

**PORT METRO VANCOUVER
ROBERTS BANK TERMINAL 2 PROJECT
PROJECT DEFINITION CONSULTATION**

**Multi-Stakeholder Meeting 5
October 30, 2012**

Notes from a multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 30, 1:30pm – 3:30pm, at Northview Golf & Country Club, Surrey, BC.

Stakeholders: Al Schulze, White Rock and Surrey Naturalists
Chris Clutchey
Darrell Hawk, Pile Drivers, Divers, Bridge, Dock and Wharf Builders
Local 2404
Hardy Wolfram
Judy Williams, Fraser River Coalition, Pacific Spirit Park Society,
VAPOR, Wreck Beach Preservation Society
Larry East
Lisa Baratta, WESTAC
Liz Walker, White Rock and Surrey Naturalists
Mirjana Petrovic, City of Surrey
Nan Ames, Burns Bog Conservation Committee, White Rock and
Surrey Naturalists
Pat Pollock, RWU Local 577
Peter Maarsman, Greet Timer Heritage Society
Steve Robinson, Surrey Fire

Port Metro Vancouver: Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
Rhona Hunter, Acting Director, Infrastructure Development
Neil Turner, Senior Environmental Advisor, Container Capacity
Improvement Program
Cindy McCarthy, Communications Advisor, Port Metro Vancouver
Stefan Krepiakovich, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 1:32pm

KEY THEMES:

- Some participants were interested in Port Metro Vancouver's container forecast and asked questions about the assumptions that determined these projections.
- Participants were interested in the environmental assessment process for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, which included questions about any geographic locations outside of Roberts Bank that might be included as part of the assessment.
- Some participants were interested in increased road and rail traffic that could result from the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, asking questions about mitigation, emissions and truck routes. Participants urged the use of rail to transport containers instead of using trucks.
- Some participants were interested in the field studies Port Metro Vancouver has been undertaking.
- Participants asked about the project construction and design, including questions about construction material sources, layout and configuration.
- Some participants were concerned about the loss of agricultural land and Port Metro Vancouver's plan for mitigation.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

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

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

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

Q: *Judy Williams: I'm not familiar with the term "sweet spot". Does that mean exactly where you want to be?*

A: *Rhona Hunter: It's efficiency. 85 percent represents that place where all of the systems work most efficiently. So, you can go up to 100 percent at times, and we certainly do go up to 100 percent in terms of using all of the capacity within the facilities, but it's not a place you want to be operating on a regular basis because it's not very efficient. So when we talk about 85 percent, it's really where all of the systems work most efficiently and we don't have backlogs, we don't have breakdowns in the system. So, you're right, sweet spot's not a particularly scientific term. It's efficiency, and so the term that we use here, we say: "Container ports begin to lose efficiency when they attempt to operate above the 85 percent of their maximum capacity".*

Q: *Judy Williams: The sweet spot is 85 percent then.*

A: *Rhona Hunter: Yes.*

- Q: *Liz Walker:* I'm wondering what parameters you base low cases and high case on?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't have all of the details around exactly which assumptions go in there – but it's factors like economic growth, what kinds of ships are going to be available, projected import/exports.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* It would be interesting to be able to have a look at that. You know, especially the way things are going these days, the validity of those kinds of material.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We do have a document library on our Port website now. The first page you'll come up to you can hit past improvement plans, Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. There'll be current documents and historical documents will be another icon. This forecast was done last year and we updated it again this year. We did take into consideration 2008, where we had some substantial drops in the economy, and both of those forecasts still showed the same information.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Rhona, what I'm concerned about there is it sounds like what you're doing is you're using these former studies to get your forecasts. And my concern mirrors Liz's, because I am very concerned about what you're using as your underlying assumptions to make your forecasts. And so much of what Port Metro Vancouver, and for that matter Prince Rupert can handle, doesn't stay. There's a certain percentage that does not stay on the west coast. It's headed for other areas. And my concern is, as I mentioned in a former stakeholder workshop last spring is consumerism gone mad. Why should we be potentially threatening our environment and our own local economy by making our role as a pass-through facility, for which our environment is going south and the people on the east coast and other points across Canada and for that matter in the United States, are benefitting at the expense of our environment? Coming back to Liz's question, the underlying assumptions, is it based on extrapolation?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The assumptions are based upon both historic and future projections. So certainly we look at the history to validate our current assumptions, and we look to projections going forward. They are done on a yearly basis, and they will continue to be done on a yearly basis, if not more, as we develop this project. We're in very early stages on the project. We're in a pre-environmental stage, and we haven't even fully defined the project to go into the environmental assessment stage. Certainly as those forecasts are done and updated we will be checking to see that our previous numbers and assumptions were correct, to inform our future projections. So we wouldn't be looking at going ahead with the project if the projections and the forecasts are not telling us that information.
- Q: *Hardy Wolfram:* Well, it's actually a projection. Now, under the current transportation system you cannot make any projection whatsoever because you haven't got it. We need railroad tracks to begin with. We have to twin the lines, which we have right now, and then this little highway, which is being built is absolutely nothing. I have just been around in the world, and I would say that this few streets and this one track we have going from A to B, we cannot project anything. We have to build the infrastructure first and then you can say, okay, now we deliver.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Okay, and when you said highway, did you mean South Fraser Perimeter Road or Highway 1?

