

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

**Multi-Stakeholder Meeting 4
June 15, 2011**

Notes from a Pre-Consultation multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, June 15, 2011, 2:00pm-4:00pm, at the Eaglequest Coyote Creek Golf Cluff, Surrey, BC.

Stakeholders: Dan Barnscher, Surrey Fire
Deb Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners
Lucie Matich, Port Mann Community Association
Al Schulze, Surrey Environmental Advisory Committee / White Rock
Surrey Naturalists
Liz Walker, White Rock Surrey Naturalists
Rosemary Zelinka, Surrey Association of Sustainable Committees

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 2:00 pm

KEY THEMES:

- Participants expressed a desire to know more about the potential growth in demand for container capacity, saying they would like to discuss the idea of Prince Rupert meeting the growth in demand rather than the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project. Participants suggested that they would like to discuss whether Port Metro Vancouver could constrain its growth to make Prince Rupert more viable.
- Participants expressed concerns that Federal and Provincial environmental assessments may not adequately address community concerns with respect to the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants said they would like to discuss issues related to migratory birds during Project Definition Consultation.
- Participants said they want to discuss socio-economic issues related to the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including additional information about jobs, community benefits and the economic benefits of trade to the Lower Mainland, B.C. and Canada.
- Participants said they want to discuss whether truck traffic could be spread over a longer period of the day and night, creating less pressure on peak demand times at Roberts Bank.

- Participants said they want to discuss the implications of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project on infrastructure throughout the Lower Mainland and Fraser Valley, including rail, roads and bridges.
-

1. Judy Kirk, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review

Roundtable introductions were undertaken.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* My name is Judy Kirk and I'll be facilitating the session today. Thank you very much for taking the time to join us. This is the fourth stakeholder meeting that Port Metro Vancouver is holding as a Pre-Consultation to a multi-year, multi-stage consultation on the Proposed Terminal 2 Project. Kirk & Co. is an independent firm and we will be helping with the consultation and writing the consultation summary report for this stage of consultation. We've done two meetings in Delta, we've done a meeting in Langley this morning, we're here in Surrey this afternoon. We will also be holding meetings in Richmond and Vancouver. There will be seven meetings in all for this round. The purpose of this round of consultation, which is very early in the process, is to find out from people such as yourselves and others how you would like to be consulted and about what. Pre-Consultation is not something that a lot of organizations do but the Port agreed to do this which I think is a very good thing. This is meant to be an informal meeting. The reason we are having small group meetings is so people have plenty of opportunity to provide comments or ask questions. There will be note taking of the meeting and my colleague Dallas Henault will be taking them. We are also taping them for cross reference to make sure we get everything right. We will be attributing comments, which means anyone who says anything will be noted. If you don't want comments attributed, talk to me and I'll sort that out. Finally what I'd like to ask if for Cliff to introduce himself, and Sarah and Michelle and I'd like to go around the table for introductions and then we'll get started.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* Thanks Judy. My name is Cliff Stewart. I am the director of Infrastructure Development for Port Metro Vancouver. I am responsible for the delivery of the Container Capacity Improvement Program of which Terminal 2 at Roberts Bank is a significant and important element.
- C: *Sarah McPherson:* I'm Sarah McPherson I work for Port Metro Vancouver on the communications and consultation program for the Container Capacity Improvement Program.
- C: *Michelle Lachmann:* My name is Michelle Lachmann. I am the environmental representative for the program that Sarah and Cliff spoke about. I work for Hemmera which is an independent environmental consulting firm, but I am working for the environmental stream of the project.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So there's music on this side, so you will need to speak up on that side because it's difficult to hear.

- C: *Unknown*: I'm sorry, which firm are you with?
- C: *Michelle Lachmann*: Hemmera.
- C: *Dan Barnscher*: Deputy Chief of Surrey Fire, so I'm in charge of emergency planning for the city as well as the operations for the fire service.
- C: *Lucie Matich*: A representative of Port Mann Community Association and we are more concerned with the ports about what's going on in our area
- C: *Rosemary Zelinka*: Rosemary Zelinka with the Surrey association of sustainable communities, which is an umbrella movement of organizations in Surrey and promote sustainability and public involvement
- C: *Al Schultz*: I'm Al Schultz, I don't represent anybody, however I am a member of the White Rock Surrey Naturalists and I also sit on Surrey's Environmental Advisory Committee. So I'm here as an observer.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: An observer or participant I'm hoping. You don't have to represent anyone to be here.
- C: *Deb Jack*: I'm Deb Jack, I'm President of Surrey Environmental Partners, it's an umbrella organization of groups that are concerned about natural areas and conservation specifically here in Surrey but of course what happens with regards to the living environment in the entire valley impacts Surrey. We also have individual members and supporters.
- C: *Liz Matich*: I'm Liz Walker, I'm here as President of White Rock Surrey Naturalists.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: With that please feel free to interrupt, provide a comment or ask a question at any time. Cliff is going to go through this discussion guide that is in front of you which is the basic content of this stage of consultation. I won't let him drone on, so please do interrupt.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka*: I just have a question about Dan's presence. Has the city of Surrey taken position for or against this?
- A: *Dan Barnscher*: No. No position, I'm just here for information. Does that answer your question or...
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka*: Well I'm just a bit puzzled that's all. There aren't any other city staff like planning staff.
- A: *Dan Barnscher*: This is still early in the game I think, it's more informative. I think once the Fire chief heard this was taking place he thought it might be a good idea for someone from the fire service to attend.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Rosemary, so you know we have let municipalities know both mayors, councils and senior staff, and invited them to come if they wish. We've also been to councils, or the Port has so often what we would call First Responders, that are fire and emergency come out to initial meetings like this. Especially when it has roads and infrastructure involved.
- C: *Dan Barnscher*: It's not to say there won't be city staff at further meetings, but all you get right now is me.

- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka*: I guess to some extent Port Metro Vancouver is proponent of this, and I am wondering why you are sitting amongst the proponents?
- A: *Dan Barnscher*: No. I could just as well be sitting over there.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Rosemary, we're not setting it up as a for and against.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: Dan sat down and we sat down next to him.
- C: *Dan Barnscher*: I actually have never met anyone here before, including yourselves. I'm looking forward to getting out of here at 3 o'clock.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I hear you and we'll move along. So Cliff not much about the process, let's get right into the Port.

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 three existing legacy port authorities in the Lower Mainland, the Fraser River Port Authority, the North Fraser Port Authority and the Vancouver Port Authority. The result is Port Metro Vancouver, it's the largest port in Canada. It is by tonnage the largest port on the West Coast of North America. It is the largest export port on the West Coast of North America. The mandate of the Port is to support the growth of Canadian Trade. In a very simple nutshell that is who we are.

Why is trade important?

Trade is important because Canada is a trading country, traditionally most of our trade has been north-south with the United States. That was further cemented by the North American Free Trade Agreement area in the 80s. More recently with the rise of Asia as a significant economic force, more trade has begun to move on the east west axis. Trade is important because of the economic benefits of it. Those are felt not just in the gateway, not just in British Columbia but right across the country by creating jobs, increasing tax revenue for municipalities, producing economic benefit for all Canadians. An important part of what we do is to work together towards responsible growth. We have a shared commitment to sustainable solutions and we are striving to further develop relationships at the local government and community level to help identify common values, determine sustainable legacies and mitigate potential community impacts. We are committed to sustainable development and part of why we are here today is to begin that conversation.

I wanted to say at this point that the timeline for the delivery for the delivery of Terminal 2 is about ten years. In other words, we've started this project today and assuming that this project is approved, and it's important to understand that it is not a *fait accompli*, it is something as somebody said we are a proponent of but it will go through a very rigorous environmental process. In fact we are requesting that it will be a panel process at the federal level and possibly a harmonized process with the provincial EAO. We expect that between the process of development, consultation, environmental approval, permitting

and construction it would take about ten years before the first ship could tie up at Terminal 2. Which answers the question we're often hearing such as, why on earth are you starting to talk about a new terminal at Roberts Bank now? The reason is it will take about ten years. If you look at page 6, there is a coloured graph that looks like a very simple, straight line graph of growth. It is actually based on a very detailed economic analysis that's been done using information from the Economist Intelligence Unit, which is one of the leading providers of basic economic information in the world. It is based on looking at the growth of populations and the growth of GDP per capita/economic wealth both within Canada and in Asia and looking at the expectation for increasing containerized imports and exports over the next twenty years. What that graph shows in very simple terms is that starting in about 2015 or 2016, the West Coast of Canada begins to run out of container capacity if we do nothing. As I mentioned earlier our mandate is to support the growth of Canadian trade so our job is to look at that and figure out what things we can do to ensure that we don't run out of capacity. Now in the short term that is going to mean road and rail improvements to assist increasing efficiency and capacity of existing facilities, some of that work has already been done. There were several projects at Burrard Inlet in the middle of the last decade that doubled the capacity of both Venterm and Centerm container terminals. The Third Berth project at Deltaport at Roberts bank which opened at the end of 2009 came on stream. In the short term from now until about 2020 we'll be looking to produce additional capacity by a number of small projects primarily around road and rail that will unlock additional capacity in existing terminals. By 2020, we expect that we will have achieved everything that can be achieved in the existing facilities and that's when we believe that a new terminal, Terminal 2, will be required in order to support the continuing growth. Now one of the questions that we've been asked in other meetings like this is, what happens if the terminal is not required? Very simply, if it's not required it won't be built. But we believe that it will be required and in order to ensure that we can build it, if we're correct, we have to start the process today. We have to start process today, but there is by no means, a "dam the torpedoes" approach to this. In other words if it isn't required there won't be an economic justification hence there won't be money to pay for it. If we do require it, we don't have the luxury of starting the process later. You have to start it now because it actually takes that long to get through the process and to get approvals.

Q: *Deb Jack:* If you want to have this online in ten years before the first tie up, it seems to me that you would have to start the actual construction of your infrastructure far sooner than 2020? So if for instance if you don't need the capacity at 2020 you already have a phenomenal investment in infrastructure and the costs for pre-planning, etc. I can't tell you how many times we have heard, well we've got so much already invested in infrastructure and planning that this thing simply has to go we can't stop it. I don't see, with the greatest of respect, with any difference you are saying.

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well the actual construction of the project wouldn't begin until about 2017. So by 2017 we will have a pretty good idea of whether it will be required in 2020 or not because we'll know whether what's currently a forecast has come to pass.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* Deb I think what you are saying, and correct me if I'm wrong, is that the money spent that the Port would invest for the pre-planning in advance of when they would start construction; by the time that the Port invests that amount of money, unless the regulators wouldn't allow them to build, they would continue on because of that investment. I don't want to put words in your mouth; I just want to make sure.
- C: *Deb Jack:* That's what I said and that's what we've heard so often with other projects. That then becomes the justification.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Ultimately I won't be the person making that decision but very unlikely that the investment that would be made in the first six years would ever become a justification in and of itself for the investment that would be required to build it. It's an order of magnitude of difference.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka:* Five or six years ago I was working for the municipality of Delta and wrote reports for this matter. I'm retired now of course. I seem to recollect that Delta, five or six years ago didn't like it, and I presume they still don't like it seeing they have the same council basically. One of the questions that they were raising was, why can't this development go to Prince Rupert?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We get that question pretty regularly. If, in fact, Prince Rupert builds a container terminal and if in fact business goes there, than that would likely delay the need for Terminal 2.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka:* So basically you're in competition with Prince Rupert?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* I'm not sure if we're necessarily in competition with them. But we have no authority to build a terminal in Prince Rupert. We have an obligation to provide terminal capacity when that's required. So if Prince Rupert builds on then this one is delayed. If they don't, then this one is required.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* To the question of competition that Rosemary has raised, are the items that move out of Prince Rupert are they the same things that move back and forth in Vancouver.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* Vancouver has about 5% of its import cargo destined for the United States. Prince Rupert has about 40-60% of its cargo destined to the United States. Prince Rupert is much more serving the American market than Vancouver is. In particular on the export side, to date Prince Rupert has a very small percentage of its total cargo export as export loads. A majority of boxes that are exported from Prince Rupert are empty, whereas in Vancouver it's very close to a balanced trade. In fact, the Port in Vancouver is supporting Canadian industry and Canadian business by providing a gateway for the export of cargos to Asia. Prince Rupert by and large, at least to date, has not been doing that.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka:* Doesn't somebody like the federal government have the ultimate say about where it's going to be best for port expansion? Or is it all locally raised money?

