

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

**Multi-Stakeholder Meeting 7  
June 22, 2011**

Notes from a Pre-Consultation multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, June 22, 2011, 6:00pm-8:00pm, at the Coast Tsawwassen Inn, Delta, BC.

**Stakeholders:** Andrea Jacobs, Tsawwassen First Nations  
Bernita Iversen, Corporation of Delta  
Cecilia Lawson, North Delta  
Denis Horgan, Westshore Terminals  
Geoffrey Barlow, Ladner  
Gord Westlake, BC Rail Company  
Leslie Abramson, Ladner  
Orv Nichol, Delta Chamber of Commerce  
Roger Elmsley, Tsawwassen  
Robert Butler, Delta Farmers' Institute  
Tracey Morrison, Tsawwassen

**Port Metro Vancouver:** Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator  
Allan Baydala, Chief Financial Officer  
Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development  
Darrell Desjardin, Director, Environmental Programs  
Cindy McCarthy, Port Metro Vancouver  
Chris Chok, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

*The record notes that the meeting commenced at 6:00 pm*

---

**KEY THEMES:**

- Participants were interested in whether container expansion could occur in Prince Rupert, stating that the Port of Prince Rupert was further into their project planning for the Fairview Terminal Phase 2, than Port Metro Vancouver is for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants were interested in the impact that future improvements to the Panama Canal would have on North American container trade.
- Participants noted that Port Metro Vancouver has to provide a strong rationale of the need for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants were interested in the timing of the consultation rounds for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants asked for more information about what a panel-level environmental assessment review would look like for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal Project. It was suggested that representatives from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and the BC Environmental Assessment Office attend a meeting of the Port

Community Liaison Committee to present information about their processes and answer questions from the committee.

---

**1. Judy Kirk, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review**

*Roundtable introductions were undertaken.*

C: *Judy Kirk: I'm going to say a few things up front and then Cliff will go through the discussion guide, which I hope everyone has a copy of. The first thing that I want to make sure you know is that this is the seventh meeting in Pre-consultation regarding the Proposed Terminal 2 Project. This consultation is very early in the process of consulting on the Container Capacity Improvement Program, in particular the Proposed T2. You might ask yourself why we do Pre-consultation when a lot of organizations don't. In this case the Port took our recommendation, and that's Kirk & Co., which is an independent firm helping with this consultation. It's because they were advised that it's part of best practice to do so and to ask those people who would be a part of and potentially impacted by the project to help design the consultation and the topics that would be included in the consultation. That's what this phase is about. Cliff, a little later, will be talking about the other phases of consultation over multiple years. But this is very early, to help us design the consultation. While our part of the agenda is an hour, we have been meeting here in Delta with groups this size and larger, also in Langley, Surrey, Richmond and Vancouver. The meetings have been a really good and vibrant discussion. We're hoping that notwithstanding the semi-formal format that everybody jumps in. If you have questions or comments as we move along let us know. Chris Chok will be keeping notes and the notes from this meeting will go together with those collected from the stakeholder meetings. We will do a consultation summary report. The port is committed to considering that input and being very transparent about that in publishing a consideration memo. That just gives you a sense of the process.*

*I will make sure that we move along and then have the meeting back so you can get along with the rest of your agenda of course. We really appreciate this committee taking the time to do this. We hope that as this proposed project moves through the various stages of consultation we can come back through a defined consultation period and have this kind of discussion that you want to have on these topics.*

*So in the notes, we will be attributing your comments I assume because you're part of this that's a common thing. If though, as I have told everyone else in the process, you would like to not have your comments attributed, in other words not noted as who is saying what just let me know and we'll arrange for no attribution.*

## 2. Presentation of Pre-Consultation Discussion Guide and Feedback Form – Cliff Stewart

C: *Cliff Stewart:* I'll apologize in advance, I'm on what I hope is in the last stages of a massive cold that's got me coughing a lot, so please bear with me. For those of you that have been in other sessions and I see a number of familiar faces because we are doing this within an hour versus two I will go through this guide a little quicker than I have. I think a lot of you are familiar with a lot of the background of the Port Metro Vancouver and what it is we do. I'm not going to read this guide to you, but I do want to start on page 4, talking about the importance of responsible growth and how we're working together to try and do that. I think this committee is a great example of that commitment. We have a shared commitment to sustainable solutions, we're striving to further develop solid relationships at the local government and community level to help identify common values, determine sustainable legacy, and mitigate potential community impacts.

