

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

**Multi-Stakeholder Meeting 6
October 30, 2012**

Notes from a multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 30, 6:00pm – 8:00pm, at the Hilton Vancouver Airport, Richmond, BC.

Stakeholders:

Bob Miller
Cara Kerins
Chrystal Yanoshewski
Ian Cheng, Sino Can Am Society of Business and Technology
Jennifer Wilson
Mike Isinger, ILWU Local 514
Otto Langer
Ray Kan, Metro Vancouver
Vic Rivers
Victor Wei, City of Richmond

Port Metro Vancouver:

Chris Chok, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
Rhona Hunter, Acting Director, Infrastructure Development
Crystal Lloyd, Environmental Coordinator
Neil Turner, Senior Environmental Advisor, Container Capacity Improvement Program
Stefan Krepiakovich, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 6:02

KEY THEMES:

- Some participants who live on Tsawwassen Beach noted concerns with current port operations at Roberts Bank, particularly with respect to nighttime noise, light spillage and impacts to air quality from ship and truck emissions.
- Participants noted that they were not opposed to increased trade, but wanted to ensure that Port Metro Vancouver is responsive to the concerns of those living in close proximity to port facilities.
- Some participants, who work at the Deltaport Terminal, stated that they were opposed to the development of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project as an automated terminal because they felt there would be fewer jobs available as a result.
- Some participants, who work at the Deltaport Terminal, commented on safety issues related to truck staging on Deltaport Way, and concrete barriers that have been installed on the Roberts Bank causeway.
- Participants asked whether the Roberts Bank and BC Ferries cause ways could be breached to allow water to flow underneath. They were particularly concerned about infilling of the shoreline at Tsatsu Shores.
- Some participants, representing Metro Vancouver and the City of Richmond, requested that Port Metro Vancouver expand the boundaries of its transportation study to include areas north of the George Massey Tunnel, such as Richmond and Vancouver.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Chris Chok

Chris Chok welcomed participants to the multi-stakeholder meeting and explained the format of the meeting, as well as introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Chris 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.

Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview on the need for container capacity, including the forecast demand and planned capacity increases on the West Coast of Canada (page 4 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Bob Miller:* Is there any plan that calls to reduce the amount of container capacity in the inner harbour?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No.

Q: *Bob Miller:* Is there any plan to expand Fraser Surrey Docks?

- A: *Rhona Hunter:* No. Fraser Surrey Docks has a limited ability to service containers in the future due to its location in the inner river, the size of the boats, as well as the depth and width of the river.
- Q: *Otto Langer:* And nothing to be developed at Richmond Fraser?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There are no plans for container expansion in the Fraser River.
- Q: *Otto Langer:* Does that make sense with the VAFFC plan to bring Panamax tankers up that part of the river? Why would they do it?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I can't speak to tankers going up the river.
- Q: *Victor Wei:* Fraser Surrey Docks, is that under your control?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* It's a facility within Port Metro Vancouver, yes.
- Q: *Victor Wei:* Is someone coordinating among all of these four ports?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Absolutely.
- Q: *Victor Wei:* My second question is: what kind of economic conditions will be considered as low case, base case, and high case?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So, when we do forecasts, that there is any number of factors that go in to it - current trade, projected future trade, economic stimulus, and all those factors have a range. So when the forecast is done, the upper range would be the high case and the lower range would be the low case. We do have our 2011 forecast online, and so if you are interested in the specifics of what those criteria were, and how they led to a low base and a high case you can look on our website.
- Q: *Victor Wei:* Looking 30 years down the road, because right now global trade is increasing, is the current trend still sustainable? Also 20 years from now, there is this conversation about international trade versus local products – what kind of effects would that have on the future?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* When we do a forecast – it's looking into the future and it's saying, "based upon what we know today, how do we project something that happens in the future?" That's why it's called a forecast. The rationale for doing forecasts more than once is that what we know today is different than what we knew last year, so theoretically we can forecast more accurately things on the current knowledge base and situation. So the forecasting allows us to ascertain whether we do need something based on our current situation. Knowing that we are very early in the project, we're probably looking at a five-year environmental review process, at which point we would then be in a situation to decide whether we would go or no-go. So at that point we would have another forecast that would say "okay, are we still looking a situation where our forecasts said we would be five years ago, three years ago, two years ago?" We also will be going to the marketplace for capital to build this and there are certainly limitations on what an investor would invest in. It won't get any investment if there isn't any return on it.
- Q: *Otto Langer:* Is Squamish at all getting into the diagram on page four?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Squamish is not here. Squamish is not a container terminal.
- Q: *Otto Langer:* So there are no plans there for containers there?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* There are no current plans for container shipping through Squamish.

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: *Bob Miller:* What is the purpose of Port Metro Vancouver? Is it a profit centre for the federal government? Is it a profit centre for B.C.? Is it a privately-owned operation? Could you just tell us a bit about who or what is Port Metro Vancouver?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Port Metro Vancouver is federal Crown. It's got one shareholder, that's the federal government. Unlike most Crowns, though, Port Metro Vancouver actually pays the federal government. So we pay the federal government a percentage of our revenue that we bring in. The remaining revenue that the Port brings in is reinvested in the port. So the Port does not take federal money to provide the services. It is a self-sustaining Crown corporation, and when it needs more money, as I mentioned to Victor, on a project like this, it will have to go to the marketplace.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* So what is the determination of profit? Or when is it revenue? How do you account for revenue and expenses in a form that a normal financial statement would present? Do you do that sort of thing? Can you help us understand the costs of moving of one TEU through the port and what the revenue is generated from that? I'm trying to get my mind around the size of the dollar volume that Port Metro Vancouver is generating in Roberts Bank.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't have the business numbers for the Port in terms of the revenue generated by the Port, but I can give you some information about how the Port is structured. So, the Port is like a landlord. It doesn't operate containers or terminals itself. It has long-term lessees who are the operators of the terminals. So the Port is the landlord.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* So who operates Roberts Bank?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* TSI and Westshore. Westshore is a coal terminal, and TSI is the container terminal operator.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Okay. Can you tell me what TSI stands for?
- A: *Chris Chok:* Terminal Systems Incorporated. Terminal Systems Incorporated is the operator of Deltaport, and I believe the parent company is Global Container Terminals.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Thank you. Is there someone available from Global Terminal Systems?
- A: *Chris Chok:* No, but we can get you this information. The Port produces an annual report, which is available on the website.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* I'd appreciate that. Because it's three profit centres – one for the federal government, one for Westshore and one for TSI. Is that a fair comment? And by profit centre I mean a place where you monitor the revenues coming in and the costs going out to determine whether or not the amount of revenue coming in is in excess of the cost of running the terminal.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So each terminal has a business agreement and a lease with the port. I wouldn't necessarily say that they're all structured the same way.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Is it possible for us, as individuals, to determine the amount of profit that is coming out of those terminals? Or is that private?

