

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

**Multi-Stakeholder Meeting 2
June 14, 2011**

Notes from a Pre-Consultation multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, June 14, 2011, 2:00pm-4:00pm, at the Delta Town & Country Inn, Delta, BC.

Stakeholders: John Appleby, Delta Chamber
Farida Bishay
Anita Den Dikken, South Fraser Action Network
Irene Forcier
Paul Foster, Roberts Bank Lifeboat
Robin Gardner, Roberts Bank Lifeboat
Paula Hill, Tsawwassen Business Association/Scotiabank
Vicki Huntington, MLA
Esther Johnson, Tynehead Hatchery
Tom Johnston
Clint Morgan, Delta Chamber of Commerce
Eliza Olsen
Paul Rasmussen, Roberts Bank Lifeboat
Ian Robertson
Thomas Schmitz, Con-Tech Systems
Lloyd Sim

Port Metro Vancouver: Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development
Sarah McPherson, Senior Advisor, Communications and First Nations
Carrie Brown, Environmental Team, Container Capacity Improvement Program
Dallas Henault, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 2:05 pm

KEY THEMES:

- Participants said that they would like one body responsible for all port operations on the Canadian West Coast, rather than two separate entities in Vancouver and Prince Rupert.
- Participants said that they would like to be consulted about whether the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project should proceed, noting that adding container capacity at Prince Rupert may be a better option and more acceptable to the Prince Rupert region than the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project is to the Delta community.

- Some participants said that Port Metro Vancouver should consult with the public and stakeholders about additional infrastructure such as the road, rail and ship infrastructure that would be needed to support the increased operations associated with the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
 - Some participants said that they would like to be consulted about how the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project could benefit the community with local employment, additional health, education services or other social and economic benefits.
 - Participants said they would like Port Metro Vancouver to provide full and transparent access to as much information available as possible during the consultation stages, including study outlines, study results and technical work.
 - Participants said they liked the small-group meeting format as a consultation method and also asked that open houses include a question and answer component.
-

1. Judy Kirk, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review

Roundtable introductions were undertaken.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I will be facilitating this session. I am the president of Kirk & Co., which is a firm which specializes in consultation. This is the second multi-stakeholder meeting of Port Metro Vancouver's Pre-Consultation concerning the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. Cliff will go into some considerable discussion about that, and it's contained in this discussion guide. This is also posted on the web and it has a feedback form which we would very much appreciate you filling out today. I'd like to leave a few minutes at the end to do that. We find that if we don't get the feedback forms on the same day sometimes we're lucky to get them, lots of times we're not. That said, it is online and we'd very much appreciate getting it from you today or if you would fill it in online.

I just want to reinforce that this is the second multi-stakeholder meeting; there will be seven in this round. This is the first of a very comprehensive consultation that Port Metro Vancouver anticipates doing about the proposed T2 project that will include, likely, six rounds of consultation over approximately seven years, though the number of years depends on Provincial and Federal regulators. That gives you a sense of how early this particular process is, Pre-Consultation.

On my right here, my colleague Dallas Henault will be taking notes and we will make sure that your comments and questions are attributed. If you would like to speak to me now or later and you would not like your comments attributed just let me know and we can make sure that it's taken out of the record. Otherwise we will have attributed comments on the record. There will be a Consultation Summary Report, an independent report written by Kirk & Co. that will summarize this round of Pre-Consultation. The Port will consider that input as it goes forward in planning subsequent consultation and dealing with other phases in this consultation program for this Proposed Terminal 2.

- Q: *Tom Johnston:* What are exactly, are you expecting to obtain from this group? What's your objective?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* Our objective, through Pre-Consultation today and any other meetings we are having, in Delta, Langley, Surrey, Richmond and Vancouver, is to find out from you what topics you would like to be consulted on and how you would like to be consulted. Consistent with best practice, and I can tell you because I've been doing this kind of work for 28 years in British Columbia and across Canada, Pre-Consultation isn't always done. In this case the Port Metro Vancouver was given the advice to do this and they took the initiative to ask people early, who may have an interest in the Proposed Terminal 2, how they want to be consulted and about what. So that is the goal today.

Please do interrupt at any point. Cliff, as I say is going to present some of the information just by going through this guide. We have found that it's a comfortable way to go through it. But please do, at any point along, ask question and provide a comment. Just let me know and I can make sure that we make time to do that.

- C: *Cliff Stewart:* My name is Cliff Stewart, I am the director of Infrastructure Development for Port Metro Vancouver and the CCIP program that I am going to speak about is my program, that's what I am responsible for. Terminal 2 is a significant component of Container Capacity Improvement Program.
- C: *Sarah McPherson:* I am Sarah McPherson and I work for Port Metro Vancouver and I am working on the communications and consultations part of the Container Program.
- C: *Carrie Brown:* My name is Carrie Brown, I'm also with Port Metro Vancouver. I work for the Container Capacity Improvement Program and I am on the environmental front.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Thanks Carrie. I may ask you to speak up a bit. I don't know about you, but it was a bit hard to hear Carrie.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Cliff, I am going to ask you to go over some of the first sections of the discussion guide. I just want repeat, please interrupt at any time. That's why we are doing small groups to make sure that any and all comments you might have or things you want to discuss are brought up.

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

- C: *Cliff Stewart:* So I'm starting on page 2, the inside cover of the discussion guide.

What is the purpose of the discussion guide?

To guide the discussion about the program, the project and in particular to explain the consultation process, including the round we're in now, Pre-

Consultation, what it means and what its objectives are, as well as the rest of the program. The Container Capacity Improvement Program is a multi-year program designed to ensure that Port Metro Vancouver delivers deep sea container capacity in a timely manner to support the growth of international trade. The Terminal 2 project at Roberts Bank is a significant component of that program, but it is not the only part of the program.

We want to hear from you.

We are holding seven separate meetings in this round, and there will be seven rounds of consultation. It is important to note, that the statutory requirement is two rounds, and we have significantly expanded that program to ensure that to the largest extent possible we understand what people's interests and concerns are, and we're able to incorporate them wherever possible into the program.