### **Why do we need to plan for growth in containerized trade?**

This is a very simple graph. It looks at the forecast growth in containerized trade through the West Coast of Canada, so it's both Port Metro Vancouver and Port of Prince Rupert over the next twenty years. The green line represents the current installed capacity. We could have a lengthy debate about whether that line should be slightly tilted because, of course, there are opportunities to enhance capacity in existing facilities. Part of what we're going to take about today is part of the Container Capacity Improvement Program is in fact a project that looks at exactly that. As the capacity exists today, that's what the green line represents. The growth on average is about 5% over the next twenty years. That is the forecast that has been put together for us by Seaport Consultants that was completed in May of this year. Interestingly enough, just before I came to this meeting I was on the phone with another stakeholder group who do the same sort of thing, and their numbers projects very similar growths. So from my perspective in terms of getting the same information, from my perspective yes we are.

So expecting growth of about 5% a year through 2030 means that probably about 4 million TEUs of additional capacity will be required on the West Coast by 2013 and current installed capacity is about 4.3-4.4 million TEUs. So it's almost a doubling over the next twenty years.

### **What is the Container Capacity Improvement Program?**

It is a multi-phase approach to looking at how we provide capacity to handle the growth that we are projecting is going to occur over the next 20 years. It includes looking at potential efficiency capacity improvements in existing facilities. That includes road and rail projects to unlock additional marine terminal capacity. It involves looking at marine terminals themselves to see if there are additional investments and additional opportunities to produce capacity there. We think that will take us through to about 2020. But by 2020,

we expect that there will be a requirement for an entirely new container facility on the West Coast. In Vancouver that opportunity is called Terminal 2. It's a multi-berth marine container terminal with a capacity of more than 2 million TEUs.

TEU is a twenty-foot equivalent unit, it's an industry standard, so when you see a twenty-foot container that's 1 TEU and if you see a forty-foot container that's 2 TEUs. It's interesting, because when you talk to people who actually operate the terminals they don't talk about TEUs because they get paid by lifts. So if it's a 40 or a 20, they're not concerned because a container's a container.

Sometimes people can use one number without being clear that it's a lift and another person can use a different number without being clear that it's a TEU. The ratio is about 1.75, in other words each container on average is about 1.75 TEUs. That's sort of the multiplier here.

The scope, scale and location of the proposed Terminal 2 at Roberts Bank has not been fully defined. We are working on that now, working towards getting ready for the next phase in this consultation process which is called Project Definition. It's really important to understand that this project is subject to a thorough environmental assessment review. As people have asked us in other of these sessions that we have been in, isn't this just a *fait accompli* and you're just going through the motions. Absolutely not, the decision as to whether or not this Terminal 2 will be built will be up to a number of parties and there are a number of stages that we have to pass in order to justify the need for the terminal. To make sure there is in fact a business case to pay for it and most importantly that it meets the test of environmental sustainability and social sustainability and of course the equally important economic test. If we're right that we need this by 2020.

Q: *Bernita Iversen*: I'm just wondering about Prince Rupert and the capacity to expand up there.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Prince Rupert's a question that comes up a lot. There are a number of issues around how the trade action works. For the average person seeing a container go by it's just another container. The flow of containers and what I call Containers 101 is really important to understand in understanding why or why not Prince Rupert is a viable alternative. If the Prince Rupert terminal does get expanded as they have said that it will and if the business moves to Prince Rupert that would give us some breathing room in terms of delivering the terminal by 2020. But if it doesn't, we are on a critical path already for deliver in 2020 so we have to get started with the process. The process of design, the process of consultation, the process of environmental assessment but we have lots of lots of gates where we can pause the process as we go along. What we don't have is the luxury to wait and see whether or not Rupert truly is a viable option. It's only a viable option if someone builds it, and the customers come to it. If that happens, then that certainly would delay the

need for Terminal 2. But it's not ultimately going to change the requirement in the long term. It might just delay it.