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* The majority of this money would be either be from the Port authority, a private investor or some combination of the two.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka:* So there's no federal or provincial funding?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* One's always careful not to say none, but nothing substantial.
- Q: *Judy Kirk:* Before I come to you Deb. Rosemary, to your question, it seems to me Michelle that there seems to be an important question around the Environmental Review process. While it isn't determined yet for this project and you'll see it's in the next page where we get into the layers of consultation rounds. The federal and provincial Environmental Review processes generally look at project justification. To that degree, I'm not speaking for the regulator but just because you've asked the question there would be, as part of the Environmental Review, a discussion of project justification. I assume Michelle, correct me if I'm wrong, that some of that would be in relation to Prince Rupert. Within independent environmental review, which the public has an opportunity to provide input on the scope of, I think you would know if you worked in Delta, you'd have an opportunity within that scope.
- Q: *Deb Jack:* My understanding was that the ports are under federal jurisdiction, and indeed they can do pretty much as they want because of that. What those provinces, jurisdictions and certainly municipalities might want or not is essentially irrelevant.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* It's interesting that it is a widely held view and to suggest that any organization can do whatever it likes, dam the torpedoes is probably unlikely in this society. There are certain things which port authorities are able to do by delegated constitutional power, but ultimately every organization has to be responsive to the community. Having said that, when there is a mandate, and the port authority has a mandate to meet certain requirements for Canada, one of which is, the most important which is to meet trade that has to be considered as part of the decision making process for any approvals process. But I think that's very different from saying it can just do what it wants.
- C: *Deb Jack:* I do appreciate that my perspective at this point is relatively cynical.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* I guess deeds speak louder than words. If the world was as you have described it we wouldn't be here today, in simple terms. If the world was as you described it we wouldn't need to consult and simply do what we wanted to do and that's not what we are doing.
- C: *Deb Jack:* Perhaps we should have a chat over a cup of tea.
- Q: *Al Schulz:* Well my experience has been that you consult and do you still do what you want to do. On the hand, Surrey wants to be the most sustainable city in Canada and yet they are chopping down trees at record levels.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* The Port's not chopping down trees is it?
- C: *Al Schulz:* Well you're influencing the marine environment?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That is fundamentally why this project will go through an independent environmental assessment. To ensure that that the laws that are protective of the environment are followed as part of the process.

- Q: *Liz Walker*: I guess that's part of our skepticism too, you see what happens to Burns Bog and South Fraser Perimeter Road I mean there's been covenants there and nobody is standing up saying no. You are contravening covenants and you should be legally binding but they're not being accountable.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: At the end of the day, we have a system of checks and balances in Canada, and I know nothing of what you're speaking of. Certainly, if there are legally binding commitments that aren't being met, there is a process to ensure that they are going to enforce that if we were to indeed find ourselves doing what you are talking about that there would be people standing at the door with injunctions to stop us. That's not where we go.
- Q: *Liz Walker*: That's interesting that that's your understanding. As NGOs, the people who have been involved in these sorts of things for quite a while, we see the Burns Bog Conservation Society having to fundraise to try and get some legal authority to challenge this. If they weren't able to fundraise nothing would be done. Even then it's ten years. So with respect, I just don't see those safeguards in place.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Can I summarize just what Deb, Liz and Rosemary, and I don't want to put any words in your mouth, that what we're hearing here from you so far is a scepticism if not cynicism, a real concern, about the environmental review process and whether it will adequately address your concerns.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka*: Well it goes beyond the Environmental Assessment as some of us are asking the basic question, is this really needed.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: It's unfortunate that it is called an Environmental Assessment because it is in fact one of the fundamental requirements is the economic assessment. In other words, does it have an economic benefit? The question of whether it's needed, that one's fairly simple in that if it isn't needed, then it won't be forthcoming because there won't be a business case for it. I don't think there needs to be a concern that somehow because it's not public money that's being invested here, there isn't going to be an ability to simply build it for the sake of building it.
- C: *Deb Jack*: I know there's a lot more here to go through. When you say that the issue is that you're mandate is to support trade for Canada. So I am not at all confident that those decision makers for Canada really care less about what the environmental situation is here in the Fraser Valley. I'm not confident that they are concerned that we are one of the primary positions of the Pacific Migratory route, which is an international, not a local, not a national, but an international responsibility that extends far past North America. I'm not confident they are concerned about what will happen with regards to that whole aspect, with regards to the impact on our fisheries. I am aware that the provincial environmental review has never turned down any request. Indeed I was flabbergasted when the feds turned down Trout Lake and the mining thing. I still can't understand the fact that they did it. But of course the company has now turned around and is now making some modifications which they said were absolutely and totally impossible beforehand. But, that perhaps in the medium term they might have to do their dumping in Trout Lake. That's the kind of thing

on a macro scale that those who are concerned about the living environment are dealing with, those are realities, sir. I'm not confident that this area of the country isn't being considered as expendable for purposes of their trade. I do know that when I listen to the words and I see what's in here it's a slight off from Metro Vancouver's representative, a female, who used to talk at the Metro Vancouver Sustainability lunches, about how everybody wanted to have their gigantic TV and wanted to have it today, and therefore we have to have an expansion in Port Metro Vancouver. Where we are in the terms of the life of all of us and everything else and the future generations, I'm not altogether sure that's an adequate explanation anymore. If you're aware of what's happening in regards to living environment on a worldwide basis and then we see what's happening on local basis there's profound concerns. I'm not sure that the thing about consumer goods is the best argument any longer.