Pre-Consultation is about two things: What do you want to be consulted on and how do you want to be consulted. The, what, is pretty simple, we'll talk about that later and all the various things that are of interest to you that you think this program has an impact on. The, how is, do you like small group meetings like this, do you like online, do you like webinars, what methods for being consulted work for you and are important to you.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* Cliff I'm going to ask you to just pause there for a minute because I'm a bit remiss that I didn't go around the table. I wonder if we can do that, starting with you Irene. Just say who you are and either what organization you're with or where you live or whatever interests you might bring to the table. Then I'm going to ask you at the end to put in your tent cards so we can see it.
- C: *Irene Focier:* My name is Irene Focier, I've been a resident of Delta and all three areas for the past 50 years. I'm past president for the Rotary Club of Ladner and currently with the Children with Learning Disabilities, raising 4 million dollars to build in Ladner.
- C: *Eliza Olsen:* I'm Eliza Olsen; I've lived in North Delta and South Delta since 1967. I'm very heavily involved with Burns Bog Conservation Society and a few other organizations. But I'm representing myself here at the table.
- C: *Thomas Schmitz:* My name is Thomas. Our family business is at Tilbury Park, Delta, we supply rock and soil we bring in quite a bit in terms of containers and do quite a bit of shipping and are affected by what's happening.
- C: *John Appleby:* I'm John Appleby, I'm an immediate Past Chair of the Delta Chamber of Commerce and I've been active in the past fifteen years in the Transportation Committee and my own business is in high speed freight transfer technology. I'm representing the Delta Chamber of Commerce and our primary concern is the development of an adequate level of infrastructure, not only in the Port but also inland, and the efficiency with which the Port operates, not necessarily to land material but how we get it out. So we're not interested in the roads and rail and short sea shipping.
- C: *Anita Den Dikken:* My name is Anita Den Dikken and I'm a resident of South Delta for the past 5 years, I'm a retired Federal public servant, I'm proud to say

that. I'm a member of the South Fraser Action Network and Burns Bog Conservation Society. My interest in this project is on various levels and I'm wondering about issues people have with the Port of Prince of Rupert and interested on impacts in Agricultural land and on the Pacific Flyway and environmental impacts in general and I'm representing myself.

C: *Esther Johnson:* I'm a volunteer at Tynehead Fish Hatchery which is in Surrey, 96th and 176th, and our half million salmon come from the hatchery and come down through here and they definitely need to have a way to get through to get up the coast and also to come back.

C: *Paula Hill:* I'm Paula Hill, I'm the Past President of Tsawwassen Business Association and I'm also here on behalf of Scotiabank Tsawwassen and Scotiabank which will be opening up in Ladner next.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Vicki you probably don't need to introduce yourself, but please do.

C: *Vicki Huntington:* Vicki Huntington, I'm the MLA for Delta South and here to listen to others.

C: *Clint Morgan:* My name is Clint Morgan, I am sitting on the Transport Committee for the Chamber of Commerce, and I'm here on their behalf. I'm also the President of a company that operates container depot, Delta Container Limited Partnership in Calgary. So anything to do with containers is of interest to us.

C: *Tom Johnston:* Tom Johnston a former resident of Lander and now living in Tsawwassen on the waterfront, so my big concern there is primarily environmental and I'm also heavily involved with the First Nations development there, the consultation strategy

C: *Paul Rasmussen:* My name is Paul Rasmussen and I represent the Roberts Bank Lifeboat Society and have a station at the Port right now. So we're just here to see how it is going to affect our locations and what we can do for the Port in the future.

C: *Paul Foster:* Paul Foster, also from the Roberts Bank Lifeboat Society. I'm just here to listen to see what happens and affect our station out there.

C: *Lloyd Sim:* I'm Lloyd Sim, I'm a resident of Ladner and I was involved in the Deltaport 3 and interested in what the Port is doing in terms of economic development. I'm representing the interest of my grandkids.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Starting on Page 3.

What is Port Metro Vancouver?

In 2008, three legacy ports, the Vancouver Port Authority, the Fraser River Port Authority and the North Fraser River Port Authority were merged to form Port Metro Vancouver. Port Metro Vancouver is the largest port in Canada and the most diversified port of the West Coast of North America. It's also the largest export port on the West Coast of North America. The mandate of Port Metro Vancouver is to support the growth of Canadian trade.

Why is Trade Important?

Trade is important because the economic benefits of trade are felt not just here in the Pacific Gateway itself, but across the entire country. It helps to create

jobs, it increases tax revenue for municipalities and producing economies and it produces economic benefit for Canadians.

One of the questions that is very important to us at Port Metro Vancouver is how do we work towards responsible growth? The way we do that is with a shared commitment to sustainable solutions. We are striving to further develop solid relationships at the local government and community level and to help identify common values, determine sustainable legacies and to mitigate potential community impacts. That obviously will be important part of consultation process as we move forward.

Port Metro Vancouver is committed to sustainable development.

C: *Judy Kirk:* You can see when Cliff is moving the page, but I think he's now on...

C: *Cliff Stewart:* I'm moving now onto page 6.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Which is I think, dealing with demand, and is an important area.

Q: *Tom Johnston:* Is there any reason why you are omitting a particular section at this time?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* In the interest of me not reading to you what you can read yourself and there's lots of time for questions.

C: *Judy Kirk:* We're just using it as a guide.

C: *Cliff Stewart:*

Why do we need to plan for growth in containerized trade?

The projections that we have done and they were released in May of this year show that we expect the existing container capacity to be constrained in fairly short term. That means probably by 2015 or 2016. We project that 4 million TEUs of additional capacity will be required to meet future West Coast container demand by 2030. To put that in perspective, that's just slightly less than all of the existing capacity on the West Coast of Canada today. Growth is expected to double over next 10 – 15 years, and to nearly triple by 2030.

Q: *Clint Morgan:* On what basis do we come up with such a projection? Surely the population of North America is not going to triple in the next 20 years. Obviously containers are all about consumption, buying goods and selling to foreign countries. So I'm just curious what the projection is based on.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It's based on a combination of things. The data originates primarily with the Economist Intelligence Unit, and it's based on things like GDP growth per capita, population growth, shifting trade patterns. One of the things that you've probably seen a lot in the paper lately is, whereas virtually all of British Columbia lumber used to go south to the United States, significantly increasing amounts now goes to Asia. So yes, the primary direction is still from Asia to Canada, but more and more, as that growth is happening the export growth is

keeping pace and so you're continuing to see that it's growing in both directions.

Q: *Clint Morgan*: Do you see balance going forward?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: We expect it to continue to be relatively balanced, yes.

Q: *Tom Johnston*: What about development in the north of BC?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: And I can talk about that a little bit.

C: *Judy Kirk*: Tom, I want to make sure that everyone heard that. What about development in the north of BC?

Q: *Tom Johnston*: It seems to be centralized right here, I don't know why we have to take all of the expansion when there's an expansion north of here.

C: *Judy Kirk*: I think Anita, you asked about Prince Rupert as well. So maybe Cliff you should address some questions about Prince Rupert.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: In the event that Prince Rupert proceeds then Terminal 2 would probably be delayed because it would not be required as soon as it would be if Prince Rupert doesn't proceed. But Port Metro Vancouver doesn't have any control over whether Prince Rupert proceeds or doesn't proceed. But we do have a mandate to ensure that trade is able to continue. So when you look at a project like Terminal 2 and we're here in Pre-Consultation, from the beginning of this process we're in now it's expected to take 10 years until a ship could tie up alongside and discharge. In the event that Prince Rupert doesn't proceed for any number of reasons, in order to ensure that in 2020 there's sufficient capacity to support Canadian trade we need to be starting now. We don't have the luxury of waiting three or four years and then saying, if Prince Rupert doesn't proceed, now we are going to go ahead. What we do have the ability to do is to start the process now and if the capacity comes online in Prince Rupert to slow down or delay the project at Terminal 2 until the growth has caught up to and consumed the capacity the Prince Rupert might make available. It is really as simple as that, we can't rely on Prince Rupert happening. If it happens great, if it doesn't happen then we have an obligation to provide that capacity.

