Notes from a Pre-Consultation multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, June 8, 2011, 2:00pm-4:00pm, at the Coast Tsawwassen Inn, Delta, BC.

**Stakeholders:**
- Ruth Adams, Tsawwassen First Nations
- Leslie Abramson
- Robert Butler, Delta Farmers Institute
- Brad Cooper, Ladner Business Association
- Rick Davies
- Roger Emsley, Against Port Expansion
- Julie Hobart
- Susan Jones, Boundary Bay Conservation Committee & Against Port Expansion
- Christine Lyon, South Delta Leader
- Dave Melnychuk, Agricultural Liaison - SFPR
- Bob Miller
- Joyce Miller
- Anne Murray
- Jim Northey, Tsatsu Homeowners
- Vic Rivers
- Jim Ronback, Delta Naturalists
- John Savage, Delta Farmers Institute
- Carol Vignale, Environmental Advisory Committee Delta & Safe Route Tsawwassen
- Don Watson

**Port Metro Vancouver:**
- Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
- Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development
- Sarah McPherson, Senior Advisor, Communications and First Nations
- Michelle Lachmann, Environmental Lead, Container Capacity Improvement Program
- Chris Chok, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

*The record notes that the meeting commenced at 2:00 pm*
KEY THEMES:

- Participants requested additional information regarding Port Metro Vancouver’s container traffic forecast.
- Participants were interested in how goods in containers would be transported through Delta, Ladner and Tsawwassen by truck and train, and the impacts that these movements would have on the community.
- Participants noted that they would like to be consulted about the potential impacts of the project on agriculture and agricultural land.
- Participants were interested in discussing enhancements to local habitat and other potential benefits to the community as a result of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants requested that Port Metro Vancouver provide more information about the economic impacts of the project, particularly in relation to benefits to small businesses and local jobs.

1. Judy Kirk, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review

Roundtable introductions were undertaken.

C: Judy Kirk: Thank you all for coming today. Let me tell you a little bit about the consultation process.

This is part of a pre-consultation process which is consulting you and others in seven face to face meetings about how you want to be consulted and what you want to be consulted about what. It is very early and consistent with consultation best practice to ask you and members of other communities such as Langley, Surrey and others, about how and what you want to be consulted on regarding the proposed Terminal 2 Project. We will be using this discussion guide in front of you which is available online. There is a feedback form attached to this which we would appreciate getting from you. Our experience is if we get them from you today, it’s better than having you send them to us later. Right now there could be a postal strike, but also because people tend not to fill it out. I would certainly ask for you to fill it out today. If you don’t, it is online and more and more people are filling them out online. The feedback we receive from you and others who attend the seven stakeholder meetings we are holding will be summarized in a Consultation Summary Report. Kirk & Co., which is an independent firm specializing in public consultation, will write that report for the consideration of Port Metro Vancouver. That will be written within a month of the end of the consultation. The deadline for this consultation will be June 30th. That just gives you a very quick run-down of the consultation at this stage. The reason we have asked you to fill out the tent cards, is that we will be attributing your comments. If you do not want your comments attributed please let me know after the meeting. We will be taping so that we can have a fact check and the ability to correct the notes.
Any questions before we get into the content? Please do feel free to ask questions or provide comments at any time. That’s why we hold smaller sized meetings.

Just before we get started, I would like to do a round table introduction, starting with you, Cliff...

C: **Cliff Stewart:** My name is Cliff Stewart, I am the Director of Infrastructure Development for Port Metro Vancouver and the program director for the Container Capacity Improvement Program, of which Roberts Bank Terminal 2 is a key element.

C: **Michelle Lachmann:** My name is Michelle Lachmann. I am working with the Port Container Capacity Improvement Program and I am working on the environmental component of the program.

C: **Sarah McPherson:** My name is Sarah McPherson from Port Metro Vancouver, and I’m part of the Communications and Consultation team.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Why don’t we quickly go around the room, we only have 2 hours, so I hope you’ll give me permission to move us along.

C: **Rick Davies:** I am Rick Davies, live at Tsatsu Shores; I’m very concerned about the environment.

C: **Judy Hobart:** Judy Hobart, Tsatsu Shores, same thing, environmental issues.

C: **Vic Rivers:** Vic Rivers, Tsawwassen Beach.

C: **Don Watson:** Don Watson, Tsatsu Shores.

C: **Roger Emsley:** Roger Emsley, I live on [Beach Grove road], lived in the community for 40 something years. I’m the Executive Director of Against Port Expansion (APE) which is a community organization.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I think you’re on an advisory committee to. Am I right?

C: **Roger Emsley:** On the new advisory committee? Yes.

C: **Leslie Abramson:** And the old.

C: **Judy Kirk:** And the old, exactly.

C: **Roger Emsley:** I was on the old advisory committee.

C: **Jim Ronback:** Jim Ronback. I live in Beach Cove, also member of the Delta Naturalists and member of the Boundary Bay Conservation Committee.

C: **Brad Cooper:** I’m Brad Cooper. I am with the Ladner Business Association and chairing the Ladner Business association.

C: **Leslie Abramson:** I’m Leslie Abramson. I’ve lived here for 40 plus years, I’ve been a merchant in this community for 40 plus years. I live in Ladner; I was on the old and the new advisory committee.

C: **John Savage:** John Savage, President of the Delta Farmers Institute, fourth generation farmer in Delta. I’m concerned about how this impacts agriculture and sustainability.

C: **Robert Butler:** Robert Butler, I work for the Delta Farmers Institute in administration.

C: **Joyce Miller:** Joyce Miller, Tsawwassen Beach.

C: **Bob Miller:** Bob Miller, Tsawwassen Beach.
C: **Susan Jones:** Susan Jones, Boundary Bay Conservation Committee and Against Port Expansion.

C: **Judy Kirk:** If you don’t mind my mentioning, she’s hard of hearing so I’ll ask everyone to speak up.

C: **Carol Vignale:** I’m Carol Vignale. I am on the advisory committee for Delta and I’m the coordinator of something called Safe Route Tsawwassen about green transportation and respect for the land and respect for the Tsawwassen first nations, the keepers of this land. Thank you.

C: **Ruth Adams:** I am a Tsawwassen First Nations Elder, and I also sit on the Delta heritage commission. So we’re the heritage of everyone here. That’s why I’m here to see what everyone is up to.

C: **Anne Murray:** I’m Anne Murray I’m a writer and a naturalist. I’m with a number of different naturalist organizations in the province. I was thinking it was going to be an open house, so I’m not going to stay the whole time.

C: **Judy Kirk:** No problem, and there certainly will be open houses as we proceed through consultation on this project. Before Cliff begins, in terms of going through the discussion guide I should say that this it he first of seven rounds, potentially, in this proposed project over multiple years, so there will be many opportunities for consultation including many opportunities for open houses.

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

C: **Cliff Stewart:** I’m going to start with this document. We are going to use this discussion guide to lead us through a conversation about the CCIP and Terminal 2, and what it is we are doing here today.

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

It is our long-term strategy to reliably support growing international trade in an efficient and sustainable manner.

**What is the Robert Bank Terminal 2 project?**

It is a multi-berth marine container terminal that could provide additional capacity to service projected import and export demand in the Pacific Gateway.

Why are we here today? We want to hear from you. We are taking a staged approach to reviewing the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. As Judy mentioned, this is the first of seven meetings in this round, and this is the first round of seven rounds of consultation about this project and about the program.

What exactly is Pre-Consultation? As it says, pre-consultation is ahead of the consultation program. It is the first step in a best practice of consultation. The purpose of it is to ask two questions – how do you want to be consulted? Whether it’s this type of meeting, whether it’s an online meeting, whether it’s webinars. And then on what issues you want to be consulted? We’re here today, fundamentally to talk about those two questions. How you want to be
consulted and about what topics as we move into later rounds of the consultation process.

I probably don’t need to ask this question in here, but the question is what is Port Metro Vancouver?

**What is Port Metro Vancouver?**
Port Metro Vancouver was formed by the merging of three legacy ports in the beginning of 2008. Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is the legal name and it is the port authority for the entire Lower Mainland in Canada’s Pacific Gateway. It is the largest port in Canada and the most diversified port in North America. Importantly, it is the largest export port on the West Coast of North America. Our mandate as Port Metro Vancouver is to support the growth of Canadian trade.

**Why is trade important?**
The economic benefits of trade are felt not just in the Pacific Gateway way itself, but across the entire country - creating jobs, increasing tax revenue for municipalities and producing economic benefits for Canadians.

**How do we work together towards responsible growth?**
With a shared commitment to sustainable solutions, we are striving to develop solid relationships at the local government level to help identify common values, determine sustainable legacies and mitigate potential community impacts. We are committed to sustainable development.

The question I hear most often is; why do we need to plan for growth of containerized trade?

C:  
*Judy Kirk:* Cliff is on page 6 and 7 now.

C:  
*Cliff Stewart:*

**Why do we need to plan for the growth of containerized trade?**
The graph at the bottom of the page shows the expected growth and container demand on the West Coast of Canada over the next 20 years. The left hand end is the actual container trade on the west coast of Canada last year. The green line is the existing installed capacity in Greater Vancouver and Prince Rupert. The slope of the line is fundamentally the growth we expect to see based on a fairly extensive investigation of the basis of trade including GDP growth and changes in both production and consumption habits. Container traffic predicts that the existing container capacity will soon be constrained. We expect that we would need additional container capacity as early as 2015 in the gateway, and we expect that the trade through the west coast will double over the next 10 - 15 years and could triple by 2030.
We project that over 4 million TEUs of additional container capacity will be needed to meet future West Coast container demand by 2030. That’s Canadian West Coast.

What is the Container Capacity Improvement Program?
Fundamentally, the program is delivering the projects and the required infrastructure to meet that anticipated growth in the container sector. As an integral part of the program, we are assessing potential efficiency gains throughout Lower Mainland container facilities. This follows significant improvements at both Centerm and Vanterm in the inner harbour in 2005 and the completion of the Deltaport Third Berth Project in 2010. We are now evaluating additional terminal improvements as well as road and rail improvements at Roberts Bank. These are the most immediate and cost effective capacity increases that can achieve improvement and container capacity.

Roberts Bank is very well positioned to accommodate trade growth. It has well established international shipping routes and has excellent access to important Lower Mainland markets and major North American road and rail transportation corridors.

In addition to capacity improvements at the existing Deltaport terminal, we are also exploring an additional multi-berth container terminal at Roberts Bank that is Terminal 2.

Terminal 2 is expected to be a multi-berth terminal with additional capacity of more than 2 million TEUs and it is designed to meet forecast demand until the late 2020s. Although the scope, scale and location of the terminal have not been fully defined a preliminary vision includes multiple berths equipped with ship-shore cranes capable of handling, not only the latest generation of container ships, but those which we foresee as being likely the future.

Subject to environmental approvals, this project could be built adjacent to the Deltaport and Westshore terminals in phases, brought on based on market conditions.

The mid-term capacity requirements by 2020 can be met with development of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. There may also be an opportunity to reconfigure inner harbour terminals later in the 2020s to meet forecast demands beyond 2028. The progression of capacity developments, starting with the road and rail and efficiency improvements at Deltaport through T2 and into inner harbour corresponds with the lowest cost per TEU development option at each stage. Also, it reflects the realities at each stage of existing facilities with existing tenants and leases.
The question that you are probably asking how you can get involved. Firstly, the fact that you are all here speaks volumes to how you want to be involved and you’ve figured out how to be involved. Port Metro Vancouver is undertaking a comprehensive, multi-round community, stakeholder and public consultation process, which is occurring in several phases starting June 2011, regarding the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. It is anticipated that this consultation process will include seven rounds of substantive community, stakeholder and public consultation over several years, including Pre-Consultation, Project Definition, Pre-Design, Environmental Assessment public comment periods, Preliminary Design and Detailed Design Consultation.

Pre-Consultation, as I said earlier, is an opportunity to get your feedback regarding the design of the proposed consultation program. As we move through the different phases we ask how do you want to be consulted and what do you want to be consulted on?

**How will that input be used?**
At each stage, the feedback will help to shape the scope and content of subsequent consultation rounds.

It will help shape the specific information we are seeking at each stage, whether it is Project Definition, Pre-Design through the panel process and then finally to Detailed Design. There will be Consultation Summary Reports produced by Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., on behalf of the Port Metro Vancouver, following each consultation round, summarizing input received from participants. The Consultation Summary Reports will be considered, and in the process of the consideration of that in the terminal development, a consideration memo will be produced following each round which documents how that input was considered in refining.

In addition, there is a separate First Nations consultation process that runs parallel to the community, public and stakeholder consultations.

There will also be other community engagement and communications activities as mentioned here, building on the success of the Deltaport Third Berth Community Liaison Committee. A new Deltaport Community Liaison committee has just been formed and we expect that group to be an important stakeholder in this process.

**Will there be an Environment Assessment?**
The proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 will be subject to a thorough and independent environmental assessment. The scope and nature of that assessment has yet to be determined by the federal and provincial regulators, it is anticipated that it would be some form of panel review, which is the most rigorous type of environmental assessment. There will be opportunities for communities, stakeholders and the public to provide input on the scope and
nature of studies to be completed as part of the environmental assessment, as well as to review and comment on the results of those studies.

Environmental permits and approvals are required prior to construction of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

3. **Q&A and Discussion**

C: *Judy Kirk:* Cliff before you go to the next page, are there any questions or comments so far before Cliff moves on with some of the topics that have been anticipated?

Q: *Bob Miller:* You mentioned the liaison committee. Are there members from the previous liaison committee here today?


Q: *Bob Miller:* Did those people on that committee feel that their input was considered and acted upon or was it some other outcome?

C: *Judy Kirk:* Considered or acted upon in relation to?

Q: *Bob Miller:* In a positive way, to eliminate concerns that that group had?

Q: *Judy Kirk:* For the committee or Deltaport Third Berth project?

Q: *Bob Miller:* Was it effective, or was it a whitewash? You’ve highlighted the fact that you have this committee, and I wondered whether if it was effective.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Why don’t we hear from the members who are here on that briefly.

A: *Vic Rivers:* Generally, I was not particularly impressed with the results of the committee.

A: *Roger Emsley:* Bear in mind, number one, that the committee was only formed after the approval to go ahead with the Deltaport Third Berth, so it was constrained from the get go. We had some successes in getting changes made, but, there are a number of significant issues on the table that the Port did not resolve satisfactorily.

A: *Leslie Abramson:* But to be fair, there were a lot of strides that we took to hold the Port’s feet to the fire. They did listen; they did act on a number of issues which were brought up. Don’t forget that the same as around this table, everybody is here because everyone is either against the Port or getting something for their organization. We had the same format, nobody was all for, nobody was all against, and you will have this constantly, and you will have this no matter what committee comes to do this. There were some strides made.

A: *Robert Butler:* You have to remember that it was after we started and we had people who came to the table perhaps totally opposed to it. What it did, is it brought the group together so that they get different positions. Whether they were satisfied or not, some of us were, some of us weren’t, I think we got the issues out, we discussed it, and we had communications going out to the public.

A: *Vic Rivers:* One of the main problems with the committee from my perspective is that it had no clout. It reported to nobody. If there was a disagreement between the committee and the Port was listening to, there was no third party we could go to for intervention or moderation. Who do you go to when the Port just listens and does exactly what it wants to do?
Q: **Susan Jones:** I have a question about the graph on page 6; the last sentence there is saying that we need over 4 million TEUs above what we have now to meet future West Coast container demand. I’m presuming that’s B.C. not all of North America.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** That’s just B.C.

Q: **Susan Jones:** So I’m presuming that it includes Prince Rupert, so I don’t understand this gap. Because with Prince Rupert and the plans they have, that gap is already filled up. I’m kind of curious where this need comes from?

C: **Judy Kirk:** If I understand your question correctly, it is with additional capacity provided by Prince Rupert what is this gap? Or is there a gap?

C: **Susan Jones:** There isn’t a gap.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Ok, you’re certain there is no gap. Alright.

Q: **Vic Rivers:** Does that take into consideration the Panama Canal expansion?

C: **Judy Kirk:** Let’s take the one question, and then I’ll come to that.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Certainly if Prince Rupert builds everything they have said they are going to, then Terminal 2 would not be required until much later. But it takes about 10 years to develop and deliver a terminal, and if Prince Rupert doesn’t build them, then we don’t have the luxury of waiting until they don’t build to start the process.

Q: **Susan Jones:** But they are way further ahead with their container expansion then the Vancouver area. They’ve already got their Phase 2 lined up and their Terminal 2 lined up. They just signed an agreement with the First Nations, got the infrastructure. All I’m saying is that it is way further ahead, it’s lined up and everything is there, so I don’t understand the gap.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Fair enough. Vic, your question about the Panama Canal.

Q: **Vic Rivers:** Just a question about if the Panama Canal expansion was considered in this straight line expansion?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yes it was in fact. 95% of the container cargo that goes through Port Metro Vancouver, and about 60% or more of what goes through Prince Rupert, is primarily destined to Toronto and Montreal. And the Panama Canal doesn’t have any significant impact on the economics of those containers going through the West Coast. In other words, it wouldn’t make economic sense for a shipper going to Toronto or Montreal to go through the Panama Canal by sea and then by rail the other way.

Q: **Vic Rivers:** Nothing coming through Vancouver goes into the US east?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** About 5%.

Q: **Roger Emsley:** I’m also on page 6 and I would like to get a breakdown of the extreme left hand side 2010 in this gap of container capacity. The reality is, when the Port Metro Vancouver did the justification of Deltaport Third Berth, they lowballed the capacity in the documents that were put out without a justification of the expansion. They talked about a capacity of all three berths of 1.35 million. In fact, that was later up to 1.8 million, with TSI and Port operators on record of saying that they can handle at least 2.1 million. So I would like much more detail on that end of how these figures were determined.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Is that kind of detail available?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** I can say that it would be a good piece of detailed discussion at the next round of consultation. It is an issue that has certainly caused significant concern within the community. It was a situation that when it was said in 2001 or 2002, it was absolutely true, because that was the state of the art in the world at the time. Unfortunately, as the project progressed over nine years, those numbers were never revisited and revised to reflect the changes that were taking place. The state of the art today is about 800,000 TEUs per berth in a multi-berth terminal. The state of the art ten years ago was about 400,000 to 500,000 TEUs. It is important, and in fact, you’ll see that these numbers here were from a report done in May of this year. This is very different from the numbers we had even 12 months ago, because of what’s happened in those 12 months. So yes, that changed over time, and the numbers were never revisited. I can guarantee that if you stay in this process over the next seven rounds these numbers will continue to change because that’s the nature of this business. Hopefully that starts to answer it, and we can certainly talk much more about it in the next round.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Roger, is that an information request from you? I’m assuming it is. Or are you also saying that you would like to discuss that more as a consultation topic in the next round? In other words, because we’re looking at what do you and others want to be consulted on. It’s a forecast, so it’s not something generally to be consulted on, but if it is something that you want to be part of discussion going on I encourage you to put that in your feedback form.

A: **Roger Emsley:** Yes, and I would like to get whatever detail Port Metro Vancouver has.

C: **Judy Kirk:** We’ll make a note of that as a follow up.

Q: **Leslie Abramson:** Along with that note can you make sure that the dates are on. I’ve heard them say that by the time they got to our consultation the numbers were six or seven years old. Can the date that these facts were acquired?

A: **Judy Kirk:** This is May 2011.

C: **Leslie Abramson:** I see that that’s the date of the forecast, but when did you collect them from? How old are they?

C: **Judy Kirk:** How old is the data?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** It is a forecast, so the data starting from 2010 is an actual. The forecast is developed based on information that is known that was acquired in the first quarter of 2011. The important point I wanted to make in that, is that what we tell you in today with respect to forecast for demand and forecast for capacity will almost certainly change during the process because the dynamic of the trade change and the technical innovation of the operators changes and improves over time.

C: **Judy Kirk:** And that’s the nature of forecasting.

Q: **Robert Butler:** If I read this document, you’re going we are going to have another 2 million for Roberts Banks, maybe 5 million right?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** We are saying more than 2 million, yes.
Q: **Robert Butler:** That is the target for this port. What is going to be the impact of the number of trucks, length of trains? What’s going to happen to the railway and highways, etc.? It is important to know this information as early as possible.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Right. Those are important aspects of consultation in the first round of the consultation process.

Q: **Rick Davies:** Mine was on the transportation system also. Saying here that the most economical way to move one of these TEUs is by truck, do you know the difference...

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Sorry, no...

Q: **Rick Davies:** That wasn’t correct?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No.

Q: **Rick Davies:** What was the most economical? I thought I heard you say most economical way of...

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Moving to Toronto or Montreal from Asia would be by vessel to the West Coast of Canada, then by train.

Q: **Rick Davies:** From here to Toronto or Montreal would be by train?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yes, it would be by train.

C: **Chris Chok:** But I think your question was around the most economical cost per TEU improvement.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** That is for construction of capacity.

Q: **Rick Davies:** Have they considered moving to electric train instead of diesel? They are spending $1 billion for a new highway to move stuff around, and putting in an electric system would be a lot better for the environment in our area.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I would suggest that that might be a topic that you put down for the consultation. Not just the proposed Terminal 2, but what they call the “supply chain”, how things move.

C: **Rick Davies:** Ok, thank you.

Q: **Dave Melnychuk:** I think the last two people hit on what I was going to ask. Looking at page 6 with the increased container movement through Delta, how are we going to move these containers through the community? Also what about the staging and storage of these containers? What are the implications to the agricultural land base in Delta? It’s an issue to come forth in the analysis I guess. It is kind of scary that we are at 3,000 and we are going to go to 7,000 and we have traffic congestion.

I did have more of a specific question on page 8 where these phases of consultation - is there a time table for these various phases when you expect to launch them, how long they will take? That would give us a little better idea of where we are starting today.

A: **Judy Kirk:** I will answer this question. We are here in June with Pre-Consultation, and we are anticipating that Project Definition Consultation would take place in fall 2011. But there has to be some technical work done before you come out and we need to see the results of this consultation. The Pre-Design Consultation
would be anticipated sometime in the fall of 2012. I’m saying anticipate because again, the technical program has to provide some information. Then when you walk through the Panel Guidelines, and Preliminary Design Consultation and Environmental Assessment, that I really can’t give you any sense of yet, because the Federal and Provincial regulators need to determine the scope and timing of those phases, particularly the draft panel and the public hearing process. The Preliminary Design Consultation will be determined by when those last two are. The last phase, Detailed Design Consultation will be based on when all of these others are undertaken or finished. So the thinking is that within approximately within 6 years, the 7 rounds would be done. But that’s crystal ball gazing in a lot of ways, because the provincial and federal regulators will determine that.

C: \textit{Susan Jones:} That information that Roger was asking for that we don’t seem to agree on is a big part of the \textit{Canadian Environmental Assessment Act.} The justification which they really skimmed over on the Deltaport Third Berth and there never was a proper report. So, it’s not just what we want around the table want, it’s also a legal requirement; that needs to be looked at very closely. And Mr. Stewart, could you repeat the numbers about where the containers from the one that comes into Vancouver and the ones coming into Prince Rupert.

C: \textit{Cliff Stewart:} About 95% of the containers through Port Metro Vancouver are for Canadian destinations; for local and central and Eastern Canada.

Q: \textit{Susan Jones:} Can you be more specific. How many local? Do some of them have to go through the Rockies?

A: \textit{Cliff Stewart:} The vast majority go through the Rockies.

C: \textit{Susan Jones:} Wow. And then for Prince Rupert you said about 60% goes back East?

A: \textit{Cliff Stewart:} About 60% now, and about 40% goes to the United States.

Q: \textit{Dave Melnychuk:} A very specific question. In terms of the actual authority to build in the foreshore, that requires certain approvals and permits. Has that application for that site been put into the system?

A: \textit{Cliff Stewart:} No.

A: \textit{Judy Kirk:} No, it hasn’t. This is Pre-Consultation and this is very early in the process.

Q: \textit{Dave Melnychuk:} I remember seeing maps before with reservations by crown lands in the foreshore.

A: \textit{Cliff Stewart:} That is a different question, and I am going to be very careful because I don’t know the specifics of that. I know as a general comment. On Sturgeon and Roberts Bank there are a number of reservations. The Vancouver Airport Authority has a reservation for a certain part of the bank. There are certain parts of the bank that the Port Metro Vancouver owns and or has long term interests in. And I can’t tell you specifically whether there has been any for this project. But there has not been a permit application submitted at this point.

C: \textit{Susan Jones:} I can partially answer that question because there was protection around that area at Roberts Bank and the Deltaport. When they did the Deltaport Third Berth BC Crown Lands transferred 2,800 acres of foreshore land
Brad: I will take on that other side of the question which is representing the business community. When you do Pre-Consultation of this nature, how is it, and is it possible to determine what the economic impact to the community where this...

Judy: By way of answering this question, you know, rather than moving that to Cliff. Pre-Consultation isn’t always done, and I look around this room and see that people have been involved with consultation of various sizes and shapes, dealing with lots of projects over several years. This consultation precedes that kind of study. I just want to let people know where we are, and that’s why we wanted to bring this graphic on page 8. The Environmental Assessment, which would include the socio-economic study, which includes as part of it the economic impact, which is something that the Federal and Provincial regulators will require. But it is probably a year or more away in terms of that kind of filing for a process.

Brad: Ok. Thanks, Judy.

Julie: Back to page 6 again, and the gap in container capacity, Mr. Stewart has mentioned that there is a big effect on the global effect of the economy with buying and selling and delivering. I guess this is crystal ball gazing again, but it seems to me that the global economy is changed a lot in the last year, and if this continues, then surely, we won’t be needing the same kind of products delivered in Canada that we have in the past if this economic levelling off.

Judy: Can I ask your question in another way and see if it makes sense to you? I think what you are saying is, if subsequent forecasts show demand falling, would the Port Metro Vancouver look at not doing this project?

Julie: Yes, exactly. Thank you, Judy.

Cliff: I would suggest yes. I will go back to what I said before. It takes ten years to go through this process, from the first commitment to begin the process until you can tie up a ship, load it and unload it. At any point in this process you can stop, but if you aren’t sure, and don’t start now and you need it in ten years you can’t come in later and speed up the process. The process is almost completely inelastic because it requires this sort of work, leading into a very structured environmental assessment process. Of the 10 years, probably 3 or 4 is construction. You can throw a lot of money at a construction project and speed it up a little bit. If in terms of being ready in 2020, if this is right, we don’t have a choice but to start now, but if it is wrong, then we can easily slow or stop.

Judy: Can I ask a supplemental question, because I think it’s important for people’s understanding. Is there a multi-stage process where decisions are made various ways and times?

Cliff: Absolutely.

Judy: Is there an opportunity to proceed or not proceed with the process?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yes, absolutely. Certainly, within Port Metro Vancouver, definitely, and ultimately, within a proponent who would actually be coming in to build the facility, there are a whole lot of places where the process could be put on hold or stopped because it doesn’t make sense for any number of reasons. It’s a good question, it’s important to understand it. I remember reading an article where somebody said “they don’t need it for 10 years, why are they starting now?” We’re starting now because if we need it in ten years we’re on the critical path, if we don’t need it then we can stop the process.

Q: **Jim Ronback:** This applies to determining the scope of the Environmental Assessment. At one point the initial construction of Deltaport Third Berth, and Roberts Bank Terminal 2 were coupled, then they were decoupled which precluded any cumulative effects being taken into account the effect of Third Berth. Do we have any input into determining the scope of the Environmental Assessment or it that takes into account the previous projects and their affects add up from one project to the next?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** I would like to split my answer into two pieces because you started with a statement. I hear it often. The Third Berth cumulative effects study included T2. In fact, it’s required that any cumulative effects study included all projects that are reasonably foreseeable. So Terminal 2, as it was foreseen in 2002 was included in the Third Berth cumulative effects study. That wasn’t why it was decoupled, and decoupling did not remove T2 from the cumulative effects study.

Q: **Jim Ronback:** I see no reference to T2 in the environmental assessment.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** If you look in the cumulative effects study, you’ll see what the numbers are in there for.

C: **Chris Chok:** If you would like a copy of that we can provide you with a link to read the report.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** This goes back to the numbers changing, it was Deltaport at 2 million, and T2 at 2 million. So nine years ago 2 million was a considered a high end of what a container could deliver with three Berths. So the cumulative effects for T2 will have higher numbers. But T2 was considered as part of Third Berth. What was the question after the statement?

C: **Judy Kirk:** The question was about can people influence the scope and nature of studies including cumulative effects going into a regulatory process? That’s not exactly what you said, but I think that’s the gist of it.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** And the answer to that depends upon the panel. It would be expected that you could.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I’d like Michelle to add to that, since she brings the Environmental expertise.

A: **Michelle Lachmann:** We are anticipating that this would be a panel process. As part of that, they set up a thing called panel guidelines which outline the scope to be considered in the Environmental Assessment. Those guidelines do get circulated for public consultation and will be mapped out as part of the panel process once it’s fully understood.
Q: **Jim Ronback**: And is it by definition that the panel will not have conflicts of interest?

A: **Michelle Lachmann**: Yes, it will be set up as an independent review panel.

C: **Judy Kirk**: The only thing I would point out is that you just asked a question of representatives of the Port Metro Vancouver and a consultant in environment, not the regulators themselves. There is information on the web about the Canadian Environmental Assessment Review process and the BC EAO process.

Q: **Jim Ronback**: And will it be harmonized?

Q: **Susan Jones**: The scoping document is the most important document of the whole process and that happens before the panel set up. It’s a federal process and doesn’t even go on the provincial website. You get 30 days to respond to the scoping document, and for the Deltaport Third Berth Project it came out at the end of July, and was due at the end of August when everyone was on vacation. So there was not proper input to the scoping document, and once that’s done it’s over. That is a very key question.

C: **Judy Kirk**: And I would encourage you not to limit your comments in this feedback form. Anything you would like to say about that in this feedback form because we are going to make this available to the regulators.

Q: **Susan Jones**: The message from me and Jim is that this scoping document needs to be out there to the public, what it is and what it stands for. That’s what you’re working for. That limits what happens after if it’s not in that scoping document, it’s dog meat.

C: **Chris Chok**: Jim had a question about whether the environmental assessment would be harmonized.

C: **Jim Ronback**: Will it be harmonized? Will the Federal and Provincial join their assessment to avoid having two separate reviews? Will this forthcoming one for Terminal 2 be harmonized?

A: **Judy Kirk**: They can’t answer that question because that is a question for the regulators. They will decide.

A: **Michelle Lachmann**: Susan, I agree with you, absolutely, the scoping document, from an environmental practitioner’s point of view, is a key resource. The Terminal 2 project will go through a very different EA process. It will have a much different way of engaging with the public and so it is important that we carry on with the consultation so everyone is educated on that ahead of the game so we know timing wise and expectations for when there’s feedback.

Q: **Jim Ronback**: Is it decided that there will be a panel process?

A: **Judy Kirk**: No, it has not been decided.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: If I could explain that – it is the Federal Minister of Environment who makes that decision.
Q: **Joyce Miller:** Will the scope extend beyond what the parameter of the Ferry terminal to the Ports are? Because there is a lot of stuff happening southeast of the Port that previously we were concerned about, and it wasn’t part of the consideration before. Is it going to be part of consideration now?

C: **Judy Kirk:** Would the Environmental Review look at developments east of the ferry terminal?

Q: **Bob Miller:** The impact of the current developments, and Terminal 2, east of the ferry terminal. When I talked to the environmental folks at the Port, they said no once you get to the Ferry Terminal we have no interest in anything beyond that. As we sit and go to the park, once you get to the park you’ll notice that Tsawwassen Bay is filling in. The Port of Vancouver, in all previous conversations, has denied any interest, or responsibility, in monitoring or being concerned about what happens east of the ferry terminal. Will it include anything down to, and including, Point Roberts?

C: **Judy Kirk:** I don’t think that Michelle or Cliff could answer that question, because they are not the regulators. That said, I encourage you to put that in your feedback form, as something that you are interested in being consulted on. It will be both the Port and the regulators who will decide what the scope of the consultation is.

C: **Susan Jones:** I can answer that because it’s a requirement of the **Canadian Environmental Assessment Act**, Sec. 16., that they do include these associated developments. They are supposed to include all of these associated. They pay lip service to it, but legally, it’s supposed to be in there.

Page 10 – On What Topics Do You Want to Be Consulted?

C: **Cliff Stewart:** What we are here to talk to you about today are about what topics you would want to be consulted on and how you want to be consulted. A lot of these things were brought up through the Deltaport Third Berth Project. This is a list of things we would expect to consult on, but want you to use this as a starting point, rather than the ultimate list.

**Project Design Elements** could include topics such as layout of the proposed terminal, marine traffic, land reclamation, roads, rail and other related topics.

**Culture and Heritage** could include topics such as maritime heritage and marine archaeology.

**Socio-Economic** could include topics such as road, rail and marine traffic, potential economic benefits and costs, construction and operational activities, business opportunities and effects, and creation of direct and indirect jobs.

**Wildlife and Habitats** could explore potential habitat preservation and enhancement, potential habitat compensation, and potential impacts on endangered species/species at risk.

**Water Quality and Marine Species** could focus on water and sediment characteristics and the marine species that inhabit Roberts Bank.

**Infrastructure** could examine proposed port facilities including the berth,
terminal, shore protection, road and rail access, industry and municipal services.

**Local Benefits and Opportunities** could include options for contributions to community amenities such as parks or other recreation opportunities, facilities or infrastructure.

**Local and Regional Area** could consider topics such as air quality, safety, greenhouse gases, land use, noise and light.

Q: Carol Vignale: It struck me that what we talk about is the economic benefit for our country of Canada, the province of British Columbia and Metro Vancouver. It seems to me that this benefit needs to be coupled with a local benefit. What I have heard in the past, groups that are against development, is about mitigation, reducing the impact on the habitat and the community, with increased traffic and poorer air quality. So I guess the challenge, it would seem to me, is how can a project like this, not only talk about – the purpose is to enhance this trade and economic – could we think about enhancing the local habitat? I had a tour with the environmental advisory for Delta of the Port, and saw how various marine life were being brought back or improved around the Port, and some land quality at the edges. So I wonder if we can think about enhancing our local human as well as our local natural environment with this project. Right now, I’ve lived here for 30 years, and that edge, that Salish Sea/Georgia Sea is almost invisible to the community of Tsawwassen and Delta, and they have bared with the traffic and bother, and nothing has been part of our community, including the Tsawwassen First Nation and their traditional territory there, and their community. And so I really look forward to a project like this to bring a positive energy to both the natural and human environment and would like to see that as our core aim in this kind of project.

A: Judy Kirk: I encourage you to put that in your feedback form as something that should be discussed in length. I can tell you that discussion of benefits is not usually very well done. I think you raise a very good point. It’s something I’ve recommended that the Port look at this and they have indicated a real interest.

C: Roger Emsley: I think something that needs to be on this list is how the environmental review is going to be carried out. A key question that I would like answered quite early in the piece because then we could save a lot of time and effort. If, as it did, last independent review panel, recommended against development in exactly the area that the Port is now proposing to put Terminal 2. What has changed that makes it acceptable now, that made it unacceptable then? The project was an expansion of the Port facilities, the federal environmental assessment review panel reported in 1979 and it said, at the time, the Port wanted to go ahead with a number of pods, and it said, this was what was proposed, out here – east side of where the coal terminal is now, they recommended against any development because of the significant environmental impacts. I think that has to be answered right off the bat. Nothing has changed in terms of the environment except we know more about
the importance of Roberts Bank and the whole area. Unless we answer that, there is no point in doing anything else.

C: **Judy Kirk:** That’s a well-articulated question, and putting that in the feedback form as well as noting it in the notes, is very important. I say that without knowing what the regulators would bring to the table with that report.

Q: **Roger Emsley:** I suspect that report is difficult to find.

C: **Judy Kirk:** But you have it.

Q: **Roger Emsley:** I have it, but I’ve asked Environment Canada about that report and another one and gotten no answer.

C: **Judy Kirk:** 1979 isn’t that long ago, in terms of records.

C: **Michelle Lachmann:** We have records.

