

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

**Small Group Meeting 3
October 10, 2013**

Notes from a small group meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 10, 1:00pm – 3:00pm, at the Delta Town & Country Inn, Delta, B.C.

Stakeholders: Bernadette Kudzin,
Carol Thibault
Don Paulson
Gary Zabenski
Harvey Thibault
Jako Krushnisky
Jerry Cherwonick
Jim Northey
Jim Ronback
Judy Williams
Leisa Yee
Peter Holt
Robert Butler
Tom Bearss
Walter Zmud
Wilma Haig

Port Metro Vancouver: Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
Cliff Stewart, Vice President, Infrastructure Development
Sarah McPherson, Manager, Project Communications
Michael Zachary, CCIP Project Manager
Ben Wheeler, Senior Environmental Advisor, Container Capacity
Improvement Program
Stephanie Williamson, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd.
Matt Skinner, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 1:03pm

KEY THEMES:

- Participants stated that any additional port expansion to meet forecasted growth should be pursued in Prince Rupert, and not at Roberts Bank.
- Participants expressed a preference for containers to be transported by rail, as opposed to being transported by truck.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding Port Metro Vancouver's assessment of alternative options to create required container capacity, and inquired as to Fraser Surrey Docks' plans in light of the announcement to replace the George Massey Tunnel with a bridge.
- Participants requested a thorough social-economic analysis of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project that studies the social impacts of the project, not just the economic impacts.
- Some participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver consult with local naturalists and environmental groups regarding habitat mitigation and enhancement efforts to determine local preferences regarding what habitat projects should be undertaken.
- Some participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver consider opportunities to preserve and showcase the natural environment and wildlife at Roberts Bank.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

Judy Kirk welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting, and also introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Judy informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy, and outlined how participants could provide feedback. Roundtable introductions were then undertaken.

Q: *Harvey Thibault:* Are you under contract with Port Metro Vancouver?

A: *Judy Kirk:* Yes. Kirk & Co is under contract with Port Metro Vancouver but we are an independent firm being paid by them. We are contractors, not employees.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

Cliff Stewart reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including the role of Port Metro Vancouver (page 4 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Walt Zmud:* It is something about the nature of Port Metro Vancouver. I am assuming that if this project goes forward, some of that money would be forthcoming from the government. Or would it be forthcoming from the ability of Port Metro Vancouver to raise money? In other words, how is the second terminal being financed?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* The intention at this point is that this project would be financed primarily by private money.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* So you have to go out and raise the money? Offshore money?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We have to go out and raise the money. So primarily pension funds and that type of money.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* In other words, at this point in time there is no way to know because you have not yet gone through that effort?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well we certainly haven't finished that effort. It is ongoing. I think the important fact is that this project will only proceed if there is a business case that supports it. It is not dependent upon either provincial or federal money.

Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of the importance of trade to British Columbians, as well as container handling at Port Metro Vancouver (page 5 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Walt Zmud:* What happens to all those empty containers that arrived full?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* They go back empty. And the reason for that is that the ships actually reach their gross weight quicker with exports than they do with imports, and they have to top off with empty containers.

Who is Part of the Container Supply Chain?

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of container handling logistics, and also described some of the different participants in the supply chain, including trucking companies (page 6-7 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Jim Ronback:* Are you telling me that 9 chances in 10 a truck on the causeway won't be a port truck?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, I am not saying that on the causeway, I'm speaking generally. Interestingly, we were hearing a lot of complaints about container trucks in Langley. We have GPS on half of our fleet. We know that almost no container trucks go to Langley and yet we were getting a lot of energy from the room about truck traffic in Langley. In most instances, it isn't port truck traffic because the trucks don't go out there.

C: *Jim Ronback:* The problem is in Delta.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, in Langley people felt that there was a problem in Langley. We know that there are a lot of container trucks here.

Why do We Need Container Trucks?

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of how container trucks are used in the supply chain, and described the various types of transload activities that take place in the Lower Mainland, as well as the advantages provided by Roberts Bank (page 8-10 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Harvey Thibault:* What about Prince Rupert?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It's not a case of "either/or", it's a case of "and".

C: *Wilma Haig:* In 2008 the federal government issued a report commissioned by Minister Emerson at that time, and that was a stakeholder report and it clearly stated that no further containment port expansion in the Lower Mainland should be undertaken until the port of Prince Rupert had been maximized. And that has not happened.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Within the context of the Lower Mainland, there are no other available lands or places to build lands that offer the required combination of deep water access, road and rail access.

There are two other projects that have been under development for several years, which have the dual purpose of both mitigating the impact of past developments and also creating opportunity for Terminal 2 to be brought on line without further impacting road and rail traffic. Those are the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which I think you are all aware is going to be opening sometime in the next few months here. And the other is the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program, collectively about 1.5 billion dollars of infrastructure designed to reduce truck congestion, traffic congestion and to reduce the impact of the rail line on the communities that are on either side of it.

Q: *Wilma Haig:* I heard you say that it had to be Delta because there was no other place with enough land. Just exactly how much land, given that the land here is agricultural land, are you planning to take?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We're not planning to take any. We're planning to build about 108 hectares, give or take. So it's not the land in Delta, it's the land for the terminal that's important.

The other thing I want to mention is that on the 20th of September, Premier Clark announced the replacement of the George Massey Tunnel and that for people who commute through that tunnel, it's obviously a good news story.

C: *Wilma Haig:* Not necessarily.

Q: *Judy Williams:* The timing of the announcement comes at a rather suspect time since the provincial government is trying to consider whether or not they're going to go ahead with allowing jet fuel into the estuary on the south arm of the Fraser or any arm of the Fraser River estuary. I am not talking about expansion so you can bring coal to the Surrey Fraser Docks or bring more Panamax freighters of jet fuel up into the sensitive estuary. The rumour I've heard is that they're going to remove the tunnel itself instead of leaving it to silt over. And if they do remove it that means a deep keel hull freighter will be able to come up the river. Now is it going to be removed or is it not going to be removed?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* I have been told that it is going to be removed but I can't confirm that.