Q: *Eliza Olsen*: What events would prevent Prince Rupert from proceeding because I've always heard that they're going to be fully open at 2012?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Well, I guess there are a number of things and we could spend a lot of time doing what I call containers 101, understanding the dynamics of how containers travel and what various people do with those containers. The underlying assumption we have is that if it doesn't proceed it's not economically viable, if it's not economically viable I guess you could turn that around and say if it's economically viable it'll proceed, if it's not economically viable it won't. But we don't have the luxury of being able to wait to find that out.

C: *Judy Kirk*: But I think underneath Eliza's question is probably, Eliza correct me if I'm wrong, is what would affect that economic viability?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Let me go back to what you've heard about it opening in 2012. It hasn't yet got permits, it hasn't started construction so it's almost a given it won't opening in 2012. It may well get permits and it may well go ahead, but I think it's more likely going to be the middle of decade before it happens. Given the process that we're involved in takes 10 years and there's no ability to speed

up that process, there's no ability to say if we wait five years to say we shouldn't have waited because Rupert hasn't gone ahead and then compressed the project. Whereas we have the ability to start now and move along the process and we talked about at any point along the process where we can stop, put it on hold, reactivate it. That's the perspective we're coming from. If Prince Rupert gets build, great, if Prince Rupert doesn't get built we have an obligation to ensure that capacity is available.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* Anita did you have a follow up question on that?
- Q: *Anita Den Dikken:* This is a bit perplexing to me. Is there an ongoing basis for communication between Port Metro Vancouver and the Port of Prince Rupert?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes.
- Q: *Anita Den Dikken:* How is that accomplished?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's accomplished at the Executive level.
- Q: *Anith Den Dikken:* Which is?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Our president speaks to their president on a regular basis.
- Q: *Tom Johnston:* We're talking about a competitive situation here and you getting off the block quickly enough is probably to the detriment of decision making process up north if you are off the blocks first.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well we're not off the blocks first. They're much further along in the process than we are. We're at the Pre-Consultation stage, so we haven't even got a plan at this point.
- Q: *Tom Johnston:* Well I don't know any residents who really want another port. You have people in Prince George who are desperate to have one. I'm asking the question, why is it happening here and not up north where there's a demand for employment, demand for business and we're only going to get pollution?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So Tom in relation to Pre-Consultation then would it be fair to say that you would like to discuss that fundamental question. It may be that others would. In other words the fundamental question being, do we want a Proposed Terminal 2 versus an increasing capacity from Prince Rupert?
- C: *Tom Johnston:* Well I'm glad to see we have a good representative of a political format here. No disrespect. I think this will come down to a political decision.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* It may, and I can't say whether it will or not. I don't think anyone can, including MLA Huntington. I think the point here for this consultation is that this is a fundamental question. If this is the topic you would like to have discussed, one of the reasons we have a feedback form here and why we're doing this is to articulate that. This is the second meeting, in the first meeting this was not a topic that came up. In this meeting, it has, and I want to land on it and make sure it's something you want to think about and consider.
- C: *Tom Johnston:* I have a former restaurant in Tsawwassen with a large customer base down there and I've discussed it with many people, can't find any that want T2.

- Q: *Anita Den Dikken*: It sounds to me as if there are two rival factions, I don't know if that's quite what this is but it sounds like there's no one over seeing which facility and location will have an expanded port.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: Anita, I'm going to step in and answer that instead of Cliff. The truth is if this project goes to Federal and Provincial Regulatory through the EA, they will look at need and alternative means of delivery and rationale for the project. But you should ask them directly. Vicky you're saying they don't? The Feds do.
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: The Feds do, the province don't.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Actually, the province does too in the BC EAO guidelines, they look at alternative means.
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: Not with alternatives.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Alternative means?
- C: *Unknown*: No, that's the problem
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: They look at the application in front of them, they cannot look at alternatives.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: I didn't say alternative to, I said alternative means of delivery. You and I can talk offline, I think they do. But in any case, in terms of the Terms of Reference for the Environmental Assessment, you would also have opportunity to comment on that. But Anita, to answer your question of who is overseeing? The Provincial and Federal Regulators will oversee the regulatory and Environmental Assessment process. Otherwise, certainly levels of government may weight in.
- C: *Anita Den Dikken*: I'm just not getting a great level of comfort from all of this. It just seems to me that there should be an emphasis on developing one port and not developing two. I could be wrong; I could be way out to lunch for all I know.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Fair enough, I think it's a good question. It may well be something, and it's in the notes, we will record as a concern as cooperation and integration of the Ports as well, and not this project.
- C: *Esther Johnson*: I've been at Rupert and I know the depression that's there, it's a good sea port to go into. From anything I've heard, it's faster to go to Eastern Canada from Prince Rupert than from down here. I see the difficulty that Langley has with the trains going through. Again, what I get from newspapers is conflict between Rupert and Vancouver and Vancouver having more say and therefore Rupert not getting the support that they need. Am I wrong?
- Q: *Clint Morgan*: What I was going to say was, that it is my understanding, that Prince Rupert is a better location to service cargo that goes east, away from the West Coast and Vancouver is a better location for cargo that stays in the Lower Mainland. I understand that it is anywhere from 30 – 40% that stays in Vancouver and 60 – 70% that moves east of Vancouver. Do we know projections of volume tripling over the next 20 years or so? Do we have an idea what sector is going to go more? I imagine probably anything going east of Vancouver because there's more relation that includes cargo going in to the US. Wouldn't that be a reason to predicate where the growth ought to take place?

