PORT METRO VANCOUVER
ROBERTS BANK TERMINAL 2 PROJECT
PROJECT DEFINITION CONSULTATION

Multi-Stakeholder Meeting 3
October 24, 2012

Notes from a multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 24, 6:00pm – 8:00pm, at Newlands Golf & Country Club, Langley, B.C.

Stakeholders:	Brad Nichol, Britco Nathan Pachal, South Fraser OnTrax
Port Metro Vancouver:	Chris Chok, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator Rhona Hunter, Acting Director, Infrastructure Development Ben Wheeler, Senior Environmental Advisor, Container Capacity Improvement Program Stefan Krepiakevich, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder Katie Baker, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd.

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 6:05pm

KEY THEMES:

- Participants were interested in mitigation for the loss of habitat that could result from the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including potential locations for habitat banking projects.
- Participants noted that they wanted to ensure that Port Metro Vancouver balanced environmental and community needs when developing the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- With respect to the location of the intermodal yard, one participant noted that security of an upland intermodal yard should be a major consideration, and that given that much of the project would already be built in the marine environment, it would make sense to build the intermodal yard there as well.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Chris Chok

Chris Chok welcomed participants to the multi-stakeholder meeting and explained the format of the meeting, as well as introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Chris informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy. Roundtable introductions followed.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* What do you define as a stakeholder?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* A stakeholder would be a person who has shown a particular interest in the project in the past. We've been out in the community before, so we consider our stakeholders people who have had some ongoing interest in the Port, the Port business over the course of both this project and the previous projects. It's a fairly loose definition. It's certainly an opportunity for us to have a more intimate dialogue with people who have an active and ongoing interest in port operations and development.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* And the open house would be more like a one-off kind of thing?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* The open houses are not formal than this. It's a room with story boards. People freely mingle around, stop where they want to, ask questions. There's no minute taking or record taking at an open house.

A: *Chris Chok:* I would also point out, Nathan, that the stakeholder meeting schedule, you see it published here in the inside cover. Those are open to anybody. Anybody can come to those. We do ask for RSVPs, so we know how many people are coming out.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

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

Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?

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

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* With the Tsawwassen plans, there was a plan for industrialization in the north part of that, what's that for?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* That's the Tsawwassen First Nations, and it's not part of our program. Tsawwassen First Nation is doing development works on their own land.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So the Port's not doing anything with those former agricultural lands?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, the Port doesn't have any use or is not using those lands in any way. Those lands are being developed by the Tsawwassen First Nations independently of the Port.

C: *Brad Nichol:* Is Gateway part of that as well? The original Delta project?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* The Deltaport Third Berth is already considered complete. That's not part of DTRRIP. That was a previous project to increase capacity with a new berth. DTRRIP is really dealing with deficiencies at the existing container terminal at Deltaport, the road systems and rail systems that support it, both on the causeway, on the terminal and on the uplands.

Containerized Trade On The Canadian West Coast

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

Q: *Brad Nichol:* Have you considered the Ioco area for a container port? It's owned by Esso or Imperial Oil. I think they are looking into residential developments as opposed to industrial.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* The Port would only be looking at land that it has under its own control in terms of either non-developed or leased.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So just for a stat thing then, for your maximum expansion in 15 years you would say there's going to be the ability to move more than 4 million TEUs of stuff, where in the same period you would have 2 million TEUs coming out of Prince Rupert?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We currently have just about 4 million TEUs of capacity now. So with the addition of Prince Rupert and the DTRRIP program in 2015 we would have just over 6 million TEUs of capacity in BC.

C: *Nathan Pachal:* That's a pretty substantial improvement in Prince Rupert then.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* Right, they're adding another berth in Prince Rupert. And then they would actually be adding additional capacity to their existing berths in 2020.

Q: *Brad Nichol:* So by 2020, they'd be looking at going to about 2 million TEUs total?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah, that would be about 2 million TEUs of capacity.

Why Roberts Bank?

