

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

**Small Group Meeting 4
October 15, 2013**

Notes from a small group meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 15, 1:00pm – 3:00pm, at the Surrey Arts Centre, Surrey, BC.

Stakeholders:

Al Sabey, Third Age Learning at Kwantlen
Al Schulze, White Rock Surrey Naturalists
Chip Dhaliwal, IUOE Local 115
Cliff Caprani, Citizens Against Port Expansion
Dan Barnscher, Surrey Fire
Dean Pronyk
Deb Jack, White Rock Surrey Naturalists, Surrey Environmental Partners
Elizabeth Model, Downtown Surrey Business Improvement Association
Eoghan Moriarty, Sightline Institute
Judy Higginbotham, Cloverdale Chamber of Commerce
Keith Alton, Kards by Keith
Kent Webster, Interested Citizens of Surrey
Mike Isinger, ILWU Local 514
Mira Petrovic, City of Surrey
Nan Ames, White Rock Surrey Naturalists, Burns Bog Conservation Society
Rob Terris, Tynehead Community Association, Surrey Board of Trade – Transportation Task Force
Wayne Mills, IUOE Local 115

Port Metro Vancouver:

Anna Wright, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
Rhona Hunter, Acting Director, Infrastructure Development
Carolyn Parenteau, Communications Advisor
Michael Zachary, CCIP Project Manager
Erin Bishop, Environmental Advisor, Container Capacity Improvement Program
Matt Skinner, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 1:01pm

KEY THEMES:

- Participants questioned the economic benefits of port-related activities in the Lower Mainland, particularly the tax revenue generated by port businesses.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding the rationale and business case for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver pursue other options for increasing container capacity on the Canadian West Coast, including expansion in Prince Rupert and efficiency improvements at existing container terminals within Port Metro Vancouver's jurisdiction.
- Participants questioned whether the removal of the George Massey Tunnel would allow Fraser Surrey Docks to address additional container capacity requirements in the future.
- Participants expressed concern regarding potential impacts on the Fraser River estuary, particularly with respect to bird and fish species in the area.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding Port Metro Vancouver's Habitat Banking Program and the manner in which the Program could be used to mitigate project impacts elsewhere in the region.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Anna Wright

Anna Wright welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting, and also introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Anna informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy, and outlined how participants could provide feedback. She then explained the difference between the port-led consultation process and the environmental assessment process.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

Rhona Hunter reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including ways to participate in the consultation and how this consultation feedback is considered by Port Metro Vancouver. She then gave an outline of the information presented in the consultation discussion guide.

Why is Trade Important to British Columbians & Why Do We Use Containers?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the types of import and export goods that travel through the Pacific Gateway, and also described some of the different participants in the supply chain, including trucking companies. She then explained how containers move around in Vancouver, including how transloading enables various logistical efficiencies (pages 5-9 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Wayne Mills:* How does 120 feet go into 106 feet? I'm just curious, since you said that three 40-foot containers can fit into two 53-footers.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right.

Q: *Wayne Mills:* So there is some left over?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I would imagine that they have got it down to a science that they can make the three 40s into two 53s.

- A: *Michael Zachary*: Quite frequently, they can actually get two 40-footers into one 53-foot high cube because they're taller and are carrying lighter clothing or something versus heavy materials, since the 53-foot containers are not as strong as the 40-foot containers
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: The diagram shows 5% is for local delivery, and I imagine that would be a portion of the goods they are offloading onto a truck.
- Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: What is the value of the goods?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: I don't have that off the top of my head, but I can certainly get that number.
- Q: *Rob Terris*: With the 53-foot containers, why can't you use these on the ships? Why transfer the contents in Vancouver?
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: The question is why are there 40-foot containers on the ships and not 53-foot containers on the ships?
- C: *Rob Terris*: Yes. In Canada they have a bigger one, because it fits our rail.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: It's the international standard, so it is what is used on the international waterways, is the 40-foot container. So, our rail standard is a Canadian rail standard, so we've just learned to adapt those two standards together.
- A: *Michael Zachary*: Most of the ships, from the 1970s and 1980s, were built with cell guides that were 40-foot. The largest marine container is 45-foot, you have got to put them on the deck. But the domestic containers Eoghan started talking about were 53-footers and the 48-footers on the trains. The double stacked trains you see have containers that stick over on the end and within the turning radius. They found they could put the bigger containers on the top, and that is what generated the longer container in North America. But right now, the bays and the cell guides within the bays of the vessels, are geared toward 40-foot or two 20-footers.
- Q: *Deb Jack*: It seems to be an incredible waste of resources in so far as these steel containers are concerned, to having them reduced to 40-foot. Why not adjust them into the ships to accommodate bigger ones and conserve steel?
- A: *Michael Zachary*: Well, the biggest issue is in China. You can't have a 53-foot there, since there is no room for it in the cities or where the factories are. It is just too big a container. Most of them come on little tiny lorries. In Hong Kong for instance, there is close to 60,000 lorries coming into Hong Kong every hour, getting stuffed and destuffed. Part of it is the tradition of the industry, part of it is that they found a very economical way of doing it. Remember, containerization has only been around effectively since the late 1980s.
- C: *Deb Jack*: The community in which I am is constantly berated for saying things like "traditionally".
- C: *Mike Zachary*: I understand. But there is a system that's built around it, and so part of it is, you can change one component of the system, and they are slowly getting through, you are slowly starting to see more 53-footers. You are starting to see more 45-footers on the deck of some ships. But right now, the structural integrity of a 53-foot container can't hold heavy weights.
- Q: *Deb Jack*: The question I had was, there is so much truck traffic going on in the Lower Mainland, and if we just regard the entire Lower Mainland as a port, I am wondering what the compensation is with regards to the wear and tear on the infrastructure? We are paying for all of this stuff out of the local tax dollars. Where is the compensation back to the taxpayers with regards to the use

of the road and bridge infrastructure we have here in the valley for goods that are not even going to stay here in B.C.?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Well, all of the businesses that support the logistics chain also pay taxes as well.

Q: *Deb Jack:* That is local. I am talking about all of the goods that go to the States and go to Eastern Canada. Where is it that they provide us compensation?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Railways pay taxes. All of the businesses all pay taxes like you pay taxes as well.

Q: *Deb Jack:* Do they come to B.C. specifically?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I would imagine that there is tax revenue that comes to the province.

C: *Deb Jack:* It might be a good PR position for you to get those kinds of figures, because we keep shelling out humongous amounts of money for what is relatively a small population for both Canada and certainly for the North America. It would be nice to know what comes back in so far as that shelling out is concerned.

Q: *Judy Higginbotham:* Related to that somewhat, when we look at compensation and we say "taxes", for example, my understanding for Port Metro Vancouver is that it has special compensation, special prices. They don't necessarily go along with the average price of the land, and they get a more or less flat rate for some of the port facilities as well as railroads.