C: *Judy Kirk:* In other words, meeting demand, what you're questioning, and I'm going to turn this to ask you Deb, is this something you would want to discuss in the consultation process?

C: *Deb Jack:* It's absolutely essential.

C: *Judy Kirk:* That we discuss the premise of whether meeting demand, in other words the demand forecast on the page that Cliff just went over, of whether meeting demand is actually something that you want?

C: *Deb Jack:* Or indeed if the demand is going to be there.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Sure, fair enough,

C: *Deb Jack:* When you take a look at that which you are citing are the major exports out of this port, those are essentially natural resources and the manufacturing is extremely small. So if you look at it from historical perspective and I don't wish to bore everyone to tears but if you look at it from a historical perspective our position hasn't changed one bit from that of being a colony. We are the extractive place and what's more, we're contributing to that by investing all sorts of Canadian monies into creating a possibility for all these other countries in the world to benefit from all our resources. It seems to me, could be construed that we are selling out our children's birthright. I don't wish to be sounding too dramatic, but you know when you follow onto it that's what you come down too. So yes, the environment is a real, the need for it, what's going to happen in the short and the long term is also needful to be discussed and of course the living environment component.

Q: *Lucie Matich:* Because I have taken a tour of the port through South Fraser Perimeter Road I've also heard it from the Port point of view. Especially continuing through the South Fraser Perimeter Road I was able to witness how large a project it is and how demanding of the environment. I was also able to see the remedial projects that have occurred because it was and it is being built and some of the good things and innovative things that have had to happen because someone had to solve the problem. But along the discussion here, I am wondering why the Port of Vancouver needs to supply so much more than what BC and Alberta needs for example. I understand that Prince Rupert is five hours closer to Chicago than Vancouver is. So why do we insist on using the limited

environmental area that's Vancouver and Delta and not use the presuming that environmental damage is less in Prince Rupert. So would we not triage the type of commodities that we use the port for?

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* These are interesting, almost philosophical questions. It's interesting, there was a comment earlier on government money to be invested in fact Prince Rupert is a classic example of a government project. A majority of the spending in Prince Rupert to build it in the first place was government money. It was classical regional development type of function. The market has not adopted Prince Rupert, in other words there's still only one shipping line going there.
- Q: *Lucie Matich:* Why not constrain Vancouver enough so people go to Prince Rupert?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* There's a good example of that in Canada, it's called Mirabell airport. The government decided where the airport should be built and it built it at great cost, and the market chose not to use it. In fact, eventually the government acknowledged that its attempt at social engineering hadn't worked very well and it shut it down.
- C: *Lucie Matich:* Politics.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* Well it wasn't politics. The airplanes wouldn't go there and the passengers wouldn't go there. Prince Rupert fundamentally, and if Prince Rupert gets built and the customers go there, great. But so far, and it's been open for four years, and all of the descriptions of it would seemed to have implied it should have been filled up a day after it opened, because it had all of the advantages. But all of the people who make their living doing the things that Prince Rupert was designed to support a majority of them have said, you know it doesn't actually work. So if the market changes its mind and if the expansion gets built in Prince Rupert that's great.
- Q: *Lucie Matich:* I understand that the Vancouver Port would like as much business as they can possibly get. That's normal.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well that's not what this is about. What this is about is ensuring that, and I've heard some very strongly expressed opinions about what is or isn't appropriate economic development, what is or isn't appropriate environmental interference. A lot of those reach the level of belief if you will, as opposed to thought and ultimately there is a process in place in Canada and what I'm hearing is a cynicism about it and a disbelief in it, but I accept that is a view of the process, but ultimately the process is what it is and we don't have an ability to change that.
- Q: *Lucie Matich:* I'm speaking as a resident who has lived in the same place for 42 year and has seen the CN and the effects of it. Believe we I do get on good and bad terms sometimes. The sacrifice, both the environment and the resident have to make in order to avoid social engineering, the philosophies that you're talking about and it is a price that should be considered we make decisions. I'm not opposed to development but there has to be a limit. The limit has got to be somewhere where the liveability of the residents and the capacity to earn a

living and facilitate trade has got to be balanced and cannot be tilted heavier on one side then on the other.