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

Q: *Brad Nichol:* When you talk about containers leaving the port, is rail or truck transport preferred?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* The majority of the containers leaving the terminal leave by rail. It's about 70%.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Right now we're seeing a certain number of trains. In the next 20 years is that expected to double?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It's not supposed to double. It would be another 8 to 10 trains per day. So that would be 4 to 5 in and 4 to 5 out, in addition to what you have now. This infrastructure work is being done long before the expansion at Roberts Bank and it is designed with that in mind

C: *Nathan Pachal:* Just a comment. Brad, you've raised this point about the Gateway program. My understanding is that the Gateway infrastructure program has been around for a long time, and that South Fraser Perimeter Road and the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program are elements of that.

C: *Brad Nichol:* It's like your neighborhood expands and then you build the schools and everything else to match the increase in population. You're kind of putting the horse before the cart now, so as taxpayers, especially the taxpayers of Langley of Delta aren't hit with that later.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* And a more recent announcement was the Premier's commitment to look at replacing the George Massey Tunnel.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* How does that help the Port?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Well, it's not so much that it helps the Port, but it will certainly deal with some of the traffic concerns that are out there for the residents in Richmond, Delta and the Surrey area who were commuting and probably from this area. I am not sure whether people commute from here through George Massey. But from South Surrey into Vancouver would benefit from the replacement of the George Massey Tunnel.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* There was a document way back for expansion, but their plan was to go with transit in that corridor because it was said that they would have to do capacity improvements along the whole corridor, and that wasn't going to happen. So it's not going to expand through Vancouver and over the Oak Street Bridge. For trucks and for actual goods movement that is.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't think the tunnel replacement is going to deal with trucks going into Vancouver. But it will certainly alleviate the congestion that the tunnel experiences. This has just been announced that, we thought was pertinent to provide context that these are all related improvements to improve transportation.

C: *Nathan Pachal:* This is an additional improvement but it really doesn't affect the plan.

C: *Chris Chok:* We did a round of consultation last June on this project, and also for the Deltaport Terminal Road and Rail Improvement Project last fall, and one of the things that we heard very clearly at that point is, they said no more until something is done about that tunnel, and mostly from commuters, who see trucks using the tunnel and so that's been raised as a concern. And so the reason why we wanted to include this in here is to acknowledge the fact that yes, the Premier has made this commitment to study it and that it will alleviate some of those concerns.

And, we could also point out as well; they've set a 10-year timeframe, which would likely be before this project could be on-line.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* As in all of these construction projects, it takes a long time to actually get something built. You have to do a lot of work at the front end before you can evens tart construction.

In this case on page 8 is a diagram that shows the infrastructure for the South Fraser Perimeter Road as well as the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program, and includes 9 overpasses, which removes traffic conflicts at those at-grade crossings.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* There was something a while ago about the truckers being very unhappy because you changed how they did their scheduling. So I think that might have been mainly in Vancouver, where you had to show up within some window of two minutes or something or you lost your spot?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right. I don't think it was two minutes, but yeah, we've put a reservation system in place. In this consultation process and previous project consultation processes, as well as the Port's general engagement and outreach to the community, the issues of trucks and trucks moving around and truck congestion has led to a number of initiatives and certainly one of those is the reservation system, whereby there's a half hour window that they can show up to. If they don't have that reservation, then they have to call truck staging facilities and will go in

order of truck staging facilities, so that we don't have trucks on the road at times when they shouldn't be on the road.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Has that been successful then?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It's been successful in that it's in place and I think that what happens is that over time people will realize the ramifications of not meeting their time. It's not like you can turn a switch and all of a sudden everybody is in compliance. We have a pilot program where we have GPS in many trucks and we'll soon have GPS in most of the trucks so we'll actually know where the trucks are on the road system, since our operations centre can monitor that.

So there are a number of initiatives that are being undertaken by the Port to try and deal with trucks on the road and making them more efficient and less of an impact on the regular traffic on the road.

Q: *Brad Nichol:* Is there any focus on the green portion of traffic? Certainly there are new trucks out that have a better emission system. But we talk about idling and having customers, you know the TSIs of the world. Whose responsibility is this?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We have actually the Truck Licensing System, which is designed specifically to address that, in that right now in 2015 all trucks that access the Port will be required to obtain a 2007 engine emissions standard. In order to get into our Ports you have to have at least a 2007 engine platform. So we are phasing that over time to remove the less efficient trucks from the road and require them to be at a certain standard.

