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Notes from a multi-stakeholder meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 23, 1:30pm – 3:30pm, at the Coast Tsawwassen Inn, Delta, BC.

Stakeholders: Arno Schortinghuis. HUB: Your Cycling Connection
Bernadette Kudzin, Vicki Huntington’s Office, MLA South Delta
Bernita Iversen, Corporation of Delta
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Brian Yamaguchi, Harbour Link Container Services
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Dave Moffat
Ed Ries
Jean Wightman, Go Green Delta
Jim Northey, Tsatsu Shores Homeowners
Jim Ronback, Delta Naturalists
John Bourbonniere, Harbour Link Container Services
Josh Jensen
Julie Hobart, Against Port Expansion
Peter Duffey
Peter Holt, Praxispoint Consulting Group
Richard Swanston, Burns Bog Conservation Coalition
Roger Emsley, Against Port Expansion
Ruth Adams, Tsawwassen First Nation
Terry Bogyo
Walt Zmud

Port Metro Vancouver: Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
Cliff Stewart, Acting Vice-President, Infrastructure Delivery
Rhona Hunter, Acting Director, Infrastructure Development
Neil Turner, Senior Environmental Advisor, Container Capacity Improvement Program
Matt Skinner, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

The record notes that the meeting commenced at 1:32
KEY THEMES:

- Participants expressed interest in having access to various project documents and records, as well as records of consultation with various parties, including First Nations.
- Some participants thought the demand for additional container capacity was overstated and the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project would therefore exceed demand.
- Participants asked if there were other efficiencies that could be undertaken, such as introducing more shifts at Deltaport Terminal, prior to building more capacity.
- Participants expressed concern regarding potential project effects, including impacts to biofilm, wildlife and agricultural land.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding environmental compensation and mitigation and said that commitments made as part of the Deltaport Third Berth Project were not adequately fulfilled.
- Participants expressed interest in potential social benefits of the project, including a cyclist and pedestrian overpass on Deltaport Way and improvements to transit.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

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

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

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

Q: Bernadette Kudzin: I just wanted to clarify that we’re here to be consulted about the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project?

A: Cliff Stewart: Yes.

Q: Bernadette Kudzin: What does that actually mean?

A: Cliff Stewart: So there are a number of steps in the process where we plan to be back in the community having conversation. This is the first session where we actually have something specific to talk about with respect to Terminal 2. So if you remember when we were out last year, in Pre-Consultation we were talking about the consultation process itself: How do people want to be consulted; what forms of communication work for them.

This is the first one where we’re actually out with something specific that says “here’s what T2 generally looks like”. You can see on the front cover. We’ve shown you where it is and approximately how big it is. So it is very conceptual at this point but our commitment is to be out early and often so that people have an opportunity to A) ask questions and B) to express their thoughts about the information that we’re providing and also give us the opportunity for
things where there's issues identified as a result of the consultation to refine the design of the facility over what we expect will be probably about a five year definition and approval process.

So it is very early days and so there may well be things that you like to talk about that we are happy to hear but we may not have answers yet, depending on what exactly it is.

Q:  
Roger Emsley: I'm confused. Certainly since Bill C38 the whole of the regulatory process and legislation has been totally revamped, though I don't claim to understand the current regulatory process, so to an extent I'll have to draw back to the previous one. Under the previous one there was a requirement to file terms of reference and then you proceeded from there. I don't yet fully understand what Bill C38 did in terms of this process. But my understanding is that there is still a place in that legislation that talks about an independent panel. Certainly I have assurances from some people, who would be influential in this, that this is likely to go the independent panel route.

So with that preamble, where does this sit? What is your understanding of current Federal legislation in terms of environmental assessments? Will there be terms of reference formally put out, or is this just some kind of informal process that sits off in the side?

A:  
Judy Kirk: Roger, in answer to your question, at the open houses we're going to actually have one board that shows where we are in the process of the environmental assessment at the top and where we are in terms of the consultation process right underneath it so that you can see how the two relate. And I think that's important because these processes are complex, particularly the environmental assessment.

So if you look on page 20, the first box, "Pre-Environmental Assessment Phase" is where we are now. In fact we're even ahead of that. The terms of reference which you've just referred to which deals with the scope and nature of studies to be looked at in the environmental review, is now called the "Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines". It's the third bullet down on the second box on page 20. As for consultation, we're doing this phase of consultation to define issues and to talk about features of the proposed T2 project.

The development of Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines includes public comment periods that are run by the provincial and federal agencies. It is anticipated that there would be a joint review panel here. I'll perhaps leave it to Rhona or to Cliff to add anything further but that gives you a sense of where we are.

Q:  
Terry Bogyo: Okay, it also says on page 22 you have a separate parallel process with the First Nations group and yet that seems a little odd because I certainly was very interested in knowing what their positions would be and how it impacts the project. That would, to a certain extent, have a bearing and perhaps could influence how I feel about the process, some of the issues that they raise or some of the issues that I would perhaps be concerned about. Will there be a way on integrating those? At the moment it says it's separate.

A:  
Cliff Stewart: Well, certainly First Nations are welcome at and invited to participate in this public process but they also have a separate, constitutionally mandated process. They are, as First Nations under Article 35 of the Constitution, entitled to a separate process.

C:  
Terry Bogyo: But "separate" does not mean "secret".

A:  
Judy Kirk: There actually is confidentiality around the process. But Terry, in terms of integration, one of the really great things about the environmental review process is that it does bring them
together. They are in a working group. First Nations are invited to the working group, and so are local government and so are some other groups. So that's where the integration generally occurs.

A: Cliff Stewart: There are separate consultations with each First Nation, and it's up to them who else they'd like to invite but it's not up to us to tell them who they should be inviting.

Q: Terry Bogyo: So we won't know what their input is until the joint phase?

A: Cliff Stewart: Generally that's correct.

Q: Walt Zmud: The assumption I'm making is that because they are in fact another level of government, they will be treated as another level of government?

A: Cliff Stewart: I would not deign to speak for First Nations but I think if you were to say that to them they would have a very different explanation.

Q: Walt Zmud: Okay. Second, to that point, can we, the rest of the public, determine or refine the means by which we may be able to determine what those conversations are? Will the conversation with the band be public or private?

A: Cliff Stewart: It would be private.

A: Judy Kirk: But you know, that said, I mean if the others are concerned about that, we can certainly get that in the record. Cliff,

C: Walt Zmud: Then it should be noted.

A: Judy Kirk: I would ask as a facilitator that perhaps the question be posed to some of the First Nations, because there are usually consultation agreements that are struck and so this could be noted or at least asked.

Q: Walt Zmud: But you're obviously aware of the appearance?

A: Judy Kirk: Yes, and you know others have made that observation before but I think the point that Cliff has clearly made is that they are bound by a legal framework.

C: Walt Zmud: I realize that, but I think the public has a right, if I'm not mistaken, to be able to share in that kind of information.

C: Carol Vignale: Seems to me that if you can note to the First Nations that there is real interest in the community about their positions and it seems to me the reason that so much is confidential discussion is because of the lack of trust that has generally existed between the First Nation and the non-First Nation community. You know, that Terry and Walt were genuinely interested. I think what I get is there's a real interest in our community to be a community that is together, that has some coordination, that has some sense of team, of some sense of a circle in the aboriginal sense. We want to be in the circle with them in our dealings with the Port. We want the Port, First Nations and the Delta community to be in the same circle. And we really look to them for some leadership in this because we certainly want them to prosper in this circle the way Delta has prospered. And you know, the Port is about prospering and helping us all to prosper as a country and so we all have the same basic agenda and so I think that's the strong message that I'd like you to convey.

C: Ruth Adams: Yeah just listening to everyone. What you are asking for is new, so I don't see anything wrong with that. I would say that to the Tsawwassen First Nation government and see
what they would feel about that, putting it up at these proposed open houses for everyone to come to and we have had good turnouts for those. But I think we can figure out something, but like I say, this would be a first. Okay? There hasn't been anything that would put a municipality in with a First Nation to be together to question the Port or any other kind of business that we're going to be doing. So I don't see anything wrong with that. That there's an interest there and I think you have to know that, yes, there has been quite a big confrontation between Delta and Tsawwassen First Nation as of lately, so that would be something that maybe could pull it together. I wouldn't want something coming in to bash Tsawwassen First Nation and the Port. Nobody wants to see that. So as an elder, I wouldn't want to put our people through that. So if we could do this in a respectful way, then I think we would have to get in touch with Tsawwassen First Nations.

Q: **Jim Ronback**: I notice that the project includes both federal and province environmental acts and they also have another harmonization agreement between the province and the federal government. Will this be a harmonized study, and if so, will the terms of reference indicate who's going to do what with which and to whom? In looking at another study that came down on the transportation and the jet fuel project out to the airport, there was no statement from the federal agency, which was Port Metro Vancouver and was independent of any decision that the province would make. I'm curious as to how you arrive at a unified decision, if any? One could disagree and another could agree and is one over the other?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: So the decision on all of that stuff you just talked about would be the decisions jointly of the Federal and Provincial Ministers of Environment. It is probably the biggest change with respect to what Roger mentioned with the new act. But for this one thing the process looks and acts very, very similar for a project of this magnitude in the new system as it did in the old system.

The one difference is that in the old system the port had the ability as a regulated authority to request a panel. In the new system, we no longer have that ability. We simply apply, we commence the process and within the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency there is a side process which decides whether there is to be a panel and whether it's to be joint or whether it's to be federal or provincial and that whole mechanism now resides with the senior levels of government.

Q: **Walt Zmud**: And if I'm not mistaken, the biggest change is that I think the process itself is limited to 12 months, is it not?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Well it's similar to a chess clock. Its 24 months in total from the time the process is kicked off, which happens with the submission of a document called the Project Description. I tell people that's like the key to the lock. The lock is the environmental assessment process. You put the submission in, the chess clock starts. But that two-year chess clock, we expect, will take probably about 4 years in total to actually wind its way through the process.

Q: **Jim Ronback**: What stops the clock?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Whenever the process comes back to the proponent and says “go and do this thing” or “go and do that thing” or “we need this information” or “we need that information”. So whenever there's a request for information or a request for further work, the clock stops until that work's completed. Have I got that right, Neil?

A: **Neil Turner**: Yes.
**Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?**

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

Q: **Jim Ronback**: Does this include the Terminal 1 capacity in the total estimate?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: You mean the existing container terminal at Roberts Bank?
C: **Jim Ronback**: Yeah.
A: **Cliff Stewart**: Yeah, so this includes the two terminals in the inner harbour. It includes currently Fraser Surrey Docks. It includes the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project as well as the existing third berth capacity at Delta Port.

Q: **Jim Ronback**: Is this for the entire west coast?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: Yes, the entire west coast of Canada.

Q: **Ed Ries**: Prince Rupert currently has one berth?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: That's right.

Q: **Ed Ries**: Through Phase 2, how many berths would they have?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: Stage 1 gives them another berth and Stage 2 gives them significantly more terminal capacity.

Q: **Peter Holt**: Have previous forecasts been accurate going back 10 - 15 years to 1980. Have they depicted that level of growth, minus 20 percent? How confident are you in these figures?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: Well, it is interesting, because we’ve had two forecasts done by two separate companies, one last year, a different one this year. The one that did this year’s forecast we actually went back to a forecast they did in 2002, and the same sort of a cone you see here, with the base low and high, and their low actually encompassed the world economic crisis of 2008. They were still within that cone even with something as dramatic as that going on. I think this is pretty good accuracy, recognizing it is a significant band as you move further out.

C: **Roger Emsley**: Just several comments. First of all, we disagree with the capacity that is shown here, we believe it is significantly more, or could be, with expansions that are out there. Second of all, just to note, since 2007, and including up to an estimate of what 2012 would be, the growth in Vancouver has been cumulatively 2.38 percent. That shows you the kind of differences that we are looking at in terms of these forecasts, which we certainly regard as optimistic to the point of we are out there building another Mirabel which for those of who may remember, was the Feds putting in a huge airport outside of Montreal, which subsequently was closed.

Q: **Terry Bogyo**: That actually raises a little bit of a concern. There doesn’t seem to be any discussion about the possible reuse or repurposing of any of the existing terminals in decline, or closing off or segregation of any imports out there that currently exists. We know that there has been a lot of pressure to release some of those other lands for other purposes, and also for things like security and clearance and for transport that would reduce capacity. Does this forecast take into account any of those possible contingencies?
C: Judy Kirk: So the repurposing of other port land that isn’t used?

Q: Terry Bogyo: Well, somebody might suggest that what we -- that what in some cases might be happening, is we might be in fact moving capacity from very valuable inshore container terminal land within the Port of Vancouver which would make fabulous condo land, and moving the containers and less desirable use out into the middle of the strait. And what we would be concerned over that time frame is that indeed, that may be what this extra capacity is perhaps being used for.

A: Cliff Stewart: No, in fact, you’ll notice there is in the late 2020s additional capacity intended to be added in the inner harbour, not taken away from the inner harbour.

Q: Terry Bogyo: So there are no other port facilities in this timeframe that are slated or optioned to be repurposed or decline in capacity? Only increased?

A: Cliff Stewart: There may be conversions from one product to another or changes in use, but there is nothing that is coming available that could otherwise be purposed to contain er capacity.

Q: Terry Bogyo: And nothing that would be reducing current container capacity?

A: Cliff Stewart: The only one where current container capacity is expected to be reduced is Fraser Surrey Docks, and that is fundamentally a function of ship size. The ships are getting bigger and bigger. It is partly a draft issue, but at a certain point it becomes a length issue as well. We simply can’t move the longer ships safely up the river, turn them around, and bring them back down again. In theory, Fraser Surrey Docks probably currently has about 400,000 TEUs of capacity, but in practice it is handling less than 100,000 TEUs a year, and that is simply the market speaking about its ability to put the ships up the river.

Q: Terry Bogyo: And this is about capacity? At least two of the lines are?

A: Cliff Stewart: Yes, that is right. So, by 2020 or thereabouts, if we were looking at the underlying data, Fraser Surrey Docks capacity would fall to zero

Q: Terry Bogyo: And there is nothing else like that in any of the other port container areas?

A: Cliff Stewart: No.

Q: Walt Zmud: I think that the notion of capacity on what is required is going to be something of a sticking point, and I am wondering who the consultants were that provided the reports? Is it possible to secure those reports to see what kind of a methodology was used? Because I think there are a number of people in this community that might be convinced that the capacity argument necessarily washes.

A: Cliff Stewart: Can I just address that for a moment? Because we recognize it is a concern we’ve heard every time we are out here. As I mentioned, we are in the beginning of what we think will be a five-year consultation and permitting process. So what is currently forecast in five years will be realized then. So, to a large degree, much of that concern will be self-managing, because if the demand isn’t there, then the volume won’t be there. And it will largely become a moot point.

C: Walt Zmud: Except that sometimes these projects get a life of their own, okay? And once they get started, it is awfully hard at some future date to get them to stop. We’ve seen that all over the place.
C: *Judy Kirk:* Let's answer that other question though, which is, is the study available?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Parts of it can be made available. One of the things that we heard when we were out in the public about a year ago, talking about this project was a request -- there are a lot of studies available and many of them were publicly available or had been at various points in the past. And the request was made, and I think it was actually Roger that made the request, or certainly somebody that was in one of these sessions that we make these available, all in one place and easily accessible. So, we spent the better part of the last year doing that, and those are now all available. There are well over 100 studies of various types, whether they be environmental, economic, engineering, that are all now available. If you go to the project website, there is a library so those studies are there, and the parts of the forecast studies that are available public- -- or can be made available publically, I know that the 2011 one is there. I don't think the 2012 one is yet, but certainly we can make a commitment to get the non-sensitive parts of that on there.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Okay, another point pertains to the notion of terminal capacity is the operation of the terminal itself. You already suggested this is going forward and there have been improvements made in the operation of terminal that have resulted in increased capacity. I am assuming that might apply in the future as well. Has that been taken into consideration when it comes to determining the eventual capacity? I don’t know what the procedure is currently, but at one time, it was a one-shift operation at the terminal. I don’t know if it is any different than that today. I know there have been improvements, although I don’t know for sure if it is a two-shift or a three-shift operation. If it isn’t then it represents a different way of doing business at marine terminals, if you follow the example of what is being done in Long Beach for example. So, maybe there should be more emphasis put on improvements, as opposed to the requirement to build another facility?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* For over a decade Port Metro Vancouver has been working on what has been called a three-legged stool of capacity. The first leg of that stool is exactly what you’re talking about, operational efficiency. If you looked underneath the numbers here for a terminal like Deltaport, existing Deltaport Third Berth, and post-DTRRIP, we are claiming about 800,000 TEUs of capacity per berth. That number is up from something in the neighbourhood of about 300,000 to 400,000 a decade ago, which is a significant increase. We haven’t actually reached that by the way. The numbers that we put in here, that horizontal line, those are numbers that are notionally possible to reach, not numbers we have actually achieved. They are not numbers that have ever been achieved anywhere in North America or in Europe, frankly. There are some terminals in Asia with very different business and labour practices that have achieved that or slightly higher, but they are very much at the top end of what current capacity or current practice can achieve. Do I think that in the 50 year life of a project like Terminal 2 that there will be no increase? Absolutely not, I think you will see continuing increases. But for the purposes of this conversation, all of that latent capacity has been assumed to have been found. I can’t tell you specifically how it will all be found yet, because it is an industry that changes by the month. But yes, all of those obvious low-hanging fruits have been plucked.

