

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

**Small Group Meeting 6  
October 16, 2013**

Notes from a small group meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 16, 9:00am-11:00am, at the SFU Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue, Vancouver, B.C.

**Stakeholders:**

Katherine Hammod, C.A.P.E.  
Ray Kan, Metro Vancouver  
Eric Aderneck, Metro Vancouver  
Bob Wilds, Greater Vancouver Gateway Council  
Max Gotz  
Neil Gillespie, Vancouver Police Department- Marine Unit  
Terry Burgis, Kiewit

**Port Metro Vancouver:**

Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator  
Rhona Hunter, Acting Director, Infrastructure Development  
Dennis Bickel, Transportation Planner  
John Parker-Jervis, Communications Advisor  
Lisa-Marie Gagne, Communication Advisor (Observer)  
Ben Wheeler, Hemmera, Senior Environmental Manager  
Matt Skinner, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

*The record notes that the meeting commenced at 9:02am*

---

## KEY THEMES:

- Some participants expressed concerns about the environmental impacts of both the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project and other projects being undertaken as part of the Habitat Banking Program.
- Some participants questioned the container traffic forecast and the rationale for terminal expansion at Roberts Bank instead of in Prince Rupert.
- Some participants asked for information regarding the intermodal split between trucks and trains, and the additional trucking that would be required by the increased container volume from the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Some participants questioned the cost of expansion versus optimization of existing facilities within the current footprint.
- Participants questioned how the value of habitat improved as part of the Habitat Banking Program would be assessed and compared to the value of habitat impacted by the project.
- One participant pointed to the positive effects that are resulting from Port Metro Vancouver's initiatives to reduce air quality impacts.

---

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

### 1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

*Judy Kirk welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting, as well as, the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Judy Kirk informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy.*

### 2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide- All

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

#### **What is Port Metro Vancouver?**

*Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the importance of trade to British Columbians, container trade in the Asia- Pacific Gateway, and the container supply chain (pages 4 to 7 of the Discussion Guide).*

**Q:** *Katherine Hammod:* That's such a low number of trucks. Once we get rid of the tunnel, which obviously Port Metro is supporting, and we put up a big bridge, then we can expect to see Panamax ships in our future coming up the river. Each of those ships carries 13,000 containers. Won't you need 13,000 trucks to unload one ship? If this is the number, why the huge discrepancy?

**A:** *Rhona Hunter:* Okay. I heard a couple of questions in there. I heard "what number of trucks are actually required in order to service the port business?", and "are container ships going to be going up the Fraser?". I'll answer the second question first.

Container traffic up the Fraser River is not expected to grow. In fact, we see it as being something that will cease to occur, simply because, as you mentioned, the ships that are currently servicing Deltaport, and will continue to service the container facilities in Port Metro Vancouver, are not getting smaller, they're getting bigger. The ship's length actually dictates their ability to use the Fraser River as a waterway to access ports. They simply can't turn in the river because of their size. So, container ships will not be going up in increased volumes. In fact, we anticipate that the container ship traffic volume will go down travelling up the Fraser River.

Q: *Katherine Hammod:* Are you saying that the draft has nothing to do with the fact that big ships can't go over the tunnel now and it isn't an issue for the port?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Draft has a play in it, but length is actually what's going to limit it. They can't turn around. So they can't go up.

To answer the second question about trucks, not all containers that come in through a port are actually put on a truck. Around 70 to 80% of containers that come into a port are put on rail directly at the terminal. So, although you're absolutely correct and the bigger ships are 18,000 TEUs and even bigger ones that will be coming and will carry more, the majority of that cargo goes onto a train.

Q: *Katherine Hammod:* Are you going to be promoting a further expansion of train systems? We already have six tracks crossing the Delta farmlands now consuming huge amounts of land. Does the Port want more tracks than that? Or are we looking at different expansion there?

C: *Rhona Hunter:* We're going to talk a bit more about the Project a little bit later. If you wouldn't mind holding off that question, we can make a note of that, and come back to that when we come back to exactly what the Project is. Is that okay?

C: *Katherine Hammod:* Okay.