And secondly, I think that the funding does go to the province. I guess my question is how much tax revenue does go to the provinces, and then again back down to the cities that are looking after the infrastructure? And I guess mixed in with that question is if we are able to look at who is responsible to federal government for transportation? The Department of Transportation is often a law unto itself. And it is sometimes the jurisdiction and the ability for us to understand that it is somewhat complicated, and we would have the opportunity to honestly make any type of meaningful input.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I can't speak to other businesses and the logistics and what their tax structure is. Port Metro Vancouver does pay taxes. It pays taxes to the local communities in which it operates.

Q: *Judy Higginbotham:* Who makes the assessment and is it based on the assessment of the value of the land? Or is it based on a special compensation assessment from the province?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I can't answer that.

Q: *Anna Wright:* So, the question is, and we can look into this for you, but is the port paying the same amount that another tenant or another user of the land would pay the cities in property taxes?

Q: *Rhona Hunter:* Port Metro Vancouver is accountable to the federal Minister of Transportation.

C: *Mike Isinger:* Just on page 8, it says trucks getting all the containers leave the terminal on trains, I think it's going to be extended quite a bit, because it says the remaining one-third leave the terminal by truck and are transported to a transload facility or warehouse in the Lower Mainland where goods are unloaded, sorted, and reloaded for further transportation.

That is simply not accurate. There's tens of thousands of intermodal rail containers that go out of Deltaport specifically by truck and go to CN's yards since CN got in the intermodal business. For example, in the last two years every inbound and outbound reefer container at Deltaport container terminal has gone to CN's yard by highway truck. And there is absolutely no reason for

it. You know? So this should be expanded a bit, because that statement in here is not accurate. There are tens of thousands of unnecessary truck trips in and out of Deltaport every year. It should go on the train.

C: *Anna Wright:* Mike, that feedback will form part of the record, but feel free to write things like that into your feedback form.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* But I mean does the Port have any comment about that? Is that accurate or not? Is Mike correct in what he is saying?

A: *Michael Zachary:* What Mike is saying is true. It fluctuates depending upon the time of the year, it fluctuates depending on the congestion that occurs down at the railway, but there is a tonne of containers that are transported like he says.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Unnecessarily? It almost sounds like there is a better way to do it.

A: *Michael Zachary:* Well, if you can easily put them on at the on-dock intermodal facility at Deltaport, they are going to go to Montreal, they are going to go to Toronto, they are going to go to Chicago, you know, wherever they are going to go. And the only times that they really get congestion is when the railroad itself is congested on the causeway at Deltaport and they have to meet a deadline or meet a train. This is what Roberts Bank Terminal 2 is hoping to mitigate. So yes, with RBT2 coming on line, and the fact that you are going to have a wider causeway and get rid of that train congestion, those trucks that Mike is referring to will disappear.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Who makes that decision whether they go on trucks or train?

A: *Michael Zachary:* The railroad and the terminal operator. I want to go back to something that Deb said. You said 2,200 trucks. It was 22,000, so the port trucks are about 10% of the total trucks. And so all those other trucks are paying taxes, the port trucks are paying taxes, so your point is well taken, but the port component of the trucking is 10% of the total picture.

Q: *Eohgan Moriarty:* Does that include CN?

A: *Michael Zachary:* That includes all trucks.

C: *Anna Wright:* I think the question is, do the CN trucks make up that 10% of what you are saying for trucks?

A: *Michael Zachary:* They are part of the 2,000 licensed trucks.

Q: *Kent Webster:* With reference to returning the empties, where is the mathematics done about the paying of returning that empty back to China or wherever they are coming from? They have got to go back on a boat somehow. Is the cost of taking it back tagged onto when they are coming over full? Or where does the split come as to take them back empty?

A: *Michael Zachary:* Yes, the ocean carrier pays for the repositioning. There are two aspects of it. As Rhona said, it is heavier going out, so they can't load the ships full of loaded containers, so there is room to put empties on which are very light, but it is a repositioning. About 80% of the containers in the world are owned by the steamship lines. And they control their inventory of containers throughout the world. So that is the repositioning component of it.

And the other part of that is that they lose control if it goes inland. So, part of it is keeping control within the Lower Mainland. But the fact that I can put it on at 53-foot which is owned by the

railroads, or a logistics company, and I now, if I am Hyundai or Maersk, I can control that container, bring it back to the port, put it on a ship, and reposition it.

Why Roberts Bank?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of various geographic options for container terminals, as well as the existing and planned infrastructure at Roberts Bank (page 10-11 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Deb Jack:* What are you going to do with Fraser Surrey Docks? It's going to be coal?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Fraser Surrey Docks is looking to repurpose itself. I am not in that business.
- C: *Deb Jack:* You guys must have some very clear notion if that's the case because certainly it's generally thought that removing the tunnel is in order to get the deep draft container ships up to Fraser Docks if not further up the river.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* The length of the ships is actually what limits the ability of the container ships to go into the Fraser River. They are too long to turn in the river so even if the tunnel is removed and the draft issue is taken away; it is still the length of the ships that would prevent container ships from going up the river. We will continue to see the large container ships at Deltaport, and will see larger ships coming in in future and not smaller ships.
- Q: *Deb Jack:* Right. So what do you see Fraser Surrey Docks doing?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I know that there is a proposal from them to look at a coal facility there.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani:* But just to clarify again. There has not been a proposal from Fraser Surrey Docks for containers?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, there is no proposal from Fraser Surrey Docks for containers.
- C: *Mike Isinger:* So is that what we're discussing now the lack of a business case for T2? Because there are a lot of us--port workers included--that do not believe that T2 is necessary. The current container terminals in British Columbia are not being used to their maximum capacity. For example the ships are worked 21 shifts a week, the rail yards work 21 shifts a week, and we have street trucks bringing and taking away containers from the container terminals five shifts out of 21. We're not even using our existing terminals to their maximum capacity. We will get double the capacity with the existing terminals we have. Is that what we're talking about now the business case, because we don't believe that T2 is necessary. There is no business case for Terminal 2 and the port is not using the assets that are currently online to their maximum utilization at all and no will to do so.
- C: *Anna Wright:* We can talk about that or do you want to ask another question? I think that's in the information that comes on the next page.
- Q: *Rob Terris:* Yeah, part of the problem with the big ships is the dredging issue. There is not enough federal money coming in for dredging on the Fraser River right at Fraser Surrey Docks. Is that part of the problem?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So I'm talking here about containers so I can't speak to dredging in the Fraser River. I can say that the limitation on container ships to access the Fraser River is their length. That the size, the length of ships that currently are coming into Deltaport and the length of ships, as those of you who worked in the business know, they will become longer, cannot access the Fraser River due to their length. So it's not it's not the dredging. It's not the tunnel. It's the

length of the ships that is limiting the ability for container expansion or development within the Fraser River.