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We're in danger of getting into containers 101, and I'm actually happy to do that for people, probably this isn't the place to do it. There are a number of commercial issues that Prince Rupert faces. The first one is that they are only serviced by one railroad. The Port of Halifax is served by that railroad solely. Prince Rupert has been open for 3-4 years and they have only managed to attract one shipping line customer. I guess you could say that the market is speaking about its view of that. It was originally built and marketed as being primarily for US cargo. They sold themselves as days quicker to Chicago. In fact that hasn't been what has developed.
- Q: *Clint Morgan:* I've heard that it is a tougher port to get into in the winter months. Between weather and rough seas, I heard that from a captain.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Certainly, that much further north. Ultimately, to a large degree the market will decide where market wants to go. If the facilities are built in Prince Rupert and the market is happy to go there, then as I said earlier, this capacity will be built later. There are ultimately only two places on the West Coast of Canada where deep water, road and rail all come together; they're the Port of Vancouver and the Port of Prince Rupert. Ultimately I think all of these facilities will end up being built.
- C: *Lloyd Sim:* Cliff has touched on some of what I was going to say. I lived in Prince Rupert and I worked out of Prince Rupert for twenty years in the marine field, and a lot of the dreams that Prince Rupert have, never materialized. Which may be unfortunate, but that's the reality. They are not served by a good road and they are only served by a single train. They're only up to four ships a week and it's taken a few years to develop. I know the people of Prince Rupert are disappointed by the lack of commitment by the shipping lines to Prince Rupert. There are so many dynamics that we're not aware of, that for us to go through the he said she said, I read, she read scenario that we could go here for months without resolving anything. Although the internet has given us a lot of information and faster, in the end the people with the money talk, let's be honest. And if customers want to go through Prince Rupert, they will, or if they want to go through Port Metro Vancouver, they will. I would prefer only one Port Authority on the West Coast of Canada, that way we have the most efficient use of all the Port facilities. That's not the current situation and I may not live to see that. We are a growing economy, goods have to be moved, and that's how I made my living for many years. Although it seems that the mariners are the low spade of the infrastructure, I support the idea of preparing for expansion, but I also support the idea that it be done in a responsible, environmental way. Because of timelines involved, I believe that we as a community have the ability to encourage the port to do everything properly.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* That's good. I just want to make sure that we have the opportunity to go through some other stuff. So I wonder if I can ask you Cliff to move along and make sure that we cover the topics we are consulting on. Please feel free to interrupt as we move along.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* Moving on to Page 7.

What is the Container Capacity Improvement Program?

It is the important next step in delivering projects required and the infrastructure that is necessary to meet anticipated growth in the container sector. This isn't something that's just starting. There have been new developments in both Vanterm and Centerm in the Burrard Inlet in the middle of the last decade. The Third Berth at Deltaport that opened at the end of 2009 and came online in early 2010. There's the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor, to address the comments you made about traffic in Langley, Surrey and here in Delta, to reduce that interaction between road traffic and rail traffic and allow people to live their lives without worrying about when the trains are coming through. It includes the South Fraser Perimeter Road in terms of capacity to handle the growth in truck traffic as was mentioned. Those aren't part of the Container Capacity Improvement Program, but are things that are being done in part of growth in container capacity. Roberts Bank is very well positioned to accommodate future trade growth. It has excellent road and rail connections to the rest of North America. That's a point that was mentioned earlier about American cargo, that's a point I want to make. Currently about 5% of Port Metro Vancouver container traffic is American destined. This growth that we're talking about is not based on growing the percentage of American cargo. This is strictly based on growing the mix that exists today with 5% as American cargo and 95% as Canadian cargo.

What is the Proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project?

It's a multi berth, marine container terminal, expected to have a capacity of more than 2 million TEU's built to bring the capacity on around 2020 and see the capacity growth through the decade of the 2020s. We would expect that between now and 2020; we would look to increase laden capacity within existing facilities, including Deltaport at Roberts Bank through road and rail infrastructure improvements to allow increased capacity out of all of the facilities that exist in the Lower Mainland. By 2020, the midterm capacity would come from Terminal 2, and in the event that Prince Rupert does get built, then Terminal 2 would be built later.

On page 8.

How can I get involved?

You see at the bottom of the page showing the comprehensive multi round community, stakeholder and public consultation process. Pre-Consultation is the one we are in now. The purpose of that is to allow people to be heard on the question of how do you want to be consulted in the subsequent rounds and on what issues do they wish to be consulted in the subsequent rounds. The seven rounds are expected to take place over a number of years. To a large degree the actual timeframe and schedule will be subject to the Environmental Assessment Review Process. It is our expectation that it will be a panel process, ultimately the decision about that will be made in Ottawa and in Victoria, but at this point, we are very early in the process. The objective is to give the community an

opportunity to talk about how they want to be consulted through the subsequent six or seven years of the consultation process.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: If I could just on page 8, where you see the fourth box moving from left to right, where it says Draft Panel Guidelines. There's an assumption being made here by Port Metro Vancouver that there would be a Federal panel because of the significance of the proposed project. So that would be one that would be part of the Environmental Assessment, and two more along Environmental Assessment public hearing process, there's an assumption that it would be a public hearing process. That's an assumption, the regulators might decide to do more and indeed past history with other large projects has shown that sometimes they do more. So it's just to give you a sense of what is in addition to the regulatory.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: So moving on to page 9.

How will the input be used?

As Judy mentioned, Kirk & Co. will be doing an independent report of the input that's received in the process, reporting back to the people who have provided that input and also to the Port to allow us to develop and shape the consultation process so it meets the needs of the community. As well there will be a consideration memo produced at the end of each round of consultation to explain how the input was used in the process and how it helped to shape the process. Judy, anything else you want to say on process?

- C: *Judy Kirk*: No, but are there questions on that?
- Q: *John Appleby*: I'm not getting much of a sense as to on where you would stand on enhanced infrastructure through the Lower Mainland on this. If we're going to triple the growth of containers, statistics Canada will tell us that the population in this area is going to grow by roughly about a million over the same period. We're going to have the same issue that we have right now where we have containers competing for space with buses. So we need to grow the infrastructure in the lower mainland. It's not so much a matter of finding corridors for rail; it's a question of using the rail that we have more efficiently. It's a question of perhaps using the river, I'm thinking that the lower mainland actually starts in Chilliwack and that if we're doing a transshipment issue then Chiliwack, Tacoma, Nanaimo and Squamish power the same water system and I don't actually get a sense that that's factored into the planning here.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: If I could John, that's a really good comment, as many of the others are. If you look at page 10, if everyone does, part of what Cliff is about to go over are some of the topics that the Port Metro Vancouver thinks that the people would be interested in. They're not guessing on this because Deltaport is not that long ago. They did look at whether these would be some topics. What you have just talked about is something in addition to that.
- C: *John Appleby*: Well it is and it's the sort of thing that I see buried in related topics and I think it's a little more important than that.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* We hear you and we've marked it down. I encourage you to put it in your feedback form as well because it's a very good comment.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* I think it's important to note, we ran into this in the first session as well. We are here to hear what it is you want to talk about and what you want to make sure we are thinking about. Because of where the Pre-Consultation process lies in the overall development process we don't actually have anything to talk about; we're that early in the process. We are preparing those sorts of things, but we're actually ahead of that.
- C: *Tom Johnston:* I'd like to point out that it's to be commended on taking this step forward so early in this process. I think it's commendable that it's happened now versus the 6 months before the start of the project. On the Environmental Assessment, my area of interest, I have researched the environment testing that was done for the first port and in my opinion it was seriously flawed. The stations up on top of the bluff and the station right down on First Nations, with the prevailing winds after living on the water there's no way that measurements there could accurately reflect reality. And there are a lot of solid particles coming there. You can fish for crab out there and it's questionable so I'm looking for soil samples, I'm looking for new station locations, ones that have been affected with contamination and I would like to be involved in that discussion.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Thank you Tom for articulating that.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* That's good because that is really what this round of consultation is about, the very specific things that you want to know more about and want to make sure we're looking at.
- Q: *Robin Gardner:* As much as John had comments around the sort of regional impact, I guess my colleagues may have already said that one of our interests is in the general area of marine safety and the ever increasing marine traffic in this general nexus of the port, the ferries and recreational use. I think we need to give some very specific thought to the increasing risk that's occurring for negative interaction between the marine resources. So for those of us representing the Lifeboat interest, which is a specific interest that we have, it's not just our individual interest around the Lifeboat, but it is a broader question of marine safety.
- Q: *Irene Forcier:* Looking at this list of topics that could be included they seem very sparse. I mean, this is a huge undertaking, albeit a ten year undertaking, but it's going to have an impact on this particular community, it's not just a Delta port, it's for the world, but the impact is going to be solely set at the feet of people who live in Delta. What I'm getting at is what is this going to do for the community, because everyone can see where it's going to negatively impact, whether it is infrastructure, roads, bridges etc. What is it exactly going to do for the community to help people continue to live in this quiet dead end community? It is dead end; I mean we're ended with the ferries. We have the First Nations who are also in the throes of building huge buildings and shopping centres and what have you, and container facilities. It seems to me there should