- A: *Rhona Hunter:* The annual report is probably the best place to get that information.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Is it your understanding that there is a breakout of this?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't believe that there will be a breakout in every case per terminal, as you are asking. But I would suggest that if you take a look at the annual report, and then if you have any more specific questions, then we can put those directly to the appropriate person at the Port. Some of the information is business information, and I'm not sure exactly what gets released publicly.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* But from a person who is impacted by the operations of the Port – it would be very useful to know whether the costs that I believe that I might be carrying, as an example, because of the actions of the port, I need to paint my house every four years, not every 14 years. So that's the impact that I have to absorb because of that activity. So, it would be useful for me to know whether or not I can make a determination as to whether I'm being treated in an equitable fashion. And without access to the numbers, you can understand that it's quite difficult to come to any conclusion on that.
- A: *Chris Chok:* We'll get you a copy of the annual report.
- C: *Bob Miller:* Thank you.
- Q: *Victor Wei:* I suspect it runs much like the Vancouver Airport Authority which operates the airport, pays rent to the federal government for the use of the airport lands and the facility and then invests the remaining revenues it collects into additional facilities within the boundaries of the airport. It sounds to me like that's more or less what you guys do.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* It's a similar model.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* When a freighter comes in to the terminal, they turn on the generators and we see plumes of black smoke which is enjoyed by everybody in the Lower Mainland basin. Because the prevailing winds move that stuff off towards Hope. So one of the questions running through my mind is, why don't they plug in? Why don't they plug in to electricity, because it seems that one of the things that B.C. has to offer the world is cheap power? I'm all in favour of people making money. I'm not in favour of people making money if they're peeing in the stream uphill and I've got to drink the water downstream. If it's all clean water, then I'm all in favour of them making money. If I had to pay a price for what they're doing, then I question it. Is this making any sense to you?
- A: *Chris Chok:* Yeah, I understand. You're feeling that someone who lives in the vicinity of the port facility is impacted by the operations.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Yeah, and I have no problem with that, okay? So as long as that impact is not fouling up the environment that I'm living in. If it's possible to do it and then if it's too expensive to provide the power, then one answer might be, well, then, I guess the Port is not economically viable. So, I have some questions to ask later about standards at the Port.
- A: *Chris Chok:* So perhaps what I'll do is ask Rhona to speak to the ship-to-shore power, and then if we could move through the project.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Sure, okay. One other comment before we go. It would have been so helpful to have the discussion guide mailed it to us so I could be prepared, I think you would be better served and all of us would be better served, because people who are prepared do a better job.

- A: *Chris Chok:* We certainly did post it online and we emailed notification of that. But I can take note of that.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I think what I'll do is just quickly talk to shore power and then we will move on through because there is certainly a lot of information and perhaps some of those questions may come up. Shore power was incorporated into the design for the Deltaport Third Berth Project and it will be included in the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project as well. There are a number of issues. We can provide the facility, but the ships also have to be able to plug in. So that is something that we're working with our shipping partners to encourage that conversion. There is also this standard plug – the standard for that plug has yet to be established, and so we are working towards establishing that standard. I would anticipate that by the time that we are looking at the proposed Terminal 2 project, we will have most of that reconciled and we'll see a greater number of ships being able to plug-in than we do today.
- Q: *Vic Rivers:* For the three years that I sat on that community liaison committee we were talking about shore power. The whole time they were there, they were sort of waiting for the ISO to come up with some decision about the type of connection that was going to be used to connect to the ship, and standardize it. It's my understanding that Long Beach has already got shore power connected to ships so it makes me wonder why it's taking so long. If it's already being done in California, why it can't be done in Vancouver? The problem seems to be is they're standing behind the IMO, but I don't really get the feeling that the Port really wants to go ahead with this, or wants to do it very quickly, because if they did, they could put a spec together and in six months go to General Electric and they'll be quite happy to prepare a cable system and a connecting system to connect to the ships. I guarantee that within six months they'll come back with whatever you need to meet whatever spec you want to draw up. And if General Electric won't do it, Siemens will do it, and if Siemens won't do it, Philips will do it. So somebody will do it if you just put your head down and say, "This is what we are going to do, we're going to do it by a certain date and we're going to be leading in this thing, and we're not going to be sitting back and waiting for Mongolia or Panama or some other country to get onside with whatever kind of connector they want to put on board their ships."

What we have now out there in the summertime, especially, is these three ships parked alongside Deltaport. They're all running their generators that are on board in order to keep the refrigerated containers cold, keep the lights on and are pumping away, hour after hour, day after day, night after night. In the summertime, when you have inversions over the water and there is nothing between you and the container ship, for two and a half miles, just open water, that sound reflects off the inversion and comes right back down on our house and you've got to put up with it. In the summertime, when you have the windows open, you have this thump-thump-thump-thump-thump all night long from these ships sitting there with their generator humming. So something really needs to be done to solve that problem, and I think it needs to be solved before you go ahead and build any more terminals out there. You deal with the issue that you already have, with respect to shore power, and a ship sitting there idling and blowing smoke into the air. There is sometimes in the summer and August when there's virtually no wind, you can see a layer right over the top of Deltaport, and it's surely just the exhaust from the ships going out, hitting the inversion and just sitting there, over the top of the Port. I've got all kinds of photographs. I've got a camera that I sit there and take photographs every time I see it going out there, and I could plaster this whole wall here with photographs of that. And you see it more when you're at a distance than you do when you're actually sitting in the Port. If you're not

aware of it, you don't see it. But when you get away two or three miles and you look at this black line sitting over the top of the Port, you know what's going in the air. So I think that's something that you guys really got to put your mind to – don't sit around and use the excuse that you're waiting for China to do something. It's already being done in Long Beach, no reason why it can't be done here.

Why Roberts Bank?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of related infrastructure improvements being made to support Roberts Bank (page 7 of the Discussion Guide).

- C: *Bob Miller:* The current Premier did not make a commitment to replace the tunnel. She said something vaguely like sometime in the next generation we've got to get around to it.
- A: *Chris Chok:* You are right. She made a commitment to study it.
- C: *Bob Miller:* Just to study it, yes, but not necessarily replace.
- A: *Chris Chok:* Yes, you are right.