- C: *Rob Terris:* Another thing they are proposing at Surrey Fraser Docks is putting another facility there on a little island there. It's included in the transportation plan for the Fraser River.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* If you would like to talk about Fraser Surrey Docks, I can certainly get somebody from the Port to speak to you about some issues around Fraser Surrey Docks. I'm here to talk about the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project, which is a container project. And we cannot expand container business within the Fraser River due to the length of the ships that are currently servicing our facilities, as well as the ships that we anticipate coming into our facilities in the future.
- Q: *Rob Terris:* Can I make a statement about the containers that go through on the Fraser Docks? Is there a way like a garbage container that you have a lid over and you tip it, the lid lifts up and it dumps in? So it keeps the dust down when it comes through.
- Q: *Rhona Hunter:* You're talking about coal?
- Q: *Rob Terris:* I'm talking strictly about coal. And vents on the front and rear so at least you can vent it, so that the dust stays within. Is there something like that that can be done? Because if you can do that, that's a huge environmental concern and it would reduce a lot of people's concern about the dust flying.
- A: *Anna Wright:* Yeah, I think through this process we have heard this input from various community members. It's not directly related to the containers. The Port has a number of avenues where you can talk about the coal issue. And certainly we will note it here but there's going to be a more direct way to get to the Port about the coal.
- C: *Rob Terris:* I'm talking about containers, strictly containers.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* Coal is not in containers. We do not transport coal in containers at Deltaport.
- C: *Rob Terris:* Well, you have it in the rail cars. Maybe even a roller thing that can slide over and stop a good portion of the dust. Something like that makes a huge difference, and it cuts down the concerns in the community. It's strictly coal I'm talking about.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* I know and we're not talking about coal here; we're talking about servicing a container facility and a container port. We don't transport coal in containers.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Can I ask you a question about Prince Rupert? You said that they were at capacity for now and into the future. Do you know what their capacity is? How many TEUs?
- A: *Michael Zachary:* Two million TEUs. What you see here includes a total of 2 million which is a full expansion of what they call Phase 2, Stage 1, which is coming on board in 2015 and then their Phase 2, Stage 2 which takes it up to just under 2 million TEUs.
- C: *Cliff Caprani:* My information is they actually have plans funded to go to 5 million.
- C: *Michael Zachary:* Well, you have to tear down a complete mountain to do so, so it's going to be very, very expensive.
- C: *Cliff Caprani:* Fair enough but they have plans to do it though; it's actually on the books. So that's one of the things that I think might be possible with the capacity available at places other than Deltaport.

- C: *Michael Zachary*.: There is capacity and then there is reasonable capacity to take a look at. They have to move a complete mountain. It's huge.
- C: *Cliff Caprani*: But, as I said, there are plans to do that.

Why Do We Need More Capacity for Containerized Trade

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the container growth forecast (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).

- C: *Mike Isinger*: I wanted to discuss the lack of the business case. The independent container traffic congestions I believe have been superseded by newer information. In August in the *Journal of Commerce*, August 5th edition, Bill Mongelluzzo has a detailed name for it in which he quoted Mr. Nye. Mr. Nye says that Pacific Coast Ports in the U.S. and Canada handled 23 million TEUs last year. Their capacity under their current operating conditions is 35 million TEUs. If they operated more density on the European model they could handle 52 million TEUs and we're currently only handling 23.

Well, we're having a problem with the ex-CEO of Port Metro, Norman Stark, up till three years ago said that there would be a fourth berth at Deltaport before T2 was ever considered. And the federal government in their own report, 2008 said that the expansion of Prince Rupert prior to any additional dollars. It seems as soon as we hired Robin Sylvester to head up Port Metro, all the old way that we were going to progress with additional container capacity, the fourth berth at Deltaport and increasing Prince Rupert, all of a sudden it is T2 and we've got to have it.

We suggest to you as port workers that it's not necessary. We should improve our current efficiencies at the ports in British Columbia that handle containers. And there are a lot of efficiencies that are available just sitting on the table waiting to be grabbed.

And I would like to know from Port Metro why Port Metro Vancouver is subsidizing customers to call Deltaport when their business is closer to the inner harbour terminals? And we were up at Prince Rupert two months ago and the terminal manager was begging for additional business that is being steered to Deltaport. So I just put those questions out.

- C: *Rhona Hunter*: And certainly in your response to us, you could give us some ideas about where those efficiencies are. I think that is very valuable information for us to receive from you.
- C: *Mike Isinger*: Well, I did make that comment previously that a 100% reservation system currently is running 70% of reservations. In the inner harbour, the trucks are waiting four hours for containers because there is no will on the part of Port Metro to show some leadership on developing a 24-hour a day truck delivery system.

Like I said, the ships work 24 hours a day, the rail lines work 24 hours a day and we're expected to handle all that cargo. It's like a big choke point in all the terminals here in the Lower Mainland because trucks are only picking up during the Monday to Friday dayshift. And other than putting GPS in the trucks, which didn't do anything to improve the efficiency.

It is wrong what's happening to the truck drivers that haul these containers on behalf of these companies. Some of those guys are working for \$50 a day because of the inefficiencies getting in and out of the port because they are supposed to pick up all their containers during the Monday to Friday day shift. Reservations open up at midnight; by 12:01 all the reservations are gone for picking up the containers for the Lower Mainland container terminals because there is no will on the part of Port Metro to resolve this long standing trucking issue.

- C: *Rhona Hunter*: We do have a section later on in the guidebook that will speak about some specific feedback that we would like to have from you on trucking. So certainly we can dive into that a little bit more at that time.
- C: *Mike Isinger*: Okay, thank you.
- Q: *Deb Jack*: Everything that is being discussed right now is highly important and once again environmental issues are right at the very end. And we have an hour left so I wonder if we could have at least a minimum of 20 minutes to discuss the environmental issues? Too often it goes maybe the last five minutes.
- A: *Anna Wright*: Yes.
- Q: *Wayne Mills*: Currently there is 3.3 million 20-foot units going through and they say by 2030 it will go to nine-and-three-quarters, so it is going to triple through Vancouver and through the B.C. Coast in the next 14 years. Now is this traffic because the U.S. ports are running out of space? Because from what I gather out of Rupert, 90% of it is heading straight to Chicago, so that's all heading to the States. It's not anything to do with Canadian economy or a very small bit, so this isn't because you don't need this because the American economy you believe is going to keep going?
- Q: *Michael Zachary*: 10% of the cargo that comes through the Lower Mainland through Centerm, Vanterm and Deltaport goes into the U.S. That's all. Prince Rupert, because of CN is geared to hit the heartland of both Canada and the U.S. but our target market is the eastern Canadian market.