be a little bit more emphasis on what it can do for the community. I know parks; buildings and what have you, but seems like small token amounts of whatever could happen. Is there any change there is going to be some educational facility built for marine, important projects that are coming up, or other buildings or anything like that, that could enhance and bring employment to people who are living in this community so they don't have to go out on those highways that are going to be crammed with container trucks and the likes of that?

- A: *Judy Kirk*: Irene, you have added some information with your examples that really bring that notion alive. What I was just writing in the note to myself was around a topic for discussion is that you're suggesting that it would be a good thing to discuss what is going to be done for the community and that you would want to be consulted about benefits for the community. I've used that benefit word as a way to summarize because you talked about hospital, education, maybe marine and those kinds of things.
- C: *Irene Forcier*: If you keep people happy about traffic for instance, maybe something to create employment within our community might be an advantage to keeping some people in the community that might otherwise have to move out. Or keep them off the roads in order to stop competing with the traffic that's obviously going to occur.
- Q: *Paula Hill*: DO you have any figures on what kind of job creation would be and how many households that might create. Of course I find that a lot of my clients that work either at Westshore Terminals or at Deltaport, generally like to be local and what kind of impact that might have on housing. I've looked at the TFN plan and they have some housing projects in there. Do you have any figures, even preliminary on how many jobs would be created on this?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: We don't at this point, we are working to develop. I can give you something that you can use as guidelines. Existing container business in Vancouver on the long shore side, so that's before it leaves the terminal, each TEU contributes around an hour of employment. So 2.4 million TEUs would deliver in the neighbourhood of 2.4 million hours of employment a year, plus the staff that's involved in that. That would be just a starting point because there are obviously other jobs associated.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I think the other part of your question Paula, and then I'll come to you John, was something about housing impacts. I want to check that you're saying if there was quite an increase in local employment what would be the impact be on local housing.
- Q: *Paula Hill*: Right. Or what could it be? It looks like there's two sides to this with the TFN working on it. Of course they have years out, as well as this is, it looks like they would almost co-exist.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Is that a topic that would be of interest for you?
- C: *Paula Hill*: Yes.
- Q: *Eliza Olsen*: I appreciate the fact you talk about Environmental Assessments and things like that, I'm also very aware that sometimes you have to be very careful of some things that sound like a good environment mitigation actually is a

disaster. There are some things of concern here. The First Nations consultation, on the international table UN has declared that treaty is illegal and although UN has no power to enforce it does have the power to influence. I think that needs to be addressed because it gives a black mark to the Canadian government to be involved, or anybody else to be involved with a treaty that's considered to be illegal. The UN has declared that the Tsawwassen treaty is illegal.

C: *Unknown*: Would you know any more details about that?

Q: *Eliza Olsen*: The person you need to discuss that with is Bertha Williams because she has gone on her own dime three times to the United Nations. It has to do with the process, the way that it was set up. I know it's only been reported in the small blurbs in the local papers. But it is something on international level gives Canada a black eye. Anyone who works with consultation with the First Nations should be aware of that and how you deal with it is going to be up to you. But you should be aware that it has been deemed illegal and that gives Canada a black eye. The other thing is the Environmental Assessment and jobs. I think we had better discuss what kind of jobs we are going to get? An example of that is technical report number sixteen, page thirty-nine, I have it memorized, they do talk about increased employment in the health sector, due to increased respiratory and cancer illnesses caused by the road. We are going to talk about, are we going to increase our hospital because we are going to have more health problems, cancer related, etc. It's unfortunate that all of these things cannot be looked at in a more global perspective, because whatever happens here, even with the best of intentions is going to have an impact elsewhere. I'm curious why Prince Rupert hasn't got the permits? They are pleading for this. You don't have control of that; you may have the power to influence. If they want it and people here don't want it, and we are in a very enclosed area here, somebody said this impacts people right up to Chilliwack. Again, because of the air shed we also have the problem of the loss of farmland. If you talk to Harold Steeves we should be adding something like 500,000 acres back into the ALR and not taking it out and this will have an impact. How are we going to do it? There may be creative ways we haven't thought of. At one time I was embarrassed to call myself an environmentalist, not quite proud of it, I am aware of green washing and I am very aware of being cautious of jumping on any green wagon because sometimes that green wagon is not as green as it looks. So we have to look at everything from many angles. I think a classic example of that are those nice whirly gates that we are now using for lights. People are now concerned about them because of the mercury involved. I don't know how they do the LEDs, whether it's better or not, but we have to be sometimes careful with what we wish for.

C: *Judy Kirk*: Thanks, Eliza.

C: *John Appleby*: Again, it's an issue of scale. It's sometimes not readily appreciated we think, but then we're the Chamber of Commerce. The Tilbury and Annacis Industrial Parks are the two largest in the country. The capacity increase of the Tilbury Park or Tilbury area is approximately some 500 acres with probably a lot more to be obtained through infill. There is a lot of

concentration of employment that will occur in that area, with probably a similar thing happening in Annacis. When we talk about Vanterm and Centerm and to a certain extent Lynnterm, when you start to move a thousand foot container vessel around in the Port of Vancouver, all of a sudden the Port of Vancouver becomes real small. The likelihood is that if ships are going to be larger than 1,000 feet I don't suppose that the Georgia Straight is going to be much smaller either. So the issue of how do you handle this increase in volume? I do appreciate that you're starting this process now but the decisions you do make almost immediately are going to be the ones that govern the situation in 2030.

Q: *Lloyd Sim*: My question has nothing to do with the content of this; it's to do with the different stages. I know that there's a T2 committee coming on stream, made up of a number of organizations. Where does all this fit in with the next step?

A: *Judy Kirk*: I think I'll ask Sarah to answer that, but the committee you are referring to is the Delta Community Committee that Naomi from the Port.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: PCLC

A: *Judy Kirk*: What does PCLC stand for?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Port Community Liaison Committee.