Q: *Judy Williams:* And what is the reasoning behind that removal?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Because they are building bridge.

Q: *Judy Williams:* I know they are building the bridge. I'm asking about why they can't just leave it in place and build a bridge?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* For the reason that you just said.

Q: *Judy Williams:* So it is because they're anticipating more traffic up the river?

C: *Judy Kirk:* Judy, I think what you're saying is that taking out the tunnel would allow for more ships and deeper ships, is that it?

Q: *Judy Williams:* Yes, deep keel hull like for the Panamax oil tankers.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So let me very quickly explain this because we could spend a day talking about it. The Panamax-class vessels that you mentioned tend to be dry bulk vessels, but are a good proxy for some tanker types. About 80 percent of the world's Panamax fleet could go up the river fully loaded today without any problem. So removing the tunnel certainly does have an impact

because if you remove the tunnel and slightly deepen the channel then the other 20 percent of the Panamax vessels could also go up there.

While the tunnel is currently a limitation to container vessels going up the Fraser River, if the tunnel were removed the next size of container vessel that could get up because of the draft restriction being removed is too long to be turned in the river. So the replacement of the tunnel doesn't have anything to do with containers. In terms of both dry or liquid bulk, while the tunnel might be a slight impediment to some parts of the world fleet, the types of vessels that I think people have in mind, which is what we would call on the liquid side Aframax, or on the dry bulk side Capesize vessels. Capesize is the sort of 100,000 tonne vessel that you see out at Roberts Bank loading coal.

C: *Judy Kirk*: Judy, just for everyone else's benefit, I think Geoff Freer is the Project Director for the Massey Tunnel project, and Cliff may well have been told that the tunnel is coming out but I think your question and anyone else interested in that would be better directed to the Ministry of Transportation.

C: *Jako Krushnisky*: There several different layers you can look through and figure out on this thing. I have lived here 47 years, and I've seen some changes so far but nothing as dramatic as what the port is driving right now and there are several reasons why it is happening. And you can look at a lot of different things going on that all point to the port as the reason it's all happening. The treaty that Tsawwassen First Nation achieved where we now have a fairly good chunk of very good farmland is now being classified as commercial/industrial. Coincidentally, I listened to some of what the Tsawwassen First Nation said in our rotary meeting earlier this morning. It was a very poor presentation, poorly informed, it's just a bad presentation and there's really not a lot of expertise over there. They decided at their last election with 89 votes that they are going to build a 1.8 million square foot mall in the middle of nowhere, and they're going to convert a major chunk of farmland to industrial use to support the port.

Replacing this tunnel is not about the need for residents to move through the tunnel. It's not really Delta that's grown, it's areas to the south but it is primarily truck traffic. I thought when they put the new connection to Highway 17 that the idea was to take it over through this industrial area and over the bridge to locate it closer to the Knight Street Bridge or something like that. The way they show in the picture is very misleading. It is not going to be this low-slung structure. It blows right by Steveston Highway. There is no way this bridge works in this area. The Massey Tunnel was configured at a different cost rate because it fit the area. The new bridge is connected to the port.

Q: *Walt Zmud*: My question is about what's likely to be shipped out of the Fraser Surrey Docks? Now as you probably know and I am assuming that most people in the room already know as well, they made a proposal for shipping coal from that location.

A: *Judy Kirk*: Walt, we're here to talk about Terminal 2.

Existing Containerized Trade on the Canadian West Coast

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the existing opportunities for containerized trade on the Canadian West Coast (page 13 of the Discussion Guide).

C: *Judy Williams*: Fraser Surrey Docks is only mentioned on the map, it's not mentioned in the text.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* That is because it doesn't have a viable container future and is not going to be a facility in the future. It currently handles a few containers but it is almost out of that business simply because there are so few ships calling Vancouver that can actually get up the river.

Q: *Judy Williams:* Yes, but what if the bridge goes through?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Still doesn't have a viable future. The ships are too long to turn around. The biggest ship that can viably be turned up there was about 280 metres. Most of the bigger ships calling now or over 300 metres and a number of them are already at 350-metre length so they just don't have a future in the river.

So that, and virtually all of Burrard Inlet is already either developed or is a park or is planned for development. The river's not an option, and that really leaves only Roberts Bank.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* If in fact the container business leaves, what would that facility do?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* That is why they are pursuing the coal proposal because they are no longer going to be in the container business.

Q: *Judy Williams:* You say others already are planned for development so they're not available. What development?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Do you mean in Squamish and Kitimat and Rupert? There is no land available in Squamish.

Q: *Judy Williams:* No, I'm thinking of the inner harbour, at Vanterm and Centerm.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* There is a stretch on the North Shore that's currently vacant but Richardson Terminals are in the process of building a grain facility there. So if that's something you're interested in, the Port is doing consultation on the Land Use Plan, and we've got lots of stuff on the website. Nothing is ever cast in stone, but there are no other existing opportunities for container terminals.

Why Do We Need More Capacity for Containerized Trade

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the container growth forecast (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Jim Ronback:* How accurate have their projections been in the past?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Interesting question. They did a similar forecast in 2002 for us, with a base case, low and high case, and when you looked at the actuals they were within the cone even through the world economic crisis. The cone is between the blue and the green lines, and as you go out, uncertainty grows so you have a range. They have a pretty good track record.

Q: *Gary Zabenski:* Let's say all things being equal and this goes forward. Do your figures take into account the extra business that would come in? Since the container traffic is being deferred to Seattle because we're not able to handle it efficiently, so they are docking in Seattle instead of Vancouver and then trucking it up. So if this comes available, then we become more efficient and therefore reclaim some of the shipping that we've lost going to Seattle. Because people forget that Vancouver used to be the busiest port on the Pacific coast and now it is being lost to San Francisco and possibly Seattle because of the proximity to Asia.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Actually it's pretty much the opposite of that. In the container business about one percent of our cargo leaps across the border and goes to American ports and about one percent of their cargo leaps across the border and goes to our ports.