- C: *Judy Kirk:* In answering that question before you have also explained the difference between what happens in Prince Rupert and what happens here.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* Prince Rupert was originally built and marketed as a US Gateway terminal. So the idea was it was a day shorter sailing from Asia, and with the dedicated CN line it was some number of hours shorter rail time to Chicago. In fact there's very little difference in the rail time from Prince Rupert to Vancouver. The uptake has not been primarily American cargo. The numbers I have seen recently are about 40% US and 60% Canadian. That's a significantly higher amount of US cargo than what you'll see in Vancouver where it's been about 5%. In terms of the vision of what Prince Rupert was to be, the market hasn't embraced. It's been open for almost four years now, and there's still only one shipping line calling and there are certainly a whole host of reasons why and we will include if people want the whole fundamental of Containers 101. The flow of containers, both in bound and out bound where the import cargo goes, where the export cargo comes from and how it interacts with what we call domestic, you'll see the big 53' domestic rail containers, how that all interacts has a big impact on whether Prince Rupert really is a viable port for the majority of cargo. We don't think that it is, but certainly, if we're wrong about that then we have the ability to slow the process down.
- C: *Roger Emsley:* I would like to continue on the same area, and also talk about this gap analysis. My understanding is that Prince Rupert is in its environmental assessment for expansion to 2 million TEUs and has the ability to go to 5 million TEUs. When I look at the flat lined Port capacity I have some problems with that, because it's even short of what is available today, but it certainly doesn't appear to take into account even the first step that Rupert is taking to 2 million TEUs and their ability to go beyond that. And we need to frame that discussion, not necessarily here, but I would like to have that discussion framed around the 2008 Federal government report on the Gateway that was done for at the time Minister of Transportation Emerson. It's called the Strategic Advisor's Report. They did an extensive analysis of the whole Gateway. In that report, one of their recommendations is that there be no further port infrastructure development in Vancouver until Prince Rupert's capacities and capabilities be maximized. And I would like, certainly not now, but certainly in this early process to understand why Port Metro Vancouver is not following that recommendation.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Thanks, Roger. And what I was a bit remiss in doing is reinforcing that it's exactly that kind of comment, what people would like to be included as a consultation topic and how they would like to be consulted is exactly why we're here.
- C: *Orv Nickel:* I can probably answer a bit of that question. I work with the ports in that industry and 6% of the material that comes from the ports stays in the Lower Mainland district. If you import that material into Prince Rupert I would have to truck that material from Prince Rupert to Vancouver for the same

consumers who are consuming it when it comes out of Deltaport and then it ends up at the Home Depot or the local Walmart station within a short period of time. So the cost of importing material for British Columbia for consumption through the Port of Prince Rupert is extremely costly to the consumer. So it doesn't make sense. The amount of truck traffic to put on the roads from Prince Rupert to Vancouver to bring that material down from Prince Rupert is absolutely prohibitive. I don't think that the roads are in that good shape to take that kind of traffic. Just a comment in terms of why Vancouver and why not Prince Rupert in terms of the cost to the consumer.