Q: *Jim Ronback:* Can you make available the link to those studies to the group here before we leave?

A: *Judy Kirk:* You can go to the website on the back and click right to it.
Q: *Jim Ronback:* For example there was a biofilm study that was done for the jet fuel transportation and made use of experts from many sources. Would you be using that as an input to your studies?

A: *Neil Turner:* Yes, that information has been obtained by our group, and will be used in going forward with our biofilm studies for this proposed project as well.

C: *Peter Holt:* Looking at this page for the graphs, I think there is one thing that is properly missing and that is potential capacity. You’ve got planned capacity, but I believe potential capacity is an essential item for you to understand. I believe for instance that Centerm has offered to double their capacity. That is not a planned capacity. It is not shown here. I think that if you want to think of an overall capacity on the west coast you should show potential here as well, and there should be a study to show that, so. And the economic benefits and the cost of doing so. I think that is a major omission.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* It is actually shown in the inner harbour capacity in the late 2020s. I am happy to have a conversation offline about that, but it is all in there.

**Containerized Trade On The Canadian West Coast**

*Cliff Stewart* provided information regarding existing containerized trade on the West Coast of Canada (page 5 of the Discussion Guide), as well as an overview of opportunities for creating additional container capacity (page 6 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Peter Holt:* Could I ask you, what is the size of the ships and the depth needed? Is it always the largest ship you are considering? Or is it also a combination of the smaller ships that would go through a particular area where you don’t have to put so much infrastructure in and so much dredging?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes. It is a combination. The Port Metro Vancouver land use plan is currently being updated, and there is a public process underway as we speak, so for those of you who have more general land use questions, that process exists, and I would happily point you towards it. I just wanted you to know about that.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* Ports are very much constrained by their ability to move things from the port inland to their eventual destinations just the same as bringing them across the dock. And so when you have your capacity figures, a part of that becomes your ability to move by rail and also by road. My understanding would be that there is enormous stress on the rail across the Rockies to cope with such a major increase in the port’s capacity. And we can obviously see the new sidings going in and taking account of that, but it seems whenever I speak to senior people at the railroads they say they have not got the capacity to get over the Rockies with the amount of containers that you might bringing in to the Deltaport. Is it only going to grow to this capacity with the provision that the linear impact of the rail moving up the valley and rail going over the Rockies is also improved significantly from where it is today? I’m pretty sure it is, but the question is, is the whole transportation system growing together? Are we leaving it just to the port? Or is the port growing together with rail? And I don’t see that in here. I know it is a bigger issue.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So, we’ve done detailed modeling for what we call the Vancouver terminal, which is from Mission west. We have done what I would call high-level modeling of the joint running section which is where the CN and CP share each other’s infrastructure between Mission and
just west of Kamloops, and we've also solicited their opinions about that section and we have sort of checked those against other authorities and then we've said, “And what about east of there?” And their assertions between here and Kamloops are that there is lots of capacity for the kind of volumes that we are talking about, and the other organic growth that will happen over the next 25 plus years. And beyond there, both railroads have said, “That is not the problem, that is just a matter of putting more track in. And that is what we do, we are railroads, we build track, and capacity isn't an issue.” So, they are the ones that have to be able to move the cargo. Obviously as we get further into this, there will probably be a requirement for more concrete commitments, but at this point, they have said it is not an issue, and when you compare it to the other authorities that are out there that say you can assume this type of capacity on this type of infrastructure, that supports their position.

Q: Peter Duffey: So the length of the train is obviously one thing we’d have to increase as well?
A: Cliff Stewart: Length of trains obviously increases capacity, but that given, there is sufficient capacity. Certainly we have thought about that and thought that through because if you build a port and you can’t get to and from it, then you have a pretty significant problem.

Q: Jim Ronback: What is the split between trains and trucks?
A: Cliff Stewart: On the import side, about 70 percent goes by rail, 60 to 70 percent goes by rail directly, and about a further 10 to 20 percent indirectly, and I can talk about that now or some other time, but -- it is mostly rail. And then on the export side, although it arrives here by rail, it doesn’t get into a container until it is here. So most of it comes in by rail and then it gets to the dock by truck.

Why Roberts Bank?

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding other related transportation infrastructure to support growth at Roberts Bank (page 7 of the Discussion Guide).

C: Roger Emsley: The George Massey Tunnel announcement was nothing but public relations. There is no money, there is no plan, it shouldn’t even be mentioned here.

C: Cliff Stewart: Well, I can tell you this: that before that announcement, the Ministry of Transportation were not doing any work to look at the George Massey Tunnel. There was nothing within their organization to even have a conversation about it. And there absolutely is an ongoing conversation about it now, so I respectfully disagree.

C: Walt Zmud: Is that because there is an election coming up?
A: Cliff Stewart: It may well be, but you know, if you look at something like the Port Mann/Highway 1 Project, it takes about 10 years from the time you actually make a commitment to start talking about it, until you can deliver something.

Q: Brian Yamaguchi: But with the inception of the South Fraser Perimeter Roadway, how does that affect the business that is going on Highway 17 now? Does everything go out onto the South Perimeter Roadway, coming back? So going into Richmond, they'll have to go back, go out east and then come back? Can they still utilize highway 17?
A: Cliff Stewart: This is a Ministry of Transportation and Corporation of Delta question, but our understanding is that trucks will be moved off of Highway 17, onto Highway 99, SFPR and Highway 99 primarily, so it will have a significant reduction on traffic impact in the Ladner area.
To answer your question, no, they don’t have to go east to the Alex Fraser, they can still go through the Massey Tunnel, but they get there on SFPR and Highway 99, not Highway 17 to Highway 99.

Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project

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

Q: Ed Ries: I guess this is a naïve but obvious question. You have done a lot of thinking and you are spending a lot of money to make the movement of containers efficient. Why not go the next step and move the coal terminal somewhere else so that there is only container traffic going out there and then instead of building a new pod here, expand where the coal terminal was?

A: Cliff Stewart: I guess there are a couple of answers to that. The first and most obvious one is that there is somebody who has a lease on the coal terminal, they are running a business and they are quite happily running that business.

Q: Ed Ries: I thought that was a PMV operation? Don’t you own it?

A: Cliff Stewart: Well, it is leased. We own the land, but the terminal has a long term lease to Westshore Terminals. So that is the first answer. Second answer is even if that wasn’t the case, you know, even if there was an opportunity to move it out of there, and if we had to pay to put it somewhere else, it is not economically sensible.

Q: Ed Ries: Oh it would have to show up somewhere else, but the overall efficiency of goods movement seems to me would be improved if you didn’t have two different types of goods competing for the same rail line to serve that port.

A: Cliff Stewart: The very, very simple question of would the rail line operate better if it had no coal trains and just had container trains? It probably wouldn’t make that much of a difference and the cost of achieving that would be in the billions of dollars.

Q: Ed Ries: Have you tried to negotiate with Westshore Terminals?

A: Cliff Stewart: There is no business case for moving that. It doesn’t make economic sense when you look at what you get as a result of moving it, and what it would cost you to move it, there is absolutely no business case to do it.

Q: Peter Duffey: I’m very interested in how this is all going to be financed. I notice on page 10 that you have had consultation with the province communities, British Columbia Railway Corporation, local governments, user railways industry, regulators and First Nations. Now, there are a lot of jobs here, and a lot of income, and a lot of benefits. But it has to be paid for. Where are you getting your money? Who owns the Port Metro Vancouver, who is the major shareholder, and what risks financially are you going to undertake when you get committed to this project?

A: Cliff Stewart: Okay, that was several questions, let me start with Port Metro Vancouver. It is a non-shareholder corporation whose owner is the federal government. And the question of where does the money come from, the money comes from really probably two places: one is from Port Metro Vancouver itself, and we manage federal lands, so all of what you call Port lands, belong to the federal Crown. And we manage those on behalf of the federal government, and the money that is generated from that is reinvested in infrastructure. So that is one place
that money would come from. And the other is it would come from some form of private sector investors who would be looking to either run the business or to invest in the business.

Q: Peter Duffey: I may be completely wrong here, but I have information that Port Metro Vancouver in fact is capitalized with investors at the moment, and there are many foreign holders.

A: Cliff Stewart: No, I’m sorry, your information is not correct. We are wholly owned by the federal government.

Q: Peter Duffey: So is the federal government the chief financial holder of the project?

A: Cliff Stewart: No.

Q: Peter Duffey: You said you were going to finance this and borrow money?

A: Cliff Stewart: In fact, Port Metro Vancouver actually pays money to the federal government. We pay a stipend as a percentage of our revenues every year to the federal government.

Q: Peter Duffey: So the taxpayers of Canada will be building this port?

A: Cliff Stewart: No, the taxpayers of Canada will actually make money off this port. Unlike the American ports that we compete with who have the ability to issue bonds and tax residents, we are entirely self-financed.

Q: Peter Duffey: So, if you want a multiple million dollar injection to start this project, you go to the market to get the funds?

A: Cliff Stewart: We would have to go to the market in some form.

Q: Peter Duffey: So you are vulnerable to the vagaries of the economic situation?

A: Cliff Stewart: Well, a project like this is certainly vulnerable to the vagaries of the economic situation.

Q: Peter Duffey: A huge project of this nature is a tremendously risky project in today's economic times. What certainty have you got that your plan is going to be carried through in these times?

A: Cliff Stewart: Absolutely none at this point, because we don’t even have permits yet. And frankly, until you have permits, you can’t really get investors interested, so this five year process that we are undertaking to get the project approved, in essence the port is taking the risk on that.

Q: Peter Duffey: So many assumptions would be made, at the moment, based on prorated information about a market situation or an economic situation which may not exist when the final decision to proceed is made in five years time?

A: Cliff Stewart: Absolutely, that is right.

C: Judy Kirk: Peter, you sound really very informed so you probably know that large complex infrastructure projects like this have multiple stages, and usually multiple decision points. So I would assume, for the benefit of others, that it is important for you to know that whether it’s a financial situation that Peter describes or the environmental permitting or perhaps something that the Board of Port Metro Vancouver would want.
C: *Cliff Stewart:* No, that’s a very good point and I think it is often, and I heard it said earlier that a project like this gets its own momentum, but the reality is that at the point where the really serious investment need to be made, if the project doesn’t make sense to those who need to invest in it, they are simply not going to invest, in which case there won’t be a project. The project could be stopped for any number of reasons before that point, if the decision was that it didn’t make sense to continue, but, you know, there are, as Judy knows, multiple stages where our board or others could say “We don’t think that it’s appropriate to proceed, we are not prepared to make the investment.”

And the investment to get through to the point where you can actually ask somebody to invest their money in building it is in the tens of millions, if not hundreds of million dollars.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* Have you any idea of what committal point along in the five-year period you might reach a no-go situation?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We can reach a no-go at any point in the process.

**Marine Terminal**

*Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the proposed marine terminal design and orientation (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).*

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Will Terminal 2 require the creation of turning basins?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No. There is a dredge in the deep water, you can’t tell here, and there’s a fairly distinct line where the water starts to get deeper quite quickly. Tends to be shallow out to just beyond the edge of the terminal and back sort of in this area here, it’s approximately a few hundred metres from the deep water. I think the edge of the terminal now is at about the 10 metre natural draft and the berth pocket needs to be 18 metres. There’s about 8 metres of dredging in that area. And very quickly you’re out into water that’s naturally deeper than that.

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Another question, if I may, this time referring to page 14. This shows the effect and the proposed expansion the other components? What I don’t suppose it does show, and you’ve had difficulty doing it, is what some of that land might look like, okay, if some of the other kinds of support services are going to be required will be placed on the land proper.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Which land are you talking about now, Walt?

Q: *Walt Zmud:* Okay, well if you look at page 14. I can understand where the transportation corridor is going to go. But one assumes that as part of the port expansion that there will be other kind of support services, support buildings, structures going to be required. And I’m assuming that’s going on some piece of land somewhere? And that’s, of course, what’s got a lot of people in this room quite exercised, because we see that that will probably go on what today is farm land. So I’m not suggesting that you’re doing anything improper. I’m just suggesting that what you’re displaying and exhibiting as what it may look like. It’s not properly what it’s going to look like. There’s not going to be too many ports in the world, okay, where they don’t look like ports.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* So I think what you’re talking about is what we would call off-dock container support facilities. So that would be empty container yards, warehouses and that sort of thing. There is sufficient unused industrial land in Metro Vancouver today to support the growth of this business without the need to -- and I think you’re probably speaking of non-TFN agricultural lands in this area. Call them the Emerson lands, if you like. I’ll use that term. I think most people
here know what that means. No, there is no requirement for that land to be used to support Terminal 2. There are no plans for that land and we’re not part of that conversation.

Q: Bernita Iversen: Just a quick question about the proposed locations on the terminal. Has Environment Canada had an involvement in the decision making process?

A: Cliff Stewart: What Environment Canada did the last time we went through the T2 process a decade or so ago was they told us where it couldn’t go.

Q: Bernita Iversen: And that looks like where they say it couldn’t go.

A: Cliff Stewart: No, it’s not. Where they said it couldn’t go was either south of the causeway or inland, further inland and north of the causeway.

Q: Bernita Iversen: So Environment Canada is okay with its location?

A: Cliff Stewart: We haven’t begun that process of conversation with them yet.

Q: Judy Kirk: In other words, is it true that the environmental assessment process will be part of Environment Canada weighing in on that?

A: Cliff Stewart: Absolutely. And it goes back to a question somebody asked earlier: “where are we at in this process?” We are very early in this process. In fact, we believe this is best practice to be out this early, but it causes a bit of confusion because we’re out before we’ve actually sat down with regulators. We’re out before we sat down in the environmental process. We’re out saying “okay, we’ve done the preliminary sort of environmental and engineering work and based on the work that we’ve done, this is what we think is the best way to do this”. But we haven’t even done the formal project description, which kicks off the EA process. We’re actually coming out and asking for input now, to enable that work to be informed by public input.

Q: Roger Emsley: One question, one comment. I’m looking at page 11. Would you please tell me on the north side of the causeway, all the way back to the mainland, how much you are adding on the north side of the causeway in terms of the width of expansion?

And my comment is that the location that you have chosen, this one here, according to some environmental experts and experts that have knowledge about the tidal flows and the topography, the impact of that is enough to destroy the biofilm that exists on the north side of the causeway closer into the shore, and it will decimate that area, possibly cause the population-level negative consequences to shore birds and in particular to the Western Sandpiper migration.

A: Cliff Stewart: Well, I think it’s great to share that with us, Roger. The nice thing about going through an EA panel process is that we have to get our experts up on the stand under cross-examination and the people who want to offer contrary opinions also have to get up on the stand under cross-examination and that all will come out in the process that we’re entering into.

Certainly the work that we’ve done to date doesn’t indicate that, and obviously if it did indicate that we wouldn’t be proposing this as the solution that we think is.

Q: Roger Emsley: Oh, the work you’ve done, but what other people have done who are very knowledgeable about this area going as far back as the last time there was an independent panel review, which was 1979, and DFO and Environment Canada as we went through the third berth exercise all expressed those kinds of concerns. And it’s fine to zero in on studies that are favourable to you, but I would suggest to you since 1979 there hasn’t been any change in the
environment when the panel turned it down, and therefore we know much more now about the environment and about its value in terms of the whole ecosystem in this area, which is regarded as the most important bird area in Canada. And to propose this in light of all that, just seems to me to be irresponsible.

C: **Judy Kirk:** So Roger, we’ve got that comment, but I want to make sure your other question is answered, which is how much would be added to the causeway.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** And it’s varying, varying widths up and down. I don’t have the number exactly. I think it’s about 150 metres? 150 metres give or take, wider in some places, narrow in others. And it’s shaped specifically to avoid bio-film for example. It’s narrower at the base than it is further out.

C: **John Bourbonniere:** Just a comment back to the land footprint on page 15 of the land use footprint, and the complimentary services that would be required. I just want to point out that when Deltaport was built, the footprint in this picture looked no different than it does today. There was no additional land-used off dock. So in terms of commercial land viability and what is currently available today, in terms of being used today and wasn’t used back then, this is still your primary result, but that doesn’t take away from the fact that TFN might have a different thought of what they might want to do. But in essence there’s been no developmental plans around Deltaport to support off-dock services or anything else.