- C: *Hardy Wolfram*: Well, it takes some traffic away, but it doesn't. You know, everyone is against it and of course the current attitude people have, well you get nowhere. You have to build it. Just like I said, I been around in the world and we are so far behind here in North America it is just awful.
- Q: *Judy Williams*: You're referring to Roberts Bank, but I saw a study somewhere, put out by PMV, that that also includes Sturgeon Bank. When you're looking at the Roberts Bank area are you also including Sturgeon Bank in that?
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Do you mean in environmental studies, Judy?
- Q: *Judy Williams*: No, I mean in any way. When you're speaking of that expansion, are you also including Sturgeon Bank?
- A: *Neil Turner*: Sturgeon Bank is included in the environmental assessment because it's regionally affected, but as far as I'm aware, in terms of development proposal, it's nothing.
- Q: *Judy Williams*: Then why is it being included in the environmental assessment unless there is no future plans for it?
- A: *Neil Turner*: Because of the regional impacts. Environmental study is not just concentrated on the footprint of the actual development, it goes beyond that. It depends on the scope of the study and what environmental component you're looking at. If you're looking at, for example, migratory birds, it's an extensive area. So that's probably what you're making reference to - in the field study publications that went out. There were references to studies in Sturgeon Bank and Roberts Bank for a number of the studies. So that's what that's in reference to, the environmental studies are wider than the project.

Opportunities for Creating Container Capacity

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of opportunities for creating additional container capacity (page 6 of the Discussion Guide), as well as related infrastructure improvements being made to support Roberts Bank (page 7 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Pat Pollock*: When you said replace the grade-level crossings, what does that mean?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: There will be either an underpass or an overpass constructed, depending on the local configuration. The at-grade crossing will be replaced so that the trains won't have to stop and traffic won't have to stop. So the whistling will be removed, as well as the interface between cars and trains.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Patrick, page 8 shows the location of those crossings.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: The black line with the red dots. They will be online in 2014.
- Q: *Pat Pollock*: What's the percentage of the containers coming in by truck and by rail?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: It's around 70 percent by rail, 30 percent by truck.
- C: *Mirjana Petrovic*: I am from Europe, so my point of view is kind of different than North Americans. We actually didn't have big trucks coming through residential areas. We have very few routes for trucks that big and they were all licensed and with a permit to do that. I really don't understand how we can allow every single arterial road to transport them with the dangerous goods and things like that. I live in Vancouver, and I see it everywhere. Main,

Cambie, Granville, every single road. Could we do something in that respect and kind of divert traffic from truck routes? I did a study where I spent a whole week with one truck driver, in his car and in the yard to understand everything involved.

Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project

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

- Q: *Al Schulze:* What I marvel at is, 4,500 jobs are paid by \$1 billion, and then 18,000 jobs only make 620 million, which is roughly half. Yet the number of jobs is four times. Are they that much more expensive to operate -- to construct? Do they make four times as much money?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The projections there would take into consideration much of what you're saying - the type of jobs during construction as opposed to more jobs but less wage. The 1.1 billion in wages is for the six year period. So, it's a six-year construction period, so it's 4,500 jobs and 1.1 billion.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* What's the capacity of these vessels?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't have that off the top of my head, but we certainly can get that to you, Judy.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* How many of these do you anticipate being for hazardous goods? Two?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I do not have a breakdown of that, and I can see whether we have a breakdown. We probably don't. We would only be able to look at our existing inventory to determine a projection of the future inventory.
- A: *Neil Turner:* No, I don't think we've got that level of detail.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* We'll make a note of that, Judy.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Okay. We're sitting here in a stakeholder meeting. You've got a number that you've already concluded and a number more to go. We're about mid-way through the process. If you get public feedback that this is not wanted and not needed, is there any chance that this might not go forward?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We're very early in the process, so a decision as to whether it's a go or no-go is still up to the board of Port Metro Vancouver. But we are very early and we certainly are looking to see what the communities' opinions are about the project.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* But you know what, Judy, I would add, because Kirk & Co. has been asked to help with the consultation, what Rhona said is absolutely true. That said, the Port is a proponent, and once they file the Project Description, which they haven't yet, but in a couple of pages you'll see where the Port is in terms of the environmental assessment process. When they do file that Project Description, as you know that triggers the beginning of an environmental assessment. They are then officially a proponent and they are saying essentially to the regulators, we intend to proceed with this project if it is environmentally certified to proceed.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* But one of the problems, particularly with the fuel tanks on the south arm and the transportation of jet fuel up the south arm of the Fraser is that the Port is like the fox in the hen house. The port is the one who is also very strongly involved in the environmental assessment.