Q: *Brad Nichol:* So will there be spot checks on that?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* They actually have to be individually licensed. So it doesn't get a license until it passes the standard. So it's much like the Air Care standard in that way.

Q: *Brad Nichol:* Even if it's a U.S. bound truck?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* To access the port they will have be. And that's really to address the air quality. The reservation system is also designed to improve the air quality by eliminating truck idling. If they're not within their half-hour window or they're early, then they will have a staging area where they will sit with their engines turned off until their window is available.

Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including estimated economic impact (page 10 of the Discussion Guide), and terminal orientation and location (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).

C: *Brad Nichol:* I think from my experience on reading some of the dissertations from Gulf Canada, was that caissons were fairly proven and that was almost 25 years ago. And I know that Holland is using similar technology for building some airports. I think this is the better way. Obviously Fraser River Pile and Dredge or a couple of other pile driving companies, would love to drive 1,500 piles for you, but the noise considerations and specially stability factors, I personally would say caisson. And I think probably would open up future chances for expansion, because there's still a lot of room to expand here. That's beyond our live times for sure. But personally, that would be my recommendation.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* One of the considerations with the piles was that there was a concern of the impact on the mammals from the noise of the pile driving for that many piles for that length of time and the impact on the marine wildlife.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Is it not on the Pacific Flyway down there?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It is, yes.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So that would disrupt birds, probably.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* More likely the impact to the Killer Whales and those sorts of things. Although I would imagine that certainly the wildlife, the flying wildlife would be not happy with the noise from pile driving. They'd likely stay away from those pile driving noises too.

Marine Terminal

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the terminal layout (page 14 of the Discussion Guide), as well as the tradeoffs between potential locations of the terminal intermodal yard (page 15 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* That's a multi-kind evaluation. Did you do one of those? Where you list it all out?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, we haven't done a tradeoff analysis of on the causeway, off the causeway, or upland or on the causeway. We're very early in the process here, and through the consultation process, if there is a preference that says "really we'd rather that you not increase your footprint on the marine environment" or "you should consider what the impacts will be if you, went into the upland", then we would go forward with that evaluation. We'd have to do a lot more work around what exactly the upland or the causeway would look like.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* But at this point, like just for someone like myself, it would be very hard to make a decision on 1A or 2B or anything because I have no idea what is better or worse.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I recognize that. And so we're looking for a preference or a direction. As I said, we're quite early on in the process here.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So you could study both and figure out which one is better and put it on a sheet of paper so you have something that you can compare.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So if you would like to see a tradeoff analysis of the upland versus the marine, I recommend that you put that in a feedback form. That kind of feedback helps us.

We're not taking any more agricultural land then we need to. That's really one of the primary drivers because we are going to be creating land and we're going to be impacting the marine environment. We knew that if we were going to go into the upland environment we probably needed to have a really good reason to do that. And so we thought if we went to the public in a consultative process and there was a clear directive from the public saying, "You know what, we can't just make that choice, we need to consider both of them" then that would be, an impetus for us to go forward and do that analysis. But we wanted to sort of have that that litmus test before we went there.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* I remember some people talking a while ago about things like in-land intermodal facilities. So why not go to Kamloops?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right. No, that hasn't been part of this analysis.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* And is that something that would be seriously considered or is that sort of a pie-in-the-sky thing?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Not for this project. Things would have to be very, very different.

Q: *Chris Chok:* Are you referring to Ashcroft?

C: *Nathan Pachal:* Yeah, I think it must have been Ashcroft.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* So, I've heard that as well, but we don't have any plans to consider that within the context of this program. So unless a partner came forward with a very quick and expeditious manner to sort of say, "we've got it all lined up", seeing as we don't own that land.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Is it outside of the Port's jurisdiction?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.