Q: *Bob Wilds:* Just a couple of things. First of all, the larger container ships are not likely going to call here in any event because of the size of our market. We're going to be limited to the much smaller container ships. The larger ones will go to the L.A., Long Beaches, and to Europe.

On the trucking side, is it true that the 2,000 licenses that are currently issued are more than what is really required to service the Port? And if the Port had its own way would it have fewer licenses available to truckers to service the port? Many of the licenses are grandfathered, is that why we have so many of them?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Over the last number of years, the number of trucks that are moving the container traffic is half of what it was ten years ago. We have increased the number of containers that have been serviced through the Port almost two-fold, and in the meantime, the number of trucks has decreased by half.

We're getting more efficient with our trucking than we have been, and the licensing system certainly has helped promote those efficiencies. I'm not entirely sure as to whether 2,000 is the optimum number though.

A: *Dennis Bickel:* Bob is quite right, the number of trucks is normally sufficient to service the volume in the foreseeable future. We are continuing to work on facilitating improvements within that sector to make it even more efficient. But we don't see a real need for more and more trucks coming into the future.

### **Why do we need trucks & why Roberts Bank?**

*Rhona Hunter detailed the need for both trucks and trains to service the Port, and also explained the process of import and export transloading, and the general movement of goods to and from the port facilities. She then provided an overview of the existing infrastructure projects that will benefit the movement of goods to and from Deltaport, including the South Fraser Perimeter Road and the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program (pages 8 - 11 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* Do you feel that there are additional lands available in Delta? Is that what you're saying?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* No. We will be developing some lands in Delta at Deltaport.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* Okay. So you're going to take our farmland, basically. So you consider that available land?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* No. We're building a marine terminal.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* Everything will be contained on the marine terminal?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We'll go into the Project components in the next section.

### **Why do we need more capacity for containerized trade?**

*Rhona Hunter explained the economic forecasts for container shipping growth through to 2030. She also highlighted the improvements currently underway with the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project and the planned growth at Prince Rupert (pages 12 and 13 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Ray Kan:* In terms of the projections, I know that 2011 and 2012 reports are on your website. Is the 2013 report also on it?
- A: *Matt Skinner:* It is there. It's in the same place as the other reports.

### **Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project**

*Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the project, including the marine terminal and the road and rail infrastructure along the causeway (page 16 of the Discussion Guide).*

- C: *Judy Kirk:* To answer your question, Katherine, this does not speak to any agricultural land. It's just the widening of the causeway and the creation of a pod.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* Nonetheless, the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which is actually an industrial superhighway, has already taken a lot of land. Will the rail systems expand their perimeter?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The scope of this project does not include rail expansion in the uplands. It includes only rail that is required as a result of the port and the port business. The railways themselves will determine how they tie into this project. And the railways will determine when and if additional infrastructure is needed. They will then work within the appropriate regulatory environment, and appropriate mechanisms, in order to put forward any additional capacity or rail infrastructure that would be required. At this time, it's not part of the scope of this project, and we've had no indication from the railways that they are moving ahead with anything.

### ***Economic Benefits of the Project***

*Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the economic benefits of the project and projected jobs that would be generated by the project (page 17 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Terry Burgis:* When do you think you're going to start construction? How is it going to fit in with other projects in the province, and the capital size of the project?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Terry, do you mean assuming that the project receives environmental certification, what do you think the start date of construction would be?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We're currently forecasting between three to five years for an environmental review process. So it has a little bit of a window there with a six-year construction period. The soonest would be a three-year scenario, so we would be looking at 2017. The latest would be 2018, or 2019, depending on when that approval would come through.
- Q: *Terry Burgis:* It's probably too early to ask this question, but do you perceive it as one big contract or multiple contracts? I don't know how you've structured those.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We haven't finalized any of that yet. We are working on getting our operators on board and figuring out what the business model for developing it would be. It would be likely something that we would be able to share in a year or two from now when we have more details around how that construction staging might work.
- Q: *Judy Kirk:* Rhona, is there a business directory? In some other infrastructure projects there is a place where people like Terry can sign up and get information.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't think we have that yet, but that's something certainly we can put forward as a possibility, and I know that there would be interest going forward for people to get more information.
- C: *Terry Burgis:* That would be great.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* I have a question about environmental reviews. And I'm new to this situation, but I understand when the existing Roberts Bank Terminal was built, there were two definite recommendations that were the result of the environmental review process. One of them was that all of the overhead lines should be buried, because they're in the path of migratory birds and cause a huge amount of destruction. Second was that there should be free water flow through the causeway, I guess, in the form of large culverts or something. But neither of those was ever carried out. Why is that?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We are currently doing our baseline studies, which include looking at birds. I don't know about whether there was a specific requirement to look at them as part of an EA.
- A: *Ben Wheeler:* Actually, I think you're right Katherine, that the historical EA had some recommendations around birds, and bird strikes. The port is aware of those. Like Rhona was saying, we're actually studying that to understand what that effect would be. So in our environmental assessment, which will come up in about a year or two, you'll see what those effects are, and what mitigation measures can be put in place to actually reduce or minimize that.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Will you be looking specifically at whether those power lines should be buried?
- C: *Ben Wheeler:* Absolutely. It's been raised in the past. Do you want to know about that?