C: *Judy Kirk:* In that case -- what Judy is referring to is a jet fuel pipeline proposed, where the Port has regulatory authority because there's land that the port is responsible for. They have delegated federal authority to be an agency permitter. But in this the federal and provincial regulators, both CEAA and BCEAO, will be the permitting authorities, not the Port.

It is anticipated, Judy, that there would be a joint review panel. So, it would be the most comprehensive kind of environmental review that is done in Canada. And you can see, as Rhona has explained, that we are in advance of right now the very left-hand column of 2012 through April 2013. In other words, the pre-environmental assessment phase is ongoing right now in terms of some studies, and Rhona and Neil will talk to that in a moment. But the consultation that we're doing is even prior to that.

So we are very early in a multi-year, multi-phase process.

Q: *Judy Williams:* Okay, just one other question for clarification. Your company has been retained and there's a lot of studies that have gone on and been looked at for forecasting. How much money has the Port already invested in this project?

Too often, and this is no criticism against you at all, but maybe of the Port. I mean, how much have they already invested in this? So is it a done deal because they can't just throw away that money that they've already invested?

C: *Judy Kirk:* So you know what, I'll start the answer and then I'll ask Rhona to chime in.

First of all, it's not a done deal. Why? Because the Port Metro Vancouver Board has several places along the way where they have to approve additional funding or approve proceeding or not. So in addition to the environmental review certification required for this to proceed, the Port Board at several places needs to also approve it to proceed to next levels of spending. With respect to the spending to date, I don't know, Rhona, do you have that number? It's in the tens of millions.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It's a substantial investment in the tens of millions range.

Q: *Judy Williams:* So they would never go back on it then.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't think that's true. I mean, we only have approval to proceed to a certain stage by our Board, and the Board has been very clear about not providing approvals to go through the entire process. So it's absolutely not a done deal. The investment that we've put in to date is expected.

We've actually questioned that and we've come to the determination, both through our internal resources and external resources, have looked at that question of how much we've done before we actually have moved forward with the project, and it is, in this day and age, with the size of this project, the expectations in terms of pre-investment before you go forward, we are not out of line, but it is substantial.

Q: *Al Schulze:* The coal facility won't be expanded?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No.

Q: *Al Schulze:* Now, as far as I can tell, you have a three-berth arrangement right now at Deltaport?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.

- Q: *Al Schulze:* Okay, so this in a sense will double. However, you've got some ships that will be bigger, probably they're moving more containers that can be handled right now.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I believe that these berths were designed for the same sized ships.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* You see, one of the problems that some of the people in Surrey face is the coal dust, and that will not increase because of the expansion, because I know that one of the committee members lives in Panorama Ridge which is just off the railroad track.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* That's right, there won't be an expansion to the coal facility.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* When I looked at this picture it talks about options of the orientation. So I'm wondering, especially if we go to an open house - could you not have an overlay that shows us which way the water currents and that flow without this?
- C: *Judy Williams:* That's a very good suggestion.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Speaking to your point, Liz, we did look at a number of trade-offs in terms of the orientation and the positioning of the terminal, and interestingly enough, often in these sort of trade-offs the environment and the engineering sort of are at oppositions. But in this case the environmental consideration and the engineering considerations clearly led us to the current design, which is to have it as far off from the foreshore as possible. And so although we did look at the W2 as its presented in the diagram on page 12, it was not as favorable, both from an engineering and an environmental perspective to the one that we have proposed to go forward with.
- C: *Liz Walker:* Okay, I just think that a lot of us here are already aware of those sorts of issues, right? So much of the public just sort of assume that everything is being taken care of. They don't know that that's a change that could occur. So in the interests of public education, I'm always trying to push the limits of it, saying let's provide the information - it gives us something to ask questions about too, because if they're not aware that those changes could occur, then it's never going to occur to them to ask those questions now or in the future.
- Q: *Steve Robinson:* Just a question back on the rail traffic. Does that correspond to the doubling of road and rail traffic?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We will be increasing both the rail and road traffic. It'll approximately be double.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* Does the existing facility as it stands now silt up and do you have to dredge it?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There would be some maintenance of the berth structure, in terms of maintaining the berth face.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* Because it will fill in and the ships can't dock there?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* That's right.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* Well, the same thing would happen with the new terminal. Have studies been done to see whether or not the requirement will be higher?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes. Consideration of the dredging requirements were certainly taken into that trade-off. In fact, there's less dredging requirements in its current configuration because we were able to push the berth as far into the deep water as possible.