When our one percent gets down there, and since their economy is ten times the size of ours, our one percent becomes about point one percent of theirs. It's a rounding error. Their one percent comes up here and it's about 10 percent. So about 10 percent of the volume that we handle today and have handled historically is American. We have assumed that that same proportion would carry on into the future. The capacity we're talking about building is primarily for Canadian business though.

Prior to the opening of Deltaport in 1996, about 30 percent of Canadian import containers went through American ports primarily in Seattle and Tacoma. As soon as Deltaport opened, those containers came back up here, and the reason they came back up here is because it was much more efficient, much more cost effective for the logistics chain for getting Canadian destined goods into Canada and getting Canadian originated exports out of Canada.

Q: *Gary Zabenski:* So if Roberts Bank is built, you're assuming there would be no additional traffic coming to Vancouver that used to go to Seattle? Is that what you're suggesting?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* If I understand the question, we expect that the cargo coming to Terminal 2 would be 90 percent Canadian cargo and about 10 percent American cargo. This is pretty much what we have today. So there is container growth but the split will still be 90/10.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Is the forecast for the port available for any kind of independent scrutiny?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, it is online at www.portmetrovanancouver.com/RBT2.

Q: *Don Paulson:* When was the forecast started and completed by Ocean Shipping Consultants?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* They did a forecast in 2012 and they updated it again in 2013.

Q: *Don Paulson:* So it was after the big economic turn down of 2008?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* The one I was mentioning that they did in 2002, obviously that was before, but this is a completely new forecast done in 2012 and then updated in 2013.

Q: *Harvey Thibault:* The question I have actually relates back again to Prince Rupert. You said there is no opportunity to expand Prince Rupert, that you can't grow there?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, what I said was they have two projects scheduled. So they currently have about 700,000 TEUs in capacity and they're pretty much full. Once those are completed that will take them to about 2 million TEUs, which will make them just slightly smaller than Terminal 2 or Deltaport would be.

Q: *Harvey Thibault:* I guess what I am trying to sort out is you said the expansion has to be here. Can Prince Rupert not take up the extra growth that would be here and also what is there.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So let me just tell you what you're seeing on this graph. This is the West Coast of Canada so it is both Vancouver and Prince Rupert. The horizontal purple line is the capacity of existing terminals today and then each of the vertical lifts is a project either here or in Prince Rupert that is forecast to add capacity. The dotted purple line below it, we call it the 85 percent line. In any thing you have a certain ultimate capacity but when you hit the ultimate capacity it's

not running very well. You can stuff more through but it doesn't run very well. Eighty-five is sort of the free flow, and it's where you want to be most of the time, there or below.

The green, red and blue lines are the demand forecast lines. So in other words, any time the demand line crosses either the 85 percent that means you're running a bit rough or if it crosses the true capacity line you actually have to turn cargo away.

Q: *Don Paulson:* So what are they doing in Prince Rupert?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So they built their first terminal, and their future projects are Phase 2, and they have split them into stage 1 and stage 2. And those two projects together will take the total capacity in Prince Rupert to 2 million TEUs.

Q: *Don Paulson:* So Phase 2 doesn't exist yet? It's a planned initiative?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Stage one doesn't even exist. They have permits but they haven't actually started construction, which is a bit problematic for us because we are kind of depending on them building their stage one by about 2015 or so. Otherwise you can see it's going to be a little bit tight.

But those are both notional projects. Those are projects for which there is land available, beyond that there is no other land available in the Prince Rupert, since it's already been earmarked for other purposes.

Are There Other Options for Creating Container Capacity?

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the various options for creating additional container capacity at Port Metro Vancouver (page 14 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Walt Zmud:* So what you're saying is that you've squeezed some efficiencies out of the system and increased the capacity to handle more terminal traffic. But it seems to have reached the point where there is some degree of dissatisfaction, at least as part of the trucking community. The turnaround problem is becoming critical again.

Has there been any consideration given to a multi-shift operation? My observance is at this point that you guys are basically operating on one shift. My question is why not two, why not three?

C: *Jako Krushnisky:* You can't sleep at night around a port when they do that.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Before I ask Cliff to answer that question I am going to ask Judy and Jako to go and then if you could answer Cliff.

Q: *Wilma Haig:* I'm wondering what the premise is for all this growth that you're forecasting. I mean do you really think that we're all going to need so many more television sets. You know the planet is not growing. It's seems high to me. I don't know why you think we're going to grow and grow and grow and grow and grow. It just can't happen.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* I guess the premise is growth. If growth doesn't materialize then the terminal won't be required and if it is required then it will be built.

Q: *Wilma Haig:* But it doesn't sound like that. It sounds like you're building it anyways. It sounds like it's build it and they will come.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No. It's 'build it if they're coming', NOT 'build it and they will come'.

Q: *Judy Williams:* How are you going to determine and who's going to determine if they are coming?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's the demand forecast. If you go for the next four years and you're on the demand forecast lines that you have here then I think you've got some rationale to say "yeah, it looks like it is still happening, we best get started".

If for the next four years you don't see any growth then you would say, "well, I guess it's not happening and therefore we don't require it". Therefore we don't need to be rushing to build it. The challenge that we face is we don't have the luxury to see. In four years we can pause but if we pause now and we discover that we needed it, we can't make up those four years. So that's why.

C: *Judy Williams:* You can't make up the biofilm either that will be destroyed.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* But we won't be destroying anything for the next four years, we're in a permitting process.

Q: *Judy Williams:* I guess I would like to know what the determinants are. You mentioned earlier that if the expected growth didn't occur or develop, and you're talking now of a ten-year span of time, that you could either delay the development or abandon it all together. Now what would it take – besides everybody on this planet getting smart about sustainability and not buying throw away goods from Asia – what would it take to abandon this project?

Would you be able to, after all of the I's are dotted and the T's are crossed, would you be able to extricate yourself from any of those commitments that you've already made? It seems to me that it's a done deal. Why are we even sitting here?

A: *Judy Kirk:* We will come back to that. I think what Cliff said earlier was the business case would have to be there. The demand would have to be there.