Q: **Ruth Adams:** Thank you so much for this, because I wondered when I sat down that everyone was against it, I’m in the wrong room. But I’m in the right room, and I’m in the right place to speak like this. What I want in this, and I think it should be told, because everyone here talks about the east of the Port, and I they are going right over us – Tsawwassen First Nation. What I want to be told is that under the Indian Act, we weren’t mentioned at all, and we didn’t have any say. So now that Tsawwassen First Nation is under the treaty, I think it is very important that all Canadians know it means a lot to the First Nations – being participant in all that’s going on around us. And I’m here to hear what the people of Delta are saying. I’ve been in a lot of places where people are against everything. But I say I’m really happy that you are here, Port Metro Vancouver. I think that everyone needs to get the education of how the governments work and how it all comes together, because you will be surprised what you’re wanting for and going to all the different governments. I think you are getting a good education because these are things for the good of our country. This is for Canada, and if you can’t see... I watch everything that is going on because of the economic development so I’m one of those crazy First Nations people who wants to know what’s going on. And you’ll be surprised; all First Nations are watching what’s going on globally. Because globally, we are a country that can give a lot of this earth. We can do it in a good way without fighting with each other. I loved what Carol said, and I’ve got this hidden agenda. Yeah, it’s a hidden agenda, and it’s about working with the community and be participants with communities. And I can’t kick all of you out of my territory. Together we can be strong for Canada. This is about Canada; this is about local to global. And if you think that Canada has this book that says this is how it’s going to be done? No – we’re going to work it out. Ok? There’s work to be done. The work has to be done together. So I just wanted everyone here to know that it wasn’t a hidden agenda. I’m not against the Port. I’m very happy to be working with everyone along with First Nations. A lot of First Nations are, they’re just not at these tables. My hands go up to you. Thank you so much. This is so grand for you to do this. No one can say they haven’t been involved. You do put out everything and I know that everyone doesn’t read everything. But if you want to be involved, you have to read everything.
Q: **Dave Melnychuk:** In regard to what topics, I come from an agricultural background, and I have all my life. I work in the community, and I am trying to mitigate for South Fraser Perimeter Road and its impact. In view of the fact that most containers are going to be travelling through farm community and expanded roads and railways; I think it’s very important as a separate item – all these are important, I’m not discounting them – but what I don’t really see here – and I think after all experiences we have had in Delta over the last 50 years, no one has really grappled with what is the cumulative impact on agriculture, land loss, traffic patterns, drainage, air quality for example. So what I’m asking is that the Port supports a very focused analysis of your impact to agriculture short term and long term. I would like to see it come out in the page that they recognize that the bulk of the land outside the estuary is farmland. It’s taken a really big hit in the last few decades. And I think it needs to be recognized and we need to develop mitigation strategies to minimize impacts.

Q: **Don Watson:** Every morning I wake up and look out my window and there is the Port – I have no problems whatsoever. But, my concern is, I was on the Delta advisory planning commission on the area plan for a year or so. Tsawwassen is a beautiful town surrounded by farmland but it’s a bedroom community. What we need here is jobs, and I was wondering, how many jobs are going to be produced – I understand that they are going to be well paying jobs – how many are going to be available for the people in Tsawwassen? I heard once that all the hiring was all done down in Burrard Inlet. Is that still the case or would they be able to be hired out of Tsawwassen?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** I have to be careful because I spent ten years operating a terminal and my immediate thoughts were to the collective agreement, and thought about that. The analysis on jobs isn’t done. If your question is, jobs on the terminal – and I can speak about today at Deltaport – the local is called the New Westminster Local. But the vast employment of that local is out here at Roberts Bank. It’s not Burrard Inlet, it’s on this side of the Fraser River. One would assume that it would be something similar for any new developments at Roberts Bank.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Do we have any estimated job numbers for this proposed project?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Today, and it gets more efficient every year, it’s about an hour of employment for every TEU. So 2.5 million on the terminal, 2.5 million hours a year for a 2.4 million TEU terminal.

Q: **Don Watson:** My concern is how many of those jobs are going to be in Tsawwassen and Lader, local jobs?

A: **Judy Kirk:** I think that’s a very interesting topic – I think what you’re saying, and we don’t have all the answers, because it’s so early in the process so we don’t have all the answers. But it seems that you would like to talk about what is the potential for local employment out of this proposed project.

C: **Don Watson:** Yes, that’s right.

Q: **Leslie Abramson:** My other hat was the president of Chamber of Commerce. One thing I haven’t heard or seen a lot of is the impact on business and what it
does for this business community. We talk about the impact on the environment, truck traffic, the air quality – we have the new air quality station up here, that’s one thing the committee did. But what is the impact on the business community? How many rooms this hotel sells? How many pizzas does a pizza company sell because they have a late shift at the Port? How many tires the tire company sells? I think this is important because we are becoming a brown paper community. And it could get worse if the Tsawwassen First Nations big shopping centre goes in. I think they should be pushing the economic impact that it has in this village in Tsawwassen and Ladner.

Q:  Robert Butler: One of the comments you got is page 4, and it’s talking about “a shared commitment to sustainable solutions, we are striving to further develop solid relationships at the local government level to help identify common values, determine sustainable legacies and mitigate potential community impacts.” When you look at the work sustainable, and it is mentioned in this discussion guide four or five times, I would like to know how the Port defines that word. Because I think it’s important to understand what it means for this community and groups around here. Sustainable to some groups means to some “my business only”, but in reality is that sustainability should be sustainability of everyone involved around what’s going on so no one is any worse than when the project started. I would like to find out whether that’s the Port’s interpretation.

A:  Judy Kirk: Good topic and having done this for many years, the definition of sustainability has evolved over time.

C:  Robert Butler: Evolved if you mean almost nothing today because it only means what we each want it to mean. So what does it mean in terms of the Port.

Q:  Brad Cooper: That actually was the question that I was asking regarding the economic impact – I’m asking about the small businesses of Delta. I represent a business association in Ladner that is going through a pretty frightening change in transportation. The thought that potentially the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which is being built to take on the capacity of the Port as it exists today that there is a chance that we will start looking like some of the communities on Vancouver Island where they put on the Sea Island Highway and eventually some of the small communities, which used to have traffic directed through it, now you have to know you want to be in that place or you miss it.

C:  Judy Kirk: So creating a bypass.

Q:  Brad Cooper: Highway 17 will probably stop being a provincial highway probably, and become a municipal road and the business community in Ladner is concerned about that and the impact on the small business. We have had the pleasure of having representatives from the Port come in and share with us and many of our members come and share how much business they do get from the port. It is not small by any means, but it is something that should be expanded upon to let them know. There are a lot of issues from this from an environmental side, and I think we have to look at them very carefully, but we
don’t want to sideline the communities, they need to see that this is a positive all the way around. That’s just the big fear right now.

Q: **Jim Ronback:** My background is as a system safety engineer. I don’t see any indication about establishing a safety management system, which identifies all the potential hazards which can take place during the construction and operation of Terminal 2. It’s not clear to me how hazardous goods would be handled, what could be contained in these containers that are brought through here, or could they bring flammable liquid like jet fuel or gasoline?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** It’s something called a “tanktainer”, and it’s not inside a box, you can see it, it’s got square ends on it and it’s a tank and marked.

Q: **Jim Ronback:** So conceivably we could have jet fuel coming through these ports?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Conceivably jet fuel isn’t something you’d find moving that way.

Q: **Jim Ronback:** What other flammable liquids and chemicals. What I see missing is the safety management system.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Michelle, is that something that would generally be part of the environmental scope?

C: **Jim Ronback:** Not necessarily.

A: **Michelle Lachmann:** It should be, it’s not, but defiantly we’ll take that down.

Q: **Ruth Adams:** Just listening because I’m part of Safe Route and we just got our little bus going from First Nations up here to this town centre. But I think what the Port Metro Vancouver can really look into and put into their plan is this transportation plan – the bus system and the bike system – I said that because my daughter was working down there and taking her bicycle and I hear that a lot of people take a cab. If we had a transportation system that could bring us around to those work areas, people around here seem to think that there could be some work to be done here around the Port and at the ferries. There is work there to be done, but I think to have them, if we had a good transportation plan with a bus system. Also, to put it in a plan, some people were asking what the benefits would be. Maybe the benefit would be that because this is a no growth area in Delta, we don’t get the bus system, because you don’t have the numbers, can’t get the numbers because we don’t want growth. Since we are within Metro I would love to put this big bang on the table, and say let’s get this transportation system. It would be a good benefit for Ladner and Tsawwassen and for us too – if there was a good transportation system for all those new roads going in, I think it could be put with transportation.

Q: **Susan Jones:** Referring to page 10, where you have these topics that we want to be consulted on think we should add a number of topics – as discussed here the impacts to agriculture. When they did the Deltaport Third Berth assessment at public meetings, when asked about agricultural land the answer the Port gave was that the scope here, the Terms of Reference stopped at the land, they were only looking at the Port area. There again, the scoping document, Terms of reference are key, impact on agriculture, impact on local business with numbers. They say we will do this many jobs, it’s all glossed over, it needs to be
very specific. I would also like a credible feasibility study done and I’d like that early in the game.

C: Judy Kirk: Feasibility for the proposed T2 Project?
Q: Susan Jones: For the whole proposal and a credible cost benefit analysis. I would also like to see habitat compensation and mitigation plans on the table early. These happen probably about two years after approval so the public has no input to that whatsoever. That’s what happened before. They go on that table of commitments and assurances, and that is way too late for the public. That should be right at the second meeting.

C: Judy Kirk: I’m just going to ask Michelle, since I’m not an expert in Environment, but those which I’ve observed and have been part of, the mitigation plans have been part of the application for environmental certification which does have a process around it. Michelle, am I right on that?
A: Michelle Lachmann: Yes, generally. For DP3, the mitigation plans that were in the application, and there is a general tie back to the commitments table. Susan’s right, there was probably a one or two year process after the approval where there was a refinement.

C: Judy Kirk: But that’s generally not the way it is.
Q: Susan Jones: Excuse me, if you read the table of commitments and assurances, “management plan to be drawn up”. This is all future stuff and it’s very general like she said, there’s just general “yes we’ll replace the fish habitat”, but no numbers, no specifics, nothing that anyone can provide input.

C: Judy Kirk: I’m not questioning DP3. My question to Michelle was, generally in Environmental Assessment processes, are draft mitigation plans part of the application?
A: Michelle Lachmann: Yes
C: Judy Kirk: Yes, so if that’s the case this time, again we’re in the territory that it’s up to regulators.
Q: Susan Jones: My request here is more specific. It’s way too general.
C: Judy Kirk: That’s something we’d need to pass onto the regulators.
A: Michelle Lachmann: I would agree with you, Susan.
Q: Anne Murray: I have a comment about wildlife and habitats too. Compensation on mitigation has been a big problem, not just with DP3 but also with South Fraser Perimeter Road. They are still working on habitat mitigation. It’s one of those adaptive management things that you never get to comment and never see a proper plan. It’s a real failure in terms of follow up and accountability. Actually, it’s a real opportunity missed to get input from the public who often know these areas more than some of the people handling it. Also, I would like to comment on “potential impacts on endangered specials/species at risk.” on page 10. I just want to reiterate that this area – Roberts Bank, part of the Fraser River Estuary is considered to be one of the most important areas in the whole of Canada for migratory birds. Now, a lot of those birds are not species at risk, but are migratory bird that depends on this area specifically. They are not red listed as species at risk – there are lots of them. If you take out this habitat, you are going to make a hole in the Pacific Flyway and it could have a huge impact. Last time, for the DP3, they said no problem, anything is mitigatable, and they
didn’t really look at species – the overall impact on the flyway, the huge number of shore birds that come through. They are common birds, but they are important for this area. If we are just going to carry on with the same thing and I almost didn’t even comment on it. Like most people at this table, I have seen many of these and I wonder we go there and we spend months and months, giving up our time for a corporation that’s going to make money out of this and we get nothing. It’s just community involvement giving up afternoons on a sunny day, evenings. I feel we get nowhere; I’m really frustrated with these processes. I appreciate that we are being pre-consulted here, I shall fill out my feedback form, I shall send it in, I shall attend all of the meetings and everything, but at the end, what we are seeing is that our community is just being destroyed piecemeal, bit by bit. I really didn’t feel much like commenting and I’m going to have to leave in a minute anyway.

Q: **Bob Miller:** I agree with your comments. I’m interested in knowing what base level documentation that the Port has with regard to flow of water and the use of Roberts Bank incubator space for young salmon in be integrated into salt water. And how important it was for the Ferry terminals and how much of the degradation of that area has occurred because of the original port and the additional construction that has gone on so that we can try to figure out... One of the things that’s running through my mind is sustainable, the word that was mentioned several times, but the key word that was mentioned only once is at the lowest cost. It’s almost unstated, but it seems to me that a key part in here is sustainable at the lowest cost – so that if it costs more not to bugger up the environment, they could do it the cheaper way, then I perceive that as our community is providing a subsidy to the Port of Vancouver for their lowest cost. When perhaps their threshold of investigation, which we never get to discuss, the threshold of investigation is always underlined at the lowest cost. If it should foul up the community for example, this very small thing, before Roberts Bank went in, you could go and crab, with your family, out on Roberts Bank. From the time they started putting these facilities in, it’s basically a quagmire out there. You can barely walk out there with your grandchildren because it’s unsafe. It’s working for lowest cost and their threshold of sustainability appears to be low enough. It’s sustainable at the level they are doing it because it affects their lowest cost. It’s not sustainable of what the environment was capable to do before they went in to do their work. If it’s not able to do that work then somehow that’s a subsidy that this community is providing the Port of Vancouver and I think it’s wrong.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I appreciate that explanation, especially that notion of subsidy is important to understand. Are you saying that you would like to discuss the relationship between environmental, economic and social, in terms of sustainability and the relative trade-offs between them and the levels.

Q: **Bob Miller:** In addition to that, the base information of the 1979 report that Roger has, what information was available then or is it now been run through the trashing machine.
Q: **Ruth Adams:** The crab part, that was before anyone came, that’s not the Port’s fault. It was the farmers, and then the tunnel came and the ferry came. So I wouldn’t blame the crabs on the Port because it was the farmers who came.

Q: **Susan Jones:** There is a process going on there, called eutrophication where we are raising, with the habitat and fish. I’m following up on what Roger said about the 1979 report, there were letters from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in 2003 saying you cannot build here you should not build here. And the scientists that wrote that were moved sideways and the rubber stamp came in and they were ignored.

Q: **Vic Rivers:** We have talked about mitigating the wildlife and the agricultural land. We also need to talk about how you are going to mitigate to the people who live on the west side of Tsawwassen. Following on what Bob said it seems to me that we are subsidizing the Port by putting up with the increased activity going on out there; the noise pollution that’s getting bigger and bigger as time goes on, the problems with light pollution that never got resolved with DP3. We just have this insidious creep that’s getting bigger and bigger, it’s a significant impact. I’ve lived on Tsawwassen Beach 34 years and I’ve lived in Tsawwassen 42 years. When I first came there was a ferry at 7 in the morning and it quit at 10:35 at night and it was quiet. Now we have Roberts Bank, and the conveyors for the coal, DP2, DP1 now we have DP3 and I presume you’re going right to DP6 I presume. And it’s a very increasing and increasing, and it’s an insidious thing, and it’s getting worse and worse as time goes on. We aren’t getting anything back from it, but we are contributing in a subsidy to the Port. Someone has to address that as we go forward. We should, for instance, be going to shore power that would get rid of so much noise out there. But the Port is hiding behind the IMO and we can’t do anything until IMO decides and it goes for years and years. These things have got to be addressed because the people on the west side are having to put up with this gradual, insidious noise, and light pollution and all the rest of the stuff that goes on.

**Page 12**

C: **Judy Kirk:** Just like Cliff did, I want to go through these consultation methods those listed here: attending a small-group meeting like this, attending an open house in your community or neighbourhood, participating in an online video open house, and I’ll explain that in a minute if you have questions about it, completing an online feedback form, attending a webinar, providing a written submission or other methods of consultation. These are not meant to limit, only to provide ideas. We would like to know whether you are more interested in face to face meetings, or online, or a combination. At the risk of offending those in the room who are over 40 – and there are a few of us – I just want to remind us that if you do prefer face to face we need to remember that the younger generation, who need to be involved in these processes, very much prefer, or are starting to tell us, that they want online opportunities as well. I want to ask about your ideas as to how you want to be consulted and make sure that you fill out your feedback form regarding that.
Q: **John Savage:** Just a comment on Bob’s comment about the crabs. I was up there Saturday and had four traps out there with eight guys, got one hundred and fourteen crabs.

C: **Bob Miller:** But John, my comment wasn’t the fact that the crabs aren’t there, my comment was that you can’t walk out there. You can go on your boat and drop the trap.

Q: **John Savage:** I walked.

C: **Bob Miller:** No kidding. You can’t from our side.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Methods of consultation are changing. We want to hear from you about how you want to be consulted. Please take us seriously and answer how you want to be consulted about this over time.

Q: **John Savage:** And all due respect to everyone here, we all have concerns in specific areas, and I respect that fully as well. I think Ruth made a pretty good statement about coming to a resolve; you can only do that by consultation. And the real task in front of all of us here, no matter what the interest is to make sure we get the points across and they are clearly understood even when it gets to a panel. There is no sense just having the consultation and get into the point of presentation and it’s disregarded. It has to be really forthright and understood by all, and given the proper time that is required, so that those processes can take place.

Q: **Roger Emsley:** I believe under point 3 that should be an additional aspect that should be considered, and that is the Port making available, online, a number of background documents and statistics so we have the opportunity to review them and not go hunting for them to find them. I would like to see the Port being proactive putting those out there. And one of the specifics I would like to see – up until 2006, we knew what the actual volumes were going through Deltaport. Since roughly 2006 – 2007 we’ve had to guess because the Port has refused to provide that information.

Q: **Susan Jones:** I remember with the Deltaport Third Berth that the public got upset and they held one or two public meetings with microphones, because there was an outcry and there was a response. So you never know when you’re going to get people out to a big meeting, they had a panel with people at the front and many people got up and asked a lot of questions. Sometimes you do that, and nobody shows up. I think you need to do all of these options here, and as Roger suggests. The one problem I have is I like to hear what other people are saying and so with all these meetings, these Pre-Consultation meetings, and open houses; I never got to hear what people said. I would like the whole community to know what people around this room are saying in all of these consultations. I would like to know how you do that. All we had with the last two processes we’ve had for the South Fraser Perimeter Road and Deltaport Third Berth was people who went to a lot of trouble to write submissions and a lot of people aren’t going to do that. There’s an incredible record there, but
nobody ever listened to it, and so it’s like Anne said, you don’t want to sit down and write a 10 page report that was ignored. I spend the whole of August writing a report in response to the comprehensive study – totally ignored. There was no acknowledgement, no response, nothing. So there is no feedback from peoples input, but on the other hand I still want to be able to access that. The people are not being listened to. You can go to both processes, you can go to the website, submit wonderful comments, and incredible information and absolutely nothing happened. It’s not consultation, it’s just back and forth.

C: Judy Kirk: So Susan, with respect to what you were saying regarding the ability of people to look at submissions and feedback forms and that sort of thing.

Q: Susan Jones: I don’t know how you document a meeting like the one today, so that somebody who can’t be here today can hear. There’s some expectation around that.

A: Judy Kirk: Let me answer this question, very specific to this process. There will be a Consultation Summary Report which will be written by Kirk & Co. independently. Cliff said earlier on behalf of the Port earlier today. Actually to be absolutely correct, it is an independent report which be filed with the Port. That report has as appendices these meeting notes, written submissions and feedback forms. With British Columbia’s protection of privacy and access to information and with the Port as a federally regulated agency the federal requirements for privacy and access to information, you can look at your own feedback form and your own written submission. If someone gives permission with respect to their written submission and feedback form you can look at others. But there are caveats around that. All the information is there, and attached, but the access to individuals with their names etc. is something that needs permission.

Q: Susan Jones: Another comment regarding questionnaires. I find 99% of them biased and I hate answering because my answer is none of the above and I never have that option. Any questionnaire should be fair and not stupid and not a waste of time. With this one today, a lot of these questions are going to have to be in the Environmental Assessment act. They are going to have to be there anyways, whether or not you like it, it is important to the act, so they have to be there, they are kind of redundant.

A: Judy Kirk: I just want to say to you on that – if we hadn’t noted them... and there’s an agree scale on there, in other words, we’re saying to people how important to you. There’s no question that in the Environmental Review, all if not more, of these topics will need to be looked at. But the Port is saying to you, that they are doing consultation over and above the Environmental Review. This Pre-Consultation, the Project Definition and the Preliminary Design Consultation are all over and above Environmental Review. If all of these are extremely important to you, and that’s fair enough, but some of them might have a higher important to you; certainly no desire to be redundant.

Q: Susan Jones: We had an overabundance too in the South Fraser Perimeter Road. We had meetings up the ying yang, and none of it was listened too.

C: Judy Kirk: That’s a different point and I respect that point.
Q: *Jim Ronback:* One thing you don’t have here is asking whether the writer has made given permission to make it public, you should add that. We need to have meetings where the proponent of the project is there to answer questions from the public and that there should be someone there representing from the regulators. So that they can also be asked questions.

A: *Judy Kirk:* We will put that down. We can only ask. Generally they only attend the processes over which they are overseeing.

Q: *Jim Ronback:* Quite often it’s a process question that we’ve got in mind.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Yes, fair enough.

C: *Susan Jones:* It’s not easy to get the money

C: *Judy Kirk:* No it isn’t, but I hear you. They are under resourced in a lot of ways aren’t they.

Q: *Carol Vignale:* A small group meeting like this is very useful. In the past when other projects have been in this community often, this is not done. I’m just really surprised and pleased about this round table. I think it’s really helpful because it’s often not been done. When you have these open houses, and the project is shown off, or people speak privately to the consultants for the project it’s not so helpful. We come from a lot of different perspectives in one community and often people don’t get to hear these different perspectives. It’s kind of cool that we have a First Nations person; Ruth is here to cross over. We have the business community and they all meet together and we have the Against Port guys and they meet together. Very seldom in our community in Delta do we have an opportunity really to be neighbours to one another. Not everyone may agree. But I for one really think what you have done today is extraordinary for our community and I am pleased to be here. I would like to see more of these small group meetings so that neighbours can get to know each other. There are perspectives that aren’t loud voices and that don’t belong to a group like Against Port Expansion or the business community or the Farmer’s Institute, like the voice that I have. There are lots of people with voices like mine and lots of other voices. I agree with Susan, it’s really important for us to get to know each other as neighbours. And it would seem to me that as a cohesive community group, we looked at our not at self-interest, but community interest, national interest, provincial interest, regional interest, and, then we could actually propose certain elements of the project that we all agree on and not fighting against each other. I want to look at the whole benefit for the whole community, including all of these voices we heard today. And I think we can find that if we all continue to work together in small groups.

Q: *Susan Jones:* I would like to see something specific about employment opportunities. But I would like specific information – are they temporary, part-time, permanent, construction are they at the terminal. How many of it is on borrowed tax payer’s money, how much is going to be paid out by the Port? I’ve never seen that.
C: *Judy Kirk:* I would like to ask you to fill out your feedback form here today before you leave and leave it with either Chris or myself. Thank you in advance for participating in such a very meaningful way in terms of speaking up and saying what was on your mind.

Q: *Unknown:* You said online as well?
A: *Judy Kirk:* Yes it is. You can do it online, I’m saying please send it in if you do that. We really want to get it from you.

*The meeting ended at 3:30pm.*
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The record notes that the meeting commenced at 2:05 pm

KEY THEMES:

- Participants said that they would like one body responsible for all port operations on the Canadian West Coast, rather than two separate entities in Vancouver and Prince Rupert.
- Participants said that they would like to be consulted about whether the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project should proceed, noting that adding container capacity at Prince Rupert may be a better option and more acceptable to the Prince Rupert region than the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project is to the Delta community.
• Some participants said that Port Metro Vancouver should consult with the public and stakeholders about additional infrastructure such as the road, rail and ship infrastructure that would be needed to support the increased operations associated with the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
• Some participants said that they would like to be consulted about how the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project could benefit the community with local employment, additional health, education services or other social and economic benefits.
• Participants said they would like Port Metro Vancouver to provide full and transparent access to as much information available as possible during the consultation stages, including study outlines, study results and technical work.
• Participants said they liked the small-group meeting format as a consultation method and also asked that open houses include a question and answer component.

1. Judy Kirk, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review

   Roundtable introductions were undertaken.

   C: Judy Kirk: I will be facilitating this session. I am the president of Kirk & Co., which is a firm which specializes in consultation. This is the second multi-stakeholder meeting of Port Metro Vancouver’s Pre-Consultation concerning the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. Cliff will go into some considerable discussion about that, and it’s contained in this discussion guide. This is also posted on the web and it has a feedback form which we would very much appreciate you filling out today. I’d like to leave a few minutes at the end to do that. We find that if we don’t get the feedback forms on the same day sometimes we’re lucky to get them, lots of times we’re not. That said, it is online and we’d very much appreciate getting it from you today or if you would fill it in online.

   I just want to reinforce that this is the second multi-stakeholder meeting; there will be seven in this round. This is the first of a very comprehensive consultation that Port Metro Vancouver anticipates doing about the proposed T2 project that will include, likely, six rounds of consultation over approximately seven years, though the number of years depends on Provincial and Federal regulators. That gives you a sense of how early this particular process is, Pre-Consultation.

   On my right here, my colleague Dallas Henault will be taking notes and we will make sure that your comments and questions are attributed. If you would like to speak to me now or later and you would not like your comments attributed just let me know and we can make sure that it’s taken out of the record. Otherwise we will have attributed comments on the record. There will be a Consultation Summary Report, an independent report written by Kirk & Co. that will summarize this round of Pre-Consultation. The Port will consider that input as it goes forward in planning subsequent consultation and dealing with other phases in this consultation program for this Proposed Terminal 2.
Q:  *Tom Johnston:* What are exactly, are you expecting to obtain from this group? What’s your objective?

A:  *Judy Kirk:* Our objective, through Pre-Consultation today and any other meetings we are having, in Delta, Langley, Surrey, Richmond and Vancouver, is to find out from you what topics you would like to be consulted on and how you would like to be consulted. Consistent with best practice, and I can tell you because I’ve been doing this kind of work for 28 years in British Columbia and across Canada, Pre-Consultation isn’t always done. In this case the Port Metro Vancouver was given the advice to do this and they took the initiative to ask people early, who may have an interest in the Proposed Terminal 2, how they want to be consulted and about what. So that is the goal today.

Please do interrupt at any point. Cliff, as I say is going to present some of the information just by going through this guide. We have found that it’s a comfortable way to go through it. But please do, at any point along, ask question and provide a comment. Just let me know and I can make sure that we make time to do that.

C:  *Cliff Stewart:* My name is Cliff Stewart, I am the director of Infrastructure Development for Port Metro Vancouver and the CCIP program that I am going to speak about is my program, that’s what I am responsible for. Terminal 2 is a significant component of Container Capacity Improvement Program.

C:  *Sarah McPherson:* I am Sarah McPherson and I work for Port Metro Vancouver and I am working on the communications and consultations part of the Container Program.

C:  *Carrie Brown:* My name is Carrie Brown, I’m also with Port Metro Vancouver. I work for the Container Capacity Improvement Program and I am on the environmental front.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* Thanks Carrie. I may ask you to speak up a bit. I don’t know about you, but it was a bit hard to hear Carrie.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* Cliff, I am going to ask you to go over some of the first sections of the discussion guide. I just want repeat, please interrupt at any time. That’s why we are doing small groups to make sure that any and all comments you might have or things you want to discuss are brought up.

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

C:  *Cliff Stewart:* So I’m starting on page 2, the inside cover of the discussion guide.

**What is the purpose of the discussion guide?**
To guide the discussion about the program, the project and in particular to explain the consultation process, including the round we’re in now, Pre-
Consultation, what it means and what its objectives are, as well as the rest of the program. The Container Capacity Improvement Program is a multi-year program designed to ensure that Port Metro Vancouver delivers deep sea container capacity in a timely manner to support the growth of international trade. The Terminal 2 project at Roberts Bank is a significant component of that program, but it is not the only part of the program.

We want to hear from you.
We are holding seven separate meetings in this round, and there will be seven rounds of consultation. It is important to note, that the statutory requirement is two rounds, and we have significantly expanded that program to ensure that to the largest extent possible we understand what people’s interests and concerns are, and we’re able to incorporate them wherever possible into the program.

Pre-Consultation is about two things: What do you want to be consulted on and how do you want to be consulted. The, what, is pretty simple, we’ll talk about that later and all the various things that are of interest to you that you think this program has an impact on. The, how is, do you like small group meetings like this, do you like online, do you like webinars, what methods for being consulted work for you and are important to you.

C: Judy Kirk: Cliff I’m going to ask you to just pause there for a minute because I’m a bit remiss that I didn’t go around the table. I wonder if we can do that, starting with you Irene. Just say who you are and either what organization you’re with or where you live or whatever interests you might bring to the table. Then I’m going to ask you at the end to put in your tent cards so we can see it.

C: Irene Focier: My name is Irene Focier, I’ve been a resident of Delta and all three areas for the past 50 years. I’m past president for the Rotary Club of Ladner and currently with the Children with Learning Disabilities, raising 4 million dollars to build in Ladner.

C: Eliza Olsen: I’m Eliza Olsen; I’ve lived in North Delta and South Delta since 1967. I’m very heavily involved with Burns Bog Conservation Society and a few other organizations. But I’m representing myself here at the table.

C: Thomas Schmitz: My name is Thomas. Our family business is at Tilbury Park, Delta, we supply rock and soil we bring in quite a bit in terms of containers and do quite a bit of shipping and are affected by what’s happening.

C: John Appleby: I’m John Appleby, I’m an immediate Past Chair of the Delta Chamber of Commerce and I’ve been active in the past fifteen years in the Transportation Committee and my own business is in high speed freight transfer technology. I’m representing the Delta Chamber of Commerce and our primary concern is the development of an adequate level of infrastructure, not only in the Port but also inland, and the efficiency with which the Port operates, not necessarily to land material but how we get it out. So we’re not interested in the roads and rail and short sea shipping.

C: Anita Den Dikken: My name is Anita Den Dikken and I’m a resident of South Delta for the past 5 years, I’m a retired Federal public servant, I’m proud to say
that. I’m a member of the South Fraser Action Network and Burns Bog Conservation Society. My interest in this project is on various levels and I’m wondering about issues people have with the Port of Prince of Rupert and interested on impacts in Agricultural land and on the Pacific Flyway and environmental impacts in general and I’m representing myself.

C: **Esther Johnson**: I’m a volunteer at Tynehead Fish Hatchery which is in Surrey, 96th and 176th, and our half million salmon come from the hatchery and come down through here and they definitely need to have a way to get through to get up the coast and also to come back.

C: **Paula Hill**: I’m Paula Hill, I’m the Past President of Tsawwassen Business Association and I’m also here on behalf of Scotiabank Tsawwassen and Scotiabank which will be opening up in Ladner next.

C: **Judy Kirk**: Vicki you probably don’t need to introduce yourself, but please do.

C: **Vicki Huntington**: Vicki Huntington, I’m the MLA for Delta South and here to listen to others.

C: **Clint Morgan**: My name is Clint Morgan, I am sitting on the Transport Committee for the Chamber of Commerce, and I’m here on their behalf. I’m also the President of a company that operates container depot, Delta Container Limited Partnership in Calgary. So anything to do with containers is of interest to us.

C: **Tom Johnston**: Tom Johnston a former resident of Lander and now living in Tsawwassen on the waterfront, so my big concern there is primarily environmental and I’m also heavily involved with the First Nations development there, the consultation strategy.

C: **Paul Rasmussen**: My name is Paul Rasmussen and I represent the Roberts Bank Lifeboat Society and have a station at the Port right now. So we’re just here to see how it is going to affect our locations and what we can do for the Port in the future.

C: **Paul Foster**: Paul Foster, also from the Roberts Bank Lifeboat Society. I’m just here to listen to see what happens and affect our station out there.

C: **Lloyd Sim**: I’m Lloyd Sim, I’m a resident of Ladner and I was involved in the Deltaport 3 and interested in what the Port is doing in terms of economic development. I’m representing the interest of my grandkids.

C: **Cliff Stewart**: Starting on Page 3.

**What is Port Metro Vancouver?**

In 2008, three legacy ports, the Vancouver Port Authority, the Fraser River Port Authority and the North Fraser River Port Authority were merged to form Port Metro Vancouver. Port Metro Vancouver is the largest port in Canada and the most diversified port of the West Coast of North America. It’s also the largest export port on the West Coast of North America. The mandate of Port Metro Vancouver is to support the growth of Canadian trade.

**Why is Trade Important?**

Trade is important because the economic benefits of trade are felt not just here in the Pacific Gateway itself, but across the entire country. It helps to create
jobs, it increases tax revenue for municipalities and producing economies and it produces economic benefit for Canadians.

One of the questions that is very important to us at Port Metro Vancouver is how do we work towards responsible growth? The way we do that is with a shared commitment to sustainable solutions. We are striving to further develop solid relationships at the local government and community level and to help identify common values, determine sustainable legacies and to mitigate potential community impacts. That obviously will be important part of consultation process as we move forward.

Port Metro Vancouver is committed to sustainable development.

C: Judy Kirk: You can see when Cliff is moving the page, but I think he’s now on...
C: Cliff Stewart: I’m moving now onto page 6.
C: Judy Kirk: Which is I think, dealing with demand, and is an important area.

Q: Tom Johnston: Is there any reason why you are omitting a particular section at this time?
A: Cliff Stewart: In the interest of me not reading to you what you can read yourself and there’s lots of time for questions.
C: Judy Kirk: We’re just using it as a guide.

C: Cliff Stewart:

Why do we need to plan for growth in containerized trade?
The projections that we have done and they were released in May of this year show that we expect the existing container capacity to be constrained in fairly short term. That means probably by 2015 or 2016. We project that 4 million TEUs of additional capacity will be required to meet future West Coast container demand by 2030. To put that in perspective, that’s just slightly less than all of the existing capacity on the West Coast of Canada today. Growth is expected to double over next 10 – 15 years, and to nearly triple by 2030.

Q: Clint Morgan: On what basis do we come up with such a projection? Surely the population of North America is not going to triple in the next 20 years. Obviously containers are all about consumption, buying goods and selling to foreign countries. So I’m just curious what the projection is based on.
A: Cliff Stewart: It’s based on a combination of things. The data originates primarily with the Economist Intelligence Unit, and it’s based on things like GDP growth per capita, population growth, shifting trade patterns. One of the things that you’ve probably seen a lot in the paper lately is, whereas virtually all of British Columbia lumber used to go south to the United States, significantly increasing amounts now goes to Asia. So yes, the primary direction is still from Asia to Canada, but more and more, as that growth is happening the export growth is
keeping pace and so you’re continuing to see that it’s growing in both directions.

Q: **Clint Morgan:** Do you see balance going forward?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** We expect it to continue to be relatively balanced, yes.

Q: **Tom Johnston:** What about development in the north of BC?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** And I can talk about that a little bit.
C: **Judy Kirk:** Tom, I want to make sure that everyone heard that. What about development in the north of BC?
Q: **Tom Johnston:** It seems to be centralized right here, I don’t know why we have to take all of the expansion when there’s an expansion north of here.
C: **Judy Kirk:** I think Anita, you asked about Prince Rupert as well. So maybe Cliff you should address some questions about Prince Rupert.
A: **Cliff Stewart:** In the event that Prince Rupert proceeds then Terminal 2 would probably be delayed because it would not be required as soon as it would be if Prince Rupert doesn’t proceed. But Port Metro Vancouver doesn’t have any control over whether Prince Rupert proceeds or doesn’t proceed. But we do have a mandate to ensure that trade is able to continue. So when you look at a project like Terminal 2 and we’re here in Pre-Consultation, from the beginning of this process we’re in now it’s expected to take 10 years until a ship could tie up alongside and discharge. In the event that Prince Rupert doesn’t proceed for any number of reasons, in order to ensure that in 2020 there’s sufficient capacity to support Canadian trade we need to be starting now. We don’t have the luxury of waiting three or four years and then saying, if Prince Rupert doesn’t proceed, now we are going to go ahead. What we do have the ability to do is to start the process now and if the capacity comes online in Prince Rupert to slow down or delay the project at Terminal 2 until the growth has caught up to and consumed the capacity the Prince Rupert might make available. It is really as simple as that, we can’t rely on Prince Rupert happening. If it happens great, if it doesn’t happen then we have an obligation to provide that capacity.

Q: **Eliza Olsen:** What events would prevent Prince Rupert from proceeding because I’ve always heard that they’re going to be fully open at 2012?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, I guess there are a number of things and we could spend a lot of time doing what I call containers 101, understanding the dynamics of how containers travel and what various people do with those containers. The underlying assumption we have is that if doesn’t proceed it’s not economically viable, if it’s not economically viable I guess you could turn that around and say if it’s economically viable it’ll proceed, if it’s not economically viable it won’t. But we don’t have the luxury of being able to wait to find that out.
C: **Judy Kirk:** But I think underneath Eliza’s question is probably, Eliza correct me if I’m wrong, is what would affect that economic viability?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Let me go back to what you’ve heard about it opening in 2012. It hasn’t yet got permits, it hasn’t started construction so it’s almost a given it won’t opening in 2012. It may well get permits and it may well go ahead, but I think it’s more likely going to be the middle of decade before it happens. Given the process that we’re involved in takes 10 years and there’s no ability to speed
up that process, there’s no ability to say if we wait five years to say we shouldn’t have waited because Rupert hasn’t gone ahead and then compressed the project. Whereas we have the ability to start now and move along the process and we talked about at any point along the process where we can stop, put it on hold, reactivate it. That’s the perspective we’re coming from. If Prince Rupert gets build, great, if Prince Rupert doesn’t get built we have an obligation to ensure that capacity is available.

C: Judy Kirk: Anita did you have a follow up question on that?