- Q: *Al Schulze:* And where would the material to build the port come from?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The material to build the port will be coming from the dredging activities within the Fraser River.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* Okay. So in other words, it won't be shipped, say, by rail from far away.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The majority, with minor exceptions, will be coming in by barge.
- C: *Mirjana Petrovic:* I just wanted to suggest something. Usually when we go to public meetings for the residents, and that's the trickiest part of everything, we will have all the things that are bad. I would suggest that you have a list of good things that people will get from this kind of a big project, because everybody wants progress but not in their yard.
- It's extremely important to put it on the understandable level, to have somebody that can directly answer their questions, have a list of benefits, for the society or that particular area.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* It's really important that we are as clear as we can be about how early in the process we are here. None of the effects assessment studies have been done yet. The port is only at the baseline studies.
- And so part of what you're saying, explaining to people clearly, what are the potential effects, those studies haven't yet been done. But they will be done. But with respect to the benefits, Rhona did summarize the jobs and some of those things, but again, not all the studies around socioeconomic costs and benefits have yet been done.
- A: *Neil Turner:* I think the issue is the studies. These are the areas that are commonly part of an environmental assessment process. So the Port has said, "go off and look at these particular areas" and to your point, it may be positive, it may be negative in some of these areas. Once we actually conduct the baseline studies and actually have that information submitted as part of the process, it will then be talked about as part of the environmental assessment process and brought out.
- And today part of that, Judy, also is that to get some feedback in terms of everyone's impressions of the study areas that we're currently undertaking, and also to see if there are any here that perhaps we should put more emphasis on, less emphasis on or is an area of study or area of investigation that somehow we've missed.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* Well, if I could comment. Earlier when we were looking at that page of economic benefits and the prominent title at the top, and I said, okay, are there going to be any environmental benefits, because that's something I question.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* And it's too soon to say because those studies haven't yet been done.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* Because we've heard about the federal government changes and that with environmental assessments and is there a time limitation here?
- A: *Neil Turner:* Well, basically, the clock doesn't really start in terms of the federal CEAA process until we submit the Project Description, which is not going to be at the earliest until next year. The actual scope of this study or these studies will actually be dictated by the federal and provincial governments. So we're proposing these areas, we're undertaking the baseline, but it will be validated and confirmed by the federal and provincial governments that we study all the right study areas and to the right extent.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* And Liz, you know, often organizations do not start this early. They start in fact once they file the Project Description. And what often residents will say is, “Why didn’t you start earlier than that?”

Marine Terminal

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the proposed marine terminal design and orientation (page 12 of the Discussion Guide) as well as the berth structure and construction method (page 13 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Judy Williams:* How toxic is the concrete that you’re going to use for the caissons?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Concrete isn’t typically toxic. It does, certainly, wear well. Probably better than the piles, which would have to be maintained and replaced, and that was one of the considerations for using the caissons as opposed to pile driving because of the long-term maintenance of piles.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* What are they coating it with?
- A: *Neil Turner:* I don’t think there’s any coating on the concrete itself. There’s no other additional coating that goes on other than pouring concrete in form.
- Q: *Hardy Wolfram:* In regards to concrete, we are living in the mountains. Wouldn’t it be better to take natural rock and kind of fill it in?
- Q: *Hardy Wolfram:* It’s supposed to be cheaper.
- A: *Neil Turner:* I don’t know if it would be cheaper, with the extraction of the rock and the transportation of the rock and you have a lot more issues with getting rock through the city.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There is a tremendous amount of land for the terminal that will be rock and sand based. Only the caissons will be concrete, because you need a vertical berth face. The fill will be coming from the Fraser. It will be built primarily from the Fraser River dredging programs. And there will be rocks. The whole mechanism for building land is a combination of rock and sand.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* Where is the container storage yard on this?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The container storage yard is on the terminal.