- Q: *Geoffrey Barlow:* I have a question about the enhancements done at the Panama Canal. Also, Rupert has branded themselves as a US Gateway, however with the enhancements of the Panama to accommodate the next generation vessels what's going to be that impact to the whole North American trade?
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* It's interesting, there has been work done by American economists that looks the line of equal price around the United States based on coming in through the West Coast and going by rail versus going through Panama. Of course the Panama option exists today that doesn't change. What changes is the amount of capacity and the economics of that capacity when the new canal opens in 2014. Toronto and Montreal, which is the destination of 85%-90% of the import rail cargo today it's already within the price point where Panama makes economic sense, but that's not where the customers are choosing to go. The newer capacity and the newer price of the Panama Canal don't affect that. It's already as cheap to go through Panama to Toronto and Montreal as it does Vancouver. And yet the cargo chooses to go through Vancouver, for a whole list of reasons. I would just like to go back to Roger's comment, and I think it's important, remembering that tonight is about Pre-Consultation. Yes, that question will be extensively canvassed, the whole question about Prince Rupert as part of the consultation process because that is an important question.
- C: *Roger Emsley:* There are a number of recommendations in that report I only highlighted one. There are a large number of recommendations for the Port.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* The report was for the federal government with recommendations to the federal government and certainly the formation of Port Metro Vancouver was one of those recommendations. The formation of a west coast port authority was another one, which the federal government for good and valid reasons I'm sure chose not to follow. We can talk about that at some length, Allan probably has a better perspective on that than I do. Ultimately as I said if Prince Rupert goes ahead you're absolutely right it is in its environmental approval stage. If it does get approved and if it does get built, if the customers do go there it will delay the requirement for Terminal 2. But if it doesn't for any number of reasons we don't have the luxury of waiting for three or four years to wait and see whether it does materialize. If that happens we then won't have time to go through this entire process of ten years. The actual construction of Terminal 2 is probably three or four years. The front end permitting phase is about six years.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: If I could, having facilitated all of the meetings so far with the exception of one, the question that has been raised here so far about demand, about meeting that demand and how to meet that demand given either Prince Rupert or Panama or even changes in demand forecasting or real demand, has been something that has come up in virtually every meeting. So as a consultation topic, it is one that will be seriously considered. When we draft the consultation summary report, I haven't looked at all the data yet, and I'm not going to presuppose but just so the group as a committee here you know this topic has come up virtually everywhere.
- C: *Roger Emsley*: I don't want to take any more time, but I have real issues with volumes that are shown here based on all that I have seen. Indeed one of the studies which was recently supplied to me by Port Metro Vancouver, all the way through, it seems to use the high end, whereas they came up with a base case, a low and a high. Bottom line, I don't believe these figures.
- A: *Judy Kirk*: So what Roger has brought up I think, and for me something to remind you of and that is one of the reasons we do this kind of a meeting is so that people can hear one another as well as provide a comment or question, but also have access to Port people who have the expertise to provide answers. But we also have a feedback form at the end of this discussion guide. That's intended to get your individual feedback. Roger, to your point, I appreciate you saying that you don't want to take up a whole bunch of time. If there are things that you would like to elaborate on, on this same point or another point please do put it in the feedback form. And that of course stands for everyone so that we can have a fulsome notion of what people want to be consulted about.
- C: *Bernita Iversen*: I just want to reiterate, it is a very fundamental question that a lot of people are asking, and until people are convinced that we really need it, it's not going to go through very easily.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: It seems to me a very fair question. It's one in my experience of twenty years of consultation in this region and around this province that the whole issue of justification and need is something that regulators look at as well. So it's got to be looked at very carefully.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: It is a really important point to make, this isn't going to be government money, so if the people who are going to spend \$1-2 billion don't believe that it's required then it simply won't be built. It's no more or less complicated than that. You are part of a large group of people, including anybody who would be investing in this and the regulatory process for who those answers have to be forthcoming. I think the other point is this project wouldn't be shovels in the ground until 2017, so as we'll have this discussion but as we go through this process, we will have not a seven year forecast but we'll have seven years of actual data. Then we'll know whether Panama has made a difference, or whether Prince Rupert has happened. That certainly will be an important part of the process over the next six years.
- C: *Allan Baydala*: I think that's an important point. There is no ability for government to fund container expansion. They haven't done that in the past and they would have to change the *Canada Marine Act* for them to in fact do

that, so it's against the law. That means that it's private money that would have to come in. I'm assuming, I'm a business man and a finance person, that the people who are actually going to lay out \$2 billion plus are going to make sure that they are very sure about just that question that Roger posed. Doesn't matter what we think, but those who are going to put out that kind of money forward are going to make sure of that answer. This isn't going to be government money where governments can do things for other reasons than possibly based on the numbers.