A: *Judy Kirk*: We are going to have a meeting like this with them and they will be involved as a stakeholder group along the way because they are set up, as I understand it Sarah correct me if I'm wrong, to deal with many issues not just this proposed project.

Q: *Lloyd Sim*: Are the results, as you call our questions and concerns, moved up to that committee?

A: *Judy Kirk*: All of the input, the notes that are being done today, and the Consultation Summary Report that will be done, including comments from the Port Liaison Committee you just heard referenced will be summarized and given to the Port. Ultimately the Board of Directors is the responsibility authority to make the decisions.

C: *Vicki Huntington*: Thank you. I'd just like to go through a list of things I would like to see as this process develops. On Page 9, you talked about First Nations consultation. In my experience the First Nations is better and more productive than communities that are not First Nations. I would like to see that last sentence, seek ways to avoid, mitigate, or accommodate adverse impacts, and identify potential opportunities for collaborative and beneficial working arrangements. I would also like to see that become a part of how you treat Delta. It's something that is a problem province wide, I think we should be treated with no less respect and obligation. I agree very much with Tom Johnston about soil samples and air pollution stations and all of those things we need to understand as DP3 becomes far busier. We haven't seen how busy that berth can be yet because it came online at the same time as the recession. I would like to see within studies a greater interest in light pollution issues, and I am really disappointed in the way the Port Metro Vancouver followed through

on light pollution issues for the Third Berth development, that may be a part of the Environmental Assessment, but I'd just like to comment that I thought that was very poorly handled by the Port. You mentioned through here attending an open house in your community, Delta hates open houses; they are nothing but manipulative opportunities to tell us what we're getting and see it nicely on pictures. Please, if you're going to have an open house, follow it up that evening with a public question and answer process where everyone can hear. If you don't do that you're not going to have any credibility in the communities you go forward in.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: That's exactly the kind of thing we want to hear.
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: I want to see as you go along, full and transparent access to all of the studies and background data. Environmentally, people will say they are up on the website for the EAO process, but we're not seeing seismic studies that are going on right now. There's data that's going to be undertaken in the consultation phase we're not necessarily going to have access too. If you want credibility I think we need access to those things as they develop and even input into those initial studies as they're being undertaken. The same goes with your transportation studies and your cost benefit analyses. Let us know what you are basing your projections on. Some of it will be proprietary; I understand that, but that which isn't ought to be made available to all of the stakeholders who want to be involved. I'd like to see feedback, very specific feedback on where the consultation input is being used and managed or why it isn't being accepted and why it isn't being part of the process. I also believe ultimately, that the Detailed Design Planning Stage which always comes after the Environmental Assessment Stage should be part of the risk assessment; or at least be subject to a further review by the EAO as the detailed designs unfold. Because we're seeing it with SFPR, the Detailed Designs are having major impacts and major changes and hasn't had the benefit of the assessment process in the beginning.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: There's not monitoring of that either Vicki?
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: No. Well some of it, when the table of mitigation or the table of commitments has interfered with, then they have to go back to the EAO.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: But that's in relation to the previous iteration. It's actually the first time I've heard that notion around the Detailed Design.
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: But if it wasn't in the table of commitments and big changes are made like hectares on the fringe of the bog are being mowed down. That wasn't part of the assessment and it should be. Last thing I would like to say is that I would like to see in this process an absolutely full and open discussion of the backup needs of the Port. What other Industrial Land needs are going to be required? Where are they going to be required? Does the Port anticipate ALR lands taken up? This discussion about foreign trade zones, what does that mean and how do they unfold? Does the Port anticipate that? Certainly Gateway studies anticipate it. We shouldn't as a community, have to find out piece meal all of these things that really ought to be part of the assessment.
- Q: *Tom Johnston*: I'd just like to ask Vicki, do you know anything about First Nations Agreement? I know it's not a topic, but it's important.

- C: *Vicki Huntington*: It's an internal dispute between bands on traditional territories, other times between band members and councils who engage. I don't know specifics and it's not something that as a community we can get involved in.
- C: *Tom Johnston*: No I didn't think so. Thank you.
- Q: *Anita Den Dikken*: I'd like to return to the issue of agriculture, also the Pacific Flyway which no one has mentioned. Let me address agriculture first. With climate change, it's speculated that our traditional sources of imported foods may be drying up, and we have to look at how climate change has impacted produce from California, Mexico and so forth. We've got the best agricultural land in the Province and in the Lower Mainland here. This delta is all part of it and so was Richmond. We need to ensure that we have adequate resources in terms of land, air and water to support ourselves because we're probably going to have to do that increasingly in the future. So when farm land is being gobbled up for industrial uses I'm really alarmed. The second thing is that the Pacific Flyway is the route that migratory birds take when they are coming from the north and going south. As you probably are well aware we have record numbers of migratory birds here in Delta. There are bird counts done every year I think on Boxing Day. We are the highest area or second highest area in the country for a number of different species. We need to develop more of an ecotourism industry, which I really don't see happening and it should be happening here because at certain times of the year we have the resources. I think that if this project goes ahead in the future, before it goes ahead there needs to be an assessment, about how additional port facilities are going to impact the birds. I won't get into it any further than this; it is an important consideration for future economic benefits.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Cliff can I ask you to move to page 11/12 and discuss consultation methods.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: Okay, moving on to page 12 then, and we've heard Vicki express a view on a particular consultation method. The objective is to understand and broadly what people feel about the specific methods that are listed here. But more particularly if there are other methods that you feel would be appropriate, that you could list those methods as well. It does tend to be community specific and I think it also tends to be demographic specific. I speak as the father of a five year old daughter; we're far more interested in consultation opportunities that don't require us to hire a babysitter to go and be involved. There are different types of consultation process that suit different people in different places and different times in their lives. The objective here is to try and understand to the greatest extent possible how can we craft a program to craft a program that gives everyone a chance to be heard in the way that they want to be heard.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: If I could add a little something there, that the Port Metro Vancouver is looking seriously at 8-10 methods of consultation. In other words the kind of meeting that Vicki was referring to with question and answer sessions where there are microphones and people can come up, talk and provide a comment with their fellow residents and be heard by one another. In addition to this kind of meeting also, online feedback forms, some people are now increasingly asking for other online methods such as webinars and things that give them options. Really what we are asking here for is there are a particular range of consultation methods that you like better? Or if you don't see it listed here that you would add? I can tell you having done consultation practice for now almost twenty eight years it has changed a lot in that time period. I think that we need to make sure we provide a whole range of options. We are interested in seeing what you would like to do.
- C: *Anita Den Dikken*: I like these face-to-face meetings where we get a chance to hear various viewpoints. Not only hearing, but seeing. Body language can tell a lot.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I agree. There's no desire to limit any face-to-face. In fact, people say over and over again that face-to-face is one of the preferred methods. Really what we're after is, are there any other methods that you're interested in, in addition to the face-to-face.
- C: *Robin Gardner*: I think one of the things that Vicki touched on was credibility and trust. It's important there be understanding for all the parties of what consultation actually means. Historically it is often meant that the proponent of the project tells you what is going to happen rather than it be a truly participatory venture where the community is actually able to influence the outcomes. I think anything that can help, particularly in Delta where the impacts are very significant. The socio economic impacts are significant both plus and minus. So any mechanism you can come up with that assures people of the contribution that they make can influence the outcome.
- Q: *Ian Robertson*: I wonder whether or not it's a foregone conclusion the Port is going to expand come hell or high water. Or whether or not the Port wants to find out what the reaction within the community about whether or not this expansion should take place in South Delta? That's a question for you. If you're serious about that question then you would submit yourself to a process which you're not used to doing. Which would be somewhat akin to a public hearing process where you present your case and the population would be prepared to present their case for and against it and the debate would ensue from that point. You might find that expansion for the Port is strongly supported in the community; you might find that it's not supported by the community. The rounds that we have experienced in the last five years with regard to the Port have in my view been a sham. The Port has come in and said we're going to come in here and do this and we just want to hear from you as we go along the way. The second question I have, it's really more of a comment is on page 6 of