C: *Brad Nichol:* I think they're going to be disturbing the marine environment and as far as I'm concerned, it is really not a question. Because you're already going to be disturbing the marine environment already taking the caissons and sinking them. I don't think you're looking at significant costs either.

One of the things that isn't in the pros and cons here is security, when you look at the fact that you want to maintain control of these containers. You also have competitive landscape that you are talking about, Los Angeles, Prince Rupert and every other port on the west coast that is vying for that one container to come to this port. You want to make sure that you can move that as quickly -- as quickly as possible into Canada or to the other markets.

So if you want to talk about trying to create the operational efficiencies, 1A just seems to be, you know, the best alternative, and having been on the docks and see what really goes on on the docks with security, especially since 9/11, is of the utmost concern. And for a port to have control of that container until it gets to the rail is of upmost importance to, not only you, but also to Canada as far as national security.

Having been, and then to see all the container ports, it is sometimes when those big container ships come in, it is mayhem and to have control of that and not have to double handle something --

A: *Rhona Hunter:* And post 9/11, that certainly impacted the security issues on all of our port faculties, which weren't there 15 years ago.

In addition to the terminal, there is causeway widening, and the causeway widening supports additional rail tracks, as well as a new repair yard for Terminal 2. So there are repair requirements for the trains that visit the existing Deltaport terminal as well as Terminal 2. So we would have to realign the existing tracks as well.

In terms of road improvements and this of course relates to a 1A option with the intermodal yard being on the terminal. If it were to change, then this configuration of the rail would also change.

Road improvements on the causeway include an additional overpass on the causeway adjacent to Terminal 2. There would be a Terminal 2 access road, there would be a vehicle access and control system, security environment, as well as we're looking at the possibility of an emergency access road being put on the terminal, which would be a two-lane gravel road which will

facilitate the ability to get emergency vehicles out onto the terminal in case there was some blockage on the existing road.

Q: *Brad Nichol:* You mentioned earthquakes. We know the big one is coming, and when it comes it's going to be devastating. Let's look at the design of this terminal. Is there any qualification or in the back of your minds thinking that if it does happen this is going to be liquefied and there won't be anything left?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It's an interesting question, and one that we haven't firmed up our design criteria on. We know we're not rebuilding the existing causeway, which had a design which was done back in the sixties. So it's probably not to today's standards in terms of seismic stability. So if the big one came along, the causeway itself would probably be the limiting factor in that the existing causeway would not be able to withstand the big one. And so whatever we do on the causeway, we may build additional parts of the causeway to current designs, but we're not going to replace the existing causeway.

The terminal itself will be designed to current seismic standards for marine terminals. Because the causeway is that limiting factor, we haven't quite made up our minds exactly where that threshold is. It will certainly meet current standards, but how far beyond we go hasn't been determined.

But it's not being designed right now to withstand the big one because the related infrastructure is not at that stage. So unfortunately, like most of our systems and infrastructure, we'd probably be in a situation where we would have less than ideal services for a period of time.

The upland road and rail, under a 1A scenario would include some new rail sidings and new rail tracks at the two existing yards, Gulf and Fisher. On page 14 there is all future yards, which are quite a bit upland from the causeway and there'd be a new turning wye off Arthur Drive.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So that's the 10 hectares of land that would come out of the ALR?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* That's right. These upland requirements are within the existing options lands, and it would take approximately 10 hectares of the existing option lands to meet the upland requirements of the new terminal as it is currently designed.

There would be road improvements including four-laning Deltaport Way intersection, improvements and redesign on 41B and Arthur Drive, and those would all take place in the existing B.C. Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure right-of-way.

Habitat Replacement

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

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* With the new federal requirements, do you have to do more or less compensation work?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We don't know yet, actually, because they're only now drafting the regulations. We don't actually anticipate seeing the outcome of those regulations probably until early next year. We know that it's changing and that there's potential that we're going to go from strictly habitat compensation to mitigating for fish habitat specifically. So we understand that there are

some changes, but the actual specifics of what that looks like to us, we won't know until probably early next year.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So if before you were going to conserve 100 hectares, and now you don't really have to do anything and you say "law says we only have to do 50 now and only in this spot so that's what we're going to do".