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: *Bob Miller:* What are the existing Option Lands?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* They are lands adjacent to the current rail corridor that were acquired by BC Rail.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Is that options in the real estate sense that somebody has paid somebody for an option? Or does it mean that they're optional, that the federal government can come and expropriate because the rail use is considered more appropriate than agriculture?
- A: *Neil Turner:* What happened was BC Rail acquired the land and then they leased it back to the farmers and said you could use it so long as required, until we need to pull it back.
- C: *Bob Miller:* When you go back long enough, all that land out there, including the land that became part of the TFN by treaty, was land that was expropriated by the provincial government.
- C: *Neil Turner:* Okay. I understand that there were expropriated lands, but I don't believe the BC Rail lands were expropriated. I believe it was purchased from the farmers. I could be wrong but my recollection is it wasn't expropriated. At any rate, the Option Lands that we are referring to now are provincially-owned and are currently leased back to the farmers.
- Q: *Jennifer Wilson:* How many jobs will be created for the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So for construction, it's 4,500 jobs. Once it's fully operational at full capacity it will be 18,000 jobs.
- Q: *Jennifer Wilson:* So without Terminal 2, what is the number right now on the current terminal?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I would have to get back to you on that. I don't have the number for what the current jobs on the terminal are.
- Q: *Jennifer Wilson:* What's the difference between what's currently on the existing terminal and what would be in terms of jobs on the new automated terminal?

- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Our planning is for a semi-automated facility, which certainly would probably have fewer jobs than the current facility, because it's not as automated. The final configuration will depend on the actual operator who's on that facility, and what they choose to have.
- Q: *Otto Langer:* You have numbers for the actual jobs employed at the Terminal 2, without all of the multiplier spin-off jobs?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't have it at the top of my head, but I think that we certainly can get it.
- C: *Otto Langer:* Yeah, that's easier to relate to really, because a lot of us disagree with these multiplier factors.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* What's the cost of the project?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Over \$2 billion dollars.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Okay and how much of that is to mitigate the environmental damages?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Well, that will depend on the regulator. The current project cost projections are based upon what we anticipate. It's a round budget – when I say the project cost is over 2 billion dollars, it's very, very round numbers. So, we don't have costs associated specifically on what it will be, because it will be the regulator that will dictate exactly how much is in there. It's certainly in the hundreds of millions of dollars for habitat compensation.
- Q: *Vic Rivers:* You mentioned this was going to take six years?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Six years to construct.
- Q: *Vic Rivers:* Six years. Is that going to be like it was for DP3 which is 24 hours a day, seven days a week type of construction? Or is it going to be nine to five, Monday to Friday?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We don't have a construction plan at this point.
- Q: *Vic Rivers:* When they built DP3 it was a 24-hour operation, seven days a week. Delta, in order for us to have the quiet enjoyment of our homes and properties, has bylaws that restrict construction between 7 in the morning and 7 at night weekdays, 9 in the morning to 5 in the afternoon Saturdays, and no construction noise on Sundays. However, when you guys are building these great ports, you work 24 hours a day, seven days a week. And for months on end, and for almost years on end, 200 homes that face the Gulf of Georgia either on the top of the bluff and one block back, and those that are down on the bottom are subjected to all kinds of unacceptable noise in the middle of the night, like the Columbia dredge. If you don't know what a Columbia dredge looks like, it looks like a big shoebox with a bunch of steel sticking out of the front. It dredges the bottom of the ocean, and dumps it up on a barge or something else. The problem with the Columbia dredge is it's probably one of the noisiest pieces of equipment in the whole Lower Mainland and they run that months on end, at night. It's only two and a half miles between my place and that Columbia dredge. When it's the summertime and you have an inversion over the water, you might as well be sitting next to it, because the noise just comes screaming across the water and into the bedroom. A scientist friend of mine at UBC and I went out with some noise measuring equipment when the dredge was operating and we were within 200 metres of it. It had the side doors open, and it was doing its thing out there. We were measuring about 95 decibels, 200 metres away. Back in my bedroom, sitting on my bed, with a noise meter equipment, it was reading anywhere from 75 to 78 decibels. This is at night, and it

goes all night long, month in, month out. There is nothing we seem to be able to do about it. I think that that's something that has to be taken care of, if they're going to do it.

Noise is an issue. There is no compensation made to the people that are living there, that have to put up with it. My beef is that you have environmental compensation out there putting eel grass beds in on Sunday morning at 7 o'clock, 200 feet from my bedroom window, and that's being compensated, but this guy here, me, and all the people that live along the bluff, we don't get any kind of compensation. We just say, "Tough, we've got to put up with it." You're telling me six years, that's just too damn long to have to put up with that kind of construction noise. In here, you're talking about driving piles?

- C: *Chris Chok:* What the port is saying is that they are not looking to drive piles. And we'll get to that in a second.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* But before you get to that, can I ask a broader question? How does the Port determine the environmental effects from one of its projects? I read your statement about the environment on your site, it said nothing. So I'm interested in if you could describe how you determine the environmental impacts of your projects? And I've talked to people about the effects of your project on the disbursement of sediment from the Fraser River and the response I've heard is "We are not responsible for anything that's south of the ferry terminal." Also, when do you decide whether what you're doing requires mitigation. Are you in a position to answer that?
- A: *Neil Turner:* The environmental assessment begins with the submission of the Project Description. Through the environmental assessment process, we'll actually sit down and study by study determine where the bounds of those studies are.
- Q: *Jennifer Wilson:* Who makes that determination?
- A: *Neil Turner:* The regulator. In this case they will likely be the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and the B.C. Environmental Assessment Offices.
- Q: *Jennifer Wilson:* Just wondering if those two organizations are the same people who are assessing the environmental factors for Enbridge?
- A: *Otto Langer:* It's the National Energy Board and CEAA. It's joint with two federal agencies whereas here it's a joint federal/provincial.
- A: *Neil Turner:* But that's under a slightly different regime as well.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* So in an observational way, one would say that Port Metro Vancouver has been very successful in persuading the regulators that anything that they're doing has no impact beyond the ferry terminal.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I think you might be talking about the Fraser River discharge? I'd have to go back to my colleagues on the dredging program to determine the bounds of the scope of their work, and it may be absolutely correct that for some reason, they don't have to go south. I can't speak to that because I'm not clear. But I think if we come back to this project, as Neil said, the physical bounds of our study area and our impact will be verified by the environmental regulators who are reviewing the project, and whether it's a panel process and a federal/provincial panel process, that would be the federal and provincial government that would make that assessment. But we're not drawing those boundaries.