- Q: *Katherine Hammod*: How long have the power lines been up?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: I think the power lines have been there as long as the causeway has been there, since the mid-1960s.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod*: This recommendation was made some time ago. Why hasn't it been followed up on sooner?
- A: *Ben Wheeler*: Well, I think the short answer is, parts of it have been followed up. There have been some mitigation measures put in place. There have been some bird diverters, and there has been some success around minimizing the strike risk with birds. That's all I can really say at this point; I'm not that familiar with more details.
- Q: *Judy Kirk*: Is there more information on the Port website about birds and the bird program?
- A: *Ben Wheeler*: I think mainly it's around the studies that we're actually executing. So the terms of reference of the studies would provide information to understand that.
- C: *Rhona Hunter*: It will be coming out as part of the environmental assessment.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod*: The other question about the water flow through the causeway?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: So, we're actually going to be putting out some information on that because it is a question that has been raised before. It was an idea that was put forward but, in fact, once the modeling took place, and the experts looked at it, the negative impact to the sensitive foreshore area as a result of creating water flow in that constricted environment through the causeway far outweighed any potential fisheries benefits.
- C: *Ben Wheeler*: It is something that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans raised with Port Metro Vancouver in the past so the regulators are aware of that, and they have asked those questions. I think that from what I can tell, they understand what the reality is there.
- Q: *Ray Kan*: Just going back to economic benefits. These are the economic benefits nationwide right now?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes.
- Q: *Ray Kan*: In terms of the direct employment jobs, is that in addition to what exists now?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes.
- Q: *Ray Kan*: What is the current jobs number from port operations at Deltaport?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: I don't have that at the top of my head.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod*: Back to my question, are you going to be getting written approval from DFO, and from the Department of the Environment, to proceed with this? Is that going to be sort of a report that's available?
- A: *Judy Kirk*: Let me speak to this process as we move forward because the Port can't really speak to it.

### **Environmental Assessment Process**

*Judy Kirk provided an overview of the environmental assessment process and explained the role of the regulator in determining the scope of the project and the scope of assessment. She explained that there are multiple steps in the process and various studies that will be required (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* I noticed that air quality stations in Delta have significantly lower air quality objectives than regional, even though all of the pollution that the ships, containers and the coal is creating in and around Port Metro Vancouver blows up into the Fraser Valley. We have huge air pollution problems up there; that's where I moved from. What's the point of checking air quality in Delta when we've got strong westerly winds blowing all of the pollution that's created into the Fraser Valley and Hope?
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Well, we have two guys here from Metro Vancouver who have the authority for air quality. I'll put you guys on the spot. I know they're the ones that regulate the relationship between Metro Vancouver and is it the Fraser Valley Regional District? They have responsibility for air quality, too, do they not? Or is it just delegated to Metro Vancouver?
- A: *Bob Wilds:* I think it's just delegated to Metro Vancouver. In fairness, I think, there are a significant number of things already being done and put in place to mitigate that you might not be aware of. I think that the port does deserve credit for their programs put in place to reduce emissions and the types of fuel burned while ships are in port. They have plug-ins for cruise vessels and all kinds of things that are being done to lower that impact. There are strict diesel requirements to promote movement away from diesel fuel to power things. Significant improvements have already been made, and continue to be made. We all live here and we all have the same issues.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Thanks Bob, your background is in trucking, so you know that stuff and we appreciate that comment.