Marine Terminal

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

- Q: *Al Schulze:* Since ships can’t dock at Alternative 2 and 1B, how do you get the containers from there to the ship? It has to be on rail.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So there is equipment that is used to transport from the storage yard to the rail yard, and that equipment would then have to be transporting longer distances. It would likely be some form of truck. So what it would mean is that there would be no rail on the terminal at all. The rail would either be on the causeway if the intermodal yard was on the causeway, or it would stop for the new terminal.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* So that is one of the questions that Rhona talked about, which I think people should clearly understand, is a trade-off between going in the water or marine works versus utilizing agricultural land within the Option Lands.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Don't forget wetlands, because it's not just agricultural lands, there's wetlands between them.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* In the Option Lands? I don't think in the Option Lands, though, Judy. I don't think in the Option Lands, which is the lands that they're talking about here.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, it's agriculture.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Even right beside the water?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* It wouldn't be right beside the water.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Doesn't that come to about 500 acres? I'm asking how many acres would be involved in that option.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, we don't have a number for that. Our current design has around 10 hectares being utilized in the upland improvements.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So you don't know the exact use in the uplands, but what you're saying is it could be more efficient in the upland environment.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* It could be more efficient in the upland environment. Obviously in a terminal we have much more constraints in terms of operation.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* You looked at terminal options – yes? Did you look at the option of putting in that third terminal versus going to Prince Rupert and expanding Prince Rupert? Now tell me why those other two options were not viable for the Port Metro Vancouver.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So Port Metro Vancouver doesn't control Prince Rupert. We require both the Prince Rupert operations as well as what we anticipate expanding for in Port Metro Vancouver. They're both needed in order to meet the future west coast of Canada throughput of containers. So they're both required. In terms of whether we would look at other opportunities within Port Metro Vancouver, we have looked at other opportunities within Port Metro Vancouver. We're currently optimizing the existing facilities at Deltaport through the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project. We've done efficiency and expansions within Centerm and Vanterm. Fraser Surrey Docks has limited potential for long-term growth, primarily because of the river, the size of the river and the depth of the river and the size of ships that will be servicing the west coast. So that's why we got to the point where really our last opportunity for expansion is going to be at Roberts Bank.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Why couldn't Prince Rupert expand? It doesn't have a migratory flyway, Pacific migratory flyway running over it, and it does not have the bread basket of the Lower Mainland there. I don't understand why you couldn't be working in concert. You're all doing the same thing. You're all moving goods and services elsewhere. So why not pick an area that isn't going to impact so dreadfully?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Prince Rupert is expanding.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* No, but I think that Judy's point is, and tell me if I'm wrong, Judy. You're saying that why not have Prince Rupert expand even more than is talked about here?

- Q: *Judy Williams:* I just think that it is dreadful that you're going into agricultural land as a possibility, and that you're putting in a third terminal at all.
- Q: *Peter Maarsman:* What you're talking about is moving somewhere else? But you're already building the South Fraser Perimeter Road. You can't stop the road being built. It's almost complete.
- Q: *Mirjana Petrovic:* Its connection between Highway 1 and Highway 99 and Highway 91, and it's the kind of road that can handle lots of traffic.
- Q: *Hardy Wolfram:* I say that Alternative 2 is absolute nonsense. You have to bring everything out into the ocean, and we should even eliminate the Fraser dock in the river. There's too much pollution being brought up. So we have it right in the Georgia Strait, farther out we have nothing but soil. You can dig it up. Rocks, you can do everything. I mean, we have to plan ahead.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* Just to come back to the capacity, what will stay here in the Lower Mainland or in the vicinity and what goes out east?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So, 70 percent of the containers leave the terminal on rail, 30 percent on truck.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* Okay, so the rail would actually be long distance, more so than the truck.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* No, no, that's if Prince Rupert expanded, it's a more efficient way of shipping the stuff east, because here you have the bottlenecks. The elevation and so on over the Rockies, what have you. Whereas Prince Rupert is more level and it's a shorter distance to go east.
- Q: *Chris Clutchey:* You were saying that it's shorter to ship it back east, and that's not true. It's shorter -- it's closer to Asia, but it's not shorter to ship back east from Prince Rupert.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* I would think it is.

Road and Rail Infrastructure

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of planned road and rail infrastructure on the Roberts Bank causeway and upland area (page 16 and 17 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Judy Williams:* What's a turning wye?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* A turning wye is a rail configuration that allows a locomotive to change direction and go back again.
- Q: *Hardy Wolfram:* We should be utilizing more rail. Look at Europe, look at other countries. It's way more efficient and less polluting.
- C: *Chris Clutchey:* You have to move bulk traffic in terms of pollution or use of fuel. There's nothing that beats the railway in terms of moving volumes.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* It says that you could replace those 210 hectares, which is about 500 acres, with the creation of new habitat such as inter-tidal marshes and submerged reefs? We're losing the wetlands so fast with the Fraser River now, that I just don't see where you're going to be able to create more.

- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We're looking both in the Roberts Bank and Boundary Bay area. There are additional sites, for example the salt marsh restoration, we've got some on the TFN lands that we're looking at. We've got some land on Boundary Bay that we're looking at. Other programs which aren't marsh restoration, they're marsh creation are taking place within the Fraser River Estuary.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Where?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There are some sites on Westham Island that we're looking at. We're looking at some sites out towards the airport. We're identifying sites as we go along. So we will look, as much as possible, from a banking perspective, around the area and in the region. So as was done with Deltaport Third Berth we will also be creating habitat opportunities directly in and around the existing new terminal.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Are you aware of what's coming down the pipe from the federal government about the airport about the new runways that they're going to create? So they're going to have to go out over the water, which is over Sturgeon Bank, which is where salmonid populations rest before they head for the open sea. It's precious land, precious habitat, and to say that you're going to create marshes around the airport, when they're trying to get rid of the marshes to discourage the birds, so there's no bird strikes, that's not productive. I sit on the Airport Environmental Review Committee. They have a bird kill program in place. So you create marshes, you're going to create more birds.
- Q: *Al Schulze:* Could I just ask a question about the 210 hectares - does that include the widening of the causeway?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.
- Q: *Chris Clutchey:* Given that the bulk of the rail traffic goes east and south would it be safe to assume that those trucks just service the Lower Mainland?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Much of the trucks will service the Lower Mainland. There are some that will continue on. My understanding logistically is that many of the trucks that continue on are packed and re-packed locally, stuffed and re-stuffed locally in the Lower Mainland.
- Q: *Chris Clutchey:* So there's no real way to lower that number if it's servicing Metro Vancouver?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right, and even if it's not servicing Metro Vancouver, as I say, typically they would go to a stuff and de-stuff facility.
- Q: *Pat Pollock:* I work at Rogers Sugar. And since they increased their capacity at Vanterm we've had nothing but problems. I don't know how many times I'm late for work because I'm sitting there behind a kilometre worth of trucks and I'm just wondering when this will be fixed? When are they going to get their act together to get the trucks scheduled properly.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There's the trucking coordination issue and then there is the infrastructure, I think, and they really work in tandem. We actually have a sister division that is working on optimization looking at how we can provide truck staging, how we can reduce the road/rail interface, how we can make the road and rail systems on the south and north shore more efficient, so that there's less congestion. So there's a number of programs in that area of the Port's infrastructure program dealing with that exact issue.

- Q: *Judy Kirk:* Rhona, are you saying that it's underway or that it's being looked at?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, actually it's underway. Those programs will be complete by 2014. Once we've got some of the infrastructure, then enforcement of some of the truck strategy, and the Port does have a truck strategy group that's working on dealing with the congestion of trucks, both within the inner harbour as well as at Deltaport.
- Q: *Pat Pollock:* Certainly it would be a relief to see congestion reduced. Also I'd like to raise a concern with the tolling of the Port Mann. Trucks are going to be able skip off the South Perimeter Road and head over the Pattullo Bridge creating congestion.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I would have to say I don't know the interchange on the South Fraser Perimeter Road to answer that directly.
- C: *Pat Pollock:* I'd like to see some instructions to trucks. Because that just becomes a nightmare.
- Q: *Mirjana Petrovic:* How many hours daily is the Port open? Twenty-four hours?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah. I think it depends on the terminal and it depends on the operation, the hours.
- Q: *Judy Kirk:* What about Roberts Bank?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Roberts Bank I believe operates for twenty-four hours.
- Q: *Mirjana Petrovic:* I think this kind of added capacity is extremely important. I personally see an opportunity at night to reduce congestion. I know that's a big deal with union, but we cannot build so many roads to accommodate every single type of vehicle who not experience congestion. Because there is no way that we can widen, widen more and more. We have to utilize what we have, and there is a mechanism to do it in the process of management of working out.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* And certainly, Mira, I know that Port Metro Vancouver, the City of Vancouver, Metro Vancouver, the regional district, and other agencies have all heard that from people, that people would like 24-hour operation and therefore to move trucks from peak to off-peak hours. I would encourage you to add that into the additional comment section at the back.
- C: *Mirjana Petrovic:* One thing that Port of Vancouver controls is actually how many hours they're open. So truck drivers should have opportunity to make their trips in off-peak hours.
- Q: *Hardy Wolfram:* The only thing is, if we rely on truck transportation and the increasing population, we are always behind. We have to look at different ways. We only have few bridges. We only have one tunnel. How do we bring the traffic through those - it's impossible. We have to definitely work on trains.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* I had the privilege of going down to Port Metro Vancouver's headquarters and looking in on their command centre, and I believe that the command centre anyway, I don't know about the trucks, the command centre has these screens of every area covered by Port Metro Vancouver, right up Burrard Inlet and they are monitored 24/7.