C: *Jako Krushnisky:* To your question about is the world going to keep growing, and of course people do keep needing goods, it's true. But if shipping goods and moving things across the planet like we do were to accurately reflect the carbon footprint shipping fruit from Israel to here, we wouldn't be doing it. I will say that.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* There are three main parts to the terminal. There is the shipside berth, there is the rail side, and there is the truck side. Ship and rail work seven days a week, 24 hours a day, and trucks tend to work Monday to Friday, day shift only. There are several reasons for that. The main one is that it's a pitch and catch business. So if you want to open your marine terminal truck gates at night everybody else has to be open at night as well. And at this point in time we're just on the cusp where I think you are going to start to seeing that happen again.

I say "again" because it did happen in the early part of the last decade. We ran a lot of night shifts and then as the gates got more efficient and the terminals got expanded there was enough capacity to do it during the day shift, then nobody on the pitch and catch side outside the terminal wanted to be open at night anyway. So as soon as there was enough capacity, the night gates went away. And we're going to talk about that in a minute here.

C: *Walt Zmud:* But you will agree that as a practice it is something that is being in fact practiced in other jurisdictions, such as Long Beach.

- C: *Cliff Stewart:* Yeah, and there is a whole other department in our organization that is working on the operational side of trucking. And we will talk about that in a few minutes.
- Q: *Gary Zabenski:* I would like to know how many thousands of truckloads of sand and rock will be required for Terminal 2 and where is it coming from?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's a great question. Ultimately, whoever ends up being the design-build-finance-maintain contractor to build it will make that decision. But in all likelihood, the vast majority of the sand that's used will either be dredged on site or it will be surplus sand from the annual Fraser River maintenance dredging program. About 10 of the 14 million cubic metres that's required to build the terminal is that type of material. I don't know where the large rock that is required to build the dykes would come from, but it is likely that it would come from quarries that are accessible by sea. It is too early to say what else would come by truck, but the majority of the material to build would likely come by barge.
- Q: *Gary Zabenski:* I would like to know whether structures like the South Fraser Perimeter Road are all being done for Roberts Banks as it is today or is it being done because you're going to build another terminal at Roberts Bank? If it's just for Deltaport, if Terminal 2 is built will the infrastructure be adequate to support all the additional traffic being used on the infrastructure that's being built today?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* The federal government put about 4 or 5 hundred million into the South Fraser Perimeter Road. They did that on the premise that it was to support international trade, which includes both the existing Deltaport and a potential future Terminal 2. There are several intersections that are currently being built as intersections, which could be converted to interchanges at some point in the future. That may be required before Terminal 2 or it may be required after Terminal 2. It is obviously too early to answer that, but the provision is there for it.
- Q: *Gary Zabenski:* So you are suggesting that the infrastructure that's being built will support the additional traffic from Terminal 2?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes.
- Q: *Jim Northey:* In order to build this, you're going to have to have banking and what I want to know is how much of that banking is required for a project like this and will there be third party companies offering to bank habitats for Port Metro Vancouver?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* Thank you for asking that because within 50 minutes we have to get to that topic because it is an important topic to this. There is information in here and we're going to come back to it Jim.
- C: *Peter Holt:* This is a linear project serving Deltaport. The question was whether the South Fraser Perimeter Road is built with current operations or for future ones. I know from my time when I was with the Surrey Board of Trade, the situation of moving heavy traffic through Surrey and the Centre of Surrey along the urban roads was long overdue in their view. It was very much to serve the current size of the port as it is today and down the future as well.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Yes, if you go back and look at all the literature and rationale for that project, it was current and future.

Marine Terminal

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including economic benefits and jobs generated by the project (page 16 and 17 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Bernadette Kudzin:* Some time ago when you had other consultation and meetings about this, one of the discussions was about having more intermodal yards and space. And there was talk about whether it was going to be on the causeway or whether there was going to be the need to get more ALR land to do that. Am I right to assume that the decision has been made that it's just going to be provided for in the widening of the causeway?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* So you are absolutely correct that this design assumes the intermodal yard is on the terminal. Right out on the pod in fact.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* I know that Dr. Royanne Pettrell up at UBC has been working on what to do with petroleum derivatives in terms of run-off from the roads or the asphalt. I see your asphalt grading there, what are you going to be doing about controlling that going into the waterways?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Obviously the detailed design of that is yet to come, but the best practice for that is to have what are called oil/water separators so that if there is any hydrocarbon runoff, those will be captured and disposed of properly.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Would they be using charcoal? You really need to talk to Dr. Royanne Pettrell at UBC because anything less than what she would advise you would be absolutely useless.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* And those sorts of details probably won't be dealt with until we go through the environmental assessment process and we understand what the regulated components or best practices are.
- Q: *Walt Zmud:* Insofar as the terminal is concerned, the new one will require the creation of a new turning basin to house the vessels?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Let me talk about that. You will notice that the orientation of the terminal is at 90 degrees to the orientation of Deltaport. So where the front edge of the terminal is, the low water level at that point is about 10 metres. The berth pocket has to be about 18 metres. So that is dredged down to about 18 metres and it simply goes out to the point where the natural depth is already that deep.
- Q: *Walt Zmud:* So you're suggesting that whatever dredging occurs, begins at the terminal itself, and will have no effect on the foreshore?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* In essence it begins at the terminal face and it goes out in a bit of a wedge shape out to deep water. And in fact that is a really good point because the zero tide line runs behind the terminal, so the entire terminal is being built in deep water. It's all subtidal waters for the island.
- Q: *Don Paulson:* If you look at the front cover, which is a good illustration for what it will look like, you notice the coal port at Roberts Bank. They have a conveyer system out to a pier with a ship on the right-hand side extending toward us. And we have a lot of water with no docking facilities there. So what is that? Is that water in there an allowance for West Shore Terminal for expansion?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* When the first part of Roberts Bank was built in the '60s, they didn't have as good an understanding of seismic issues and they were afraid they might have a problem if they got

too close to the edge so they built the island back a bit and then they put the dock out where the deep water was. In the intervening years, fish habitat has been developed in that water area. So much of that water now has special habitat features, particularly reefs.