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Again, putting aside for a moment the individual perspectives on the process that's what the process is designed to do. Whether we believe it does or doesn't do it, that's its intent.
- C: *Deb Jack:* May I give you an example, Cliff. With regards to the Environmental Assessment on South Fraser Perimeter Road, there is a section which says that yes indeed there will be an increase in the particulates in the air and I won't get into all the details and specifics, and it will indeed be an impact on the health of little ones and the seniors, however this will be balanced off by the fact that there will be more jobs in the public health sector. It says that, so with reference to what Lucy said it becomes difficult.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Does it say it will be offset by those jobs?
- C: *Deb Jack:* Yes, we're not sure if that's the exact words.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I would like to go back and look at that.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* That's a very interesting perspective.
- C: *Deb Jack:* Unfortunately it was sent to me and my computer ate over half of what was stored on it one day and I still haven't been able to retrieve it otherwise I would forward it to you.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* No problem, I'm sure it's somewhere. We've heard of that before. I haven't heard the offset remark, but I have heard something else related to jobs versus health effects. I haven't heard the offset.
- C: *Deb Jack:* Offset, balanced by, in effect it's like doing a cost benefit analysis.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I hear you, I'm not disputing the concept at all.
- C: *Deb Jack:* I couldn't believe what I was reading.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I remember the media coverage on it too.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* I have another question concerning projected traffic. Does the widening of the Panama Canal have any effect on trade to Vancouver? If for instance you ship things from here to Chicago would it be smarter to move a container to Carolina then ship it to Chicago and New York.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* It's interesting, there is quite a bit of work has been done studying that question. There's a line, I don't know the technical term for it, like an isobar in meteorology or a line of equal elevation in a map, and the line moves inland certainly, and the line where it makes more sense to come to the West Coast and then go by rail versus going through the Panama Canal or versus going through the Suez Canal. All those options exist today, but the economics of these things will change based on the enlargement of the Panama Canal. The line moves; the line where it makes sense to go to the West Coast moves inland, but it doesn't move near Toronto or Montreal which is where the vast majority of cargo coming through Vancouver ends up going. So our belief is that it won't make a difference, but again part of what is good about the timing of this process is the Canal will be built and open in operation several years before there's any decision about actually putting shovels in the ground on this project. If we're not right, great, because ultimately if the terminal is not required, and I

know Deb has expressed her opinion about that, the dollars won't be available if there isn't a compelling business case to do it. Somebody once said to me that trade is like water – it finds the lowest level, and it finds the least expensive level. Our objective is to support Canadian trade. Remember, before Deltaport opened, the vast majority of Canadian containerized trade was handled through US ports. Interesting to think what might have happened in the context of September 11th, 2001 if a majority of our trade was being handled through US ports and the Americans closed the border. All of a sudden that question of getting that flat screen TV or not getting a flat screen TV, and it would just be that, we wouldn't be exporting the commodities going back into the containers. To a certain extent there is a national interest involved in this but ultimately the economy will make the decision. If there isn't a need for it, it simply won't get built.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: Mindful of time, Cliff I'm going to ask you please to briefly go through what the Container Capacity Improvement Program is and what is the proposed Terminal 2 project. Briefly go through topics that we think people may want to discuss and then I'd like to get right to what in addition to what you've already said would you like to discuss and how would you like to be consulted. There are some options here but we'd like to discuss that in a little bit more depth.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: So the Container Capacity Improvement Program, I've talked about it a bit about it already, is looking at what is required to ensure that the available capacity stays ahead of demand through the next twenty years. In the short term it's a series of projects to get more capacity and more efficiency out of existing port facilities. In the medium term it's to build a new facility and in the long term it's to go back to facilities which have just been rebuilt in the last five years and rebuild them yet again for the next stages of growth beyond 2030.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka*: Is it a question of how many ships can you dock or is it a question of how fast you get them away from the port and get them to where ever they're supposed to go? Because it's a huge amount of improvements in the latter I understand.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: It's an interesting question; in 1999 the entire port of Vancouver and Fraser River and all of the ports that were here at the time doing container business handled about 1 million TEUs through the whole year of 1999. In 2010, all of those facilities together handled 2.5 million TEU's, two and a half times as many with less vessel calls. Fewer ships came in the container sector in 2010 then came in 1999. The ships got bigger, and amount of cargo on them got bigger. So it hasn't really been about the number of vessel calls. There are two things that regulate it if you get beyond that. One of the things is how much land you have to receive and to dispatch the cargo. The other thing as you say is the infrastructure inland, the roads, rail and other supportive infrastructure that enable the multiplicity of flows to happen. Some of the flows will go directly onto rail at the container terminal and leave the region and some of them are

transloaded, go to rail and leave the region, some of them going to distribution centres and then are transloaded and leave the region. Some of them go to distribution centres and are distributed within the region. So it's a whole combination of all of those things.

- Q: *Lucie Matich*: Following on that, larger ships, how does that affect the Fraser Docks and what is the future in your plan for the Fraser Docks?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: We are actually looking at that to see whether or not things can be done to allow larger ships that are coming in to go to Fraser Surrey Docks. There are a number of challenges with that as you can imagine. The most obvious one is the George Massey Tunnel. It is part of what we're examining and whether it has a role and what role it continues to have in container business as a deep sea terminal or as a short sea shipping terminal.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I'm going to ask Cliff to carry on a bit on what is Terminal 2 and if you could note your questions for a moment because I want to get to the topics of consultation methods. I am very mindful of time and Dan you were talking about 3 o'clock and I want you to feel free to leave if you need to leave.
- C: *Dan Barnscher*: Don't worry I have no qualms at leaving at three. This is an education though, I'm very impressed.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: This is a very early process to be out talking to the public and somebody said to me about the project, I feel like I'm in a fog because I can't really see what it is we're talking about. I said to them, you're not in a fog we're so early in the process that there's nothing to see. That's important to understand as I talk about Terminal 2 as a proposed, multi berth container terminal with a capacity of more than 2 million TEUs. It is intended to be located at Roberts Bank and those of you who have been part of the processes in the past looking at Terminal 2 it's not something new. We haven't created an entirely new vision. We're re-examining the options that had been looked before. The scope, scale and location have not been defined and once they are at the point when there is something to consult on, then we will be back as part of the next phase in the process to say here's what it is we're actually talking about in detail. Again notwithstanding the view of this, subject to environmental approvals, would be constructed at Roberts Bank adjacent to Deltaport and West Shore Terminals. From our perspective the critical term there is, subject to environmental approvals and recognizing that some of you have scepticism about that. The intention is that this facility could be delivered by 2020 and that it will be connected to particularly Canada by combination of Roberts Bank Rail Corridor and the road network that would be in place at that time and potentially by the Fraser River as a short sea shipping route. I say potentially because to this point the market has not accepted that's a valuable method and lots of things may change relative to that in the next ten years.

- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka*: I seem to recollect there were suggestions as to why can't the distribution centres in the Lower Mainland open up at night? Because they only seem to be open when everybody else wanted to travel.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I think Rosemary inside that comment is a question about, could we make sure that is a subject of discussion in this consultation. I've heard it discussed elsewhere in the region and I don't know definitively what the reason is.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: It's an interesting question because it runs smack dab into the whole question of global interest. In certain municipalities, trucks aren't allowed to travel at night because it's considered to be a problem. So that's one of the issues. Another issue is the issue of the market and cost of operating differential hours and whether or not there's value in that. Ultimately, I think you'll see all of those sorts of things happen to get the most out of the infrastructure that's there.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka*: Is it the intention that the economic analysis part of the Environmental Assessment will include an analysis of this sort of thing in its consideration?
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Michelle would it include that?
- A: *Michelle Lachmann*: An economic analysis of running the operations differently?
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Right, of longer working.
- C: *Rosemary Zelinka*: It all serves to try and identify the need for this.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: We have to be extremely careful because ultimately the panel or whatever environmental regulatory process we are part of will tell us what we have to study. There certainly things that we are going to look that we think we need to look at and this is a good example of it. But ultimately, we can't tell you today what the scope of studies will be because it will be a panel that will make that decision.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: But we can say Michelle, or tell me if you cannot that socioeconomic studies in relation to environmental assessments can look at things like that.
- A: *Michelle Lachmann*: Yes.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: I think Rosemary that's a good question and I think Cliff may not be able to answer it definitively because he's not the regulator. But other environmental processes have done socioeconomic studies and do look at things like that.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka*: Did it not say that the Environmental Assessment has to provide a justification for building it?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: No, absolutely not. The Environmental Assessment reviews justification, it does not build justification. It looks at whether there is justification. Now that's a very big difference and it's almost the opposite of what you said. I just want to make sure there's no misunderstanding.
- C: *Rosemary Zelinka*: This is what we want.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: The proponent...
- C: *Rosemary Zelinka*: This is what the public will want, a justification for doing this.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: I want to be really clear here. The environmental review processes, and you will have an opportunity to look at this in detail if there's an environmental review and the documents haven't yet been filed to ask them

about that. But if there is then you will have an opportunity to look at study outlines, and at what studies should be done. Within that the socioeconomic analysis are generally done and this whole notion, the proponent whether the Port or whoever else, not just this project but others. They have to demonstrate need, and it is the regulator reviews and determines whether that justification is reasonable.

Q: *Rosemary Zelinka:* So you're saying you have to justify it.

A: *Judy Kirk:* Right.

Q: *Rosemary Zelinka:* Sorry I thought you said earlier you didn't have to.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* No, the panel doesn't have to justify it; the panel has to review the justification.

C: *Rosemary Zelinka:* I never said the panel has to justify it.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Yes, you did actually a few minutes ago that's why I jumped on it.

C: *Rosemary Zelinka:* I intended to say it was my understanding that you had to justify it.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* The Port must, yes. Absolutely.

A: *Judy Kirk:* Good. I just want to make sure because it's a very important distinction. Then the regulator reviews it.

A: *Michelle Lachmann:* There is a requirement in the act for a proponent to provide a justification for the need for the project.

C: *Rosemary Zelinka:* Our advice to you is you need to do that.

Q: *Liz Walker:* Is there something written that tells us what the criteria are in order for them to determine that there is a need present? Like something quantitative?

A: *Michelle Lachmann:* I haven't seen that, I'm not a regulator so whether they have their own internal guidelines I'm not aware. But I haven't seen that line by line, tick the box, yes this meets the justification.

C: *Judy Kirk:* We should take that as a follow up Dallas and I think we should take that as a follow up Michelle. It's a very good question about whether regulators have essentially a Terms of Reference or something around that.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* We're getting into a level of discourse that probably needs to identify for a moment that regulators are different from a panel. The panel is quasi-judicial body that has the power of subpoena and allows the power of cross examination. That panel is not the regulators. The regulators are people like the Canadian Wildlife Service, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Department of Transport and others that have acts they are required to enforce. Panel looks at whether or not, and includes submissions, whether or not what it is that the proponent is saying meets those requirements.

C: *Judy Kirk:* But I think what Liz is saying Cliff and I think it's a very good question, is if you're required to justify the project what are the criteria for looking at that justification. It's a good question and we should at least follow up to see if that criteria exists.

C: *Liz Walker:* I always want to learn more.