- C: *Bob Miller:* It's up to people like us to raise hell with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Office. They don't have a wide enough terms of reference, and it's an iterative process, but those processes are all highly questionable at this stage of the game.
- Q: *Vic Rivers:* Environmental Assessment Agency – wasn't that the lead agency in the last go-round, when they did their last construction work?
- A: *Otto Langer:* Oh, I don't think so. But the BCEAO is generally not taking a lead where there is a big federal mandate, but the feds seem to be backing out, retreating as quickly as they can.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* And that goes back to my first question – that there is always a balance between revenue and expense. So you're saying that if the damage is such that we would have to step in and do something – do you have a policy on that? Or do you wait for the regulators to tell you? Because Rhona has mentioned that you make a proposal, which presumably you defend? Then the regulator and us 'Joes' don't have that much of an opportunity to review.
- A: *Neil Turner:* No, the process establishes the timing and you will have an opportunity to be consulted, an opportunity basically to look at the terms of reference for the scope of the studies, and the extent of the studies. There is a consultation period after the project description is submitted.
- C: *Bob Miller:* Good. Because I have talked to one of your planners and wrote a letter to him, about the fact that Tsawwassen Beach Bay is filling in. He had no interest or care because it's out of his terms of reference - it was just cut and clear. There is no small fish out there to speak of now, as compared to 1915 – my family has been involved in this area for a long time. So we have some history as to how the environment has been damaged.
- C: *Mike Isinger:* I think everyone is aware of this Against Port Expansion community group. They have a flyer out here. Apparently there has already been an assessment done. It says:
 "Location now identified by Port Metro for the new T2 was turned down previously by an independent panel that concluded significant environmental damage and risk would result from the proposal. The panel recommends that the expansion as proposed not be permitted to proceed. And the Department of Fisheries and Oceans has told Port Metro Vancouver there is no possible amount of mitigation projects DFO could envisage that would compensate for the environmental damage that T2 would cause. Environment Canada has gone on record as saying they are concerned that the chain of the Pacific flyway could be broken for shore birds at some point, given the ongoing Port development in Delta."
 I'll just enter the entire document in for the record. You know, we're going at it again. A lot of us that work on the waterfront, we're very concerned that it's unnecessary. For the people in the room that don't know, there is a travelling road-show that's going around globally, comprised of the automation companies and the container steamship lines. What they're trying to do is entice individual port authorities into building over capacity and preferably automated docks that are not good for the workers. There are hardly any workers there. That's where our concern comes in. So we believe that T2 is not necessary. We believe that they should expand in Prince Rupert and the Inner Harbour, and go along with the fourth berth that was supposed to happen prior to T2 but we don't see any of that in the table. This is not good for us. Our people are working in fear now because our companies told us "Oh, yeah, T2 is going ahead and there is nothing you could do. And two-thirds of you are going to lose your jobs." A lot of people think longshoremen, they're all this and all that, but we waived our automation protection provision

of the *Canada Labour Code* some years ago. Where are the good-paying jobs for Canadians? A lot of those people live in the community. I live in Richmond. A lot of them live in Tsawwassen, Delta -- there's a lot of money generated by those good-paying Canadian jobs, and those won't exist if T2 goes ahead. So a lot of us not in favour of T2. Number one: because of the environmental damage. Number two: we don't believe it's necessary.

C: *Jennifer Wilson*: Just to add on to what he said - these semi-automated ports, we pay taxes, income tax, which we've put back into the community. We spent a lot of money in Tsawwassen and Ladner. I plan on moving there. But you know, these semi-automated machines, they don't pay taxes. So, all around, it's not good for anything.

Q: *Vic Rivers*: I'm not going to argue about whether this thing should go ahead or not -- but I have issues with certain things if it goes ahead. I was reading up recently about the Big Dig in Boston, where they tore down some overhead roads and built a big tunnel through the city, and they put in 24-hour, 7-day-a-week operations. One or two interesting things here that I'd just like to read to you:

"The work must be done without violating stringent noise limits brokered by environmental and community groups, who validly try to halt the demolition but the limits are routinely broken. On the noise front, project officials have spent four years mapping out a plan to quiet the roar. They now say they have created the most comprehensive aggressive noise abatement plan for any construction project ever in the United States. 'We are really writing the book here. This project is fully committed to dealing with noise. More than \$4 million was spent to treat 200 windows along the corridor, to hang noise curtains, to erect barriers, and a staff of workshops with noise patrol officers. The officers, armed with decibel detectors, are theoretically empowered to shut down the work if the noise gets too loud.'

That's the kind of thing they did in Boston, the Big Dig. I'm hoping that you guys, when you get your planning going, focus in the back of your mind and say, "We have to deal with noise, because we do have people that live nearby." There is no barrier between the container port and those homes. The noise comes flying across the water, and if you're doing it 24/7, it's a real pain to do that for six years.

Marine Terminal

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the proposed marine terminal design and orientation (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Bob Miller*: What studies have you done on the impact of that growing being further out on the distribution of sediments from the Fraser River?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: What we're doing right now are baseline studies. It's important to remember we're very early on in the process. So what we're establishing now are current conditions. Once the baselines are established then modeling begins to evaluate what the potential impacts are.

Q: *Bob Miller*: You just said that your studies are showing that this is the best place. So, if this is the best place but you haven't got baseline studies for all the sediment out of the Fraser River and how that's going to impact that compared to before how can you come to the conclusion it's the best place?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: We're early. We don't have a project that's being put forward yet. So part of that process is that once we propose a project, federal and provincial regulators determine whether

our assessment is indeed valid, or whether we do need to do additional studies, or whether what we have currently is sufficient.

- C: *Otto Langer*: If you have a public hearing process, you probably should look at three or four configurations and let the environmental panels look at the best one, and not let any superficial studies like Port Metro Vancouver determine it. They went out and bought the land, and came up with ten sites, and then wrote off nine of them quickly, superficially, and said, "This is the only one that's good." And that was such a bullshit approach. People are going to fight this project more so than anything you've ever seen in British Columbia, other than Enbridge. If you want another Enbridge on your hands, you've got it.

Berth Structure

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the berth structure and construction method (page 13 of the Discussion Guide).

- Q: *Bob Miller*: Can you describe whether or not the one you have chosen is the most economical to build?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: It is, and it comes down to long-term operation and maintenance of the piles, as opposed to the caissons.
- Q: *Bob Miller*: One of the problems you read from people in Point Roberts is that they believe part of Point Roberts is being eroded, and flushed back into the Tsawwassen Bay, because of the actions of the water due to what you folks are building, which you claim do not have any impact south of the ferry terminal. It's really scary to think about how we are going to affect the sediment distribution out of the Fraser River.
- Q: *Vic Rivers*: What's the thinking of making it like a hockey stick rather than just continuing on going northwest in terms of the existing area?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: If you look back on page 12, there were a number of configurations, and it was the design and the environmental considerations around those two configurations that led to the preferred one which would be, as you say looks like a hockey stick. Bob, just speaking further to your question, no, there is no consideration in the proposed design for breaching the causeway.
- Q: *Bob Miller*: And why would that be?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: My understanding of the foreshore area is that any disturbance of the foreshore area has geomorphic implications – the coastline gets further eroded by impacting the coastline. So by simply providing a bridge over there, and providing water flow through that causeway, would have greater impact to leaving the causeway as it is.
- A: *Neil Turner*: There has been concern in the past from DP3 with both channel formation and erosion. We're actually looking at the movement of sediment and the speed at which water is moving in and out of these various areas. So we're going to find out the baseline data on how sediment is moving, and how is it accumulated, and where is it going to accumulate, and where it's eroding.
- Q: *Bob Miller*: My relative wrote to the government when the ferry terminal was first put in. He spent his life on the ocean, saying we need a breach in the ferry terminal.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: We've noted that comment.