Q: Anita Den Dikken: This is a bit perplexing to me. Is there an ongoing basis for communication between Port Metro Vancouver and the Port of Prince Rupert?
A: Cliff Stewart: Yes.
Q: Anita Den Dikken: How is that accomplished?
A: Cliff Stewart: That’s accomplished at the Executive level.
Q: Anith Den Dikken: Which is?
A: Cliff Stewart: Our president speaks to their president on a regular basis.
Q: Tom Johnston: We’re talking about a competitive situation here and you getting off the block quickly enough is probably to the detriment of decision making process up north if you are off the blocks first.
A: Cliff Stewart: Well we’re not off the blocks first. They’re much further along in the process then we are. We’re at the Pre-Consultation stage, so we haven’t even got a plan at this point.
Q: Tom Johnston: Well I don’t know any residents who really want another port. You have people in Prince George who are desperate to have one. I’m asking the question, why is it happening here and not up north where there’s a demand for employment, demand for business and we’re only going to get pollution?
C: Judy Kirk: So Tom in relation to Pre-Consultation then would it be fair to say that you would like to discuss that fundamental question. It may be that others would. In other words the fundamental question being, do we want a Proposed Terminal 2 versus an increasing capacity from Prince Rupert?
C: Tom Johnston: Well I’m glad to see we have a good representative of a political format here. No disrespect. I think this will come down to a political decision.
C: Judy Kirk: It may, and I can’t say whether it will or not. I don’t think anyone can, including MLA Huntington. I think the point here for this consultation is that this is a fundamental question. If this is the topic you would like to have discussed, one of the reasons we have a feedback form here and why we’re doing this is to articulate that. This is the second meeting, in the first meeting this was not a topic that came up. In this meeting, it has, and I want to land on it and make sure it’s something you want to think about and consider.
C: Tom Johnston: I have a former restaurant in Tsawwassen with a large customer base down there and I’ve discussed it with many people, can’t find any that want T2.
Q: Anita Den Dikken: It sounds to me as if there are two rival factions, I don't know if that’s quite what this is but it sounds like there’s no one over seeing which facility and location will have an expanded port.

A: Judy Kirk: Anita, I'm going to step in and answer that instead of Cliff. The truth is if this project goes to Federal and Provinical Regulatory through the EA, they will look at need and alternative means of delivery and rationale for the project. But you should ask them directly. Vicky you're saying they don't? The Feds do.

C: Vicki Huntington: The Feds do, the province don't.

C: Judy Kirk: Actually, the province does too in the BC EAO guidelines, they look at alternative means.

C: Vicki Huntington: Not with alternatives.

C: Judy Kirk: Alternative means?

C: Unknown: No, that's the problem

C: Vicki Huntington: They look at the application in front of them, they cannot look at alternatives.

A: Judy Kirk: I didn't say alternative to, I said alternative means of delivery. You and I can talk offline, I think they do. But in any case, in terms of the Terms of Reference for the Environmental Assessment, you would also have opportunity to comment on that. But Anita, to answer your question of who is overseeing? The Provincial and Federal Regulators will oversee the regulatory and Environmental Assessment process. Otherwise, certainly levels of government may weight in.

C: Anita Den Dikken: I'm just not getting a great level of comfort from all of this. It just seems to me that there should be an emphasis on developing one port and not developing two. I could be wrong; I could be way out to lunch for all I know.

C: Judy Kirk: Fair enough, I think it’s a good question. It may well be something, and it’s in the notes, we will record as a concern as cooperation and integration of the Ports as well, and not this project.

C: Esther Johnson: I've been at Rupert and I know the depression that’s there, it’s a good sea port to go into. From anything I’ve heard, it’s faster to go to Eastern Canada from Prince Rupert than from down here. I see the difficulty that Langley has with the trains going through. Again, what I get from newspapers is conflict between Rupert and Vancouver and Vancouver having more say and therefore Rupert not getting the support that they need. Am I wrong?

Q: Clint Morgan: What I was going to say was, that it is my understanding, that Prince Rupert is a better location to service cargo that goes east, away from the West Coast and Vancouver is a better location for cargo that stays in the Lower Mainland. I understand that it is anywhere from 30 – 40% that stays in Vancouver and 60 – 70% that moves east of Vancouver. Do we know projections of volume tripling over the next 20 years or so? Do we have an idea what sector is going to go more? I imagine probably anything going east of Vancouver because there’s more relation that includes cargo going in to the US. Wouldn't that be a reason to predicate where the growth ought to take place?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: We’re in danger of getting into containers 101, and I’m actually happy to do that for people, probably this isn’t the place to do it. There are a number of commercial issues that Prince Rupert faces. The first one is that they are only serviced by one railroad. The Port of Halifax is served by that railroad solely. Prince Rupert has been open for 3-4 years and they have only managed to attract one shipping line customer. I guess you could say that the market is speaking about its view of that. It was originally built and marketed as being primarily for US cargo. They sold themselves as days quicker to Chicago. In fact that hasn’t been what has developed.

Q: **Clint Morgan**: I’ve heard that it is a tougher port to get into in the winter months. Between weather and rough seas, I heard that from a captain.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Certainly, that much further north. Ultimately, to a large degree the market will decide where market wants to go. If the facilities are built in Prince Rupert and the market is happy to go there, then as I said earlier, this capacity will be built later. There are ultimately only two places on the West Coast of Canada where deep water, road and rail all come together; they’re the Port of Vancouver and the Port of Prince Rupert. Ultimately I think all of these facilities will end up being built.

C: **Lloyd Sim**: Cliff has touched on some of what I was going to say. I lived in Prince Rupert and I worked out of Prince Rupert for twenty years in the marine field, and a lot of the dreams that Prince Rupert have, never materialized. Which may be unfortunate, but that’s the reality. They are not served by a good road and they are only served by a single train. They’re only up to four ships a week and it’s taken a few years to develop. I know the people of Prince Rupert are disappointed by the lack of commitment by the shipping lines to Prince Rupert. There are so many dynamics that we’re not aware of, that for us to go through the he said she said, I read, she read scenario that we could go here for months without resolving anything. Although the internet has given us a lot of information and faster, in the end the people with the money talk, let’s be honest. And if customers want to go through Prince Rupert, they will, or if they want to go through Port Metro Vancouver, they will. I would prefer only one Port Authority on the West Coast of Canada, that way we have the most efficient use of all the Port facilities. That’s not the current situation and I may not live to see that. We are a growing economy, goods have to be moved, and that’s how I made my living for many years. Although it seems that the mariners are the low spade of the infrastructure, I support the idea of preparing for expansion, but I also support the idea that it be done in a responsible, environmental way. Because of timelines involved, I believe that we as a community have the ability to encourage the port to do everything properly.

C: **Judy Kirk**: That’s good. I just want to make sure that we have the opportunity to go through some other stuff. So I wonder if I can ask you Cliff to move along and make sure that we cover the topics we are consulting on. Please feel free to interrupt as we move along.

C: **Cliff Stewart**: Moving on to Page 7.
What is the Container Capacity Improvement Program?
It is the important next step in delivering projects required and the infrastructure that is necessary to meet anticipated growth in the container sector. This isn’t something that’s just starting. There have been new developments in both Vanterm and Centerm in the Burrard Inlet in the middle of the last decade. The Third Berth at Deltaport that opened at the end of 2009 and came online in early 2010. There’s the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor, to address the comments you made about traffic in Langley, Surrey and here in Delta, to reduce that interaction between road traffic and rail traffic and allow people to live their lives without worrying about when the trains are coming through. It includes the South Fraser Perimeter Road in terms of capacity to handle the growth in truck traffic as was mentioned. Those aren’t part of the Container Capacity Improvement Program, but are things that are being done in part of growth in container capacity. Roberts Bank is very well positioned to accommodate future trade growth. It has excellent road and rail connections to the rest of North America. That’s a point that was mentioned earlier about American cargo, that’s a point I want to make. Currently about 5% of Port Metro Vancouver container traffic is American destined. This growth that we’re talking about is not based on growing the percentage of American cargo. This is strictly based on growing the mix that exists today with 5% as American cargo and 95% as Canadian cargo.

What is the Proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project?
It’s a multi berth, marine container terminal, expected to have a capacity of more than 2 million TEU’s built to bring the capacity on around 2020 and see the capacity growth through the decade of the 2020s. We would expect that between now and 2020; we would look to increase laden capacity within existing facilities, including Deltaport at Roberts Bank through road and rail infrastructure improvements to allow increased capacity out of all of the facilities that exist in the Lower Mainland. By 2020, the midterm capacity would come from Terminal 2, and in the event that Prince Rupert does get built, then Terminal 2 would be built later.

On page 8.

How can I get involved?
You see at the bottom of the page showing the comprehensive multi round community, stakeholder and public consultation process. Pre-Consultation is the one we are in now. The purpose of that is to allow people to be heard on the question of how do you want to be consulted in the subsequent rounds and on what issues do they wish to be consulted in the subsequent rounds. The seven rounds are expected to take place over a number of years. To a large degree the actual timeframe and schedule will be subject to the Environmental Assessment Review Process. It is our expectation that it will be a panel process, ultimately the decision about that will be made in Ottawa and in Victoria, but at this point, we are very early in the process. The objective is to give the community an
opportunity to talk about how they want to be consulted through the subsequent six or seven years of the consultation process.

C: Judy Kirk: If I could just on page 8, where you see the fourth box moving from left to right, where it says Draft Panel Guidelines. There’s an assumption being made here by Port Metro Vancouver that there would be a Federal panel because of the significance of the proposed project. So that would be one that would be part of the Environmental Assessment, and two more along Environmental Assessment public hearing process, there’s an assumption that it would be a public hearing process. That’s an assumption, the regulators might decide to do more and indeed past history with other large projects has shown that sometimes they do more. So it’s just to give you a sense of what is in addition to the regulatory.

C: Cliff Stewart: So moving on to page 9.

How will the input be used?
As Judy mentioned, Kirk & Co. will be doing an independent report of the input that’s received in the process, reporting back to the people who have provided that input and also to the Port to allow us to develop and shape the consultation process so it meets the needs of the community. As well there will be a consideration memo produced at the end of each round of consultation to explain how the input was used in the process and how it helped to shape the process. Judy, anything else you want to say on process?

C: Judy Kirk: No, but are there questions on that?

Q: John Appleby: I’m not getting much of a sense as to on where you would stand on enhanced infrastructure through the Lower Mainland on this. If we’re going to triple the growth of containers, statistics Canada will tell us that the population in this area is going to grow by roughly about a million over the same period. We’re going to have the same issue that we have right now where we have containers competing for space with buses. So we need to grow the infrastructure in the lower mainland. It’s not so much a matter of finding corridors for rail; it’s a question of using the rail that we have more efficiently. It’s a question of perhaps using the river, I’m thinking that the lower mainland actually starts in Chilliwack and that if we’re doing a transhipment issue then Chilliwack, Tacoma, Nanaimo and Squamish power the same water system and I don’t actually get a sense that that’s factored into the planning here.

C: Judy Kirk: If I could John, that’s a really good comment, as many of the others are. If you look at page 10, if everyone does, part of what Cliff is about to go over are some of the topics that the Port Metro Vancouver thinks that the people would be interested in. They’re not guessing on this because Deltaport is not that long ago. They did look at whether these would be some topics. What you have just talked about is something in addition to that.

C: John Appleby: Well it is and it’s the sort of thing that I see buried in related topics and I think it’s a little more important then that.
C: **Judy Kirk:** We hear you and we’ve marked it down. I encourage you to put it in your feedback form as well because it’s a very good comment.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** I think it’s important to note, we ran into this in the first session as well. We are here to hear what it is you want to talk about and what you want to make sure we are thinking about. Because of where the Pre-Consultation process lies in the overall development process we don’t actually have anything to talk about; we’re that early in the process. We are preparing those sorts of things, but we’re actually ahead of that.

C: **Tom Johnston:** I’d like to point out that it’s to be commended on taking this step forward so early in this process. I think it’s commendable that it’s happened now versus the 6 months before the start of the project. On the Environmental Assessment, my area of interest, I have researched the environment testing that was done for the first port and in my opinion it was seriously flawed. The stations up on top of the bluff and the station right down on First Nations, with the prevailing winds after living on the water there’s no way that measurements there could accurately reflect reality. And there are a lot of solid particles coming there. You can fish for crab out there and it’s questionable so I’m looking for soil samples, I’m looking for new station locations, ones that have been affected with contamination and I would like to be involved in that discussion.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Thank you Tom for articulating that.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** That’s good because that is really what this round of consultation is about, the very specific things that you want to know more about and want to make sure we’re looking at.

Q: **Robin Gardner:** As much as John had comments around the sort of regional impact, I guess my colleagues may have already said that one of our interests is in the general area of marine safety and the ever increasing marine traffic in this general nexus of the port, the ferries and recreational use. I think we need to give some very specific thought to the increasing risk that’s occurring for negative interaction between the marine resources. So for those of us representing the Lifeboat interest, which is a specific interest that we have, it’s not just our individual interest around the Lifeboat, but it is a broader question of marine safety.

Q: **Irene Forcier:** Looking at this list of topics that could be included they seem very sparse. I mean, this is a huge undertaking, albeit a ten year undertaking, but it’s going to have an impact on this particular community, it’s not just a Delta port, it’s for the world, but the impact is going to be solely set at the feet of people who live in Delta. What I’m getting at is what is this going to do for the community, because everyone can see where it’s going to negatively impact, whether it is infrastructure, roads, bridges etc. What is it exactly going to do for the community to help people continue to live in this quiet dead end community? It is dead end; I mean we’re ended with the ferries. We have the First Nations who are also in the throes of building huge buildings and shopping centres and what have you, and container facilities. It seems to me there should
be a little bit more emphasis on what it can do for the community. I know parks, buildings and what have you, but seems like small token amounts of whatever could happen. Is there any change there is going to be some educational facility built for marine, important projects that are coming up, or other buildings or anything like that, that could enhance and bring employment to people who are living in this community so they don’t have to go out on those highways that are going to be crammed with container trucks and the likes of that?

A: **Judy Kirk:** Irene, you have added some information with your examples that really bring that notion alive. What I was just writing in the note to myself was around a topic for discussion is that you’re suggesting that it would be a good thing to discuss what is going to be done for the community and that you would want to be consulted about benefits for the community. I’ve used that benefit word as a way to summarize because you talked about hospital, education, maybe marine and those kinds of things.

C: **Irene Forcier:** If you keep people happy about traffic for instance, maybe something to create employment within our community might be an advantage to keeping some people in the community that might otherwise have to move out. Or keep them off the roads in order to stop competing with the traffic that’s obviously going to occur.

Q: **Paula Hill:** Do you have any figures on what kind of job creation would be and how many households that might create. Of course I find that a lot of my clients that work either at Westshore Terminals or at Deltaport, generally like to be local and what kind of impact that might have on housing. I’ve looked at the TFN plan and they have some housing projects in there. Do you have any figures, even preliminary on how many jobs would be created on this?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** We don’t at this point, we are working to develop. I can give you something that you can use as guidelines. Existing container business in Vancouver on the long shore side, so that’s before it leaves the terminal, each TEU contributes around an hour of employment. So 2.4 million TEUs would deliver in the neighbourhood of 2.4 million hours of employment a year, plus the staff that’s involved in that. That would be just a starting point because there are obviously other jobs associated.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I think the other part of your question Paula, and then I’ll come to you John, was something about housing impacts. I want to check that you’re saying if there was quite an increase in local employment what would be the impact be on local housing.

Q: **Paula Hill:** Right. Or what could it be? It looks like there’s two sides to this with the TFN working on it. Of course they have years out, as well as this is, it looks like they would almost co-exist.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Is that a topic that would be of interest for you?

C: **Paula Hill:** Yes.

Q: **Eliza Olsen:** I appreciate the fact you talk about Environmental Assessments and things like that, I’m also very aware that sometimes you have to be very careful of some things that sound like a good environment mitigation actually is a
disaster. There are some things of concern here. The First Nations consultation, on the international table UN has declared that treaty is illegal and although UN has no power to enforce it does have the power to influence. I think that needs to be addressed because it gives a black mark to the Canadian government to be involved, or anybody else to be involved with a treaty that’s considered to be illegal. The UN has declared that the Tsawwassen treaty is illegal.

C:  
Unknown: Would you know any more details about that?

Q:  
Eliza Olsen: The person you need to discuss that with is Bertha Williams because she has gone on her own dime three times to the United Nations. It has to do with the process, the way that it was set up. I know it’s only been reported in the small blurbs in the local papers. But it is something on international level gives Canada a black eye. Anyone who works with consultation with the First Nations should be aware of that and how you deal with it is going to be up to you. But you should be aware that it has been deemed illegal and that gives Canada a black eye. The other thing is the Environmental Assessment and jobs. I think we had better discuss what kind of jobs we are going to get? An example of that is technical report number sixteen, page thirty-nine, I have it memorized, they do talk about increased employment in the health sector, due to increased respiratory and cancer illnesses caused by the road. We are going to talk about, are we going to increase our hospital because we are going to have more health problems, cancer related, etc. It’s unfortunate that all of these things cannot be looked at in a more global perspective, because whatever happens here, even with the best of intentions is going to have an impact elsewhere. I’m curious why Prince Rupert hasn’t got the permits? They are pleading for this. You don’t have control of that; you may have the power to influence. If they want it and people here don’t want it, and we are in a very enclosed area here, somebody said this impacts people right up to Chilliwack. Again, because of the air shed we also have the problem of the loss of farmland. If you talk to Harold Steeves we should be adding something like 500,000 acres back into the ALR and not taking it out and this will have an impact. How are we going to do it? There may be creative ways we haven’t thought of. At one time I was embarrassed to call myself an environmentalist, not quite proud of it, I am aware of green washing and I am very aware of being cautious of jumping on any green wagon because sometimes that green wagon is not as green as it looks. So we have to look at everything from many angles. I think a classic example of that are those nice whirly gates that we are now using for lights. People are now concerned about them because of the mercury involved. I don’t know how the do the LEDs, whether it’s better or not, but we have to be sometimes careful with what we wish for.

C:  
Judy Kirk: Thanks, Eliza.

C:  
John Appleby: Again, it’s an issue of scale. It’s sometimes not readily appreciated we think, but then we’re the Chamber of Commerce. The Tilbury and Annacis Industrial Parks are the two largest in the country. The capacity increase of the Tilbury Park or Tilbury area is approximately some 500 acres with probably a lot more to be obtained through infill. There is a lot of
concentration of employment that will occur in that area, with probably a similar thing happening in Annacis. When we talk about Vanterm and Centerm and to a certain extent Lynnterm, when you start to move a thousand foot container vessel around in the Port of Vancouver, all of a sudden the Port of Vancouver becomes real small. The likelihood is that if ships are going to be larger than 1,000 feet I don’t suppose that the Georgia Straight is going to be much smaller either. So the issue of how do you handle this increase in volume? I do appreciate that you’re starting this process now but the decisions you do make almost immediately are going to be the ones that govern the situation in 2030.

Q: *Lloyd Sim*: My question has nothing to do with the content of this; it’s to do with the different stages. I know that there’s a T2 committee coming on stream, made up of a number of organizations. Where does all this fit in with the next step?

A: *Judy Kirk*: I think I’ll ask Sarah to answer that, but the committee you are referring to is the Delta Community Committee that Naomi from the Port.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: PCLC

A: *Judy Kirk*: What does PCLC stand for?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Port Community Liaison Committee.

A: *Judy Kirk*: We are going to have a meeting like this with them and they will be involved as a stakeholder group along the way because they are set up, as I understand it Sarah correct me if I’m wrong, to deal with many issues not just this proposed project.

Q: *Lloyd Sim*: Are the results, as you call our questions and concerns, moved up to that committee?

A: *Judy Kirk*: All of the input, the notes that are being done today, and the Consultation Summary Report that will be done, including comments from the Port Liaison Committee you just heard referenced will be summarized and given to the Port. Ultimately the Board of Directors is the responsibility authority to make the decisions.

C: *Vicki Huntington*: Thank you. I’d just like to go through a list of things I would like to see as this process develops. On Page 9, you talked about First Nations consultation. In my experience the First Nations is better and more productive than communities that are not First Nations. I would like to see that last sentence, seek ways to avoid, mitigate, or accommodate adverse impacts, and identify potential opportunities for collaborative and beneficial working arrangements. I would also like to see that become a part of how you treat Delta. It’s something that is a problem province wide, I think we should be treated with no less respect and obligation. I agree very much with Tom Johnston about soil samples and air pollution stations and all of those things we need to understand as DP3 becomes far busier. We haven’t seen how busy that berth can be yet because it came online at the same time as the recession. I would like to see within studies a greater interest in light pollution issues, and I am really disappointed in the way the Port Metro Vancouver followed through
on light pollution issues for the Third Berth development, that may be a part of the Environmental Assessment, but I’d just like to comment that I thought that was very poorly handled by the Port. You mentioned through here attending an open house in your community, Delta hates open houses; they are nothing but manipulative opportunities to tell us what we’re getting and see it nicely on pictures. Please, if you’re going to have an open house, follow it up that evening with a public question and answer process where everyone can hear. If you don’t do that you’re not going to have any credibility in the communities you go forward in.

C: Judy Kirk: That’s exactly the kind of thing we want to hear.

C: Vicki Huntington: I want to see as you go along, full and transparent access to all of the studies and background data. Environmentally, people will say they are up on the website for the EAO process, but we’re not seeing seismic studies that are going on right now. There’s data that’s going to be undertaken in the consultation phase we’re not necessarily going to have access too. If you want credibility I think we need access to those things as they develop and even input into those initial studies as they’re being undertaken. The same goes with your transportation studies and your cost benefit analyses. Let us know what you are basing your projections on. Some of it will be proprietary; I understand that, but that which isn’t ought to be made available to all of the stakeholders who want to be involved. I’d like to see feedback, very specific feedback on where the consultation input is being used and managed or why it isn’t being accepted and why it isn’t being part of the process. I also believe ultimately, that the Detailed Design Planning Stage which always comes after the Environmental Assessment Stage should be part of the risk assessment; or at least be subject to a further review by the EAO as the detailed designs unfold. Because we’re seeing it with SFPR, the Detailed Designs are having major impacts and major changes and hasn’t had the benefit of the assessment process in the beginning.

C: Judy Kirk: There’s not monitoring of that either Vicki?

C: Vicki Huntington: No. Well some of it, when the table of mitigation or the table of commitments has interfered with, then they have to go back to the EAO.

C: Judy Kirk: But that’s in relation to the previous iteration. It’s actually the first time I’ve heard that notion around the Detailed Design.

C: Vicki Huntington: But if it wasn’t in the table of commitments and big changes are made like hectares on the fringe of the bog are being mowed down. That wasn’t part of the assessment and it should be. Last thing I would like to say is that I would like to see in this process an absolutely full and open discussion of the backup needs of the Port. What other Industrial Land needs are going to be required? Where are they going to be required? Does the Port anticipate ALR lands taken up? This discussion about foreign trade zones, what does that mean and how do they unfold? Does the Port anticipate that? Certainly Gateway studies anticipate it. We shouldn’t as a community, have to find out piece meal all of these things that really ought to be part of the assessment.

Q: Tom Johnston: I’d just like to ask Vicki, do you know anything about First Nations Agreement? I know it’s not a topic, but it’s important.
C: Vicki Huntington: It’s an internal dispute between bands on traditional territories, other times between band members and councils who engage. I don’t know specifics and it’s not something that as a community we can get involved in.

C: Tom Johnston: No I didn’t think so. Thank you.

Q: Anita Den Dikken: I’d like to return to the issue of agriculture, also the Pacific Flyway which no one has mentioned. Let me address agriculture first. With climate change, it’s speculated that our traditional sources of imported foods may be drying up, and we have to look at how climate change has impacted produce from California, Mexico and so forth. We’ve got the best agricultural land in the Province and in the Lower Mainland here. This delta is all part of it and so was Richmond. We need to ensure that we have adequate resources in terms of land, air and water to support ourselves because we’re probably going to have to do that increasingly in the future. So when farm land is being gobbled up for industrial uses I’m really alarmed. The second thing is that the Pacific Flyway is the route that migratory birds take when they are coming from the north and going south. As you probably are well aware we have record numbers of migratory birds here in Delta. There are bird counts done every year I think on Boxing Day. We are the highest area or second highest area in the country for a number of different species. We need to develop more of an ecotourism industry, which I really don’t see happening and it should be happening here because at certain times of the year we have the resources. I think that if this project goes ahead in the future, before it goes ahead there needs to be an assessment, about how additional port facilities are going to impact the birds. I won’t get into it any further than this; it is an important consideration for future economic benefits.

C: Judy Kirk: Cliff can I ask you to move to page 11/12 and discuss consultation methods.

C: Cliff Stewart: Okay, moving on to page 12 then, and we’ve heard Vicki express a view on a particular consultation method. The objective is to understand and broadly what people feel about the specific methods that are listed here. But more particularly if there are other methods that you feel would be appropriate, that you could list those methods as well. It does tend to be community specific and I think it also tends to be demographic specific. I speak as the father of a five year old daughter; we’re far more interested in consultation opportunities that don’t require us to hire a babysitter to go and be involved. There are different types of consultation process that suit different people in different places and different times in their lives. The objective here is to try and understand to the greatest extent possible how can we craft a program to craft a program that gives everyone a chance to be heard in the way that they want to be heard.
C: Judy Kirk: If I could add a little something there, that the Port Metro Vancouver is looking seriously at 8-10 methods of consultation. In other words the kind of meeting that Vicki was referring to with question and answer sessions where there are microphones and people can come up, talk and provide a comment with their fellow residents and be heard by one another. In addition to this kind of meeting also, online feedback forms, some people are now increasingly asking for other online methods such as webinars and things that give them options. Really what we are asking here for is there are a particular range of consultation methods that you like better? Or if you don’t see it listed here that you would add? I can tell you having done consultation practice for now almost twenty eight years it has changed a lot in that time period. I think that we need to make sure we provide a whole range of options. We are interested in seeing what you would like to do.

C: Anita Den Dikken: I like these face-to-face meetings where we get a chance to hear various viewpoints. Not only hearing, but seeing. Body language can tell a lot.

C: Judy Kirk: I agree. There’s no desire to limit any face-to-face. In fact, people say over and over again that face-to-face is one of the preferred methods. Really what we’re after is, are there any other methods that you’re interested in, in addition to the face-to-face.

C: Robin Gardner: I think one of the things that Vicki touched on was credibility and trust. It’s important there be understanding for all the parties of what consultation actually means. Historically it is often meant that the proponent of the project tells you what is going to happen rather then it be a truly participatory venture where the community is actually able to influence the outcomes. I think anything that can help, particularly in Delta where the impacts are very significant. The socio economic impacts are significant both plus and minus. So any mechanism you can come up with that assures people of the contribution that they make can influence the outcome.

Q: Ian Robertson: I wonder whether or not it’s a foregone conclusion the Port is going to expand come hell or high water. Or whether or not the Port wants to find out what the reaction within the community about whether or not this expansion should take place in South Delta? That’s a question for you. If you’re serious about that question then you would submit yourself to a process which you’re not used to doing. Which would be somewhat akin to a public hearing process where you present your case and the population would be prepared to present their case for and against it and the debate would ensue from that point. You might find that expansion for the Port is strongly supported in the community; you might find that it’s not supported by the community. The rounds that we have experienced in the last five years with regard to the Port have in my view been a sham. The Port has come in and said we’re going to come in here and do this and we just want to hear from you as we go along the way. The second question I have, it’s really more of a comment is on page 6 of
your report and I apologize for being late. There wasn’t much that I had to go on for what this was all about. This graph, simplistic as it is, as it shows how the growth is going to go on doesn’t seem to speak at all about the impact of the Panama Canal. From my understanding of the Panama Canal, once that is opened any goods that are coming through this port that are heading to the East Coast of the US or Canada can make it to the East Coast of US or Canada more cheaply by going through the Panama Canal, which then reduces the impact. As we talked about a tripling and quadrupling of this I don’t have the economics behind me, but at what point have we imported more than 100% of what we need. This game doesn’t go on forever. It has a maximum at which point there’s some kind of response going on and I’m not even going to get into the economics of South Asian countries or anything like that. The rationale that is used to support the obvious thing which is the expansion of the Port seems to me in some ways to be very simplistic.

C: Judy Kirk: So let me take the first question because I think there were several there. I think I heard three, so I’m going to summarize them and ask Cliff to take them one at a time. The first one, it’s not exactly in the order but you should answer the one about the Panama Canal and what that would do to demand in the forecast?

Q: Ian Robertson: In the ten year period once it’s over.

C: Judy Kirk: I think your second one had to do with, is the Port prepared ask...

Q: Ian Robertson: Submit its proposal to the community and find out if there is support for it.

C: Judy Kirk: Right. In other words should it proceed or not proceed is the question that you’re after.

Q: Ian Robertson: It paints the question of who’s in charge? Does the Port have the right to do it notwithstanding what the community wants.

C: Judy Kirk: I think the third one had to do more with, I’m not sure if I’ve got this right and that’s why I want to check it. You were talking about how much you can import? It’s more of a materialism question. Was it?

Q: Ian Robertson: When do we reach a capacity of importation where you can’t run the straight line of expansion for the next ten years?

C: Judy Kirk: Right. So in that order Cliff.

A: Cliff Stewart: So let me talk first about the Panama Canal. There’s no question that the Panama Canal changes the line, and there isn’t a technical term for it, it’s like a topographic line around the continent. Changes to the line for which goods going inland it makes more sense to travel through the canal and to the East Coast then it does to come off of the West Coast and get on a trail and go. But it doesn’t change it enough to impact where 95% of the stuff coming from the Port of Vancouver goes which is Toronto and Montreal. Once you have to get on the railroad anyway and you start balancing the economics of traveling through the Panama Canal, around the other side and then getting on a railroad. All of the reports that we’ve seen say that it’s not going to affect Chicago which is where the bulk of the relatively small amounts of cargo going to the United States going to. It is not going to affect Toronto and Montreal. That’s what we’ve seen. The economics won’t be there. Certainly if you were living in
Houston, Savannah, Atlanta, yes it makes a big difference. Probably might make a difference if you are living in Halifax, but it would probably be cheaper if you were to come the other way and through the Suez Canal, if you’re going to Halifax. There is very little cargo that actually goes to the East Coast, when you think about Canadian geography that actually goes to the centre of the country. So that’s the Panama Canal question. The beauty of this process and you missed this conversation; it’s a 10 year process in order to actually deliver this facility. The Panama Canal opens at the end of 2014. So we will actually have some real data before we get the point of actually proceeding or not proceeding with the project. So we’ll be able to understand. We’ll have a lot more data about this forecast line. Although it looks like a relatively simplistic line, it’s based on a very complicated economic analysis of where the growth is coming from. That was the first question, the second question was...

C: Judy Kirk: The second question was would Port Metro Vancouver submit to a question to the community of to proceed or not proceed. I’m not sure frankly, if Cliff can answer...

A: Cliff Stewart: I couldn’t answer that. That would be a Board of Directors question. It might even be a Federal Government question because it has a lot of constitutional overtones to it.

C: Judy Kirk: In any case, it’s here and you’re not the first one to ask that. I think it was also, either Tom or Lloyd, who asked that. It was asked earlier in a session as well, in a slightly different way, but essentially the same question.

A: Cliff Stewart: But in a slightly different part of the question I heard asked earlier was part question, part statement. Is the port going to do this come hell or high water? This project has a number of hurdles, both internal and external that it has to clear. One of which is the Environmental Assessment process. That is an independent process, at least at the Federal level, and possibly the Federal and Provincial levels. So to say that the project is going to come hell or high water, no, it’s not going to come hell or high water. It’s going to come if it makes economic sense and if it is able to clear the Environmental Assessment process. Remember, the Environmental piece, looks at not only environment in the sense of the green environment, but it also looks at the socio-economic environment. So in order for this project to be approved all of this stuff has to be proven beyond a balance of probabilities to an Environmental Assessment Panel. At least we assume it’ll be an Environmental Assessment Panel.

C: Eliza Olsen: I would like to reinforce what Ian has said. As far as the Environmental Assessment is concerned, there’s a little more faith in the Federal. I think most people around this table are rather jaded about Provincial Environmental Assessments. It’s really going to have to be a good one for anybody to have any faith in it.

Q: Tom Johnston: Just to bring Ian up-to-date around the discussion about Prince Rupert before him coming in there were a few questions about that. The inevitability is of some concern around this table, is it necessary? I think that sums up a lot of the discussion.
C:  *Judy Kirk:* Ian, it was Tom’s question around the question of whether it should proceed or not. It was in relation to Prince Rupert that he asked that. Are there any questions or comments about how you want to be consulted to what Vicki offered earlier? Also what Anita said about face-to-face?

Q:  *Robin Gardner:* Judy I have one comment and I apologize for being a late arrive. Was there discussion about the what?

C:  *Judy Kirk:* Yes

Q:  *Robin Gardner:* So there was clarity about what the actual project is?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* No.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* About what the actual project is?

Q:  *Robin Gardner:* Not the process, but the project. What actually is embraced by the words Terminal 2.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Well, Terminal 2. What we said was.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* Yes there was a brief explanation.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, it is a multi-berth of capacity probably greater than 2 million TEUs.

Q:  *Robin Gardner:* On the north side of the coal terminal?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* We have not yet spoken to that. That comes with part of the Project Definition Consultation.

Q:  *Robin Gardner:* When would that appear? I think one of things that maybe this table is prepared to be more esoteric about the project is that as soon as the public is interested they are going to want to know what the hell is this.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* Absolutely, and certainly what I have said and what the firm has said to the Port is, as soon as you know what the key elements of this project are, we need to come out and talk to people about the definition of the project. On page 8, Project Definition Consultation is the very next phase. After Pre-Consultation it is the very first phase and the Port is thinking they will be ready to do that in the fall. Exactly when in the fall it hasn’t been determined because they haven’t got their project definition, the key themes of the project, nailed down yet.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* However, and I don’t want to create panic where panic doesn’t need to be created here so Judy kick me under the table but while I can’t tell you that the project is specifically, and you used the word north, everyone I’ve talked to about Deltaport has a different interpretation of where north is. On the upside, choices of where the upside or down side, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans has stated in writing that a terminal on the Deltaport side by the causeway would not be permitable. That’s just information and make up what you will.

Q:  *Vicki Huntington:* Can I just clarify, Cliff, your comments around open house. If looking for how we want to be consulted then are you prepared to add to the list an open house/public meeting combination?

A:  *Judy Kirk:* Yes, absolutely. I can answer that for Cliff. Because if people want to do that, it is a very reasonable format in any case, Vicki.

C:  *Vicki Huntington:* That would go a long way.
A: **Judy Kirk:** Because here is the thing, Vicky. For everyone here, the best open houses that I have seen undertaken, it doesn’t matter on whether it's policy, planning or infrastructure have been those that allow people to look at some information that might not be nearly as informed as you are or others, and then to have a Q & A session. Those are usually the best. If you go right into Q&A, people who are not as informed and involved as you are don’t have any basis of information at all or an opportunity to talk. So there will be some combination.

C: **Vicki Huntington:** The combination is just great. That’s fine as long as you have the second component of it.

C: **Judy Kirk:** You know what, mea culpa on that, we should have probably indicated that.

Q: **Ian Robertson:** I’d like to make a suggestion. Fifteen years ago when I was involved in details of and some around the table may recall, as the conflagration around cement plant and burning of materials for energy resources. When I first got involved with that there was an awful lot of anxiety in this community. I’m not going to take credit but two and a half years later we had difficulty getting the photographer for the paper to come out to the final meeting as we announced in a twenty page report. In addition to that twenty page report final report there was over three hundred documents which were indexed, cross indexed and then filed at the Ladner Public Library and it was kept on the shelves at the public library for some five years after until it was gathering dust. So my thought for you would be going forward if it’s possible you may do yourself a great service to make sure that everything you do, and in this case what was included in that were in minutes of every meeting we had, in making that available. Electronically is obviously the preferred method now if you can access it but hard copy in a library or more than one library would also be suggested. If you do this on a going forward basis it’s the cost of incremental printing. You do it after the fact and you have to hire somebody to go through the indexes. It would be my suggestion that keeping it very visible and transparent would be one of the ways to do it.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Thank you for that. I think before you got here too Ian, and I won’t repeat much else, there was also requests for as much information as possible. Things like study outlines and the studies themselves, results and those kinds of things to be made available and technical work.

A: **Ian Robertson:** The last study had the binders after the fact, there’s no cross-indexing so welcome to the three hour job of doing something to finding the document you’re after.

Q: **Judy Kirk:** Any other comments on topics or methods of consultation? Yes John and then what I’m going to ask people to do if you don’t mind is to fill out the feedback form and then we’ll leave about five minutes or so for any remaining questions you might have.

C: **John Appleby:** One of the things you might give some thought to, and it might have fallen on something Ian might have said is the legitimacy and the
documentation of backup studies. As a case in point one of the issues we’re having with the Provincial Government of the traffic studies they made of the South Fraser Perimeter Road is that we have a real problem with the base of studies because they haven’t actually clearly stated what they are. It looks very much as if someone picked a set of figures that were generated in 1988 and added to them using some figures of approximating a growth of population or something like that. Where in actual fact something different has happened in that area so we think their figures are wrong. So we’re both wasting a lot of time as we’re trying to work out just exactly where we are on that. If you document your figures it will save greatly with time.