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I think we'd wait to see what the regulations say. I think the Port has a really good track record of mitigating for environmental impacts.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Has it been above and beyond?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Typically, it's been what's been required through the environmental review process. But what we're doing here, and that relates to that question, is that what we're doing here is that we're embarking on a program that's going to develop and restore habitat. So we actually have started already to do the habitat redevelopment, habitat mitigation, we're looking at building habitat. And we're putting it into a bank, and so we're building the new habitat before any project is even approved. And we're anticipating that regardless of what happens in those projects, whether it goes ahead or it doesn't go ahead, the Port is embarking on a preemptive program to create habitat, bank it, so that any proponent of the port can come forward and they can withdraw as compensation when their project is approved from the bank.

So we're actually coming in ahead of the game. We're trying to actually re-establish and redevelop and build habitats before projects impact the habitat.

And one of the things that's really beneficial about that is that typically the regulations have had some high ratio compensations, so they say to the proponent, "You need to build a two-to-one offset" because they know that if you build two hectares of habitat, in five years' time there really may only be a hectare and half of functioning habitat, or maybe even less, maybe only one hectare of functioning habitat.

So the requirement at the beginning is that you build more because you might have less that's actually functioning. By banking habitat you actually put it in the bank. It's functioning habitat and it has to be viable functioning habitat and stable habitat before you can withdraw from the bank. So when you're withdrawing a hectare of habitat from the bank, it's established habitat.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So are you in the business of conservation then and have people working for the Port that are conservationists, much like Metro Vancouver parks people, the stuff with Burns Bog, or do you work in collaboration? Or how are you doing that?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We're actually going to be working more in collaboration with existing organizations. We anticipate it being a lot of partnerships with First Nation communities, both their businesses as well as their members, because we see that as being a tremendous linkage with their interests and their goals, as well as the Port's goals. We see that as being probably the biggest component.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Would you compensate mostly in the Lower Mainland, or would it be like the ALR, where "Oh yeah, I did a project in the Peace River"?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Our focus is in the Lower Mainland. Certainly if we got to the point where we exhausted all options in the Lower Mainland we would start to expand that outside of the Lower Mainland, but our initial look is at the Lower Mainland. And we also see this not only First

Nations, but in communities or Ducks Unlimited or other conservation groups have projects or want to partner with us on projects, and we see that as being a catalyst for developing habitat.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So you could do restorative work in the Nicomekl floodplain and river then? And perhaps the City of Langley could, for example, ask you for a lot of cash to restore stuff?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right now we are working with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans on this, and so we have some requirements as to what we can bank. It has to meet their requirements. So it's not just any kind of habitat. We can't go and build wildlife habitat and make it into this bank. This is a fish-oriented banking system.

So certainly there are opportunities to work with communities and on rivers and marine environments.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* And I guess municipalities must be aware of this? I'm on the parks committee for the City of Langley.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We are only just embarking on our sort of community engagement on this component. But if you'd like to have some more information, we could provide that.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* That would be really good if you talked about that on our committee meetings. We have a lot of fish-bearing waterways and areas that were classified by DFO as being important.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Excellent, and we would love to take an opportunity to get engaged and communicate what our program is and see whether there's opportunities, and that's exactly what we are looking for. We prefer to work with existing proponents and existing organizations who have already the ideas and perhaps even the infrastructure to do this sort of stuff and we can help fund it.

C: *Chris Chok:* We'll note it as a follow-up.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah, absolutely. There is an interesting picture here in the guide further on habitat is that for DP3. This is one of our projects that we did and it's a salt marsh restoration. So, you'll see here this is an area on the left-hand side, 2007, that on the foreshore of this TFN you can just see the causeway in the background there, with the trains on it, and it was basically smothered by logs over hundreds of years and we simply went in and we removed the logs. The simple activity of removing these logs then three years later there is a fully functioning salt marsh that exists, and that's the type of things that we would do in terms of marsh restoration and habitat work.