- C: *Cliff Stewart*: Where I was going next was, panel ultimately decides the criteria. It's a public process where the scope of studies is proposed by the proponent, it goes through a public consultation process.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: It does, but I think you might find, you know there might not be something definitive to this project Liz, but to answer your question other projects have had to do this, there have been other criteria and it may very well be of interest to you. That's all. I think Liz's question is more general. It's wanting to know, generally what would that proponent have to do.
- C: *Liz Walker*: Otherwise it's very big, it's just nice to nail down.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I just think it's a reasonable follow up, and Michelle we should check. I don't know whether it exists.
- Q: *Deb Jack*: It's really interesting, the fact that you're in this process and you don't know. I assume that it doesn't exist because we ought to be able to go somewhere and say what are the Term of Reference for the regulators and for the panel.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: Well because we're sooner than that Deb. To Cliffs point we're in advance of that.
- C: *Deb Jack*: I mean that there should be somewhere a list of criteria that cover all of them.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I think there might be and it's not all but a core of criteria and then there might be per project different things. I think we should go to the Federal Environmental Review sites and see. You can go to the Provincial and you may find it and I think Michelle can help look.
- C: *Dan Barnscher*: Excuse me and thanks. This has been extremely interesting and invigorating I just wish I had more to offer. I am looking at it from a First Responder perspective.
- C: *Deb Jack*: I was just about to say that I see First Responder implications there with regards to their expansion.
- C: *Dan Barnscher*: First Responders have concerns over rail, road, shipping traffic and all that stuff. It's just things we have to evolve and we can't really comment that, no you can't do it or we don't want you to do it, it's that we have to adapt to it. That's our responsibility as First Responders.
- C: *Deb Jack*: It's not just adapting sir; it's also to ask for more resources so you can do what you're supposed to do.
- C: *Dan Barnscher*: That could be one part of adapting, but not necessarily the only one. It's not always more resources, more money, more firefighters etc. It's maybe we have to change the way we do business and apply it differently. There are alternatives to things for sure, we've learned over the history that it's not always about digging deeper into the tax payers pocket it's about maybe adapting and changing the way we do business to make that dollar stretch to one dollar fifty and two dollars now when it didn't used to be because we were so eager to ask for more money.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Thank you very much for coming. Alright, I'm going to ask you please Cliff to carry on to Page 8. Then if you could quite quickly go through that, then I

want to go through the topics because we've only got about twenty to thirty minutes before I'd like you to fill out your feedback forms.

- C: *Cliff Stewart*: The question is, how can I get involved? The fact that you're here obviously means that you do know how to get involved. But as we move forward, you can see at the bottom of page 8 that this is the first of at least seven planned rounds, and I say at least because the fourth and sixth boxes have a little asterisk beside them. Those are the two that are required as part of the assessment process, the Draft Panel Guidelines and Environmental Assessment Public Hearing Process. The panel, assuming it is a panel, may require additional rounds of consultation over and above those. So it's at least seven rounds and we expect it to take place over the next six to seven years. What we're here today specifically to do is ask you two questions. If you move onto page 10 the two questions are: When we get to the consultation process, which continues with Project Definition, what topics do you wish to be consulted on and how do you wish to be consulted. Those really are the things we really want to come away from today's meeting with. Certainly we've heard some things already but when you get to the questionnaire we would ask you to think not only of yourself, but a lot of you represent other groups and certainly there are demographic differences in terms of how people would like to be consulted. If you have some awareness about what you think other demographic groups think is appropriate please be comfortable to speak to that as well. We have a list on page 10 of the potential consultation topics. A good example of one that isn't on the list but has come up several times and it came up here again today is the Pacific Flyway and the whole issue of migratory birds and potential for impacts on migratory birds. There are probably others that we haven't got here. Please don't think of this list as definitive but rather as a starting point for thinking about other things that you feel should be involved in the consultation process. That's the first question, what do you wish to be consulted on? The second question is how and if you turn to page 12, this one I will turn over to Judy because she's the consultation expert and she can talk about what it is that this is about.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Sure and just before I do that I know that Cliff touched on this lightly, on page 10, where we summarized some topics, project design elements and then given some examples such as the proposed terminal, marine traffic, land reclamation, roads, rail and other related topics. Culture and heritage, which could be maritime heritage, as well as marine archaeology, and on down the list, these are meant to indicate that the port has given this some serious thought. Not in any way to limit the range of topics that you might want to discuss. It would not have been reasonable in my view to come out with a blank slate. On page 12, again the same thing we're given some examples of small group meetings which is the kind of thing we're holding right now and an open house or series of open houses with Question and Answer periods, online video open houses. We're trying to think more of digital ways. Because you can see with demographics of all of us that we don't have anyone under thirty in this room I

- don't think. I have been doing this work for 28 years and I'll tell you that the demographic in this room is not uncommon.
- C: *Unknown:* We're here in the middle of the day, what do you expect.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* We do weekend, evening, breakfast meetings. The thing is that people who are of childbearing age and family age don't have a lot of time to come out to meetings. They've got meeting demands of their time. Young people generally are not as comfortable about voicing their views in this kind of venue or open house venue. So all of that to say, we're looking for a range of ways for online feedback forms, potentially online webinars, that kind of thing, in addition to the face-to-face meeting we're doing here. All of that to say we're very interested in some ideas about how not only how you might like to participate, but others. We've just given a few examples.
- C: *Deb Jack:* I think you have got it pretty well covered. Certainly when we go out and meeting with the public the ones with children and all the rest of it say we have no time, simply no time we depend on you. Which makes the representation even more important.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka:* The question is what material are you going to present for whatever it is you do, whether it's a meeting or whatever it is? Some of these topics relate specifically to the site in Delta. I don't think people in Surrey are going to be that interested in how many oysters are going to die around the new dock.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Really?
- C: *Rosemary Zelinka:* I think so.
- C: *Deb Jack:* Well with respect Rosemary, We often forget that we are bounded on three sides by marine life and river life.
- C: *Rosemary Zelinka:* What I'm trying to say is whatever you present to people in the Surrey area I think has to be more related to the sort of infrastructure, traffic and the rail.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* That's exactly why, Rosemary we're coming to different communities. The Port could have, though it never said it wanted to, just stay in Delta. I mean but that is exactly why we are meeting not only here in Surrey but also in Langley, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver. So anything like that is of real interest.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka:* So really there's another layer here and that's an area layer. Do people want to know about projects throughout the whole area or is it just the Port that's one option and then the infrastructure implications of the valleys.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's one of the things that we hope to get out of this, is an answer to that. I don't think we're going to be showing different information in different locales, we will show everybody everything. But those things that people choose to be most focused on will be up to them.
- Q: *Rosemary Zelinka:* The people in Surrey, except for a small group of us. I don't think people in Surrey are going to be very interested because they aren't going to see any implications that have any effect on them. It could have considerable impact, but mostly from the perspective of traffic etc.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* But not withstanding that we'll show you here when we come out.