your report and I apologize for being late. There wasn't much that I had to go on for what this was all about. This graph, simplistic as it is, as it shows how the growth is going to go on doesn't seem to speak at all about the impact of the Panama Canal. From my understanding of the Panama Canal, once that is opened any goods that are coming through this port that are heading to the East Coast of the US or Canada can make it to the East Coast of US or Canada more cheaply by going through the Panama Canal, which then reduces the impact. As we talked about a tripling and quadrupling of this I don't have the economics behind me, but at what point have we imported more than 100% of what we need. This game doesn't go on forever. It has a maximum at which point there's some kind of response going on and I'm not even going to get into the economics of South Asian countries or anything like that. The rationale that is used to support the obvious thing which is the expansion of the Port seems to me in some ways to be very simplistic.

C: *Judy Kirk:* So let me take the first question because I think there were several there. I think I heard three, so I'm going to summarize them and ask Cliff to take them one at a time. The first one, it's not exactly in the order but you should answer the one about the Panama Canal and what that would do to demand in the forecast?

Q: *Ian Robertson:* In the ten year period once it's over.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I think your second one had to do with, is the Port prepared ask...

Q: *Ian Robertson:* Submit its proposal to the community and find out if there is support for it.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Right. In other words should it proceed or not proceed is the question that you're after.

Q: *Ian Robertson:* It paints the question of who's in charge? Does the Port have the right to do it notwithstanding what the community wants.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I think the third one had to do more with, I'm not sure if I've got this right and that's why I want to check it. You were talking about how much you can import? It's more of a materialism question. Was it?

Q: *Ian Robertson:* When do we reach a capacity of importation where you can't run the straight line of expansion for the next ten years?

C: *Judy Kirk:* Right. So in that order Cliff.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So let me talk first about the Panama Canal. There's no question that the Panama Canal changes the line, and there isn't a technical term for it, it's like a topographic line around the continent. Changes to the line for which goods going inland it makes more sense to travel through the canal and to the East Coast then it does to come off of the West Coast and get on a trail and go. But it doesn't change it enough to impact where 95% of the stuff coming from the Port of Vancouver goes which is Toronto and Montreal. Once you have to get on the railroad anyway and you start balancing the economics of traveling through the Panama Canal, around the other side and then getting on a railroad. All of the reports that we've seen say that it's not going to affect Chicago which is where the bulk of the relatively small amounts of cargo going to the United States going to. It is not going to affect Toronto and Montreal. That's what we've seen. The economics won't be there. Certainly if you were living in

Houston, Savannah, Atlanta, yes it makes a big difference. Probably might make a difference if you are living in Halifax, but it would probably be cheaper if you were to come the other way and through the Suez Canal, if you're going to Halifax. There is very little cargo that actually goes to the East Coast, when you think about Canadian geography that actually goes to the centre of the country. So that's the Panama Canal question. The beauty of this process and you missed this conversation; it's a 10 year process in order to actually deliver this facility. The Panama Canal opens at the end of 2014. So we will actually have some real data before we get the point of actually proceeding or not proceeding with the project. So we'll be able to understand. We'll have a lot more data about this forecast line. Although it looks like a relatively simplistic line, it's based on a very complicated economic analysis of where the growth is coming from. That was the first question, the second question was...

C: *Judy Kirk:* The second question was would Port Metro Vancouver submit to a question to the community of to proceed or not proceed. I'm not sure frankly, if Cliff can answer...

A: *Cliff Stewart:* I couldn't answer that. That would be a Board of Directors question. It might even be a Federal Government question because it has a lot of constitutional overtones to it.

C: *Judy Kirk:* In any case, it's here and you're not the first one to ask that. I think it was also, either Tom or Lloyd, who asked that. It was asked earlier in a session as well, in a slightly different way, but essentially the same question.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* But in a slightly different part of the question I heard asked earlier was part question, part statement. Is the port going to do this come hell or high water? This project has a number of hurdles, both internal and external that it has to clear. One of which is the Environmental Assessment process. That is an independent process, at least at the Federal level, and possibly the Federal and Provincial levels. So to say that the project is going to come hell or high water, no, it's not going to come hell or high water. It's going to come if it makes economic sense and if it is able to clear the Environmental Assessment process. Remember, the Environmental piece, looks at not only environment in the sense of the green environment, but it also looks at the socio-economic environment. So in order for this project to be approved all of this stuff has to be proven beyond a balance of probabilities to an Environmental Assessment Panel. At least we assume it'll be an Environmental Assessment Panel.

C: *Eliza Olsen:* I would like to reinforce what Ian has said. As far as the Environmental Assessment is concerned, there's a little more faith in the Federal. I think most people around this table are rather jaded about Provincial Environmental Assessments. It's really going to have to be a good one for anybody to have any faith in it.