- C: *Don Paulson:* Well, from a business case it just seems like an awful lot of wasted water where you could have ship loading facilities. So you've got two pads or two islands out here and you've got about a quarter of the foreshore here that's not being used. It just seems very inefficient. I'm not going to tell you to build more dock. I am just saying it doesn't look practical.

Habitat Banking Program

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of Port Metro Vancouver's Habitat Banking Program (page 22 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Jim Northey:* With it being a bank, can it be treated as a commodity? Secondly how much banking is required for this project?

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* I think the bank analogy is a good one. It's a bit like saying "I want to save money for a car", and then you put money in the bank. Whether you actually use it for a car is another question when the time comes to take the money out. Yes, it certainly is a commodity in the sense that you can sell credits. In fact the banks that have been developed historically have been used for that purpose. Port authorities are in a much better position to manage the creation and the management of habitat than developers are. And DFO is much more comfortable having something like the port authority managing the bank. But there is certainly the opportunity to then have those habitat credits used by third parties.

How much would be required for Terminal 2? That is a question, which ultimately will be decided by the regulators, particularly Department of Fisheries and Oceans, but it is likely to be hundreds of hectares.

- Q: *Carol Thibault:* Would this banked habitat be in this area or could it be anywhere?

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* It's about the species that are going to be impacted at Roberts Bank. So if those species can be benefited with habitat that's up the river a ways, then it could be. Somebody asked me, "Are you going to put this in the Kootenays?" and the answer is absolutely no. It's about the species that are being impacted.

So if the species goes through Roberts Bank in its lifecycle and there is an impact there and you can offset that impact somewhere else then we could do that. But it is not just about creating habitat willy nilly.

- A: *Ben Wheeler:* Cliff is right. Once we understand what the effects are of the project, and which species potentially are affected, we'll have a better sense of how much habitat or offsetting would be required and where. Right now we're just collecting baseline information and just beginning the actual analysis of the effects.

- Q: *Harvey Thibault:* Two points about the habitat mitigation that bothers me, and I think it is a little bit of a double-edged sword because if you're creating and encouraging some ecosystem to move into a new area, we all know that can lead to rabbits in Australia or the zebra mussel. There's that concern. But also if you successfully created a new habitat then you decide we're going to sacrifice this other one that functions just as well as your new one does. So are you going to do away with a natural habitat? You're robbing Peter to pay Paul and you're getting cut in the process.

- A: *Ben Wheeler:* It's a good point and it's something DFO actually looks at. They actually look at what the baseline property value of that habitat would be in comparison to what we wanted to build on or improve. That is part of the accounting mechanism that Cliff was talking about. So absolutely it is something that DFO endorses.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Harv, on page 31 in the feedback form there are very specific questions looking for just the kind of feedback that you gave right now about what you think about the habitat mitigation ideas. And there is room here for your comments and if you think it doesn't make sense to rob Peter to pay Paul, I would just really encourage you to put it in there.
- C: *Tom Bearss:* On this habitat banking, which I didn't know very much about, I would like to suggest that Port Metro Vancouver consult with some of the local groups, such as the Delta Naturalist Society. Or have some expertise on habitats before they go about doing their banking and what they are going to exchange for what, because we were kind of caught by surprise with this logging thing. In our mind, it wasn't a fair or even a reasonable thing to do. You did it very quickly, and then we find out it's banking for something that we don't know what's going to happen in the future. So it just looks bad for you guys and it might be helpful if you used some local expertise to tell you whether what you're wanting to exchange or what you're wanting to do is good or not, be it logging, foreshores or whatever.
- C: *Judy Williams:* Okay I want to go back to something that Cliff or Ben said about the great successes of habitat banking and mitigation in the past. I would like to challenge that because that is not so. Take a look at the Surrey Fraser Lands Area for example. A lot of that did not take. Habitat banking can work if it's in an area that is going to enable the current species. Just as you said it has to be species specific. And going up the river for Orca habitat mitigation or lack of siltation, how the hell are you going to stop the siltation getting into the resident Orcas. You cannot use some riverine or estuarine areas or the areas that are along in the area where you now have some mitigation going on. On the cover, this one right here, in here you say you have something going on in there to protect the species. Well, so if you take and put in industry in there you're going to ruin whatever you might have been able to establish for the resident Orcas or the juvenile salmonids.
- So I just wanted to caution you about habitat banking and habitat mitigation. FREMP would have told you it doesn't always work, if the feds had still left FREMP in place. It may have only had gums but it still was a very valuable organization. As Tom just said, you have to involve the locals who know the area and know the species.
- C: *Jim Northey:* I just wanted to comment further on what the last two speakers said. For the reed grass that was planted by the ferry terminal, I think 95 percent of it ended up rotting on the beach a little bit after the first storms. And I know we've seen the logs being removed from Boundary Bay., I happen to live in Tsatsu Shores. We have residents sitting waiting for them to come and remove our logs. The communications in my opinion has been absolutely abysmal.

Habitat Mitigation

Cliff Stewart provided details for the Habitat Mitigation consultation topic, including options for mitigating impacts from the project (page 23 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Jim Northey:* My concern is that how do you justify removal of logs in a foreshore beyond the high tide line as compensation for fish habitat? You are affecting a different species.