Marine Terminal

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including the anticipated economic and job benefits of the project (page 16 and 17 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Deb Jack*: Excuse me. We're British Columbia, we're the Lower Mainland. When it says \$1.63 billion to the Canadian economy, quite frankly that doesn't appear to be very much, but how much of that occurs here in the Lower Mainland? That's the kind of stuff that we need to know here so that we can make accurate responses and certain decisions if there ever needs to be a decision made by us citizens. So all of these things need to be broken down.
- A: *Erin Bishop*: Part of the environmental assessment is a detailed economic impact assessment, and that's where you'll find a detailed analysis of that kind of breakdown that you're looking for, including exactly where the economic contributions will be nationally, regionally and locally. It will also include a section on government revenues, so that's where you'll see the details of the tax that Port Metro Vancouver will pay provincially and federally and what happens to that tax revenue, to the best of our knowledge. And that's being done by an independent economic impact assessment expert.
- C: *Deb Jack*: Well, I'm a little bit skeptical. I don't appreciate the reason why when for the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which is really a super highway, the environmental assessment said that, yes, indeed there would be an impact on the health of seniors and children because of the particulates as a result of all the truck traffic but that would be compensated by more jobs in the health sector in the future. If that's the type of thing that we can expect from this environmental assessment, then I'm wondering about its real sound utility. I wish that what I just said was not so, but really an exaggeration. I thank you very much.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Can we have a comment about that? Are you just going to note that down and put it in the report?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes, we've noted a concern. We will take that concern. I didn't do the environmental assessment for the South Fraser Perimeter Road.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Okay, so then it comes back to what Mike just asked a second ago about the fact that terminal is not running at capacity. Again, no comment from the top table about that? I mean is this accurate? Is it just the ravings of a wild man here from the lowly union? What's your take on that, please?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So we have done economic forecasts and we have determined based upon our operational understanding of the terminals and the capacity that we currently see them and that we project those terminals to be provided that Terminal 2 is required.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Okay, and I ask you then for the snapshot that Mike provided of today, that it's not running at capacity. Is that accurate?

A: *Michael Zachary:* If we go back to what Rhona said for DTRRIP, Deltaport is at about 1.6 million TEUs. You're doing 51,000 or 38,000 feet of train a day and DTRRIP within two years is going to take up to 2.4 million TEUs and close to 70,000 feet of trains a day. So, yes, right now they're not operating at the true capacity. They're getting two more brand new ship-to-shore gantry cranes. They're getting four more rail mounted-gantry cranes. They're getting 48 more hostlers, you know, they're getting a whole bunch of more equipment and so just by the numbers, they're not increasing any land area, and they're going to have to operate 24/7.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* But no I'm just trying to get an honest assessment of whether the snapshot that Mike provided is accurate or not. You're telling me that it is?

A: *Michael Zachary:* It is today. I don't know what your throughput per TEU is, but he's talking about L.A./Long Beach being about 4,500 TEUs. Seattle-Tacoma about 3,000 TEUs. That's where he's coming up with. You guys are much higher than that, as you're already densified. With the stuff that's coming down online for DTRRIP, they're going to be at where Terminal 2 is absolutely required.

C: *Cliff Caprani:* I don't agree with that I think. Thanks.

Marine Terminal

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the terminal design and construction (page 18 and 19 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Rob Terris:* The sand, does it come and silt in where the ships are? Is it a dredging issue, or is that not a problem there?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It hasn't been a problem at Deltaport and we do not anticipate that there's going to be a need here but that's something that we would have to determine once it's operational. Our current design and understanding is that the continual dredging of the berth front is not going to be required.

C: *Michael Zachary:* That's correct. We're also doing hydraulic modeling.

Q: *Deb Jack:* One of my concerns is just generally for anything, is that if adequate research and everything else is not done before plans are made, then one organization winds up being in

constant repair mitigation. Was a very thorough environmental assessment, with a hydrological and all of the different kinds of issues assessment done before this proposal was put out there?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Good question. There was an analysis done on the actual location of that land mass and it was a balance between the environmental considerations with the sensitive foreshore and staying out of what's called the zero tide line, which is the area where, once you start to cut into it, you get substantial scour and you get little channels in the mud flat. This was balanced with the seismic requirements and stability of the island the further out into the deeper water that we go.

Interestingly enough, it was a balance that the engineers and the environmentalists sort of came together and said, "This is the best place for it," and it happened to be the same place for each side.

C: *Deb Jack:* I ask because I do remember in the ancient olden days when they were initially talking about the original terminal, and there were supposed to be all sorts of ways in which the water would flow through and the animals could go underneath the causeway. As I understand, these are not existing, so there are some serious consequent issues on the south side of that causeway.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* So to the question of why is there not a breach in the causeway, it causes more damage because you're cutting into the intertidal zone and there's lots of scientific reasons and I think there's a memo that's out there that speaks to it. We can certainly get that to you. It speaks to why breaching that causeway is actually is more detrimental than the good that it would provide.

C: *Deb Jack:* Okay, as I said, I remember that being discussed in ancient things and it wasn't done. So thank you very much.

Q: *Rob Terris:* Have you communicated with YVR to see if there are any flight issues, especially with the south terminal?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* That's probably part of the environmental impact assessment. Currently there has been a red flag raised at this time.

C: *Rob Terris:* Well, sometimes it's an emergency and somebody at the terminal may have to land and sometimes they come in pretty low.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* That's part of the environmental assessment process.

A: *Michael Zachary:* The answer is yes to your question. The land that you have here right now, not only to count the two items that Rhona talked about, but we're also looking specifically at aircraft landing patterns and the winds and the currents.

Q: *Rob Terris:* And you have communicated with YVR?

A: *Michael Zachary:* Yes. So that portion of it has been done and I think when Rhona gets into the process of the environmental assessment and who is doing what to where, a lot of these questions are going to come up.

Q: *Judy Higginbotham:* Just listening to the conversation, am I hearing that in the long term you're looking less and less at using the Fraser River for any container shipping?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.

Q: *Judy Higginbotham:* So you're moving it more away from the river. And what's the capacity you're looking at? We fly into Singapore and there's a city of shipping containers. It boggles your mind when you see it in daylight. When you see it at night, you think it's a city. It's mind boggling to see the amount of container traffic. I guess this is often my concern that "long term" in politics is five years, and port containers and so on look 20, 50, 100 years down the road. And will this still be a terminal in that time according to whatever studies we do have? Because it still is a sheltered area, it still is and has its limitations.

Q: *Rhona Hunter:* Are you talking about the Fraser River?

Q: *Judy Higginbotham:* I'm talking about the port itself. Like what is the overall capacity that you're putting there? I quite agree with putting the ports along the Fraser River. But you're saying that the ships are getting larger, so any of this container traffic is then going to more and more go to Roberts Bank and away from the existing ports. That's more my question.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* In the future, we do not anticipate Fraser Surrey Docks growing their business. In fact, we would see their container business declining because of the size of container ships that are coming to the West Coast of Canada and the United States cannot navigate in the Fraser River.

Q: *Judy Higginbotham:* Okay, and I like the answer to that question. But having said that, I guess I'm looking at the entire sort of passage of Terminal 2 and Terminal 1 in Tsawwassen. This is where you're doing most of the major port activity. We would also be moving away from the Vancouver area? Is what you're saying?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No. Centerm and Vanterm remain and will be optimized and in fact if you go back to page 12, you'll see around 2028 we have inner harbour improvements, so we do anticipate that Centerm leases and potentially some land could be acquired that we would be looking at some further expansions within the inner harbour.

Q: *Judy Higginbotham:* And you know, I think one of the challenges is that you have to look at the Lower Mainland as an overall system because of the shipping. Just so inextricably linked and if one is out of whack then you have problems in the entire Lower Mainland. And we fought for the South Fraser Perimeter Road. We didn't have a whole lot of ability to make sure that the route was pristine because it does have some environmental challenges. And we need a North Fraser Perimeter Road and if you don't get some of those things, you're going to be somewhat hamstrung and crippled. These are the things that I think when I look at the picture; I'm trying to sort of figure out down the road how long is this going to play on. The best place to put it is where we should be looking at expansion.