### **Marine Terminal**

*Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including the design of the marine terminal, as well as the road and rail improvements on the causeway (page 18 - 21 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Eric Aderneck:* For the construction materials that will be used for construction of the new terminal, where are those going to be sourced, and what impact will that have on the local construction market?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Dredged sand from the Fraser River will make up the majority of the fill. here is also some dredgate from the actual berth face that will be used in the fill. There is a certain portion of the dredged material that comes out of the Fraser River that has to remain available for local market, so we will not be able to use the entire amount from the Fraser River dredging program. In fact, that supply is one of the reasons why there is a six-year construction period because we can only get so much material over a period of time.
- Q: *Eric Aderneck:* And for the crushed rock on the perimeter?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* That hasn't been sourced yet.

Q: *Eric Aderneck:* Will containers be loaded directly from ship to rail or directly from train onto ships? Or do they stop on the ground first?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Typically what happens is containers comes from the ship into the storage yard, and then from the storage yard it then goes onto rail or truck. There isn't a direct link from the ship to a truck, or from the ship directly to rail process.

C: *Neil Gillespie:* Is there an estimate of what goes on trucks versus rail?

Q: *Rhona Hunter:* It's around 70 percent on rail and 30 percent on trucks.

### **Habitat Banking**

*Rhona Hunter discussed the proposed role of the Habitat Banking Program as a mitigation option to rehabilitate, enhance or develop marine habitat for the project. She then explained the role of regulation by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the environmental assessment (pages 22 and 23 of the Discussion Guide).*

Q: *Katherine Hammod:* Rhona, have you identified what the effects of this port expansion are going to be? Do you want to mitigate the environmental effects in advance, now?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No. In fact, where we are right now is what's called baseline studies. So baseline studies, which are listed on page 28, are used to determine what the existing conditions are. Once we have finalized our baseline studies through the regulatory process, then we will look at what the potential impact would be of this development on the environment. Through the regulatory process, we work with the regulators and our designers, engineers and environmental team to mitigate that impact as much as possible by refining the design, and changing aspects of the design. At the end of that process, there is a determination of what the residual impact is, and a proposal for mitigation of that residual impact, if there is any.

Q: *Katherine Hammod:* This is broad-spectrum, which is wonderful. This past summer, as a local resident, I received a Port Metro Vancouver survey about the impact of the port on local citizens. There was only one item that was being questioned, and it was the effect of vibration. I refused to answer that survey. It was not a survey at all. There are about ten big issues here and vibration is one small one that I perceive. What's the point of sending out such an inadequate survey?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* That was a targeted survey on vibrations and we were looking for very specific information around vibration to establish baselines.

Q: *Katherine Hammod:* That's fair enough. Why don't you email a follow-up survey that people feel is more inclusive and more complete, and more informative?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* For the list on page 28, there are probably ten sub-categories of baseline studies under each of those categories, so there are many studies going on. In our study design, some studies require us to go out to the public to ask questions and some of them do not. The Port contracts environmental specialists on various subject areas, such as air quality, to conduct these studies and most often they are not conducted all at one time. These specialists design and determine who to ask questions. Additionally, the regulator has not yet determined the scope of our assessment. We are early in the process. I would suggest that if there is something that you feel you really want to provide some input on, this Discussion Guide is a fabulous place for you to give us that feedback.