C: **Peter Holt:** Yeah, and the point I was going to make about off-dock services, and the linear aspect of this, and I know you’re going out to Langley and Surrey, so you are going to get a little more obvious. The significant impacts on that the rail in here, whether it’s TFN and things like that. Is that part of this study, or is that going to be a different thing because I know that in the Roberts Bank rail corridor as part of the assessment, because I don’t think it was. Is this environmental assessment going to cover the railcar traffic out to Mission, particularly the rail lengths?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** So the work that we’ve done to date says that the only place that there may be a requirement for rail improvements beyond the immediate vicinity is in the area between Mission and a place called Hydro. And Hydro is the place on the CN mainline where the Roberts Bank rail corridor separates and comes down south into Langley. We haven’t yet sat down with CN to see whether they agree with the work that we’ve done.

Q: **Peter Holt:** By Trinity Western? Is that where Hydro is?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No, Hydro is right up on the river. It’s on the CN mainline, so between there and Mission there may be some works required. But between there and the actual terminal at Roberts Bank, there’s no additional works required that we’re aware of on the actual Roberts Bank Rail Corridor itself, with the possible exception of a siding, as you say, near Trinity Western around the north side of the highway. It’s an extension of existing siding. But there’s no other works required.

C: **Peter Holt:** Because I would like to make a point that the fact that you’re not seeing any of this offsite sort of development around Deltaport and the Tsawwassen First Nations doesn’t mean it’s not happening in a profound way elsewhere along the corridor. And I do have a concern that we are not, in the process of the port expansion, addressing adequately what’s going to happen along the rail line. The number of crossings and overpasses and things like that.
A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Okay. The Roberts Bank Rail Corridor is intended to address that. The Roberts Bank Rail Corridor project is building a series of overpasses. And as I say, apart from one siding extension there is no other rail work on the corridor as a result of this project. The capacity already exists.

**Marine Terminal**

*Cliff Stewart* provided information regarding the terminal orientation and structure options (page 13 of the Discussion Guide), as well as the tradeoffs between potential locations of the terminal intermodal yard (page 15 of the Discussion Guide).

Q:  *Peter Duffey:* There’s general concern about the loss of agricultural land, which may come from Alternative 2. Could you say how much of that land might be needed?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* We haven’t done a detailed design of that. I think the question really is, it’s a hectare of agricultural land or a hectare in the marine environment. That’s really the conversation that we’re engaging in.

C:  *Peter Duffey:* Perhaps an open question, but I think the community would be very concerned to see a large amount of agricultural land, and I believe that some quantity in your planning should be reviewed.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Say less than a hundred hectares in total is what would be shifted from one to the other. The total footprint would likely be about the same, but the question is, would you be more concerned about the loss of agricultural land or would you be more concerned about the loss of the marine environment? That’s really the trade-off question.

Q:  *Peter Duffey:* At the same time, you’ve increased the rail sidings in your present upgrade, which is going ahead, and is that not sufficient for the handling?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* You’re talking about the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project? The works that are being done there are only what’s required for current operations.

Q:  *Peter Duffey:* So you will have another area for loading and unloading apart from that.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Yes.

Q:  *Peter Duffey:* Two areas?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Well, the work that’s being done now is not for loading and unloading. It’s for arriving and departing trains.

Q:  *Peter Duffey:* For splitting the trains up?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Yes. And so what is designed here and what we have shown here on page 11 is the same principle. That the actual loading and unloading goes ahead on the terminal, and that the land that’s required in the upland area, and I think in this design it’s about 10 hectares. It’s essentially the remainder of the option lands. They’re just under 20 hectares and I think 8 or 9 hectares are going to DTRRIP and the other 10 would be required for Alternative 1A. The other 10 would be required for trains in the T2 timeframe.

What we’re saying is, there is a completely different alternative which is take all of your rail operation and put it on the uplands, don’t do any of it on the marine terminal.
Q: **Ed Ries:** Further to Peter’s question, on page 17 you talk about upland rail and road infrastructure and the rail is stated to be 60 metres wide. Is this possible alternative to 100 hectares or less included within that 60 metre wide strip?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No. All I can tell you is that if there was an interest in it, we would be prepared to do some work to understand it better, but it would likely be more than. How much more than? We really don’t know at this point.

Q: **Ed Ries:** Okay, let me ask you this question differently then. You said that the Emerson lands, which I understand are the ones that Vicki Huntington brought to our attention, the purchase option. You said that there’s no plan to use those.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** There is currently no plan to use those, that’s right.

Q: **Ed Ries:** Okay. If you opted for Alternative 2 would you use them?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** We would have to look and see what the lands are and whose lands they are and whether they’re even available.

Q: **Ed Ries:** So you’re saying you wouldn’t use it?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well no, let me be really clear here. We’re asking you a very, very direct question. A land or marine environment trade-off -- an acre of marine environment or an acre of farmland. That’s the question. So if you came back and said “No, we really would prefer that you do it on agricultural land”, then we would have to go and see what that looks like.

Q: **Ed Ries:** You don’t want to do it on agricultural land. Your CEO has told us that within the week. Now, could you instead employ TFN lands for this hundred hectares. They’ve got 300 plus acres that they’d just love to lease to you, and it’s already zoned industrial, and out of the ALR.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Unfortunately, we probably couldn’t.

Q: **Ed Ries:** Why?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Because it’s not in the right place and it’s not the right shape. I’m happy to explain what I mean by that, but it’s not a quick answer.

C: **Judy Kirk:** What you’re saying is, you haven’t done the technical work.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No, we haven’t designed an upland terminal.

Q: **Carol Vignale:** Okay. Continuing the question is, you’re asking the public an acre of marine or an acre of farm land for this purpose. It seems to me that it’s very important to know what the environmental impact of that decision is. And I, as a member of the public, who care actually about the environment, cannot make that decision without knowing what Environment Canada would say to that and would have some kind of a professional assessment of that, and I think that’s extraordinarily important and I think it’s very strange to ask sort of in a general way the public-- I guess it’s okay just to sort ask that question in a gut sort of way.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** That’s really what it is.

Q: **Carol Vignale:** Yeah. But, you know, if you wanted to have a positive impact in the community, and the community wants a positive impact, then we want to have all of the data in front of us.

C: **Judy Kirk:** You know what, Carol, that’s a fair comment, and we left room for comments in the feedback form on this, and if your view was “It’s too soon to give you my view on this, we would
need to see the environmental assessment of both options,” then I think that’s what you would want to put down.

Q: **Carol Vignale:** But my question is, will that be possible? Will it be possible for the public to see Environment Canada’s impact assessment at a stage where the public can still have some, you know, some input?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** I think that’s a fair question. I don’t know. I think that some of you are going to have to plan for, if you’re looking at Environment Canada to make comments specifically on agricultural land versus marine land. I mean, they’ll make comments on the proposal as provided in the project description. So I think you’d have to make some sort of allowance or some sort of request of Environment Canada to answer that question directly. But I don’t think it’s impossible.

Q: **Carol Vignale:** What is the impact on the marine life? Because contrary to what Roger has said, I read the preliminary studies about the birds populations at the port presently and have done a visit to the port with the environment advisory committee which I am of member and I was really heartened to read the results and to see all the shore birds that around the facility. And I thought it was a rather independent study from the professors at universities in our neighbourhood who were given the assessment of the increase of bird populations around the port. So it would seem to me from the studies I’ve seen and from the work that’s been done, and the work that you are planning to do, one wonders how serious the marine impact is.

C: **Judy Kirk:** But I think in essence, Carol, what you’re saying is you, before answering this question, would like to have more information about environmental impacts.

C: **Carol Vignale:** Yes.

Q: **Jim Northey:** Are there any facilities at all for custom inspection in any of your alternatives here?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** We expect that the customs facility issue will have to have been dealt with well before T2 comes along. It’s an issue that’s being addressed currently.

Q: **Jim Northey:** We could still expect the trucks to go Burnaby and come back and go back and forth?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, if that’s the decision that’s made as to how that’s to be addressed. I think there is a proposal out right now to try and have one much closer than Burnaby.

Q: **Jim Northey:** Are the customs people participating in these round of talks at all?

C: **Cliff Stewart:** You actually are the very first people of any type outside the port team to participate in these talks. This is very, very early days. But we can take note of that question.

Q: **Jim Ronback:** A free trade zone might be in the works?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No, I think he’s talking about the customs inspection facility that currently is in Burnaby, so if Customs says that container needs to be destuffed and inspected, it’s put on a truck, driven to Burnaby, it gets destuffed, it gets inspected, it gets restuffed and brought back to the terminal.

Q: **Jim Ronback:** I have a question that has to do with the transmission lines improvement. Can’t the port demand that any ships that come to the port, either the existing one or Terminal 2 that they get shore power to reduce pollution?
A:  *Cliff Stewart:* We’re assuming that by the mid-2020s that ships that are coming here will have shore power capability. We’re assuming that shore power would be a component of this facility and we’re assuming that given that it’s available and that the ships are ready to use it, that they would be using it.

Q:  *Jim Ronback:* Can you require the ships to have it?
A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Can you require it? I don’t know at this point. We certainly couldn’t today since the ships don’t have it and we don’t have the power.

Q:  *Jim Ronback:* Don’t they require it at Long Beach?
A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Well, they don’t really because they don’t have the supply and the ships don’t have the capability, but certainly we would be moving in that direction.

Q:  *Peter Holt:* Yeah, it’s probably for Neil and it’s just possible I missed it in just the way potential effects and things are put here. And it’s to do with full cost accounting and raise with customs and inefficient movement, in addition to additional greenhouse gasses and all that. Also the selection of the three sites. If you take a whole bunch of million containers of TEU a year a thousand five hundred a day and you’re moving down an extra, you know, 5 kilometres or something like that, that’s probably needs to be accounted for.

A:  *Neil Turner:* And it’s part of the process, the whole sustainability. It’s in the sustainability report and components of the EIS itself. There will be some consideration given for improvement, greenhouse gas emissions and how that plays into it.

Q:  *Peter Holt:* I’m not sure that’s true, because that’s a component.
A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Those are parts of the trade-off for sure.

Q:  *Walt Zmud:* It should be noted that at this point in time, we don’t have a project, okay? There won’t be a project until you actually submit an application. And we don’t really have a design at this point in time. We have a possible design.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* No, I would say we have what we are proposing currently, and we are proposing some alternatives.

Q:  *Walt Zmud:* Yeah, but we don’t have a project as such, okay, that has been identified to the government.
A:  *Cliff Stewart:* That’s correct.

Q:  *Walt Zmud:* There will be a lot of questions raised about the environmental impacts. There is a process that’s identified here and I’m assuming will be undergone, and could follow this, which is that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Office will be performing such an assessment. But that won’t happen until we actually have a project.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* That’s right.

Q:  *Walt Zmud:* So what we’re dealing with right now, okay, is very much in the becoming stage. We haven’t yet got to a point, okay, where the proponent has been able to identify it. So questions relating to what will be the environmental impacts really won’t be addressed, I don’t believe, until such time as the assessment actually takes place.

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* That’s totally correct.
Q: **Terry Bogyo**: How far upland is upland? What is the minimum and maximum upland?

C: **Cliff Stewart**: So for the purposes of road, it’s as far as the SFPR on and off ramps. In other words, Deltaport Way, our initial studies suggest that Deltaport Way would need to be widened to four lanes to accommodate the fact that there are stop lights on it. It’s that simple. Two lanes on the causeway is sufficient because it’s free flow. When you get on the uplands, to get to the SFPR and back from it, you need to go to four lanes or you need some sort of grade separation for the existing overpasses, which since we’re assuming intersections with stop lights that would be Deltaport Way is widened to four lanes. So for the road that’s as far as it is. SFPR and whatever other projects are out there handle the road traffic beyond there.

For rail, it’s as far as 72nd Street. So the Fisher Siding which is the northbound leg of B.C. Rail, there would probably need to be an additional track in there. If you look on page 14 you will see where it says “Fisher Yard Rail Improvements” on the right-hand side right under the Boundary Bay Airport logo. And the only thing beyond that that might be considered upland is what CN might need to do to deal with the area between Mission west to Hydro that I mentioned earlier.

C: **Terry Bogyo**: An important fact I need to know in making my decision.

Q: **Roger Emsley**: Just so we’re all clear, can you please tell us with DTRRIP and with what’s here, first of all, how many tracks there will be in Fisher and how many tracks minimum/maximum there will be in Gulf. Without answering that, there is nothing in here about the lighting and lighting impacts of a rail yard. So what are the lighting impacts not so much in Fisher but in Gulf?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: So Fisher is one new siding and I believe DTRRIP is one siding, so there would be three tracks in total at Fisher. So that would be between 72nd and 64th give or take.

I think that over the broad length of Gulf, I think the DTRRIP project adds four, and then this would add a further six as designed today. So that would be about 12 or 13 in that area. As far as lighting is concerned, the only lighting that I am aware of would be workplace lighting at switches, and that would be very --- that would be cut-off lighting that’s shining down for worker safety.

Now, that’s with this design. If you suggested that you liked Alternative 2, that would be a completely different conversation. We haven’t done the work on that so I wouldn’t even begin to guess what that might look like.

**Habitat Replacement**

*Cliff Stewart provided information regarding environmental impacts and habitat replacement (page 17 of the Discussion Guide).*

Q: **Terry Bogyo**: You clearly mentioned electrical in Jim’s question. That means of course there’s got to be electrical power of sufficient quality to be brought out there. But it also begs the question regarding sewer, bilge, ballast, water, all of that infrastructure that I assume will be going up the causeway.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Water would be coming down the causeway. Sewer, the existing facilities out there have their own sewage treatment plant.

Q: **Terry Bogyo**: So this one has its own?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: The assumption is it would have its own sanitary sewage treatment plant. That’s built into the plan. Ballast water and bilge water are managed under federal legislation. Bilges
are actually locked and sealed. They’re not allowed to be pumped out. And as far as ballast water, the way that’s managed now, ballast water has to be exchanged hundreds of kilometres offshore. So there’s no impact from that. That’s an ongoing operational issue that’s been addressed a number of years back.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* Will you be burying the power lines?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* At this point we don’t believe that it’s required. We are doing additional studies to confirm or refute the findings of the studies that have been done over the last several decades that say that the work that’s been done with bird diverters has addressed the bird mortality concern. Whether or not the panel shares that view is another issue. But at this point we’re not recommending burying power lines.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* The Alternative 1A, 1B and Alternative 2 all have a statement in here which says that the birds are going to be affected in a general way. Is this because of the power lines?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, certainly any time you build something in an area where animals are, there is a potential effect.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* What is it? Is it explicitly for power lines, just for power lines? We know birds get killed by power lines all the time.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yeah, so seabirds and waterfowl. Well, lighting potentially, human activity potentially. Those are all things that need to be considered.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* It is the change of land use.

A: *Neil Turner:* You’re replacing the current land use with, obviously, operations, so that would have an impact on the seabirds and seabird use of that area.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* So the power lines if they were buried would reduce bird mortality.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Well, we’re looking to see whether or not there is a significant bird mortality or not.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* Thank you. The second part of my question is that I have information that the DFO has said to you that there’s no possible amount of mitigation projects DFO could envisage that would compensate for the environmental damage that the Terminal 2 would cause. Have you had that communication with DFO?

C: *Cliff Stewart:* We have not had such a conversation.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* I don’t where this has come from then. I’m pleased to hear that it hasn’t happened.

C: *Bernita Iversen:* That statement was made in 2004 when Terminal 2 was brought forward DB3 as a joint project. At that time Environment Canada said it wouldn’t consider the project because of the environmental damage.

Q: *Peter Duffey:* I was wondering if their views have changed in the interim.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* That’s why we have a process. We’ll find out.
Environmental Assessment Process

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding compensation for agricultural land (page 19 of the Discussion Guide) as well as an overview of the environmental assessment process (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Peter Duffey: You’ve got consultative topics listed, and it’s not limited to the following. So when you add topics, will that go on the website? Can we add topics or will you add topics?

A: Cliff Stewart: No. We have identified some specific topics that we’re asking for feedback on. That’s the consultation topics. We encourage you and you are more than welcome to comment on anything.

C: Judy Kirk: I just want to clarify for people. There are stages of consultation and there are defined periods. And so when we next come out, if the port felt that was a study area -- for example when you look on page 21 under Agriculture, Lighting, Marine Fish, Terrestrial, etc., which I think Cliff will go over very briefly in a moment, but if there were things in addition to that, it would be brought out for public comment in the phases that Cliff has just described. At least it’s anticipated that because the regulators will ultimately determine that.

C: Cliff Stewart: And that’s a really important point. And I was just about to go to topic number 4 which in many ways is the one that probably many of you are most interested in, and these are the things that we think need to be studied. Obviously we’re very interested in what you think needs to be studied. And then collectively we all will hear what the regulators think needs to be studied.

C: Bernita Iversen: I just wanted to make sure that the consultation looks backwards as well in that we look at the impacts of DP3 and the Adaptive Management Strategy that’s still going on. I think it’s important that we look at that development and see what the impacts of that development were, if any, and learn from that development and take that forward to this development and that’s part of the cumulative effects assessment. And I just wanted to say that we need to be looking back, not just using today as a baseline.

C: Cliff Stewart: No, it was a very important to be looking back and looking forward at cumulative effects session. Hopefully we’ll address those issues then.

