

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

**Multi-Stakeholder Meeting 3
June 15, 2011**

Notes from a Pre-Consultation multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, June 15, 2011, 10:00am – 12:00 pm, at Newlands Golf and Country Club, Langley, B.C.

Stakeholders: Nan Ames, BBCC / WRSN
Denni Bonetti, Chamber of Commerce & Bonetti Meats
Rick Green, Mayor Township of Langley
Peter Holt, Valtac
Ed Kolla, ISL Engineering & Langley Chamber of Commerce
Lee Lockwood, Valtac
Roy Mufford, Valtac
Nathan Pachal, City of Langley
Rudy Storteboom, City of Langley
Lynn Whitehouse, Greater Langley Chamber of Commerce

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

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 10:00 am

KEY THEMES:

- Participants said that the consultation process for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project needs to include consideration of rail corridor issues through Langley. There was concern expressed that the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project would increase the number of rail trips through the community, disrupting community connections and quality of life.
- Participants said that they would like Port Metro Vancouver to conduct open houses with a public meeting or question and answer component, not just an open house format.
- Participants said they would like Port Metro Vancouver to ensure there is educational information available to the public so that they can be informed participants in the process as it proceeds through multiple stages over multiple years.
- Participants requested that Port Metro Vancouver encourage representatives of railways, TransLink, Metro Vancouver, Transport Canada and others to participate in

the consultation process and encourage a more integrated planning process for regional transportation planning, including road and rail goods movement.

- Participants expressed a desire for Port Metro Vancouver to include options for consideration, as much as possible, as part of the consultation process for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
 - Participants expressed appreciation that Port Metro Vancouver is conducting pre-consultation and noted that it is refreshing to see the Port asking stakeholder how they want to be consulted and about what topics.
-

1. Judy Kirk, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review

Roundtable introductions were undertaken.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* Thank you all for coming today. Let me tell you a little bit about the consultation process. This is the third stakeholder meeting of seven that Port Metro Vancouver will be holding in this very early round of Pre-Consultation of the Proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. There are just a couple of things before I ask Cliff Stewart to introduce himself and some of the other Port people who are here with us. I'd like to ask people to put their phones on vibrate or turn them off or something that doesn't disrupt the meeting. I appreciate you putting your name on the tent cards so I can see them. We will be keeping notes and my colleague Dallas Henault will be keeping notes which will form part of the consultation record.

Kirk & Co., which is an independent firm that specializes in consultation, is doing this for the Port. We will use the notes; together with all the notes to provide a consultation summary report. We are doing a small group meeting like this so that there are lots of opportunities for you to ask questions of the Port representatives here of which there are three. You can also provide comments. The purpose of Pre-Consultation is to find out from you and others, around the region in terms of the communities we are going to, Delta, Surrey, Langley, Richmond and Vancouver to find out how you would like to be consulted and about what. This discussion guide summarizes the introduction to the Proposed Terminal 2 Project and Cliff will talk about that in a little bit. Some initial topics that the Port thinks people may want to talk about, but then you will find that what we are seeking from you by way of feedback form and today's meeting are your suggestions for how you want to be consulted and about what. So we'd appreciate your feedback forms today because we find that if we don't get them on the day of the meetings we don't get them back, or we get back fewer. That said everything is on the web, there's an online feedback form in you feel you want to think about it longer and do it online and send it to us that's fine too.

Any questions so far? I wonder if I can ask Cliff to introduce himself and continued with Sarah and Michelle.

- C: *Cliff Stewart:* My name is Cliff Stewart and I am the Director of Infrastructure Development for Port Metro Vancouver and my primary responsibility is the Container Capacity Improvement Program which Terminal 2 is a part of.
- C: *Sarah McPherson:* I'm Sarah McPherson, I work with Port Metro Vancouver on the Communications and Consultation program for the Container Capacity Improvement Program.
- C: *Michelle Lachmann:* My name is Michelle Lachmann and I am the environmental representative for the Port's Container Capacity Improvement Program.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So why don't we continue along Ed and introduce themselves very briefly and we can get started.
- C: *Ed Kolla:* I'm Ed Kolla and I run a business here in Langley and been I've also been involved in the Chamber of Commerce.
- C: *Nathan Pachal:* I'm Nathan Pachal, City of Langley Parks and Environment Advisory Committee.
- C: *Lynn Whitehouse:* Lynn Whitehouse, Greater Langley Chamber of Commerce.
- C: *Denni Bonetti:* Business owner in Langley and incoming President for the Chamber of Commerce.
- C: *Nan Ames:* Boundary Bay Conservation Committee and WRSNA.
- C: *Lee Lockwood:* Lee Lockwood, Valtac.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* What is Valtac?
- C: *Lee Lockwood:* It's a group of citizens who are concerned about the lousy transportation plan being done in the Lower Mainland.
- C: *Roy Mufford:* Roy Mufford, I'm a director for Valtec as well.
- C: *Rick Green:* Rick Green, Mayor of the Township of Langley.
- C: *Peter Holt:* Peter Holt, I'm also a member of Valtac, and also quite heavily involved in the Chamber of Commerce and the Vancouver Board of Trade's Regional Transportation Task Force as well.
- C: *Rudy Storteboom:* I'm Rudy Storteboom, I'm a Councilor with City of Langley
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Sometimes these meetings feel more formal than we actually want them to be. The intention of having a small meeting is that if at any time over the next two hours you have a comment or question, please let me know and we can get any feedback, questions or comments that you have.
- C: *Rick Green:* Well I can only speak from my side, I want there to be a significant amount of opportunity for input from our side. We appreciate this and we want to hear the outline, hear what is proposed and we've read the material.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* What I'd like to suggest is Cliff why don't you introduce with page 2, actually starting with what's the Port of Vancouver and give a little bit of background on the Proposed Terminal 2 Project.