- C: *Katherine Hammod:* I think people are feeling jaded about the experts. It's just like a trial where lawyers hire the experts with the opinion that they seek. And we, as a community, are concerned about this. Is there any arm length's distance between the experts of Port Metro Vancouver since they are actually hired by the Port, and not employees for it, or in fact are they completely impartial third parties?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* So, I think that's fair comment. But part of the environmental assessment process is government oversight on any and all of the work that's done. One of the things that is established in this process is what's called a working group. In a working group, there is local government representation, and local government brings with it experts, engineers and others. There is also First Nations representation, and various agencies that may have an interest and expertise to first of all determine scope, and then review results. If there is a panel, which as I mentioned earlier hasn't yet been determined, there would then be that additional layer. So there is a layering of objective review. I would accept that there is also criticism of the environmental review process, but I wouldn't want the impression left with the group that somehow it stands only on one or a series of studies.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* Are you aware that there is a perception in the community that Port Metro Vancouver is basically autocratic? That it's not interested in dialogue? Certainly they engage in the exercise of consultation but is it actually meaningful? I'd just like to ask you a specific question, touching on government oversight. I'm wondering why in 2008 the federal government issued a report commissioned by then-Minister Emerson, which clearly stated that no further container port expansion in the Lower Mainland be undertaken until the port of Prince Rupert has been maximized? It talks about how Port Metro has continued in the interim to increase in volume and now it wants to increase by three fold or something. So, why is Port Metro Vancouver ignoring the recommendations in this federal report?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't have the specifics of that in front of me; you're quoting something that I don't have the background on.
- A: *John Parker-Jervis:* This does go back to page 12, and the container projections that we're seeing. And our scenario does take into account both Prince Rupert and Port Metro Vancouver. My understanding of what is happening in Prince Rupert is that there is a planned capacity increase, which will essentially max out Prince Rupert. It's not a scenario where we can just do Prince Rupert and then we would be okay to support the local and Canadian economies.
- A: *Bob Wilds:* I think it's a little more complicated than someone just saying if you did something here versus there, in that where the cargo goes is determined by shippers and by shipping lines. And it's very difficult to try and direct everybody where they're going to ship their cargo to. I mean, we have facilities here. We have shipping lines right now. There are about one or two shipping lines that call in Prince Rupert. Whereas we have every major shipping line in the world calling in Vancouver. This is where people come. This is where we get export cargo far greater than Prince Rupert. And you have a domestic population to service, which doesn't exist in Prince Rupert. So, it's not just that simple to say everybody should go to Prince Rupert.
- Q: *Max Gotz:* Regarding the Habitat Banking Program, is there a breakdown of how the units are calculated and how many units are currently in the Port's account, and what deposits and withdrawals have been made? It seems to me that it's very good and the log removal program, I think was fantastic. It was long overdue and has a lot of benefits. But it's not on Port land, a lot of it, and I fail to see the connection in a lot of ways. For example, if the Port helped to mitigate

or recover extremely sensitive habitat in the south Okanagan, would that count towards this project as well?

And it seems a bit Orwellian in the sense that habitat can't be created or destroyed, it just is. I mean, the log removal, for example, it didn't create habitat. It just changed what was there. The habitat was not useless in the first place, it was heavily used. It's even better now. My whole problem with it is that under the current design, the damage to wildlife, fish, everything, would be severe and irreversible in many regards. While very valuable, a lot of this is kind of like putting lipstick on a pig.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* The federal government's Department of Fisheries and Oceans is going through a review of their fisheries policy right now; therefore, we can only operate under the existing structure we have. We do anticipate it's going to change. We anticipate it's going to change to something that has a much more holistic approach as opposed to hectare to hectare. So right now we are simply putting in hectares that are being agreed to by DFO, who look at the existing value of the location—what value does it have now? What is the incremental additional value through the mitigation that we are providing? What is that differential deposited? We don't have it as a register on our website and I don't know whether we're going to be putting that on our website. We'll have to look at that as a possibility for the future. Right now, we're looking at actually getting that developed, through conversation that we're having with DFO.

A: *Ben Wheeler:* You raise some good questions, Max. I think that Rhona touched on it. We understand that there is an existing value for the habitat. DFO actually looks at that value and has a formula and a calculation to sort of say how we need to keep that in account. So we don't start with zero, we start with something. In terms of seeing all the numbers, you will get to see all that in the environmental assessment. At least it is our expectation that a full account of what kinds of habitats are affected from the terminal and how these other projects would potentially offset that would be part of the environmental assessment. So those linkages between the effects of the terminal and the habitat banking, or some of these other mitigation measures that Rhona was talking about, that should be all displayed in the environmental assessment.