So I guess basically I am asking you how much lobbying have you done? How much have you worked with some of the other stakeholders to look at the entire picture in the long term. And this is why I'm listening to the conversation and I am learning a great deal. I don't know how you answer some of those questions.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So big projects like this take a long time to come to fruition. We are still quite a ways out from even having the necessary permitting to even begin to construct it. And it's a six year construction period. So we're quite a ways away from actually having this capacity and this project on line, if it is approved. So there is a tremendous amount of work that continues to go on in the port to look at exactly what you're talking about: What are the other requirements that are going to be needed in order to facilitate making these terminals that already exist more

efficient? What are some of the other infrastructure that needs to be looked at to ensure that the logistics chain operates efficiently? So yes, we continue to look at all of those in a more holistic way for the port and the adjacent communities and businesses. Put that feedback in a written submission as well so we can capture those comments.

- C: *Judy Higginbotham*: Oh absolutely, because there is such definition around Vancouver and the Lower Mainland. You're talking about mountains, which control certain things like dredging, which if you don't have the federal government bridge then the rivers are still too much.
- Q: *Deb Jack*: How high do they anticipate the sea levels are going to go at which time? The reason I ask that is because just lately we've got the latest WCC report which says that things are heating up much faster than they thought, even 10 years ago. And it looks as if all of that is happening much sooner, which means of course we're going to have seas rising faster. I understand that Surrey in its assessment is taking approximately 1 metre increases. It looks as if it is probably going to be sooner than later.
- A: *Michael Zachary*: 3.5 metres in a hundred years. That's what this is designed at, but we've got a problem called the causeway, so unless we go back and rebuild the causeway, which you can dyke. So when we looked at this we looked at the sea rise at the 20-, 40- and 100-year marks and we got all sorts of numbers. The high number was 7 metres, the low number was 1 metre. So the engineers right now, based upon what we're all saying in terms of the analysis, we're looking at 3.5.
- Q: *Deb Jack*: And those numbers were determined when?
- A: *Michael Zachary*: Within the last six months.
- C: *Deb Jack*: Okay, that's interesting.
- C: *Michael Zachary*: Again, the process that we're going through in this environmental assessment, as Rhona said, there's a lot of studies that are going on now. Erin just mentioned three or four different studies. Whoever the final ultimate decision makers are is going to tell us what studies need to be done. This is the preliminary design.
- Q: *Al Schulze*: Since we're talking about the causeway, will there be an increase in the width of the causeway?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes.
- Q: *Al Schulze*: So it will get wider?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes. The causeway has been strategically designed to be widened where it actually has infrastructure on it that requires it. So we actually use an undulating shoreline. In some places it gets widened as much as a 100 feet and in other cases it only gets widened by 50 feet. So it's going to depend on what infrastructure is required at that place along the causeway. We've done engineering to avoid as much of that sensitive foreshore area where the biofilm and intertidal marsh is.
- Q: *Al Schulze*: That begs the next question, is there any plan for increasing the coal capacity? I know this has nothing to do with containers.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: No.
- Q: *Al Schulze*: Are there any plans to get rid of the coal capacity?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: No.

Q: *Al Schulze*: Because if you build a bridge and then it would be impossible to bring those ships up the Fraser, the ones that move the coal, to say the Surrey Fraser Docks. Is it possible that might be the plan?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: There is no plan to change the operations at Deltaport. Those are long term leases.

C: *Al Schulze*: Because currently there is a movement to bring more coal in from New West. I know it is not going to go to Deltaport as it is right now. In fact none of it as far as I know.

C: *Rhona Hunter*: I can't say because I'm not in that business.

C: *Al Schulze*: Because I get the coal trains going by in South Surrey.

Habitat Mitigation

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the habitat mitigation work that Port Metro Vancouver is contemplating as part of the project (page 22 and 23 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Cliff Caprani*: Just two quick questions. The exchange rate at the habitat bank, you take out an acre and you want to use it somewhere else, is it a one-for-one or is it a two-for-one where you have to replace twice what you took out?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: It will depend on two things. It will depend on the *Federal Fisheries Act* that is going through revision and we don't quite know what the new fisheries regulations are going to say. Our understanding is that they are going to change from this "one-to-one" that's currently in place. In the past it's been one hectare that you either offset for two-to-one or three-to-one or four-to-one and therefore for every one hectare of impact you would offset with two or three or four depending on what the environmental review process had stipulated.

We don't know what that is going to look like so it will be whatever is required in accordance with the new regulations as well as what the regulator then determines through their approval process.

Q: *Cliff Caprani*: Okay, second question: Sometimes land is destroyed in such a way that it can't be replaced. For instance, I am thinking of the biofilm around that area that we've spoken of. If that gets destroyed and can't be replaced, what happens there? I mean, not everything that's removed from here can be rebuilt over there. What happens in that case?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: So, it really comes down to the regulators and the environmental assessment process. It wouldn't be for me to make that determination; it would be up to the regulators and the environmental process to determine how they could offset that impact and what other things might be value added to offset the impact.

Q: *Cliff Caprani*: All right, so just one last question: Does that happen before or after the project is completed?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: The assessment happens before the project is completed. The mitigation, anything that is not in the bank would be done either in conjunction with the project or after the project in accordance with the approvals from the regulators.

C: *Cliff Caprani*: So, it's going to be kind of difficult if something gets destroyed and late in the project. If the Port wreaks havoc in some area later on in the project and, you know, the agency

that's responsible is not going to say, "Cease and desist. You can't build the port now. You're 90% completed, okay, so you destroyed something that can't be replaced."

- C: *Rhona Hunter:* Well, there is integrity within the process itself and the regulatory process is supposed to prevent that type of situation.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Well, how can it?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So that's what the regulatory process does. We work very extensively determining what the baseline conditions are. So the first stage that we're in is that we do extensive work in environmental studies that determine what the existing baseline is. What the conditions are out in the environment as we stand now. What's done then is the project itself, after we come to consensus what the regulatory process is, and then it is determined what the impact of that project is on the environment. There are then refinements to offset and reduce that input. The mitigation of any residual impact that the project has then becomes part of the approval process within our permit to build.
- C: *Cliff Caprani:* I am not terribly heartened by that.
- C: *Rob Terris:* Yes, I agree with the federal government, too. I did work at the ports, and the Canadian Environmental Assessment is unbelievably strong and strict. All of my projects, that is part of the process, and I have to say it is a benefit in B.C. environmental assessment process. You know that. And Fisheries and Oceans, Transport Canada, Environment Canada, they are so stringent on everything. When they do this process, it is very strong, and it is there for the environment and for the better, that is my feeling.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani:* I mean, you are aware that DFO have been gutted in recent years, right?
- A: *Rob Terris:* The Canadian Environmental Assessment process is very good.
- C: *Deb Jack:* With respect, nothing now is the same as it used to be. Nothing now is.
- C: *Rob Terris:* It is even better.
- C: *Cliff Caprani:* Oh, stop.
- C: *Rob Terris:* In the past there was none.
- C: *Cliff Caprani:* There is a federal gag order on the scientists for crying out loud.
- Q: *Deb Jack:* I wish I had more information than just what was written here. As I listened to you talk, what went through my mind was the Pacific Carbon Trust, which when I first saw it, my perception which never got changed by what happened subsequently was, "This was a scam." I am concerned when it says here "creating and improving fish and wildlife habitat in advance of potential port development projects." So, on the top of it I can see, okay, that it is done, and it may look like a very good thing, but then that would provide the allowance for destroying stuff? Because you would be able to say, "But we did this ahead of time, and this is our bank." But that is assuming that the bank has the exact same environmental value on a specific and a general basis, as what it is that is being destroyed in the process of construction.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So it's a very good question. The bank is not a panacea. The bank has not been licensed to do anything; the bank simply is a depository for habitat which could be used in accordance with an environmental review process, and in approvals through the regulatory agencies to offset or to mitigate a future project. So the bank doesn't give a license to do