Compensation for Agricultural Productivity and Environmental Assessment Process

Rhona Hunter and Neil Turner provided information regarding Port Metro Vancouver's potential mitigation and compensation options for the loss of agricultural productivity (page 19 of the Discussion Guide), as well as an overview of the environmental assessment process for the project (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Judy Williams:* I'd like to know where this proposal falls? When they came in with the changes to the *Fisheries Act* and the *Navigable Waters Protection Act*, which is just more recent than the *Fisheries Act* changes, it is pulling any authority that Fisheries might have had, and that the *Waterways Protection Act* might have had. So, would this project, the third terminal, fall under the old EAO process, or is it going to fall under the two new *Acts* or is it some hybrid in between? What I'm hearing is it sounds like it's a hybrid in between.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* No, I don't think that's right. It would be the new regulations and correct me if I'm wrong, because 2013 is the submission of the Project Description, and that Judy, is the trigger for the regulators to review and determine what the scope of the environmental review will be, and under what legislation and regulation. So it's not until that application is made via the submission of the Project Description that they determine the scope.
- Q: *Chris Clutchey:* Will they also be the ones to determine what efforts are made to mitigate the impacts?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Yes, that's right.
- Q: *Chris Clutchey:* That's too bad.
- C: *Judy Williams:* It's sort of like the fox and the hen house, and again it comes back to -- it sounds very good on paper to say that you're going to do some mitigation work and compensation, but like the airport, I can't stress enough how hard they are working to discourage birds from landing. They're filling in ditches, they're doing all kinds of things, and they would never allow you to build a marsh there.

Categories for Environmental Study

Rhona Hunter and Neil Turner provided an overview of the planned categories for environmental study as part of the baseline field studies (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Judy Williams:* Well, I'd say every one of these topics is important, but one of the questions I have is you've got biofilm listed here, and I know that on October 9th Adrian Pollard of the Vancouver Airport Fuel Facilities Corporation (VAFFC) wrote a letter to the EAO office about the biofilm study. Would you be utilizing their biofilm study or doing your own?
- A: *Neil Turner:* The biofilm studies that were conducted as part of that will be taken into consideration. Whether it's the same in terms of Deltaport or to the same extent is yet to be determined. I mean, the issue of biofilm is quite a new study area of importance. It obviously is important in terms of the environment, but it's come to light in terms of a study area onto its own because of the importance for migratory birds and Western Sandpipers.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* So just for clarification, would the port be undertaking its own biofilm study?
- A: *Neil Turner:* Correct. It would. But it will also take into consideration the past studies.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* When you look at marine fish are we just looking at commercial fish or are we

looking at the whole gamut?

A: *Neil Turner:* The whole gamut.

Q: *Al Schulze:* Has a study ever been done in the past that considered the impact of the original port that is at Roberts Bank, but also the terminal for the ferry?

A: *Neil Turner:* As part of the environmental assessment there's a section called "Cumulative Effects" and cumulative effects is not only the effect of what you're developing but also what's happening in the region and how that impacts all these areas of study. There's a section on the website that shows all the historical documents and goes right back to development. You'll see some historical documentation from other environmental assessments that look at cumulative effects.

Community Legacy Benefits

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of potential legacy benefits for the community as part of the proposed project (page 22 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Pat Pollock:* Does that mean the operating costs are taken on by the city and the capital expenditure is done by Port Metro Vancouver?

C: *Rhona Hunter:* Could be a partnership.

Q: *Pat Pollock:* Or it could be a non-profit.

Q: *Al Schulze:* Just a final comment - is it possible to get some sort of tour for stakeholders who are really interested in the existing terminal?

C: *Judy Kirk:* So let me ask Cindy that. Cindy, are there public tours available in the port facilities?

A: *Cindy McCarthy:* No, I don't believe they have public tours available, but I'm sure if you were to perhaps email the facility operator, they might be able to.

Q: *Al Schulze:* I'm thinking in terms of this group. I'm a bird watcher, you know. I can sit there and see what's going on.

Q: *Judy Williams:* What about if it came from this panel?

Q: *Al Schulze:* Or a larger stakeholder group?

C: *Judy Kirk:* We'll take that back and see if that is something that is feasible. I think you all know there are security concerns and so we need to look at that.