## Page 8

- C: *Cliff Stewart*: I would like to turn to page 8. This guide was developed for people who were coming to these meetings who were already involved. The question of how I can get involved is somewhat rhetorical. It's important to understand as Judy mentioned that this is a multi-round, multi-year process. The minimum legal requirement for a project like this would be probably two to maybe three rounds. The fourth and sixth there have an asterisk beside them, an environmental panel may choose to add a round or two. But we are starting with this Pre-Consultation round, which is very early in the process. We are proposing a much more complete and thorough consultation process over the next probably six to seven years. The next step we are preparing for is Project Definition Consultation. That's a really important one because that's where the broad outlines of what the project is likely to look like starts to be settled. Not the fine details but the broad issues. So the Project Definition Consultation is critically important and what we are here today to do is ask you those two questions. What topics do you wish to discuss, both in that round and potentially through other rounds through the next six years. Also, very importantly how do you wish to be consulted? It's been very interesting going through the meetings and this is the seventh in the last two weeks. I happen to have a young daughter. A five year old daughter and I certainly don't go out to public consultation meetings on my own time. The demographics of those who come out to these certain meetings is very different. That's a great example of finding the need to find other ways to consult with people who maybe don't have the time to come to meetings at night or meetings during the day. So when you're answering that question please think, not just of yourself and groups you represent, but also others in your community who may wish to be heard but don't have the luxury of using this type of forum, which is a great forum. We're looking for all types of ways to get the best and most complete input of what the communities interest are.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: The only thing I would add there is that we're looking for a range of consultation methods. The Port, certainly on our recommendation, won't be picking one or two methods. There will be a variety of methods to ensure that people can chose to participate in one or several ways. We have to be very aware of the digital age and the fact that the internet is an engagement tool that is changing rapidly as everyone knows. But also is becoming, in my experience, more effective. It was only about seven years ago that people were

faxing us feedback forms and only faxing feedback forms. Today, online feedback forms, and filling out print feedback forms is the most common. We would like you to look at that and let us know if there are other things such as webinars, online forums or other various ways that people are interested in not only engaging themselves, but having younger people and others who don't have time in their schedule is what we're looking for. If there are ways in which you just don't want to be consulted, that would be important too. That's one of the reasons why we provided room for comments.

## Page 9

C: *Cliff Stewart:* So moving on to page 9 the question: How will input be used? There are two critical steps that follow each consultation round. The first is the development of the consultation summary report which identifies the key themes and key issues from people. That's prepared independently by Kirk & Co., that's fed into the project team. And our commitment is to a consideration memo process, and what that means is we will explain how we have incorporated the feedback. And if we have not incorporated that feedback, we will explain why we haven't incorporated it. That will be a process we follow for each phase of the consultation process, including this Pre-Consultation round.

For example, if someone was to suggest that we should have face to face meetings in Cancun in the winter we will probably explain why we're not able to facilitate that. But I can't see much else at this stage of Pre-consultation that we wouldn't be able to incorporate. Other than perhaps if we are being asked to consult on the federal EA process which is something beyond our mandate. At each stage we will be fully transparent, both on what the community is saying and how that information is being used.

The other point I would like to make is that there is a parallel First Nations process going on. In fact, meetings were held this week with several First Nations whose interests are potentially affected by this program.

In addition to the formal consultation process, there are ongoing community engagement and communications activities. All the usual things, whether it be feedback lines, the website or other initiatives and we're always looking for and always looking to the opportunity for conversation and dialogue.

The other question that is asked on page 9 is: will there be an environmental assessment?

Yes, there will absolutely be an environmental assessment. The form and nature of that will ultimately be the discretion of the federal and provincial ministers of environment. The request that the Port plans to make is for a harmonized panel process. It is the most stringent panel assessment process available under the federal and provincial legislation. Ultimately the decision about that will be

made in Ottawa and Victoria. But we expect given the level of public interest in a project like this, that there will be a panel process.