Compensation for Agricultural Productivity

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding Port Metro Vancouver's potential mitigation and compensation options for the loss of agricultural productivity (page 19 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* With the ALR exclusion, I remember something from a while ago that was already excluded from the ALR. Have you already gotten that land removed or hasn't been removed but allowed for non-farm use and transportation?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* That's right. That's why it's called the Option Lands.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Because I did a report on the ALR just south of the Fraser and I seem to recall it's already happened.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* That's right. So that happened in 2009 and it was designated for rail use. It wasn't removed until the land is required, and so in DTRRIP we are using a portion of that option lands for the rail works.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* But you don't see a request for this project to exclude further land from the agricultural land reserve?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Final design would dictate exactly how much. We're currently looking at around 10 hectares, which would be within the existing option lands.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* But I guess if you were to do the upland intermodal that would take a lot more agricultural land.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We would have to take lands in excess of what we have within the options, yes.

A: *Chris Chok:* There's a footnote on page 19 explaining. It's owned by the Province of B.C. through B.C. Rail.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* And so if anything more than the option lands was needed it would have to go through a process far more rigorous than using the option lands, which is still an application, but we would have to go through a larger application to use more of those lands.

Environmental Assessment Process

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the environmental assessment process for the project, including identification of anticipated consultation opportunities and categories for environmental study (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* For the community legacy benefits, could you do something similar to mitigating traffic with investments and public transit and funding that, or would that be not something you could actually do?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I would say if that's an idea that you have, absolutely put it down. We'll get to community legacy benefits in a little bit, but none of that really has been defined yet. It's something that we're really looking and we look towards communities to provide us with what it is that they want.

We anticipate the environmental assessment process taking up to five years, certainly four years, up to five years, depending on how much additional work the regulators may require of us in terms of studies or assessments. And as I say, the environmental assessment process has its own regulator and consultation process. We will be overlaying that with our own consultation process along that period as well.

We do envision being through regulatory process by 2016, which would allow us to begin pre-construction activities in 2017. It is anticipated to be a six-year construction process. So that would have us coming on-line around 2024.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Is this fully funded?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* The funding mechanism is something that's going on in parallel with our design and market review process, and if I were to sort of extrapolate upon that, the Port is a non-shareholder, financially self-sufficient corporation. So we actually have one shareholder only, that's the federal government, and we pay the federal government.

So the Port doesn't get funded by the federal government, the Port funds the federal government. However, in a project of this size and magnitude we would be going to the marketplace for funding, and the shape and form of that ask and configuration of what that looks like has yet to be determined. But that's a process that's being run in parallel to this.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So there are no funds for this right now and you're going to see funds from the marketplace. Is that like government and people that use the Port facilities kind of thing?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It would more than likely be private funding. It wouldn't be government. Not to say that there wouldn't be funding opportunities that we could take advantage of, much like any other entity that could take advantage of funding opportunities, but we don't foresee it as being government-funded. Those would be separate or distinct programs that are available through regular channels to other developers of property. We primarily see funded outside of the federal government.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So an operator would come and build this facility and take care of it.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Or a funding partner with an operator. We could potentially partner with a number of operators. We might partner with a private financial institute, maybe a combination of those. So that mechanism is something that's being determined as we go along, and probably won't be finalized until we've actually got the permit in our hands, because there's obviously a close tie between the ability to build the project and a funding partner being willing to sign a cheque.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Is there a dollar amount attached to this yet?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah, we're looking over $2 billion.

C: *Brad Nichol:* Is this the last opportunity to expand for the Port? There's no other area within the Burrard Inlet area?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* If we were to look at our existing terminals as they exist now, we do see some optimization within the inner harbour that might take place in the late 2020s. That would be based upon existing leases and infrastructure that would have to be put in place in the inner harbour in advance of an increase of capacity there.

Q: *Brad Nichol:* So in the Port Moody area there's nothing that the Port owns right now that could be used?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, there's no additional capacity increases contemplated outside of those Roberts Bank Terminal 2 and then potentially in the inner harbour.