anything. The bank is just a place that a project can go and say, "Through the environmental assessment process, we have determined that you need X," whatever X is, "in order to mitigate your project."

Q: *Deb Jack:* So, perhaps I misheard you earlier. Would this would solely be for Port Metro Vancouver, not for any other organization to draw on?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No. This is the Port Metro Vancouver's bank. We have the understanding that the first user will be Port Metro Vancouver, because it's our bank, and we will certainly look to our bank for any port project or any of our tenants' or proponent's projects, but we are absolutely open that if there is availability in the bank that those people don't need, and suits the needs of another third party. They certainly would have access to that bank at a cost.

Q: *Deb Jack:* Okay, then I did hear, and my concern with regards to a replication of the carbon trust has some validity. And on the face of it, as I said, I would have to do a great deal more reading and consideration. That raises concerns.

Now, let me just push over. I think you've got two good illustrations here on your graphs at the bottom. I just heard of the instance where a huge amount of log debris was removed from the bank and all the rest of it. This has currently been done in another area because the port has been able to do that?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.

C: *Deb Jack:* One of the interesting things, and it was mentioned to me because I am not a birder, is that virtually nothing was left for providing a habitat for the snowy owls which are now coming down in huge numbers compared to what they used to, and they are going to go back there and there won't be any place for them to perch. And indeed, according to what I have been told, there is no place in the greater Vancouver area for them to go and perch.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* So there were strategic logs and perches left in place, and in fact, Carolyn here is the expert on those exact projects. They were left there strategically for perches and for birds to utilize in the area. Environment Canada and the Ministry of Forestry, Lands and Natural Resource Operations was part of the conversation around that, and they raised concerns, and they were very, very happy with the work that was done. So there are a lot of people who are involved in approval and the proceedings of that project in Boundary Bay, including regulatory agencies, wildlife, marine people, all who move forward with this as being a very positive for both birds and fish.

C: *Deb Jack:* You will appreciate that so many people who are concerned about the living environment here in the Lower Mainland are extremely skeptical, and based on previous experience, not very confident. And one of the concerns expressed by many is that the people who know the area best, who are those who are actively in the field all the time making observations in the course of doing the things that they enjoy aren't ever consulted. So these kinds of things have been happening out of the consultation, actively and intensively by these regulatory people and the people who work for the governments. Because quite frankly, all of the people who work for the governments are so clearly politically driven that people who are on the field and live as residents are concerned about the kinds of things that are produced as a result.

C: *Anna Wright:* So Deb, we do have a number of meetings upcoming and if you know of anyone that would like to participate in this process and provide very specific input about areas that, as

you say, they know because they've been living in those areas, please let them know about how they can participate in this.

- Q: *Al Schulze:* We are talking about the current area of 72nd Street, 64th Street and so on. There are some logs sticking out to be sure but it will take time for this to mitigate itself, if it does. What do the birds do this winter, because the logs do release food for them as well because there are moles and whatever living in the logs? My question is: how is this financed?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* By Port Metro Vancouver.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* So they have a bank where they get money from to pay for the bank?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* It comes out of our capital projects, yes.
- C: *Rob Terris:* Reifel Island is a huge area of habitat for birds. Some of my projects were there. You just have to go look and you'll see the snow birds there. And T1 is in their flight path, they virtually land in that area, and it's massive.
- C: *Cliff Caprani:* You're talking about the geese.
- C: *Deb Jack:* You are talking about the geese; we are talking about the owls.
- C: *Rob Terris:* I mean there is every type of bird there.
- C: *Deb Jack:* Rob, I am fully aware of Reifel. What you are talking about is condensing everything into the small area of Reifel when the natural habitat is the entire Lower Mainland.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* So we do have some consultation topics around mitigation, it's not just some sort of smaller banking projects, we do have some questions that we are asking specifically around preference in terms of whether we do want to look at a lot of smaller projects or whether there is a preference that we look at some bigger projects or if we actually look at some infrastructure like a fish hatchery. So, on page 23, we do have some more details around some of the things that we are currently looking at from a mitigation standpoint that we would like to have your input on preferences or where you think there should be an emphasis placed.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani:* In the Project Description what you don't have, on page 36 there was something about potential trans-boundary effects. Underwater noise with soil density based on pile driving during construction. My question is how long is that underwater noise going to last?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There is minimal pile driving. There might be some around the tug basin. That is it.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Well, I am more interested in the actual underwater noise itself, and soil densification, underwater noise in berthing, all that stuff. How long is that going to go on for?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The construction period is six years, and I would say that the berth face would probably be one of the first areas, so I don't have detailed plans now on the construction sequencing.
- Q: *Judy Higginbotham:* But you also have an environmental window that you can build in each year?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We will have all sorts of constraints put on us that we don't know right now. We will work around SRKW and marine mammals, but we don't have that yet. We are not there in

the environmental process, so we can't speak specifically as to what those windows are, what we would do to work around them.

C: *Rob Terris*: The new pounders now that they have are very quiet. When they built the new bridge it was unbelievably quiet, and it went down so fast you could virtually see it in the water. I was almost in shock because I have lots of trepidation on the pounding and the banging and the loud noise. I say it is one-one hundredth of the old way. If you had a chance, you could have gone down there and seen the pounding working, and you'd be surprised and in shock at the quietness. So the new methods now they are really good.

C: *Cliff Caprani*: I am more interested in the underwater stuff. Not just above ground.

C: *Rob Terris*: This is the water stuff I am talking about.

Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: I just want to confirm that the Terminal 2 project will not handle anything besides containers? It won't handle coal; it won't handle oil and gas by the barrel? It will only handle container traffic?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Only containers.

Road and Rail Traffic Considerations

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the road and rail traffic considerations, as well as the various options for mitigation that the port is looking for feedback on (page 24-29 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Al Schulze*: On page 24, you talk about eight to 10 container trains. Is this in addition to the current trains? Or is this the total?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: No, that is eight to 10 additional trains, four to five in, four to five out.

C: *Al Schulze*: So, because the way it reads, it looks like it is for the whole. You know, it doesn't say "additional" it just simply says, "would generate between," and so on.