**Page 10**

C: *Cliff Stewart:* We have a list of topics that people may wish to be consulted on. We aren't coming with a blank sheet; we have been through this process before with the Deltaport Third Berth project. We have some understanding of issues in the community and that's where this list has come from. But we want to make sure you don't look at this as a limiting list, but rather as a starting point for anything that you wish to be consulted about that you feel free over on page 11, to talk about your overall view of importance, or not important or extremely important to each of these elements.

On page 12, you have the opportunity for you to list anything else that we may not have thought of that you feel you should be consulted on. Similar with respect to the consultation process, we have listed some types of consultation and again, giving you the opportunity to comment on whether you feel that's appropriate or not. Also, there's room to add additional types of consultation method.

We've talked, also on page 13 there, about other ways to communicate with you. Perhaps the most important item is on page 14, item 7. That's the one, if you want to talk about something other than consultation methods or topics please feel free to use that form to give us your feedback about the program.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Any questions or comments about any of this? The feedback form that starts on page 11 and ends at essentially the back cover is detachable and we would very much like to get this back from you today. Our experience is that if we don't, we won't get the feedback form back. That said, it is online and if you feel you want to reflect a little more on this then please take the time to do so.

Finally, what I would say is that on the inside of the discussion guide your name and information is here and we'd very much appreciate you filling that out. It is optional, and it is being collected for the purposes of this consultation and that's it. I just wanted to land on that for a minute to make sure people know that.

Q: *Allan Baydala:* What is the purpose of providing the contact information?

A: *Judy Kirk:* Really the biggest purpose is that this early in the process we would be able to notify a participant. For example of when the consultation summary report was ready and even send them a link. So whoever participated would get that and notice of the subsequent stages of consultation. It's really as simple as that. We do not plan to do any other gradation by community for example of the input to be able to provide people with an invitation.

Q: *Bernita Iversen:* Are you expecting the Corporation of Delta to provide feedback in this form?

A: *Judy Kirk:* Usually from local governments we would like it in a separate form. In other words local government are elected representatives of the community and others are representing the community but are not part of government if I can put it that way. So generally, what would happen, and in this case there have been meetings with Delta for example and I think Langley although I need to double check on that, I think written correspondence with this or without this, would be better. We wouldn't generally summarize local government input in a consultation summary report, but absolutely the Port would welcome it and is looking for it.

Q: *Robert Butler:* Just a question about page 8. Do you have a timeline for the consultation?

A: *Judy Kirk:* It's going to be a two part answer. My answer is going to be with respect to the consultation expertise but then I'll hand it over to Cliff on the project. The environmental assessment process as Cliff said earlier has not been determined. We don't know the scope or length of the environmental review. We can't say more than about 6 years, which I think is what Cliff said earlier. We don't know for sure what the time frames will be but we think that relatively soon and we will let people know.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We have done a case study of fifteen to twenty panel processes in western Canada, including northern Canada over the last two decades. We have looked to see what caused the outliers, either a long period or a short period. We have come to the conclusion that a panel process for a project like this would probably take about four and a half years from the time the request was first made until the panel rendered its recommendation. There is then a further year of process, the minister has six months to respond. If the minister approves then the regulatory authorities have six months to issue the appropriate permits. So about five and a half years from the time the panel is empaneled. I mentioned earlier that we will be requesting a panel because that expedites the panel coming into being. You simply submit an application and ask for the process to wind its way through. It takes a lot longer to get to the point where someone to make a decision that requires a panel. Lots of people would prefer to stay away from the panel process, we welcome it. We think it's the appropriate process. So by requesting it we hope that expedites the process but about five and a half years.

Q: *Denis Horgan:* Who usually sits on these panels?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* It's typically experts in recognized fields. Usually it's retired academics or retired senior servants.

Q: *Unknown:* The government appoints?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* Yes, the panel is actually appointed through consultation with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and the Minister's office. They have an office that deals specifically with panels and they would look for the expertise in the nature of the project.