Categories for Environmental Study & Community Legacy Benefits

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the categories for environmental studies as part of the environmental assessment (page 20 of the Discussion Guide), as well as potential legacy benefits for the community as part of the proposed project (page 22 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So education could be a legacy thing?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Education? As long as it's a capital funding scenario. We couldn't get into an operating-type of scenario.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Are there examples of where the Port can come and build the new facility and make the economy go better and provide jobs and also making the environment better at the same time? Because sometimes it feels a bit one or the other.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I would say yes, and it would depend on what it was.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* I was just wondering if the Port, once you're done this project, will the economy and the environment be better off?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I think the Port's vision is that it does actually provide both stimulation in a sustainable manner, and that we look at what we do from an infrastructure standpoint, from a sustainable standpoint and we're looking at putting in shore power, which is something which today is not widely used simply because the vessels that are currently in the fleet are not fit for shore power. But we allowed for it it on DP3, as well planning on putting it in Terminal 2, getting ready for ships to plug in as opposed to idle offshore to provide their services.

I would have to say that that whole question of did we come out even or did one come above the other is more the perception from communities and what the person brings to the table in terms of what they value.

I think that's where the legacy benefits really comes in, is that the Port says, we're part of this community and this is things that we have to do because that's what we're regulated to do, but we recognize that being part of the community means that we give back to the community, and so that investment is an initiative that the Port has to say, we want to give back to the communities because we want to do more than what we have to for regulatory requirement, and it's not just the environment that needs to be supported, it's the community.

C: *Chris Chok:* I don't work for the Port, and I know that the Port has a dedicated environmental programs department and they were the first port in Canada to have that. And so they deal basically with the Port's operations and act as a regulator on the development of their tenant land projects. And they do have a very good track record. The Deltaport Third Berth Project, for example, included improvements to Highway 17 that separated the truck lanes and so on, as well as the $25 million worth of investment that was done for the habitat compensation.

Q: *Brad Nichol:* Well, it could even be something as simple as the marine mammal rehabilitation fund, which is supported by the Vancouver Aquarium. To perhaps become involved with that, because there is an environmental impact on the sea and then if you are saying, "Okay, we recognize that. But in retrospect we're giving back in this way." And you know, that's appropriate to have in place for a number of years. But we even have, again not becoming involved in operating capital, but a bursary to that, or a bursary to set up a facility or possibly have something in the Delta area that may be able to benefit.

C: *Chris Chok:* That's a great suggestion and something that we'd love to see in your comments.

C: *Brad Nichol:* Sounds like a great project.

C: *Nathan Pachal:* I guess I liked seeing that there's a balance that's going on. There are some projects that seemed to happen overnight in the province, where someone wakes up and "Oh, we're getting a tunnel and a Port Mann bridge," and that didn't come from any document I saw. I've seen some of the decisions and how they're made, and a 15-page document decides it. The Evergreen Line was decided on a 15-page document and it's a $2 million dollar project, and this is a $2 billion project and you're spending a decade on it, so that's really good.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah, and you know, to that point, Nathan, we are really at the early stages and although we hope to be in a regulatory process sometime next year, that's not definitive either. So, we have an opportunity to provide input and feedback into the process and then again, once we're in that regulatory process there's a lot of opportunity for public input in the process then too. So, and as I say, we're running a separate process in addition, so we really do feel strongly that continual consultation, engagement, information is going to ensure that we have a better project.

We have, as I said, a feedback form here, which covers the questions that were raised in the discussion guide. There is the type of berth structure; the second one is the location of the intermodal yard; the third one is agriculture; fourth one are some questions around the environment and categories for environmental studies; and the fifth one is around those links and benefits.

So, if -- and then we have the last page here, and it's all online too, so it's available there, are additional comments. And so anything that doesn't fit into any of those categories that you've heard about or that you would like to provide specific, more information about, or you looking to get some more specific information from us, feel free to add that there.

I do want to let you know that we do take this information seriously, and that we are committed to providing a mechanism for participants to see what comes out of this process and then to see also how we consider it. And so what will come out of this process will be a consideration document, where data has been assimilated by Kirk & Co., and that we would then identify how we've taken that information and considered it in our project.

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

The meeting ended at 7:35pm.