- A: *Ben Wheeler:* Yeah, that's something we actually talked about a lot with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. We do know from our literature that there are juvenile salmon and other species using that area.
- Q: *Jim Northey:* You don't have logs above the high tide line though.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* So by definition if the logs were brought in by the tide they are not above high tide line.
- Q: *Jako Krushnisky:* When the first aspect of the project was built, what conclusions did the authority responsible for approving this thing come to in terms of not having water flow underneath the causeway? And how has it impacted the flow? Because I understand it's had a great negative the cumulative effect with the ferry terminal and the causeway. If that's true, then there has been significant damage or some cause and effect from this. Could the addition of Terminal 2 involve correcting that problem that has been created by this?
- A: *Ben Wheeler:* It is something that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans looked at and suggested investigating a breach along the causeway. Some work was done which determined that by breaching the causeway you actually have more of a negative impact. It affects the way the sediment moves as well as the way the water moves and that actually can have a larger effect than what exists right now. That's the short answer.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* It's a great question because I asked the same question. The experts don't want it done.
- Q: *Jako Krushnisky:* So water doesn't flow right now?
- A: *Ben Wheeler:* No, it does not.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* They said that if they did breach the causeway, it would be worse than if it was not breached, is that correct?
- A: *Ben Wheeler:* Yes. You are probably aware that there is eel grass on either side of the causeway and sensitive habitat there as well.
- C: *Jako Krushnisky:* Dirk Brinkman is an environmental minded forester. He has knowledge of what's been done and he said that if it initially had been done that way that would have been good but because of what has now occurred with the causeway being solid, it would impact things that are now okay.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So, Ben, let me just ask because I think it's a good question. Will that be looked at again in the process of evaluating Terminal 2?
- A: *Ben Wheeler:* Absolutely. Studying how water moves at Roberts Bank is a very important part of our studies.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* I just want a point of clarification. Roberts Bank is a loosely used term here. I just want to know if that is also inclusive of Sturgeon Bank? Can you just answer that briefly?
- A: *Ben Wheeler:* No, Sturgeon Bank is very clearly separate from Roberts Bank.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* But in the study on the biofilm they're going right straight through and also assessing Sturgeon Bank are you not?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, it is true, we have studied both Sturgeon Bank and Roberts Bank.

Q: *Judy Williams:* Does that mean you intend to expand into Sturgeon Bank at some point?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* That is not a part of the project or the design here.

Road and Rail Traffic Considerations

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of road and rail traffic considerations, as well as the traffic mitigation opportunities being considered as part of Pre-Design Consultation (page 26 - 27 of the Discussion Guide).

C: *Peter Holt:* I think one of the main considerations with this truck traffic is optimizing the flow so it moves efficiently. I think there are some easy ways as well as awfully complex ones, and the easiest ones have to be by the interchanges on the South Fraser Perimeter Road. At the moment, there is apparently a cost saving by putting in traffic light stops on there, rather than an interchange. I think that is definitely going to have a measureable effect on the air quality in the area. And as you know, should this go ahead to its full extent, and should the increase in traffic occur, then the lack of those interchanges will have an increasing effect on the air quality in the region. I just think it's a no brainer.

C: *Don Paulson:* We haven't seen the impact of the opening of the South Fraser Perimeter Road yet because it is not finished. But a lot of people really wonder how successful that is going to be. We still have a huge volume of trucks right now that plague the tunnel and the streets of Delta.

And one of my good friends who is in the same business as you said "Trucks are not the answer, you should be looking at rail". Railing everything out of Delta to a central location like Kamloops with CN and CP terminals where you can segregate your shipments, you've got two thirds going east and so forth. I realize that there is some issue with rail going through the Fraser canyon that may make that impossible. But how about Langley or somewhere else? Get it out of Delta. We don't have the capacity.

We're talking about the tunnel, which won't be ready for seven or eight years, and maybe we need to have a moratorium so that Deltaport trucks don't go through the tunnel until that facility is complete in seven or eight years. We have a real problem and even when I go through the tunnel at 10 o'clock in the morning it's all clogged up with Deltaport trucks. It's just a terrible bottle neck. There are too many trucks going through the tunnel and they need to control it.

Q: *Robert Butler:* On page 24 it mentions that the proposed 2.4 million TEU terminal results in 3,700 total truck trips and generates between eight and ten container trains. Is this in addition to the current numbers?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes.

Environmental Assessment

Ben Wheeler provided an overview of the environmental assessment process for the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including the baseline studies that are currently underway. (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).

C: *Judy Kirk:* Thanks Ben. So the only thing that I would add is that the terms of reference for these baseline studies that Ben has just mentioned are available on the project website. People asked here in Delta for that level of information. It took a while but it's now on the site.

- Q: *Jim Northey:* It states here that it's going to be a thorough and independent environmental assessment. I find it difficult to see how independence is achieved when Port Metro Vancouver is going to do the environmental assessment on their own project. There is going to be a conflict of interest.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* As with any project in British Columbia that is assessed environmentally, the proponents are required to provide the expertise to do the studies but the regulators review that information.
- Q: *Jim Northey:* But Port Metro Vancouver is the regulator... They're conducting the environmental assessment? If not, who is? How do they vote for harmonized projects?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* It's the federal government and the provincial government departments. It is not the Port.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We assume they are the regulator. We've applied and the federal government will make that decision on the 7th of November. We assume that they will be the regulator.
- Q: *Jim Northey:* What determines that Port Metro Vancouver is not allowed to do their own environmental assessment?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* As I said at the beginning of the meeting, you really need to talk to the regulators about that.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Who are they though?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency.
- Q: *Carol Thibault:* Okay, just in the case that these environmental assessments are done by the federal government and provincial government, I take it that the federal one would be the one that would supersede the provincial one. But in the end would they truly be respected or would there be other interests that would override the environmental assessments?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* These people can't answer that question, Carol, they really can't.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* I forgot to mention that one of the hats I am wearing today is the BC Surf Spawners Association. These fish are the building block of the rest of the life chain. We're talking about the surf smelt in particular. We're talking about some of the other five fish in there. But the question that I have is: when you did your studies on Roberts Bank, I remember asking you if you were going to be determining whether there were any surf smelt spawning going on in there. And can you simply tell me 'yes' or 'no' whether there is or not?
- A: *Ben Wheeler:* While I can't tell you what the results of the studies are, I can tell you that we have conducted a study to answer your exact question. And I can also tell you that that was something that was raised as part of the Deltaport Third Berth process. So we understand the importance of the forage fish and we are looking at that.
- Q: *Judy Kirk:* So in the analysis of the proposed Terminal 2, you will also be looking at surf smelts?
- A: *Ben Wheeler:* Absolutely.
- Q: *Walt Zmud:* I am assuming that it will be a blended effort between the federal and provincial government. Whichever one of those two agencies that is responsible to perform the assessment. But I understand the assessment will largely consist of the proponent actually doing

the studies, subject, to whatever kind of regulations and stipulations, Canadian Environmental Agency might stipulate. Is that correct?