Q: *Mike Isinger*: So, a trip in and a trip out is classified as two trains?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes.

Q: *Al Schulze*: Okay, well fair enough. My question is, currently, there is also many trains go in and out. This is in addition. So, if you have 10 trains a day now, it will be 20?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes.

C: *Al Schulze*: Maybe that should be indicated somewhere.

C: *Rhona Hunter*: Good point. Thank you.

C: *Deb Jack*: This is where it is frustrating that you are only dealing with one and not dealing with the holistic thing. Because I fortunately live in the centre of Surrey, so depending on the winds, I don't get the impact of all of the trains going through. What is going to happen with regards to Surrey port and the coal issue, then we would have a really much better picture on what it is that we are going to be facing and could then better comment and feedback. If we only had an isolated thing, that makes it very, very difficult.

Environmental Assessment

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the environmental assessment process (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Deb Jack:* So, when you do these cumulative effects assessments, do you also consider that which is being proposed by other organizations?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Reasonable, foreseeable projects are not just port projects. They are reasonable and foreseeable within a geographic area. So it doesn't matter whose project it is.
- C: *Deb Jack:* Because one of the things that I would like to see is some kind of an assessment of what the increase in all of the shipping is going to be in the entire Lower Mainland. That includes over in Vancouver, on the North Shore, in the harbour there, going all around to the port part of the river, as well as other ports so that we can see.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* So the scope is determined through the regulators. I can't say that as part of our project we would do a, you know, northwest coast of Vancouver Island assessment of all shipping. That's probably out of our scope.
- Q: *Deb Jack:* No, I appreciate that, but we are getting so much that is isolated, we have so many things as citizens with which we have to deal. And if you all live here in the Lower Mainland, you also know our citizens are going to be impacted. It's very difficult to get a summative number. So I would anticipate now that we would get some kind of a number through your studies that will give us an idea of what the anticipated increase in marine traffic would be with regards to expansion that is going to happen on the North Shore, the expansion that is going to happen with regards to Kinder Morgan, with regards to just regular stuff that is going into Vancouver, all the stuff that is proposed for the river, and all the stuff that is proposed for the port, so that we could see the increased demand with regards to here, what is going to happen here to all our waterways, and indeed, what is going to happen at the entrance to the Salish Sea. Because that is also an issue with regards to all of this traffic, and where is it going to go, and how is it going to go through. And there would also be an impact on the increase that has been forecasted for Victoria, because it uses the same outlet to the ocean. So, I would hope that we would see all of that?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The scope of the assessment is determined by a regulator, and so that will then determine the geographic area which we would do cumulative effects.
- Q: *Deb Jack:* I guess what I am doing is asking at the very least you might be proactive.
- A: *Erin Bishop:* Deb, I can speak to that. So, in addition to the cumulative effects assessment that looks at planned projects and separate projects that don't exist now, each study in every environmental assessment includes a local study area, or local assessment area, that looks at where the anticipated effects of the project are, and a regional assessment area or study area that provides context to the impacts of the project. And I think that is what you are speaking to. And that will tell you what is happening in a broader area. Even if there isn't a new planned project, just with the growth of our other facilities, that will be the context for the impacts that are anticipated as a result of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project.
- So, short answer is yes, you will see what you are looking for in the environmental assessment.
- C: *Deb Jack:* It is perhaps an issue of semantics of the definition of "local" and "regional". I would suggest that "local" encompasses the entire mouth of the Fraser River, and that "regional" would then encompass the impacts of the Salish Sea going out to the ocean. We are talking about an international port, and that has been emphasized constantly, so I think we have to expand the definition of "region".

C: *Judy Higginbotham*: When I look at that over a period of years what we've experienced in the City of Surrey, not just more trains, but longer trains, and then a different mix of goods that are coming on the trains. All too often a lot of stuff we don't know about, and many of that goes around the South Surrey area, right around and cuts off Crescent Beach, quite regularly when it stops, and we do understand that any impact or the doubling of whatever you do in the port area, or in the airport, deals a lot, deals a tremendous amount with trucking. Their increase is where they impacts us, but they are not increasing their facility particularly.

We know you have an intermodal yard in North Surrey, but the trains that are coming up to those intermodal yards are government linked and they weren't ten years ago. And they are certainly carrying goods. Many of them are not proper and uniform. They're sometimes a little sloppily looked after. And you don't have jurisdiction over them. But the impact of those things on which you don't have control can be very great on community, and those are part and parcel I think of many of the concerns and many of the things that the community thinks of. Because you have to look at environmental as well as the social impact, and too often I think we are called emotional.

And sometimes we may be. If I hang up a white washing on the line, which we haven't done for 20 years, but if I did, and it was black from the coal trains going by. I mean, there is so much that I know you are trying to do, and I certainly know that you are dealing with the issues that you have control over. But it's the issues that you don't. The capacities of the trains, the length of trains, the frequency of trains, and so on and so forth. What you are talking about here is just one issue and then you look at the building and the capacity of the trucks and the frequency of trucks, and those are all issues.

And I know you have indicated, and you have spoken about it, but you have control over 2,000 of the 24,000 trucks. You also will be putting new containers and more containers on trains, which I agree with. I mean I think it's not a bad thing, but unfortunately we do have a lot of challenges and problems with rail regulations and how they regulate their goods in transport and so forth. And that's a big issue to us. So we need your help, and we need your voices making sure that you are dealing with those issues in a very practical way. Thank you

Community Legacy benefits

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the types of community legacy benefits that Port Metro Vancouver is looking for feedback on (page 22-29 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Deb Jack*: What kind of money are you talking about?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: We don't have a dollar figure at this point but it will be substantial and significant.

C: *Deb Jack*: Because the kind of money that would be expended in what's being suggested here under environment is certainly nowhere near comparable to some of the others.

C: *Rhona Hunter*: We would love to hear from you if you would have some ideas. So please provide any comments or additional suggestions on the feedback form under those sections.

C: *Deb Jack*: Because I also have a concern where it suggests essentially that the community benefits would be replacing or supplementing what government levels are supposed to be doing as a matter of course, for example, additional air quality monitoring stations. That's the responsibility of government, and this should not be considered for community benefits.