C: Jim Ronback: As part of the review process it often has a technical working group or advisory group established. I’m concerned that is there only one window at the panel review stage for public comment. I think it’s highly important to have during working group discussions, during public comments on the detailed studies as they are evolving and arising out of it. But if you ask for additional information from the proponent -- you know, a study is initiated but it’s important to have for that study public input as well.

C: Judy Kirk: So, Jim, I’m going to answer that question because, you know, the Port can’t really say what the regulators will determine. Part of determining what the scope and nature of studies will include that Cliff was talking about in the pre-panel review stage, so the second gray box on page 20. Part of determining those guidelines is the regulators will determine how much public comment there should be, how many public comment periods, how many open houses, where and when they should be, when the working group should be struck and who should be in it.
C: *Jim Ronback:* My particular example is we just finished the proponents for the jet fuel transportation project on the Fraser so that their study on the biofilm but there was no opportunity for public comment on that study. And I think that’s wrong.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Well, and those are things that the regulators will indeed take under consideration. It will be up to them to determine these things, not the Port in that kind of review.

C: *Rick Swanson:* Yeah, I’m going on to page 22. We’re progressing into legacies. We are going through a legacy process with DP3 currently, where we are faced with a legacy of poor planning and coordination of truck traffic causing total bedlam in our community. And the two major links that we have because the community of South Delta is an island - the Alex Fraser bridge and the Massey tunnel. Last month we were monitoring truck traffic and every morning we were dealing with the legacy of up to and over 150 trucks lining up along Deltaport Way. Yesterday there were 86 trucks lined along the causeway. And as part of the legacy of the environmental review process, we were supposed to have a reservation system. We were supposed to have openings of the gates of the port at alternate hours to sort of smooth out the traffic over a long way, over a 24-hour period possibly rather than have it all concentrated to the morning rush hour, all concentrated to the afternoon rush hour. This is the legacy that we’ve been left with by DP3.

And I just want to know, what is going to be done when we review this, and are we going to have anything done prior to the inception of the improved so-called rail and road improvement program that’s going to hamper us with even more trucks?

Another legacy we were left with was a complete distrust of the whole environmental review system, because we were told in these glossy brochures that we get in the prelude of this process about all the great things that the port was going to do for us. And a lot of these things were washed away in what was called the Table of Commitments. So we were told things like they wouldn’t be refueling trains on the causeway, and this was always accepted by the community that they’re accepting the fact that this is a very environmentally sensitive habitat and we don’t want to have diesel oil spilled on the rock ballast of a railway track where it can’t be confined, contained and removed. This was great.

But then the Table of Commitments wrote the whole thing away. So, in this process where we thought you had the same thing, where we’re getting all these glossy little statements produced by Port Metro Vancouver, the proponent, about what great things they’re going to do for the people of Delta and the environment, the sensitive environmental nature that they are working in, and then all of a sudden after the process is started we come up with a Table of Commitments and these things are washed away like sands.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* In simple terms, the process that is followed is not something that we manage or control. So the Table of Commitments is the critically important document because the Table of Commitments is what we are required to do. So I’m not sure if that answers your question.

C: *Rick Swanson:* No, it doesn’t, because we’re told something in these documents and we comment on them, and then the Table of Commitments comes after the comments and after the process and we don’t get a chance to see these Table of Commitments. All of a sudden we see something being conducted that was adverse to what was said on this document or these documents, the PR. And then we start complaining about this process and it’s either, well, they’re contractors, they’re rail people. We have nothing to do with rail. We’re Port Metro Vancouver. That’s the rail companies. Not us.
C:  *Roger Emsley:* I want to come back to 21 and these baseline studies. I just want to make sure that when we talk about baseline we do indeed go back far enough to get a proper picture, because, contrary to perhaps something that was said here earlier, western sandpipers are in a period of decline. They may have flattened out, but if you go back and look at the Western Sandpiper population, it has come down significantly. And that is important in doing any kind of baseline study, aside from which and what some people will perhaps realize and recognize, counting Western Sandpipers is a very difficult proposition. There have been a number of studies that have identified the issues and problems with counting that particular sandpiper population because of the way that they operate.

Q:  *Arno Schortinghuis:* My question relates to community legacies and also improvements on the Deltaport Way. And I represent HUB: Your Cycling Connection and we are working with numerous groups including Tsawwassen First Nations, BC Ferries, and an experienced appraiser, and our vision, which we call the Great Blue Heron Way, is to develop a cycling and pedestrian path between North Vancouver and the BC Ferries terminal, and it would extend along the shoreline. And one of the big barriers is the Deltaport Way, and I’m wondering if the Port would consider as one of their community improvements to have a safe and convenient pedestrian cycling crossing of the Deltaport Way at the shoreline, and would they also consider funding a portion of the path as well?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* So thank you for taking the consultation topic number 5. We are in the process of initiating discussions with both local and regional governments regarding what community legacy benefits would be appropriate. That certainly is the type of thing that could and should be considered, but it would be a multi-party consultation, ultimately a decision as to what the benefits might be. I would not even begin to speculate at this point. Suffice to say that the likely investment would be significant, so what you’re describing is certainly the type of thing that could be envisaged within the scope of a community benefits program along with a number of other types of things from unrelated transportation improvements. And by that I mean not as transportation mitigation but as other transportation improvements and community well-being. You know, we’ve heard people saying “well, we’d like improvements for the hospital or we’d like improvements to this facility or that facility, arts, sports fields”. Those are the sorts of things that this conversation is about, and we would encourage you to fill out on page 30 the consultation topic number 5 about what you would like to see, and I think we know what you’d like to see because you just told us, but that is exactly what community legacy benefits is about. It’s about those things. What’s in it for us? Over and above, you know, don’t screw up our traffic, don’t damage the environment. Those are baselines. What else? What else is in it for us?

Q:  *Bernadette Kudzin:* So are you including that community legacy, then, something like dredging the Ladner Reaches in the harbour which we’ve been begging for and which some would argue is the port’s responsibility to do it, but it’s been abandoned for the last ten years?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* Well, I know that there is money waiting for other parts in the local channel dredging program. I would say probably not, simply because that is an ongoing operational requirement. This type of benefit tends to be the provision of some kind of capital asset.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* I would urge you to put it down as one or more ideas.

C:  *Terry Bogyo:* That’s because in the drawings I didn’t see anything that showed public space for viewing of the terminal or picnic area or park. I don’t know if it’s just because it’s a small drawing.
C:  *Cliff Stewart:* Unfortunately it’s not consistent with the security requirements of terminals in a post-9/11 world, unfortunately.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* But again, Terry, that’s an idea you think would be a benefit?

C:  *Terry Bogyo:* Yes, if it didn’t compromise safety and security. I ride the Superport Road quite often and Highway 17, and the detritus from the trucks, from the containers themselves, the lock pins, the pin connectors that are off, and the belts, reflector tape, the amounts of that are just huge that really are a problem that’s just from the amount of truck traffic you’ve got. The blown tires that come off in these areas. And they stay there for ages because Mainland just doesn’t clean it that often. And so it’s bad for everybody looking it and driving by on their bicycles. So it isn’t a good situation but we could expect more of that.

But I do appreciate the opportunity to be involved at this early stage. Clearly there are some big issues that are out there, but at least you’re talking to us about it. I think having Tsawwassen First Nations involved and knowing where they are, I think is really important to this process.

C:  *Ruth Adams:* Just to add a little bit to what Arno was saying. That was my thing about the Great Blue Heron Way coming out to Tsawwassen First Nation and to our neighbours, so it’s a social activity, that instead of having the roads and railroads and everything divide us because we’ve been divided with Delta for a long, long time and there has not been any good feelings. So going along on the bicycles or even walking along that shoreline would make a lot of difference for us getting together as neighbours and enjoying the beauty of the land.

I go over the overpasses and you can see the farmland, you can see Tsawwassen First Nation. Those are all so beautiful. So I’m very for overpasses. I see a lot of us, we just sit on top of the overpass and look out. What a great tourist thing that is. It’s a social thing they are asking for, and I think it’s the first time that this would be done. It’s the first time and this would be under Truth and Reconciliation between all of Canadians and First Nations. This would be the first step in this on First Nation land. I want that put in there that it comes out of the Tsawwassen First Nation, going out to the neighbours with a good feeling. I really wanted that to be put into there because I don’t think -- I think all of that that we do is for the environment and I’m talking about us as a people. We need a good environment to each other as well as the birds. The birds can do it, they can fly but we need to be on the land. We can’t fly like birds yet.

C:  *Ed Ries:* I think perhaps quite a few of us are here because of the good work that Vicki Huntington did in bringing to us information about some 600 acres with the financial option on it to use for port support facilities. And I read in your literature that Port Metro Vancouver will present information regarding the conceptual project design. That’s why I’m here. I wanted to hear that. And you have told us, Cliff, that “no plan for Emerson lands to be used”. That’s what you said. And then when we started talking about the Alternate 2, it turns out it could use Emerson lands, but you don’t know whether they’re appropriate because you don’t know where they are. Yet Vicki had published that, it’s been in all the local newspapers, all the drawings showing which plots of land and so on.

It’s my recommendation, Madam Chairman, that you abandon these meetings until you have something substantive for us to talk about.

C:  *Carol Vignale:* Well, in contrast to the last speaker and with others, I very much appreciate being here, hearing what the plans are to date, and I think especially to listen to my neighbors to find
out what they’re thinking and their good questions and comments and build on the work that’s been done by our MLA.

I think, for me, there is some exciting opportunities to really nag some environmental shifts that I hear from the Port. So for example we hear on and on people say they’re unhappy with the trucks because it interferes with their access with their vehicle. Now, because I take the bus everywhere I’ve never felt inconvenienced over the last ten years I have missed traffic because the bus has its own lane, and more and more the buses have a design so that they move independently and quite well. So if the Port could work with TransLink, for example, and with the Metro Vancouver Regional District to really look at very seriously making a big shift in transportation in our region so that we would have — and I think it was mentioned at Delta Council where Mr. Silvester was last Monday — to look at some kind of public transit improvement that might involve a rail or, you know, those kinds of things that are really revolutionary, that we can really start to move people from our community to the places they need to go, to Richmond, to Vancouver, Surrey, without having to rely only on their private vehicle. I mean many people need their private vehicle for the kinds of work they do, and I don’t dispute that of course, and we all like to go places in a vehicle often. But we don’t need it all the time for the kind of commuting that I see lined up at that tunnel, with one person in his vehicle. And it’s kind of bizarre. And I think that because of the level that the Port is at in terms of our federal government, we have a real opportunity for the court to work with the other players in the region, to be a real leader in making a shift for transportation. And I do think that Arno’s point of how it would be for cyclists, and actually I have also worked with that project, the Great Blue Heron Way because I’m in a group Safe Route Tsawwassen here in Tsawwassen.

Another component of that is the TransCanada Highway. I mean the TransCanada Trail. It goes to Horseshoe Bay but it doesn’t go to the Tsawwassen Terminal because the Delta farmers in the past have not been comfortable with the trail going through Delta land, and so it’s been frustrated. So the TransCanada Trail is really looking forward as one of our partners in Blue Heron Way.

So there are just so many components of changing, making a shift to a green transportation strategy in Metro Vancouver, and I think the Port can be a big player. Thank you very much.

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

The meeting ended at 3:38pm.
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The record notes that the meeting commenced at 6:00pm
KEY THEMES:

- Participants questioned Port Metro Vancouver’s demand forecasts and the justification for additional capacity.
- Participants expressed concern about noise and air quality impacts from the existing port facilities, as well as impacts to birds, fish and other wildlife.
- Ship-to-shore power and noise attenuation barriers were identified as potential solutions to noise pollution that should be implemented immediately.
- Participants expressed concern that Port Metro Vancouver’s approach to mitigation and compensation does not adequately deal with the impacts that may be caused by this type of project.
- Participants expressed concern about the proposed location of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. Participants did not agree with Port Metro Vancouver’s assessment that this orientation would have the least environmental impact.
- Participants wanted more information about the project and wanted their concerns and opposition to be heard.
- Participants asked to see the Terms of Reference for each baseline study, and suggested that the baseline studies should compare environmental values that existed prior to any port development.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

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

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

   Why Do We Need More Capacity for Containerized Trade

   Cliff Stewart reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including ways to participate in the consultation, as well as the list of information items and consultation topics. He then provided an overview on the need for container capacity, including the forecast demand and planned capacity increases on the West Coast of Canada (page 4 of the Discussion Guide).

   Q: Marek Wieckowski: Why are you calling this an improvement?

   A: Cliff Stewart: Page 6 actually talks to that, because in fact there are a number of things that we want to do before we have to build the new terminal all around continuing to ensure that there is capacity, capable capacity available. Building the terminal is the last step in the process. First of all, we worked to increase the efficiency of existing terminals. We looked to expand the
capacity of existing terminals, the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project is an example of that. The last step is to build the new terminal.

Q: **Marek Wieckowski:** I think the important thing is that before you jump with both feet, you fix the Terminal 1 problems. How can you talk about the Terminal 2 if you show your incompetence on Terminal 1? On the infrastructure? How can you do this?

I am talking about traffic and noise from the containers. How do you do that? Why? Don’t you think that it could be very logical to fix the problems, the existing problems, because you say, “oh, yeah, we have so much demand ten years from now.”

C: **Judy Kirk:** So, sir, let me ask Cliff to at least address the question, which I think is “How can you even propose T2, having not solved the problems created by the initial Port development?”

A: **Cliff Stewart:** And I guess what I would say about that is that Port Metro Vancouver has active and ongoing programs to address a whole range of concerns. You mentioned truck congestion. There are a couple of things that I can say about that. One of them is significant investments by both the provincial and federal governments in cooperation on the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which is designed to address truck traffic, the recent announcement by the Premier of B.C. to address the George Massey Tunnel which is, I know, a significant traffic concern in this community.

With respect to pollution, we have the Eco-Action Program which has, and continues to significantly reduce emissions, ship emissions and the Truck Licensing System which has been very successful in significantly reducing truck emissions. So there are a whole host of other programs that are going on in concert with this. Certainly we are not in any way saying that things are today the way they need to stay for the next ten years. And colleagues of mine are working actively on those programs as well.

My particular focus is this project - whether you want to call it a luxury for me to be able to look at the future - is to talk about something that wouldn’t come to pass for probably about ten years.

Q: **Marek Wieckowski:** But you mentioned about the emissions from trucks. What about the emissions from the ships?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, there are a number of things that have been done, and in fact Port Metro Vancouver was a leader in that field with the Eco-Action program that’s now been picked up by the International Maritime Organization, and is leading to what’s called an ECA, which is an Emissions Control Area, which is leading to a requirement that ships burn ultra-low-sulphur diesel when they’re in, I think it’s 200 miles or 200 nautical miles off the coast. And so in fact as a result of that program, the majority of the contaminants of concern that arise from ships burning -- running their engines -- comes from the sulphur content in the fuel, and by the time that’s fully in place next year, it will be -- I think we’re going from 2 percent sulphur fuel down to 0.1 percent sulphur fuel. So it’s about an 80 to 90 percent reduction in the contamination.

Q: **Marek Wieckowski:** Why don’t you test -- you know, I am sorry to say it, but figures can lie. And you should give us percentages. They don’t mean anything. I live on the bluff. And I look at the pollution coming from the containers. And if you say that that’s an improvement, it’s an outrageous lie. Okay? That’s not an improvement. What you have to do is to put shore power in. Why don’t you do that?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, let’s talk about that, because that is an element of this project. We believe that shore power will be available by the time this project is deployed.

C: **Marek Weickowski:** It has to be now.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, that’s a separate conversation. I’m happy to have that, but, I mean, we’re here today and we’ve invited people to come and talk about this, and I’m happy to talk about this project. I’m certainly happy to have the conversation about shore power off-line. I will tell you this: that by the time there is a ship available to plug into shore power, it is most likely that shore power will be available for that ship to plug into.

C: **Judy Kirk:** And, sir, what I would say as well is that we’re getting your concerns down as well, and I don’t think that Cliff is going to be able to answer all the questions you may have. But we’re certainly getting it down.

C: **Marek Weickowski:** Just for your information, I’ve had so many discussions with Port Authorities. And I was asking about shore power. And nobody can tell me when.

Q: **Clint Morgan:** Just a quick question regarding what the gentleman just talking about. I realize that none of the existing vessels are equipped for shore power. Is there a rule now for new-built vessels that they all must be equipped with shore power? Like something international?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No, but there is a new standard coming out of the International Maritime Organization for what that shore power should look like -- what the plug should look like. And that either has just been released or is about to be released. So that then allows sort of the final step, which is people designing and planning for it. So, you know, new ships will almost certainly have it available. Ships that are already built may or may not be converted, depending on, you know, what their primary trade routes are.

Q: **Clint Morgan:** So it’s not a requirement right now yet?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** It’s not a requirement right now.