C: **Vicki Huntington:** Judy, can I just add on number one where you’re listing the different components and topics. Wildlife and habitats, water quality and marine species – one of the problems Delta in particular has is the only legislation requiring certain behaviour of a proponent is the *Fisheries Act*. And yet in Delta, what we basically support is the Migratory Bird Flyway and yet there’s no legislation that requires the Port to do anything about it. It would be really nice to see the Port take a very proactive role in understanding that the Migratory Bird Flyway is in danger here. It’s in danger because of the Port activity. I don’t feel that going forward that the Port should take the normal position and hid behind the *Fisheries Act* which is what happened with the Third Berth.

C: **Judy Kirk:** That was mentioned in a previous meeting too, Vicki. Not in the way in which you just articulated it but Cliff you remember someone said that they felt that the fisheries were adequately studied, but the migratory birds were not.

C: **Vicki Huntington:** Because there’s not legislation requiring the Port to do anything about it.

Q: **Tom Johnston:** Can I ask some of the politicians present, what is the legal position regarding the local authority for example, having a referendum on this? Anyone?

A: **Vicki Huntington:** You could have a referendum but it wouldn’t be binding. It is a Federal project which means that it can go forward regardless.

C: **Clint Morgan:** I was going to say rightfully so, that’s a remark I was going to say earlier on. I’ve lived in Delta many years, I’ve worked in Delta. But we need to realize this is a national interest, this is not about Delta, this about Canada. So what rights have we got to prevent a project that is so important to the whole country, from happening?

C: **Vicki Huntington:** You know something, Clint, we’re getting into this argument. There’s also a moral issue and I remember when Les Little said to me, Vicki, you’ve got to balance the economy and the environment. Yes we do, but Delta is all that’s left of the Migratory Bird Flyway. Delta is it, and we are the balance. That’s why I think you see so much concern about how this project proceeds. All of us know it’s in the national interest but we have a moral obligation not only
to do it right, but to consider whether it can be done and still maintain the Flyway and that’s the issue that’s in front of us.

C: Clint Morgan: I guess that’s the choice between birds and Canada as a whole.

C: Vicki Huntington: Is that a choice? I mean is that really a choice?

C: Clint Morgan: I mean those containers need to come in somewhere on the West Coast. If it’s not Delta, if it’s not Prince Rupert then where else?

C: Eliza Olsen: Prince Rupert wants it and if not good for us it’s not good for the rest of Canada. If we need bailing out for whatever reason it’s going to be the rest of Canada that’s going to have to pay it. So we’ve got to make sure good for everyone.

C: Judy Kirk: It’s a very serious conversation. What I would appreciate is if you would fill out feedback form with consideration of what you heard and what you are thinking about how you want to be consulted and about what. You’ll notice that at the very end, which we always recommend and I’m glad they took our advice on it, on page 14, there is space for any additional comments you might have. In other words please do not be constrained by either this conversation or the topics that are in here. If there’s anything and any additional points that you would like to make please do make them. I’d very much appreciate if you would fill this out now. As I said earlier if you would prefer to take it home or fill it out online that’s quite fine.

The meeting ended at 3:30pm.
Notes from a Pre-Consultation multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, June 15, 2011, 10:00am – 12:00 pm, at Newlands Golf and Country Club, Langley, B.C.

**Stakeholders:**
- Nan Ames, BBCC / WRSN
- Denni Bonetti, Chamber of Commerce & Bonetti Meats
- Rick Green, Mayor Township of Langley
- Peter Holt, Valtac
- Ed Kolla, ISL Engineering & Langley Chamber of Commerce
- Lee Lockwood, Valtac
- Roy Mufford, Valtac
- Nathan Pachal, City of Langley
- Rudy Storteboom, City of Langley
- Lynn Whitehouse, Greater Langley Chamber of Commerce

**Port Metro Vancouver:**
- Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
- Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development
- Sarah McPherson, Senior Advisor, Communications and First Nations
- Michelle Lachmann, Environmental Lead, Container Capacity Improvement Program
- Dallas Henault, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

---

**The record notes that the meeting commenced at 10:00 am**

### KEY THEMES:
- Participants said that the consultation process for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project needs to include consideration of rail corridor issues through Langley. There was concern expressed that the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project would increase the number of rail trips through the community, disrupting community connections and quality of life.
- Participants said that they would like Port Metro Vancouver to conduct open houses with a public meeting or question and answer component, not just an open house format.
- Participants said they would like Port Metro Vancouver to ensure there is educational information available to the public so that they can be informed participants in the process as it proceeds through multiple stages over multiple years.
- Participants requested that Port Metro Vancouver encourage representatives of railways, TransLink, Metro Vancouver, Transport Canada and others to participate in
the consultation process and encourage a more integrated planning process for regional transportation planning, including road and rail goods movement.

- Participants expressed a desire for Port Metro Vancouver to include options for consideration, as much as possible, as part of the consultation process for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants expressed appreciation that Port Metro Vancouver is conducting pre-consultation and noted that it is refreshing to see the Port asking stakeholder how they want to be consulted and about what topics.

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

   *Roundtable introductions were undertaken.*

   **C:** *Judy Kirk:* Thank you all for coming today. Let me tell you a little bit about the consultation process. This is the third stakeholder meeting of seven that Port Metro Vancouver will be holding in this very early round of Pre-Consultation of the Proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. There are just a couple of things before I ask Cliff Stewart to introduce himself and some of the other Port people who are here with us. I’d like to ask people to put their phones on vibrate or turn them off or something that doesn’t disrupt the meeting. I appreciate you putting your name on the tent cards so I can see them. We will be keeping notes and my colleague Dallas Henault will be keeping notes which will form part of the consultation record.

   Kirk & Co., which is an independent firm that specializes in consultation, is doing this for the Port. We will use the notes; together with all the notes to provide a consultation summary report. We are doing a small group meeting like this so that there are lots of opportunities for you to ask questions of the Port representatives here of which there are three. You can also provide comments. The purpose of Pre-Consultation is to find out from you and others, around the region in terms of the communities we are going to, Delta, Surrey, Langley, Richmond and Vancouver to find out how you would like to be consulted and about what. This discussion guide summarizes the introduction to the Proposed Terminal 2 Project and Cliff will talk about that in a little bit. Some initial topics that the Port thinks people may want to talk about, but then you will find that what we are seeking from you by way of feedback form and today’s meeting are your suggestions for how you want to be consulted and about what. So we’d appreciate your feedback forms today because we find that if we don’t get them on the day of the meetings we don’t get them back, or we get back fewer. That said everything is on the web, there’s an online feedback form in you feel you want to think about it longer and do it online and send it to us that’s fine too.

   Any questions so far? I wonder if I can ask Cliff to introduce himself and continued with Sarah and Michelle.
C: **Cliff Stewart:** My name is Cliff Stewart and I am the Director of Infrastructure Development for Port Metro Vancouver and my primary responsibility is the Container Capacity Improvement Program which Terminal 2 is a part of.

C: **Sarah McPherson:** I’m Sarah McPherson, I work with Port Metro Vancouver on the Communications and Consultation program for the Container Capacity Improvement Program.

C: **Michelle Lachmann:** My name is Michelle Lachmann and I am the environmental representative for the Port’s Container Capacity Improvement Program.

C: **Judy Kirk:** So why don’t we continue along Ed and introduce themselves very briefly and we can get started.

C: **Ed Kolla:** I’m Ed Kolla and I run a business here in Langley and been I’ve also been involved in the Chamber of Commerce.

C: **Nathan Pachal:** I’m Nathan Pachal, City of Langley Parks and Environment Advisory Committee.

C: **Lynn Whitehouse:** Lynn Whitehouse, Greater Langley Chamber of Commerce.

C: **Denni Bonetti:** Business owner in Langley and incoming President for the Chamber of Commerce.

C: **Nan Ames:** Boundary Bay Conservation Committee and WRSNA.

C: **Lee Lockwood:** Lee Lockwood, Valtac.

C: **Judy Kirk:** What is Valtac?

C: **Lee Lockwood:** It’s a group of citizens who are concerned about the lousy transportation plan being done in the Lower Mainland.

C: **Roy Mufford:** Roy Mufford, I’m a director for Valtac as well.

C: **Rick Green:** Rick Green, Mayor of the Township of Langley.

C: **Peter Holt:** Peter Holt, I’m also a member of Valtac, and also quite heavily involved in the Chamber of Commerce and the Vancouver Board of Trade’s Regional Transportation Task Force as well.

C: **Rudy Storteboom:** I’m Rudy Storteboom, I’m a Councilor with City of Langley

C: **Judy Kirk:** Sometimes these meetings feel more formal than we actually want them to be. The intention of having a small meeting is that if at any time over the next two hours you have a comment or question, please let me know and we can get any feedback, questions or comments that you have.

C: **Rick Green:** Well I can only speak from my side, I want there to be a significant amount of opportunity for input from our side. We appreciate this and we want to hear the outline, hear what is proposed and we’ve read the material.

C: **Judy Kirk:** What I’d like to suggest is Cliff why don’t you introduce with page 2, actually staring with what’s the Port of Vancouver and give a little bit of background on the Proposed Terminal 2 Project.
2. **Presentation of Pre-Consultation Discussion Guide and Feedback Form – Cliff Stewart**

   **C:** *Cliff Stewart:* Port Metro Vancouver was formed in 2008 by the merger of the three Lower Mainland Port Authorities the Fraser River Port Authority, Vancouver Port Authority and the North Fraser Port Authority. It is the largest port in Canada. It is the largest, most diversified Port on the West Coast of North America and it’s the largest export port on the West Coast of North America. Our mandate is to support the growth of Canadian trade and essentially that is what we will talk about today. Why is trade important and what has Terminal 2 got to do with it?

   **C:** *Judy Kirk:* You know I’d explain a little bit about Terminal 2 as well.

   **C:** *Cliff Stewart:* If you move on to page 6 in the guide, although it looks like a simple straight line graph, in fact it’s the result of a detailed examination of expected trade pattern changes over the next twenty years based on population and per capita growth in Canada and also with our trading partners in Asia. The population, as you often know, the container business in Vancouver is much a two way business we export nearly as many containers loaded as we import loaded. What this talks about in simple terms is that over the next twenty years, based on those demographic and economic fundamentals we expect to see growth of around 5% a year. Result of that is that by the middle of this decade, there will be a gap in available container capacity on the West Coast and by the end of this decade there will be a significant gap in container capacity. The Container Capacity Improvement Program is Port Metro Vancouver’s initiative to ensure that gap is filled before the demand is realized. In the short term that’s going to involve road and rail changes to help realize additional capacity at existing facilities, primarily at Roberts Bank and also the lower mainland. Later on in the decade, in the twenties the provision of Terminal 2, a whole new multi-berth terminal at Roberts Bank. The objective is that we will be able to provide more than 2 million TEUs of new capacity by then. It’s important to understand that we are starting this process today because it would take about ten years from the time we start these conversations until there’s that facility in place with that equipment on it. Some of the questions that we have had asked of us are, why isn’t this capacity being built in Prince Rupert? In the event that the new capacity is built in Prince Rupert that will give us the ability to slow down our delivery of Terminal 2. It is important to understand that it simply becomes a question of when, not if, we need that capacity. Again, just to reiterate, if we’re right about 2020 we are on a critical path today with ten years today. If we don’t need it in 2020 we can always slow the process or halt the process temporarily at any stage along that ten year path. If we wait five years for someone else to take care of the problem and they don’t then we will have lost that five years and there’s no room to make it up.

   **Q:** *Nathan Pachal:* So just for clarity then, you propose that you can slow down the process if there’s economic changes in the forecasts but to say that you would
actually be breaking ground in 2020 is that going along as you predict? Is that incorrect? Building it now?

A: Cliff Stewart: The terminal would be built in 2020.

Q: Nathan Pachal: So you would be building it now?

A: Cliff Stewart: No, we expect the permitting approval process will take about six to seven years.

Q: Nathan Pachal: So you’d be building it in 2018?

A: Cliff Stewart: 2017. That is based on a very thorough evaluation. First of all I should say we expect that this will be a panel Environmental Assessment process. That would be what the port will request, the ultimate decision on that is the decision of federal Minister of the Environment in Ottawa and potentially the Provincial Minister of the Environment in Victoria. We would request and would expect it will be a panel process. In reviewing panel processes in Western Canada over the last several decades the average length of time that these processes take we have come up with an expectation of six to seven years from now through the point where construction could begin.

As I mentioned the program is multi fold. Part of it is to achieve better utilization of existing facilities and achieve additional capacity growth there. There are several programs that have already taken place, both Vanterm and Centerm improvements have their capacities increased by almost 100% as a result of projects in the middle of the last decade. In 2010 the Third Berth Deltaport opened with capacity at that berth unlocked and has mostly been used. There were 1.5 million TEUs of containers moved through Deltaport last year, with a capacity of about 1.8 million TEUs today. And we’re looking to increase the capacity there.

Q: Lee Lockwood: Did you say that Vanterm and Centerm will be left in tact? I mean I look at as being fabulous real estate to be tied up in the terminal business, when that can be farmed out to the Surrey docks or Roberts Bank. I look at Gregor Robertson, I look at that saying that is a multi-billion dollar piece of real estate that isn’t being used for its highest levels.

A: Cliff Stewart: The Port’s perspective on that is that those terminals would remain in the container business.

Q: Lee Lockwood: Really?

A: Cliff Stewart: In fact, the final phase of this program sees us reconfiguring the harbour in the mid-twenties (2020s). Looking to increase capacity there so we won’t see those terminals get apprehended.

C: Judy Kirk: Lee, if I could add, and Rick you might know from your experience on the regional district, at Metro Vancouver where I used to be on the executive, if you look at their most recent plan and even the regional strategy, which is the one you raised before they were looking pretty seriously at preserving industrial land and not converting it to either commercial or residential. This plan, which is running into some roadblocks as we speak but the current one looks at that
even more strongly. Does that square with what you’ve been doing at the region, Rick?

C:  

Rick Green: We have got a regional growth strategy and we have a planning meeting tomorrow. There are a number of significant pressures, and I’ll get into some of that, in terms of industrial land, developing regional growth strategy. How can we get into protecting the areas we need to protect? That’s why we are a little off base with Coquitlam right now. Some of the language that is being used within the region they see it as an affront to a municipality’s rights. Yet we are all trying to find that balance.

C:  

Judy Kirk: A little on the proposed project and I think we should move on to what people want to be consulted on and how.

C:  

Cliff Stewart: Somebody once said there’s nothing new under the sun. This is an example of the Terminal 2 project building on work that was done in the late 90s. We are talking today about the consultation process itself, we look at the next phase on Project Definition Consultation and at that point we will be talking about location and specifically where it is that Terminal 2 will be, but we haven’t really invented anything.

Q:  

Rick Green: If I may, on the timing of consultation, you’re going through the Pre-Consultation time. What is the time frame in terms of consultation?

A:  

Judy Kirk: If I can get you to turn to page 8 it outlines seven rounds of consultation, and it is over about six maybe seven years Rick. The reason we can’t say for sure how many years it’ll be is because the federal and provincial regulators are going to determine whether we’ve made the right assumption, which is that there will be two regulated processes, or there might be three or even four. In other words they do public comment periods, hearings and we’ve assumed two of those.

Q:  

Rick Green: So it’s talking about the six year time frame, and all the things in that six year time frame. The next step from this?

A:  

Judy Kirk: The next step from this is Project Definition Consultation and that’s the second box in.

Q:  

Rick Green: What would be the timing for that?

A:  

Judy Kirk: We’re thinking the fall. Now the technical work has to happen first. If the technical work hasn’t happened it’ll be pushed off a bit. But we’re thinking the fall and it would be about a month to six weeks, which is a pretty healthy length of consultation. It would include many methods of consultation, in other words online, feedback forms, small group meetings like this around the region probably in the range of fifteen or twenty meetings; we’d probably do an open house in every community, by every community I mean the Port communities.

C:  

Rick Green: I want to get into that.

A:  

Judy Kirk: That is the kind of feedback we are looking for. We want to know how you want to be consulted and recognizing that everyone in this room, with few exceptions, is of an age that is not as comfortable with online stuff as face-to-
face. What we are looking for a mix because people are telling us they want a whole variety of things.

C:  

Cliff Stewart: Are there any questions at this point?

Q:  

Nathan Pachal: How much work been done up to this point or is this a Pre-Consultation that will define what you will be writing and submitting for the Environmental Assessment. As in do you already have a stick document with what you want to see and what you want to do to the port expansion and you’ve done some preliminary work and you’ll be submitting based on this feedback?

A:  

Judy Kirk: I’m going to answer that in two ways. As to the consultation, this Pre-Consultation right now – most organizations don’t do Pre-Consultation. We recommend it all the time, not very many organizations do it. Why? Because it takes time and costs money etc. This is as you can see, before any of the process starts. There hasn’t been any submission to regulators yet, there’s been no outline of studies done. This is the very beginning. My firm is going to write out a report based on this feedback and the input into the process, by process I mean the consultation process, and the topics people want to discuss will inform the next stages of consultation. For example, in the last couple of meetings people have said, in the Delta area, that there’s been nothing, in their view, on migratory birds. There is a topic, that isn’t listed in this guide that certainly I hadn’t thought about. I’m sure Michelle who’s an expert in environment has thought about, but I’m not going to presuppose the seven meeting, but that may end up being something we put on for discussion in terms of subsequent consultation because people said they want to talk about migratory birds. It’s just an example, but there’s a difference between the consultation program and the environmental review and the scope of those studies which regulators determine, not the Port.

Q:  

Nathan Pachal: So you haven’t come with a closed… sometimes with consultation they have it already and they just want to rubber stamp. But from what you’re telling me you haven’t actually done any work now except for what we’re doing right now?

A:  

Judy Kirk: When you say work what do you mean?

Q:  

Nathan Pachal: Or not work. Decisions

Q:  

Judy Kirk: Ok, because I just want to make sure. When you look at page 8 we’ve done work to determine how many phases there should be in the consultation program.

A:  

Cliff Stewart: Well there was a question asked yesterday and this was from people who had seen previous presentations on this in the last decade and they know that there are five locations proposed on as possibilities for T2. We haven’t made any decisions on those five locations; however, DFO has made a clear statement about two of them that they would not be permitable. So while we haven’t made the decisions about those, we certainly aren’t looking at those two that the DFO has identified. If that’s what you mean by decisions, there are some things that have been decided, but right now we are looking at options.
C: Judy Kirk: Anything else before we move on? So a bit about the proposed project.

C: Cliff Stewart: So a multi-berth container terminal connected to the new road network that’s being built, the South Fraser Perimeter Road, at Highway 17 connected to the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor and beyond that, we are just at the beginning stages of asking questions about what does that mean in detail in communities that are affected.

Q: Rick Green: Maybe I come at this with a bit of a unique perspective in that I was an alderman in Delta, lived in Delta for thirty years. I was very involved in the former provincial Government and very active with it. Some I’m coming from a very staunch free enterprise point of view but I also live through as a member of council for the Spetifore Hearings for the South Delta lands and all of the environmental issues that came to that. I’ve seen all of the hits that Delta has taken. Now fast forward to moving out here. First of all I want to congratulate Port Metro Vancouver for going into a Pre-Consultation; I think this is a first. You should be congratulated for it. Going to Nathan’s point, I think Nathan’s point was very important, as long as decisions haven’t been made to get to this point. As you may or may not be aware, as you’ve mentioned the Mufford name is somewhat familiar to those that have followed some of our goings on out here. When I ran last time, I ran because there were a number of things that I felt were sadly missing here and I felt it had a lot to do with the lack of public consultation. I said right from the outset that the proposed Mufford Crescent diversion, which was one of a series of nine overpasses that were going to take place and with the Roberts Bank Corridor and everything else. I don’t apologize for it, I fought it, fought it very hard with the community and it was never about the overpass, it was about road network and what have you. One of the things, if anybody takes this very serious look at the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor will clearly understand that the Langleys, and I’m not going to begin to speak for Langley City they can certainly speak for themselves, I’ll speak for the people of the Langley Township, are probably affected more by the Rail Corridor then any community in the Fraser Valley. Right now we have 15 trains a day and some of them are up to 12,000 feet in length. The overpasses that we’re talking about are effectively overpasses of some convenience, not practical use. In other words, we haven’t dealt with the bypass, we haven’t dealt with 100 Street, we haven’t dealt with the Fraser Highway. Those are the three most highly used transportation corridors we have. When you look at the growth, and I’ve been saying this for the last two and a half years so it’s not a surprise to anyone at this table who knows me, if we don’t fight this, and I want to be part of the solution I don’t want to be part of the problem. I think that there are other options. We all believe there are other options.

C: Judy Kirk: What do you mean other options to the Proposed Terminal 2?

C: Rick Green: No, for rail.

C: Judy Kirk: I just want to make sure that the record got that right. So other options for rail.
Rick Green: For heavy rail. I met with two other MLAs shortly after the election and it was suggested by the area MP that we might as well forget that idea because the heavy rail will happen with us or without us. There is one thing I do know, that I will fight it with every ounce of energy I have. We also have renewed passenger rights, thankful to a few people at this table, on the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor between the Pratt Livingston Corridor, between Trinity and Cloverdale. Those rights were renewed by BC Hydro in May 2009.

Judy Kirk: Renewed passenger rights?

Rick Green: That's right.

Judy Kirk: That were renewed by BC Hydro?

Rick Green: There is a master agreement that I encountered that when provincial government sold the Interurban Corridor the rail and the rolling stock, they protected passenger rights in perpetuity. We've got press releases from the provincial government, we've got the master agreement from the provincial government and they deal with the fact that we have passenger rights at no cost for the people of British Columbia. So the biggest problem with that is obviously the need to negotiate passenger rights between Cloverdale and Trinity. But quite frankly, much to CP's chagrin they don't have a choice because we have passenger rights up to 33% of all the wheelage that is used in the corridor now. So when you take a look at the expansion of rail traffic on this corridor of fifteen trains a day to potentially thirty-five or forty. In my opinion if you want to talk about safety of community and building of community you're going to end up with two communities, one north of the tracks and one south of the tracks that's what it's going to amount too. It's absolutely ridiculous. Anybody in their right mind, in my mind and I'll campaign on this at any level, it is just fundamentally wrong. Now there are other options, and where I want to get to on this, so I've explained my position, that's my personal position and maybe the position of some at this table and others. But one thing I want to be consistent of which I was over the Mufford Crescent, after the election I phoned the Agricultural Land Commission and advised them, even though they had previously approved that corridor, that I was going to bring it back to two open houses and a public meeting. Which I did and over one thousand people came out and that was just over that one issue. What is really important to me, however we move forward, when we talk about the consultation, open houses don't cut it. Public meetings – it has to be a public meeting of some form.

Judy Kirk: Rick, let me just interrupt you for a minute. Vicki Huntington came to yesterday afternoon's meeting and she said the same thing. There was pretty general agreement around the room. Now what do you think about open houses with a Q & A period.

Rick Green: No.

Judy Kirk: Just hear me out here. I've been doing this a long time.

Rick Green: You know what Judy, so have I since the mid 80s.

Judy Kirk: But here me out. Why I am saying is that not everybody is as involved and informed as you are and some of the rest of the people in this room. So what I would like to propose and I'd like your feedback on it either in the feedback form or here verbally which I know you won't be shy about giving.
Would you be comfortable with assuring that people who come in the door, say we’ve got a four or five hour open house, for the first couple of hours we allow people to come in, talk to the Port representatives, talk to subject matter experts, depending on whether we are in the environmental review or not. By the way, on the environmental review side they’ll do what they want.

C:  
Rick Green: Absolutely. I know that.

C:  
Judy Kirk: What I would like to propose is that we do an open house portion for say a couple of hours and then open it up to essentially a public meetings format which would be Q&A. For at least an hour, two hours or frankly, whatever it takes. Because not everybody is comfortable standing up at a microphone.

C:  
Rick Green: Fair enough, I can go back to the Mufford Crescent thing and effectively that’s what we did at Mufford Crescent. We had two open houses, we had all the experts there, we had the boards and all that stuff and people got into a Q&A. That’s OK, but it really doesn’t fulfill. And anytime, and I’ve seen it through the Spetifore Hearings, there is an absolute need, there a democratic need for people to be part of the process and feel that they have been heard.

C:  
Judy Kirk: No debate about that. Consultation has come a long way since the Spetifore Hearings.

C:  
Rick Green: Excuse me. Just so you know the Spetifore Hearings, we were very open.

C:  
Judy Kirk: I recognize that.

C:  
Rick Green: We gave 108 hours for people to come to a microphone and speak. That’s what I want to see and what I’m here to propose, and I’m more than willing to do it, if you want me to chair it that’s fine, if you want somebody else to chair it that’s fine. But it should be a public meeting with an opportunity for people to come forward and speak, at a microphone, their feelings about it.

C:  
Judy Kirk: So we will provide that opportunity, but I think there will also be an open house component.

C:  
Rick Green: I’m OK, as long as we don’t cut off the public meeting side, and more than a Q&A. The problem with Q&A is that you get a couple of people asking a question. I’ve been to too many of them.

C:  
Judy Kirk: It’ll be the kind of thing where there are microphones, people can come up, they can line up and have their say. That’s the kind of thing that we’re talking about here. In addition to all of the other methods so that people who aren’t comfortable doing that can fill out a feedback form or come to a small group meeting or any number of other ways.

Q:  
Peter Holt: I think to add to what Rick said. One of the things that has been evident over a lot of the public engagements that have gone on, particularly transit and many other things is that in the open house sections particularly, who tells the story is rather key. The example I’d make is Bob Paddon’s TransLink group, when they come up. They way they tell the story is absolutely geared to the solution they want to hear. To the point where data is blatantly wrong. I can give you an example of the Surrey Rapid Transit at the moment. One of the things that’s in their data if you actually drill down into is, that
they’ve cost the Light Rail at $77 million a kilometer, which Bombardier rolled their eyes and go, what? That is the problem that I see in many of the public engagements. The stakeholders, in this case it would be the Port or the railways would want to educate the public. And in doing that, they educate them along the lines that they’ve already got their choice.

A: Judy Kirk: That’s really important. You know what Peter, people are going to have to make up their own minds as they go along. But my firm is one of the leading experts in consultation in this province and we are going to make sure that the information is credible. The reports are going to be independent. That said, you’re going to have to make those judgements along the way.

C: Peter Holt: Just if I can one a final point is very quickly is that the other thing is blatantly clear from body language when you’re doing these things is that there’s not really a willingness to hear a contrary view. The way it’s dealt with is to listen to it and then never talk about it again.

Q: Lynn Whitehouse: I agree with what has been said and what happens a lot is that people are going to learn that there’s going to be an expansion. In the Langley’s especially, like Mayor Green said, transportation and traffic gridlock is just horrendous and the effect on personal lives. I think the education component is absolutely critical to Joe-citizen, who will only see the fear and not understand how they can participate and get their feelings heard. In saying that, as a citizen, I have to support the Port and I do. I live with the fear of the trains and the increased truck traffic on the road. I’m just wondering, can the consultation, once you get to the project development, will there be consideration given to using the river and perhaps looking at inland shipping in the load and unload facilities that are outside the urban area?

A: Judy Kirk: I can’t answer that question and I don’t think Cliff can either. But the importance of you raising that here and it was raised yesterday too, is if the notion of alternative distribution methods like the river is something you want to talk discuss then that is one of the topics you put down. Because right now that’s not listed and that’s exactly why we’re here to find out if there are alternative or additional topics.

C: Lynn Whitehouse: I’ll write it down.

C: Ed Kolla: I agree with what’s been said and I also agree with Judy. In a process like this, you have to have first of all inform the people of what is out there and what is taking place, what is happening, why certain things are being done. The process she is talking about is not a done deal, “here is what we’re giving to you”. If I understand what she is saying the process an iterative process where she’s going to work through, or the Port is going to work through what they are trying to do, look at options, and look at things. I think what we’ve got to get across to them is the issues and concerns of the area. I have been involved in numerous transportation projects on a smaller level and I have seen projects go off the rails for the wrong reason because of what I would call a mob psychology, where you get all the naysayers in a room and they take up the whole time and the good of the project gets lost. I am a firm believer that the
public has to have an opportunity to see what is being planned, why it’s being planned what are the benefits to the global community and then look at how you mitigate the issues that are going to impact certain areas.

C: **Rick Green:** Ed, it is really easy to look at room full of concerned citizens and I’ve been on the political side in more cases then not, and deem that mob psychology. Now what it is, is protection of community. Let’s be real clear, nobody has to try to suggest that I don’t embrace economic growth, economic development, what is good for the world economy, what is good for Canada’s economy, BC’s economy. I will be there with bells on to protect that. But I am also a strong believer that we don’t have to have that at any cost, in other words there are other options. You can go to CP/CN, they will tell you without question there are no other choices, that lines there, that’s the end of the discussion. I don’t believe that. I can tell you that there were about one thousand people that were involved in the Mufford Crescent decision. They spoke passionately about it. One thing about democracy, I’m sorry to have to try to preach to people, but one thing about democracy, people have the right to be wrong. I can tell you right now if you look at the Spetifore hearing or the Burns Bog hearings, fifty years from now seventy years from now people might look at that and say council was wrong on the decision they made. But we weren’t, we were right because that was what the people of Delta wanted. The people of Langley have a right for the protection of their community and not to be sold out on the fear of protecting the world economy. The world economy is going to do very well thank you very much.

C: **Ed Kolla:** Rick, I’m not disagreeing with you and I’m not disagreeing that you have to take all of these things into consideration. All I was supporting was that the process has to be an informed process that people understand what is being done, why it’s being done and also to put on the table the implications that are associated with it and how those things are going to be mitigated.

C: **Judy Kirk:** If I could say, I think it is clear what people are saying here and if I can summarize this and get a reaction get some reaction. Rick, you might argue with me but it seems to me that people would agree in this room that there needs to be a body of information. I think Peter you referenced some concern about some information from TransLink around some of their studies. There needs to be a body of information about the project and about studies both environmental, economic and transportation and all the list that has to be done, that needs to be available to people. Then it’s to have a process to allow for some exposure, people will decide how much they want to be exposed to that information and that’s not up to anyone here to judge in my view. But at least that information needs to be available and then people will participate as they will and we’re going to provide a bunch of opportunities to do that and we’re interested to hear about what those might be.

C: **Nathan Pachal:** My comment, I’ll say public consultation as far as public engagements from A to B, I think people like to be part of the decisions process so if you can do this with your public consultation you could give education first.
Say this is what we’re doing, this is why we’re doing it and here are some options. We can have a, what happens if you don’t build Terminal 2 here are the options and these are the consequences, what if you build it here, what if you build rail capacity here. You can give people a list of options and let them pick what they want. I like being involved in that way. You probably know that you get better plans when you let people decide instead of saying this is what we’ve decided, what’s your feedback. People can be reactionary when they see feel that they are getting things thrown on them.

C: Judy Kirk: That’s a good comment.

Q: Lee Lockwood: Three simple comments. Back to the consultation process, the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor was pretty much a done deal it saw the light of day. Another thing you want to keep in mind is the fact that, you look at the gentleman who made the statement, that this will be the biggest port operation on the West Coast. It’s going to exceed Long Beach.

C: Cliff Stewart: It is now the biggest port in Canada.

C: Unknown: That’s also the north side. It’s the bulk in the North Shore.

C: Lee Lockwood: I look at California, they built the Alameda Corridor. The Port is the biggest customer the railroads have. You as a customer should be able to sit down and tell the railroads what you will have them do. The last time I looked, when I was a customer I would tell my suppliers what the hell I wanted.

C: Peter Holt: I sympathize with Cliff because I think the railways run the ports as much as it is the other way around.

C: Judy Kirk: I think many Canadians know how much influence railways have.

C: Peter Holt: There’s a very interesting microcosm of the bigger debate when Ed made the comment about how there’s a certain way of doing things which he thought made sense and a mob came in with contrary views. My first point was very much to have a willingness to hear those contrary views and not to use language that is very common and used to shut people down. Whereas people like Rick and maybe myself are not easy to close down in that respect, the average guy will walk out and say forget it. I think that is a really important point in that language.

C: Judy Kirk: Peter, can I just say on that, when Kirk & Co. was asked to look at the potential scope of this project and the amount of consultation, and you can see on page 8 that this will be the biggest consultation ever undertaken by the Port and that’s without the environmental reviews adding in. I think frankly, there’s potentially at least two more. I just want to point out that I have been pretty strong that the voices need to be heard and need to provide multiple rounds to do that.

C: Peter Holt: The main point I was actually going to make was to go back to the education sessions and how people can understand what is out there and what are the options. Without exception, in my fifteen years or so in this region, the information put out is put out by the companies, individuals and organizations that want to institute the change. In this case it’s the Port, although in many ways it’s the Port and Railways in many respects. TransLink obviously it’s the
regional body. When that body of information is put forward at open houses in all the displays, people come to those and they often will challenge the actual numbers. Nathan, you’ve done it. Lynn I’m sure you have as well, there’s no opportunity before those, some would say propaganda boards, are put up for people with a contrary view to display at the same open house to point out the short comings of some of the arguments put forward. I think that is a change that would be a change that would be very beneficial. It would also give the appearance of fairness. If you wanted to go really overboard, taking the HST debate example, provide money, and this is not necessarily yours by the way, to organizations that might have contrary views so that they in fact can have a side to show their vision. Because organizations such as Roy’s been in and I know Lynn’s see it, and I’m sure you’ve seen it as well. You can go back to the 1960s for this region and see some spectacular visions that in 2010 you go, oh I wish. If it is going to be consultation, it is a battle of ideas and we need to approach that. My final point is we’re already chasing the hare, the hare is zigzagging across the field, the hare is Port Metro Vancouver to some extent and the railways because we’re being told, and I think Ed was very accurate what he said, there’s a national reason and a global reason why we have to make our port bigger. Some people wouldn’t agree with that, I’m actually sympathetic regardless of what I might be sounding like. What we do have to say is if we are going to make that port bigger then we have to look at all downstream effects of roads and railways. Poor Langley and the City of Langley, I know five years ago I used to say there’s no way this is going to stay single track to serve the port’s needs and I think you’ll agree with that. People would just put you aside because it wasn’t convenient to hear at this stage.

C: Judy Kirk: On the point of funding for groups, if federal government does agree to hold a review panel, they do consider applications for capacity funding, intervener funding and other kinds of funding. So if it does go to, which as Cliff indicated it may well, that’s something to consider. The province doesn’t usually do that, but the feds do.

C: Lynn Whitehouse: These projects aren’t built in a year or two, and as we’ve discussed this one has a very long life term. What is happening to a number of projects out in this region, I’m older then dirt so I’ve been involved in many, at beginning. You get intense consultation, stakeholder feedback and all that good stuff and then five, six and seven years down the road when things are really starting to take off half of those people that were involved at beginning as the stakeholders are gone, they’ve changed or whatever. There hasn’t been a continuous review or follow up, and I think that is going to be really important that throughout the entire project that there needs to be progress reporting and reviewing for new people that are coming in to keep them educated and aware of what is going on. Things will happen and people will say, well why didn’t you find out what was going on in your backyard. Well where do you start to look? I think that’s really important.

C: Judy Kirk: It’s a good addition to the education point you make earlier.
A:  **Cliff Stewart:** I’d just like to respond to something Peter said earlier. I want to bring you back to page 9. How input will be used. I can’t remember exactly how you put it Peter, but I think it was something like this; people don’t want to hear contrary views. The commitment that we have made and the commitment that Kirk & Co. have demanded an arm’s length ability to do what they feel is the right thing to do here. They have insisted to have independence to be able to do two things in this process. One, are the consultation summary reports so that those of you who are involved in the process will in fact get fed back what it is that we have heard from you so that if we haven’t heard you can say we’ve missed a point. The second is a consideration memo, after we get the consultation summary report we take that away within the program and we do whatever we do with it. Then a consideration memo is developed which explains what’s been done or what hasn’t been done. So if we choose not to listen to what you’ve had to say we have to explain why we’ve done that as opposed to hearing you and walking away. I think that’s a really important piece of the process that I want to highlight.

Q:  **Denni Bonetti:** I just wanted to clarify the information you just talked about on the consultation summary reports, will it only be what we’ve discussed here or will we be privy to the other consultations as well?

A:  **Judy Kirk:** So here’s what’s in the consultation summary reports. I would encourage you to have a look at some samples. It will summarize the Pre-Consultation input that we hear here. What it’ll summarize is, the meeting notes from this and the other seven meetings that we are holding. It will summarize the quantitative and qualitative information that we analyse and summarize from the feedback forms. So there’s an agree scale for quantitative type questions for those who just want to fly through and for those who want to provide a little bit more input and provide the reasons will also be providing written submissions. There’s an inquiry response line that’s set up through the port.

A:  **Sarah McPherson:** It’s containerimprovement@portmetrovancouver.com.