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

- C: *Cliff Stewart:* Port Metro Vancouver was formed in 2008 by the merger of the three Lower Mainland Port Authorities the Fraser River Port Authority, Vancouver Port Authority and the North Fraser Port Authority. It is the largest port in Canada. It is the largest, most diversified Port on the West Coast of North America and it's the largest export port on the West Coast of North America. Our mandate is to support the growth of Canadian trade and essentially that is what we will talk about today. Why is trade important and what has Terminal 2 got to do with it?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* You know I'd explain a little bit about Terminal 2 as well.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* If you move on to page 6 in the guide, although it looks like a simple straight line graph, in fact it's the result of a detailed examination of expected trade pattern changes over the next twenty years based on population and per capita growth in Canada and also with our trading partners in Asia. The population, as you often know, the container business in Vancouver is much a two way business we export nearly as many containers loaded as we import loaded. What this talks about in simple terms is that over the next twenty years, based on those demographic and economic fundamentals we expect to see growth of around 5% a year. Result of that is that by the middle of this decade, there will be a gap in available container capacity on the West Coast and by the end of this decade there will be a significant gap in container capacity. The Container Capacity Improvement Program is Port Metro Vancouver's initiative to ensure that gap is filled before the demand is realized. In the short term that's going to involve road and rail changes to help realize additional capacity at existing facilities, primarily at Roberts Bank and also the lower mainland. Later on in the decade, in the twenties the provision of Terminal 2, a whole new multi-berth terminal at Roberts Bank. The objective is that we will be able to provide more than 2 million TEUs of new capacity by then. It's important to understand that we are starting this process today because it would take about ten years from the time we start these conversations until there's that facility in place with that equipment on it. Some of the questions that we have had asked of us are, why isn't this capacity being built in Prince Rupert? In the event that the new capacity is built in Prince Rupert that will give us the ability to slow down our delivery of Terminal 2. It is important to understand that it simply becomes a question of when, not if, we need that capacity. Again, just to reiterate, if we're right about 2020 we are on a critical path today with ten years today. If we don't need it in 2020 we can always slow the process or halt the process temporarily at any stage along that ten year path. If we wait five years for someone else to take care of the problem and they don't then we will have lost that five years and there's no room to make it up.
- Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So just for clarity then, you propose that you can slow down the process if there's economic changes in the forecasts but to say that you would

actually be breaking ground in 2020 is that going along as you predict? Is that incorrect? Building it now?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* The terminal would be built in 2020.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So you would be building it now?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, we expect the permitting approval process will take about six to seven years.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So you'd be building it in 2018?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* 2017. That is based on a very thorough evaluation. First of all I should say we expect that this will be a panel Environmental Assessment process. That would be what the port will request, the ultimate decision on that is the decision of federal Minister of the Environment in Ottawa and potentially the Provincial Minister of the Environment in Victoria. We would request and would expect it will be a panel process. In reviewing panel processes in Western Canada over the last several decades the average length of time that these processes take we have come up with an expectation of six to seven years from now through the point where construction could begin.

As I mentioned the program is multi fold. Part of it is to achieve better utilization of existing facilities and achieve additional capacity growth there. There are several programs that have already taken place, both Vanterm and Centerm improvements have their capacities increased by almost 100% as a result of projects in the middle of the last decade. In 2010 the Third Berth Deltaport opened with capacity at that berth unlocked and has mostly been used. There were 1.5 million TEUs of containers moved through Deltaport last year, with a capacity of about 1.8 million TEUs today. And we're looking to increase the capacity there.

Q: *Lee Lockwood:* Did you say that Vanterm and Centerm will be left in tact? I mean I look at as being fabulous real estate to be tied up in the terminal business, when that can be farmed out to the Surrey docks or Roberts Bank. I look at Gregor Robertson, I look at that saying that is a multi-billion dollar piece of real estate that isn't being used for its highest levels.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* The Port's perspective on that is that those terminals would remain in the container business.

Q: *Lee Lockwood:* Really?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* In fact, the final phase of this program sees us reconfiguring the harbour in the mid-twenties (2020s). Looking to increase capacity there so we won't see those terminals get apprehended.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Lee, if I could add, and Rick you might know from your experience on the regional district, at Metro Vancouver where I used to be on the executive, if you look at their most recent plan and even the regional strategy, which is the one you raised before they were looking pretty seriously at preserving industrial land and not converting it to either commercial or residential. This plan, which is running into some roadblocks as we speak but the current one looks at that

even more strongly. Does that square with what you've been doing at the region, Rick?

C: *Rick Green:* We have got a regional growth strategy and we have a planning meeting tomorrow. There are a number of significant pressures, and I'll get into some of that, in terms of industrial land, developing regional growth strategy. How can we get into protecting the areas we need to protect? That's why we are a little off base with Coquitlam right now. Some of the language that is being used within the region they see it as an affront to a municipality's rights. Yet we are all trying to find that balance.

C: *Judy Kirk:* A little on the proposed project and I think we should move on to what people want to be consulted on and how.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Somebody once said there's nothing new under the sun. This is an example of the Terminal 2 project building on work that was done in the late 90s. We are talking today about the consultation process itself, we look at the next phase on Project Definition Consultation and at that point we will be talking about location and specifically where it is that Terminal 2 will be, but we haven't really invented anything.

Q: *Rick Green:* If I may, on the timing of consultation, you're going through the Pre-Consultation time. What is the time frame in terms of consultation?

A: *Judy Kirk:* If I can get you to turn to page 8 it outlines seven rounds of consultation, and it is over about six maybe seven years Rick. The reason we can't say for sure how many years it'll be is because the federal and provincial regulators are going to determine whether we've made the right assumption, which is that there will be two regulated processes, or there might be three or even four. In other words they do public comment periods, hearings and we've assumed two of those.

Q: *Rick Green:* So it's talking about the six year time frame, and all the things in that six year time frame. The next step from this?

A: *Judy Kirk:* The next step from this is Project Definition Consultation and that's the second box in.

Q: *Rick Green:* What would be the timing for that?

A: *Judy Kirk:* We're thinking the fall. Now the technical work has to happen first. If the technical work hasn't happened it'll be pushed off a bit. But we're thinking the fall and it would be about a month to six weeks, which is a pretty healthy length of consultation. It would include many methods of consultation, in other words online, feedback forms, small group meetings like this around the region probably in the range of fifteen or twenty meetings; we'd probably do an open house in every community, by every community I mean the Port communities.

C: *Rick Green:* I want to get into that.

A: *Judy Kirk:* That is the kind of feedback we are looking for. We want to know how you want to be consulted and recognizing that everyone in this room, with few exceptions, is of an age that is not as comfortable with online stuff as face-to-

face. What we are looking for a mix because people are telling us they want a whole variety of things.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Are there any questions at this point?

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* How much work been done up to this point or is this a Pre-Consultation that will define what you will be writing and submitting for the Environmental Assessment. As in do you already have a stick document with what you want to see and what you want to do to the port expansion and you've done some preliminary work and you'll be submitting based on this feedback?

A: *Judy Kirk:* I'm going to answer that in two ways. As to the consultation, this Pre-Consultation right now – most organizations don't do Pre-Consultation. We recommend it all the time, not very many organizations do it. Why? Because it takes time and costs money etc. This is as you can see, before any of the process starts. There hasn't been any submission to regulators yet, there's been no outline of studies done. This is the very beginning. My firm is going to write out a report based on this feedback and the input into the process, by process I mean the consultation process, and the topics people want to discuss will inform the next stages of consultation. For example, in the last couple of meetings people have said, in the Delta area, that there's been nothing, in their view, on migratory birds. There is a topic, that isn't listed in this guide that certainly I hadn't thought about. I'm sure Michelle who's an expert in environment has thought about, but I'm not going to presuppose the seven meeting, but that may end up being something we put on for discussion in terms of subsequent consultation because people said they want to talk about migratory birds. It's just an example, but there's a difference between the consultation program and the environmental review and the scope of those studies which regulators determine, not the Port.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So you haven't come with a closed... sometimes with consultation they have it already and they just want to rubber stamp. But from what you're telling me you haven't actually done any work now except for what we're doing right now?