C: **Susan Jones:** Just referring to the graph on page 4. First let me say I share the agitation and the concerns expressed by Marek. I’m very angry about this. I’m very upset about this. I’m very agitated about this. So I’m trying to keep calm about it, because it’s the same charade that we went through before with Deltaport Third Berth and the South Fraser Perimeter Road. So I come here with great frustration.

Page 4, there is a huge credibility gap of your statistics here. And you mentioned that you have a forecast in 2002 that you said, “We have fallen within that range.” If you go to the documents for the Deltaport Third Berth, it says the lowest-case scenario we would have 2.8 million TEUs by 2010. That has never happened. We still aren’t there. And that was your lowest forecast back there for Deltaport Third Berth. So, we’ve had 2.5 million TEUs from what, 2007 to 2011. So it is only beginning to go up now.

That’s 2.5 million TEUs, with all the capacity in B.C., we can go anywhere right now, for anywhere from 6 million to 10 million TEUs, depending on whose statistics you look at. We’ve already got capacity with what we’ve got and the planned expansions, particularly of Prince Rupert.
So, I question your statistics. I question this graph. I think it’s totally wrong. I don’t know what you’ve based it on. I don’t know what you based your statement on about the 2002 forecast, because the one for the Deltaport Third Berth has never been realized.

It’s all about justification of what you’re doing. If you don’t present us with a proper projection of TEUs, the whole thing is based on a false premise. Of course we need containers, and of course we’re not in Grade 4. Everybody here understands what a container carries and what it does. What we’re here about, what does B.C. need? What has B.C. got? Why Roberts Bank, when we’ve got a deep-sea harbour in Vancouver, we’ve got Prince Rupert, which is doing very well. There is absolutely no justification. And if you base it on false statistics that are based on some projection that I don’t know where it comes from, we’re just starting in the wrong place. I just think this graphic is not correct.

Q: Marek Wieckowski: I just want to answer Clint’s concern. Because you mentioned that the new ships don’t connect to the shore power. And the present flotilla does not have to have it. Somehow, Los Angeles resolved that problem. All the ships which come to Los Angeles have shore power? How do they do that, and you cannot?

A: Cliff Stewart: Well, first of all, not all ships going to Los Angeles do have shore power. Some do.

Q: Marek Wieckowski: So all the ones that do, they come to Canada?

A: Cliff Stewart: So, Prince Rupert for example, has installed shore power. They’ve had it installed for over a year. But they haven’t actually plugged in a single ship, because the ships that are on the north Pacific trade routes don’t currently have the ability to plug in. So our commitment is to be ready so that when the ships are able to be plugged in, that we will plug them in.

Q: Susan Jones: These ships that you’re talking about, is it possible for them to after-the-fact equip themselves to use shore power? Or will it only be new ships?

A: Cliff Stewart: No, they could be retrofitted, but it’s very, very expensive.

Q: Susan Jones: So it’s not going to happen. The cost isn’t too great, you know.

A: Cliff Stewart: Well, it depends on the age of the ship, certainly, and depends on where else it’s going and whether or not shore power is available. If it goes to 10 to 12 ports in its rotation and shore power is available in 10 or 12 places, they probably will. If it’s available in one, they probably won’t.

Q: Nav Brar: Is it not true that in Vancouver there is some cruise ships that plug into shore power now?

A: Cliff Stewart: There are, yes.

Q: Nav Brar: So it’s coming?

A: Cliff Stewart: Oh, it’s coming. I mean, Deltaport Third Berth was built with the capability to add shore power, so the conduits and knockouts are there on the dock. And certainly the Terminal 2 will be designed for it.

Containerized Trade On The Canadian West Coast

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding existing containerized trade on the West Coast of Canada (page 5 of the Discussion Guide), as well as an overview of opportunities for creating
additional container capacity (page 6 of the Discussion Guide) and other related transportation infrastructure designed to support growth at Roberts Bank (page 7 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Judy Kirk: So, Cliff, just before you move on, Pam, you’re representing South Fraser Perimeter Road, just one question. Is it on schedule?
A: Pam Tattersfield: Yes.
Q: Judy Kirk: It is. And the completion is estimated for?

Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project

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

Q: Izabella Wieckowski: Essentially we are building a second artificial island in around the most important habitats for salmon at the mouth of the Fraser River. Also you can’t tell me that there is not going to be an impact on the habitat as well as on the wetlands, and it will not conflict with the flyway, which is one of the most important migratory flyways. When you actually notice the results of the destruction, there is usually nothing that can be done to reverse what has been happened. And I think that you don’t even know yet the impact of your Terminal 1 on the environment. We start noticing it now. You know, there is no Orcas any more, okay? There is more pollution, more dead birds.
You also said when -- I remember when you were building the Terminal 1 you said that you were going to bury the power lines, I believe, and I believe that power lines are still over ground. Is that correct?
A: Cliff Stewart: That’s correct.
C: Izabella Wieckowski: So how are you going to look to your grandchildren in the future and say, “I destroyed it? I don’t care.”? I agree with Susan, it’s a global world, okay? We are going to have containers, but do we need to import garlic from China to here? How long can we actually sell the garlic from China for a dollar, cheaper than the ones here? I mean, come on.
Q: Vicki Huntington: Cliff, I’m extremely interested in the illustrations, the artist rendering of the proposed project on page 11. The last one I saw was three options that the port was proposing. Do you have a picture of those three options here with you?
A: Cliff Stewart: No. Are you talking about the previous process from a decade ago?
Q: Vicki Huntington: No, I’m talking about the options that were being considered for the placement of Terminal 2. One was this new island out -- you say sub-tidal. I would like to ask some questions about that if we have time at some point. The other was an extension of the existing terminal, so that it would be larger rectangle, and the third was a rectangle that went down the causeway further.
A: Cliff Stewart: Yeah. I think what you’re talking about is from the last process, which was, believe it or not, almost a decade ago now.
Q: Vicki Huntington: What I saw was very recent, Cliff.
Cliff Stewart: Well, this is the first document that’s been produced for this phase of work on Terminal 2.

Vicki Huntington: I know, which is why I’m worried. I guess what I’ll ask, is this the place Terminal 2 will go if it is allowed to be built? Is this your preferred option and is this the option you’re basing all of your studies on?

Cliff Stewart: Yes.

Vicki Huntington: That’s it, we won’t change it?

Cliff Stewart: Not at all. This is the place that we believe has the lowest environmental impact at Roberts Bank for this terminal, but it isn’t final at all.

Judy Kirk: But I think you asked another question, Vicki, which was would there be any changes to this.

Vicki Huntington: I’ve seen three proposals for the placement of Terminal 2.

Judy Kirk: So can I get you to turn to page 12, because Cliff, correct me if I’m wrong, this shows at least two orientations. Now, to Vicki’s point, was there a third orientation?

Cliff Stewart: There were four orientations.

Vicki Huntington: I recall three, and the other one was farther down. But if there were four, then I apologize. All I want to know is, because we saw this concept and it was always, until the moment it started being built, a concept design. And then when the P3 was let, or the construction started, the engineering company had the right to change the design for financial reasons or whatever else might have gone the other way.

Is this what you are planning on constructing if the process is approved?

Cliff Stewart: Yes, subject to whatever changes the process may recommend or impose.

Vicki Huntington: Okay, and is the Port aware of anything that is likely to change in terms of the essential placement of this?

Cliff Stewart: Let me put it this way. This is something that we believe can be built, can be compensated or mitigated and will work. So, this is the essence of what we will, subject to the consultation we’re doing here now, this is what we will put forward as a project when we do the project description. So the project description is the beginning, it’s the first step in the environmental process. For this project, and obviously this is an artist’s rendition, but this is the project that we’re proposing.

Nav Brar: The Roberts Bank Rail Corridor. Is that on schedule? Is there anybody here to speak to that material? Because we’ve seen parts of it constructed in the local community but not going up to Langley.

Cliff Stewart: Yeah. It is on schedule for completion, I believe by the end of 2014, possibly sooner. Several elements have already been delivered. We have the 418 and 80th Street overpasses are delivered. There was an event kicking off the 192nd, 196th, 54th and 56th, which collectively are called the Combo Project. So they’re underway. 232nd Street is underway. I know that the Mufford and 64th is gone back, back and forth, but I think it’s now designed and is nearing completion on that.
So yes, they’re all either delivered or well underway for a 2014 delivery.

Q: *Nav Brar:* Okay, and you were also involved with the Container Capacity Improvement Project as well?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yeah. So this, this project falls under the Container Capacity Improvement Program.

Q: *Nav Brar:* Okay, so part of the CCIP, you have some construction that was planned on the Deltaport Causeway and some improvements at Deltaport?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* That’s right. That’s called the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project, and we are in the final stages of getting approvals and project agreements, and if all goes according to our schedule, we would begin construction in the new year.

Q: *Nav Brar:* Is that not something that was supposed to be started in the summertime?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, it’s taking a little longer to work out some of the details, but it’s still scheduled for completion by the end of 2014.

Q: *Nav Brar:* So how does that project affect the forecast that you’ve presented?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It’s actually built into that forecast on page 4. It’s one of the two projects in the 2015 timeframe. See there DTRRIP and Prince Rupert phase 2, stage 1. So that volume has already been accounted for.

Q: *Susan Jones:* In terms of this diagram and this location for the proposed Terminal 2, again, as far as I’m concerned, there’s a huge credibility gap in terms of saying this is the least affecting the environment. It could be the most affecting the environment for all we know.

In 2003 the Department of Fisheries and Oceans wrote three letters to Port Metro Vancouver saying, we will not even consider a location here for a terminal. And they explained why, and now that’s all gone by the wayside because they’ve gutted the Fisheries Act. So those guys don’t count any more. But they were very clear that they wouldn’t even discuss it further with the Port. They had a meeting with the Port, they had three letters, they’re on record, they said this is very detrimental to fish habitat.

Now you’re saying by moving it out of this area that you’re taking it out of the habitat on the North side.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, what they said was they would not consider it on the south side as a shoreward extension of the existing terminal. They said they would not consider it on the north side in this intertidal area here. So, I’m going back to what Vicki said, she remembers three. There were actually four, four potential locations at that time, a decade ago.

Q: *Susan Jones:* So you just moved it over a bit?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, we actually responded to what they said. They said that of those four there are two that really were non-starters, and so we didn’t consider those.

Q: *Susan Jones:* So we’re not going to hear from them anymore because they don’t have any power any more. They destroyed the whole Fisheries and Oceans department, so it doesn’t matter what they say. But this area out here, I think it’s nonsense to say it won’t affect the habitat. This is other habitat. This is not one piece of habitat. There’s a whole inter-connected bunch of habitats, and you put mud pollution out here, noise pollution, you dredge, you fill,
you’ve got to be a fool to think that you’re not going to have an effect on the fish, the wildlife, the migratory birds, the Orcas.

So I don’t know who came up with this, but again, huge credibility gap.

A: Cliff Stewart: So what we’re actually saying, if I could just respond to that, is that we believe that the impacts of this project can be mitigated or compensated. We’re not saying that there aren’t impacts. What we’re saying is that it’s possible to deliver the project and address the impacts that result from it.

Q: Susan Jones: Compensation and mitigation are words bandied around. They mean nothing when you did the Deltaport Third Berth. You destroyed everything. They compensated way far away from here, over on some islands where they dug out a deep water trench for Ducks Unlimited to shoot ducks. They got paid all the money.

I mean, there was never any scientific information about how that -- what we destroyed and what we compensated. It was just money, $1.2 million that went to Pacific Salmon Foundation and Ducks Unlimited, to who knows what because you go through all this process, you’re going through a process for two or three years, and you know what at the end of it? It’s going to be mitigated and compensated. They don’t tell you how, they don’t provide any science. This is what happened with DP3. Still don’t know the science behind any of that. It’s not in there.

Marine Terminal

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the proposed marine terminal design and berth structure (page 12 and 13 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Nav Brar: What was used at the Deltaport Third Berth? What style of construction and what kind of feedback did you get from that?

A: Cliff Stewart: It was caisson. Similar to what the first two berths at Deltaport were as well.

Q: Nav Brar: And what kind of feedback did you get from the community?

A: Cliff Stewart: I’m not sure at that point whether or not there was a consultation on the caisson versus pile and deck. I would say for the first berth there probably wasn’t. That was about 18 years ago.

Q: Nav Brar: For the Third Berth there must have been?

A: Cliff Stewart: I’m not sure whether it was offered as a consultation opportunity.

Q: Vicki Huntington: Sorry, I just wonder how, how you expect people to get this in an evening, not having had a chance to read it.

C: Judy Kirk: So what I made very clear at the beginning of the meeting is that the consultation is from October through the end of November. And so this is on-line. You can return it on-line at the end of November if you like, but it’s not tonight. Tonight is for you to hear what the project team has to say and to ask questions. And there are other meetings on the inside cover, which I think is important for you too, Vicki.

C: Cliff Stewart: There’s one other thing, and that’s a new feature for us in this community, and it’s a thing called Port Talk, and it’s available on the project website and it enables you to put questions in and have those responded to very quickly.
Q: Vicki Huntington: How could I knowledgeably comment on caissons versus rock fill without some independent authority that could advise me?

C: Judy Kirk: But you know what, Vicki? You know I’ve been doing this a long time and if we don’t ask people these questions early on, you know, they’d say, “Well why didn’t you ask us about the caisson versus the pile and deck?”

C: Vicki Huntington: The point is whether we can provide meaningful input and whether we’ll be listened to.

C: Judy Kirk: They have been analyzed, and what the Port is sharing with you is that we’ve looked at these trade-offs and think that the noise created by pile driving would be more than the community would want to sustain.

C: Vicki Huntington: Versus the number of trucks that was required to bring rock and fill in for a 200-acre deep sea port. Do you know what that is?

A: Cliff Stewart: I think you can assume that for the delivery of the bulk of those types of constructions materials for either design would come in by barge, most likely.

C: Judy Kirk: But you know, Vicki, further, you raise a really fair comment, which is if you felt and others felt that there wasn’t enough information here at this stage to provide comment on this, then that’s what you should say.

C: Cliff Stewart: So there are a number of opportunities over the next I guess three weeks to be in both this type of format meeting and also in open houses. There’s a significant amount of information available on-line, on the website, and I mentioned before you came in there are now about 100 historic documents that we have available on the website for people who are interested in digging more into the details of this.

And you identify a challenge in providing an opportunity for input. You know, the questions are challenging questions. But I think it’s fair to point out, and in every case of things we’re asking for consultation on, we are recommending a particular direction, but we’re not coming out and saying, “Well, you tell us what you think and then we’ll figure it out.” We have done the initial work and said, “This is what we think is the appropriate way to go, but....” There are three technical and one other consultation suggestions, plus the opportunity to comment on anything, whether we’ve asked for consultation feedback or not.

Q: Vicki Huntington: Just one other question then. If we approach the Port and say “Could we have the two technical studies and the analysis done on these two options”, would they be made available to us?

A: Cliff Stewart: Probably. I can’t imagine why they wouldn’t be.

Q: Vicki Huntington: Because unless we can see your analysis, it’s very hard for some of us who do fairly deep examinations on some of these topics -- unless we can freely see your analysis, we can’t comment.

A: Cliff Stewart: We will get back to you on that. I can’t imagine a reason why we wouldn’t be prepared to share that.

Q: Susan Jones: I agree with Vicki. I mean, my question to you is, why would you possibly ask us this question at this time when there’s been no information given about environmental effects, costs or priorities or where this comes from. My guess is you’ve been sitting at a table with a lot
of people for a lot of years, you’ve already decided all this and we’re just going through a PR process here, because that seems to be what happens every time.

I think you’re looking for what you call manufactured consent here. This first question is about if you want this guy or this guy, and I couldn’t possibly know. But to me it’s like asking, you want to be ruled by Hitler or Mussolini? Like I don’t want either, thank you very much.

And so I really protest here, and I think this is a very stupid question to ask us at this time. There’s no information. We’re talking about Terminal 2, you’re saying it’s a given, it’s going to happen. I don’t know. There’s no justification for the project. It’s environmentally disastrous, and we’re not talking about any of that. We’re talking about whether we want this or that or whether we want to put the buildings here or the buildings there. I don’t want any part of it.

So I think this is manufactured consent. I think it’s a stupid question, and I’m certainly not qualified to answer it or talk to any of it.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** So on page 31 we have an area for additional comments. We’re also happy to receive on-line feedback or written submissions.

Q: **Susan Jones:** We’ve been giving so much feedback for years. None of it has ever been listened to, none ever been responded to. Twenty years. We’ve got thousands of submissions to the Port.

**Marine Terminal**

*Cliff Stewart* provided information regarding the project elements (page 14 of the Discussion Guide), as well as the trade-offs between potential locations of the terminal intermodal yard (page 15 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Vicki Huntington:** This is on top of the DTRRIP?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** This is on top of DTRRIP, that’s right. And Deltaport Way would need to be widened, our initial studies indicate to four lanes in the section where the signalized intersections are shown as the green line there.