A:  **Judy Kirk:** Anything we get there through the consultation will also be summarized. That’s in the report called, consultation summary report. The attachments or appendices are every single one of these meeting notes, the feedback forms though because of protection of privacy and freedom of information, on the feedback forms you can look at your own but you can’t look at everybody else’s. That’s just the way it is, and any of the other information will be appended as well. It’s a complete report, the consultation discussion guide that you have before you will be there, etc. That will all be online as well as physically available.

Q:  **Denni Bonetti:** That question was just regarding that, I had some other points. First of all, excellent process, it sounds like you are open to our feedback and not coming in with pre-conceived opinions. It sounds like you’re open to listening to people and that’s great. Similar to what other people are saying, education, I think that’s really important and we’ve learned that through the
HST process, people forming opinions without educating themselves. We need to inform and I think this is an excellent piece to start with. We’d like to know if you guys would come out to a chamber meeting and do a similar process there to inform people. Letting them know what’s planned and why it’s planned and how it will affect the people of Langley so they can form better educated opinions.

A: Judy Kirk: So I’ll get Sarah McPherson to follow up with you afterwards. As far as anyone else is concerned we can look at that as well.

Q: Rudy Storteboom: I just want to start at the top again and just say I appreciate Port Metro Vancouver and I recognize that the current configuration makes it most significant. Not just to our local economy, but to our national economy. I appreciate the consultation process. It’s the most comprehensive that I have ever seen with this type of a project. In the past we have had information sessions but precious little has actually been implemented. It’s my hope that there will be some kind of accountability in consultation process because we have a relationship with the railway whether we like it or not, we have a relationship with Port Metro Vancouver and we’d like that relationship to be healthy. As much as the Port has a mandate for trade, I have a mandate for the quality of life here in my community. I think that we can come to terms recognizing that we’d both like to operate efficiently, safely and benefit our local, regional economies. Please remember it isn’t just about the environment of trees and animals, but people are the environment too. The quality of life associated with people is substantial and has to be taken into consideration. At this point my community is at a point where we’re actually paying for overpasses and infrastructure to accommodate the railway, while the railway is forcing itself into our community every day. It has no business here and with increased traffic it’s killing us. We need to find alternative routes for the railway to go, and there are alternatives. But the railway has to come to an accountable relationship with the community by recognizing that they are overwhelming us and it’s killing the community at large. With that being said I appreciate the consultation process and I suggest that we have some kind of mapping component identifying clearly where the Port Metro Vancouver is, how the system is working and how it all feeds into the Port, where the overpasses are, possible alternative routes, possible water-based transportation services and have an overview of the area so that people can see clearly how it all fits together. Rather than just talking about a road or a bypass and some people not getting it because maybe they don’t relate to that. A map would be an image that they might relate to. Finally, I want to suggest that as much as we are looking into the future, does it consider the possibility that we may be developing some of these natural resources ourselves in the future? It’s my hope we won’t be shipping natural resources around the world to be developed and then returned to us with a significant mark up. It’s my hope that we’ll be doing some more manufacturing of our own and creating jobs for our young people and our province. So I’m not sure if that’s been considered. As much as I admire your growth and encourage you in that because it benefits us all, the
future should consider what the world would look like in a few years because we know it’s changing dramatically before us. So what will it look like in ten or twenty years relative to our economy, our people, and our position in the world.

Q: **Peter Holt:** I think, like a lot of people have been saying it’s a great summary. My point was and it’s to you Cliff when you spoke earlier on, I absolutely believe that Port Metro Vancouver is trying to do the very best job in Canada. I have no problem with that and I think that’s the genuine situation. However, I do think for this to be a successful exercise, if I don’t see CP, CN and BNSF sitting next to you we can’t do it. You cannot possibly cover everything and make commitments on their behalf. I want to see four people at the table. Not meaning to diminish Port Metro Vancouver, but in my view, railways run ports as opposed to the other way around. It just is the way it is. I think it’s a huge comment and I don’t mean it to be negative.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I’m not sure you’re going to get that Peter.
C: **Peter Holt:** The comment’s there.
C: **Judy Kirk:** I don’t think the port has control of that.
C: **Peter Holt:** They don’t. I’m sure they don’t.

Q: **Denni Bonetti:** Have you had discussions at this point with any of the railways?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Not about that specific issue.

C: **Lynn Whitehouse:** What Peter said is exactly what I was going to say. What’s happening a lot in region is we have different groups that are going out and doing planning, but they’re not talking to each other. I think it would be absolutely critical that not only railways but also TransLink needs to be strongly encouraged to attend consultations as observers so that they can hear firsthand from representatives around the region because one thing does affect the other.

C: **Rick Green:** I think Lynn made a good point, if you look at the incredible difficulties at the regional transportation level. We’ve all had our say about TransLink and I can sit here for about five or six hours and talk about it, but the one thing that the twenty-three mayors, we have been unanimous in terms of our position. We’ve got, this is what we’re talking about everything is servicing the Port the trucks and all this stuff. We’ve got two regional districts, we have two regional planning authorities, and we have two transportation providers in BC, BC Transit and Translink. We’ve got all of these organizations and groups who are quite frankly running at cross purposes. For this thing to really work and I agree with Peter that someway somehow, and I know that we say don’t hold your breath that the railways at the table. Someway, somehow, don’t hold our breath to get the railways at the table. One thing I was told that railways are bigger than our federal government and we all know because they predate our generation and all that wonderful stuff and they’ve got all these massive powers. But I have to tell you when we found master agreement on the corridor, the township lawyers couldn’t have been happier because for the first time in history, we had the railways over the barrel in terms of a legal agreement that they have no option to go along with. I just think that we have
to use whatever leverage we can to be able to get our railways to the table and be part of the process. The idea of TransLink, absolutely they should.

C:  

*Ed Kolla:* I agree with what Rudy said and I agree with what Rick is saying. In fact I think that we’re all saying the same thing. We’re all saying that whatever is done, it has to be an informed process. I think it has to be demonstrated in alternate methods of movement. I think we’ve got a river that could be a viable option to get container traffic through the urban areas and I think that what the community here is looking for is not something that is a slam dunk here is what we’re doing and why. The community is looking for an informed process that is going to demonstrate, what is the best way to move these containers from wherever they are unloaded through the urban area. How can we mitigate the impacts associated with that the Port is trying to do. I think that’s the critical issue that everybody is concerned about. The question I hear at a lot of meetings is why are we unloading them out there, and then trucking them and putting them on rail and it’s running through the different communities. Can we unload them out there or unload them farther up on the river and have a transfer point there. I think from a transportation perspective, those types of things have to be seen and I think that’s what the community’s looking for. Is it by rail, is it by water. What are the different options? I mean we are talking about a project that in twenty or ten years when you are first going to start constructing. The thing is, let’s do our due diligence. The bottom line is if this is where it got to be, on the rail corridor must be a bonafide process to how the impacts are mitigated to the communities. If I look back at the previous project that took place, that was one of the things that the communities really pushed back hard about. Sure we didn’t get it all, we didn’t get a lowered rail, but we have got some mitigation of the increased rail traffic on the rail. Yes, all the rail overpasses is not the answer and yes it would be nice to move the rail somewhere else, but the one thing is that you’re still going through communities. So I think the bottom line is that it has to be demonstrated to the public that the due diligence has been done and this is the best solution and we have looked at all the different options.

C:  

*Lee Lockwood:* I think that there are a couple of things that you need to keep in mind too is that if next 20 years there’s another half million people moving south of the Fraser. By implication we are actually affecting their well-being. They don’t get a vote; they don’t get to attend an open house. Number two is that we’ve got to keep in mind that we’ve probably got forty trains a day going up and down the valley. These are diesels, very poor particular management, why don’t we look at electrifying from Chilliwack and done on in. Air quality in the valley is worse than it is in California. They electrified the whole thing in Holland from the German/Deutsch border all the way through to the Port of Rotterdam. Why aren’t we doing that here?

Q:  

*Nathan Pachal:* I guess it’s the same thing everyone’s saying is the fact that I don’t think we want the pre-conceived; we have to do it this way because we’ve
done it this way before. We need to look at being progressive. The other issue that ties into that is that I’m usually the youngest person at all these things. So what are you doing to get people under a certain age involved in the process.

A: Judy Kirk: It’s a very serious question and we’re looking at a whole range of things, including things like Facebook and Twitter, using online technology, making sure that notification is done in a way that we’re connecting with younger populations as well. So any ideas that you have on that, we are very interested in. Much like I try to discourage people from making judgements about how informed people are before they provide comment that’s up to the individuals. The same thing applies here really as well. We need to make every effort we can to connect with younger people in ways that they want to connect. But at the end of the day it’s going to be up to them.

C: Nathan Pachal: If I can, just to follow up with what you are saying to that, I guess with Twitter and social media some people don’t get it, I understand how the process is a two way communication. I’ll actually give TransLink credit for this, they’ve realized that Twitter, for example, is a two way communication media and they’ve embraced that and it works very well. They did, Be Part of the Plan, and you can argue about what came out of, Be Part of the Plan. The actual method was really good and it was successful.

C: Judy Kirk: We are definitely looking at that but please put that down. As you can see you’re outnumbered and not that numbers are everything. We are looking very seriously at a whole suite of online and digital options. In some ways we’re going to be doing some of this stuff for the first time. Something that we’re looking at too is something like an audio discussion guide so that people who don’t take the time to read it, maybe they’re in the car or maybe they’re at home and they want to listen to it. Maybe they want to listen to it in a group. In other words we’re trying to think of different options.

C: Unknown: Radio chat shows. I’ll put it in my feedback form, but have people on CKNW or something talking about it. That’s how you educate.

C: Judy Kirk: Absolutely. Now that as you know, something like CKNW would have to agree. That’s not something the Port can control.

Q: Lee Lockwood: How involved through this process will Kirk & Co. be involved?
A: Judy Kirk: So the question was how involved will Kirk & Co. be in the multi-stages? Very involved.

Q: Lee Lockwood: So you’ve signed on for the long haul.
A: Judy Kirk: The answer to that is yes, there was a Request for Proposal where we were a part of that selection process. The point is that the Board of the Port Metro Vancouver has the authority at multiple stages of this process to proceed or not proceed. They can also determine who’s going to be involved. While that’s what we anticipate, that’s not necessarily the outcome. We’ll see over time. Six years is a long time to look ahead.

C: Rick Green: Certainly in the political field I think we tend to talk about education, and education is really important, and as long as we don’t approach education as a talking down to you and the end result is: well we told you what
it was all about and the fact that you can’t understand it well then you have got to be an idiot. I’m sorry to be using that. I fought that a little bit at the hall and I think we are changing our processes in terms of that and providing options and everything else. The only other thing I’d say which I think is really important and touched on in a significant way is the Langley’s are most affected communities in the valley. There is no question about it. I came from Delta and I lived thirty years there, I’ve had a business in Tsawwassen, I lived in North Delta and I can tell you there’s a whole bunch of farmland between the two. The train runs through the farmland and there are overpasses and underpasses and all that wonderful stuff. But the net effect to any community and no community will feel the impact of heavy rail that Langley will. Not even close and that includes Surrey. It comes in the peripheral of Cloverdale and what have you, but it just doesn’t have the effect. What are we talking about purely and simply is liveability. Remember, in the Township we’ve got 106,000 people today and under the Regional Growth Strategy we expect to double that in the next twenty to twenty-five years, or close to it. If anybody uses the 200th Street corridor, Highway 1, Fraser Highway, bypass and everything else you start putting 70,000 people up on Willoughby corridor, 30,000 people on Brookswood/Fernridge and you see how those communities have to connect with each other. You start putting forty-five trains a day down that corridor our community ceases to be liveable. Certainly the city of Langley...

C: **Rudy Storteboom:** Yes it’s killing us. We can’t take anymore.

C: **Judy Kirk:** That’s pretty loud and clear.

C: **Rick Green:** We may have made it clear but we will be harped on and harped on.

C: **Nan Ames:** Just to bring in another thought. I am against rail going through Langley and Delta. If short sea shipping is suggested as a mode to get to the remote spot used to load and unload the ships into, say, trucks, the idea of ships coming up the Fraser River which is a highly sensitive area for wildlife, migrant birds, resident birds, orcas and all those things. The wake from one of those huge ships coming to that area would be devastating. Another thought that I had is that way back in the graph shows a progression up and yet over the last few years has been levelling off. Will there be a financial basis? I think the Port is wrong, I think the origin is the head of the snake, I just don’t see any great solution.

C: **Lynn Whitehouse:** I want to go back to trying to get representatives from the rail and TransLink to attend and participate in these consultations. I understand that when you said good luck with that.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Actually what I said was that the Port doesn’t have the authority to insist that they attend.

C: **Lynn Whitehouse:** Right. All levels of our government are being criticized for not integrating things. This could be a very good opportunity. We have representatives of our two municipality councils here and I am very confident that they both would then go back and say OK, get to Metro and to TransLink and say, we require someone to be here. I think if a request went out to our
MLAs and our MP just stating important of this entire process. Transportation throughout this entire region is of the most critical concern to everybody, business and residents alike. I think that they would be able to apply enough pressure to make some them come to the table. They will be setting a precedent showing that levels of government do work together. I think there’s an opportunity.

C: **Rick Green**: Maybe if I can say Lynn to that it’s a very good point. I’ll take it to my council and I’ll hopefully, I’m sure we will, get a resolution from council in terms of the support for that initiative. Maybe Rudy can do the same thing.

C: **Rudy Storteboom**: Absolutely. I would suggest to that we consider contacting the Canada Transportation Agency in terms of Transport Canada, other related agencies and invite them to come and certainly provide them with information so they can review that and they can get a feeling for what the consultation process has brought forward.

C: **Rick Green**: It is the bringing together and I think that part of that is for all agencies to request the railways to be a part of this.

Q: **Judy Kirk**: Michelle, I don’t want to put you on the spot here, but in your knowledge of the environmental review process and the working groups that they set up which are in my experience generally multi-agency. Could they or do they include the railways? I’m asking you for information, recognizing to everyone here that Michelle wouldn’t be speaking for the regulators.

A: **Michelle Lachmann**: Well the panel process is a little bit different. Definitely the agencies that you mentioned like Transport Canada and those would be available. How and when they would bring in the actual railways to the table I can’t speak to.

C: **Judy Kirk**: I think we should take that away as a follow up item and try to find out from the federal regulators whether working groups would include the kind of integrated multi-jurisdictional plan that you’re talking about. The thing is that it would have the strength of legislation behind it.

C: **Rick Green**: I think to that if we have resolutions from our councils from Delta, Surrey, Abbotsford, Chilliwack and I don’t think that we’d have any problem getting those resolutions. To all of our respective MLAs and MPs we can take that to the Mayor and TransLink council today. The real important part is if we stand behind this position that this is what we need. That is the key to this. We all support the Port, I want that real clear, it’s just how do we service the Port in the best way possible.

Q: **Lynn Whitehouse**: I have one more question. I understand that the permit approval process can take up to six or seven years? Did I hear you correctly?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: The process that leads up to it and that process itself could take six to seven years.

Q: **Lynn Whitehouse**: Would that include the Environmental Assessments?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Yes.
Q: **Lynn Whitehouse:** There has been a fair effort to both the provincial and federal governments to look at doing a one Environmental Assessment instead of two. Would that change that time period would that come to be?

A: **Judy Kirk:** You know what Lynn we just don’t know yet. Michelle you can say otherwise, but I think we are so early that we just don’t know what the federal government and the province are going to do with respect to this yet. We’re hoping, the Port is hoping that it will. Certainly from my view in terms of consultation fatigue which I’m sure that everyone here knows you’ve got to set up a process to make sure that people can come to one place. By one place I mean one process. That’s certainly the desire, but it’s not up to the Port. That regulatory part of it is going to be up to the feds and the province.

Q: **Lynn Whitehouse:** But when you built the schedule it basically was planned with two separate assessments.

A: **Judy Kirk:** No it was assuming harmonized. Because that’s what makes sense.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** I think it’s important to point out that the six to seven years process is based on whole range of ten to fifteen or more panel processes which are taking place in Western Canada in the past decade or more. It’s a bit of a guess, we think this is how long it will take but there’s no guarantee.

A: **Michelle Lachmann:** It is a guess, but it is based on case studies and from my experience working fifteen years on the environmental side is, what the regulators tell you procedurally and what actually happens are always wrong, but it’s often for just for a number of reasons, it’s not wrong because want it to mislead. It’s just because that’s the way the process happens. Coming up with the timeline we wanted to come up with something that was reasonable and looking at case studies and this is what we’ve pulled together. Given, knowing the size of the project, the issues that people are going to be bringing forward and the amount of attention that the project warrants for making those considerations. Factoring in the likely, the independent panel review assessment process. That’s the background for that.

C: **Nan Ames:** I was just going to question the harmonized process. From Boundary Bay, they've seen it in the South Fraser Perimeter Road, where everything was compartmentalized to avoid large review, but the fact that there was a harmonized approach meant nobody, not the federal or provincial, would take responsibility or have responsibility for the eventual outcome. So it’s not clear who’s in charge.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Correct me if I’m wrong Michelle but I think it was a British Columbia Environmental Review for the SFPR not a federal review.

C: **Michelle Lachmann:** It was the harmonized led by the province, much like the Deltaport Third Berth. Both acts apply and by the harmonization agreement it was decided that the provincial process will meet both intents.

C: **Rick Green:** Judy, I might add and I wanted to ask if this was what Roy was going to say. We didn’t want to bring up, there’s a lot of history and I think that’s a lot of the anxiety around this. If you go back to first process, the environment side was not considered to be a linear process, it was Delta. It was only through the work of the community members that got them to have a meeting out here, I
think they went into Delta, but the reality was that it was identified as a local, environmental issue as opposed to a linear environmental issue. Therefore none of the environmental issues in Langley were considered. Roy did you want to...

C:  
*Roy Mufford:* That’s absolutely true, mind you I have to say that is refreshing. This Pre-Consultation process is very refreshing because if you go back in history to when the provincial government decided to build the port in the first place they never told Langley or anyone about it until the decision was cast. Langley took the time to call in the BC Hydro’s top executives and ask them what was going on. We have the minutes from all of the meetings. Our mayor at the time, Bill Poppy said point blank, what are you doing here. I mean Langley had not been consulted whatsoever. The provincial government had decided to put the trains through and it was the easiest and shortest way to get to the Port. It just progresses. They called the three top executives from BC Hydro to a council meeting to explain what was going on. The commitment at the time and it’s in the minutes, was one train each way a day. That’s all we had to worry about and we know what’s happened since. So you have to understand why we’re a little concerned about this. There are other alternatives and what we need is a master transportation plan. That’s why Peter and Lynn, and I agree with them wholeheartedly, you’ve got to drag CN, CP, BNSF to the table and you’ve got to say look at this, this can’t go on. We’ve got to fix this and there are ways to do it.

C:  
*Peter Holt:* Taking the position because you’ve got to start from a certain starting position, so taking the position that Terminal 2 is a done deal. Then we are in the business of solving the problem. The problem is fundamentally goods movement problem that has to be efficient, effective and cost effective so that the Port of Vancouver will have shipping lines willing to bring their ships in and move their containers. I’m stating the obvious, but sometimes it’s worth stating. In solving the problem there’s a whole series of other things that Lynn and others are well aware of with the New Westminster Rail Bridge. You can go the generation that’s now six feet under, we’re laughing the same way twenty years later about this one. Thanks to the Port and it’s recognition of the need to expand and need 1.8 million TEUs, we are coming to the realization that we need to grow up as a regional body and actually stop to look at these problems and solve them. Here is the danger, this particular group, if we’re not careful will end up trying to solve a lot more then what we actually came into this room to talk about. We are opening up all over the place, the New Westminster Bridge is something else to try to solve that but it’s fundamental to moving goods into this region; the actual RBRC through Langleys with the growth strategy in Metro Vancouver just doesn’t fit. The movements elsewhere, there’s some problems there. There’s one other thing that I have to ask and it’s to Cliff: if Cherry Point is developed, south of the border, as both a bulk and container port in the next twenty or thirty years what impact on the viability of a Terminal 2?
C:  **Cliff Stewart:** I think 5% of import containers through the Port of Vancouver are American destined. Projections we show here don’t rely on the increasing American demand. I don’t think it will have an impact.

C:  **Peter Holt:** So the New Westminster Rail Bridge the adaptive use for railways generally to possibly mixed use, could be passenger could be small passenger traffic even and how are we going to invest in industrial lands. This is fundamental to how is the governments movements going to be managed in the next fifty years? The Port is such a major aspect of the economy of this region and BC and Canada it’s the big one.

C:  **Rudy Storteboom:** I guess I wanted to draw attention to the bottom line which is about economy and the economy of the Port and the country. There’s an old saying, in this consultation process that you might consider, people talk but money screams that’s the bottom line and that’s what people are going for. They want to see that dollar at the bottom of process and that everyone is going to benefit financially. Please consider it isn’t just about the national economy or the regional economy but the local economy as well. I think that part of the consultation process should take into consideration how local businesses are affected. For example I’m familiar with a business on the bypass that’s considering relocation because they simply don’t have the access that they once did now that an overpass has been constructed. Their vehicles have to cross over the railroad tracks and then you turn back over the railroad tracks in order to bring in their product to market and return back to the shed. The fact is it’s taking too much time and costing too much money. It’s significantly impacting to the point where they are thinking of relocating and that’s one of the major employers in our community. I think that there should be a component to the consultation process that draws from local businesses and local economies to see how they’re impacted and how much more they can take.

Q:  **Nan Ames:** What about the opening of the new and expanded Panama Canal?

A:  **Cliff Stewart:** That’s an interesting question, we have looked at it with a number of people and there was some work done by a fairly large American, transport economist organization. It moves the line inland and moves the line around the US East Coast, that says if your goods are coming from Asia, there are three ways to get them there. One is via the West Coast and rail, one is via Panama Canal and rail and one is by the Suez Canal and rail. The line moves in land, definitely with the Panama Canal expansion in 2014. But 90% plus of cargo that leaves here by rail goes to Toronto and Montreal for consumption. The line that Panama Canal moves doesn’t touch Toronto, Montreal or even Chicago, that’s where the 5% American destined from Port Metro Vancouver, most of it goes to Chicago.

C:  **Judy Kirk:** I want to thank you very much for participating in a very robust and thoughtful discussion. We really appreciate it. I would like to ask you to fill out your feedback forms to make sure that we get your individual input as well as
the collective input here. Please be aware that the consultation period ends June 30th, so on or before. Thank you all very much.

The meeting ended at 11:50am.
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Notes from a Pre-Consultation multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, June 15, 2011, 2:00pm-4:00pm, at the Eaglequest Coyote Creek Golf Cluff, Surrey, BC.

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

**Port Metro Vancouver:**
- Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
- Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development
- Sarah McPherson, Senior Advisor, Communications and First Nations
- Michelle Lachmann, Environmental Lead, Container Capacity Improvement Program
- Dallas Henault, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 2:00 pm

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

1. Judy Kirk, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review

Roundtable introductions were undertaken.

C: Judy Kirk: My name is Judy Kirk and I’ll be facilitating the session today. Thank you very much for taking the time to join us. This is the fourth stakeholder meeting that Port Metro Vancouver is holding as a Pre-Consultation to a multi-year, multi-stage consultation on the Proposed Terminal 2 Project. Kirk & Co. is an independent firm and we will be helping with the consultation and writing the consultation summary report for this stage of consultation. We’ve done two meetings in Delta, we’ve done a meeting in Langley this morning, we’re here in Surrey this afternoon. We will also be holding meetings in Richmond and Vancouver. There will be seven meetings in all for this round. The purpose of this round of consultation, which is very early in the process, is to find out from people such as yourselves and others how you would like to be consulted and about what. Pre-Consultation is not something that a lot of organizations do but the Port agreed to do this which I think is a very good thing. This is meant to be an informal meeting. The reason we are having small group meetings is so people have plenty of opportunity to provide comments or ask questions. There will be note taking of the meeting and my colleague Dallas Henault will be taking them. We are also taping them for cross reference to make sure we get everything right. We will be attributing comments, which means anyone who says anything will be noted. If you don’t want comments attributed, talk to me and I’ll sort that out. Finally what I’d like to ask if for Cliff to introduce himself, and Sarah and Michelle and I’d like to go around the table for introductions and then we’ll get started.

C: Cliff Stewart: Thanks Judy. My name is Cliff Stewart. I am the director of Infrastructure Development for Port Metro Vancouver. I am responsible for the delivery of the Container Capacity Improvement Program of which Terminal 2 at Roberts Bank is a significant and important element.

C: Sarah McPherson: I’m Sarah McPherson I work for Port Metro Vancouver on the communications and consultation program for the Container Capacity Improvement Program.

C: Michelle Lachmann: My name is Michelle Lachmann. I am the environmental representative for the program that Sarah and Cliff spoke about. I work for Hemmera which is an independent environmental consulting firm, but I am working for the environmental stream of the project.

C: Judy Kirk: So there’s music on this side, so you will need to speak up on that side because it’s difficult to hear.
C: Unknown: I’m sorry, which firm are you with?
C: Michelle Lachmann: Hemmera.

C: Dan Barnscher: Deputy Chief of Surrey Fire, so I’m in charge of emergency planning for the city as well as the operations for the fire service.
C: Lucie Match: A representative of Port Mann Community Association and we are more concerned with the ports about what’s going on in our area
C: Rosemary Zelinka: Rosemary Zelinka with the Surrey association of sustainable communities, which is an umbrella movement of organizations in Surrey and promote sustainability and public involvement
C: Al Schultz: I’m Al Schultz, I don’t represent anybody, however I am a member of the White Rock Surrey Naturalists and I also sit on Surrey’s Environmental Advisory Committee. So I’m here as an observer.
C: Judy Kirk: An observer or participant I’m hoping. You don’t have to represent anyone to be here.
C: Deb Jack: I’m Deb Jack, I’m President of Surrey Environmental Partners, it’s an umbrella organization of groups that are concerned about natural areas and conservation specifically here in Surrey but of course what happens with regards to the living environment in the entire valley impacts Surrey. We also have individual members and supporters.
C: Liz Match: I’m Liz Walker, I’m here as President of White Rock Surrey Naturalists.

C: Judy Kirk: With that please feel free to interrupt, provide a comment or ask a question at any time. Cliff is going to go through this discussion guide that is in front of you which is the basic content of this stage of consultation. I won’t let him drone on, so please do interrupt.

Q: Rosemary Zelinka: I just have a question about Dan’s presence. Has the city of Surrey taken position for or against this?
A: Dan Barnscher: No. No position, I’m just here for information. Does that answer your question or...
Q: Rosemary Zelinka: Well I’m just a bit puzzled that’s all. There aren’t any other city staff like planning staff.
A: Dan Barnscher: This is still early in the game I think, it’s more informative. I think once the Fire chief heard this was taking place he thought it might be a good idea for someone from the fire service to attend.
C: Judy Kirk: Rosemary, so you know we have let municipalities know both mayors, councils and senior staff, and invited them to come if they wish. We’ve also been to councils, or the Port has so often what we would call First Responders, that are fire and emergency come out to initial meetings like this. Especially when it has roads and infrastructure involved.
C: Dan Barnscher: It’s not to say there won’t be city staff at further meetings, but all you get right now is me.
Q: **Rosemary Zelinka:** I guess to some extent Port Metro Vancouver is proponent of this, and I am wondering why you are sitting amongst the proponents?

A: **Dan Barnscher:** No. I could just as well be sitting over there.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Rosemary, we’re not setting it up as a for and against.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Dan sat down and we sat down next to him.

C: **Dan Barnscher:** I actually have never met anyone here before, including yourselves. I’m looking forward to getting out of here at 3 o’clock.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I hear you and we’ll move along. So Cliff not much about the process, let’s get right into the Port.

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

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Port Metro Vancouver was formed in 2008 by the merger of three existing legacy port authorities in the Lower Mainland, the Fraser River Port Authority, the North Fraser Port Authority and the Vancouver Port Authority. The result is Port Metro Vancouver, it’s the largest port in Canada. It is by tonnage the largest port on the West Coast of North America. It is the largest export port on the West Coast of North America. The mandate of the Port is to support the growth of Canadian Trade. In a very simple nutshell that is who we are.

**Why is trade important?**

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

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

Q: Deb Jack: If you want to have this online in ten years before the first tie up, it seems to me that you would have to start the actual construction of your infrastructure far sooner than 2020? So if for instance if you don’t need the capacity at 2020 you already have a phenomenal investment in infrastructure and the costs for pre-planning, etc. I can’t tell you how many times we have heard, well we’ve got so much already invested in infrastructure and planning that this thing simply has to go we can’t stop it. I don’t see, with the greatest of respect, with any different you are saying.
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well the actual construction of the project wouldn’t begin until about 2017. So by 2017 we will have a pretty good idea of whether it will be required in 2020 or not because we’ll know whether what’s currently a forecast has come to pass.

A: **Judy Kirk:** Deb I think what you are saying, and correct me if I’m wrong, is that the money spent that the Port would invest for the pre-planning in advance of when they would start construction; by the time that the Port invests that amount of money, unless the regulators wouldn’t allow them to build, they would continue on because of that investment. I don’t want to put words in your mouth; I just want to make sure.

C: **Deb Jack:** That’s what I said and that’s what we’ve heard so often with other projects. That then becomes the justification.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Ultimately I won’t be the person making that decision but very unlikely that the investment that would be made in the first six years would ever become a justification in and of itself for the investment that would be required to build it. It’s an order of magnitude of difference.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka:** Five or six years ago I was working for the municipality of Delta and wrote reports for this matter. I’m retired now of course. I seem to recollect that Delta, five or six years ago didn’t like it, and I presume they still don’t like it seeing they have the same council basically. One of the questions that they were raising was, why can’t this development go to Prince Rupert?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** We get that question pretty regularly. If, in fact, Prince Rupert builds a container terminal and if in fact business goes there, than that would likely delay the need for Terminal 2.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka:** So basically you’re in competition with Prince Rupert?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** I’m not sure if we’re necessarily in competition with them. But we have no authority to build a terminal in Prince Rupert. We have an obligation to provide terminal capacity when that’s required. So if Prince Rupert builds on then this one is delayed. If they don’t, then this one is required.

A: **Judy Kirk:** To the question of competition that Rosemary has raised, are the items that move out of Prince Rupert are they the same things that move back and forth in Vancouver.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Vancouver has about 5% of its import cargo destined for the United States. Prince Rupert has about 40-60% of its cargo destined to the United States. Prince Rupert is much more serving the American market then Vancouver is. In particular on the export side, to date Prince Rupert has a very small percentage of its total cargo export as export loads. A majority of boxes that are exported from Prince Rupert are empty, whereas in Vancouver it’s very close to a balanced trade. In fact, the Port in Vancouver is supporting Canadian industry and Canadian business by providing a gateway for the export of cargos to Asia. Prince Rupert by and large, at least to date, has not been doing that.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka:** Doesn’t somebody like the federal government have the ultimate say about where it’s going to be best for port expansion? Or is it all locally raised money?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** The majority of this money would be either be from the Port authority, a private investor or some combination of the two.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka:** So there’s no federal or provincial funding?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** One’s always careful not to say none, but nothing substantial.

Q: **Judy Kirk:** Before I come to you Deb. Rosemary, to your question, it seems to me Michelle that there seems to be an important question around the Environmental Review process. While it isn’t determined yet for this project and you’ll see it’s in the next page where we get into the layers of consultation rounds. The federal and provincial Environmental Review processes generally look at project justification. To that degree, I’m not speaking for the regulator but just because you’ve asked the question there would be, as part of the Environmental Review, a discussion of project justification. I assume Michelle, correct me if I’m wrong, that some of that would be in relation to Prince Rupert. Within independent environmental review, which the public has an opportunity to provide input on the scope of, I think you would know if you worked in Delta, you’d have an opportunity within that scope.

Q: **Deb Jack:** My understanding was that the ports are under federal jurisdiction, and indeed they can do pretty much as they want because of that. What those provinces, jurisdictions and certainly municipalities might want or not is essentially irrelevant.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** It’s interesting that it is a widely held view and to suggest that any organization can do whatever it likes, dam the torpedoes is probably unlikely in this society. There are certain things which port authorities are able to do by delegated constitutional power, but ultimately every organization has to be responsive to the community. Having said that, when there is a mandate, and the port authority has a mandate to meet certain requirements for Canada, one of which is, the most important which is to meet trade that has to be considered as part of the decision making process for any approvals process. But I think that’s very different from saying it can just do what it wants.

C: **Deb Jack:** I do appreciate that my perspective at this point is relatively cynical.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** I guess deeds speak louder than words. If the world was as you have described it we wouldn’t be here today, in simple terms. If the world was as you described it we wouldn’t need to consult and simply do what we wanted to do and that’s not what we are doing.

C: **Deb Jack:** Perhaps we should have a chat over a cup of tea.

Q: **Al Schulz:** Well my experience has been that you consult and do you still do what you want to do. On the hand, Surrey wants to be the most sustainable city in Canada and yet they are chopping down trees at record levels.

C: **Judy Kirk:** The Port’s not chopping down trees is it?

C: **Al Schulz:** Well you’re influencing the marine environment?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** That is fundamentally why this project will go through an independent environmental assessment. To ensure that that the laws that are protective of the environment are followed as part of the process.
Q: **Liz Walker:** I guess that’s part of our skepticism too, you see what happens to Burns Bog and South Fraser Perimeter Road I mean there’s been covenants there and nobody is standing up saying no. You are contravening covenants and you should be legally binding but they’re not being accountable.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** At the end of the day, we have a system of checks and balances in Canada, and I know nothing of what you’re speaking of. Certainly, if there are legally binding commitments that aren’t being met, there is a process to ensure that they are going to enforce that if we were to indeed find ourselves doing what you are talking about that there would be people standing at the door with injunctions to stop us. That’s not where we go.

Q: **Liz Walker:** That’s interesting that that’s your understanding. As NGOs, the people who have been involved in these sorts of things for quite a while, we see the Burns Bog Conservation Society having to fundraise to try and get some legal authority to challenge this. If they weren’t able to fundraise nothing would be done. Even then it’s ten years. So with respect, I just don’t see those safeguards in place.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Can I summarize just what Deb, Liz and Rosemary, and I don’t want to put any words in your mouth, that what we’re hearing here from you so far is a scepticism if not cynicism, a real concern, about the environmental review process and whether it will adequately address your concerns.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka:** Well it goes beyond the Environmental Assessment as some of us are asking the basic question, is this really needed.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** It’s unfortunate that it is called an Environmental Assessment because it is in fact one of the fundamental requirements is the economic assessment. In other words, does it have an economic benefit? The question of whether it’s needed, that one’s fairly simple in that if it isn’t needed, then it won’t be forthcoming because there won’t be a business case for it. I don’t think there needs to be a concern that somehow because it’s not public money that’s being invested here, there isn’t going to be an ability to simply build it for the sake of building it.

C: **Deb Jack:** I know there’s a lot more here to go through. When you say that the issue is that you’re mandate is to support trade for Canada. So I am not at all confident that those decision makers for Canada really care less about what the environmental situation is here in the Fraser Valley. I’m not confident that they are concerned that we are one of the primary positions of the Pacific Migratory route, which is an international, not a local, not a national, but an international responsibility that extends far past North America. I’m not confident they are concerned about what will happen with regards to that whole aspect, with regards to the impact on our fisheries. I am aware that the provincial environmental review has never turned down any request. Indeed I was flabbergasted when the feds turned down Trout Lake and the mining thing. I still can’t understand the fact that they did it. But of course the company has now turned around and is now making some modifications which they said were absolutely and totally impossible beforehand. But, that perhaps in the medium term they might have to do their dumping in Trout Lake. That’s the kind of thing...
on a macro scale that those who are concerned about the living environment are dealing with, those are realities, sir. I’m not confident that this area of the country isn’t being considered as expendable for purposes of their trade. I do know that when I listen to the words and I see what’s in here it’s a slight off from Metro Vancouver’s representative, a female, who used to talk at the Metro Vancouver Sustainability lunches, about how everybody wanted to have their gigantic TV and wanted to have it today, and therefore we have to have an expansion in Port Metro Vancouver. Where we are in the terms of the life of all of us and everything else and the future generations, I’m not altogether sure that’s an adequate explanation anymore. If you’re aware of what’s happening in regards to living environment on a worldwide basis and then we see what’s happening on local basis there’s profound concerns. I’m not sure that the thing about consumer goods is the best argument any longer.

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

C: Deb Jack: It’s absolutely essential.

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

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

C: Judy Kirk: Sure, fair enough,

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

Q: Lucie Matich: Because I have taken a tour of the port through South Fraser Perimeter Road I’ve also heard it from the Port point of view. Especially continuing through the South Fraser Perimeter Road I was able to witness how large a project it is and how demanding of the environment. I was also able to see the remedial projects that have occurred because it was and it is being built and some of the good things and innovative things that have had to happen because someone had to solve the problem. But along the discussion here, I am wondering why the Port of Vancouver needs to supply so much more than what BC and Alberta needs for example. I understand that Prince Rupert is five hours closer to Chicago than Vancouver is. So why do we insist on using the limited
environmental area that’s Vancouver and Delta and not use the presuming that environmental damage is less in Prince Rupert. So would we not triage the type of commodities that we use the port for?