- A: *Cliff Stewart:* They would tend to look for a balance of someone who has environmental experience, someone who has economic or business and industry experience.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* I'm actually going to step in right now because you're answering a question that is most properly answered by the regulators. While I think the answers have been absolutely on the mark, I think that who's appointed to panels, what expertise they have, what length of time the process is and what's involved in the process is absolutely the purview of the regulators.
- C: *Darrell Desjardin:* We actually have a contact for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency; Shawn Leroy is actually the point of contact for that.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* And Allan, as the chair of this committee, it might be a great idea to invite representatives of CEA and of the BCEAO office to come and present to the committee, answer questions and provide information about their process. In my experiences that's been a very valuable information and education process.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* I think Judy's right. We're telling you what we guess but ultimately that is not up to the Port itself.
- Q: *Roger Emsley:* I received an email from someone who attended one of the meetings in Langley. I have no idea whether the comment that was made at this meeting is right or wrong but I think it's important to ask it. I readily admit that they could have gotten the wrong end of the stick. But at this Langley meeting somebody said and I think it might have been you Judy, at least that's how it was reported. That the Department of Fisheries and Oceans have come up with something and T2 may not be located at Roberts Bank.
- A: *Judy Kirk:* I can tell you first of all that wasn't me. I certainly haven't said anything about DFO or about location of the Proposed Terminal 2. I'm not an expert in the area and don't comment on those kinds of things. But you know what, any questions or comments that were made at that Langley meeting. Once the consultation summary report is complete the consultation record will include the record of these meetings. I would encourage anyone to go and take a look at those. Chris and others are very good and they are virtually verbatim. But to the content of your question, do you want to ask that question of Cliff?
- Q: *Roger Emsley:* I got this email, and knew we were meeting tonight.
- A: *Cliff Stewart:* I think I know what the question was and I think I know what the answer was. The question was asked something like this – surely you know where you're going to put the terminal. The answer to that was, there is nothing new with respect to Terminal 2 on potential locations that wasn't on the table ten years ago when this process was first discussed. There are, however, some things that are no longer on the table. For those of you who were part of that process and remember that there were four or five locations considered at the time. DFO has explicitly rejected one of those locations, which is the E1 location, which would be essentially a continuation of the Deltaport alignment up the causeway. They have said in writing that would not be permissible. They have also, although being less explicit intimated that the W3 orientation from that time, which is immediately across the causeway from the E1 location would

likely not be permissible. So I think that the question in the conversation was, we're not likely going to bring forward for discussion in the Project Definition phase locations that the DFO has said won't work.

Q: *Roger Emsley:* Where is that information available to the public?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* It's actually on the original Deltaport Third Berth website.

C: *Roger Emsley:* The responses from the original application?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* It's part of the public records. It's on the BCEAO website and it's actually on our website as well, the original project.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Any other comments or questions, either about topics or consultation methods? I really appreciate you giving us the time this evening and hope that we can have some very fruitful discussions as we move through the process.

Q: *Allan Baydala:* So Judy, what are the next steps in the immediate timeframe? How many more of these meetings do you have? When do you think you'll be putting together the consultation summary report?

A: *Judy Kirk:* This consultation ends and I'll draw your attention to where it is in the guide here, June 30<sup>th</sup>. We always like to make sure that post meetings there's at least a week. We will be finishing meetings this week, and the 30<sup>th</sup> is the deadline. We will then produce the consultation summary report within thirty days, and it will be posted online shortly after that and available to the public. Anyone who gives us their contact information and who wants to be contacted will receive notification that the consultation summary report has been completed. And as to the next phase of consultation, we don't know when that will be yet. We need to make sure that the Port's consultation work is completed and then be prepared to come out for consultation.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* One of the things that will drive that is if all of the things that we have been working on cover all of the things that people ask for, then great. But if there are things that people ask for in this process that we aren't studying then obviously that will have an impact on how quickly we'll be able to finish that next round of development and be back. But I think Judy that in terms of the next phase of consultation either this fall or sometime early next year would be likely. But that's not a commitment, that's just what we expect.

C: *Allan Baydala:* We have on our agenda today to talk about our meetings for the rest of the year. We're looking at the middle of September. By then, we will have had for some time, the consultation summary report. So that it is something that would be available for our next meeting. So that gives us context for where we would be in the process.

Thank you very much.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Thank you very much for your time.

*The meeting ended at 7:01pm.*