Q: **Don Bruchet:** Just curious on the whole rail line as far out as 72nd, I had been given to understand that all of these expansions of the rail line are taking place on land that is already owned by the Port or the rail system. In other words, it’s not swallowing up currently any farm land.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Let me clarify that. You’re absolutely right on the first point, the land is owned by BC Rail. It has been designated by the Agricultural Land Commission as rail right-of-way, and some of it is currently being farmed. So in other words, it’s recognized that it is intended for future rail use when that requirement comes along.

And just to put it in perspective, the land in question is called the Option Lands. It’s about 18 hectares. Vicki asked the question about whether or not it’s in addition to. So the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project requires about 8 hectares of that 18 hectares, and Terminal 2, as we proposed it, requires the remainder of that 18 hectares.

Q: **Susan Jones:** Just a question on that. The Terminal 2 requires more than the road and rail improvement now, is that what you’re saying?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yes, a further 10 hectares.
Q: Susan Jones: But that hasn’t gone to the Agricultural Land Commission yet?
A: Cliff Stewart: No, the entire rail area, the Option Lands, the 60-metre strip, was designated as rail right-of-way in 2008 by the Agricultural Land Commission, subject to a plan. They’ve now received the plan and they’ve approved that subject to the agreement on the agricultural compensation. And so a similar process would be undertaken for Terminal 2 for the additional 10 hectares.

Q: Susan Jones: Oh, so there would be another application to the Agricultural Land Commission?
A: Cliff Stewart: Well, it’s not an application because the approval has been given in principle, subject to the provision of the additional information. So when that information is ready to be provided, then that would go to the Agricultural Land Commission.

Marine Terminal

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the trade-offs between potential locations of the terminal intermodal yard (page 15 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Don Bruchet: Is any of that, Alternative 2 in particular, included in the TFN lands at all?
A: Cliff Stewart: We haven’t done any work on Alternative 2. It’s not what we’re proposing. What we’re saying is and we’re not proposing it because we don’t think that it is the preferred alternative to the community. But we’re not making that choice. We’re saying there could be work done to develop a plan for that if there was an interest in that as an alternative to Alternative 1A.

Q: Don Bruchet: I’m just curious to know is any part of the TFN land being used for any of the intermodal yard?
A: Cliff Stewart: In Alternative 1A, which we actually have planned and designed, no. We haven’t done any planning work on Alternative 2. We’re saying if there is an interest in that as an alternative, in which case we could do some work on it. Would it involve TFN lands? It might or it might not. We haven’t done the work.

Q: Clint Morgan: Well, am I correct to think that there would be an intermodal yard being built on the stretch, you know, along Deltaport Way to accommodate the increase of capacity of the existing Terminal 1 to kind of maximize its capacity and maybe move some of the rail operation off the terminal?
A: Cliff Stewart: No. What has been proposed is rail storage tracks. And just so I’m being absolutely clear, I’m not trying to play with words. I want you to understand, an intermodal yard is a working facility where containers are lifted on and off of trains and a rail yard is just storage for trains arriving and departing. So the answer to your question is no, there is no plan for an intermodal yard along there as part of the DTRRIP project. But for both that project and this one, we are proposing storage tracks along there.

Q: David Ryall: The 18 hectares that you have got permission from the ALR to use your right-of-way, you said there was some compensation to agriculture for taking that 18 hectares out. What is it?
A: Cliff Stewart: Well, that is a conversation that’s currently underway between BC Rail, who own the land, and the Agricultural Land Commission. For the first 8 hectares, that’s part of the
DTRRIP project. And we’ll talk about that actually. It is a consultation topic we want to talk about. So if you could hold that question, we'll come back to that a little bit later.

Q: **Nav Brar:** With the Alternative 2, so if you're including the intermodal yard upland, does that fall within the current Option Lands or does that take more farmland out of the ALR in addition to the current option lands?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** As I say, we haven't actually done design on that but it would likely take some additional lands.

Q: **Nav Brar:** From page 14 going back to page 10, so we’re talking about jobs at the operating terminal, direct and indirect employment. Do you have the stats on Deltaport right now versus what you're projecting? Because with the terminal here, this new terminal you’re also talking about a lot of automation. So to get a company coming in from somewhere around the world running an automated terminal, how are these job numbers compared to Deltaport and similar terminals.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Okay. We can get you that. My understanding is that these would be similar. Automation on a terminal doesn't make a huge difference to the amount of employment that's created.

Q: **Nav Brar:** I don't know if you have seen some of the automation videos from around the world but there's no people. I'd strongly disagree with what you're saying. So if we’re saying there's going to be 18,200 direct and indirect jobs, that's hard to swallow if there's heavy automation by some company from around the world.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** To put it in context, Deltaport, post DTRRIP, which would be about the same sized terminal, the actual on-terminal employment is about 800 to 900 jobs out of a similar sort of 18,000 jobs that are direct jobs that are created.

Q: **Nav Brar:** Okay so now we’re saying a similar size terminal that's going to have automation will give us how many jobs?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** If it were a manual terminal like Deltaport in the neighbourhood of 800 to 900 jobs of the 18,000. If the terminal were automated, something less than 800 to 900 of the 18,000. So there would be a similar reduction in the 18,000.

Q: **Nav Brar:** Well that's easy to understand. For Deltaport you're saying 800 to 900 which is probably a number that I would agree with, working there. It says "Direct employment here estimated 9,200". So 10 times more jobs in an automated terminal that's a similar sized terminal?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No. Don't confuse what's in the terminal from direct employment related to the terminal. So truck drivers, people who work on the railroad, people -- those are all included. Direct employment includes people who work on the tugboats, people who work for customs, people who work on the terminal, people who drive trucks, people who work in the warehouses that unload the containers and people work in the warehouses that load the containers.

Q: **Nav Brar:** So what's the number for Deltaport after DTRRIP or before DTRRIP? Which of those do you have?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** It's available on the website. I just don't have the number. But if you look at the DTRRIP, the same document was produced for DTRRIP, and has the post-DTRRIP numbers so you
can get a sense. I just want to go back to what you said about automated terminal, there's no people. That's a bit of a marketing -- that's a bit of a marketing tool for people who sell automation. Automated terminals have lots and lots of people. What they don't have is people on the ground in the container yard. That’s where the big difference is.

**Road and Rail Infrastructure**

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding road and rail infrastructure on the causeway (page 16 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Clint Morgan**: I thought I seen a preliminary design that was showing an elevated road alongside the causeway? So that's no longer the case?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Well, I can't say that it's no longer because I don't know that ever was but it isn't in this design. Apart from the question Vicki asked earlier about location, we really started from scratch. We didn't sort of take what someone had done.

Q: **Clint Morgan**: Because you would think that the existing causeway, which is strictly servicing Terminal 1 and the coal terminal. We’re doubling capacity of the container terminal with Terminal 2, probably going to double traffic so you would think the causeway wouldn't be sufficient to accommodate traffic.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Yeah the amount of traffic there is a two-lane road with free flow that can handle that volume of traffic. The only reason that when you get up to Deltaport Way on the mainland that it has to be widened is because the traffic stops at stop lights and so you need more width in order to accommodate that.

The existing road is utilized pretty much as is out to near the Westshore turnoff, at that point there'll be another overpass leading to a road that goes the rest of the way out to Terminal 2. There would be a vehicle access and control system to ensure that particularly the trucks that are going to the terminal are supposed to be at the terminal.

The other aspect that’s currently in the design, although it's not definitive, it's been suggested by our operations folks, is on the north side of causeway north of the new rail yard is simply a space for what they're calling an emergency access road. Two-lane gravel in the event that there was a problem on the existing road, the possibility of having traffic divert around that.

The other thing that would be on the causeway would be transmission line improvements to handle the additional power requirements and also to extend the transmission line from where it currently terminates near West Shore out the rest of the distance to Terminal 2.

Q: **Susan Jones**: And will they all be buried, those lines?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: We’re not recommending that at this point. We do have studies ongoing. There have been a number of studies over the last several decades looking at the effects of the work that's been done to mitigate against bird strikes.

Q: **Susan Jones**: Everything can be mitigated.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Those studies indicate that there's been a dramatic reduction in bird mortality.

Q: **Izabella Wieckowski**: Have you ever considered that there's less birds?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: And so we have studies ongoing right now to confirm or refute that, but based on our current understanding we would not be recommending that the power lines be buried.
Whether an independent environmental panel process recommends that is a separate conversation.

Q:  
**Vicki Huntington:** I'm curious about the sentence under causeway widening.

"The causeway needs to be widened to the northwest but to reduce potential impacts on sensitive marine habitat, the northwest side of the causeway would be widened to different widths along the side."

What do you know about those marine habitats now?

A:  
**Cliff Stewart:** Near the base of the causeway there is biofilm and in that area, the causeway is narrowed to avoid impacting the biofilm. So that's an example.

C:  
**Susan Jones:** Just a question on the road and rail improvements. It's very unclear what's being done now and what's going to be done for Terminal 2 because your diagrams don't really show it. There's no visual here that will show this is being done now and this is what's going to be needed for Terminal 2. I mean you're stating it here but a visual at some point would be much more beneficial.

Q:  
**Vicki Huntington:** This new turning wye, near Arthur Drive for locomotive turning. It's the first I've heard of that one and it would be useful to know what that means.

A:  
**Cliff Stewart:** if you think about a locomotive, if it's pointing west and you want it to point east, you need to turn it around. A wye helps you accomplish this. In theory they're supposed to be able to go backwards or forwards. What happens today if they need to turn them for some reason is they turn them through the loop tracks at Westshore. So what we're suggesting is that there may be a need to build a turning wye because Westshore may not always be in a position to facilitate that particularly as the number of trains increase for both operations.

If that were to need to happen, then our suggestion is somewhere in the neighbourhood of Arthur Drive there may need to be a construction of a wye.

Q:  
**Vicki Huntington:** So could your guide then show what the implications are. Maybe there are none, but in terms of the track widening, that it's useful to know where you're looking at it and what it needs. So you're looking at the Deltaport Way being widened four lanes from east of Arthur Drive to where you want to be. How far east of Arthur Drive?

A:  
**Cliff Stewart:** I can't tell you exactly how far east but if you look on page 14 there is a faint green line just north of the red line in that area which is supposed to be indicative of sort of the general --

Q:  
**Vicki Huntington:** So basically the Highway 17?

A:  
**Cliff Stewart:** No, it doesn't go quite that far. Sort of half way between.

Q:  
**John Lindner:** Well are there 4 lanes already?

A:  
**Cliff Stewart:** No it's actually just two lanes. But the right-of-way is there. The right-of-way is there to allow it to be widened. And the exact distance is a function of something the traffic engineers would have to sort out but in essence the reason for the widening is that that traffic needs to be able to stop at a stoplight. There has to be enough room for it, to accelerate to get going again to be able to achieve the same throughput in one end of it and out the other end of
it where there are no traffic lights by South Fraser Perimeter Road and the causeway road and so that's what that widening would be about.

And this obviously would be subject to detailed design, consultation with the Province. All we’re saying is that, you know, we've done the preliminary look-see and what the traffic engineers say is in that area you need to have more capacity and that’s the most likely way to achieve it.

**Habitat Replacement**

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding environmental impacts and habitat replacement (page 17 of the Discussion Guide).

C:  *Clint Morgan:* Yeah, you just said that the total amount would be 210 acres and most of it would be represented by the terminal itself. And that's a question that I’ve asked earlier on, because I thought I saw the answer on page 12 – it says that the terminal land created would be 115 acres, so that’s almost half of the 210

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* The total direct is about a 190 hectares direct. And then there’s another about 20 hectares of what’s called indirect. So that’s what coastal process is. So once this is built, then coastal process will change about 20 hectares of the adjacent environment, which we would also need to compensate.

**Road and Rail Infrastructure**

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of planned road and rail improvements as part of the project (page 16 of the Discussion Guide), as well as Port Metro Vancouver initiatives to address increased truck traffic volume and emissions (page 19 of the Discussion guide).

Q:  *Nav Brar:* What portion of the trucks that are currently in the fleet in the industry are compliant with that 2007 standard?

A:  *Cliff Stewart:* That’s a good question. I can’t tell you the answer to that. That standard isn’t required today except for new trucks. So any new truck entering the fleet has to have that today. By 2015 all trucks will have to meet that standard or they will no longer be in the fleet. I don’t know what the number is today.

Q:  *Nav Brar:* I don’t know if it was part of the DTRRIP or the whole CCIP but at one point there was a concept that I read over the years of trucks carrying two containers at once, similar to what they do in Alberta.

Q:  *Cliff Stewart:* That’s called the turnpike doubles. That is a possibility. There are fairly significant logistic challenges with that at both ends of the chain. The thing to understand about why the majority of containers that go onto a truck at the port in Vancouver is that these same containers are rehandled at an off-dock facility somewhere in the local region. And as soon as you put two containers on a truck, there are two main problems with that. One is it is very difficult to process those containers. The other is the public is not really happy driving alongside what amounts to a container train.

So we are not saying that’s not a possibility, but we are not pursuing that. We are designing to allow for it if that’s where the industry and the government chooses to move, but that’s not something that we are depending upon.

Q:  *Vicki Huntington:* I’d just like to offer a consideration for mitigation of the road and rail noise, and I feel that the port should build sound attenuation fences along that causeway and along
where the rail yards are going to be developed near Ladner there and the agricultural lands in there. I don’t think there’s any excuse not to have noise fencing along that causeway.

I don’t know how TFN puts up with it. I don’t know how people on the bluff put up with it, and there’s no excuse for not having it at least on the southern side. The northern side for people on Westham Island, if they find it difficult too. But I think it’s part of your social obligation to do whatever you can to mitigate that being done. And it’s not a difficult achievement. And it’s a strong recommendation I have.

I don’t know if anybody else agrees with me, but it’s a simple way of providing some mitigation for the community.

Q:  
Nav Brar: To add to Vicki’s comment there, along the causeway you’re proposing a widening. On the north side it’s admitted, you’re saying there’s lots of sensitive marine habitat. Obviously there are both sides. Why aren’t you widening to the south and then combine that with some sort of noise attenuation fencing along the causeway there. And you can widen to the south, that’s side’s already -- you just disturbed it a little while ago.

A:  
Ben Wheeler: I think it’s a good question, Nav. I think part of the answer lies in what came out of DP3. So there were some commitments the Port undertook to offset or compensate for some of the habitat that was affected along that south side. And that’s what we call the east causeway habitat improvement area. It’s roughly four kilometres, and some very substantial habitat improvement project was just built there. Fisheries and Oceans would probably not look favourably to us touching that. And so that’s one of the reasons why we stay away from that area.

Q:  
Nav Brar: Is that not something that we should look at maybe rebuilding that again, further out south, and leave the other side the way it is?

A:  
Cliff Stewart: It’s a policy question. Fisheries & Oceans generally do not allow what’s called “compensatory habitat” to be re-disturbed. If they were open to that it could be considered.

C:  
David Ryall: Well, I think Vicki’s comment on the noise, is certainly something that’s on the social side for this community. You know, tens of billions of dollars are being spent on this project.

C:  
Cliff Stewart: Billions, please. Not tens of billions.

C:  
David Ryall: Well, no, you added it up going across Canada and the trains and infrastructure, all of it, and you go to through our community and I don’t think you’re putting enough infrastructure to keep this community where it was. And I would say, not only that, we’re looking at decades, as a matter of fact, centuries, for this project. And I think all of Canada can help support our social being here a lot better than they’re doing, by far.

C:  
Susan Jones: You got that right.

Q:  
David Ryall: What’s the stumbling block with these trucks leaving empty? Cliff, it’s good to hear that you’re working on it. But as a layperson, it looks pretty silly, trucks going empty. So what’s the biggest stumbling block at getting this approved? It’s not a priority, so therefore it doesn’t get attended to. It’s only how it is perceived that it becomes something that should happen.

C:  
Vicki Huntington: The Port doesn’t make any of these social issues a priority.
C: **David Ryall:** And the other one which was good to hear and that’s the trucks stopping on the Deltaport Way. I think -- and I realize the Port recognizes to some degree that they have to attend to this, but maybe it’s because I haven’t gone along that causeway as much. And I’m just talking about from Highway 17 to the causeway. Those trucks are still parking along there far too much, and, you know, when you’ve got to travel down that road, it’s not safe. So I would suggest trying to improve on that specifically.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Yeah. And let me just comment on that, which we’re not looking to wait a decade to address that. We’re assuming for the purposes of this conversation that that will have been dealt with.

C: **David Ryall:** Yeah, well, it needs to be. Because I tell you what, nobody else in our society could pull that off. To have it go from 41B all the way to highway 17, no one else in this community could do that on the basis that you do it.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** The trucks know that if they can get on Deltaport Way today, there is nothing anybody can do about it, because there is nowhere to turn them around. So one of the things that’s being incorporated into the design of the DTRRIP project is a truck turnaround.

So, today, when the police come along and the truck is pulled over, what -- the only choice that the police have is to tell the truck to go up and drive through either 41B or Arthur Drive up the country roads of Ladner.