Q: *Judy Williams:* You said that it wouldn't be transporting coal, but look at what's happening in Bellingham and Whatcom County about wanting to increase their coal capacity. How is that going to dovetail and overlap with a huge terminus like ours? Coal dust is really deadly. Look at the crabs at Roberts Bank and what it has done to the crabs, for example.

C: *Judy Kirk:* So I think behind your question is will there be an expansion to coal at Roberts Bank, but also given some of the U.S. expansions you just mentioned, what's the relationship?

Q: *Judy Williams:* It's huge if it goes through in Whatcom County.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* There's no expansion of coal planned at Roberts Bank.

C: *Hardy Wolfram:* We have to come to a conclusion otherwise Seattle will be taking over. We've

lost a lot of passenger traffic to Seattle and Seattle is always asking “What can I do better?” So we have to keep the money here.

- C: *Mirjana Petrovic:* I would say that’s true. I am in the working group in the International Mobility Trade Corridor between U.S. and Canada, and they are really watching us, and they are so into development. My suggestion really for this group to look into the future and think about future generations, protecting the environment but still supporting the economic development of this region.
- Q: *Pat Pollock:* Quickly, on the community legacy benefit, have they earmarked any dollar figure for that?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There’s no dollar figure but it will be substantial.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* And who will determine where it goes?
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* The Port, but in consultation with the communities. That’s why we are out early at this point to try and solicit some feedback.
- C: *Rhona Hunter:* And talking to local government too.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* I can talk to Neil later perhaps, but I will have questions on how broad the field studies will be, because you did mention that, you know, it’s not just the footprint of this project, but you have to look more realistically at the Fraser River Estuary.
- A: *Neil Turner:* Depends on the study area - the scope of those studies vary considerably.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* Yeah and there’s things I would like to know more about. Like road edge effects - because you talk about habitat banking - is that really looking at only the footprint that’s taken up, or will that mitigate for road edge effects?
- A: *Neil Turner:* There are the direct impacts and the indirect impacts. The bank is for the marine environment.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* So nothing for upland?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There will be mitigation but one is a marine and it’s going to be banked. The other one would be in consultation with the Agricultural Land Commission.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* I’ve been out bird watching for the last couple of months, something that’s bothered me a great deal as I walk around Boundary Bay is looking at more and more little pink flags. I’m not sure if you guys have been looking at the encroachment of the *Angelica Spartina* that’s growing in our bay, but you know, that’s an invasive species that’s come into our areas and if there’s no money to help get rid of that, that is going to severely impact our coastal region here.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* And are they marked by pink flags?
- Q: *Liz Walker:* Well, the volunteers, as I understand are going to be doing that, and those flags have been increasing and when you look at a flag, what was a small area is now very large. I have been on a field trip where we spent a day removing that stuff and it almost killed me as a volunteer. So you know, as that encroaches and destroys more of our area, the amount of suitable habitat is being reduced. So unless that’s taken care of as well, the increasing impacts are huge, as we look at more development in the area.

- A: *Neil Turner:* We have been considering this. Invasive species are part of the compensation package. It's not just creating new habitat, it's enhancing what you've got or basically preventing what you've got.
- Q: *Liz Walker:* Yeah, I'm involved in too many things, so I'm not able to keep up with everything, but I'm not sure what's being done right now regarding invasive species that come in with container traffic and what's being done right now to avoid that.
- A: *Neil Turner:* We look at what's actually there and establishing itself as an invasive species. *Spartina* is one that basically we spend quite a bit of effort to look at the opportunities for removal and to enhance that environment. To protect what we've got, restore what we've got.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* Neil we're talking about the roadside -- the effects on the roadside ditches and swales and whatnot. I wrote to the federal department of transportation and told them about Professor Royann Petrell at UBC who has done state of the art research on how to collect aeromatic hydrocarbons off the roads. They basically wrote back and told me that wasn't their purview. So I would give you Dr. Royann Petrel's name if you want some help.
- A: *Neil Turner:* That would be great actually.
- Q: *Judy Williams:* So, you have a separate process ongoing with First Nations - how much does the process parallel the one we've just gone through and are going through, and how much weight will the First Nations be given over ours? Particularly how much attention is going to be paid to the Agricultural Land Reserve?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* Judy, there's two things. I want to make sure people know that some other questions have come up with respect to the First Nations consultation regarding confidentiality and the things you've just raised. And as I know you know, there is legislation in Canada that puts an onus on organizations like the Port to consult. There are what's called consultation agreements that are negotiated with First Nations and there are some confidentiality requirements within that. The point about weighting, the environmental agencies themselves, CEAA and BCEAO, would need to answer that question, but certainly there is no preconceived weighting of input. But you need actually to ask them that, Judy.

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

The meeting ended at 3:20pm