A: *Ben Wheeler:* The studies are actually done by third party experts.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* So is the suggestion that the agency itself is going to be performing the assessment or would your people do the assessment?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, it would be done by people like Ben, who are professional biologists and scientists.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Subject to whatever kind of rules and regulations that the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* imposes?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's right.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Now the other thing that interests me is, because it is something that we have tried to promote in the past, and I am quite delighted that it shows up in this discussion, is that there is supposed to be a cumulative effects assessment done. So in other words, the facility is being created, and the effect that it might have on the general animal population, as well as the effects it might have on the community itself. By that I suggest that there would have to be some consideration of the effects on the community, of things like traffic, air quality and so on. So it's not just the port that's being assessed. It's an assessment of the effects on the community, is that correct?

A: *Judy Kirk:* So Walt, these guys can't speak on behalf of the regulator. I've heard that comment and we've got it in the record. I recommend that those of you who are very interested should make the time to participate with the regulator, in this case the federal and provincial agencies, to help define the scope of the studies that you're talking about.

Q: *Judy Williams:* How do we do that?

A: *Judy Kirk:* First, you need to get in touch with the regulator directly, but there are two or three ways. One is that you ask. Judy, you wear several hats with organizations, right? They establish a working group early on in the process and you could ask for a seat in that working group.

Further you can participate directly in what's called the information requirement stage. And that's the stage where the scope and nature of studies are determined.

Now I am not going to go any further because I'm not a representative of the BCEAO or CEAA but I am just saying that I encourage you to go to these websites and learn about where you can get involved in that process.

C: *Judy Williams:* These are very closed groups, and by invitation only.

A: *Judy Kirk:* I've given you my advice. There are sometimes community organizations that are also involved in the working groups.

C: *Peter Holt:* I've been in a similar situation myself. You need to find a chap who is on that group and you get invited in. It must feel like a closed shop from the outside but sometimes they are actually quite happy to have new people in because it is often the same old people who are there.

Q: *Carol Thibault:* Excuse me. Why trucks and not rail?

- A: *Cliff Stewart*: So pages 8 and 9 are really the answer to the question “why containers are on trucks and why they are not on rail?” Most of them actually end up on rail shortly after they go on a truck. But it has to do with the nature of the business, with the logistics chain, with simple things like you can’t run a container train that’s full of 24 tonne export boxes like you can run one full of 14 tonne import boxes. Things like that. So there are very good reasons why it just doesn’t work.
- Q: *Carol Thibault*: You mean the engines can’t pull it, is that what you’re saying?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: The loading and unloading is more expensive. That’s not what the railroads do. Basically, in simple terms if you’re going less than about 500 kilometres you’re going to go by truck. It’s the economics. No one is going to load a train to go to Langley to unload a train. And then there is the stuffing and unstuffing, which is what this page talks about. It happens here so they can then get off the train quickly and get to where they want to go. So if you look at page 8 and 9, they explain what it is that the containers you see running around on trucks are actually doing here. And if you followed them, you will see that the import ones almost all eventually go to either the intermodal facility in Surrey for CN or the intermodal facility in Maple Ridge for CP and then they leave.
- Q: *Gary Zabenski*: Did you do any calculations to see what the returns to Delta itself would be if Terminal 2 is built?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: We’ll come back to that Gary.
- Q: *Judy Williams*: Have you looked at the true costing? In other words, the environmental budget as well as the economic one? Some things cannot be measured with economics alone.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: So, if I could, the socio-economic analysis associated with the environmental review is the mechanism whereby the social negatives and positives and the economic negatives and positives are measured or assessed. But the scope of it is determined by the regulator.
- Q: *Harvey Thibault*: How do you quantify the efficiency, profit-making opportunities of Port Metro Vancouver vis-à-vis the negative and positive effects on the quality of life in the community? Back to that little truck question where you say, “Well, it just doesn’t work.” Well damn it, it could work if that was all you decided was the option. So somewhere the issue about the money to some corporation and the quality of life of a whole community has to be addressed.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: That’s the balance that we have to try and find as the Port Authority because our mandate is in the best interest of all Canadians, but being mindful of the impacts on both industry and communities.

Community Legacy Benefits

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of community legacy benefits as part of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including categories and examples that are being presented for feedback as part of Pre-Design Consultation. (page 29 of the Discussion Guide).

- C: *Wilma Haig*: Economics just isn’t everything. Why is everything about economics? Why not about our local food systems? Why not about our quality of life?
- Q: *Jako Krushnisky*: Okay, we’ve had the benefit of looking at the existing part of this development in operation. I live on the point so I look over on the bluff. And, you know, as activities ramped up, in particular over the past number of years, I look at that thing. There are several things for

the communities that would make us be comfortable to going forward to be accepting of any addition of this facility. One of them is addressing ship noise. Ship generators are absolutely serious and horribly noisy. I wore earplugs many nights, particularly in the summer depending on which way the wind blows. The noise actually penetrates buildings and it actually can reverberate inside structures louder than it is outside. It's a real challenge.

So you have the noise from ships and the ensuing pollution in the air from running diesel constantly. And then you add to that the diesel trains, you add to that the coupling and uncoupling, and you add that to the chiming of gantry cranes, as well as the light pollution. When you add all those components and then you start layering on the rest of it cumulatively, there is a pretty big footprint that the port, as it exists, imposes on a human now. And so to consider further incursions into our environment in this area, which includes not only those things but also bridges, additional highway infrastructure, the loss of farmlands, and it's a pretty significant impact. I am very significantly interested in how the Port can deal with the existing issues relative to health, and noise is part of that. Air quality and coal dust as well, because no matter what the Port says, everyone knows that their stuff is coated in coal dust. It just is.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So the noise front, particularly on the ship generator issue, our expectation is that Terminal 2 will be fully shore power equipped. The studies that we're seeing say that by the time Terminal 2 is up and running, most, if not all of the fleet and ships calling here will be capable of using shore power. We also hope to be announcing shore power for the Third Berth at Deltaport. I would say that it's not unreasonable to expect that there will be ships plugging in at Deltaport in the next 2 or three years.