C: **David Ryall:** But, listen, to be running a port this size, it’s not really good planning. It’s unacceptable to leave the poor truck drivers in this situation. I mean, we had a farm there, they were parking, knocking over our posts, and so it’s really unacceptable to have that happen.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** I agree.

Q: **John Lindner:** I was just confused to what you said before about the empty trucks, in regards to a regulatory problem. Can you elaborate on that? I don’t quite understand.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, there are a number of players involved in moving containers around. In other words, there are a number of customers and they have their own contractual arrangements with who they choose to have haul their containers. So if, for example, the container that needs to come off the terminal is an empty container that belongs to a particular steamship line, they have a contract with a particular company to haul their containers. If there is a loaded container coming into the terminal to be exported, then the person who owns the contents of the container is paying for that truck to be hauled, and they have their particular favoured service provider. So it may be that a container coming up to the terminal, I mean, it looks really easy. Well, we should just be able to make this person, you know, use that truck and that person use that truck. It’s somewhat akin to the problem of single-occupancy vehicles at commuter rush hour. That problem could be easily solved if we could tell people they had to drive to work with their neighbours. We kind of don’t have that ability either. And it’s like that kind of a problem. It’s probably not quite as intractable as that, but it is of similar complexity.

Q: **Clint Morgan:** Is there any staging for trucks planned on Terminal 2? Because effectively what I’m hearing is that essentially the road that leads presently to Terminal 1 will eventually lead to Terminal 2, which is Deltaport Way and the causeway. And that’s going to be re-enhanced in terms of the ability to handle trucks. And we have seen trucks, like we said, lined up alongside the Deltaport way waiting to get into Terminal 1. Granted, there is not much staging on Terminal
1. So my question is, are you planning on having some kind of staging to handle X amount of trucks on the terminal so they don’t spill onto the road?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Yes, if this sort of thing is still required in 10 years, that is the intention.

**Environmental Assessment Process**

*Cliff Stewart* provided information regarding compensation for agricultural land (page 19 of the Discussion Guide) as well as an overview of the environmental assessment process (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Izabella Wieckowski*: Is there a list somewhere of which ones have you commenced, and who is conducting them, and how is the process of awarding the actual environmental assessments to a particular organization. How was this decision made that this particular organization is going to be assessing.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: No, there isn’t. These are the guys that are doing it, right down here. Hemmera.

Q: *Izabella Wieckowski*: Are you planning to put it out?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Do you want to know who has actually been awarded the subcontract for particular specialties?

Q: *Izabella Wieckowski*: Yes, and what the process was like. I would like to have access to information, how are you actually conducting the process of awarding the contract to conduct the assessment and studies.

C: *Judy Kirk*: You’re asking for the Request for Proposal, I think, is what it’s sounding like?

Q: *Izabella Wieckowski*: No, I’m talking about the responses to the RFP and how you evaluated the responses.

A: *Judy Kirk*: The RFP is public. But the responses are not public.

A: *Susan Jones*: It’s always the same one. It’s always Hemmera.

Q: *Izabella Wieckowski*: And why? I mean I work for the public organization, and that information is public.

A: *Judy Kirk*: Okay, we’ve noted that.

Q: *Vicki Huntington*: Where do we find the RFPs that the Port has put out, whether it’s for terminal operations?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Generally on our website, or on BC Bid. Now, they don’t stay there forever.

Q: *Susan Jones*: You say you put out a bid for proposals and so forth, and I have sent in questions for the Port for the terms of reference for the studies, and all we’re getting is a very, very broad general description. So my question is two-fold. One, when you put out the Request for Proposals, did you have a terms of reference so that you knew specifically what you were asking the people bidding to do? And why aren’t there, by now, specific terms of reference so we know exactly what those people are doing?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Okay. That’s a great question. Let me answer that by talking about the process. So if you look on page 20, we are in what’s called the pre-environmental assessment phase. So in other words, we haven’t actually commenced the formal environmental assessment process.
That would take place starting probably in April or May of next year, in what’s called the pre-panel review stage. And one of the key deliverables of that pre-panel review stage of the formal environmental assessment process is the delivery of Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines. So the documents that you’re talking about form part of the environmental impact statement guidelines.

C:  
Susan Jones: I’m talking about the terms of reference for the individual studies that you’re paying to get done.

Q:  
Judy Kirk: You mean the baseline studies?

A:  
Susan Jones: There’s just general discussion, “we’re going to look at the lighting, and how it affects the people”. Anybody that has any science background here knows what a terms of reference is, and we don’t have these studies. And those should be out before these people even begin their work in the field.

C:  
Judy Kirk: So, Susan Jones, you’re request is that you’re looking for the terms of reference for each of the baseline studies?

Q:  
Susan Jones: And when they were put together, and were they part of the proposal. There’s just a vague description here. I’m not talking about the terms of reference for the whole assessment. That’s another ball game.

Q:  
Vicki Huntington: But I think there should be no reason why we couldn’t have the specific terms of reference for each study.

A:  
Judy Kirk: Okay. So we’ve noted it as a request.

C:  
Cliff Stewart: So, the formal environmental assessment process commences with the submission of a document called the Project Description. And that is what kicks off the formal -- and some people have heard that it’s a one-year process, some people have heard it’s a two-year process. In reality it’s a two-year stop-clock process for environmental assessment.

And by that, I mean that the federal government, and we assume it will be a joint federal/provincial panel, but that decision obviously isn’t ours to make. The panel and the regulators have two years to do the things that they’re required to do. But every time they turn back to us, they stop the clock and say, “Now, back to you, go and do this thing, study that thing, develop this report,” and when we deliver it back, they deliver it back to us, the clock will start again. So when people hear two years, it generally -- we think it will take about four to four-and-a-half years to actually achieve the two-year time frame that is discussed there.

Q:  
Susan Jones: Under this pre-panel review, “submission of Project Descriptions”. At what stage here is this put up on the federal website? With the Deltaport Third Berth is, we didn’t know anything about it. It was put up on the federal website, which usually has nothing on it. And we had, I think, was it 30 or 60 days to respond? I think it was 30. But they did it in the summer. Nobody knew anything about it.

And that determined the whole process, and yet people didn’t even know about it. And they had no input, because by the time it came to the next stage, terms of reference, oh, that was already decided. So there is a very short -- you’ve got this two-year process, but right at the beginning they’ve cut this process federally, which I don’t understand, and it’s not written here. And it’s probably the most important part.
You say you've got a two-year process, but if you don’t get in in that first 30-day thing, you’re hooped.

A: Judy Kirk: But you know what, Susan, I would say that Cliff can’t answer specific questions about the environmental assessment process.

C: Susan Jones: Yes, he can, because it’s written in law.

A: Judy Kirk: Well, actually, the determination of how long that public comment period is --

C: Susan Jones: No, it’s fixed.

A: Judy Kirk: It isn’t. You should ask CEAA and the BCEAO. It is not fixed. And if I were you, because you’re very interested, I would inquire of them now what they are thinking about with respect to those timelines.

C: Susan Jones: But surely that’s the Port’s job to let the public know. You’re letting us know about all this.

C: Judy Kirk: Susan, in all honesty, the Port cannot speak on behalf of the regulators. They cannot.

C: Susan Jones: No, but they’re doing the process.

C: Judy Kirk: No, they’re not. I want to be really clear here. The Port is coming out early now but is not undertaking the beginning of the environmental review. They are out here talking to you before that. So any questions you would have about -- of the regulators of those kinds of time frames, you would need to ask them.

Q: Vicki Huntington: But the baseline studies are underway and we don’t have the terms of reference.

A: Judy Kirk: I hear you loud and clear on that. And I think that’s a request that needs to be considered.

C: Susan Jones: But when you have that process, you have a proponent. But when you’re saying the Port of Vancouver is not the proponent.

C: Judy Kirk: Not yet, because they haven’t filed the Project Description.

C: Susan Jones: And I’m just saying that if it’s not clear, people don’t know this.

C: Cliff Stewart: The key to the door of the environmental assessment process is this document called the Project Description. That document is currently under development, based on the design that you see here. And it will be informed by the feedback we get from this process of Project Definition Consultation. The submission of that is what kicks off the process, and then what actually happens at each stage along there is the purview of the provincial and federal environmental assessment agency offices.

C: Susan Jones: So that could happen like it did before, in July, and people have to the end of August to reply while we’re away on vacation.

C: Ben Wheeler: Susan, I hear your comment and it’s a good one. The process that we’re expecting to be led through by the regulators is one of the more intense environmental assessment models there are. And there are several opportunities during that environmental assessment where the public has an opportunity to participate. And this won’t be the first time in April or
May when this is kicked off. It’s our anticipation, although the regulators will tell us exactly, but it’s our anticipation that there will be several opportunities for people to comment.

C: Susan Jones: But we had that before. But, that Project Description was the key. And anything that wasn’t in there didn’t count.

Q: John Lindner: You say that once the Project Description is submitted by the Port Authority, that’s when the process kicks off, and the regulators will come and say “there is now going to be a public consultation period for 30 days”. But you have no control over how long that is. But you can then turn around and say to the public, that the regulators said this is now in the last 30 days. You could then turn around and inform the interested public that this is when the period is, so that they don’t necessarily have to find out from the government’s website?

A: Judy Kirk: Actually John, you would be surprised how the regulators control their purview of publicizing the process. They do require proponents to advertise in the newspapers. They require that. But otherwise, they do not allow proponents to publicize in a whole bunch of other ways. So, I just wouldn’t want the impression left that somehow the Port has free rein to publicize the process. It’s not their process. It’s the regulator’s process.

Q: Vicki Huntington: This would be my request that the Port do everything it can to as quickly as possible release the terms of reference on the studies. And as the studies become available, or I would say before they define the project, and develop their project definition document to submit, that maybe you come back, release those studies, so that people can look at them and comment, prior to the final project definition. It’s those studies that form your project. And to the extent you can release those to the public to review them would be incredibly helpful.

A: Judy Kirk: I don’t think they’re complete yet for the project.

A: Cliff Stewart: No. And I think it’s important to understand, some of the studies aren’t even started. We will take that away and understand what we can or can’t do there.

But the other thing you asked for was, finish the studies and give them to you before we launch the Project Description. We can’t even understand what the regulator’s desires for studies are, let alone do them and complete them and share them with the public, before we start the process. I can assure you that as part of the process, ultimately the studies will all be made available to the public, because it is a public process.

Q: Izabella Wieckowski: I just would like to understand the process, that’s all.

A: Cliff Stewart: The Project Description does not include the studies. It simply says, “Here’s what we propose to do.” Then you spend about two years developing first a set of guidelines, in conjunction with what’s called technical working groups. And then the Environmental Impact Statement, which -- and that document does include the studies, but there is a public process around that will occur between that and when the Project Description is submitted.

Q: Izabella Wieckowski: So, I understand that. So the Environmental Impact Statement is being done between September and April? Or is it going to be done after April 2013?

A: Cliff Stewart: After April, 2013, between the submission of the Project Description and the joint panel referral. So, until you have completed the Environmental Impact Statement and the draft mitigation plans, you can’t launch into the actual panel process, and it’s in the panel process that you actually get to see the study reports, because they aren’t completed until them.
Because up until that point, the regulators are still deciding whether they agree that those are the right studies and the right terms of reference and so on and so forth.

Q: **Vicki Huntington:** So the baseline studies provide you with the opportunity to define the project that you will then submit and go through the process?

A: **Judy Kirk:** Not quite. I think that the regulator really needs to come out and talk to you, Vicki, and to others, and I think tell you yourselves. The difference is the baseline studies also have to be agreed to by the regulator in that second step. In other words the Port can start those but it can’t finish them until the regulator says to them, “You’ve met a terms of reference we think is adequate.”

A: **Cliff Stewart:** They don’t form a part of the Project Description. They all come after. We’re gathering data because the more years of data we have the more likely we are to meet whatever requirements there are.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I just want to add something because, Vicki, you know I’ve been doing this kind of work for a long time. The misunderstanding here about what happens when across the country is also a serious problem. But quite aside from whether it’s above board here, I’m just making an observation based on work that I’ve done over the years, there’s a lack of understanding of how the regulators set that terms of reference and when.

Q: **Susan Jones:** The last time we did the studies for the Deltaport Third Berth, we were surprised to learn that they only used 2002 as a baseline for all the data. It was all measured from 2002, which is not a good baseline for what’s happened since the coal port. So is this the same thing here? Is 2002 the baseline for all these studies?

A: **Ben Wheeler:** Well, I think actually that’s a good question. We’re in a good position because we do have some data going back to 2002. So this is 2012 and actually the port has been conducting studies ever since 2002.

Q: **Susan Jones:** That there was a huge impact before that that’s not taken into account to cumulative effects. So again there’s a credibility validity problem here. You only start at 2002. You don’t include all the damage that’s already been done, which is huge.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Yeah, and it’s almost a philosophical point and I understand, Susan, where you’re coming from on that. Well, the answer is certainly not before 2002, and for some things it won’t be 2002. It will probably be 2012. It could even -- if somebody comes along and says, “We want you to study something that we don’t even know exists,” then the baseline will be whatever year we hear about it and start studying it.

Q: **Susan Jones:** Yeah, but you know, you’ve got to consider the big picture. This is the mouth of the Fraser. This is the migratory bird flyway. This is a big issue. And so if you only go back to 2002 you’re saying, well, cumulatively we’re not doing any damage to be compensated or litigated. You’re not giving a complete picture.

Q: **Marek Wieckowski:** I don’t know whether it’s possible, but we talk about this regulator. Would it be possible to coordinate a meeting with the regulator?

A: **Judy Kirk:** Yes. We’ve done it before on other projects, and I’m going to make the suggestion here. We can’t speak on behalf of them and I think it’s a good suggestion and we’ll see if we can do that. Now, because the board isn’t in the process yet I don’t know what their answer will be, but we will ask and come back to you and let you know.
C: **Cliff Stewart:** Okay. So again, I cannot emphasize enough, notwithstanding your view of what has or hasn’t been done, if you see something that’s missing here please let us know.

C: **Vicki Huntington:** Dollars to help people engage in the process.

C: **Judy Kirk:** So which, by the way, Vicki and David, the process does in that box, that April 2013-15, when the EIS Guidelines are being discussed, they do seek for application for funding.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** We have to be extremely careful not to tread on the prerogatives of the regulator. So that is the regulator that manages that.

C: **Judy Kirk:** But Vicki, you know, you’re in a very good position to ask those questions of the regulator.

Q: **Vicki Huntington:** I’m asking, yes, I understand that of the regulator. I asked if the Port could possibly assist in that regard before the process starts?

C: **Judy Kirk:** That has been noted.

**Environmental Assessment Process**

**Cliff Stewart provided information regarding community legacy benefits (page 22 of the Discussion Guide).**

C: **Vicki Huntington:** Does that include the increased taxes?

C: **Cliff Stewart:** No, because that flows naturally from the construction.

C: **Izabella Wieckowski:** It’s not enough though, because they are capped.

C: **Vicki Huntington:** The noise attenuation, the way you fellows will probably work is rather than consider it for instance to be a social mitigation factor, you’ll work on the levels of decibels that are hitting somebody’s front window rather than looking at it as a compensation or a legacy. So I don’t know why you would say it isn’t noise because I would think that some decibels don’t count and the fence will still go. And I’m sorry, I don’t mean to be putting words in your mouth.

C: **Judy Kirk:** So Vicki, in your view, what you would like to see considered, if the noise attenuation that you’ve suggested in this meeting was not considered a requirement by the environmental regulators, then you are saying, “Look, Port, why don’t you consider that as a benefit, as a legacy benefit?”

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Certainly we would happily do that if that was what the community felt was required. In other words, if the regulator came back and said, “No, there isn’t a noise problem, you don’t need to do anything about it,” and you said, “Well, we still want something done about noise,” then that would become a community legacy benefit.

Q: **Vicki Huntington:** What does it take to convince the Port that the community is interested? Does it take a statement from the mayor? Does it take a referendum? What does it take?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** That’s a really interesting question and to a certain extent the discussions regarding community benefits will help to clarify that. Articulating what it is you want and the priority you put on things is part of the process.

Q: **Marek Wieckowski:** No, no, I just resent what you said the regulator might say that noise is not a problem.
C:  *Judy Kirk*: No, all I was trying to do was to make sure that there was clarity around the fact that noise attenuation could be considered, could be considered as mitigation and/or as of community benefit.

C:  *Vicki Huntington*: And I’m saying it should be a social responsibility rather than a legacy benefit.

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

*The meeting ended at 8:18pm.*
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*The record notes that the meeting commenced at 6:05pm*

**KEY THEMES:**

- Participants were interested in mitigation for the loss of habitat that could result from the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including potential locations for habitat banking projects.