- C: *Rhona Hunter*: This kind of feedback would be greatly appreciated. We're out here in the communities. We want to hear from the communities what their desires and needs and what their ideas around community legacy benefits are.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani*: Just a quick question on the graph on page 29. I just sort of noticed it now and in brackets they have number of respondents. So for the question of the environment you asked 40 people?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: We didn't actually ask 40 people. We asked everybody who participated and provided a feedback form. Everybody who came to an open house, everybody that came to a small group meeting, and anybody who filled out a form.
- Q: *Cliff Caprani*: Do you have a sense as to how many that might be? Is it like in the thousands?
- A: *Matt Skinner*: It was in the range of a hundred people, Cliff.
- C: *Cliff Caprani*: Because I obviously I'm sort of making a point that it's only us in the room to decide for everybody else, that's what you get, it's strange.
- C: *Matt Skinner*: And Cliff, you can actually find that specific information in the Consultation Summary Report for Project Definition Consultation, which took place last fall. We recognize that it's a small number and it's not just these people making the decision. However, it was a question that was asked and as a follow-up, and is being posed now as a continuation of the conversation. That's the context for the information.
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: But you raise a good point about participation and that's why we have to encourage you to please tell your friends, colleagues, neighbours and business associates. If you're not able to make it out to a consultation event, all this is online and we'd love to hear from more people than what you've identified.
- Q: *Judy Higginbotham*: They can answer online?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes, you can read this online and you can answer it online.
- Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: So when the facility is up and running, how many people are going to be employed at Terminal 2?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: So if you go back to the beginning of the guide and we look at page 17, that's our current sort of high level projections that we have in terms of economic benefit. As Erin indicated, as part of the environmental impact assessment we'll have a great delineation of where those are regionally, locally, and community-wise.
- Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: But how many people are actually working on projects? And separated from indirect and future employees? How many employees will there be at the work site?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: So it is 9,200 total.
- Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: There's 10,000 working at the facility?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: That's direct employment, so that's not on the facility. So that would be on the facility that would be truck drivers, rail drivers, anything that's considered by definition direct. So indirect refers to employees in industries supported by port business. Induced employment refers to jobs generated by expenditures by those employees directly or indirectly.

- C: *Eoghan Moriarty*: Well, here's my point, that it's misleading to claim 9,000 jobs when you don't actually have a figure for how many people are working at that facility.
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: So you want to know how many people are going to be on the terminal?
- C: *Eoghan Moriarty*: Yeah, on these facilities.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Okay, so the number of people who will work on the terminal will depend on the terminal operator. Our current projection that is used to develop all of this economic data is that it is a semi-automated terminal. Who the eventual terminal operator is and how they choose to operate their terminal will actually then dictate how many jobs are on that terminal.
- Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: So compared to Deltaport 1, which is the same type of automated as well, there are seven hundred jobs there?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: No.
- C: *Mike Isinger*: Well, just in supplementary. Currently for eight rubber tire gantries now they employ over 20 people. In an automated terminal, one person will operate all the rubber tire gantries.
- C: *Michael Zachary*: We won't go that far.
- C: *Mike Isinger*: Which is current practice in North America, 24 jobs translated into 1 job. So we're concerned about the total man hours of support workers per TEU moved, and there will be a significant reduction and then once again we believe that the figures don't substantiate the business case, the metrics are flawed and we don't believe it's necessary and it won't be necessary for a long time.
- The Global Alliance moved, for you that don't know, moved from Seattle to Tacoma. You drive down to Seattle down the I5 you can see all the docks are empty. There's lots of capacity in the Pacific Northwest for containers for years to come and if we improve our efficiencies in our current container terminals here in British Columbia, there's no necessity for Terminal 2 whatsoever. It's been manufactured by Port Metro Vancouver and it continues to be pushed and manufactured. I would suggest to you that there's international interest outside of Canada that are pressuring for this upgraded terminal.
- Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: So do we have an idea roughly what that number would be?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: I don't have it so I would have to get you the number that we've used. We do have all of these economic reports on our website and it's in there so if you want to, you can certainly look at the economic reports that we currently have on our website and it will provide you with an assumption of how many on terminal jobs there are strictly from the terminal.
- Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: From the terminal operator?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yeah from the terminal operator, yes.
- Q: *Mike Isinger*: A question on the clean truck program, since we're finishing up on environmental. The clean truck program, LA/Long Beach 2007 Trucks, I believe January 1st, 2012. I wonder what percentage of dirty trucks are still running around the Lower Mainland being that Port Metro's program is contrary to LA/Long Beach's January 1st, 2015, no more pre-2007 dirty trucks driving around. I'm wondering what percentage of the total fleet that are licensed by Port Metro right now are dirty trucks running around the Lower Mainland?

A: *Erin Bishop*: I know we had some information about that and there was a stepwise program that the port initiated as part of its partnership with the ports of Seattle and Tacoma. It's called the Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy and there's information online about that as well.

The port initiated a program to phase out older engine model years based on some regulations and industry practice and to reduce the opacity of the emissions of those trucks and so information was provided to the trucking companies about engine retrofit options or engine replacement options and I remember I was involved several years ago, but 2017 is another year for cut off and I believe after 2017 no trucks will be able to access the port unless they have an engine model year of 2008 or newer. The information is online.

Q: *Mike Isinger*: I'm wondering what mitigation fees are attached to trucking companies that are still running those dirty trucks. I know they use the mitigation fee of \$35 per TEU to move the trucking companies into purchasing 2007 or newer engines. I wonder what the mitigation fee is that Port Metro is using to encourage those companies to upgrade their fleet?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: You know, Mike, I'd probably have to get somebody from our port operations to get back to you on that because it's a port operations question around the trucking business, and so we don't get into the fees that would be there or the incentives that would get there. But we'd certainly be able to provide you -- if there was a fee, we'd certainly be able to provide that for you.

Q: *Mike Isinger*: That's just a means to an end. I'm more concerned about what percentage of the Port Metro Vancouver licensed trucks are dirty trucks running around the Lower Mainland. That's the question I want. Leading up to 2015 banning all pre-2007 trucks?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: So we can get that data for you, yeah. We can get that data.

Q: *Deb Jack*: Just a quick question for Mike. Are you including the 22,000 articulated trucks that transport different cargos all around that relate directly to what it is the port brings in?

A: *Mike Isinger*: No, being a waterfront port worker, I'm more concerned about the trucks that are licensed by Port Metro Vancouver.

C: *Deb Jack*: I'm just wondering about these 22,000 other trucks. Because every time Ministry of Transport does one of their truck checking things, they take 50% of them off the road because they're in bad shape.

Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: Are the trains still exempt?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: It's just trucks.

Q: *Eoghan Moriarty*: It's only trucks?

A: *Erin Bishop*: There are some initiatives around rail and ship traffic as well. Ocean going vessels as well as container handling equipment as part of the Northwest port Ports Clean Air Strategy. It is a collaborative effort in place to work towards lowering emissions from locomotives, but as you indicated, the Port doesn't have jurisdiction or control around that so that I don't know the status of those ongoing conversations.

C: *Eoghan Moriarty*: It's diesel particulate matter we're talking about. Because I think since 2007, all trucks have emissions controls, and the trains should have the same thing. It's a huge number of trips.

Q: *Deb Jack:* I don't know what the terminology is for the electrical plugs for the ships that are at port can plug into?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So shore power is part of this proposed project, yes.

Q: *Deb Jack:* But it won't extend to port 1, will it?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah, probably within the next two to three years you're going to see Deltaport service for shore power. It's not our ability to have shore power; it's the ability of ships to plug in to shore power.

C: *Deb Jack:* Yeah, I appreciate that. But maybe that would be a restriction on the ships that you would have coming. That you say you have to have the capability of being able to plug in. Because after all, we are in a bowl that is funnel shaped and so the air issue here is going to get much more precarious as we increase in terms of the volume of all of the industrial activities as well as population.

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

The meeting ended at 3:11pm.