A: *Judy Kirk:* When you say work what do you mean?

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Or not work. Decisions

Q: *Judy Kirk:* Ok, because I just want to make sure. When you look at page 8 we've done work to determine how many phases there should be in the consultation program.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well there was a question asked yesterday and this was from people who had seen previous presentations on this in the last decade and they know that there are five locations proposed on as possibilities for T2. We haven't made any decisions on those five locations; however, DFO has made a clear statement about two of them that they would not be permissible. So while we haven't made the decisions about those, we certainly aren't looking at those two that the DFO has identified. If that's what you mean by decisions, there are some things that have been decided, but right now we are looking at options.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* Anything else before we move on? So a bit about the proposed project.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* So a multi-berth container terminal connected to the new road network that's being built, the South Fraser Perimeter Road, at Highway 17 connected to the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor and beyond that, we are just at the beginning stages of asking questions about what does that mean in detail in communities that are affected.
- Q: *Rick Green:* Maybe I come at this with a bit of a unique perspective in that I was an alderman in Delta, lived in Delta for thirty years. I was very involved in the former provincial Government and very active with it. Some I'm coming from a very staunch free enterprise point of view but I also live through as a member of council for the Spetifore Hearings for the South Delta lands and all of the environmental issues that came to that. I've seen all of the hits that Delta has taken. Now fast forward to moving out here. First of all I want to congratulate Port Metro Vancouver for going into a Pre-Consultation; I think this is a first. You should be congratulated for it. Going to Nathan's point, I think Nathan's point was very important, as long as decisions haven't been made to get to this point. As you may or may not be aware, as you've mentioned the Mufford name is somewhat familiar to those that have followed some of our goings on out here. When I ran last time, I ran because there were a number of things that I felt were sadly missing here and I felt it had a lot to do with the lack of public consultation. I said right from the outset that the proposed Mufford Crescent diversion, which was one of a series of nine overpasses that were going to take place and with the Roberts Bank Corridor and everything else. I don't apologize for it, I fought it, fought it very hard with the community and it was never about the overpass, it was about road network and what have you. One of the things, if anybody takes this very serious look at the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor will clearly understand that the Langleys, and I'm not going to begin to speak for Langley City they can certainly speak for themselves, I'll speak for the people of the Langley Township, are probably affected more by the Rail Corridor than any community in the Fraser Valley. Right now we have 15 trains a day and some of them are up to 12,000 feet in length. The overpasses that we're talking about are effectively overpasses of some convenience, not practical use. In other words, we haven't dealt with the bypass, we haven't dealt with 100 Street, we haven't dealt with the Fraser Highway. Those are the three most highly used transportation corridors we have. When you look at the growth, and I've been saying this for the last two and a half years so it's not a surprise to anyone at this table who knows me, if we don't fight this, and I want to be part of the solution I don't want to be part of the problem. I think that there are other options. We all believe there are other options.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* What do you mean other options to the Proposed Terminal 2?
- C: *Rick Green:* No, for rail.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I just want to make sure that the record got that right. So other options for rail.

- C: *Rick Green:* For heavy rail. I met with two other MLAs shortly after the election and it was suggested by the area MP that we might as well forget that idea because the heavy rail will happen with us or without us. There is one thing I do know, that I will fight it with every ounce of energy I have. We also have renewed passenger rights, thankful to a few people at this table, on the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor between the Pratt Livingston Corridor, between Trinity and Cloverdale. Those rights were renewed by BC Hydro in May 2009.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Renewed passenger rights?
- C: *Rick Green:* That's right.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* That were renewed by BC Hydro?
- C: *Rick Green:* There is a master agreement that I encountered that when provincial government sold the Interurban Corridor the rail and the rolling stock, they protected passenger rights in perpetuity. We've got press releases from the provincial government, we've got the master agreement from the provincial government and they deal with the fact that we have passenger rights at no cost for the people of British Columbia. So the biggest problem with that is obviously the need to negotiate passenger rights between Cloverdale and Trinity. But quite frankly, much to CP's chagrin they don't have a choice because we have passenger rights up to 33% of all the wheelage that is used in the corridor now. So when you take a look at the expansion of rail traffic on this corridor of fifteen trains a day to potentially thirty-five or forty. In my opinion if you want to talk about safety of community and building of community you're going to end up with two communities, one north of the tracks and one south of the tracks that's what it's going to amount too. It's absolutely ridiculous. Anybody in their right mind, in my mind and I'll campaign on this at any level, it is just fundamentally wrong. Now there are other options, and where I want to get to on this, so I've explained my position, that's my personal position and maybe the position of some at this table and others. But one thing I want to be insistent of which I was over the Mufford Crescent, after the election I phoned the Agricultural Land Commission and advised them, even though they had previously approved that corridor, that I was going to bring it back to two open houses and a public meeting. Which I did and over one thousand people came out and that was just over that one issue. What is really important to me, however we move forward, when we talk about the consultation, open houses don't cut it. Public meetings – it has to be a public meeting of some form.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* Rick, let me just interrupt you for a minute. Vicki Huntington came to yesterday afternoon's meeting and she said the same thing. There was pretty general agreement around the room. Now what do you think about open houses with a Q & A period.
- C: *Rick Green:* No.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Just hear me out here. I've been doing this a long time.
- C: *Rick Green:* You know what Judy, so have I since the mid 80s.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* But here me out. Why I am saying that is not everybody is as involved and informed as you are and some of the rest of the people in this room. So what I would like to propose and I'd like your feedback on it either in the feedback form or here verbally which I know you won't be shy about giving.

Would you be comfortable with assuring that people who come in the door, say we've got a four or five hour open house, for the first couple of hours we allow people to come in, talk to the Port representatives, talk to subject matter experts, depending on whether we are in the environmental review or not. By the way, on the environmental review side they'll do what they want.

C: *Rick Green:* Absolutely. I know that.

C: *Judy Kirk:* What I would like to proposed is that we do an open house portion for say a couple of hours and then open it up to essentially a public meetings format which would be Q&A. For at least an hour, two hours or frankly, whatever it takes. Because not everybody is comfortable standing up at a microphone.

C: *Rick Green:* Fair enough, I can go back to the Mufford Crescent thing and effectively that's what we did at Mufford Crescent. We had two open houses, we had all the experts there, we had the boards and all that stuff and people got into a Q&A. That's OK, but it really doesn't fulfill. And anytime, and I've seen it through the Spetifore Hearings, there is an absolute need, there a democratic need for people to be part of the process and feel that they have been heard.

C: *Judy Kirk:* No debate about that. Consultation has come a long way since the Spetifore Hearings.

C: *Rick Green:* Excuse me. Just so you know the Speitfore Hearings, we were very open.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I recognize that.