Q: *Tom Johnston:* Just to bring Ian up-to-date around the discussion about Prince Rupert before him coming in there were a few questions about that. The inevitability is of some concern around this table, is it necessary? I think that sums up a lot of the discussion.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* Ian, it was Tom's question around the question of whether it should proceed or not. It was in relation to Prince Rupert that he asked that. Are there any questions or comments about how you want to be consulted to what Vicki offered earlier? Also what Anita said about face-to-face?
- Q: *Robin Gardner:* Judy I have one comment and I apologize for being a late arrive. Was there discussion about the what?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Yes
- Q: *Robin Gardner:* So there was clarity about what the actual project is?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* No.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* About what the actual project is?
- Q: *Robin Gardner:* Not the process, but the project. What actually is embraced by the words Terminal 2.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, Terminal 2. What we said was.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Yes there was a brief explanation.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, it is a multi-berth of capacity probably greater than 2 million TEUs.
- Q: *Robin Gardner:* On the north side of the coal terminal?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We have not yet spoken to that. That comes with part of the Project Definition Consultation.
- Q: *Robin Gardner:* When would that appear? I think one of things that maybe this table is prepared to be more esoteric about the project is that as soon as the public is interested they are going to want to know what the hell is this.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Absolutely, and certainly what I have said and what the firm has said to the Port is, as soon as you know what the key elements of this project are, we need to come out and talk to people about the definition of the project. On page 8, Project Definition Consultation is the very next phase. After Pre-Consultation it is the very first phase and the Port is thinking they will be ready to do that in the fall. Exactly when in the fall it hasn't been determined because they haven't got their project definition, the key themes of the project, nailed down yet.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* However, and I don't want to create panic where panic doesn't need to be created here so Judy kick me under the table but while I can't tell you that the project is specifically, and you used the word north, everyone I've talked to about Deltaport has a different interpretation of where north is. On the upside, choices of where the upside or down side, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans has stated in writing that a terminal on the Deltaport side by the causeway would not be permissible. That's just information and make up what you will.
- Q: *Vicki Huntington:* Can I just clarify, Cliff, your comments around open house. If looking for how we want to be consulted then are you prepared to add to the list an open house/public meeting combination?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* Yes, absolutely. I can answer that for Cliff. Because if people want to do that, it is a very reasonable format in any case, Vicki.
- C: *Vicki Huntington:* That would go a long way.

- A: *Judy Kirk*: Because here is the thing, Vicky. For everyone here, the best open houses that I have seen undertaken, it doesn't matter on whether it's policy, planning or infrastructure have been those that allow people to look at some information that might not be nearly as informed as you are or others, and then to have a Q & A session. Those are usually the best. If you go right into Q&A, people who are not as informed and involved as you are don't have any basis of information at all or an opportunity to talk. So there will be some combination.
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: The combination is just great. That's fine as long as you have the second component of it.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: You know what, mea culpa on that, we should have probably indicated that.
- Q: *Ian Robertson*: I'd like to make a suggestion. Fifteen years ago when I was involved in details of and some around the table may recall, as the conflagration around cement plant and burning of materials for energy resources. When I first got involved with that there was an awful lot of anxiety in this community. I'm not going to take credit but two and a half years later we had difficulty getting the photographer for the paper to come out to the final meeting as we announced in a twenty page report. In addition to that twenty page report final report there was over three hundred documents which were indexed, cross indexed and then filed at the Ladner Public Library and it was kept on the shelves at the public library for some five years after until it was gathering dust. So my thought for you would be going forward if it's possible you may do yourself a great service to make sure that everything you do, and in this case what was included in that were in minutes of every meeting we had, in making that available. Electronically is obviously the preferred method now if you can access it but hard copy in a library or more than one library would also be suggested. If you do this on a going forward basis it's the cost of incremental printing. You do it after the fact and you have to hire somebody to go through the indexes. It would be my suggestion that keeping it very visible and transparent would be one of the ways to do it.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Thank you for that. I think before you got here too Ian, and I won't repeat much else, there was also requests for as much information as possible. Things like study outlines and the studies themselves, results and those kinds of things to be made available and technical work.
- A: *Ian Robertson*: The last study had the binders after the fact, there's no cross-indexing so welcome to the three hour job of doing something to finding the document you're after.
- Q: *Judy Kirk*: Any other comments on topics or methods of consultation? Yes John and then what I'm going to ask people to do if you don't mind is to fill out the feedback form and then we'll leave about five minutes or so for any remaining questions you might have.
- C: *John Appleby*: One of the things you might give some thought to, and it might have fallen on something Ian might have said is the legitimacy and the

documentation of backup studies. As a case in point one of the issues we're having with the Provincial Government of the traffic studies they made of the South Fraser Perimeter Road is that we have a real problem with the base of studies because they haven't actually clearly stated what they are. It looks very much as if someone picked a set of figures that were generated in 1988 and added to them using some figures of approximating a growth of population or something like that. Where in actual fact something different has happened in that area so we think their figures are wrong. So we're both wasting a lot of time as we're trying to work out just exactly where we are on that. If you document your figures it will save greatly with time.

- C: *Vicki Huntington*: Judy, can I just add on number one where you're listing the different components and topics. Wildlife and habitats, water quality and marine species – one of the problems Delta in particular has is the only legislation requiring certain behaviour of a proponent is the *Fisheries Act*. And yet in Delta, what we basically support is the Migratory Bird Flyway and yet there's no legislation that requires the Port to do anything about it. It would be really nice to see the Port take a very proactive role in understanding that the Migratory Bird Flyway is in danger here. It's in danger because of the Port activity. I don't feel that going forward that the Port should take the normal position and hid behind the *Fisheries Act* which is what happened with the Third Berth.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: That was mentioned in a previous meeting too, Vicki. Not in the way in which you just articulated it but Cliff you remember someone said that they felt that the fisheries were adequately studied, but the migratory birds were not.
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: Because there's not legislation requiring the Port to do anything about it.
- Q: *Tom Johnston*: Can I ask some of the politicians present, what is the legal position regarding the local authority for example, having a referendum on this? Anyone?
- A: *Vicki Huntington*: You could have a referendum but it wouldn't be binding. It is a Federal project which means that it can go forward regardless.
- C: *Clint Morgan*: I was going to say rightfully so, that's a remark I was going to say earlier on. I've lived in Delta many years, I've worked in Delta. But we need to realize this is a national interest, this is not about Delta, this about Canada. So what rights have we got to prevent a project that is so important to the whole country, from happening?
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: You know something, Clint, we're getting into this argument. There's also a moral issue and I remember when Les Little said to me, Vicki, you've got to balance the economy and the environment. Yes we do, but Delta is all that's left of the Migratory Bird Flyway. Delta is it, and we are the balance. That's why I think you see so much concern about how this project proceeds. All of us know it's in the national interest but we have a moral obligation not only

to do it right, but to consider whether it can be done and still maintain the Flyway and that's the issue that's in front of us.

- C: *Clint Morgan*: I guess that's the choice between birds and Canada as a whole.
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: Is that a choice? I mean is that really a choice?
- C: *Clint Morgan*: I mean those containers need to come in somewhere on the West Coast. If it's not Delta, if it's not Prince Rupert then where else?
- C: *Eliza Olsen*: Prince Rupert wants it and if not good for us it's not good for the rest of Canada. If we need bailing out for whatever reason it's going to be the rest of Canada that's going to have to pay it. So we've got to make sure good for everyone.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: It's a very serious conversation. What I would appreciate is if you would fill out feedback form with consideration of what you heard and what you are thinking about how you want to be consulted and about what. You'll notice that at the very end, which we always recommend and I'm glad they took our advice on it, on page 14, there is space for any additional comments you might have. In other words please do not be constrained by either this conversation or the topics that are in here. If there's anything and any additional points that you would like to make please do make them. I'd very much appreciate if you would fill this out now. As I said earlier if you would prefer to take it home or fill it out online that's quite fine.

The meeting ended at 3:30pm.