect. They may eventually arrive, but currently when they would normally be there, they are not there anymore. So what you've done does have an effect, and certainly in that case it appears to be negative. So we are a bit concerned going forward.

- C: *Rhona Hunter*: The log removal at Boundary Bay was examined by both federal and provincial wildlife, as well as the Department of Fisheries, as were the other log removal projects that we've undertaken on TFN land adjacent to Roberts Bank. It was determined that it was a beneficial project and in the past these projects have been beneficial and they have not adversely impacted the environment. They actually do enhance the environment.
- C: *Roy Mufford*: There was one thing that we haven't talked about, maybe it isn't part of your mandate, but what is it costing Langley to watch these trains go by? When we went through this process before the group sat down and we went out and took the crossings from 232nd and 56th Avenue and counted the number of people waiting for the trains. They took ten of the eighteen trains a day that are going through. There were 890 vehicles waiting for any given train. They waited an average of three minutes, which we know is light now. The average vehicle occupancy was 1.5 people. These are the figures that were used. Fuel consumption 1.66 litres per hour in the average vehicle. This was calculated at 90 cents per litre back then. The lost time to individuals was only \$9 per hour. Total this all up. At that time it worked out to \$6,600 per day to the residents of Langley in lost productivity watching the trains go by. This translated to about \$2.5 million dollars a year for the privilege of witnessing these trains.

Well, now we are looking at \$1.20 or \$1.30 for a litre. We'd like to think we've got more than \$9. I think minimum wage is higher than that. And the average train now is taking at least, what seems like, five minutes. Maybe it's only three minutes. The point is we only took ten trains and there's going to be 38.

Who is going to pay Langley for watching all these trains while they sit on the bypass on 200th Street and Fraser Highway? Has that ever been considered? You see what I'm getting at. There are issues here that probably aren't part of your mandate but they are very real to all of us. Something has to happen. You've got to fix this.

- C: *Chris Chok*: That is noted.

Chris Chok thanked everyone for attending and encouraged participants to provide feedback to both the Port Metro Vancouver-led consultation process and the CEAA regulator-led consultation process.

The meeting ended at 7:18pm.