Q: *Bob Miller:* When I first moved down there forty years ago – between then and now, at the far end of the Tsawwassen Bay, there is a build-up of sand – that was never there before. So to conclude that your activities are having no impact when you haven't studied it, and now you're going to do baseline studies that are at least 40 years late, and you'll say, "Well, that was there when we started." Like, it just doesn't make any sense. I don't say people are trying to be untruthful, but they are very close to that line.

Q: *Vic Rivers:* I've been there 44 years, and that corner has been filled in dramatically in that 44 years.

A: *Otto Langer:* As a fisheries biologist, and then working in Roberts Bank even before the port was there, they just filled in the site when I came to this coast. I support some of the comments made, and I don't know these gentlemen. One of them said he met me years ago, but I didn't conspire with him to raise his comment. But I think if there's going to be any review, you've got to do an overall ecosystem review of this whole part of the world, and that's in the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, looking at cumulative impacts, and that's what we're not doing. Probably the most destructive thing that affects mudflats and marshes are the linear facilities, causeways. There's nothing more destructive. Same with this jetty that they're talking about. It's blocking movement of material that's being eroded, and it's trapping it, including the stinky rotting eel grass. Then between the causeways, you're getting no sediment now, and as soon as the super port and ferry terminal was built, the marshes started collapsing in front of the Indian reserve. This is a tremendous erosion problem and a causeway was unwisely built across there, was part of that overall problem – they interfere with fish and they interfere with sediment transport. Before the port was built I said there ought to be a breach put in it. But I wasn't in charge of the project in Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and the sand was dumped there, and nothing was developed. So these two gentlemen are really dead-on, and I think that should be recorded.

C: *Vic Rivers:* The Surveyor General added 25 feet to the front of my property because of the land moving in.

Marine Terminal

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

C: *Bob Miller:* Given what Victor has said about the noise at night, and having had the opportunity to be around shunting yards at other times in my life, what you're proposing is to further aggravate the noise problem by either 1A or 1B. In the summertime all the problems that Victor was talking about will be exacerbated if you're going to have trains shunting out there – and probably trains burning diesel, okay? But the shunting, that noise we hear it now in the summertime when they're unloading the coal trains – and you're proposing that they exacerbate that problem as if to say, "You folks that live there, we don't care about how what we do impacts your life."

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Well, actually, we are asking that question, and so I would draw your attention to page 23, where we're asking specifically for your feedback on that question on page 24.

Q: *Vic Rivers:* This intermodal yard, is that where they assemble the trains?

- A: *Rhona Hunter*: It's where the trains are loaded and unloaded.
- Q: *Vic Rivers*: Well, you already loading and unloading them down here already with those moving things that run along and put the container in the train.
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: No. So the intermodal yard is that specific component of the terminal operation that takes it from the storage racks and puts them onto the trains. So under the current configuration, it can be done on the terminal. For example, on the Deltaport terminal it is done on terminal.

But we're building a new terminal, so we have an opportunity to put it either on the terminal, like it is on Deltaport, which is what we proposed, or somewhere else.

- Q: *Vic Rivers*: How do you get the containers from the storage yard to wherever you're putting them on the train?
- A: *Rhona Hunter*: It would have to be by truck.
- C: *Cara Kerins*: If you're doing it off-site and you're trucking it out on a semi-trucks and you'd have noise from all that too. So I don't know.
- C: *Bob Miller*: Doesn't make much sense to me. I don't think that part of it is particularly noisy. I'm pretty conscious of what kind of noise we hear, and you drop the hatches from three feet under the ground, it makes a hell of a bang as it comes across the water. But when you put the containers on to the train that way, that's nothing. When you went to bells, it made a big difference.
- Q: *Otto Langer*: But when you look at a highly stressed estuary and more and more pressure being put on, the airport's talking about new runways, jet fuel up the Fraser River, we start sacrificing more of it for a parking lot, whether you're BC Ferries or Port Metro Vancouver, and to be quite honest, I think that's stupid to even consider it.

And the other question I have is, are you doing any consultation south of this line on the map in Point Roberts? Because the reason I mention that, and I didn't come here to raise the issue, I'm not representing Americans, but I camped down there twice this summer, Point Roberts at the far end, and you won't believe how noisy it is way at the far tip of Point Roberts 24 hours a day from the port. They shut down, for some reason, on one Sunday. You wouldn't believe how quiet and nice it was. And I think you owe it to Americans to do some consultation south of the border. They are really affected and they live a lot further south than these two gentlemen. And I was actually quite shocked. It's the first time I've ever camped down there in the summer.

- C: *Vic Rivers*: When you have a snowstorm, that's when you really realize how much noise is coming out of there. If you hear nothing, then it's snowing. And all of a sudden it clears and then you hear the background noise going all the time.

Road and Rail Infrastructure on the Roberts Bank Causeway

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the planned road and rail improvements on the Roberts Bank (page 16 of the Discussion Guide).

- C: *Mike Isinger*: It behooves me, on behalf of the people that I work with, we have a very dangerous situation on Deltaport causeway. There's been over a dozen people killed on that causeway, and lately, even since Evergreen's left, and I don't know if you're aware, Evergreen

was one of the largest customers. It's temporarily in the inner harbour. In December, it's coming back out your way.

They have a major problem with their reservation system. The trucks are backing up all the way down Deltaport Way and for our workers to get to work at Deltaport, and at Westshore Coal Terminal, they have to come into opposing traffic, and some of these trucks parked end-to-end. It's over a mile long. And something has to be done. The truck drivers are not happy with the level of service they're getting out there. They've had numerous strikes. They come out of their truck in an aggressive fashion and our female checkers are very concerned about violence at the terminal. So we have a number of current issues that are not being handled appropriately.

We don't see anything being done. I know there are a number of meetings that have been happening. So we'd like that in the record. This is occupational health and safety problem, and an immediate problem for our members. And we phone the police every day, and every day we come and there is another mile or two-mile line-up of trucks off on the shoulder, and you have to drive into the other lane for a mile or two miles, and you don't know what's coming, because you can't see that far. Just to get to work.