C: *Rick Green:* We gave 108 hours for people to come to a microphone and speak. That's what I want to see and what I'm here to propose, and I'm more than willing to do it, if you want me to chair it that's fine, if you want somebody else to chair it that's fine. But it should be a public meeting with an opportunity for people to come forward and speak, at a microphone, their feelings about it.

C: *Judy Kirk:* So we will provide that opportunity, but I think there will also be an open house component.

C: *Rick Green:* I'm OK, as long as we don't cut off the public meeting side, and more than a Q&A. The problem with Q&A is that you get a couple of people asking a question. I've been to too many of them.

C: *Judy Kirk:* It'll be the kind of thing where there are microphones, people can come up, they can line up and have their say. That's the kind of thing that we're talking about here. In addition to all of the other methods so that people who aren't comfortable doing that can fill out a feedback form or come to a small group meeting or any number of other ways.

Q: *Peter Holt:* I think to add to what Rick said. One of the things that has been evident over a lot of the public engagements that have gone on, particularly transit and many other things is that in the open house sections particularly, who tells the story is rather key. The example I'd make is Bob Paddon's TransLink group, when they come up. They way they tell the story is absolutely geared to the solution they want to hear. To the point where data is blatantly wrong. I can give you an example of the Surrey Rapid Transit at the moment. One of the things that's in their data if you actually drill down into is, that

they've cost the Light Rail at \$77 million a kilometer, which Bombardier rolled their eyes and go, what? That is the problem that I see in many of the public engagements. The stakeholders, in this case it would be the Port or the railways would want to educate the public. And in doing that, they educate them along the lines that they've already got their choice.

- A: *Judy Kirk*: That's really important. You know what Peter, people are going to have to make up their own minds as they go along. But my firm is one of the leading experts in consultation in this province and we are going to make sure that the information is credible. The reports are going to be independent. That said, you're going to have to make those judgements along the way.
- C: *Peter Holt*: Just if I can one a final point is very quickly is that the other thing is blatantly clear from body language when you're doing these things is that there's not really a willingness to hear a contrary view. The way it's dealt with is to listen to it and then never talk about it again.
- Q: *Lynn Whitehouse*: I agree with what has been said and what happens a lot is that people are going to learn that there's going to be an expansion. In the Langley's especially, like Mayor Green said, transportation and traffic grid lock is just horrendous and the effect on personal lives. I think the education component is absolutely critical to Joe-citizen, who will only see the fear and not understand how they can participate and get their feelings heard. In saying that, as a citizen, I have to support the Port and I do. I live with the fear of the trains and the increased truck traffic on the road. I'm just wondering, can the consultation, once you get to the project development, will there be consideration given to using the river and perhaps looking at inland shipping in the load and unload facilities that are outside the urban area?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: I can't answer that question and I don't think Cliff can either. But the importance of you raising that here and it was raised yesterday too, is if the notion of alternative distribution methods like the river is something you want to talk discuss then that is one of the topics you put down. Because right now that's not listed and that's exactly why we're here to find out if there are alternative or additional topics.
- C: *Lynn Whitehouse*: I'll write it down.
- C: *Ed Kolla*: I agree with what's been said and I also agree with Judy. In a process like this, you have to have first of all inform the people of what is out there and what is taking place, what is happening, why certain things are being done. The process she is talking about is not a done deal, "here is what we're giving to you". If I understand what she is saying the process an iterative process where she's going to work through, or the Port is going to work through what they are trying to do, look at options, and look at things. I think what we've got to get across to them is the issues and concerns of the area. I have been involved in numerous transportation projects on a smaller level and I have seen projects go off the rails for the wrong reason because of what I would call a mob psychology, where you get all the naysayers in a room and they take up the whole time and the good of the project gets lost. I am a firm believer that the

public has to have an opportunity to see what is being planned, why it's being planned what are the benefits to the global community and then look at how you mitigate the issues that are going to impact certain areas.

- C: *Rick Green:* Ed, it is really easy to look at room full of concerned citizens and I've been on the political side in more cases than not, and deem that mob psychology. Now what it is, is protection of community. Let's be real clear, nobody has to try to suggest that I don't embrace economic growth, economic development, what is good for the world economy, what is good for Canada's economy, BC's economy. I will be there with bells on to protect that. But I am also a strong believer that we don't have to have that at any cost, in other words there are other options. You can go to CP/CN, they will tell you without question there are no other choices, that lines there, that's the end of the discussion. I don't believe that. I can tell you that there were about one thousand people that were involved in the Mufford Crescent decision. They spoke passionately about it. One thing about democracy, I'm sorry to have to try to preach to people, but one thing about democracy, people have the right to be wrong. I can tell you right now if you look at the Spetifore hearing or the Burns Bog hearings, fifty years from now seventy years from now people might look at that and say council was wrong on the decision they made. But we weren't, we were right because that was what the people of Delta wanted. The people of Langley have a right for the protection of their community and not to be sold out on the fear of protecting the world economy. The world economy is going to do very well thank you very much.
- C: *Ed Kolla:* Rick, I'm not disagreeing with you and I'm not disagreeing that you have to take all of these things into consideration. All I was supporting was that the process has to be an informed process that people understand what is being done, why it's being done and also to put on the table the implications that are associated with it and how those things are going to be mitigated.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* If I could say, I think it is clear what people are saying here and if I can summarize this and get a reaction get some reaction. Rick, you might argue with me but it seems to me that people would agree in this room that there needs to be a body of information. I think Peter you referenced some concern about some information from TransLink around some of their studies. There needs to be a body of information about the project and about studies both environmental, economic and transportation and all the list that has to be done, that needs to be available to people. Then it's to have a process to allow for some exposure, people will decide how much they want to be exposed to that information and that's not up to anyone here to judge in my view. But at least that information needs to be available and then people will participate as they will and we're going to provide a bunch of opportunities to do that and we're interested to hear about what those might be.
- C: *Nathan Pachal:* My comment, I'll say public consultation as far as public engagements from A to B, I think people like to be part of the decisions process so if you can do this with your public consultation you could give education first.

Say this is what we're doing, this is why we're doing it and here are some options. We can have a, what happens if you don't build Terminal 2 here are the options and these are the consequences, what if you build it here, what if you build rail capacity here. You can give people a list of options and let them pick what they want. I like being involved in that way. You probably know that you get better plans when you let people decide instead of saying this is what we've decided, what's your feedback. People can be reactionary when they see feel that they are getting things thrown on them.

C: *Judy Kirk:* That's a good comment.

Q: *Lee Lockwood:* Three simple comments. Back to the consultation process, the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor was pretty much a done deal it saw the light of day. Another thing you want to keep in mind is the fact that, you look at the gentleman who made the statement, that this will be the biggest port operation on the West Coast. It's going to exceed Long Beach.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* It is now the biggest port in Canada.

C: *Unknown:* That's also the north side. It's the bulk in the North Shore.