Q: *Max Gotz:* Does that include a breakdown of all the units?

A: *Ben Wheeler:* Exactly, and how we calculate it. We spent a bit of time actually figuring out how to do that.

Q: *Max Gotz:* Well it seems like you're never going to be able to mitigate it totally. We're talking about the Fraser River estuary here. The values are just off the charts in terms of how productive it is. I lived in Europe for many years and they have had centuries of development. They basically have no more room. Everything is used and spoken for and that's just the way it is. They do this stuff all the time and they don't use extra land. The thing that concerns me is that footprint is incredible. It almost doubles the size of the terminal. I'd love to see Port Vancouver get what they want, and all the economic benefits but I wonder, considering the amount of money involved here, is there no way to redevelop this using the existing footprint? In Europe, that's what they do all the time.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes. The Port does look at optimizing and creating efficiencies within its existing footprint on an ongoing basis. There actually is a section in the Discussion Guide that speaks to that on page 14. In 2008, we looked at creating some additional efficiencies on the existing

terminal footprints at Centerm and Vanterm. We've looked at Deltaport and the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project is an efficiency project on that existing footprint.

I would speculate that over time and as technology, systems and logistics change, we will continue to add additional efficiencies and optimizations on the existing footprint. However, at this point, we don't have that and so we are planning on an additional footprint that we need.

One of the things that's important to remember is that this is business case driven. We are going to the private market for money. So there are people that will be investing. Probably a pension fund of some kind will be investing in this. If there is no business case, the project will not go forward. So, if technology, for some reason in the next six years, or say five years, gets to the point where we have such great new technology that we can create additional efficiencies within the existing footprint, then the business case becomes less robust. It would mean there may be a delay. It would be ten years down the line that we would look at a new footprint.

Q: *Max Gotz*: I don't think it has anything to do with technology. Basically the pressures here are not as great as the places that have used up all their land. It's still a bit of a Wild West and why not, mentality here. It's cheaper to expand. The pressure is just not there.

A: *Ben Wheeler*: Max, you raise a really good question about potentially mitigating the effects of Terminal 2, and it's something that we're going to spend a lot of time on. I did want to make you aware that on the website there is actually something called the "trade-off study" that the Port undertook. It was a pretty vigorous sustainable perspective on where the terminal could be located in or around the actual facility that would minimize the environmental impact, and maximize the cost benefit and throughput. Actually, that is the reason why you see the terminal farther out to shore. In an initial iteration, it was actually planned further up into the sensitive habitat and through some of that trade-off we were actually able to push it out a little bit further, and actually get away from a lot of that sensitive habitat into the deeper water. It's all the way in deeper water away from the eel grass and those kinds of things. It's a really good report, and I think that may be something you'd be interested in.

C: *Max Gotz*: But it's still a massive development. It's going to have severe and irreversible effects, whether we like it or not. We're all in the same boat, we're talking about the Fraser River estuary. I think we should exhaust every possibility about building this on the same footprint. The economic pressure is not there. I mean, imagine the Port of Vancouver building this on the existing footprint. You would be environmental heroes, as far as most groups would be concerned, and you'd still have your economic benefits.

C: *John Parker-Jervis*: Our Container Capacity Improvement Program looks at these projects and prioritizes what can be done within the exiting footprint. For example, the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project that's happening right now, is the reconfiguration of road and rail, and adding an overpass on the causeway. This is all within the current footprint. This will increase the capacity when it's complete in the next few years by 600,000 TEUs. It's a good example of being able to do that in the current footprint. But we are at a point where we have to look outside of the footprint.

Q: *Max Gotz*: Would the proposed Massey Bridge weaken or strengthen the business case? Wouldn't you be able to get a lot bigger ships up the south arm?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: The proposed Massey Bridge has not been considered in any business case at this point. We can't get bigger ships up the Fraser because they can't turn around.