- C: *Crystal Lloyd:* Yeah, I just wanted to elaborate on that. I mean, I definitely understand what you guys are saying about safety and people with the trucks and everything. But I have been out there before when there hasn't been back-ups of traffic, and when people get off duty it's just insane how fast they drive, and how crazy they are, passing you on that road. And regardless of what, you know, say there's workers on the side doing work, it doesn't matter. I think it can be attributed also to people's driving safety.

I mean, I understand what you were saying about the truck traffic, and people having to go into other lanes. But you go when there aren't line-ups, I have seen people going into the other lanes to pass myself, and I'm not a truck, and I'm driving at a normal speed.

- C: *Mike Isinger:* The last part, where the security guard ships on the causeway, that lamp post that's there that now has concrete barricades, because there is a safety issue for the security guard that has to coordinate the trucks coming in, so what the Port has done is put highway concrete barricades in the middle of a highway, in this case the Deltaport causeway. We've had three workers that have gone through -- prior to the barricades being there, have gone right through that light because it gets very foggy out at Deltaport, and we've brought it up a couple of times and nothing's been done. What we have been told is that there's going to be a proper security shack placed in there and that what we have is four or five concrete highway dividers in the middle of Deltaport Way, and we're quite concerned that one of our workers going to work is going to get killed.

If anything, there should be some mitigating barriers, some water barrels or sand barrels and not pieces of concrete that are two feet high and four feet long in the middle of a highway. It's a big problem for us, right? That was a cheap fix. It should have been done properly. That's not appropriate in the middle of a highway. Three people have hit that spot where you have the concrete dividers in the middle of the road. Three people have gone through there in the last couple of years when that light was there.

- C: *Jennifer Wilson:* I was just going to say the speed limit is 80 kilometres an hour, and I realize you just added on to the flip side of the traffic concerns on that road, but again, with the truck lineups someone is going to die on that road one day.

C: *Mike Isinger:* They have. There have been a dozen people being killed on that road. There have been no improvements, and it's our members that are getting killed going to work.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* To speak to your question about Deltaport Way, there are some upland road and rail improvements as well. There will be the upland rail improvements to the Gulf and Fisher yards. There is a new rail siding in Fisher yard, there's six new rail track at Gulf, and there will be a new turning wye along Arthur Drive.

Deltaport Way will be four-laned, and there will be intersection improvements at Arthur Drive and 41B. The road improvements will all take place within the existing B.C. Ministry of Transportation right-of-way.

C: *Vic Rivers:* I think we're talking about infrastructure improvements and I raise something that's near and dear to my heart, and that is the light standards on the existing container port. Since the DP3 project, the light spill from the port on the shoreline between Tsatsu Shores and the border has increased about 50%, and is really noticeable to us.

When I was on that committee we raised the issue of lighting to try to do something with spillage that's coming off there. Maybe look at luminaries, put shielding on it, do something about it, so that in that small sector we don't look at the source of those high intensity sodium lights. Now, the lighting consultant came back and he said, "Put the same things in you've got for DP1 and 2." So that's what they put in. As a result they have 50 percent more light coming off of the thing.

Now, these lights are supposed to cut off at 57 degrees. They don't. You want to look at English Bluff and look across, you'll see that even at 90 degrees they don't cut off. And so we get every little high pressure sodium light shining across at us, you get this dazzle from all these lights and if you look at the ferry terminal you don't see that, because they've got the proper lighting.

I gave them all kinds of pictures of the ones that they use at Vancouver Airport, because I used to work there for 35 years, to prevent the dazzle from getting into the eyes of the pilots and so on. They ignored all that and put the same fixtures in. It's the same fixtures they got at Lansdowne, down here at the shopping centre, which caused all kinds of grief to local residents around here because it spilled light into their backyard.

All I'm saying is that in that little 15 degree or 12 degree sector, do something about the light fixture that's on that standard. There's about 10 of them that go around in a big circle, and fix that one so it doesn't spill the light off. You can leave the rest of them shining up to Poirier Pass and Active Pass, nobody cares, but that one that comes across, you can read a newspaper sitting on my front porch at 11 o'clock at night because there's so much light. And you don't have that problem at the ferry terminal because they've got proper lights in there and it shines down. They got down lights instead.

And the reason they didn't do any changes was because it was cheaper to put in fewer standards and make the light go this way, rather than put in more standards and make the light go that way. If you're going to do infrastructure upgrades, look at that one little sector and say "what can we do in there to make it a little bit nicer for the community?"

Habitat Replacement

Rhona Hunter provided information Port Metro Vancouver's Habitat Banking Program (page 17 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Otto Langer:* Are you saying marsh cleanup is a credit for compensation?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* That was done for DP3.

Q: *Otto Langer:* No, because when I developed the system in 1986 that was a no-no rule. It was your responsibility to cleanup harbours. You don't get credit for it, but if you destroyed something you built new habitat, you get credit. This isn't new habitat; you're cleaning up old habitat.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Well, this is not our land.

Q: *Otto Langer:* Oh, I know, but it doesn't matter whose land it is. So their system slipped a lot, environmental protection, in the last few years.

Q: *Bob Miller:* That comment you just made, it just astounds me beyond any words that you would actually go and say, down by the Nicomekl River, that where you've cleaned up the foreshore, that that mitigates the destruction that you're doing at Roberts Bank.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I'm not saying that. I'm saying that we are banking habitat.

Q: *Bob Miller:* No, hang on. Down by the Nicomekl River, that's the area you're talking about, Boundary Bay. It's quite a ways away from your property. You can't see it, can you?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So the example that I put here was the project that was approved through DP3, and yes, this particular site, in addition to a number of other habitat development sites elsewhere in the Fraser River estuary were part of the mitigation requirement for DP3.

What I'm saying is that this is simply just a pictorial example of what potential habitat restoration through the logs removal in a foreshore marsh looks like. Now, habitat banking program is a program whereby habitat, throughout Metro Vancouver, Port Metro Vancouver, and the Fraser River estuary will be developed, mitigated, improved and banked. It's applicability to a project, whether it is Terminal 2 or any other project, will be determined by the regulatory agencies. It is not being deposited against Terminal 2. It is being deposited as a means of ensuring that you are proactively rehabilitating and developing habitat before habitat is being destroyed and will be through the regulatory agencies, and primarily DFO, that habitat within the bank could then be used to mitigate a project, whether that be Terminal 2 or another one of our leases.

C: *Bob Miller:* The helpful part of that little comment was the acknowledgement that you are destroying habitat, and I thank you for that. It's very helpful, the acknowledgement that you're destroying habitat. I've never heard that acknowledgement before.