C: *Lee Lockwood:* I look at California, they built the Alameda Corridor. The Port is the biggest customer the railroads have. You as a customer should be able to sit down and tell the railroads what you will have them do. The last time I looked, when I was a customer I would tell my suppliers what the hell I wanted.

C: *Peter Holt:* I sympathize with Cliff because I think the railways run the ports as much as it is the other way around.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I think many Canadians know how much influence railways have.

C: *Peter Holt:* There's a very interesting microcosm of the bigger debate when Ed made the comment about how there's a certain way of doing things which he thought made sense and a mob came in with contrary views. My first point was very much to have a willingness to hear those contrary views and not to use language that is very common and used to shut people down. Whereas people like Rick and maybe myself are not easy to close down in that respect, the average guy will walk out and say forget it. I think that is a really important point in that language.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Peter, can I just say on that, when Kirk & Co. was asked to look at the potential scope of this project and the amount of consultation, and you can see on page 8 that this will be the biggest consultation ever undertaken by the Port and that's without the environmental reviews adding in. I think frankly, there's potentially at least two more. I just want to point out that I have been pretty strong that the voices need to be heard and need to provide multiple rounds to do that.

C: *Peter Holt:* The main point I was actually going to make was to go back to the education sessions and how people can understand what is out there and what are the options. Without exception, in my fifteen years or so in this region, the information put out is put out by the companies, individuals and organizations that want to institute the change. In this case it's the Port, although in many ways it's the Port and Railways in many respects. TransLink obviously it's the

regional body. When that body of information is put forward at open houses in all the displays, people come to those and they often will challenge the actual numbers. Nathan, you've done it. Lynn I'm sure you have as well, there's no opportunity before those, some would say propaganda boards, are put up for people with a contrary view to display at the same open house to point out the shortcomings of some of the arguments put forward. I think that is a change that would be a change that would be very beneficial. It would also give the appearance of fairness. If you wanted to go really overboard, taking the HST debate example, provide money, and this is not necessarily yours by the way, to organizations that might have contrary views so that they in fact can have a side to show their vision. Because organizations such as Roy's been in and I know Lynn's see it, and I'm sure you've seen it as well. You can go back to the 1960s for this region and see some spectacular visions that in 2010 you go, oh I wish. If it is going to be consultation, it is a battle of ideas and we need to approach that. My final point is we're already chasing the hare, the hare is zigzagging across the field, the hare is Port Metro Vancouver to some extent and the railways because we're being told, and I think Ed was very accurate what he said, there's a national reason and a global reason why we have to make our port bigger. Some people wouldn't agree with that, I'm actually sympathetic regardless of what I might be sounding like. What we do have to say is if we are going to make that port bigger then we have to look at all downstream effects of roads and railways. Poor Langley and the City of Langley, I know five years ago I used to say there's no way this is going to stay single track to serve the port's needs and I think you'll agree with that. People would just put you aside because it wasn't convenient to hear at this stage.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: On the point of funding for groups, if federal government does agree to hold a review panel, they do consider applications for capacity funding, intervener funding and other kinds of funding. So if it does go to, which as Cliff indicated it may well, that's something to consider. The province doesn't usually do that, but the feds do.
- C: *Lynn Whitehouse*: These projects aren't built in a year or two, and as we've discussed this one has a very long life term. What is happening to a number of projects out in this region, I'm older than dirt so I've been involved in many, at beginning. You get intense consultation, stakeholder feedback and all that good stuff and then five, six and seven years down the road when things are really starting to take off half of those people that were involved at beginning as the stakeholders are gone, they've changed or whatever. There hasn't been a continuous review or follow up, and I think that is going to be really important that throughout the entire project that there needs to be progress reporting and reviewing for new people that are coming in to keep them educated and aware of what is going on. Things will happen and people will say, well why didn't you find out what was going on in your backyard. Well where do you start to look? I think that's really important.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: It's a good addition to the education point you make earlier.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* I'd just like to respond to something Peter said earlier. I want to bring you back to page 9. How input will be used. I can't remember exactly how you put it Peter, but I think it was something like this; people don't want to hear contrary views. The commitment that we have made and the commitment that Kirk & Co. have demanded an arm's length ability to do what they feel is the right thing to do here. They have insisted to have independence to be able to do two things in this process. One, are the consultation summary reports so that those of you who are involved in the process will in fact get fed back what it is that we have heard from you so that if we haven't heard you can say we've missed a point. The second is a consideration memo, after we get the consultation summary report we take that away within the program and we do whatever we do with it. Then a consideration memo is developed which explains what's been done or what hasn't been done. So if we choose not to listen to what you've had to say we have to explain why we've done that as opposed to hearing you and walking away. I think that's a really important piece of the process that I want to highlight.

Q: *Denni Bonetti:* I just wanted to clarify the information you just talked about on the consultation summary reports, will it only be what we've discussed here or will we be privy to the other consultations as well?

A: *Judy Kirk:* So here's what's in the consultation summary reports. I would encourage you to have a look at some samples. It will summarize the Pre-Consultation input that we hear here. What it'll summarize is, the meeting notes from this and the other seven meetings that we are holding. It will summarize the quantitative and qualitative information that we analyse and summarize from the feedback forms. So there's an agree scale for quantitative type questions for those who just want to fly through and for those who want to provide a little bit more input and provide the reasons will also be providing written submissions. There's an inquiry response line that's set up through the port.

A: *Sarah McPherson:* It's containerimprovement@portmetrovanancouver.com.

A: *Judy Kirk:* Anything we get there through the consultation will also be summarized. That's in the report called, consultation summary report. The attachments or appendices are every single one of these meeting notes, the feedback forms though because of protection of privacy and freedom of information, on the feedback forms you can look at your own but you can't look at everybody else's. That's just the way it is, and any of the other information will be appended as well. It's a complete report, the consultation discussion guide that you have before you will be there, etc. That will all be online as well as physically available.

Q: *Denni Bonetti:* That question was just regarding that, I had some other points. First of all, excellent process, it sounds like you are open to our feedback and not coming in with pre-conceived opinions. It sounds like you're open to listening to people and that's great. Similar to what other people are saying, education, I think that's really important and we've learned that through the

HST process, people forming opinions without educating themselves. We need to inform and I think this is an excellent piece to start with. We'd like to know if you guys would come out to a chamber meeting and do a similar process there to inform people. Letting them know what's planned and why it's planned and how it will affect the people of Langley so they can form better educated opinions.

A: *Judy Kirk*: So I'll get Sarah McPherson to follow up with you afterwards. As far as anyone else is concerned we can look at that as well.