For air quality, Port Metro Vancouver financed the installation of an air quality station as part of the Metro Vancouver network in Tsawwassen. It's been operating now for about 6 or 7 years. Interestingly enough, the work that was done for the Deltaport Third Berth Project, which projected what air quality would look like at that station, the air quality is actually better than what was projected and it is the second best in Metro.

But some really good news from an air quality perspective is there is an initiative called the Emissions Control Area, which is expected to come into force sometime in the next year in Canada. This means that when the ships are within 200 nautical miles, and certainly when they are in port and at berth, they will be required to burn ultra-low sulfur diesel. So the air quality is already amongst the best and it is going to get better.

Q: *Jako Krushnisky:* For your station, do you think that's an appropriate location almost halfway across the peninsula?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It was located in consultation with community and with air quality experts to be the place that would be most representative based on the winds that are here. Most of the time the wind is blowing up or down the straight, which doesn't have an air quality impact on the shore. But when it does blow on the shore that was the place that was determined best capture the air quality conditions.

C: *Walt Zmud:* You said something about wanting to dig a little further into things like community and legacy benefits. I think this suggestion would win a lot of credibility for your proposal. You've heard the concern expressed before about biofilm? It's significant concern because it affects a population of birds. You've probably done enough research on it to know that the Western Sandpiper can be affected and as a matter of fact, you guys almost didn't get the

certificate for Terminal 2 because of concerns in that area. If you were seen in some way promoting the health and the sustainability of that, you would do yourself a big favour.

Second, there is a colony of herons that people have probably noticed as they drive out to the ferry. A very significant and large colony that most people don't even know exists because they go by in such a hurry. But it's very significant and it means something to the people in this community. If you could be seen as supporting that as a legacy you would be doing yourself a favour.

- C: *Tom Bearss:* Good point, Walt. That colony out there is Great Blue Herons. There are about 400 nests there and they even could possibly be a unique species of Great Blue Heron only found in the Lower Mainland.

As you know the port is built on the Pacific Flyway and it is designated as an important bird area internationally. And it's a RAMSAR site so it's actually the most important bird area in Canada of all the 600 sites across the country that have been designated. It's the most important because of the types of birds and species and numbers that come there. Anyhow my point is I see you might have plans for a bird area or a bird-viewing platform, which is good. But I might suggest that you even go further because this is such an important area you could have an information centre there, a nature centre on this new place and have access to that port for visitors, like naturalists like me or bringing my birding groups. I get on to the port now but I have to sneak in, because I know people so I can get in there and they know what we are so I can see stuff if I want. You've got a lot of different cormorant nests and there is all kinds of species out there that are, you know, they're pretty neat. But I don't like to do that. I don't like to go into "no entry" places.

My point is if you're talking about legacy benefits, make this place accessible, broadcast that Port Metro Vancouver are doing wonderful things for the environment. We're not harassing and ruining it we're doing these good things, look at what we're promoting around here. Look at our information centre. Look at our big study of Orca whales and vagrant whales and that we're saving their habitat here rather than decimating it. You can flip it around.

- C: *Don Paulson:* Okay, this shore power issue is really basic stuff. Canada is not a third world country, we should not be tolerating the ships coming in here, which are tin cans in the summertime heating up to 95 degrees and then running their diesel generators. A lot of them are really dirty diesels or old ships, and pollution, noise pollution, the whole works.

Why does Delta put up with this? Because people are not complaining to the right people. We're told to phone the port authority or the port and they're not going to do anything. The situation can be resolved very quickly. Port Metro should be active in this area. If you can't solve this problem I don't have a lot of faith you can do the environmental studies properly. This is real basic stuff. You can't do this in California. Long Beach doesn't tolerate it. California doesn't tolerate it. Why the hell are we?

The solution is if you have 50 cycle equipment, electrical equipment and so forth as a lot of European and Asian craft or vessels that are coming into Vancouver. You need a step down or a step up transformer to convert it to our voltage or to their voltage so they can run the equipment. We can't have this.

- Q: *Judy Williams:* Okay, first of all I caution, yes, we need to protect that heron colony. I have gloried in its wonder and in fact, even though the eagle predated on some of the chicks, it's what

keeps the other eagles away from the whole colony. What we have to be very careful with, just like the Experience the Fraser Project, is access to the colony because they spook real easily and they could just pack up and fly away if too many people are brought in there. I mean I can see the same fiasco we see in Boundary Bay with the Great White Owls.

My question is, this air Emission Control Area 200 nautical miles out, when is that supposed to come into effect?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's a really good question. Canada signed a treaty with the United Nations. It was supposed to have come into effect last August and I think that is a great question for you to ask the government.

Q: *Judy Williams:* When you say, that it was supposed to come in last August, will this include all vessels or only the larger vessels that are polluting the air? I mean jet skis and such.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* This has nothing to do with jet skis. We're talking about vessels that are registered with the International Maritime Organization. These are big freighters that burn bunker fuel or similar types of fuel.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Okay, I am going to ask you to, Cliff, attempt to answer Gary's question about economic benefits of trade to Delta.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* There are a number of benefits to Delta, The first and most obvious is taxation. The second one is jobs. As you will notice from the map on page 11, a significant portion of the off dock facilities - which is where a lot of the economic activity occurs - are in North Delta. So those would be the two main economic benefits to Delta.

C: *Gary Zabenski:* Is there a projection as to how much the taxes are?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, but we can get that for you.

Q: *Gary Zabenski:* The side issue that you said that these ships are coming in fully loaded but going back empty?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No I didn't. What I said was that for every hundred containers that these ships bring in loaded, they take about 85 to 90 back loaded and 10 empty and the reason they take less loaded is they are so much heavier when they are going back.

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

The meeting ended at 3:12pm.