- C: *Bob Wilds*: I think if memory serves me correct, as far as maximizing the use of the existing container terminals, we have one of the highest densities in North America for our facilities because we go five high. Most of the facilities on the west coast are chassis and trailer operations where they have massive land use, whereas we have RTGs and we go high as opposed to going out wide on massive land plots. We did that because of the land use, right? Originally Centerm was built for something like three or four hundred thousand TEUs and there are over 800,000 TEUs today. All of that is being done at the same time. It's trying to meet the growth that's projected long term and it can't continually be done on the existing footprint. It's a lot cheaper for the operators if we can do it on the same footprint rather than creating new facilities. That's all investigated before we build anything.
- Q: *Eric Aderneck*: You mentioned Squamish earlier. What is the capacity for Squamish? What is the limitation there?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Squamish does not have a container port. They don't have any facility that's available for evaluation, plus they don't have the rail and road infrastructure to facilitate a container port in Squamish.
- Q: *Eric Aderneck*: Conceivably could that be an investment to be developed? Or is there no room, and it can't be done?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: There is just no road and rail infrastructure.
- Q: *Eric Aderneck*: Okay. I know Port Alberni, on Vancouver Island, has made a proposal that they need a deep-sea port, and then there would be short-sea-shipping from there to here. Any comment on the viability of that or how it fits in?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Once there is a robust business case on the table, we'll certainly look at any of these projects that might be viable. At this point, we've seen no business case from them, it's just a conceptual idea. In our opinion, it does not address the issue of capacity because you'd still have to get it to shore somehow. So, until there is a business case at their end that they can actually come forward with, it has not been considered at this point.
- Q: *Eric Aderneck*: And what about the Ashcroft inland port proposal?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: Once there is a business case and they've gotten to the point where there is something to talk about we would certainly study it. We have dialogues with these people on a regular basis but we haven't actually seen anything that says there is a business case there.
- A: *Bob Wilds*: I guess the whole issue here is short-sea-shipping. We can't find a way to economically do it within the region, so why do we want to do it from Port Alberni? You're double and triple moving of the cargo. If you're going to be a competitive port, you can't do that and be competitive. I think another issue, which hasn't been included here and needs to be included as far as trucking is concerned, is the whole issue of intermodalling that could be set up under the port's leadership out in Richmond. This is where they develop five major import/export facilities under one site and eliminate a significant amount of movement of empty containers around the region by keeping it confined within that big site that they've developed out there. So a lot of these things that are going on to try and mitigate, as much as you can, the negative impact that may result as a result of economics. Reducing the number of empty container moves. Discharge the container into an inbound facility, move it over on the

export facility, and avoid that truck container load. Even moving it within the same confined facility out in Richmond.

### **Road and Rail Traffic Considerations**

*Rhona Hunter outlined existing Port-led trucking initiatives, including Smart Fleet, GPS implementation and the TLS, and also detailed the infrastructure, operational and technological improvements that the Port was seeking feedback on (pages 24 -27 of the Discussion Guide).*

- Q: *Ray Kan:* I just would like to go back to our discussion around the 2,000 trucks that are licensed at the ports. Is the current licensed capacity of 2,000 trucks related to the container business here enough to deal with the growth projected from the development of Terminal 2?
- A: *Dennis Bickel:* We don't have the answer to that yet. We're looking into that in terms of what is the optimal number of trucks that would be required to deal with the amount of containers. What we're trying to do by working with a number of industry stakeholders and partners is to try to facilitate the improvement in movement of goods. What that really means is: matching up what's happened within the terminals themselves with the trucking community, as well as industry. There are a number of examples where we've been able to trip match, so that container trucks moving around the region have containers for all legs of their movement and actually reduces the number of truck trips. We would have a better idea as to how many trucks would be required to move containers around if improvements can be successful at this for a period. We'll continue to work with Metro, Translink, and all of the government offices and industry as well.
- Q: *Ray Kan:* When do you think you would arrive at some estimate in terms of any increase in trucks?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* This would be part of the environmental assessment but as Dennis said, it is contingent on the success of many of these programs put in place to manage the existing fleet, because those would then be in place to manage any additional trucks that would be required.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* If Terminal 2 is approved, what's the percentage increase in terms of volume with container traffic? Is it doubling? Is it tripling?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* 2.4 million. So the existing Deltaport, once it has the improvements through the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project, will be around 2.4 million. The capacity for Terminal 2 is 2.4 million.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* So, doubling?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.
- Q: *Neil Gillespie:* Just to clarify. The 2,000 truck licenses are for the whole Port area, not just the City of Vancouver?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* It is for Port Metro Vancouver. So everywhere Port Metro Vancouver has lands and terminals.
- C: *Neil Gillespie:* Oh. Well, that's much lower than I thought.
- Q: *Max Gotz:* When is the federal government expecting to tell us what level of review this will be subject to?
- A: *Judy Kirk:* The federal government will tell the Port the level of review in January.