A: Cliff Stewart: These are interesting, almost philosophical questions. It’s interesting, there was a comment earlier on government money to be invested in fact Prince Rupert is a classic example of a government project. A majority of the spending in Prince Rupert to build it in the first place was government money. It was classical regional development type of function. The market has not adopted Prince Rupert, in other words there’s still only one shipping line going there.

Q: Lucie Match: Why not constrain Vancouver enough so people go to Prince Rupert?

A: Cliff Stewart: There’s a good example of that in Canada, it’s called Mirabell airport. The government decided where the airport should be built and it built it at great cost, and the market chose not to use it. In fact, eventually the government acknowledged that its attempt at social engineering hadn’t worked very well and it shut it down.

C: Lucie Match: Politics.

C: Cliff Stewart: Well it wasn’t politics. The airplanes wouldn’t go there and the passengers wouldn’t go there. Prince Rupert fundamentally, and if Prince Rupert gets built and the customers go there, great. But so far, and it’s been open for four years, and all of the descriptions of it would seemed to have implied it should have been filled up a day after it opened, because it had all of the advantages. But all of the people who make their living doing the things that Prince Rupert was designed to support a majority of them have said, you know it doesn’t actually work. So if the market changes its mind and if the expansion gets built in Prince Rupert that’s great.

Q: Lucie Match: I understand that the Vancouver Port would like as much business as they can possibly get. That’s normal.

A: Cliff Stewart: Well that’s not what this is about. What this is about is ensuring that, and I’ve heard some very strongly expressed opinions about what is or isn’t appropriate economic development, what is or isn’t appropriate environmental interference. A lot of those reach the level of belief if you will, as opposed to thought and ultimately there is a process in place in Canada and what I’m hearing is a cynicism about it and a disbelief in it, but I accept that is a view of the process, but ultimately the process is what it is and we don’t have an ability to change that.

Q: Lucie Match: I’m speaking as a resident who has lived in the same place for 42 year and has seen the CN and the effects of it. Believe we I do get on good and bad terms sometimes. The sacrifice, both the environment and the resident have to make in order to avoid social engineering, the philosophies that you’re talking about and it is a price that should be considered we make decisions. I’m not opposed to development but there has to be a limit. The limit has got to be somewhere where the liveability of the residents and the capacity to earn a
living and facilitate trade has got to be balanced and cannot be tilted heavier on one side then on the other.

A:  
*Cliff Stewart:* Again, putting aside for a moment the individual perspectives on the process that’s what the process is designed to do. Whether we believe it does or doesn’t do it, that’s its intent.

C:  
*Deb Jack:* May I give you an example, Cliff. With regards to the Environmental Assessment on South Fraser Perimeter Road, there is a section which says that yes indeed there will be an increase in the particulates in the air and I won’t get into all the details and specifics, and it will indeed be an impact on the health of little ones and the seniors, however this will be balanced off by the fact that there will be more jobs in the public health sector. It says that, so with reference to what Lucy said it becomes difficult.

C:  
*Judy Kirk:* Does it say it will be offset by those jobs?
C:  
*Deb Jack:* Yes, we’re not sure if that’s the exact words.
C:  
*Judy Kirk:* I would like to go back and look at that.
C:  
*Cliff Stewart:* That’s a very interesting perspective.
C:  
*Deb Jack:* Unfortunately it was sent to me and my computer ate over half of what was stored on it one day and I still haven’t been able to retrieve it otherwise I would forward it to you.

C:  
*Judy Kirk:* No problem, I’m sure it’s somewhere. We’ve heard of that before. I haven’t heard the offset remark, but I have heard something else related to jobs versus health effects. I haven’t heard the offset.

C:  
*Deb Jack:* Offset, balanced by, in effect it’s like doing a cost benefit analysis.
C:  
*Judy Kirk:* I hear you, I’m not disputing the concept at all.
C:  
*Deb Jack:* I couldn’t believe what I was reading.
C:  
*Judy Kirk:* I remember the media coverage on it too.

Q:  
*Al Schulze:* I have another question concerning projected traffic. Does the widening of the Panama Canal have any effect on trade to Vancouver? If for instance you ship things from here to Chicago would it be smarter to move a container to Carolina then ship it to Chicago and New York.

A:  
*Cliff Stewart:* It’s interesting, there is quite a bit of work has been done studying that question. There’s a line, I don’t know the technical term for it, like an isobar in meteorology or a line of equal elevation in a map, and the line moves inland certainly, and the line where it makes more sense to come to the West Coast and then go by rail versus going through the Panama Canal or versus going through the Suez Canal. All those options exist today, but the economics of these things will change based on the enlargement of the Panama Canal. The line moves; the line where it makes sense to go to the West Coast moves inland, but it doesn’t move near Toronto or Montreal which is where the vast majority of cargo coming through Vancouver ends up going. So our belief is that it won’t make a difference, but again part of what is good about the timing of this process is the Canal will be built and open in operation several years before there’s any decision about actually putting shovels in the ground on this project. If we’re not right, great, because ultimately if the terminal is not required, and I
know Deb has expressed her opinion about that, the dollars won’t be available if there isn’t a compelling business case to do it. Somebody once said to me that trade is like water – it finds the lowest level, and it finds the least expensive level. Our objective is to support Canadian trade. Remember, before Deltaport opened, the vast majority of Canadian containerized trade was handled through US ports. Interesting to think what might have happened in the context of September 11th, 2001 if a majority of our trade was being handled through US ports and the Americans closed the border. All of a sudden that question of getting that flat screen TV or not getting a flat screen TV, and it would just be that, we wouldn’t be exporting the commodities going back into the containers. To a certain extent there is a national interest involved in this but ultimately the economy will make the decision. If there isn’t a need for it, it simply won’t get built.

C: Judy Kirk: Mindful of time, Cliff I’m going to ask you please to briefly go through what the Container Capacity Improvement Program is and what is the proposed Terminal 2 project. Briefly go through topics that we think people may want to discuss and then I’d like to get right to what in addition to what you’ve already said would you like to discuss and how would you like to be consulted. There are some options here but we’d like to discuss that in a little bit more depth.

C: Cliff Stewart: So the Container Capacity Improvement Program, I’ve talked about it a bit about it already, is looking at what is required to ensure that the available capacity stays ahead of demand through the next twenty years. In the short term it’s a series of projects to get more capacity and more efficiency out of existing port facilities. In the medium term it’s to build a new facility and in the long term it’s to go back to facilities which have just been rebuilt in the last five years and rebuild them yet again for the next stages of growth beyond 2030.

Q: Rosemary Zelinka: Is it a question of how many ships can you dock or is it a question of how fast you get them away from the port and get them to where ever they’re supposed to go? Because it’s a huge amount of improvements in the latter I understand.

A: Cliff Stewart: It’s an interesting question; in 1999 the entire port of Vancouver and Fraser River and all of the ports that were here at the time doing container business handled about 1 million TEUs through the whole year of 1999. In 2010, all of those facilities together handled 2.5 million TEU’s, two and a half times as many with less vessel calls. Fewer ships came in the container sector in 2010 then came in 1999. The ships got bigger, and amount of cargo on them got bigger. So it hasn’t really been about the number of vessel calls. There are two things that regulate it if you get beyond that. One of the things is how much land you have to receive and to dispatch the cargo. The other thing as you say is the infrastructure inland, the roads, rail and other supportive infrastructure that enable the multiplicity of flows to happen. Some of the flows will go directly onto rail at the container terminal and leave the region and some of them are
transloaded, go to rail and leave the region, some of them going to distribution centres and then are transloaded and leave the region. Some of them go to distribution centres and are distributed within the region. So it’s a whole combination of all of those things.

Q:  

Lucie Matich: Following on that, larger ships, how does that affect the Fraser Docks and what is the future in your plan for the Fraser Docks?

A:  

Cliff Stewart: We are actually looking at that to see whether or not things can be done to allow larger ships that are coming in to go to Fraser Surrey Docks. There are a number of challenges with that as you can imagine. The most obvious one is the George Massey Tunnel. It is part of what we’re examining and whether it has a role and what role it continues to have in container business as a deep sea terminal or as a short sea shipping terminal.

C:  

Judy Kirk: I’m going to ask Cliff to carry on a bit on what is Terminal 2 and if you could note your questions for a moment because I want to get to the topics of consultation methods. I am very mindful of time and Dan you were talking about 3 o’clock and I want you to feel free to leave if you need to leave.

C:  

Dan Barnscher: Don’t worry I have no qualms at leaving at three. This is an education though, I’m very impressed.

C:  

Cliff Stewart: This is a very early process to be out talking to the public and somebody said to me about the project, I feel like I’m in a fog because I can’t really see what it is we’re talking about. I said to them, you’re not in a fog we’re so early in the process that there’s nothing to see. That’s important to understand as I talk about Terminal 2 as a proposed, multi berth container terminal with a capacity of more than 2 million TEUs. It is intended to be located at Roberts Bank and those of you who have been part of the processes in the past looking at Terminal 2 it’s not something new. We haven’t created an entirely new vision. We’re re-examining the options that had been looked before. The scope, scale and location have not been defined and once they are at the point when there is something to consult on, then we will be back as part of the next phase in the process to say here’s what it is we’re actually talking about in detail. Again notwithstanding the view of this, subject to environmental approvals, would be constructed at Roberts Bank adjacent to Deltaport and West Shore Terminals. From our perspective the critical term there is, subject to environmental approvals and recognizing that some of you have scepticism about that. The intention is that this facility could be delivered by 2020 and that it will be connected to particularly Canada by combination of Roberts Bank Rail Corridor and the road network that would be in place at that time and potentially by the Fraser River as a short sea shipping route. I say potentially because to this point the market has not accepted that’s a valuable method and lots of things may change relative to that in the next ten years.
Q: **Rosemary Zelinka:** I seem to recollect there were suggestions as to why can’t the distribution centres in the Lower Mainland open up at night? Because they only seem to be open when everybody else wanted to travel.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I think Rosemary inside that comment is a question about, could we make sure that is a subject of discussion in this consultation. I’ve heard it discussed elsewhere in the region and I don’t know definitively what the reason is.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** It’s an interesting question because it runs smack dab into the whole question of global interest. In certain municipalities, trucks aren’t allowed to travel at night because it’s considered to be a problem. So that’s one of the issues. Another issue is the issue of the market and cost of operating differential hours and whether or not there’s value in that. Ultimately, I think you’ll see all of those sorts of things happen to get the most out of the infrastructure that’s there.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka:** Is it the intention that the economic analysis part of the Environmental Assessment will include an analysis of this sort of thing in its consideration?

C: **Judy Kirk:** Michelle would it include that?

A: **Michelle Lachmann:** An economic analysis of running the operations differently?

C: **Judy Kirk:** Right, of longer working.

C: **Rosemary Zelinka:** It all serves to try and identify the need for this.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** We have to be extremely careful because ultimately the panel or whatever environmental regulatory process we are part of will tell us what we have to study. There certainly things that we are going to look that we think we need to look at and this is a good example of it. But ultimately, we can’t tell you today what the scope of studies will be because it will be a panel that will make that decision.

C: **Judy Kirk:** But we can say Michelle, or tell me if you cannot that socioeconomic studies in relation to environmental assessments can look at things like that.

A: **Michelle Lachmann:** Yes.

A: **Judy Kirk:** I think Rosemary that’s a good question and I think Cliff may not be able to answer it definitively because he’s not the regulator. But other environmental processes have done socioeconomic studies and do look at things like that.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka:** Did it not say that the Environmental Assessment has to provide a justification for building it?

A: **Judy Kirk:** No, absolutely not. The Environmental Assessment reviews justification, it does not build justification. It looks at whether there is justification. Now that’s a very big difference and it’s almost the opposite of what you said. I just want to make sure there’s no misunderstanding.

C: **Rosemary Zelinka:** This is what we want.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** The proponent...

C: **Rosemary Zelinka:** This is what the public will want, a justification for doing this.

A: **Judy Kirk:** I want to be really clear here. The environmental review processes, and you will have an opportunity to look at this in detail if there’s an environmental review and the documents haven’t yet been filed to ask them
about that. But if there is then you will have an opportunity to look at study outlines, and at what studies should be done. Within that the socioeconomic analysis are generally done and this whole notion, the proponent whether the Port or whoever else, not just this project but others. They have to demonstrate need, and it is the regulator reviews and determines whether that justification is reasonable.

Q: Rosemary Zelinka: So you’re saying you have to justify it.
A: Judy Kirk: Right.
Q: Rosemary Zelinka: Sorry I thought you said earlier you didn’t have to.
C: Cliff Stewart: No, the panel doesn’t have to justify it; the panel has to review the justification.
C: Rosemary Zelinka: I never said the panel has to justify it.
C: Judy Kirk: Yes, you did actually a few minutes ago that’s why I jumped on it.
C: Rosemary Zelinka: I intended to say it was my understanding that you had to justify it.
C: Cliff Stewart: The Port must, yes. Absolutely.
A: Judy Kirk: Good. I just want to make sure because it’s a very important distinction. Then the regulator reviews it.
A: Michelle Lachmann: There is a requirement in the act for a proponent to provide a justification for the need for the project.
C: Rosemary Zelinka: Our advice to you is you need to do that.

Q: Liz Walker: Is there something written that tells us what the criteria are in order for them to determine that there is a need present? Like something quantitative?
A: Michelle Lachmann: I haven’t seen that, I’m not a regulator so whether they have their own internal guidelines I’m not aware. But I haven’t seen that line by line, tick the box, yes this meets the justification.
C: Judy Kirk: We should take that as a follow up Dallas and I think we should take that as a follow up Michelle. It’s a very good question about whether regulators have essentially a Terms of Reference or something around that.
C: Cliff Stewart: We’re getting into a level of discourse that probably needs to identify for a moment that regulators are different from a panel. The panel is quasi-judicial body that has the power of subpoena and allows the power of cross examination. That panel is not the regulators. The regulators are people like the Canadian Wildlife Service, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Department of Transport and others that have acts they are required to enforce. Panel looks at whether or not, and includes submissions, whether or not what it is that the proponent is saying meets those requirements.
C: Judy Kirk: But I think what Liz is saying Cliff and I think it’s a very good question, is if you’re required to justify the project what are the criteria for looking at that justification. It’s a good question and we should at least follow up to see if that criteria exists.
C: Liz Walker: I always want to learn more.
C: Cliff Stewart: Where I was going next was, panel ultimately decides the criteria. It’s a public process where the scope of studies is proposed by the proponent, it goes through a public consultation process.

C: Judy Kirk: It does, but I think you might find, you know there might not be something definitive to this project Liz, but to answer your question other projects have had to do this, there have been other criteria and it may very well be of interest to you. That’s all. I think Liz’s question is more general. It’s wanting to know, generally what would that proponent have to do.

C: Liz Walker: Otherwise it’s very big, it’s just nice to nail down.

C: Judy Kirk: I just think it’s a reasonable follow up, and Michelle we should check. I don’t know whether it exists.

Q: Deb Jack: It’s really interesting, the fact that you’re in this process and you don’t know. I assume that it doesn’t exist because we ought to be able to go somewhere and say what are the Term of Reference for the regulators and for the panel.

A: Judy Kirk: Well because we’re sooner than that Deb. To Cliffs point we’re in advance of that.

C: Deb Jack: I mean that there should be somewhere a list of criteria that cover all of them.

C: Judy Kirk: I think there might be and it’s not all but a core of criteria and then there might be per project different things. I think we should go to the Federal Environmental Review sites and see. You can go to the Provincial and you may find it and I think Michelle can help look.

C: Dan Barnscher: Excuse me and thanks. This has been extremely interesting and invigorating I just wish I had more to offer. I am looking at it from a First Responder perspective.

C: Deb Jack: I was just about to say that I see First Responder implications there with regards to their expansion.

C: Dan Barnscher: First Responders have concerns over rail, road, shipping traffic and all that stuff. It’s just things we have to evolve and we can’t really comment that, no you can’t do it or we don’t want you to do it, it’s that we have to adapt to it. That’s our responsibility as First Responders.

C: Deb Jack: It’s not just adapting sir; it’s also to ask for more resources so you can do what you’re supposed to do.

C: Dan Barnscher: That could be one part of adapting, but not necessarily the only one. It’s not always more resources, more money, more firefighters etc. It’s maybe we have to change the way we do business and apply it differently. There are alternatives to things for sure, we’ve learned over the history that it’s not always about digging deeper into the tax payers pocket it’s about maybe adapting and changing the way we do business to make that dollar stretch to one dollar fifty and two dollars now when it didn’t used to be because we were so eager to ask for more money.

C: Judy Kirk: Thank you very much for coming. Alright, I’m going to ask you please Cliff to carry on to Page 8. Then if you could quite quickly go through that, then I
want to go through the topics because we’ve only got about twenty to thirty minutes before I’d like you to fill out your feedback forms.

C: *Ciff Stewart:* The question is, how can I get involved?
The fact that you’re here obviously means that you do know how to get involved. But as we move forward, you can see at the bottom of page 8 that this is the first of at least seven planned rounds, and I say at least because the fourth and sixth boxes have a little asterisk beside them. Those are the two that are required as part of the assessment process, the Draft Panel Guidelines and Environmental Assessment Public Hearing Process. The panel, assuming it is a panel, may require additional rounds of consultation over and above those. So it’s at least seven rounds and we expect it to take place over the next six to seven years. What we’re here today specifically to do is ask you two questions. If you move onto page 10 the two questions are: When we get to the consultation process, which continues with Project Definition, what topics do you wish to be consulted on and how do you wish to be consulted. Those really are the things we really want to come away from today’s meeting with. Certainly we’ve heard some things already but when you get to the questionnaire we would ask you to think not only of yourself, but a lot of you represent other groups and certainly there are demographic differences in terms of how people would like to be consulted. If you have some awareness about what you think other demographic groups think is appropriate please be comfortable to speak to that as well. We have a list on page 10 of the potential consultation topics. A good example of one that isn’t on the list but has come up several times and it came up here again today is the Pacific Flyway and the whole issue of migratory birds and potential for impacts on migratory birds. There are probably others that we haven’t got here. Please don’t think of this list as definitive but rather as a starting point for thinking about other things that you feel should be involved in the consultation process. That’s the first question, what do you wish to be consulted on? The second question is how and if you turn to page 12, this one I will turn over to Judy because she’s the consultation expert and she can talk about what it is that this is about.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Sure and just before I do that I know that Cliff touched on this lightly, on page 10, where we summarized some topics, project design elements and then given some examples such as the proposed terminal, marine traffic, land reclamation, roads, rail and other related topics. Culture and heritage, which could be maritime heritage, as well as marine archaeology, and on down the list, these are meant to indicate that the port has given this some serious thought. Not in any way to limit the range of topics that you might want to discuss. It would not have been reasonable in my view to come out with a blank slate. On page 12, again the same thing we’re given some examples of small group meetings which is the kind of thing we’re holding right now and an open house or series of open houses with Question and Answer periods, online video open houses. We’re trying to think more of digital ways. Because you can see with demographics of all of us that we don’t have anyone under thirty in this room I
don’t think. I have been doing this work for 28 years and I’ll tell you that the demographic in this room is not uncommon.

C: **Unknown**: We’re here in the middle of the day, what do you expect.

C: **Judy Kirk**: We do weekend, evening, breakfast meetings. The thing is that people who are of childbearing age and family age don’t have a lot of time to come out to meetings. They’ve got meeting demands of their time. Young people generally are not as comfortable about voicing their views in this kind of venue or open house venue. So all of that to say, we’re looking for a range of ways for online feedback forms, potentially online webinars, that kind of thing, in addition to the face-to-face meeting we’re doing here. All of that to say we’re very interested in some ideas about how not only how you might like to participate, but others. We’ve just given a few examples.

C: **Deb Jack**: I think you have got it pretty well covered. Certainly when we go out and meeting with the public the ones with children and all the rest of it say we have no time, simply no time we depend on you. Which makes the representation even more important.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka**: The question is what material are you going to present for whatever it is you do, whether it’s a meeting or whatever it is? Some of these topics relate specifically to the site in Delta. I don’t think people in Surrey are going to be that interested in how many oysters are going to die around the new dock.

C: **Judy Kirk**: Really?

C: **Rosemary Zelinka**: I think so.

C: **Deb Jack**: Well with respect Rosemary, We often forget that we are bounded on three sides by marine life and river life.

C: **Rosemary Zelinka**: What I’m trying to say is whatever you present to people in the Surrey area I think has to be more related to the sort of infrastructure, traffic and the rail.

A: **Judy Kirk**: That’s exactly why, Rosemary we’re coming to different communities. The Port could have, though it never said it wanted to, just stay in Delta. I mean but that is exactly why we are meeting not only here in Surrey but also in Langley, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver. So anything like that is of real interest.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka**: So really there’s another layer here and that’s an area layer. Do people want to know about projects throughout the whole area or is it just the Port that’s one option and then the infrastructure implications of the valleys.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: That’s one of the things that we hope to get out of this, is an answer to that. I don’t think we’re going to be showing different information in different locales, we will show everybody everything. But those things that people choose to be most focused on will be up to them.

Q: **Rosemary Zelinka**: The people in Surrey, except for a small group of us. I don’t think people in Surrey are going to be very interested because they aren’t going to see any implications that have any effect on them. It could have considerable impact, but mostly from the perspective of traffic etc.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: But not withstanding that we’ll show you here when we come out.
C:  *Rosemary Zelinka:* A lot of people may not have the time to absorb the whole thing.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* We will work to ensure to show those who wish only to see certain parts of it can find those parts easily and those who wish to see it all can find it all.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* Rosemary you know what we have done in the past, and I’ll admit here I hadn’t thought about it in this. In other projects where there have been more local area implications for things. Sometimes in a discussion guide and I’m not going to presuppose this because we haven’t finished our meeting and gathered all the input but sometimes we have actually done discussion guides that have sections and people can choose to fill out, address or be informed of all or just those related to the very local area where they are. I think that’s part, some of what you’re talking about. In any case, it’s something to consider here.

Q:  *Deb Jack:* It’s difficult to differentiate here.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* On the topic?

Q:  *Deb Jack:* Yes, because issues of clean air and clean water. The Port also impacts here in terms of clean air and clean water. GHG’s of course, the whole issue of land use and light also impact us it’s just a matter of degree. The people way up the valley, they’re the ones that get severely impacted in regards to anything that impacts the air. Where you have socioeconomic, as one fellow said to me in regards to the highway road expansion through Surrey they just go through Surrey and they don’t stop and it’s not important. The only thing important about Surrey is the fact it is a bed for the road because the trucks go from one side to the other. I thought that was an interesting perspective. He said there’s no value to those roads for us and we’re the ones who have to pay all the penalties to Surrey.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* That’s a really important point because I think part of what we want to hear about is for communities that feel that is their reality, than if you look at the second from the bottom, local benefits and opportunities, what sorts of things, given that that’s a reality, what can be done so that it does bring value and that would be one of the things we would be interested in knowing. What does the community think given that and accepting that for a moment as the reality, how does that get changed.

Q:  *Deb Jack:* Well I was being really facetious some years ago with some aspects of the South Fraser Perimeter Road and I said if all of the benefits are going to essentially the rest of Canada then why doesn’t the rest of Canada pay us compensation for all of the damage that’s being done here.

C:  *Cliff Stewart:* So the question that I’m asking you is...

C:  *Judy Kirk:* Who all across the country I suppose. The St. Lawrence Seaway can say the same thing.

C:  *Deb Jack:* Fair enough but I guess nobody’s thought about it before. But it was an interesting notion. It wasn’t original with me. But our water will be used so it will go down. Our power will be used, that will have an effect on citizens. The air will be damaged so that has health implications etc. It’s just an interesting perspective, the compensation thing so that also. The local benefits and
opportunities, so how far into the valley do you extend there. Certainly the implication impact will be extensive in Delta no question. But then we have lost a lot for the infrastructure already in so far as the South Fraser Perimeter Road installation’s concerned. From a living environment aspect an enormous amount already and a grave concern from one of our associates about the fact that the Environmental Assessment process because the planning system was fluid that the environmental assessment did not have to assess certain things that now indeed are going to be impacted but because they were left out of the original route and everything else were seen to be not needing assessment because it wouldn’t be impacted.

C: **Judy Kirk**: Just hold on Deb because what I think you’re talking about someone else mentioned that there were aspects about the Detail Design of South Fraser Perimeter Road which came after the environmental certification. I think that’s what you’re referring too. I just want to check if that is it. I don’t know if that’s true, I’m wanting to make sure that we reflect properly the comments.

C: **Deb Jack**: The latest one is why take out nearly two hectares of Burns Bog Forest Area on the periphery unless that wasn’t included. The road will go closer to Surrey Bend as I understand it was estimated initially that there was no impact statement. When you talk about land reclamation and all the rest it does have an impact on the living environment and everything that happens in the entire mouth of the Fraser and going around into Boundary Bay area. When you talk about the Pacific Flyway, it’s not just about the birds it’s the fact we have international obligations to protect those areas and there are profound environmental impacts for what goes on in Russia and way down in South America. I am not an expert in this, Liz could answer better. I’m not sure those things are included in things such as Environmental Assessments.

C: **Cliff Stewart**: That’s why we are here today because those are the sorts of things, if you have a specific issue that you think we should be consulting on that’s what we want to hear about. We want to know the full range of things that people want to talk about.

C: **Judy Kirk**: So what I’m going to ask, unless there are any other questions, because there isn’t any other information that Cliff wants to present, correct me if I’m wrong Cliff. We would like to receive your feedback for now, that said it is online if you do want to take time to reflect and not fill it out now please feel free to do so. I generally encourage people to fill it out at the meeting because we tend to get the feedback forms. If you could take ten minutes now and fill it out it would be much appreciated.

Q: **Lucie Matich**: One question, the land that is needed for expansion of the Port, is that ALR or is that Tsawwassen land? Or is there another level in there that we are missing. I’m interested in finding out where the land that you are going to use.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Again, part of the challenge in answering questions like that is we are so early in the process that we haven’t defined those sorts of things. We will
have it defined in the next consultation level by the next time we meet. But you
know if you draw circles around the terminals at Roberts Bank there’s several
types of land. There’s what is euphemistically called submerged land, so you and
I would call that water. That’s land which needs to be filled in order to be
created or at least raised above the water level. That land can be federal land,
provincial land, it can be First Nations land, depends on where it is. The second
type of land is in the broad category of what I would call land, because it’s
above the water level already. There’s First Nations industrial land adjacent,
there’s First Nations agricultural land adjacent, this is Tsawwassen First Nations’,
BC Rail owned agricultural land adjacent. There is other owned agricultural land
adjacent; there are other First Nations lands adjacent.

Q: Liz Walker: Agricultural land is ALR land though is it not?
A: Cliff Stewart: By and large I believe it is, but not all of it.
Q: Lucie Matich: It’s cultivated right now.
A: Cliff Stewart: I have to be very careful because it depends on what land you’re
talking about. But if you get on Google Earth and look at that part of the world it
certainly appears, at least the last time the satellite took a picture of it, appears
as though it’s cultivated.
Q: Unknown: I’m just wondering about the levels that you’re proposing about for
the consultation that there’s going to be.
A: Cliff Stewart: I think, as a general observation, I think the Agricultural Land
Commission will be heavily involved in the process.

The meeting ended at 3:30pm.
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Stakeholders:
Marian Adair, The Nature Trust of British Columbia
Stephen Brown, Chamber of Shipping of BC
Dan Buffett, Ducks Unlimited Canada
Jon Garson, BC Chamber
Pat Gordon, Sustainable Cities
Jeremy McCall, Nature Vancouver & Outdoor Recreation Council
Dan Overmyer, Nature Vancouver
Mauricio Seijo, Chamber of Shipping of BC
Louise Yako, BC Trucking Association

Port Metro Vancouver: Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development
Sarah McPherson, Senior Advisor, Communications and First Nations
Michelle Lachmann, Environmental Lead, Container Capacity Improvement Program
Dallas Henault, Senior Advisor, Communications and Consultation
Chris Chok, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 7:35 am

KEY THEMES:
- Participants expressed an interested in Port Metro Vancouver reviewing whether the Port of Prince Rupert expansion could address growth in demand for container capacity on Canada’s West Coast.
- Participants said that they want Port Metro Vancouver to consult with communities and stakeholders beyond the Lower Mainland, noting that the effects of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project were not only local, but also provincial and national.
- Participants expressed a desire to discuss the Pacific Flyway and migratory birds as part of the consultation regarding the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver consider integrated planning, including systems, wildlife, habitat and economic scenarios. Some participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver consider looking out further than a 20-year planning horizon.
1. **Judy Kirk, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review**

*Roundtable introductions were undertaken.*

C:  
*Judy Kirk:* Thank you for coming at this early hour, though at this time of year it feels pretty good rather than starting at this time of year in January.

I’m going to have the Port representatives introduce themselves. Kirk & Co. is a firm that specializes in consultation. Some of you here know that because we have helped the Port in other consultations and Stephen for example has been involved. We are going to be helping the Port with this Pre-Consultation, which is the first of many rounds of consultation associated with the Container Capacity Improvement Program, and very particularly the Proposed Terminal 2. This is the fifth meeting of seven. We are holding multi-stakeholder meetings in Vancouver, Delta, Langley, Richmond and Surrey. We’re hearing some very interesting view.

The purpose of this early consultation is to find out from you and others what you are interested in being consulting on, so what topics, and how. We have some ideas that are expressed here in the discussion guide, but not meant to limit at all only meant to start the conversation about how you want to be consulted and about what.

Chris Chok, my colleague will be taking notes of this session and we will be keeping a tape just to cross check the notes. We will be attributing your comments, unless you tell me you would prefer not to. If you want to do that now or later in private that’s fine, but you certainly have the option, otherwise we keep a full record of the meeting. It will form the basis of the consultation summary report that we do and the end of the stage, independently, and we will be giving that to Port Metro Vancouver to consider. They will be writing a consideration memo so you can see how the input was considered going forward.

And that kind of methodology will be utilized as we proceed in the various rounds. I have a cell phone in my briefcase, and it’s on vibrate, and I hope that yours is either off or on vibrate as well just so we don’t interrupt each other. Are there any questions before I ask Cliff and the others to introduce themselves?

C:  
*Cliff Stewart:* Good morning and thanks for coming. My name is Cliff Stewart, I am the director of infrastructure development for Port Metro Vancouver and my primary responsibility is the Container Capacity Improvement Program, which we’ll be speaking of in a few minutes. One of the major components of which is Terminal 2. Terminal 2 obviously is the subject of our discussions here this morning.
2.

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

C:  

Cliff Stewart: I’m not going to read this to you; the guide is a useful tool to structure the conversation. Please feel free to make it a conversation; it’s not intended to be a monologue. Simply, the purpose of the discussion guide is to give some structure to the conversation.

What is the Container Capacity Improvement Program?
Port Metro Vancouver, as part of its long range planning, sees a requirement for the ongoing addition of container capacity in Pacific Gateway, particularly in Port Metro Vancouver. The Container Capacity Improvement Program designed to ensure that capacity becomes available as it’s required. The proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project is a significant; probably the most significant component of that capacity improvement program and it’s the only part that’s a standalone terminal.

Why are we here today?
We are here today because we want to hear from you, in particular about two questions – as this process proceeds, we want to understand those issues upon
which you wish to be consulted, and we want to understand the nature of the consultation that you would like to see and of the format it takes.

Pre-Consultation, which is what we’re here for today is part of a best practice of consultation. It’s probably not something that you have run into before, if you have, very infrequently. Most organizations don’t engage in pre-consultation. As it says, it is that part of the process which is before the consultation. If you have specific questions about the project, I may or may not be able to answer them today because this process is very early.

The proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project has a delivery timeline of about ten years and we are in year one now. We anticipate that the approvals process would take about 6 years. This is something that we are looking to start construction in about 2017 or so.

**What is Port Metro Vancouver?**
In 2008, the three legacy port authorities in the Lower Mainland were combined, that is the Vancouver Port Authority, the Fraser River Port Authority and the North Fraser Port Authority into a single port authority, Port Metro Vancouver, in order to allow integrated planning and an integrated use of assets.

Port Metro Vancouver is Canada’s largest port, it is North America’s most diversified port and it is the largest port by tonnage on the West Coast of North America and the largest export Port. Quite simply the mandate of Port Metro Vancouver is to support the growth of Canadian trade.

**Why is trade important?**
Trade is important because of the economic benefits that are generated. Those benefits are felt not just in the gateway, not just in the region, not just in the province but across the country. Trade creates jobs, it creates tax revenue for municipalities and it produces economic benefits for all of Canada.

**How do we work towards responsible growth?**
An important part of ensuring responsible and sustainable growth is connecting with communities and ensuring that we have a shared commitment to sustainable solutions. We’re striving to further develop solid relationships at the local government and at the community level to identify common values, determine sustainable legacies and mitigate potential community impacts.

If you turn over to page 6, there is what appears to be a fairly simple graph there. It’s actually based on a significant amount of economic analysis regarding both the growth per GDP and population growth in Canada and in our trading partners’ economies in Asia through 2030. It says that on average in the next twenty years we anticipate to see about 5% annual growth in the flow of containers through the West Coast of Canada. 95% or so of the containers that
flow through Port Metro Vancouver are destined for or originate from Canadian sources. What this graph tells us is that somewhere around 2015 or so, we are going to run into a capacity crunch on the West Coast of Canada. There is a rule of thumb that says you should have new capacity ready to go when you reach about the 85% level of the existing capacity. If you run right up to the 100% capacity you start to run into lots of problems. So if you take the green line which is the existing installed capacity and take the 85% point around 2015 there starts to be a gap.

Q: Louise Yako: I just had a contextual question. I know that Port Metro Vancouver does projections fairly regularly. I’m wondering how accurate those past projects have been to date?
A: Cliff Stewart: Absent the global financial crisis, by the firm did this work for us, they have been particularly good. In spite of the global financial crisis we are now back to the low projections that were done back in the middle of the last decade. So I would say very good.

Q: Jeremy McCall: Which firm did do the projections?
A: Cliff Stewart: It was done by Seaport. Seaport Consultants.

C: Judy Kirk: Just before we continue, could you clarify please, because we have a record as well as people’s comments here. When you that last comment about the low projections are accurate, can you just explain that? What does that mean?
A: Cliff Stewart: Most projections involve and expected case, a low case and a high case. Up until 2007, the work that Seaport did for us and I think in 2004, if you take the actuals and plot them on top of the forecast at the time they follow very closely. Through 2008-2009, of course, they dropped significantly below, and then by 2010, they are back to point where they are just about at the low case forecast.

Q: Marion Adair: Just more of a curiosity question. We’ve seen over the years the change in the mode of how commodities are shipped and containers started coming in relatively recently. Is that going to be the mode, or is that projected to be the mode that is going out in the next twenty or thirty years and that’s why we’re focused on container shipping?
A: Cliff Stewart: I will just go back for a moment in answering the question, if you look at page 3 - there are actually five major streams of business in Port Metro Vancouver. One of them is automobiles, or as it’s called in the business ‘roro’ which stands for roll on, roll off. Although automobiles do get shipped in containers, both legitimately and illegitimately, that sector is not expected to change dramatically. The second sector, and that is by far the largest sector in Port Metro Vancouver, is bulk. It’s primarily, although not exclusively bulk export. By and large that is not expected to go into containers, so things like coal or sulphur or potash aren’t. There are certainly some bulk commodities, particularly in the green sector that do go in containers. I remember somebody saying a couple of years ago that they’d heard someone was shipping barley, and I don’t mean malting barley, but feed barley. The respondent said barley?
That’s like shipping dirt. There are things that are relatively low value that are beginning to go into containers. But primarily for bulk it would be high value items like malting barley. Break bulk is probably the sector that most significantly crosses over with containers. Break bulk is things like packaged lumber, baled pulp, panel products such as plywood and other sheet products. There is a significant cross over between break bulk, which is where they’re loaded by package into the hull of the ship and containers, where they are obviously containerized. Containers itself obviously and then crews, and with some very notable exceptions we tend not to ship passengers by container. We don’t see any cross over there. On the break bulk sector there is a significant cross over. The benefit from the shippers’ perspective is you’re able to ship a much smaller lot if you’re going by container then if you’re going by break bulk vessel and you don’t need specialized equipment to handle it when you get to the other end; the container can be used to deliver right to the end user.

C:  
**Judy Kirk:** Any other questions on that?

Q:  
**Louise Yako:** To go back to that graph that you were talking about on page 6. This is probably the average, what’s the range? The low and the high projection?

A:  
**Cliff Stewart:** The low, and I don’t have the number with me, I think that the high end is probably at a couple million more, and the low is a couple million less. It’s sort of in that range, by 2030.

C:  
**Judy Kirk:** I think Louise, if you’re interested, as well as others that there’s a summary of that report available online. Is there not?

C:  
**Cliff Stewart:** I’m not sure if it’s actually online, but on request we’re happy to give you a copy of it.