Now, and this has to do with shore birds, and I think that's great. You don't seem to want to get close to the fisheries habitat.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* But that's actually fisheries habitat. It's done to mitigate marine impacts through DFO and its fisheries habitat mitigation.

C: *Otto Langer:* When I directed in 1986 study on the no-net loss in the Fraser estuary, the old port was identified as the biggest loss. I think it was 78 hectares of sub-tidal loss which was never

replaced. No one's going to compensate for the loss of this additional Terminal 2, no one's going to create sub-tidal habitats

What you're doing is you're trading off deeper water habitat for fish for marshes, and that's a trade of like from like off at another site. So that's supposed to be way down the list of preferences in the national habitat policy. But of course Harper is butchering that right now so it might not matter in a few years.

But yeah, I think habitat compensation has gone off a little bit in the wrong direction here, and people are trading apples for dogs.

C: *Bob Miller:* A gentleman made a comment about your disinterest in the health and safety of your employees is one thing. That's an unfortunate thing to hear, but how you are reacting to the concerns of the folks that live in the light when the solution is clearly at hand, and the fact that Port Metro Vancouver willfully disregards how they impact the life of people who have to drink the water downstream, and how it could be mitigated with a few dollars and you refuse to do it is very unfortunate. And it will come back to bite you, because the cost of your willful choice of not mitigating simple things says more than you can imagine. It says that your behavior is no different than the robber barons of the early 20th Century.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We're taking notes of the concerns on DP3, in terms of light mitigation and I would say that on Terminal 2 we've had a number of discussions regarding lighting and no decision has been made, but certainly the use of pass lightening and directional lighting have been first and foremost in a number of conversations.

Of course I can't speak to the conversations that would have taking place during DP3, but I can speak towards what we're doing on the proposed Terminal 2, and lighting has been a consideration and acknowledgement of reducing light pollution.

Q: *Bob Miller:* It would be simple to fix DP3 and the rest of the things.

Compensation for Agricultural Productivity & the 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, including identification of anticipated consultation opportunities and categories for environmental study (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Raymond Kan:* So it's not a foregone conclusion that this project is going ahead?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No

Q: *Raymond Kan:* In terms of providing input into that decision, is this the process for that? Because the way I look at it is that Port Metro Vancouver makes the decision to submit a project description.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right.

Q: *Raymond Kan:* So that in essence means that the project will go ahead and you're going to go through the EA process to look at mitigation efforts, compensation, but in essence, that project is going ahead.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Just a clarification. The Port will make that decision and decide whether they will go through with the submission in the environmental review process. That is the first decision point.

Once it's in the environmental assessment, it's not a foregone conclusion that the project will go ahead. It simply means that the project is now in a regulated process that has a number of requirements around it, that at the end of that process will be a recommendation from presumably a panel, but we won't know until we submit whether it will be a panel, which would be similar to what's being done for Site C for BC Hydro. And at the end of that process there will be a decision as to whether the project is permitted from an environmental standpoint.

All that does then is it provides an environmental permit, and even then the project still is not a foregone conclusion. Once the environmental permit is achieved, it really then becomes a business decision as to at what speed the project is then put forward.

We're currently anticipating, through our current forecast, that we will need that capacity within the timeframe of having approval and moving forward shortly after approval.

Q: *Victor Wei:* So just to clarify then, what is the expected timeline for you to make a decision to go ahead with the project? Is it going to be six years before 2024?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So our decision to go forward with the project will be when we submit the Project Description. We're anticipating sometime in the spring of next year that we would be going forward. If the board, the Port Metro Vancouver Board, decides that that's what the Port wants to do, that's when we would formally go forward with the project.

Q: *Victor Wei:* So in other words, you could actually make a commitment to build with this within a year.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* There's no commitment to build at this point. All that we would be deciding is whether to proceed with the environmental assessment.

Q: *Victor Wei:* When do you expect that the decision will be made to build this?

A: *Neil Turner:* We anticipate it would be around 2017.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We're not going to wait until the day that the decision is made in order to line our ducks up. If we feel our forecasts are appropriate to move forward with building a project. We'll probably have a good sense before that decision is actually made whether it looks like the project will be going forward, but we can't build the project till we have an environmental approval.

So regardless of when we actually say, okay, let's start moving forward with further planning, we need that environmental approval. Our current forecast, if we go back to page 4, our current forecast is that it's a sequential. We get the approval and we move forward with construction in the same year that we have the approval. That's our current forecast. By 2016 we anticipate -- 2016-2017, we anticipate being through the environmental review process, the environmental assessment, and at that point we would make a decision whether we would go ahead.

Q: *Victor Wei:* Since I'm with the city of Richmond, obviously my interest will be on the Richmond side, the north end of the tunnel. We've had the chance to review the truck traffic study that the Port has just completed, and the conclusion of that study basically have indicated that the

largest portion of truck traffic will actually continue to use the tunnel, particularly trying to access the Richmond logistics hub.

And because there's only one route for trucks getting in and out of the Richmond properties, what I would suggest strongly, that as part of the T2 project look beyond the three miles radius of the actual T2 footprint.

So what I would encourage you to do is to include the north end of the tunnel, particularly the Richmond roadways as part of this study, to make sure that the right infrastructure investments are put in place.

C: *Otto Langer:* And beyond that. You've got Prince Rupert and port plans there. It's silly you stop at the north end of the tunnel. You've got to take it over the lower mainland ecosystem. Point Roberts. Traffic all the way out the greenway. Yeah, don't stop at the north end of the tunnel. You've got to go way north and way east of the facility and three miles, you got to go 300 miles.

C: *Bob Miller:* That's a good point.

Q: *Jennifer Wilson:* Okay, so I see on page 18, "recognizing the importance of reducing the container truck traffic in the local communities," which is what they were talking about, and "exploring the truck congestion reduction measures". So diversifying truck trip schedules. You guys have an opportunity to do that right now. Like, instead of improving on future structures and future projects, why not perfecting your existing structures, because you guys -- that number one point right there, you guys can expand them out on a longer period of time and you guys aren't implementing that.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* There are a number of initiatives through the Port's truck strategy and these are identified there, in terms of what we're doing. It's a very complex system. It involves not only the Port, it involves core operators, it involves the truckers, and so we are rolling out these initiatives and we are becoming more and more ingrained and working towards improving the trip scheduling, the reservation system. We've got GPS now in many of the trucks. We're looking at tracking them, ensuring that we know what routes they're using, so that we can start so that we can start to try and control those, where and when they're supposed to be using them.

So it's not a switch we can turn and we can make everything sufficient overnight.