- C: *Rosemary Zelinka:* A lot of people may not have the time to absorb the whole thing.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* We will work to ensure to show those who wish only to see certain parts of it can find those parts easily and those who wish to see it all can find it all.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Rosemary you know what we have done in the past, and I'll admit here I hadn't thought about it in this. In other projects where there have been more local area implications for things. Sometimes in a discussion guide and I'm not going to presuppose this because we haven't finished our meeting and gathered all the input but sometimes we have actually done discussion guides that have sections and people can choose to fill out, address or be informed of all or just those related to the very local area where they are. I think that's part, some of what you're talking about. In any case, it's something to consider here.
- Q: *Deb Jack:* It's difficult to differentiate here.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* On the topic?
- Q: *Deb Jack:* Yes, because issues of clean air and clean water. The Port also impacts here in terms of clean air and clean water. GHG's of course, the whole issue of land use and light also impact us it's just a matter of degree. The people way up the valley, they're the ones that get severely impacted in regards to anything that impacts the air. Where you have socioeconomic, as one fellow said to me in regards to the highway road expansion through Surrey they just go through Surrey and they don't stop and it's not important. The only thing important about Surrey is the fact it is a bed for the road because the trucks go from one side to the other. I thought that was an interesting perspective. He said there's no value to those roads for us and we're the ones who have to pay all the penalties to Surrey.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* That's a really important point because I think part of what we want to hear about is for communities that feel that is their reality, than if you look at the second from the bottom, local benefits and opportunities, what sorts of things, given that that's a reality, what can be done so that it does bring value and that would be one of the things we would be interested in knowing. What does the community think given that and accepting that for a moment as the reality, how does that get changed.
- Q: *Deb Jack:* Well I was being really facetious some years ago with some aspects of the South Fraser Perimeter Road and I said if all of the benefits are going to essentially the rest of Canada then why doesn't the rest of Canada pay us compensation for all of the damage that's being done here.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* So the question that I'm asking you is...
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Who all across the country I suppose. The St. Lawrence Seaway can say the same thing.
- C: *Deb Jack:* Fair enough but I guess nobody's thought about it before. But it was an interesting notion. It wasn't original with me. But our water will be used so it will go down. Our power will be used, that will have an effect on citizens. The air will be damaged so that has health implications etc. It's just an interesting perspective, the compensation thing so that also. The local benefits and

opportunities, so how far into the valley do you extend there. Certainly the implication impact will be extensive in Delta no question. But then we have lost a lot for the infrastructure already in so far as the South Fraser Perimeter Road installation's concerned. From a living environment aspect an enormous amount already and a grave concern from one of our associates about the fact that the Environmental Assessment process because the planning system was fluid that the environmental assessment did not have to assess certain things that now indeed are going to be impacted but because they were left out of the original route and everything else were seen to be not needing assessment because it wouldn't be impacted.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: Just hold on Deb because what I think you're talking about someone else mentioned that there were aspects about the Detail Design of South Fraser Perimeter Road which came after the environmental certification. I think that's what you're referring too. I just want to check if that is it. I don't know if that's true, I'm wanting to make sure that we reflect properly the comments.
- C: *Deb Jack*: The latest one is why take out nearly two hectares of Burns Bog Forest Area on the periphery unless that wasn't included. The road will go closer to Surrey Bend as I understand it was estimated initially that there was no impact statement. When you talk about land reclamation and all the rest it does have an impact on the living environment and everything that happens in the entire mouth of the Fraser and going around into Boundary Bay area. When you talk about the Pacific Flyway, it's not just about the birds it's the fact we have international obligations to protect those areas and there are profound environmental impacts for what goes on in Russia and way down in South America. I am not an expert in this, Liz could answer better. I'm not sure those things are included in things such as Environmental Assessments.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: That's why we are here today because those are the sorts of things, if you have a specific issue that you think we should be consulting on that's what we want to hear about. We want to know the full range of things that people want to talk about.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: So what I'm going to ask, unless there are any other questions, because there isn't any other information that Cliff wants to present, correct me if I'm wrong Cliff. We would like to receive your feedback for now, that said it is online if you do want to take time to reflect and not fill it out now please feel free to do so. I generally encourage people to fill it out at the meeting because we tend to get the feedback forms. If you could take ten minutes now and fill it out it would be much appreciated.
- Q: *Lucie Matich*: One question, the land that is needed for expansion of the Port, is that ALR or is that Tsawwassen land? Or is there another level in there that we are missing. I'm interested in finding out where the land that you are going to use.
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: Again, part of the challenge in answering questions like that is we are so early in the process that we haven't defined those sorts of things. We will

have it defined in the next consultation level by the next time we meet. But you know if you draw circles around the terminals at Roberts Bank there's several types of land. There's what is euphemistically called submerged land, so you and I would call that water. That's land which needs to be filled in order to be created or at least raised above the water level. That land can be federal land, provincial land, it can be First Nations land, depends on where it is. The second type of land is in the broad category of what I would call land, because it's above the water level already. There's First Nations industrial land adjacent, there's First Nations agricultural land adjacent, this is Tsawwassen First Nations', BC Rail owned agricultural land adjacent. There is other owned agricultural land adjacent; there are other First Nations lands adjacent.

Q: *Liz Walker:* Agricultural land is ALR land though is it not?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* By and large I believe it is, but not all of it.

Q: *Lucie Matich:* It's cultivated right now.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* I have to be very careful because it depends on what land you're talking about. But if you get on Google Earth and look at that part of the world it certainly appears, at least the last time the satellite took a picture of it, appears as though it's cultivated.

Q: *Unknown:* I'm just wondering about the levels that you're proposing about for the consultation that there's going to be.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* I think, as a general observation, I think the Agricultural Land Commission will be heavily involved in the process.

The meeting ended at 3:30pm.