### **Community Legacy Benefits**

*Rhona Hunter provided an overview of results from last year's consultation and explained how those results were used to shape the consultation feedback topics on environment, community well-being and transportation (page 29 of the Discussion Guide).*

- C: *Max Gotz:* I have one suggestion, because I see these types of things all the time and there is no way to mitigate a project like this by little community projects. I mean, impacts are environmental and the benefits will be economic, hopefully. So instead of giving us sports fields, why not just give the groups a percentage of your profit, so they can do with it what they wish? I mean, if the community really is behind what you're doing there, why shouldn't they also benefit directly instead of just one-offs? Give them a percentage of it. They can do with it what they wish, whether it's environmental or what have you.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Max, the Port also has a local government liaison program, where things like that are being discussed. On the last page there is room for "Additional comments," which is a perfect place for things like that, or any other thing that you might want to add that are not asked here specifically. Also I'd recommend writing to your Council about what your view is, in terms of wanting some financial benefit to flow directly to the community, or to organizations.
- Q: *Eric Aderneck:* I did have just one question. I've always wondered, wouldn't the world be more efficient if there was just one sized containers like 40s and 52s rather than stuffing and destuffing them?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't think there's one simple answer. Mike Zachary, who is a rail and container business expert on our team, was at my meeting yesterday, and he gave some good insight. The international shipping business sticks to 40-foot containers. All the ship bays are built and designed for 40-foot containers. My understanding of why we can go to bigger with containers on railways than ships is that those containers are actually far less robust. They are not as strong as the shipping containers, they sit on a rail bed and get transported on or off a rail bed so they can be bigger, whereas a shipping container has to go through a lot more movement. I don't think there is one answer. I think it is something that over time one has evolved, and we may see ships being built for larger shipping containers over time.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* I just have a quick comment about the remediation that's being done in salt marshes. I walk on the dyke a lot and that is the only place I've ever seen raptors, northern harriers, red-tailed hawks, and snowy owls. The only place they ever land on the marshes is on logs that are there. So when all of the logs are removed, I'm concerned about how that's going to impact them. Is that not in the consideration?
- C: *Max Gotz:* I can comment on that, actually. The snowy owl especially lives in tundra, so of course there is no wood in their natural habitat whatsoever.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* So you think they'll choose to just land on the marsh down here?
- C: *Max Gotz:* They're perfectly fine without the logs as well.
- Q: *Katherine Hammod:* I wonder why I've never seen one just on the marsh.
- A: *Max Gotz:* It's usually because they're hidden in the tall grass. But in Boundary Bay, and in the salt marsh, they are like barn owls, short eared owl, snowy owl, and a lot of species that will

pounce into the grass after a rodent or a small bird in their talons, and they can sit there for hours and you'll never see them.

A: *Ben Wheeler:* I can comment a little bit, Katherine. This has been something that's been raised and designed into the actual design going forward, so my understanding is that there will be roosts and some logs as perches designed into the program. So that should be maintained.

Q: *Max Gotz:* This entire feedback form, you said it's available online? Anybody can go on and give their feedback?

A: *Judy Kirk:* That's right.

C: *Max Gotz:* So I can distribute the link in forums?

C: *Judy Kirk:* Yes, please do. Well, thank you very much for coming. We appreciate you taking the time this morning and look forward to your feedback, in addition to what we've taken today.

Q: *Neil Gillespie:* One more question. What percentage of these TEUs are headed straight to the States?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It's about ten percent.

*Judy Kirk wrapped up the meeting and encouraged participants to complete the feedback form and encourage their friends and others to participate.*

*The meeting ended at 10:53am.*