Q: *Jennifer Wilson:* So these trips can be spread out right now, but they're not being spread out. Whereas last year they were spread out from seven a.m. till midnight. Now it's 7 a.m. to 4:30, sometimes 5:30, and everybody's congested everywhere, in the whole city, trying to get those trucks in till the end of the work day. Whereas they could be spread out throughout the day or looked at different schedules so that people who drive to work aren't stuck behind a big long line of trucks.

That minimizing empty truck trips, we see every single day one load in and an empty chassis out. So the environmental impact on that just seems pointless for a truck to come and pick up a cab without bringing one out. Those are things that could be looked at immediately.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* These are currently underway. Yes, these aren't future initiatives; these are actually current truck strategy initiatives that the Port is working on.

Q: *Bob Miller:* How many truckloads per day do you think you have now?

- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don't have the exact number, but I'd say probably around 3,000 trucks. We do have a tracking study that is on our website, that Vic was referring to, that speaks to the current situation.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* What were projections that were on it?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We're looking at approximately 3,700 total trucks that's 1,800 in and 1,800 out of Terminal 2 at full capacity.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Ah, 3,600. I thought I read somewhere where you were about that now. Am I wrong? What have you got now?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right, and I said I don't have those numbers in front of me. I believe they're between 2,000 and 3,000 trips.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* So you'd go up to about 7,000.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes. That would be three and a half thousand in, three and a half thousand out.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Fair enough. So do you think you know or have you determined in your study the tonnes per day of effluent, of carbon and stuff that those trucks are currently putting into the atmosphere? I mean, do you have a concern about that, firstly, and secondly, can you tell me what it is?
- A: *Neil Turner:* I don't know that it actually got down to the calculation of GHGs, but I want to address your first question about your concern the port has for GHGs. I would suggest the Port is very concerned about GHG emissions and whether it's from ship, truck, rail, the whole port operation have programs in place to reduce the GHGs.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Oh, like electrifying the ships so that they don't run their generators in port?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah, that's one of them, but we actually have ones that deal with the fact that ships aren't all electrified. We have the Eco-Action Program, and it is looking at reducing ship emissions. It's an incentive program with our shipping operators for clean fuel burning. We also have a Truck Licensing System. And the truck licensing system will require that by 2015 all trucks are achieving a 2007 emission standard or better.
- C: *Chris Chok:* The consultation period runs until the end of November, and so what I would invite you to do is to go through, read it. If you have further questions -- we have a couple of documents that we need to send you. The annual report and the truck report.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* There is a company in Vancouver called Westport Innovations. They have a program to convert diesel trucks to natural gas. Kind of leading in the world, that type of thing. Is that somewhere on your radar? A rule that all trucks coming to the port would have to be running on natural gas?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* So we don't have them having to run natural gas, but we do have a current program that by 2015 will have them at 2007 emission standards.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Your goal is to have them be one generation behind?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* At least 2007 platform as a first step.

- Q: *Bob Miller:* That to me is awful close to dragging the anchor behind what we're trying to do. I got to tell you, everything I hear you say is "Do the least we can to skim through. If we screw up the environment and we get away with it, it's a win." That's what I'm hearing.
- And I don't know whether these people have that sense, because one of the problems, I believe, that Enbridge is having is that they seem to have a head space that's very similar. And perhaps there are repercussions to that behavior, and maybe you folks want to think about that.
- Q: *Otto Langer:* Just on that subject matter that Bob brought up, you mentioned Long Beach. They had a clean air truck program initiated in 2012. They've reduced their emissions by 90 percent. As of now, at 2007 or newer trucks only. So they're already six, seven years ahead of what we just heard here, and it's 11,000 trucks in Long Beach.
- Q: *Raymond Kan:* In terms of port scope, particular the scope of community impact from trucks and the implications of infrastructure, there's the Pattullo Bridge and the traffic that is going through right now. There are also the discussion between the City of New Westminster and City of Surrey about the location of the bridge and also the capacity of any new bridge. So there are serious implications from a financial perspective, and also from a transportation pattern perspective.
- So I would encourage the port, whether through an EA assessment or some other process, and I read that a transportation plan is being prepared right now. So I don't know how that would link with this process and the EA process in the future. There's a transportation plan that's referenced on page 18. So I don't know what the scope of that is and whether this consultation is related to that process and where folks can chime in.
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I'm not sure whether the transportation plan has a consultation component it. I would have to get back to you on that specifically. But certainly it integrates to all the infrastructure development that the Port will be doing.
- Q: *Jennifer Wilson:* I was just wondering about reducing truck congestion, just to add on that. South Fraser Perimeter Road, that was initially supposed to be no lights on that, is that correct?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* I can't speak for the South Fraser Perimeter Road, but I understand there are some traffic lights
- Q: *Otto Langer:* The first habitat compensation harbour management agreement was signed in 1987 with North Fraser Commission and Fraser Port Authority liked it and did a similar one. Now you're all one group. Do you have a modern habitat compensation or management agreement with the environmental agencies?
- A: *Rhona Hunter:* We have a habitat banking agreement with the DFO.
- Q: *Otto Langer:* That's all? Because banking was about 20 percent of the agreement. Can we get a copy of that?
- C: *Chris Chok:* We'll mark that as a follow-up.

Categories for Environmental Study & Community Legacy Benefits

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the categories for environmental studies as part of the environmental assessment (page 20 of the Discussion Guide), as well as potential legacy benefits for the community as part of the proposed project (page 22 of the Discussion Guide).

- C: *Mike Isinger:* We'd just like to keep our jobs. An automated terminal doesn't benefit anybody. Building over-capacity doesn't benefit anybody, especially not us.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Baseline studies – it's an intriguing term. Can you help me understand what it means?
- A: *Neil Turner:* Basically it's considering the existing conditions. And also take into consideration historical records as far back as we can.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* So would you give an undertaking here to commit that your baseline studies would include the nature of the estuary of Roberts Bank prior to the ferry terminal and up to today?
- A: *Neil Turner:* Baseline studies related to the sediment issues, the erosion issues and everything you talked about?
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Yes.
- A: *Neil Turner:* So that is part of what's called coastal geomorphology. So in that we'll look at past conditions, current conditions.
- Q: *Bob Miller:* Beyond the ferry terminal. So south to, and including, Point Roberts?
- A: *Neil Turner:* So I can't commit to that. What I'm saying is we heard your comment that you need to consider the entire area to the extent you're suggesting south of the terminal.
- C: *Otto Langer:* Bob, just for your information, an oceanographic study showed that the Fraser Rim which goes right into Juan de Fuca, around Vancouver Island, even though the current is going the opposite direction, so that's all the more reason why you can't look at this little area. You've got to look at a giant area or else you're not going doing justice to anything.

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 8:22pm.