Q: *Rudy Storteboom*: I just want to start at the top again and just say I appreciate Port Metro Vancouver and I recognize that the current configuration makes it most significant. Not just to our local economy, but to our national economy. I appreciate the consultation process. It's the most comprehensive that I have ever seen with this type of a project. In the past we have had information sessions but precious little has actually been implemented. It's my hope that there will be some kind of accountability in consultation process because we have a relationship with the railway whether we like it or not, we have a relationship with Port Metro Vancouver and we'd like that relationship to be healthy. As much as the Port has a mandate for trade, I have a mandate for the quality of life here in my community. I think that we can come to terms recognizing that we'd both like to operate efficiently, safely and benefit our local, regional economies. Please remember it isn't just about the environment of trees and animals, but people are the environment too. The quality of life associated with people is substantial and has to be taken into consideration. At this point my community is at a point where we're actually paying for overpasses and infrastructure to accommodate the railway, while the railway is forcing itself into our community every day. It has no business here and with increased traffic it's killing us. We need to find alternative routes for the railway to go, and there are alternatives. But the railway has to come to an accountable relationship with the community by recognizing that they are overwhelming us and it's killing the community at large. With that being said I appreciate the consultation process and I suggest that we have some kind of mapping component identifying clearly where the Port Metro Vancouver is, how the system is working and how it all feeds into the Port, where the overpasses are, possible alternative routes, possible water-based transportation services and have an overview of the area so that people can see clearly how it all fits together. Rather than just talking about a road or a bypass and some people not getting it because maybe they don't relate to that. A map would be an image that they might relate to. Finally, I want to suggest that as much as we are looking into the future, does it consider the possibility that we may be developing some of these natural resources ourselves in the future? It's my hope we won't be shipping natural resources around the world to be developed and then returned to us with a significant mark up. It's my hope that we'll be doing some more manufacturing of our own and creating jobs for our young people and our province. So I'm not sure if that's been considered. As much as I admire your growth and encourage you in that because it benefits us all, the

future should consider what the world would look like in a few years because we know it's changing dramatically before us. So what will it look like in ten or twenty years relative to our economy, our people, and our position in the world.

Q: *Peter Holt:* I think, like a lot of people have been saying it's a great summary. My point was and it's to you Cliff when you spoke earlier on, I absolutely believe that Port Metro Vancouver is trying to do the very best job in Canada. I have no problem with that and I think that's the genuine situation. However, I do think for this to be a successful exercise, if I don't see CP, CN and BNSF sitting next to you we can't do it. You cannot possibly cover everything and make commitments on their behalf. I want to see four people at the table. Not meaning to diminish Port Metro Vancouver, but in my view, railways run ports as opposed to the other way around. It just is the way it is. I think it's a huge comment and I don't mean it to be negative.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I'm not sure you're going to get that Peter.

C: *Peter Holt:* The comment's there.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I don't think the port has control of that.

C: *Peter Holt:* They don't. I'm sure they don't.

Q: *Denni Bonetti:* Have you had discussions at this point with any of the railways?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Not about that specific issue.

C: *Lynn Whitehouse:* What Peter said is exactly what I was going to say. What's happening a lot in region is we have different groups that are going out and doing planning, but they're not talking to each other. I think it would be absolutely critical that not only railways and but also TransLink needs to be strongly encouraged to attend consultations as observers so that they can hear firsthand from representatives around the region because one thing does affect the other.

C: *Rick Green:* I think Lynn made a good point, if you look at the incredible difficulties at the regional transportation level. We've all had our say about TransLink and I can sit here for about five or six hours and talk about it, but the one thing that the twenty-three mayors, we have been unanimous in terms of our position. We've got, this is what we're talking about everything is servicing the Port the trucks and all this stuff. We've got two regional districts, we have two regional planning authorities, and we have two transportation providers in BC, BC Transit and Translink. We've got all of these organizations and groups who are quite frankly running at cross purposes. For this thing to really work and I agree with Peter that somehow somehow, and I know that we say don't hold your breath that the railways at the table. Somehow, somehow, don't hold our breath to get the railways at the table. One thing I was told that railways are bigger than our federal government and we all know because they predate our generation and all that wonderful stuff and they've got all these massive powers. But I have to tell you when we found master agreement on the corridor, the township lawyers couldn't have been happier because for the first time in history, we had the railways over the barrel in terms of a legal agreement that they have no option to go along with. I just think that we have

to use whatever leverage we can to be able to get our railways to the table and be part of the process. The idea of TransLink, absolutely they should.

C: *Ed Kolla*: I agree with what Rudy said and I agree with what Rick is saying. In fact I think that we're all saying the same thing. We're all saying that whatever is done, it has to be an informed process. I think it has to be demonstrated in alternate methods of movement. I think we've got a river that could be a viable option to get container traffic through the urban areas and I think that what the community here is looking for is not something that is a slam dunk here is what we're doing and why. The community is looking for an informed process that is going to demonstrate, what is the best way to move these containers from wherever they are unloaded through the urban area. How can we mitigate the impacts associated with that the Port is trying to do. I think that's the critical issue that everybody is concerned about. The question I hear at a lot of meetings is why are we unloading them out there, and then trucking them and putting them on rail and it's running through the different communities. Can we unload them out there or unload them farther up on the river and have a transfer point there. I think from a transportation perspective, those types of things have to be seen and I think that's what the community's looking for. Is it by rail, is it by water. What are the different options? I mean we are talking about a project that in twenty or ten years when you are first going to start constructing. The thing is, let's do our due diligence. The bottom line is if this is where it's got to be, on the rail corridor must be a bonafide process to how the impacts are mitigated to the communities. If I look back at the previous project that took place, that was one of the things that the communities really pushed back hard about. Sure we didn't get it all, we didn't get a lowered rail, but we have got some mitigation of the increased rail traffic on the rail. Yes, all the rail overpasses is not the answer and yes it would be nice to move the rail somewhere else, but the one thing is that you're still going through communities. So I think the bottom line is that it has to be demonstrated to the public that the due diligence has been done and this is the best solution and we have looked at all the different options.

C: *Lee Lockwood*: I think that there are a couple of things that you need to keep in mind too is that if next 20 years there's another half million people moving south of the Fraser. By implication we are actually affecting their well-being. They don't get a vote; they don't get to attend an open house. Number two is that we've got to keep in mind that we've probably got forty trains a day going up and down the valley. These are diesels, very poor particular management, why don't we look at electrifying from Chilliwack and done on in. Air quality in the valley is worse than it is in California. They electrified the whole thing in Holland from the German/Deutsch border all the way through to the Port of Rotterdam. Why aren't we doing that here?