C:  
**Cliff Stewart:** I’ll make the point here that this speaks of BC West Coast. So this includes the Port of Prince Rupert. One of the questions that we get asked is, well why don’t you just build the terminal in Prince Rupert? I mentioned earlier that our mandate is to support Canadian trade. Certainly if the Port of Prince Rupert builds facilities that will potentially delay the point at which we’re required to provide facilities here. But we don’t have the luxury of making it, if you will, the Port of Prince Rupert’s responsibility to provide those facilities. We don’t have the luxury of waiting to see if they’re going to because as I mentioned the process will take about ten years. So we have to start now in order to be able to deliver by 2020. What we can do is that if other facilities become available or if the rate of growth slows down, we have the option to slow or pause the process as we move along through the preliminary design and permitting detailed design and construction phases of this project.

Q:  
**Jeremy McCall:** I’d like to pick up on that point. I cannot believe that a Federal agency such as Port Metro Vancouver cannot work cooperatively with the Port of Prince Rupert to work out who should take the lead on the next capacity increase. Did I misunderstand what you said? That you do not work with them at all?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** No, what I said was we can’t direct them as to what they do. So they are involved in a process to permit and build a facility and if they build that facility then that allows us the luxury of being able to slow the delivery of facilities here in Vancouver. But if they don’t, and quite simply, the decision on whether a facility gets built will be a market-based decision. So if the market doesn’t support the provision of those facilities in Prince Rupert and it does support the provision here in Vancouver then ultimately that will be an important consideration of where they’re building.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Other people have asked questions around this and I think Cliff it’s useful because some people, I’m assuming Steven and Mauricio because you’re involved in trade in some way know this but others may not. That is the kind of trade in Prince Rupert versus Vancouver.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** 95% of import containers through Port Metro Vancouver are destined for Canadian markets. In Prince Rupert, it’s a much higher percentage that is destined for American markets, somewhere between 40% and 60% of their business goes primarily to Chicago. There are a number of dynamics and Louise could probably speak much more eloquently then I can to some of them. There is only one railroad serving Prince Rupert. In spite of the fact that the terminal has been open and available for about four years now, there is only one shipping line serving Prince Rupert and there doesn’t seem to have been a clamour or demand for others to go there. Part of what makes Vancouver very attractive to shippers is it has a strong import and export business. That export business requires signification infrastructure. That infrastructure exists in Vancouver today and the business is well established and understood. It doesn’t exist in Prince Rupert and hasn’t by and large, developed in the four years that the port has been open. For those of you who know Port business, the other port that is serviced by one railroad in Canada is the Port of Halifax. That single rail service can be a significant trade barrier, particularly for customers who have had issues with that railroad or wish the ability to have a competitive alternative; remembering that a significant portion of the import cargo leaves by rail and virtually all of the export cargo arrives at coast by rail.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Any other questions before I ask Cliff to carry on?

**Page 7**

C: **Cliff Stewart:** So what is the Container Capacity Improvement Program? Starting back in the middle part of the last decade, so yes talking about potentially 2007 and earlier, there were two major projects in Vancouver, in Burrard Inlet. Both of which resulted in doubling the capacity of the exiting container terminals in Vanterm and Centerm. The third major project was the development of the Third Berth at Deltaport which opened at the beginning of last year. Collectively those three projects added probably about 1.6 million TEUs of capacity into the local market. One of the things that has been happening at the same time unfortunately is the ships are getting bigger, and fewer of the ships that call in Vancouver are able to access the terminal at
Fraser Surrey Docks on the Fraser River. So part of the program going forward is looking at that facility and looking at the river to see what opportunities there are essentially maintain the capacity that’s available there. We are also looking at road and rail enhancements to unleash additional capacity in Deltaport, at the container terminal there at Roberts Bank. Those are all short term projects where we are hoping to begin delivering capacity by about 2015 or 2016. We are look. That would hopefully carry us through until T2 could be ready in 2020. The expectation is that if this growth continues as projected here that Terminal 2 would meet Gateway requirements until the late 2020s at which point we would be able to go back into the inner harbour and look at additional capacity enhancements at Centerm and Vanterm again. Ultimately, the Container Capacity Improvement Program is a series of projects, some very small and some very large, whose purpose is to continue to find new container capacity.

Page 8

C: **Cliff Stewart:** We attempt to answer the question; how can I be involved? The fact that you are here this morning shows that you are involved, and are able to be involved but we want to talk about the process of consultation. We are looking at seven rounds of consultation over six to seven years. Some of those rounds, the fourth one and sixth one in that diagram at the bottom of the page would be mandated by the federal environmental assessment review process. There may be additional rounds which that process may mandate, but those are the minimum requirements. However as you can see we have proposed a consultation process that adds an additional 5 rounds, starting right now with Pre-Consultation and carrying on, depending on the length of the environmental process, over about six or seven years. Judy, is there anything you would like to add about the process?

A: **Judy Kirk:** Only that what people have told us and told other organizations over two or more decades in the Lower Mainland and in British Columbia is that they want to be early and often. This is early, very early and certainly the Port has agreed, on our recommendation to do a multi-round process. We are interested in your feedback on that, and once we get into the next few pages, what topics you want to discuss. You may not know all the topics now but to at least start thinking about that and how you want to be consulted about that. We are in an age where depending where you are in the province, depending on the demographics of those involved, in other words the age and electronic literacy, people want face-to-face interactions or they want online interactions or everything in between. We are very interested in seeking your sense of how you would like to be involved and in what range of things. The only other thing I would say is that the consideration of the input that the Port has committed to is a very transparent process where once Kirk & Co. has written the consultation summary report the technical team at the Port will look at the feedback and articulate how they considered the input they could use and the input they couldn’t use and why. It’s an emerging best practice and when I say emerging I mean that not all organizations adopt that practice. I’m happy to take any
questions or talk to any of you afterwards about the consultation process. There is a feedback form attached to this and it is also online but we’d very much appreciate it today if you could take the time to do that.

C:  

_Clip Stewart:_ Ok, so just a reminder that what we are consulting on today is how you want to be consulted as we move through the process and the topics you wish to be consulted upon. So turning to page 10, obviously we’re not coming to this with a blank canvas and we’ve been through the Third Berth project at Deltaport the involved some aspects of this consultation process. So we do have a sense of the types of issues that people want to be consulted on. That list on page 10 is the result of that understanding. However, this is not intended to be either exhaustive of limiting, rather it’s a starting point for people to consider when they think about the types of things they want to be consulted on. Judy mentioned that the input will be used to develop a consultation summary document so that we understand the themes that have emerged from each round of consultation, and to develop a consideration memo; which explains how we used the input or if we weren’t able to, why we weren’t able to. So if you look at page 11, and on to page 12. Page 11 we have a specific list of items that you may or may not feel are appropriate for consultation and you have the opportunity to express that between, extremely important and not important at all.

Then on page 12 the opportunity to list any of those things that you don’t feel have been addressed that should be as part of the process. Then at the bottom of page 12, and on to page 13 there are lists of methods to being consulted. Those which we have specifically thought of and others that you may think of that we don’t have. And finally, on page 14, in case what you want to talk about is nothing at all about what we wanted to talk about, the opportunity to put additional comments related to the program, the Terminal 2 project or anything else that you think is germane to you and the Port.

3. **Q&A and Discussion**

Q:  

_Jeremy McCall:_ What is a webinar, please?

A:  

_Judy Kirk:_ A webinar is an online meeting. If we were holding this meeting as a webinar, every one of us would be probably at our office or our home and we would have a computer screen in front of us. The material from the discussion guide would be on the screen, you would hear us over your computer, and we would hear one another over a computer. So it’s essentially a seminar, that’s where the name emerged, but it’s online.

Q:  

_Jeremy McCall:_ Sort of like a video conference?

A:  

_Judy Kirk:_ So you can hear and see. It’s a lot like a video conference except that the information streaming is a little more advanced. The way the format is built you can see questions on the screen, you can see information on the screen whereas video conferences generally are just visual and hearing. You don’t generally see information on the screen.
C: *Cliff Stewart:* But in a webinar you don’t see the other participants.

A: *Judy Kirk:* Well interestingly you can, but here’s the limiter on that because these technologies are still emerging if you don’t have an up to date computer system with a camera then you won’t.

C: *Unknown:* Sort of like Skype.

A: *Judy Kirk:* It is, though it’s simpler than that to be honest. But the point is that you will only be seen if you have a camera and know how to connect otherwise you can be heard. What we’re finding is that a webinar is a very good tool in rural consultations, when you are trying to consult in the winter and you have travel issues, people want to be involved. Or it’s a national issue and to include people across the country. It’s not that much a tool for consultation like this one in my opinion because we’re in the Lower Mainland, very particularly Delta, Surrey, Langley, Vancouver, and Richmond where people can come together. But this is why we want feedback on it. We want to know whether people are interested in it as a method. Any questions or comments?

We would very much like to hear from you Steven and others, Jeremy, Dan and everyone about whether you think the topics adequately cover the range of things that you think should be covered or whether you think that there should be other things.

Q: *Jon Garson:* Not on the topics as such but what is the process for reaching out to communities outside the lower mainland? A lot of communities are dependent on getting their product to the market through the port. There is a lot of interest in what happens both with the Port and the transportation in the Lower Mainland in general. Is there a process for broader Provincial consultation?

A: *Judy Kirk:* We have not considered that, Jon, so that is a very good point and please put it on your feedback form and we’ll note it here. We have so far looked at this as a Lower Mainland consultation if you will, and very particularly the communities I just mentioned but you make a good point.

Q: *Stephen Brown:* Jon reminded me, before I get into any other points that I think it is important because we as an industry are faced with looking at explaining why there are increases in marine traffic, and why marine traffic is evolving. Of course, those concerns that we have to deal with extend far beyond the Lower Mainland. I think Jon raises a good point and we do need to ensure that we explain to people why there are bigger and sometimes more frequent ships. It’s probably not a bad idea that in the consultation process, we address that. The context in which it’s been happening in recent times is of course tank traffic. I think it’s important to set a context for what we’re doing here. We are a minnow of sorts in terms of containers here in Port Metro Vancouver. The total amount of containers by the end of this year that will be handled globally will be something around 600 million TEUs. So we will be handling something around half of 1% of the total global containers. Although sometimes when you look at Deltaport and you see three ships working there you may wonder what is all of this activity? I think you have to contextualize what we are actually looking at here in terms of what is going on worldwide. I think it is important that we
follow through this process; we pick up on best practices that are being adopted worldwide as well as at the container terminals. There are dozens of container terminals being developed worldwide. I think it’s a great opportunity for Port Metro Vancouver to ensure that we pick up on those best practices and steal other people’s ideas to make sure that we come out with a super duper project. I think the point that was raised about the capacity of Prince Rupert versus the capacity of Vancouver probably does need to be addressed in a little bit more thoroughness as I suspect that question will not go away. The Port of Prince Rupert has some very ambitious expansion plans. They do now have approval for their phase 2 of their own container terminal which will take them up to about 2.7 million TEUs of capacity. They have about 700,000 TEUs at the moment and they got approval for another 2 million so that’ll take them up to 2.7 million TEUs. But Cliff is very accurate in the sense that their business model is predicated on US trade, not necessarily servicing container trade; although there is an increasingly important component to what they’re doing in Prince Rupert in terms of container traffic into Ontario and Quebec. So I think what we perhaps we need to do is break down the graph on page 6 and look at that in a bit more detail.

I also think it would be helpful, because in another forum, we are talking about Port 2050. It would be helpful to look further ahead than 2030 and look at the situation in 2050. If we are to develop T2 and I’m sure that we have to develop T2, there’s no question about that, from economic necessity. But the fact is that we need to look at what is the master plan beyond T2 and at what rate of expansion would we need to build upon from a T2. I would be disappointed if we didn’t look at this project in the context of the Port 2050 discussion that the Port has already initiated about a year ago and look at the various phases of the T2 project. There are some initial comments.

I just conclude by saying we are very involved in the Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area and people around this table are quite familiar with that. You cannot underestimate the level of concern that people have with the perception that we are increasing shipping traffic and not telling people enough about what we’re up to. Here is a great opportunity for us to get it right. We haven’t done particularly well in the past but I think we can do a better job in the future. I’m really happy that we’ve started this consultation process at this level and think we can really do well.

C:  
Jeremy McCall: I cannot let that statement by Stephen go unchallenged. The statement that he made that we have to go ahead with Terminal 2 regardless. I know you represent the Chamber of Shipping, Stephen, but I do suggest that is a question that has to be resolved in terms of future capacity. Just to present another aspect of this whole question, there are seven hundred important bird areas in Canada. The number one important bird area in Canada is Boundary Bay and Roberts Bank because of its position on the Pacific Flyway because of the critical species that stop over there on their way to and from their nesting
grounds in the north and their wintering grounds in the south. I think it’s sad that Port Metro Vancouver lost a lot of credibility during the process that led up to the Third Berth at Deltaport. First of all they filed with the environmental assessment authorities the fact that they were going to move ahead with Terminal 2. Then when the question of cumulative impact assessment came up in its environmental processes they pulled it out again to try and purport that this terminal would not go ahead at all. Well, now it is presumably going ahead, Stephen says it has to go ahead. I don’t think it necessarily has to go ahead; there are a number of things happening that really put a question mark around the demand side of container traffic through Terminal 2. I think, myself, from observing most weekends what happens in the downtown container terminals and knowing what happens with the truck traffic through the tunnel and out to the Deltaport that the container traffic is being shifted from downtown to Deltaport. I think that will continue with Terminal 2. I think that whole question has to be examined. I was intrigued by something that Cliff pointed out on page 7 about the fact that maybe down the road once they’ve desecrated Roberts Bank even more, they may be some improvements to the downtown container terminals. Well, why isn’t that going to be done first? It seems to me that first of all, Port Metro Vancouver should be doing everything it can to improve the terminals downtown. Only then should it be necessary to go ahead with any other terminal if justified. I just want people to know that this proposed terminal is taking place in a very significant wildlife habitat area and I can assure you that the naturalists will be totally opposed to it. Aspects such as socio-economic as traffic, the traffic is unbelievable already. I don’t know if anyone has driven out in Delta lately like I did the other night to a meeting. The Delta farmland, some of the best farmland in Canada is gradually being covered with piles of dirt so they can build the South Fraser Perimeter Road and all kinds of other things associated with the increase in traffic in that terminal which is in exactly the wrong place.

A: Cliff Stewart: Just a couple of things Jeremy. You mentioned that T2 was removed from the table so that the cumulative effects would not need to be considered. I need to correct that incorrect statement. In fact, the cumulative effects for Terminal 2 were required to be and were included in the cumulative effects for the Deltaport Third Berth. Notwithstanding that, the project wasn’t considered to be a go at that time. Because it’s a requirement to consider not only projects that are reasonably foreseeable. So in fact, the Deltaport Third Berth cumulative effects included cumulative effects for both the increased capacity for Deltaport as it was then understood and the capacity for T2 as it was then understood.

C: Jeremy McCall: That was not my understanding.

A: Cliff Stewart: The second question was about the inner harbour. The hundreds of millions of dollars that were invested in the inner harbour were invested by private companies to increase the capacity of the terminals using the best then available technology. Those companies have leases on those terminals that have a time frame. They have to be able to get the return on the investment. The expectation is that sometime around the end of the next decade, they will be in
a position to reinvest with then best available technology with an expectation of increasing capacity again. So that’s why it’s happening in the way that it’s happening.

Q: Marion Adair: I guess a related question, I was wondering and I haven’t been as conversive in projects as I’ve been involved in today. Here we are talking about the bits that are Port Metro Vancouver’s responsibility but obviously they are interconnected with the backup, whether it’s rail or road. How much is this development? Is there going to be some sort of coordinated process with the other agencies responsible for those other infrastructures and the impacts, again it’s sort of the cumulative effects, but it’s the total project look. How the timeframes, and reliance’s of those kind of support infrastructure. Obviously I mean clogged and everything else here. How is that all related? That gives a better overall picture on what the total project implications are in the Lower Mainland.

A: Cliff Stewart: That’s a good question. There are currently two major support infrastructure projects underway. One is the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Project and the purpose of that is twofold. A relatively small component of it is to provide additional rail capacity by the extension of sidings to allow the passing of longer trains. Passing sidings at Mud Bay, at Pratt, and at Rawlison. Mud Bay is just near where the Burlington Northern line comes up at the north end of Boundary Bay. Pratt is a little further east, but not as far east as Cloverdale. Rawlison is up where the CP line crosses the freeway at 232nd St. There are three relatively small projects there to increase existing sidings so that twelve thousand foot trains can pass on the right of way. Those are the only things that are being done to actually increase rail capacity. One of the things that will be done as part of this project is to model that facility. Again, because it’s been done lots of times just to confirm that there are no other rail capacity issues required to allow this facility to be supported from the rail perspective. The much larger and I think in many ways more important part of the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor is the provision of a series of grade separated crossings, in other words overpasses to allow those communities through which the rail passes to be less affected by the rail corridor itself. In particularly the Langleys and Surrey, although there are a couple of, grade separated crossings going through in Delta as well. Now, there are a variety of results. For those who live in the Panorama Ridge section of Surrey, the grade separated crossings provide for a whistle cessation program. What that means is when you have grade crossings, every time the train approaches a crossing they are required by law to blow their whistle. So by getting rid of at-grade crossings and going to grade separated crossings first of all people who want to move north south in that corridor aren’t stopped from doing that. For the people who live on the hill above the track the trains no longer have to blow their whistles as they travel through the neighbourhood. In the Langleys, it’s purely about traffic. We were out in Langley yesterday, and I lived out there 20 years ago and it was a difficult time then and it’s obviously much more difficult today. There’s a series of overpasses that are planned or under construction out in Langley to allow people to live and work
and do their business on either side of the track without concern of the transit of trains. So that’s a really important, and I would call it a pre-cursor project, on the rail side.

Notwithstanding people’s views on the South Fraser Perimeter Road, from a traffic perspective, the South Fraser Perimeter Road will address the truck traffic that would be generated by the Container Capacity Improvement Program certainly over the next two decades.

Q: Pat Gordon: I just thought listening to the fifty years out and twenty years out that I’ve done 2-3 big planning projects and the cities in our international network for sustainable cities take on scenario planning. And I’m wondering, given the complexity and breadth and length of time that you’re trying to embrace in this that scenario planning enables participants to understand some of those interacting complexities. Even in a charrette-y way, you could do a rapid prototyping build to this so you’re not modelling necessarily; you’re actually having a conversation as part of building up those scenarios. Certainly for cities that’s what we do; we talk about long range features for the city. And then it also gets to the concept of the ‘what ifs’. What if the economy tanks? What if there’s a big change in how we ship? You are then able to articulate the need for some sort of resilience. I think some people call it risk management. The idea of being resilient within that is having the conversation at least about how you respond to another tank in the economy. Likely there could be another dip somewhere else along the way. It’s that idea of adaptability and resiliency within it. I guess they sort of fit together, but that idea of embracing the whole long term and it includes the, ‘what ifs’ in there because there are a lot of ‘what ifs’.

A: Cliff Stewart: That is a really good point. And the process that Stephen alluded to, Port 2050, is scenario planning and fits within that scenario plan.

C: Pat Gordon: Everyone wants to know. Whether it’s Prince George and this or whether it’s the whole west coast. It’s always going to be put into a broader context because you’re connected.

C: Cliff Stewart: It’s interesting, but I haven’t heard it here today but I’ll bring it up because I’ve heard it in any other meeting, the question of the Panama Canal, the widening, deepening and lengthening of the Panama Canal which is due to open in 2014. There’s been significant work done on examining the expected impacts of the Panama Canal. I remember someone saying at a conference once that transportation is like water, it finds its lowest level, its lowest cost level. What all of the experts are saying about the Panama Canal is that it definitely will move the line. There’s a line around North America where for goods coming from Asia there are three choices. Your goods can come to the West Coast and move by rail. They can come through the Panama Canal to a gulf coast or East Coast port and go by rail. Or they can come through the Suez to the East Coast and go by rail or truck. But for distance points it’s almost always rail. And the line between which it’s cheaper to come through the West Coast and go by rail versus going by Panama is definitely going to move north and inland, but it’s not
going to come anywhere near Chicago, Toronto or Montreal. Given that 95% of what we’re handling here goes to those three places there is no expectation that Panama will have any measurable impact on Port Metro Vancouver. And speaking about LA and Long Beach which are not just big players, they’re the big player. Collectively LA and Long Beach have 15 million TEUs of capacity while the coast of British Columbia has 4.3 million TEUs of capacity to give you a sense of scale. There are a number of experts who believe that absent of the Panama Canal, that LA and Long Beach will be back to gridlock by 2015. There are no projects currently down there that are going to deliver more capacity by 2015. So when you talked about putting that in the broader context for those who think that the opportunity is to simply do nothing in Canada and we’ll just use the American assets to deliver our containers it’s not realistic for a host of reasons including that by the time we would need it it’s not likely to be there.

C: 
*Pat Gordon:* I think what some scenario process would do, would allow the fact that what you’re dealing with, interactive transportation networks you’re thinking about the networks of how wildlife moves and the water systems are in there as well. Because of the level of complexity it allows you actually, and you’re not breaking it down, but dealing with just the nature, keeping that diverse enough, I think you get a much stronger product as a result. It causes you to question. The graph, standing on its own, is not enough to know, what if. Then you get stories from a person who hasn’t been involved can follow the story of the wildlife that migrates through and it’s a way to deal with that astounding amount of complexity.

A: 
*Cliff Stewart:* Something I want to mention about the graph. The graph is a call to action on the basis of how it takes to deliver capacity. It was interesting that in Surrey yesterday afternoon several of the proponents said, well once you’ve spent all the money on the planning process, you’ll just go ahead whether you need it or not. When you talk about the scale of the dollars in the planning process and the scale of the dollars in the delivery process it’s pretty clear that it wouldn’t happen. The beauty of the graph as a call to action is that it allows you to move forward to the point where you could make that decision and then make that decision on what will no longer be a forecast. But you’ll have five or six years of actual growth to know whether or not you continue to have a problem. It’s important to understand and to go back to what Jeremy was saying we’re absolutely aware of the importance of the Flyway. We’re absolutely aware that on given days 25% of the entire Western Sandpiper population is at Roberts Bank feeding on its way north or south. There are other issues out there that we may have the opportunity to deal with positively in terms of addressing things like sea levels rising related to Global Warming. Because those Sandpipers feed on biofilm, the biofilm is very sensitive to sea level. Somebody is going to need to do something about it or there’s going to be a problem or the Flyway regardless of whether there’s a terminal built. You talk about bringing together disparate issues and disparate interests. That’s a big part of what we want to hear from the public about. What good, besides economic good, can come out of a project like this and how can other things be enabled that would otherwise probably not be enabled.
C: *Dan Buffett:* Cliff, you have alluded to this as well – the importance of the flyway. As Jeremy mentioned the importance of the Fraser goes beyond national and international recognition. Unfortunately, our regulatory review mandates some very specific endangered species or fish. But the Fraser, almost the majority of its value is on endangered species and fish. I think, Pat had mentioned too, moving this beyond just site specific and thinking in terms of systems. I think that could be a really valuable asset that the Port could bring, so that we’re looking at things in terms of systems and not just here’s the site impact. Get to the spirit and intent of cumulative impacts. I’ve been in conservation for about seventeen years now and in government. We’ve been so site specific whether it’s farmland or habitat. I think there is a good opportunity, we’ve got a good planning time to look at these issues. No matter whether it’s moving forward at T2 or the Burrard Inlet, but looking at the entire system of the Fraser I think will really benefit and maintain what we have by integrity. I think there are a number of agencies that this thinking has been there for the last few years, and if it could be cultured a bit more we could actually create something great and have a lot of us not fighting. Because there is just one land left in the Fraser. Even though I’m maybe talking about wildlife and habitat, but moving beyond looking at a site. I think the economics is looking at it that way, and I think the habitat can be developed that was as well. There are a lot of partners, be it BC Nature or any other.

Q: *Louise Yako:* One of the additional pieces of information that I think would be helpful is with greater context about how we make better use of what we have already invested. I’m thinking about the possibility of operational efficiencies specifically related to terminals. What happens if we improve double ended moves, what happens if we go to 24 hour operations? How that additional piece of information will be helpful in understanding if we do that how much of this additional capacity will be required. My guess is that it’s not going to be enough to handle increased volumes. But I think it would help communities, residents, and other stakeholders understand what else what could be done to try and mitigate a need for additional capacity.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Certainly, that’s interesting, it’s something that is a part of we will be looking at. The preliminary look, it doesn’t probably address the capacity question but it definitely addresses the offsite question. The more double ended truck moves there are, the less truck moves there are per container that moves. Obviously short sea shipping is an example of something that can have a profound impact on the offsites because while 60%-70% of containers leave the terminal immediately by rail of the 30%-35% that leave by truck, 20% of them actually get reprocessed and leave the Lower Mainland by rail within 72 hours. Although people view it as being truck traffic, a significant portion of that truck traffic ultimately ends up on rail. So there are lots of opportunities to do the business differently. The 24 hour operation one is a very interesting one. As you remember during the Olympics, the question of 24 hour operations was a hot topic because of the requirement to allow it in the City of Vancouver, because currently it’s not. Lots of municipalities don’t look at 24 hours operations as a
solution they look at it as a problem. A lot of what we will run into as a program as we go through and a lot of what we as a population will run into is one person’s solution is another person’s problem. We have to negotiate that fine line that gives the best overall result to the greatest number of people, systems, and eco-systems and other.

C:  *Marion Adair:* Picking up on some of the same themes that were already picked up on and that have already been said. The question, if we are talking about overall integrated planning or system planning out into the future, climate change is definitely one to be factored in and considered. Not to be looking necessarily just at the dollars or to the bottom line, however it is you want to characterize that, but taking into consideration ecosystem, goods and services component. The provincial government says the best place on earth and all of these types of things. Port Metro Vancouver wants to stand up as being a leader and that can stand out of something that is significant at this port and in the area that has got the province of BC the highest biodiversity values in Canada, in particularly, the Fraser Estuary and its significance from a global standpoint. We already know that most of the habitat or original habitat in the Lower Fraser here has been degraded or converted. We’re looking at either having to rehabilitate and that takes a long time. Even if you look at concepts of habitat banking or whatever that should already be into looking at this process or looking at scenarios.

Q:  *Pat Gordon:* One more quick thing – working with cities, more of them are asking the avoidance questions – how to avoid having to build infrastructure and that’s just one of those cost effectiveness kind of things. How you get there is another question but if you think about energy utilities are asking that, cities with their water treatment facilities are asking that. Is there something we can do on this? It’s easy on the efficiency but efficiency and conservation, in order to stop needing to build in the first place. But it is very difficult I find talking to transportation engineers and water engineers they like building stuff. It’s almost the two year old question of why are we doing this? Way back to how do we avoid it in the first place and I don’t think that’s a bad thing to ask at this point. What does avoidance look like from cost? Cost is probably the most powerful leverage.

Q:  *Dan Overmyer:* With all of the building of new roads and rail lines, how will it relate to the Agricultural Land Reserve?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* That’s a good question, that’s part of what we’ll be looking at. The road piece apart from Deltaport Way, and we don’t know yet because we haven’t finished doing the studies, we don’t expect that there are additional roads beyond those that are already under way that would be required for this. Deltaport Way already has a right of way that already exists and allows for widening. On the rail side – the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor for those of you who don’t know, actually belongs to four different railroads. So there’s 26 miles of rail but there’s four different railroads that are involved – so when you talk
about an integrated planning process, it’s about as integrated as it gets. The Agricultural Land Commission is very involved in any conversations about construction on agricultural land. They would be ultimately the arbiters of that question.

C: Judy Kirk: Part of my job is being on time. I would like to leave a few minutes at the end for you to fill out your feedback form to encourage you to leave it here today. I do want to reiterate though it is online so if you want more time to consider it and fill it out and send it to us online that’s just fine. But I would very much like to encourage you to send it to us so we have your individual feedback as well as the summery of this discussion.

Q: Jeremy McCall: I would like to make one point about truck traffic and then comment on the chart on page 6. Cliff, you said that the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which of course we all detest but nevertheless it is going ahead, will relieve some of the truck traffic. But if you look at Knight St. and the tunnel a huge amount of the truck traffic is between Downtown Vancouver terminals and the DeltaPort. I don’t see how South Fraser Perimeter Road would alleviate that.

A: Cliff Stewart: It’s interesting what people see, what appears to be and what it is aren’t always the same.

Q: Jeremy McCall: My wife drives through the tunnel every day to work so she gives me the details. She drives in a tiny little Honda Fit, so she’s very conscious of these enormous container trucks.

A: Cliff Stewart: The majority of container support facilities, whether they’re transload facilities or others, they are in four areas. They are in Tilbury and Sunbury along River Rd. on the south arm. They are in the Richmond properties area which is near Nelson Rd. in Richmond. They are out towards the CP Rail yard out in Coquitlam. The South Fraser Perimeter Road and the Alex Fraser is likely to be a preferred choice. Today, they don’t have an option if they want to get to the Richmond properties they have to go through the tunnel. There’s really no other practical way for them to get there. In terms of the traffic on Knight Street, traffic on Knight Street is related to these terminals, it’s not related to traffic out of Roberts Bank. By and large, containers do not travel over land between marine container terminals in the Port of Vancouver. A container will come off a marine container terminal and it will go to either a distribution facility or a trans loading facility. Then that container will go back to an empty storage depot or directly to an export stuffing facility and then it will go back, most likely back to the same terminal that it originated from as an export. So yes, there are trucks on Knight Street, there are definitely trucks through the tunnel, and nothing that I’m talking about is going to have any effect on the trucks on Knight Street. But we expect that it’ll have a significant effect on the trucks that are in the tunnel.

Q: Jeremy McCall: Thank you. On the chart I wonder if you do any future documents like this for the public? Where instead of saying there’s a hard and fast line like that, show the low case, high case, and estimating case. This is really far too categorical for what the situation is.
A: Cliff Stewart: Well no, I would suggest that when you’re discussing this with the public you show the public.

C: Judy Kirk: I hear you, the high, low and medium.

C: Jeremy McCall: High, low and medium. Because a lot of people in the public would believe and say that’s it. But let’s face it, your job is to try and educate the public at the same time you’re consulting. So I suggest that people should not be asked to go to the report. But a better reading of what the report says should be shown on your public relations materials.

C: Jon Garson: You can’t post low, medium and high cases without some content as to why there are three different actions. To go to the report, you still have to put a bit of detail in context around that.

C: Judy Kirk: We will look at that. I think that it’s a fair comment around people’s interpretation of it. I think it’s important that people have access to both. We know from years and years of experience that different people have different levels of desire for information and engagement. You need to provide layers.

C: Jeremy McCall: It is also customary to put sources when you show information such as that. It is customary to show the source on the chart.

C: Judy Kirk: Is that not the source on the side there, Preliminary West Coast Container Traffic Projections. I think that is the source, but it’s not clear enough Jeremy and we’ll make sure it is.

C: Jeremy McCall: It doesn’t say the name of the consultant.

C: Judy Kirk: I take your point. Any other comments or questions before I ask to fill out your feedback form?

Q: Dan Overmyer: Are you going to give us some information about who you and Cliff are and how to reach you and what your positions are?

A: Judy Kirk: Well Cliff has introduced himself and so am I. I’m glad to talk to you more about that.

Q: Dan Overmyer: I just don’t see it in writing.

A: Judy Kirk: On the very back page of the discussion guide is the contact information for the project.

Q: Dan Overmyer: That doesn’t have your name.

A: Judy Kirk: It doesn’t but I’ll tell you what, Sarah McPherson will leave her card with you and we can put my name on it. Cliff has a card as well.

Q: Jeremy McCall: Can I ask if Darrell Desjardin is still involved with the environmental side of PMV?

A: Cliff Stewart: Yes.

Q: Jeremy McCall: He is, OK. Will he be involved in this project?

A: Cliff Stewart: Yes.

C: Judy Kirk: So please do fill out your feedback forms for us we’d very much appreciate it. Either Chris, I or Sarah will take it from you. Thanks for taking the time.
C: *Chris Chok:* That’s a good point. Jeremy was just noting that because of the postal strike the preferred options for returning this feedback form are either in person today or online. Thank you for reminding us.

_The meeting ended at 3:30pm._
Notes from a Pre-Consultation multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, June 16, 2011, 6:00pm-8:00pm, at the Hilton Vancouver Airport, Richmond, BC.

**Stakeholders:** Craig Jones, Richmond Chamber  
Peter Mitchell, Steveston Rotary

**Port Metro Vancouver:** Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development  
Chris Chok, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator

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

**KEY THEMES:**
- Participants noted the importance of further development of the Asia-Pacific Gateway as a major piece in the supply chain of trade. It was suggested that a regional approach to planning and development of transportation infrastructure in the Lower Mainland is needed.
- Participants were interested in what role the Port of Prince Rupert could play in achieving future needed container capacity on Canada’s West Coast.
- Participants were interested in discussing potential community and economic benefits of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

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

   *Roundtable introductions were undertaken.*

   **C:** *Chris Chok:* I work for a company called Kirk & Co., and I’m part of the communications and consultation team for Port Metro Vancouver’s Container Capacity Improvement Program. Our firm specializes in consultation and we’re helping Port Metro Vancouver for consultation with the Proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project. We’re keeping a record of our meetings and combined with the feedback forms that we’ve been receiving we will write a consultation summary report. It will summarize the input that we’ve received and we give that to the Port who will consider it. They will document their consideration in a memo. It shows the key themes we heard and how they’ve considered it, if they couldn’t, the reasons why. So it’s pretty transparent in terms of consultation...
best practice. This is the sixth of seven meetings. We’ve held meetings in Delta, Surrey, Langley, Vancouver this morning and now Richmond tonight.

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

C: Cliff Stewart: Some of this you probably already know. The purpose of the discussion guide is literally to lead the discussion. Particularly when there is a multi-party group and someone may not know as much about the organization or the program. The Container Capacity Improvement Program itself is the umbrella within Port Metro Vancouver dealing with the delivery of container capacity over the next twenty years. In the short term, it’s looking at primarily road and rail and other projects that will unlock additional capacity in existing Port facilities.

In the medium term, it’s Terminal 2 which is an entirely new multi berth deep sea marine container terminal designed to deliver more than 2 million TEUs of additional capacity.

In the long term in the late 2020s, to revisit terminals in the inner harbour which have been significantly upgraded in the last decade to look at taking them to their next life stage. Terminal 2 is clearly the largest project in the suite of projects that make our program. In terms of specific projects that have been identified, it’s the longest lead time project. We’re here talking today on Pre-Consultation basis on a project that we hope to be able to tie ships at in 2020. It’s about a ten year program to deliver this kind of structure.

Port Metro Vancouver, as you probably know, was formed in 2008 by the merger of the Fraser River Port Authority, the North Fraser Port Authority and the Vancouver Port Authority. Collectively known as Port Metro Vancouver, it’s the largest port in Canada, it’s the largest port by tonnage on the West Coast of North America and it’s the largest export port on the West Coast of North America. The five main lines of business are automobiles or ‘roro’ as it’s called, bulk and bulk is anything that can be poured into the hole of the ship whether it’s a liquid or a solid. There’s also break bulk which is things like lumber, pulp, and panel products and those ones in particular also transfer nicely into containers so there’s a lot of back and forth there. Containers and then finally cruise.

The mandate of Port Metro Vancouver is to support Canada’s international trade. I probably don’t need to tell you why trade is important. The economic benefits are obviously felt right across the country.

An important part of what we’re trying to do here is to work towards responsible growth. That’s a combination of sustainable but also cooperative. For example we share a commitment to sustainable solutions but we’re also striving to build links and develop solid relationships with local governments and
also with communities. We recognize that those aren’t always the same. Helping to identify common values, to determine sustainable legacies and mitigate potential community impacts. That’s an important part of the consultation process.

Why are we talking about Terminal 2 today when lots of people have said, you don’t need this for ten years.

Q: Cliff Stewart: Now Peter are you here representing yourself or are you representing a group?
A: Peter Mitchell: I was called on behalf of the Rotary Club of Steveston. In some situations I can represent the club but in other situations without having spoken to the club I can’t represent them, even though I am the president.
C: Cliff Stewart: Peter wears many hats.
C: Peter Mitchell: I’ve got about another eight or ten hats that I can represent or not represent at the same time.
C: Chris Chok: Can I make a suggestion? We would be happy to take your feedback form today as yourself. Then if you wanted to take it away and talk to your membership about it and submit something as the Rotary Club we would take that as well.
C: Peter Mitchell: That would probably be appropriate because there will be opinions from that area which is much nearer where your port is then where I personally live and not all opinions may not necessarily completely agree with me.

C: Cliff Stewart: We are here tonight for Pre-Consultation. Pre-Consultation is best practice, but it has been historically rare in BC. As somebody said to me, with this project I feel like I’m in a fog I can’t see anything. They’re not in a fog, the project is so early that there’s really nothing to see. We’re here talking at this point talking about two questions that we would like to have answered as we walk away tonight. In future rounds what do you want to be consulted about and how do you want to be consulted. We’re happy to tell you what we can tell you, which isn’t very much at this point and certainly answering questions that you have around this that we can answer. But if you look at page 6 we begin to look at the question of why. Why are we talking about Terminal 2?