Q: *Nathan Pachal*: I guess it's the same thing everyone's saying is the fact that I don't think we want the pre-conceived; we have to do it this way because we've

- done it this way before. We need to look at being progressive. The other issue that ties into that is that I'm usually the youngest person at all these things. So what are you doing to get people under a certain age involved in the process.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: It's a very serious question and we're looking at a whole range of things, including things like Facebook and Twitter, using online technology, making sure that notification is done in a way that we're connecting with younger populations as well. So any ideas that you have on that, we are very interested in. Much like I try to discourage people from making judgements about how informed people are before they provide comment that's up to the individuals. The same thing applies here really as well. We need to make every effort we can to connect with younger people in ways that they want to connect. But at the end of the day it's going to be up to them.
- C: *Nathan Pachal*: If I can, just to follow up with what you are saying to that, I guess with Twitter and social media some people don't get it, I understand how the process is a two way communication. I'll actually give TransLink credit for this, they've realized that Twitter, for example, is a two way communication media and they've embraced that and it works very well. They did, Be Part of the Plan, and you can argue about what came out of, Be Part of the Plan. The actual method was really good and it was successful.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: We are definitely looking at that but please put that down. As you can see you're outnumbered and not that numbers are everything. We are looking very seriously at a whole suite of online and digital options. In some ways we're going to be doing some of this stuff for the first time. Something that we're looking at too is something like an audio discussion guide so that people who don't take the time to read it, maybe they're in the car or maybe they're at home and they want to listen to it. Maybe they want to listen to it in a group. In other words we're trying to think of different options.
- C: *Unknown*: Radio chat shows. I'll put it in my feedback form, but have people on CKNW or something talking about it. That's how you educate.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Absolutely. Now that as you know, something like CKNW would have to agree. That's not something the Port can control.
- Q: *Lee Lockwood*: How involved through this process will Kirk & Co. be involved?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: So the question was how involved will Kirk & Co. be in the multi-stages? Very involved.
- Q: *Lee Lockwood*: So you've signed on for the long haul.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: The answer to that is yes, there was a Request for Proposal where we were a part of that selection process. The point is that the Board of the Port Metro Vancouver has the authority at multiple stages of this process to proceed or not proceed. They can also determine who's going to be involved. While that's what we anticipate, that's not necessarily the outcome. We'll see over time. Six years is a long time to look ahead.
- C: *Rick Green*: Certainly in the political field I think we tend to talk about education, and education is really important, and as long as we don't approach education as a talking down to you and the end result is: well we told you what

it was all about and the fact that you can't understand it well then you have got to be an idiot. I'm sorry to be using that. I fought that a little bit at the hall and I think we are changing our processes in terms of that and providing options and everything else. The only other thing I'd say which I think is really important and touched on in a significant way is the Langley's are most affected communities in the valley. There is no question about it. I came from Delta and I lived thirty years there, I've had a business in Tsawwassen, I lived in North Delta and I can tell you there's a whole bunch of farmland between the two. The train runs through the farmland and there are overpasses and underpasses and all that wonderful stuff. But the net effect to any community and no community will feel the impact of heavy rail that Langley will. Not even close and that includes Surrey. It comes in the peripheral of Cloverdale and what have you, but it just doesn't have the effect. What are we talking about purely and simply is liveability. Remember, in the Township we've got 106,000 people today and under the Regional Growth Strategy we expect to double that in the next twenty to twenty-five years, or close to it. If anybody uses the 200th Street corridor, Highway 1, Fraser Highway, bypass and everything else you start putting 70,000 people up on Willoughby corridor, 30,000 people on Brookwood/Fernridge and you see how those communities have to connect with each other. You start putting forty-five trains a day down that corridor our community ceases to be liveable. Certainly the city of Langley...

- C: *Rudy Storteboom*: Yes it's killing us. We can't take anymore.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: That's pretty loud and clear.
- C: *Rick Green*: We may have made it clear but we will be harped on and harped on.
- C: *Nan Ames*: Just to bring in another thought. I am against rail going through Langley and Delta. If short sea shipping is suggested as a mode to get to the remote spot used to load and unload the ships into, say, trucks, the idea of ships coming up the Fraser River which is a highly sensitive area for wildlife, migrant birds, resident birds, orcas and all those things. The wake from one of those huge ships coming to that area would be devastating. Another thought that I had is that way back in the graph shows a progression up and yet over the last few years has been levelling off. Will there be a financial basis? I think the Port is wrong, I think the origin is the head of the snake, I just don't see any great solution.
- C: *Lynn Whitehouse*: I want to go back to trying to get representatives from the rail and TransLink to attend and participate in these consultations. I understand that when you said good luck with that.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Actually what I said was that the Port doesn't have the authority to insist that they attend.
- C: *Lynn Whitehouse*: Right. All levels of our government are being criticized for not integrating things. This could be a very good opportunity. We have representatives of our two municipality councils here and I am very confident that they both would then go back and say OK, get to Metro and to TransLink and say, we require someone to be here. I think if a request went out to our

MLAs and our MP just stating important of this entire process. Transportation throughout this entire region is of the most critical concern to everybody, business and residents alike. I think that they would be able to apply enough pressure to make some of them come to the table. They will be setting a precedent showing that levels of government do work together. I think there's an opportunity.

- C: *Rick Green:* Maybe if I can say Lynn to that it's a very good point. I'll take it to my council and I'll hopefully, I'm sure we will, get a resolution from council in terms of the support for that initiative. Maybe Rudy can do the same thing.
- C: *Rudy Storteboom:* Absolutely. I would suggest to that we consider contacting the Canada Transportation Agency in terms of Transport Canada, other related agencies and invite them to come and certainly provide them with information so they can review that and they can get a feeling for what the consultation process has brought forward.
- C: *Rick Green:* It is the bringing together and I think that part of that is for all agencies to request the railways to be a part of this.
- Q: *Judy Kirk:* Michelle, I don't want to put you on the spot here, but in your knowledge of the environmental review process and the working groups that they set up which are in my experience generally multi-agency. Could they or do they include the railways? I'm asking you for information, recognizing to everyone here that Michelle wouldn't be speaking for the regulators.
- A: *Michelle Lachmann:* Well the panel process is a little bit different. Definitely the agencies that you mentioned like Transport Canada and those would be available. How and when they would bring in the actual railways to the table I can't speak to.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I think we should take that away as a follow up item and try to find out from the federal regulators whether working groups would include the kind of integrated multi-jurisdictional plan that you're talking about. The thing is that it would have the strength of legislation behind it.
- C: *Rick Green:* I think to that if we have resolutions from our councils from Delta, Surrey, Abbotsford, Chilliwack and I don't think that we'd have any problem getting those resolutions. To all of our respective MLAs and MPs we can take that to the Mayor and TransLink council today. The real important part is if we stand behind this position that this is what we need. That is the key to this. We all support the Port, I want that real clear, it's just how do we service the Port in the best way possible.
- Q: *Lynn Whitehouse:* I have one more question. I understand that the permit approval process can take up to six or seven years? Did I hear you correctly?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* The process that leads up to it and that process itself could take six to seven years.
- Q: *Lynn Whitehouse:* Would that include the Environmental Assessments?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes.

- Q: *Lynn Whitehouse*: There has been a fair effort to both the provincial and federal governments to look at doing a one Environmental Assessment instead of two. Would that change that time period would that come to be?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: You know what Lynn we just don't know yet. Michelle you can say otherwise, but I think we are so early that we just don't know what the federal government and the province are going to do with respect to this yet. We're hoping, the Port is hoping that it will. Certainly from my view in terms of consultation fatigue which I'm sure that everyone here knows you've got to set up a process to make sure that people can come to one place. By one place I mean one process. That's certainly the desire, but it's not up to the Port. That regulatory part of it is going to be up to the feds and the province.
- Q: *Lynn Whitehouse*: But when you built the schedule it basically was planned with two separate assessments.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: No it was assuming harmonized. Because that's what makes sense.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: I think it's important to point out that the six to seven years process is based on whole range of ten to fifteen or more panel processes which are taking place in Western Canada in the past decade or more. It's a bit of a guess, we think this is how long it will take but there's no guarantee.
- A: *Michelle Lachmann*: It is a guess, but it is based on case studies and from my experience working fifteen years on the environmental side is, what the regulators tell you procedurally and what actually happens are always wrong, but it's often for just for a number of reasons, it's not wrong because want it to mislead. It's just because that's the way the process happens. Coming up with the timeline we wanted to come up with something that was reasonable and looking at case studies and this is what we've pulled together. Given, knowing the size of the project, the issues that people are going to be bringing forward and the amount of attention that the project warrants for making those considerations. Factoring in the likely, the independent panel review assessment process. That's the background for that.
- C: *Nan Ames*: I was just going to question the harmonized process. From Boundary Bay, they've seen it in the South Fraser Perimeter Road, where everything was compartmentalized to avoid large review, but the fact that there was a harmonized approach meant nobody, not the federal or provincial, would take responsibility or have responsibility for the eventual outcome. So it's not clear who's in charge.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Correct me if I'm wrong Michelle but I think it was a British Columbia Environmental Review for the SFPR not a federal review.
- C: *Michelle Lachmann*: It was the harmonized led by the province, much like the Deltaport Third Berth. Both acts apply and by the harmonization agreement it was decided that the provincial process will meet both intents.
- C: *Rick Green*: Judy, I might add and I wanted to ask if this was what Roy was going to say. We didn't want to bring up, there's a lot of history and I think that's a lot of the anxiety around this. If you go back to first process, the environment side was not considered to be a linear process, it was Delta. It was only through the work of the community members that got them to have a meeting out here, I

think they went into Delta, but the reality was that it was identified as a local, environmental issue as opposed to a linear environmental issue. Therefore none of the environmental issues in Langleys were considered. Roy did you want to...

- C: *Roy Mufford*: That's absolutely true, mind you I have to say that is refreshing. This Pre-Consultation process is very refreshing because if you go back in history to when the provincial government decided to build the port in the first place they never told Langley or anyone about it until the decision was cast. Langley took the time to call in the BC Hydro's top executives and ask them what was going on. We have the minutes from all of the meetings. Our mayor at the time, Bill Poppy said point blank, what are you doing here. I mean Langley had not been consulted whatsoever. The provincial government had decided to put the trains through and it was the easiest and shortest way to get to the Port. It just progresses. They called the three top executives from BC Hydro to a council meeting to explain what was going on. The commitment at the time and it's in the minutes, was one train each way a day. That's all we had to worry about and we know what's happened since. So you have to understand why we're a little concerned about this. There are other alternatives and what we need is a master transportation plan. That's why Peter and Lynn, and I agree with them wholeheartedly, you've got to drag CN, CP, BNSF to the table and you've got to say look at this, this can't go on. We've got to fix this and there are ways to do it.
- C: *Peter Holt*: Taking the position because you've got to start from a certain starting position, so taking the position that Terminal 2 is a done deal. Then we are in the business of solving the problem. The problem is fundamentally goods movement problem that has to be efficient, effective and cost effective so that the Port of Vancouver will have shipping lines willing to bring their ships in and move their containers. I'm stating the obvious, but sometimes it's worth stating. In solving the problem there's a whole series of other things that Lynn and others are well aware of with the New Westminster Rail Bridge. You can go the generation that's now six feet under, we're laughing the same way twenty years later about this one. Thanks to the Port and it's recognition of the need to expand and need 1.8 million TEUs, we are coming to the realization that we need to grow up as a regional body and actually stop to look at these problems and solve them. Here is the danger, this particular group, if we're not careful will end up trying to solve a lot more than what we actually came into this room to talk about. We are opening up all over the place, the New Westminster Bridge is something else to try to solve that but it's fundamental to moving goods into this region; the actual RBRC through Langleys with the growth strategy in Metro Vancouver just doesn't fit. The movements elsewhere, there's some problems there. There's one other thing that I have to ask and it's to Cliff: if Cherry Point is developed, south of the border, as both a bulk and container port in the next twenty or thirty years what impact on the viability of a Terminal 2?

- C: *Cliff Stewart*: I think 5% of import containers through the Port of Vancouver are American destined. Projections we show here don't rely on the increasing American demand. I don't think it will have an impact.
- C: *Peter Holt*: So the New Westminster Rail Bridge the adaptive use for railways generally to possibly mixed use, could be passenger could be small passenger traffic even and how are we going to invest in industrial lands. This is fundamental to how is the governments movements going to be managed in the next fifty years? The Port is such a major aspect of the economy of this region and BC and Canada it's the big one.
- C: *Rudy Storteboom*: I guess I wanted to draw attention to the bottom line which is about economy and the economy of the Port and the country. There's an old saying, in this consultation process that you might consider, people talk but money screams that's the bottom line and that's what people are going for. They want to see that dollar at the bottom of process and that everyone is going to benefit financially. Please consider it isn't just about the national economy or the regional economy but the local economy as well. I think that part of the consultation process should take into consideration how local businesses are affected. For example I'm familiar with a business on the bypass that's considering relocation because they simply don't have the access that they once did now that an overpass has been constructed. Their vehicles have to cross over the railroad tracks and then you turn back over the railroad tracks in order to bring in their product to market and return back to the shed. The fact is it's taking too much time and costing too much money. It's significantly impacting to the point where they are thinking of relocating and that's one of the major employers in our community. I think that there should be a component to the consultation process that draws from local businesses and local economies to see how they're impacted and how much more they can take.
- Q: *Nan Ames*: What about the opening of the new and expanded Panama Canal?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: That's an interesting question, we have looked at it with a number of people and there was some work done by a fairly large American, transport economist organization. It moves the line inland and moves the line around the US East Coast, that says if your goods are coming from Asia, there are three ways to get them there. One is via the West Coast and rail, one is via Panama Canal and rail and one is by the Suez Canal and rail. The line moves in land, definitely with the Panama Canal expansion in 2014. But 90% plus of cargo that leaves here by rail goes to Toronto and Montreal for consumption. The line that Panama Canal moves doesn't touch Toronto, Montreal or even Chicago, that's where the 5% American destined from Port Metro Vancouver, most of it goes to Chicago.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I want to thank you very much for participating in a very robust and thoughtful discussion. We really appreciate it. I would like to ask you to fill out your feedback forms to make sure that we get your individual input as well as

the collective input here. Please be aware that the consultation period ends June 30th, so on or before. Thank you all very much.

The meeting ended at 11:50am.