It’s about a 10 year process from the time that we start this, which started at the beginning of this year until the facility is in place and ready to receive vessels. About six of those years are preparatory process leading up to the environmental assessment and the environmental assessment itself. We have spent some time looking on a case study basis at environmental assessments, large panel project environmental assessments projects in Western Canada over the last decade or more. Our schedule is based on that case study and how long we think it will take. We talk about it as a panel project, because we will request a panel, we believe it should be a panel process. Ultimately the decision for that rests with the Ministry of the Environment federally. As to whether it’s a
We've harmonized panel process, that's a joint decision of the federal and provincial ministers. We’ve done our schedule on the assumption that it will be, but ultimately that’s somebody else’s decision.

Why are we planning for containerized trade? Page 6 has what looks like a simple graph, and it is a simple graph, but it’s based on a detailed economic forecast that looks at anticipated population growth, anticipated GDP, per capita growth, anticipated conversion of cargo from existing modes to containers. For example we mentioned pulp and lumber and other export commodities which can go break bulk and are more and more moving in containers.

The economic data that this is based on comes from the economist intelligence units, so it’s pretty well respected data. When you boil it down it says that on average over the next twenty years we expect to see 5% growth in container demand year over year. It’s a little higher in the earlier years and it’s a little lower in the later years but it ends up averaging about 5%. The green line represents currently installed capacity in BC the West Coast of Canada, including Port Metro Vancouver and Prince Rupert.

We talked about whether or not we should really have it as a horizontal line because we’ve certainly seen over the last decade or more increasing efficiency and increasing capacity in existing facilities. We felt that the state of the technology has matured to the point where the likelihood of getting market increases in existing footprints is probably near the end of its time. For better or for worse, the green line is about where we are right now. As a general principal when you’re building port facilities in order not to really annoy users you kind of want the new stuff to be available when you hit 85% of existing. That last 15% of growth, it’s fine if you’re talking about seasonality but if you’re growing into the last bit of space, it gets to be a real problem for businesses. Somewhere around 2015, we need some new capacity on the West Coast. In the short term that capacity will most likely come from road and rail infrastructure improvements which will unlock additional capacity at Deltaport. We think that Deltaport, as it’s configured today has about 1.8 million TEUs of capacity, but we believe it could be about 600,000 TEUs more available if the offsite road and rail issues can be sorted out. It’s no surprise that the South Fraser Perimeter Road is a key part of that capability and the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor project. I know you’re aware of it Craig, I’m not sure if you’re aware Peter, but Roberts Bank Rail Corridor is a program that 20% of the money is going into increasing actual capacity of the facility. While 80% is going into social license issues which relates in terms of grade separated crossings overpasses so people’s lives and communities aren’t separated by that. I think it started as eleven, now it’s down to about eight or nine overpasses between 41B at the base of the Roberts Bank Causeway all the way out to 232nd Street and Highway 1 in North Langley.
Q: *Craig Jones:* There is some concern with the SFPR that the current design parameters still leave us with two or three major interchanges that are light controlled.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It’s more than that; there’s actually only two interchanges left and everything else on it is intersections. That certainly is an issue that has been identified to us already. We’re concerned about it, because it was built to handle trucks we are talking about in this consultation. We want to make sure that it’s clear who should be paying for those changes when it’s required. That’s one of the things we’ll be looking at. Certainly, others have brought that up as an issue that they want to be consulted on. Having said that, with the South Fraser Perimeter Road, lights or interchanges, this traffic is possible, without it, it would absolutely not be possible. And if I wasn’t sure of that, I was out at Westshore today and coming back at four o’clock in the afternoon.

Q: *Craig Jones:* The other thing that ties into that too and relates to this community is the potential upgrade of the Massey Tunnel.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, now it’s interesting because I think what’s happening within Port Metro Vancouver is anything that can vaguely be considered to be container-related is trapped in the CCIP pot. Certainly we’re looking carefully at Fraser Surrey Docks because that’s an existing asset that has existing capacity. The Massey Tunnel is one of eight crossings that impact the ability to get bigger ships there.

Q: *Craig Jones:* It also starts at Sandheads.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It starts at Sandheads and it’s an issue all the way up. So we’re actually looking at that as well as the road and rail projects as part of our short term and medium term in trying to figure out exactly what that is.

What this tells us is if our forecasters are right, and with the exception of that period when we fell off the edge of that financial cliff late in 2007 through to late 2009. The forecasts that we’ve been using that have been provided to us by folks that did this one, if you go back and look historically they do low case, high case and expected case, they track very well to the expected case. Of course things went off the rails in 2008 and 2009 but by 2010, what actually happened in 2010 is back up to the low case of the previous forecast. It gives us some pretty good comfort about their ability to look forward. I don’t think anybody saw the global financial crisis coming.

Q: *Peter Mitchell:* So Cliff, the green line here is base level operation of the economy?

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Sorry no, the green line is the actual container facilities.

Q: *Peter Mitchell:* In terms of capacity the tracking along here is based on average for the economy so at the present time we might be a touch late getting to the point where you hit the green line. But you say there is rebound right now?

C: *Cliff Stewart:* No. Actually we did a similar study this time last year and we were projecting the same kind of growth. We actually had 17% growth last year. We
lost two years between last year and this year we’re running at 7% right now and we haven’t hit the peak season right now.

Q:  \textit{Peter Mitchell}: The other question I have is you talk about capacity both Vancouver and Prince Rupert, does that mean that you’re much closer to capacity down here and you’ve got more room in Prince Rupert of vice-versa?

A:  \textit{Cliff Stewart}: I’ve been saying for a couple of years that Prince Rupert’s capacity is about 700,000 TEUs. They’ve been saying it was 500,000 TEUs. But now that they’re at 500,000 TEUs, they’re admitting that maybe it’s a little bit bigger.

Q:  \textit{Peter Mitchell}: I guess what I’m saying is you going to max out here, and you’ll have a little capacity left in Prince Rupert where it’ll be problematic for people down here before you run out of capacity in the province?

A:  \textit{Cliff Stewart}: I think you’re likely to run out in Rupert first. Rupert is an interesting conundrum. We have assumed for the purposes of our project that the next phase of Prince Rupert doesn’t get built. It if does get built that’s great, because that gives us potentially some breathing room. There are some things about Prince Rupert that are interesting to know when you’re trying to understand the whole context of this. The first phase of Prince Rupert was almost entirely built with government money. You can say that CN was a major investor in it but the CN money was part of the BC Rail deal and it was part of the sale price. The operation has been going for four years now, and they have still only been able to attract one shipping line. I think they’re finally getting another one just about now. It was originally sold as a gateway to Chicago. It was supposed to be all about US cargo. They haven’t been as successful at attracting US cargo as they wanted to be. I think the numbers now 40% US and 60% Canadian. Contrast that to Greater Vancouver, we’re about 5% US and 95% Canadian.

C:  \textit{Craig Jones}: But you have to also understand that over that four year period we had two plus years of a very down economy.

A:  \textit{Cliff Stewart}: There is no question of that.

C:  \textit{Craig Jones}: So the attraction was impacted.

A:  \textit{Cliff Stewart}: And the other thing we had was was the last year the industry was in collective bargaining with its labour and still in collective bargaining with its foremen, and American cargo that’s going there is completely discretionary and a lot of it chose to go somewhere else until that settled down. But we’re not saying that Prince Rupert won’t be built. What we are saying is if it isn’t built then we’re on the critical path because we’ll need that capacity. We’re probably beyond that critical path but we’ll need it at least not later than 2020. We’ll probably need it sooner.

C:  \textit{Peter Mitchell}: Thanks, and I just want to be able to differentiate a little bit. Because when you’re talking about two areas that are not necessarily both working lock step.

A:  \textit{Cliff Stewart}: What’s interesting is that the ships that go to Prince Rupert come to Vancouver. There’s lots of ability for the cargo to come off there or to come off here. The other piece that Prince Rupert is only now beginning to be able to exploit is export cargo. Vancouver’s big advantage to a lot of the players is the
fact that there’s very close to a balance between import and export. We don’t actually export as many containers loaded as we import loaded.

C: Peter Mitchell: That was going to be my next question.

A: Cliff Stewart: It’s not for lack of demand, it’s simply for the fact that because the export cargoes are heavier than the import cargos that the ships gross out before they cube out. So in other words, they get all the weight that they’re allowed to have with loads and then they have to top off with empty containers. So we’ll see what happens in Prince Rupert. We don’t think that the business case is there for the kind of investment that’s needed. But if it happens, that allows this project to be done later. But what we don’t have the luxury of doing is waiting a few years to see if Prince Rupert gets built and then come back and start this because it’s going to take ten years. Those ten years isn’t because we want it to take ten years. It’s simply what we expect the process to take.

C: Craig Jones: It’s no different than YVR. If they would have just sat back and waited we’d be in big trouble today. They had to take that look at capacity and growth, where it was going to come from and that was really dependent on, and we go back into the mid-90s, it was really dependent on the federal government and the bilateral air agreements that they had no control over. We had to look at what the possibilities were going to be and build to take advantage of the possibility.

C: Cliff Stewart: Absolutely. It’s a little like Deltaport, I mean I wasn’t in the container business; I was in the waterfront but not the container business when Deltaport opened in 1996. I remember the pundits then saying it was a white elephant, and it would never be used. Four years later when they were scrambling to expand, it the same pundits were saying that the Port had lacked vision and hadn’t understood the need. So you’re damned if you do and damned if you don’t.

Q: Peter Mitchell: Quick question. I don’t know if all this shows up later, but your planning is based on the sorts of materials you’re importing and exporting now? Or is it forecast getting into other materials that people start shipping out natural gas in much greater quantities, current or much greater quantities which come out of Alberta in terms of fuel and everything else. Are you factoring that into what you are looking at here?

A: Cliff Stewart: No, because this is purely containerized trade. The study does look at things that can convert. As much as we think that everything that we buy comes from Asia today there’s still significant ability for further offshoring and I can’t tell you the specifics of these assumptions that’s made about them. But it’s looked at that level of detail. Things that are in containers or could be in containers.

Q: Peter Mitchell: So everything that is in containers, or conceivably or economically could be in containers and forecast increase in those markets in which you’re looking at. To the degree that you see it coming in the next five or ten years.

A: Cliff Stewart: Actually we’ve looked out twenty years.
C:  *Craig Jones:* Five years ago, you wouldn’t have perceived the growth in containerized wood going to China.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* That’s a great example. Right now imports are still driving the business. During the downturn they didn’t, exports drove the business. In fact, we were importing empty containers from Asia to support the export business. That was before lumber started going to China. In this forecast, it assumes that imports continue to drive. But exports could easily. If that happens then you could see the 5% being conservative.
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C:  *Cliff Stewart:* So what do we know about Terminal 2 today? We know that it’s proposed to be a multi-berth terminal more, than 2 million TEUs. We know that it’s proposed to be at Roberts Bank. Beyond that the scope scale and location are still a work in progress. However I can say that nothing is new under the sun. So if you were involved in the process around T2 that started eight years ago we haven’t come up with something new and different in terms of location. We’re looking at the same locations that were looked at before. Now some of those locations have since been essentially terminated by DFO saying that they’re not permissible. We looked at that and said that we understand why you’re saying that and we don’t disagree. We’re working to be in a position so by the fall when we come out in the next round of consultation which will be the Project Definition Report to have the answers to those sorts of questions. I mentioned that it’s all subject to environmental approvals and it’s an independent panel process that will make that decision. We assume that it will be.
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C:  *Cliff Stewart:* The question is how can I get involved? I find that a bit humorous for people who are here because obviously you know how to get involved if you’re here. I just want to point out that this is meeting six of seven in this first round of Pre-Consultation. There are seven rounds of consultation proposed. Now when I say proposed two of those, the fourth one in called Draft Panel Guidelines and the sixth one called Environmental Assessment are mandated by the environmental assessment process under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. If and when a panel is put in place the panel may choose to have additional rounds of hearing. So it will not be less than seven rounds over the next six or seven years but it could well be more.

What we want to do today besides answering any questions you have, is to come away with answers to those questions about what you wish to be consulted on and how.

Kirk & Co. are independent, they report back to the Port. They will take the information that’s garnered in this Pre-Consultation summary round and
produce a summary report that looks at all the themes that are identified. Then once the project team has looked at all of that, we will develop a consideration memo that says how we took the input and what we did with it. In this Pre-Consultation phase since the input is primarily around the Project Definition Consultation, part of it will be the actual formation of that next round of consultation. And in subsequent rounds, when we are talking about bricks and mortar issues, environmental issues and things that need to be studied we will actually point to how it’s been used to enhance or change or otherwise impact the design and or the study process. I’ve talked about Environmental Assessment already. We believe that there will be one and that it will be a panel.
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C: Cliff Stewart: We didn’t want to come with a blank canvas. We have pretty good understanding of issues that people are concerned about. We have just come through an environmental assessment and a consultation process on the Deltaport Third Berth Project. This list has been developed based on that experience. The list is not intended to be exhausted, rather it’s a starting point for people to look and think about whether the things they’re interested in are here. If they aren’t to then tell us that in addition to that they are interested in other things.

If you look at page 11 there’s a correlation between page 10 and page 11 in an interest scale between not at all important and extremely important for each of those types of things. Then over on page 12 we ask you about any additional topics that you would like to be consulted about during the Terminal 2 Project Definition Consultation. Then we go on about how you want to be consulted. Again, we have some ideas for you to think about but also the ability to tell us about other things. Then we talked about communications and the different ways you would like to be communicated with.

Finally, on page 14, we have the additional comments section.

We’re hoping you will be able to fill this out for us tonight, because we know historically we know we have a better chance of getting it back if it’s done here. But it’s available online, you can do it online, you can take it with you and send it in. In your case Peter you can do one here and you can take another one back to the club.

C: Chris Chok: The only thing that I will point out right now is given our current postal strike, the online form is preferable.

C: Peter Mitchell: I was going to say that I can take something back in terms of hard copy. We still have one member who refuses email. But if it’s something that people can look at online I can hand out a copy and just send it around the room, get it back at the end and tell everybody where they can go have a look at
it later if they want. Or we could take this, have some people look at it, discuss it and see what people come up with.

C: Cliff Stewart: That would be great.
C: Peter Mitchell: I don’t guarantee that you’re going find with our group that more people than four people out of forty that are interested.
C: Cliff Stewart: As long as people have the opportunity to provide the input that’s great. The Pre-Consultation round ends at the end of June. Anything that we receive before the 30th of June will definitely be considered and included. Anything that we receive afterwards it’ll be a function of how far Kirk & Co. are in the process getting the report ready.
C: Chris Chok: We’ll certainly review it but it may not show up in the report.
C: Cliff Stewart: But we certainly would be interested.
C: Peter Mitchell: As with everything else if you’re well past that point in time it’s great to know and it’ll be nice for the next expansion you do.
C: Cliff Stewart: Sort of.

C: Cliff Stewart: General contact information is at the back, email and phone. I think I’ve given both of you my cards if you wanted to contact me. We have a fairly large group of people and if I’m not able to get back what I do is pass it on to people who I think will answer the question. This has been a particularly challenging two weeks because I’ve spent most of my time out doing this sort of thing. But we’ve got a great communications team with the Port Metro Vancouver folks and the Kirk & Co. folks. Any other questions that I can answer about anything to do with the business?

Q: Peter Mitchell: In terms of your current expansion what locations are you looking at? Or what projected expansion able locations are you looking at?
Q: Cliff Stewart: For Terminal 2?
A: Peter Mitchell: Yes.
Q: Peter Mitchell: So it’s what, directly north or directly south side? How is that being accomplished?
A: Cliff Stewart: I have to be very careful how I say this. First we have to agree because who’s already out there has a different definition of north, south, east and west. If you believe that the causeway runs east and west, when the program looked at Terminal 2 back in the last decade they looked at four locations. One of them was in line with the existing Deltaport and that was called E1. The second one was directly across the causeway from the existing Deltaport and that was called W3. The other two were W1 and W2 and they were located what I would think of as north of the coal terminal. DFO have started in writing that E1 and W3 are not permitable. So you can draw your own conclusions as to where we’re likely to be.

Q: Peter Mitchell: So if I’m having a beer in Point Roberts you’re not going to disrupt my view?
A: Cliff Stewart: Having a beer in Point Roberts you can’t see anything anyway because there’s no windows in that bar.
C:  *Peter Mitchell:* In the summer time you’re out in the deck.

C:  *Cliff Stewart:* We’re in the process of trying to figure that out now. That will be one of the issues that we consult on. Given the balance of probabilities it’s more likely to be on the north side.

Q:  *Craig Jones:* Closer to Richmond?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Closer to Richmond. Closer to Canoe Pass, but still connected to the whole complex.

Q:  *Peter Mitchell:* I ask for a couple of reasons. I ask because number one, you’re right it’s not east-west, it’s actually more southwest-northeast isn’t it?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, so it’s actually, north runs one way and the causeway runs another.

C:  *Craig Jones:* But simplistically you’re driving to the ferry terminal.

C:  *Peter Mitchell:* In your mind you’re going less and I understand that.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* It’s not likely to be on the ferry terminal side of the causeway.

Q:  *Peter Mitchell:* That’s the first thing. It doesn’t matter it’s all in American waters anyway until you get a couple of miles out?

C:  *Cliff Stewart:* You mean in terms of the ships departing?

C:  *Peter Mitchell:* In terms of where you have to go with the ship to get anywhere you basically cross through American waters as soon as you get out of there.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* As soon as you leave the berth you cross into American waters and you cross back into Canadian waters.

C:  *Peter Mitchell:* The transit would be very much similar to the existing transit. That raises an interesting point.

Q:  *Peter Mitchell:* Do they have to be consulted if you are going to be increasing traffic?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* That’s an interesting question. Let me answer it this way. In 1999, the Ports that now comprise Port Metro Vancouver handled 1 million TEUs. In 2010 they handled 2.5 million TEUs. They did it with less container vessel calls than they had in 1999. One of the things that is important to understand is, there is a very good likelihood because the ships are still getting bigger and will continue for a while. There is a practical limit that they are going to hit pretty soon. We think that the majority of ships that will come to this terminal after 2020 will be what’s called new Panamax so the ships that are sized to fit through the new locks at the Panama Canal. They could be bigger, and those are ships that are about 12,000-14,000 TEUs.

Q:  *Craig Jones:* Are there any draft issues that you have to consider in looking to that future from a dredging point of view or an environment point of view?

C:  *Cliff Stewart:* That gives you a certain vessel size and it’s about 16.5 meter draft. The Emma Maersk, which is the largest ship currently out there is bigger. Maersk has just conditioned the fleet of ships called the Triple-E’s, the Emma Maersk is about 15,000 TEUs and the Triple-E’s are about 18,000 TEUs. They’re not physically very much bigger, they’re slightly deeper in draft, and they’re slightly wider and slightly longer. They’ve changed the shape of the hull that’s how they get so much more in the ship. You then run into something called the
Malaccamax which is the straights between Singapore and Indonesia. That is the practical maximum. It is highly unlikely that anyone would ever build a ship that can’t go through Malacca because if you can’t go through Malacca then you’re only in the North Pacific trade and that’s too risky and too expensive.

Q: Peter Mitchell: What’s the challenge there? Depth? Width?

A: Cliff Stewart: Depth. It’s relatively shallow. In fact, the Malacca Straights at Malacca max depth are down the middle there’s not even any passing abilities and I think it’s about 20 metres or less than 20 metres depth.

C: Peter Mitchell: And if you can’t pass, you’re probably not going to have a lot of extra width either.

C: Cliff Stewart: You’re not going a whole lot of width, exactly. What we have said is we think that the vessels will probably be Panamax 16.5 metres. Let’s make sure that we allow for the ability to build the marine structures such that if you want to make changes, someone gets really ambitious and dredges the Malacca Straights and ships get deeper they could come back and dredge this terminal. We’re looking to build a terminal that will open in ten years and that has a 75 year life and trying to figure out. If you look back 85 years, they didn’t have containers, so the likelihood that we get it right is close to zero. If we do get it right it’ll be coincidence. In terms of what’s foreseeable and what’s likely to happen in the economic life.

C: Peter Mitchell: You’ll be right for decades and then you’ll be wrong.

C: Cliff Stewart: We’ll be right for decades and then we’ll be wrong.

Q: Craig Jones: So in that area with tidal flow and migratory birds is that much of a consideration?

A: Cliff Stewart: Absolutely, critically important issues. Fish habitat, species at risk, the Southern Resident Killer Whale is a species at risk and Roberts Bank is at the very northern limit of its range. Migratory birds are critically important, the Pacific Flyway. This is the one that always gets me, there is this thing called biofilm. On any given day in the migratory season, the Western Sandpiper, 25% of the entire population is at Roberts Bank having dinner on the way north or south. So that’s an important aspect of insuring that this project doesn’t interfere with that. In fact, we see this as a potential opportunity, because, not sure if you have seen the sea level rises guidelines that has come from the BC Government. When we started this project at the pre-conceptual phase last year we were using 100 millimetres sea level rise over the next century. They are now calling for a metre rise. Biofilm is very sensitive to water depth. Not only is there an opportunity for this project to help ensure that it doesn’t do it damage but even potentially to provide an opportunity to allow the authorities to deal with sea level rise. What that might look like whether it’s building some higher intertidal or some shallow super tidal land now that as the water level comes up there’s a place to migrate too so that when the birds come there’s something for them to eat. It’s a very important aspect of the project with lots of opportunities for a) doing no harm, and b) making this better.
Q: *Craig Jones:* So what about road infrastructure that we have currently underway and planning for? How does this play with increased capacity?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* As you are probably aware, the South Fraser Perimeter Road was actually built for Terminal 2. The federal money that was put in through the Gateway program was on the basis of the commitment that Terminal 2 would be built, which the Port has made that commitment continually. The whole question of intersection vs. interchange is something that has to be understood. I think the plan for the South Fraser Perimeter Road is that interchanges will be built when they are required, but a plan and a commitment are two different things. The land has been acquired to allow for the construction. Certainly the desire for interchanges is not universal. There are some communities who don’t want to see interchanges because of the height issues and other impacts. The interchanges do take a larger footprint but certainly that is an issue that we will be very cognisant of because this project couldn’t afford to pay for those interchanges.

Q: *Craig Jones:* Is double tracking still something that is being considered?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* The Roberts Bank Rail Corridor itself, that program I mentioned that maybe 20% of the money is going to rail and it’s probably less than 20%. There are three sidings that are being lengthened or built. One at Mud Bay, which is just ahead of Boundary, one at Pratt, which is just east of the Serpentine River and one at Rawlison which is where the CP tracks cross Highway 1. The objective of building those three sidings to allow for train passing, so it’s not double passing in the sense of two-way running but it is double tracking in the sense that trains can start at opposite ends, they can pass in the middle at several places and carry on.

Q: *Craig Jones:* The general public right now, that’s a confusing issue right now. They hear double tracking, and they get concerned.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We’re not calling it double tracking. The intention is that the capacity is that the RBRC project will build into the corridor should be sufficient to handle the volumes of train on the corridor. All of these things will be modelled to see what the model says about what happens at peak times. If that’s not the case, then obviously we will be going back to the drawing board looking to figure out what else needs to be done to make that work.

Q: *Peter Mitchell:* So the passing lanes will give you the capacity you need when the additional cargo comes in and you’re maxed out sixty or seventy years from now? Or it’ll get you twenty years down the way and you’ll worry about full capacity later.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well we think fully capacity would be realized by 2030 so that’s how far we’re looking out. We’re looking for full capacity for this terminal.

Q: *Peter Mitchell:* And you are anticipating that the passing lanes will get you that?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, and it’s been modelled before so we’re not just whistling on this one. We actually have some information but obviously things have changed. A really good example of how things have changed is when the Deltaport Third Berth project and the original T2 conversation started in 2002 or 2003 they saw each of those as being 1.5 million TEU terminals now realistically they’re probably more like 2.4 million TEUs. What’s changed is the technology, and the
ability to get density out of a given footprint has increased. We have to make
sure that as we model that, we understand what the limits are. If it isn’t 2.4
million TEUs in the future but it’s 3 million TEUs we need to understand the
implications of what that might become. At this point, with currently available,
or any technology that anyone has plausibly proposed for container terminals,
it’s about 800,000 TEUs of berth in a multi-berth terminal. So if you build 3
berths you’re going to get about 2.4 million TEUs.

Q: Craig Jones: Can you comment a little bit on what you feel about the local
benefits and opportunities?
A: Cliff Stewart: That’s one where we want to local communities to think about
what those benefits might be. The opportunities that are inherent in the project
are jobs. All the jobs that are associated with this business tend to be well
paying jobs. From Richmond’s perspective, there is in the Fraser Lands area a
fairly significant container support activity already, and more being built. But in
terms of what I’ll call the social benefits as opposed to the economic benefits in
that socio-economic leg of triple bottom line. That’s where we would be looking
to see what the communities are saying the benefits are. I differentiate between
mitigation, so if we’re running more truck or rail through a community we do
things to try and lessen that to differentiate from the purely legacy benefit
aspect. I don’t think it’s necessarily appropriate for the Port to be suggesting
what those might potentially be in any given community.

Q: Peter Mitchell: Where have you done your other six consultations for this
round?
A: Cliff Stewart: Tsawwassen, Ladner, Surrey and Langley.
C: Chris Chok: And Vancouver.
Q: Peter Mitchell: So with the exception of Vancouver, people geographically closer
connected and us perhaps.
A: Cliff Stewart: Yes. Richmond is more closely connected than Vancouver; I mean
there is a significant connection because of the container transport business. It’s
going to be an interesting thing to see what the impact on tunnel traffic is with
South Fraser Perimeter Road. As I look at the map and think about if I was the
driver which way I’d rather go to get to today I know they get to Richmond by
the tunnel. But would they go that way in the future or would it be easier to
follow the South Fraser Perimeter Road and go to the Alex Fraser Bridge.
C: Craig Jones: I don’t see it.
C: Cliff Stewart: Depends on the time of day. If it’s rush hour they’d likely go that
way.
C: Peter Mitchell: Well the other issue we have here is you get a traffic accident in
one part of Richmond and very quickly it takes the only way you can go.
C: Cliff Stewart: See I live on the North Shore. You’re lucky because if you get a
traffic accident on the North Shore and there’s no way out.
C: Peter Mitchell: The reality is we’ve had the odd traffic accident and if it’s here
you go there and vice versa.
C: Craig Jones: But you have to have interoperability between the municipalities. You have to have Richmond RCMP in full dialogue with Delta Police. You need common channels and you need control because you have to coordinate that if you have to divert, everyone is onside and everyone is buying into that problem. And currently, we don’t have quite that stage yet. And if we don’t get there, and we don’t get there in the region, we just clog everything down and the corridors that we do have. That regional approach is in traffic demand management as we go forward has a direct impact on the Port and the Airport. The other thing that comes into play is jurisdictional road network. We have a confusing situation these days between the provincial Ministry of Transportation and what they control and then locally and what the regional TransLink controls. Within municipalities you have a road going through and then you’ll have one between one municipality and the other. I’ll take 16th Street for an instance, the set backs are completely different. And on that particular highway it’s used, it’s designated as a truck route. Except part of it is controlled by TransLink and the other part is controlled by the ministry. Here in Richmond we’ve got the same thing. We have right now the main feeds into the Port land is Westminster Highway, controlled by TransLink. And so now, with the Nelson Road, basically a new road coming up Nelson Road, which means in this community we are now diverting that container traffic coming through the tunnel or from the main Port coming into Richmond and they’re using the East West Connector. If they’re coming out of the Port they can only make a right hand turn from Nelson onto Westminster to take them to New Westminster or wherever they’re connecting through onto the East West connector over to the Alex Fraser Bridge. But to get there has been difficult. And in getting there, because you had the municipality involved, you had TransLink involved, and you had Port Metro Vancouver involved you guys have all got that and the funding and everything. There has got to be as we move forward and to look into the next twenty to thirty years, even from a Port Metro Vancouver’s perspective we’ve got to have a more regional understanding and authority to manage this growth. We’ve got a million people coming over the same period of time; we’ve got increased capacity coming. You’ve got the desire to get people off of the roads and into some form of transit to allow the goods to move more freely. Look at the impact of some things like the Massey Tunnel, and the future capacity of the Fraser Surrey Docks. To be able to utilize the type of vessels that come up the river. Talk about the sustainability of the river on a drudging point of view. In our community being at the mouth, we feel it because we get it all. It’s up above the Mission Bridge, it’s into the sand and gravel. We’ve got this whole corridor and that river starts from the Rockies and comes all the way down. Port Metro would like to see some years in the future that Sapperton Island is built up and we get to utilize that. And we have a rail that kind of stops too.

A: Cliff Stewart: It’s interesting the rail bridge was raised the other day. People are talking about short sea shipping. There are some real opportunities for short sea shipping. But as you increase the number of transits of the river you throw that rail bridge open more and more. It’s the worst system in the world except for all the others for planning. I’m not a fan of central planning, you know, but
coordinated planning is important. I think we’re beginning to get there. We’ve taken some steps – we’ve had some missteps certainly – the North Fraser Perimeter Road, United Boulevard Extension issue was a bit of a hiccup. Although I understand it’s back on track. We just had the same thing happen in North Vancouver with Low Level road. That’s local politics for you. These are all issues, and part of what we have to ensure, as we move through this process, and by we, I mean all of us, is to make sure that we haven’t missed some critical issues that are going to impact the project, or that are going to cause the project to impact the rest of the community.

Q: Craig Jones: I guess sitting where we are today, the South Fraser Perimeter Road is going ahead and to support Terminal 2 that was the condition of the federal government. We know that the increased capacity is coming in our direction because of our dependence on Asia, that’s a fact. With this week’s arrival of China Southern it gives you another example of direct air access to Guangzhou. It increases the opportunity; it’s going to continue to grow. That whole region, I know Japan is going to rebound, in some form, they’re going to come back, and they’ve got a little set back to overcome right now. But we see in the automotive sector of our containers coming in. Tennessee and Michigan, certain lines were shut down because of a certain part that was dependent is not getting in because mother nature played a role. But that growth is going to continue, and the growth here in Vancouver and the competition, and we can’t lose sight of that as well. That’s the other factor. We have to be looking for the viability of our economic life here in the region. And if we don’t have the supply chain with good delivery in that supply chain, then you have Seattle, Portland, LA, Long Beach, San Diego, Mexico, and the new Panama. I mean things are going to change. So if we just stay still, it’s going to go right by us.

A: Cliff Stewart: I think that’s really important. We didn’t talk about it here but we certainly have looked at the Panama Canal with respect to its likely impact on the business that Vancouver currently does and is expected to do. We don’t see that it has any significant impact. What Panama does, is it moves the point where the cost is the same going West Coast and rail versus going Gulf Coast and rail. It moves the point inland and around the continent, but it doesn’t move it far enough to come anywhere near Chicago, Toronto and Montreal which are the three places that most of our cargo comes from. But it’s interesting you talk about the opportunity. There are those in the business who think that LA and Long Beach are going to hit gridlock again in 2015. If we were to depend upon American ports they’d be quite happy to take our business when they have space. The minute they don’t have space you know whose cargo is not going to go through. The minute there’s a problem with the border you know whose cargo won’t ever get to the port because it’s going to be hung up on the border. Our mandate is to support Canadian trade; we don’t have the luxury of relying on others to do it.

C: Craig Jones: The US Consulate here hosted a seminar on building prosperity between Canada and the United States as it’s related to our region. Robin was there representing the Port, Premier Clark was there and the US ambassador to Canada, David Jacobson. It was a good seminar, and it was talking about goods
movement, looking at the border and what changes that we have to make. It comes directly into how the Port operates. For us to be competitive globally both the United States and Canada, we have to protect our perimeter better, and then allow this movement within to be more seamless but still with checks and balances. The US, in understanding that, is investing more heavily into goods coming from Asia. Everything is pretty clear. It’s x-ray’d, it’s sealed, they know what it is, the manifest, everything, so that it hits it’s movement through because that’s protecting the perimeter. So they are investing outside making that happen. Therefore the rail corridor is very, very important, the road networks. And that’s what the US Ambassador talked about. He recognizes the free trade that we do have. He also recognizes that in homeland security, it’s difficult to distinguish between the Canadian border and Mexican border. Even though they know there’s a dramatic difference. From a public perspective they have to be seen as treating equal. This is important, not just to Canada, but to the US. The corridors that come in through ocean or air that are servicing both of our communities; Asia-Pacific is going to become very important. But we still have to go through the checks and balances and we still have to deal with the key points that you’ve got here that you’re going to go through. Local and regional area well we’ve seen with Tsawwassen First Nations and with the growth and opportunities a working relationship that they want to develop there. The impact that that’s going to have on the region. That seamless move, we have to make it happen because our big sisters to the east are going to be very dependent upon that.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** There are indeed. Peter, do you have any questions so far?

Q: **Peter Mitchell:** Not at this point actually no. I think I’ll just take what’s here and I’ll go have a word with my group. We’ll see if anybody bites and wants to take the lead on this for us. So we’ll see, following through with this you’ve got half a dozen steps or a dozen steps on your process and possibly more inserting along the way. Do you see the pacing as constant; sort of see you every summer? Are some sections going to come through fairly quickly and others going to be much longer consultations?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** We hope to be back in the Fall on the Project Definition Consultation. The Panel guidelines and the EA public hearing process aren’t really going to be in our control. And it’s entirely possible that the order of these may get switched around depending on what happens. But the Panel guidelines, if it happens the way we hope it will happen which is next Spring we submit the application and ask the minister to strike a panel then that would put the panel in place by the end of 2012 early 2013. One of the first things that they would get involved in is the panel guidelines.

Q: **Peter Mitchell:** Would that be Minister Lake?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No this is federal. I apologize, I should know this but I don’t know who the current minister federally is. The actual process is it goes to the Minister of Transport who requests the Minister of Environment that the panel is used. The reason we’re doing it that way is we think it’s going to end up as a
panel anyway. If we don’t do it that way it’ll probably add a year to the process of when the decision is made.

Q: **Peter Mitchell:** Do you think that having a majority government over the next four years is going to help the process?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** I think it will help it in the sense that it will give certainty to process. Not a certainty to outcome, but a certainty to process. Now they don’t have to spend political capital on this they just do it. It becomes an administrative function as opposed to a political function.

C: **Peter Mitchell:** For four years anyway.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Yes and we hope to be into the process by that time. If we’re not into the process it’s because the thing doesn’t make sense. There are lots of places and we call them off-ramps where this project can pull off and stop for a while. Ultimately it has to make economic sense. If you can’t afford to build the land that you want to build the terminal on then you can’t and there’s nothing we can do about that.

C: **Peter Mitchell:** If there’s something going on you can’t control in another part of the world.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** We expect to be well into the process in four years. I’ve mentioned that we’ve looked at other panel processes and did case studies to try to understand how long they take. We think that it will take about a year from the time the panel is empanelled until they’ve agreed on the guidelines, we’ve allowed another year for the panel not to agree with the scope of studies we think are appropriate and of course we’ll go back and do more studies. Then it takes a year for the public hearing process and the panel to deliver its decision. That then takes another year from the time the panel deliver its decision; the Minister has six months to issue his finding and the regulators then have six months to issue permits. We think that it will take from the time the panel is empanelled, a minimum of four years. We think it’ll take all of next year to get the panel empanelled. The best case scenario is end of 2017 and worst case scenario is more than that.

So that’s a very long way to say that we would be back sooner in the second phase as I’d say by the Fall. Pre-Design Consultation will probably be I would say the middle of next year, whether it’s this time next year or the following next year. Then hopefully back on the Draft Panel Guidelines by sometimes early in 2013 and at that point all bets are off.

Q: **Peter Mitchell:** That gives me something that I can say to people, here’s a timeline that you should expect to see things coming back. And again, things obviously can change and from that perspective it’s not every three months for the first half of the process and then see you in four years.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No, so every three months for the first two rounds.

Q: **Peter Mitchell:** That’s fine. You’ve talked about what of cooperation you need federally to make this go forward. What sort of cooperation do you need provincially along the way?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, they own the railroad or they own the last twenty miles of it. So if the province doesn’t want it to happen, it’s not going to happen. It’s not that they have any triggers because the only trigger environmentally on this is public interest. We’re not sure how the province is going to deal with it. Our hope is that they come in and they come into a harmonized panel process. Because there are some issues that the federal process doesn’t deal with that the provincial process does deal with. By having a harmonized process you kind of cover all your bases. The province could choose to just say, listen, it’s a federal project on federal land, it has nothing to do with us. I think if they do that, it’s politically a bit risky for the province. So my guess is that they’ll ultimately end up in a harmonized panel process. But with politics you never know.

*The meeting ended at 7:30pm.*
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 vibrate 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 eat 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 then 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.
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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.
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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 then 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.
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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 permitable. 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 permitable. 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 30th. We always like to make sure that post meetings there’s at least a week. We will be finishing meetings this week, and the 30th 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 7:01 pm.*