- Participants noted that they wanted to ensure that Port Metro Vancouver balanced environmental and community needs when developing the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

- With respect to the location of the intermodal yard, one participant noted that security of an upland intermodal yard should be a major consideration, and that given that much of the project would already be built in the marine environment, it would make sense to build the intermodal yard there as well.
1. **Welcome and Introductions – Chris Chok**

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

**Q**: Nathan Pachal: What do you define as a stakeholder?

**A**: Rhona Hunter: A stakeholder would be a person who has shown a particular interest in the project in the past. We’ve been out in the community before, so we consider our stakeholders people who have had some ongoing interest in the Port, the Port business over the course of both this project and the previous projects. It’s a fairly loose definition. It’s certainly an opportunity for us to have a more intimate dialogue with people who have an active and ongoing interest in port operations and development.

**Q**: Nathan Pachal: And the open house would be more like a one-off kind of thing?

**A**: Rhona Hunter: The open houses are not formal than this. It’s a room with story boards. People freely mingle around, stop where they want to, ask questions. There’s no minute taking or record taking at an open house.

**A**: Chris Chok: I would also point out, Nathan, that the stakeholder meeting schedule, you see it published here in the inside cover. Those are open to anybody. Anybody can come to those. We do ask for RSVPs, so we know how many people are coming out.

2. **Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All**

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

**Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?**

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

**Q**: Nathan Pachal: With the Tsawwassen plans, there was a plan for industrialization in the north part of that, what’s that for?

**A**: Rhona Hunter: That’s the Tsawwassen First Nations, and it’s not part of our program. Tsawwassen First Nation is doing development works on their own land.

**Q**: Nathan Pachal: So the Port’s not doing anything with those former agricultural lands?

**A**: Rhona Hunter: No, the Port doesn’t have any use or is not using those lands in any way. Those lands are being developed by the Tsawwassen First Nations independently of the Port.

**C**: Brad Nichol: Is Gateway part of that as well? The original Delta project?

**A**: Rhona Hunter: The Deltaport Third Berth is already considered complete. That’s not part of DTRRIP. That was a previous project to increase capacity with a new berth. DTRRIP is really dealing with deficiencies at the existing container terminal at Deltaport, the road systems and rail systems that support it, both on the causeway, on the terminal and on the uplands.
Containerized Trade On The Canadian West Coast

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding existing containerized trade on the West Coast of Canada (page 5 of the Discussion Guide), as well as an overview of opportunities for creating additional container capacity (page 6 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Brad Nichol: Have you considered the Ioco area for a container port? It’s owned by Esso or Imperial Oil. I think they are looking into residential developments as opposed to industrial.

A: Rhona Hunter: The Port would only be looking at land that it has under its own control in terms of either non-developed or leased.

Q: Nathan Pachal: So just for a stat thing then, for your maximum expansion in 15 years you would say there’s going to be the ability to move more than 4 million TEUs of stuff, where in the same period you would have 2 million TEUs coming out of Prince Rupert?

A: Rhona Hunter: We currently have just about 4 million TEUs of capacity now. So with the addition of Prince Rupert and the DTRRIP program in 2015 we would have just over 6 million TEUs of capacity in BC.

C: Nathan Pachal: That’s a pretty substantial improvement in Prince Rupert then.

C: Rhona Hunter: Right, they’re adding another berth in Prince Rupert. And then they would actually be adding additional capacity to their existing berths in 2020.

Q: Brad Nichol: So by 2020, they’d be looking at going to about 2 million TEUs total?

A: Rhona Hunter: Yeah, that would be about 2 million TEUs of capacity.

Why Roberts Bank?

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding other related transportation infrastructure to support growth at Roberts Bank (page 7 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Brad Nichol: When you talk about containers leaving the port, is rail or truck transport preferred?

A: Rhona Hunter: The majority of the containers leaving the terminal leave by rail. It’s about 70%.

Q: Nathan Pachal: Right now we’re seeing a certain number of trains. In the next 20 years is that expected to double?

A: Rhona Hunter: It’s not supposed to double. It would be another 8 to 10 trains per day. So that would be 4 to 5 in and 4 to 5 out, in addition to what you have now. This infrastructure work is being done long before the expansion at Roberts Bank and it is designed with that in mind

C: Nathan Pachal: Just a comment. Brad, you’ve raised this point about the Gateway program. My understanding is that the Gateway infrastructure program has been around for a long time, and that South Fraser Perimeter Road and the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program are elements of that.

C: Brad Nichol: It’s like your neighborhood expands and then you build the schools and everything else to match the increase in population. You’re kind of putting the horse before the cart now, so as taxpayers, especially the taxpayers of Langley of Delta aren’t hit with that later.
A: *Rhona Hunter:* And a more recent announcement was the Premier’s commitment to look at replacing the George Massey Tunnel.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* How does that help the Port?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Well, it’s not so much that it helps the Port, but it will certainly deal with some of the traffic concerns that are out there for the residents in Richmond, Delta and the Surrey area who were commuting and probably from this area. I am not sure whether people commute from here through George Massey. But from South Surrey into Vancouver would benefit from the replacement of the George Massey Tunnel.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* There was a document way back for expansion, but their plan was to go with transit in that corridor because it was said that they would have to do capacity improvements along the whole corridor, and that wasn’t going to happen. So it’s not going to expand through Vancouver and over the Oak Street Bridge. For trucks and for actual goods movement that is.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don’t think the tunnel replacement is going to deal with trucks going into Vancouver. But it will certainly alleviate the congestion that the tunnel experiences. This has just been announced that, we thought was pertinent to provide context that these are all related improvements to improve transportation.

C: *Nathan Pachal:* This is an additional improvement but it really doesn’t affect the plan.

C: *Chris Chok:* We did a round of consultation last June on this project, and also for the Deltaport Terminal Road and Rail Improvement Project last fall, and one of the things that we heard very clearly at that point is, they said no more until something is done about that tunnel, and mostly from commuters, who see trucks using the tunnel and so that’s been raised as a concern. And so the reason why we wanted to include this in here is to acknowledge the fact that yes, the Premier has made this commitment to study it and that it will alleviate some of those concerns. And, we could also point out as well; they’ve set a 10-year timeframe, which would likely be before this project could be on-line.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* As in all of these construction projects, it takes a long time to actually get something built. You have to do a lot of work at the front end before you can even start construction.

In this case on page 8 is a diagram that shows the infrastructure for the South Fraser Perimeter Road as well as the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program, and includes 9 overpasses, which removes traffic conflicts at those at-grade crossings.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* There was something a while ago about the truckers being very unhappy because you changed how they did their scheduling. So I think that might have been mainly in Vancouver, where you had to show up within some window of two minutes or something or you lost your spot?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right. I don’t think it was two minutes, but yeah, we’ve put a reservation system in place. In this consultation process and previous project consultation processes, as well as the Port’s general engagement and outreach to the community, the issues of trucks and trucks moving around and truck congestion has led to a number of initiatives and certainly one of those is the reservation system, whereby there’s a half hour window that they can show up to. If they don’t have that reservation, then they have to call truck staging facilities and will go in
order of truck staging facilities, so that we don’t have trucks on the road at times when they shouldn’t be on the road.

Q:  
Nathan Pachal:  Has that been successful then?

A:  
Rhona Hunter:  It’s been successful in that it’s in place and I think that what happens is that over time people will realize the ramifications of not meeting their time. It’s not like you can turn a switch and all of a sudden everybody is in compliance. We have a pilot program where we have GPS in many trucks and we’ll soon have GPS in most of the trucks so we’ll actually know where the trucks are on the road system, since our operations centre can monitor that.

So there are a number of initiatives that are being undertaken by the Port to try and deal with trucks on the road and making them more efficient and less of an impact on the regular traffic on the road.

Q:  
Brad Nichol:  Is there any focus on the green portion of traffic? Certainly there are new trucks out that have a better emission system. But we talk about idling and having customers, you know the TSIs of the world. Whose responsibility is this?

A:  
Rhona Hunter:  We have actually the Truck Licensing System, which is designed specifically to address that, in that right now in 2015 all trucks that access the Port will be required to obtain a 2007 engine emissions standard. In order to get into our Ports you have to have at least a 2007 engine platform. So we are phasing that over time to remove the less efficient trucks from the road and require them to be at a certain standard.

Q:  
Brad Nichol:  So will there be spot checks on that?

A:  
Rhona Hunter:  They actually have to be individually licensed. So it doesn’t get a license until it passes the standard. So it’s much like the Air Care standard in that way.

Q:  
Brad Nichol:  Even if it’s a U.S. bound truck?

A:  
Rhona Hunter:  To access the port they will have be. And that’s really to address the air quality. The reservation system is also designed to improve the air quality by eliminating truck idling. If they’re not within their half-hour window or they’re early, then they will have a staging area where they will sit with their engines turned off until their window is available.

Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including estimated economic impact (page 10 of the Discussion Guide), and terminal orientation and location (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).

C:  
Brad Nichol:  I think from my experience on reading some of the dissertations from Gulf Canada, was that caissons were fairly proven and that was almost 25 years ago. And I know that Holland is using similar technology for building some airports. I think this is the better way. Obviously Fraser River Pile and Dredge or a couple of other pile driving companies, would love to drive 1,500 piles for you, but the noise considerations and specially stability factors, I personally would say caisson. And I think probably would open up future chances for expansion, because there’s still a lot of room to expand here. That’s beyond our live times for sure. But personally, that would be my recommendation.
A: *Rhona Hunter:* One of the considerations with the piles was that there was a concern of the impact on the mammals from the noise of the pile driving for that many piles for that length of time and the impact on the marine wildlife.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Is it not on the Pacific Flyway down there?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* It is, yes.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So that would disrupt birds, probably.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* More likely the impact to the Killer Whales and those sorts of things. Although I would imagine that certainly the wildlife, the flying wildlife would be not happy with the noise from pile driving. They’d likely stay away from those pile driving noises too.

**Marine Terminal**

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

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* That’s a multi-kind evaluation. Did you do one of those? Where you list it all out?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, we haven’t done a tradeoff analysis of on the causeway, off the causeway, or upland or on the causeway. We’re very early in the process here, and through the consultation process, if there is a preference that says “really we’d rather that you not increase your footprint on the marine environment” or “you should consider what the impacts will be if you, went into the upland”, then we would go forward with that evaluation. We’d have to do a lot more work around what exactly the upland or the causeway would look like.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* But at this point, like just for someone like myself, it would be very hard to make a decision on 1A or 2B or anything because I have no idea what is better or worse.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I recognize that. And so we’re looking for a preference or a direction. As I said, we’re quite early on in the process here.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So you could study both and figure out which one is better and put it on a sheet of paper so you have something that you can compare.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So if you would like to see a tradeoff analysis of the upland versus the marine, I recommend that you put that in a feedback form. That kind of feedback helps us.

We’re not taking any more agricultural land then we need to. That’s really one of the primary drivers because we are going to be creating land and we’re going to be impacting the marine environment. We knew that if we were going to go into the upland environment we probably needed to have a really good reason to do that. And so we thought if we went to the public in a consultative process and there was a clear directive from the public saying, “You know what, we can’t just make that choice, we need to consider both of them” then that would be, an impetus for us to go forward and do that analysis. But we wanted to sort of have that litmus test before we went there.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* I remember some people talking a while ago about things like in-land intermodal facilities. So why not go to Kamloops?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right. No, that hasn’t been part of this analysis.
Q:  

Nathan Pachal: And is that something that would be seriously considered or is that sort of a pie-in-the-sky thing?

A:  

Rhona Hunter: Not for this project. Things would have to be very, very different.

Q:  

Chris Chok: Are you referring to Ashcroft?

C:  

Nathan Pachal: Yeah, I think it must have been Ashcroft.

C:  

Rhona Hunter: So, I've heard that as well, but we don’t have any plans to consider that within the context of this program. So unless a partner came forward with a very quick and expeditious manner to sort of say, “we’ve got it all lined up”, seeing as we don’t own that land.

Q:  

Nathan Pachal: Is it outside of the Port’s jurisdiction?

A:  

Rhona Hunter: Yes.

C:  

Brad Nichol: I think they’re going to be disturbing the marine environment and as far as I’m concerned, it is really not a question. Because you’re already going to be disturbing the marine environment already taking the caissons and sinking them. I don’t think you’re looking at significant costs either.

One of the things that isn’t in the pros and cons here is security, when you look at the fact that you want to maintain control of these containers. You also have competitive landscape that you are talking about, Los Angeles, Prince Rupert and every other port on the west coast that is vying for that one container to come to this port. You want to make sure that you can move that as quickly -- as quickly as possible into Canada or to the other markets.

So if you want to talk about trying to create the operational efficiencies, 1A just seems to be, you know, the best alternative, and having been on the docks and see what really goes on on the docks with security, especially since 9/11, is of the utmost concern. And for a port to have control of that container until it gets to the rail is of upmost importance to, not only you, but also to Canada as far as national security.

Having been, and then to see all the container ports, it is sometimes when those big container ships come in, it is mayhem and to have control of that and not have to double handle something --

A:  

Rhona Hunter: And post 9/11, that certainly impacted the security issues on all of our port faculties, which weren’t there 15 years ago.

In addition to the terminal, there is causeway widening, and the causeway widening supports additional rail tracks, as well as a new repair yard for Terminal 2. So there are repair requirements for the trains that visit the existing Deltaport terminal as well as Terminal 2. So we would have to realign the existing tracks as well.

In terms of road improvements and this of course relates to a 1A option with the intermodal yard being on the terminal. If it were to change, then this configuration of the rail would also change.

Road improvements on the causeway include an additional overpass on the causeway adjacent to Terminal 2. There would be a Terminal 2 access road, there would be a vehicle access and control system, security environment, as well as we’re looking at the possibility of an emergency access road being put on the terminal, which would be a two-lane gravel road which will
facilitate the ability to get emergency vehicles out onto the terminal in case there was some blockage on the existing road.

Q: Brad Nichol: You mentioned earthquakes. We know the big one is coming, and when it comes it’s going to be devastating. Let’s look at the design of this terminal. Is there any qualification or in the back of your minds thinking that if it does happen this is going to be liquefied and there won’t be anything left?

A: Rhona Hunter: It’s an interesting question, and one that we haven’t firmed up our design criteria on. We know we’re not rebuilding the existing causeway, which had a design which was done back in the sixties. So it’s probably not to today’s standards in terms of seismic stability. So if the big one came along, the causeway itself would probably be the limiting factor in that the existing causeway would not be able to withstand the big one. And so whatever we do on the causeway, we may build additional parts of the causeway to current designs, but we’re not going to replace the existing causeway.

The terminal itself will be designed to current seismic standards for marine terminals. Because the causeway is that limiting factor, we haven’t quite made up our minds exactly where that threshold is. It will certainly meet current standards, but how far beyond we go hasn’t been determined.

But it’s not being designed right now to withstand the big one because the related infrastructure is not at that stage. So unfortunately, like most of our systems and infrastructure, we’d probably be in a situation where we would have less than ideal services for a period of time.

The upland road and rail, under a 1A scenario would include some new rail sidings and new rail tracks at the two existing yards, Gulf and Fisher. On page 14 there is all future yards, which are quite a bit upland from the causeway and there’d be a new turning wye off Arthur Drive.

Q: Nathan Pachal: So that’s the 10 hectares of land that would come out of the ALR?

A: Rhona Hunter: That’s right. These upland requirements are within the existing options lands, and it would take approximately 10 hectares of the existing option lands to meet the upland requirements of the new terminal as it is currently designed.

There would be road improvements including four-laning Deltaport Way intersection, improvements and redesign on 41B and Arthur Drive, and those would all take place in the existing B.C. Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure right-of-way.

**Habitat Replacement**

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding environmental impacts and habitat replacement (page 17 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Nathan Pachal: With the new federal requirements, do you have to do more or less compensation work?

A: Rhona Hunter: We don’t know yet, actually, because they’re only now drafting the regulations. We don’t actually anticipate seeing the outcome of those regulations probably until early next year. We know that it’s changing and that there’s potential that we’re going to go from strictly habitat compensation to mitigating for fish habitat specifically. So we understand that there are
some changes, but the actual specifics of what that looks like to us, we won’t know until probably early next year.

Q:     Nathan Pachal: So if before you were going to conserve 100 hectares, and now you don’t really have to do anything and you say “law says we only have to do 50 now and only in this spot so that’s what we’re going to do”.

A:     Rhona Hunter: I think we’d wait to see what the regulations say. I think the Port has a really good track record of mitigating for environmental impacts.

Q:     Nathan Pachal: Has it been above and beyond?

A:     Rhona Hunter: Typically, it’s been what’s been required through the environmental review process. But what we’re doing here, and that relates to that question, is that what we’re doing here is that we’re embarking on a program that’s going to develop and restore habitat. So we actually have started already to do the habitat redevelopment, habitat mitigation, we’re looking at building habitat. And we’re putting it into a bank, and so we’re building the new habitat before any project is even approved. And we’re anticipating that regardless of what happens in those projects, whether it goes ahead or it doesn’t go ahead, the Port is embarking on a preemptive program to create habitat, bank it, so that any proponent of the port can come forward and they can withdraw as compensation when their project is approved from the bank.

So we’re actually coming in ahead of the game. We’re trying to actually re-establish and redevelop and build habitats before projects impact the habitat.

And one of the things that’s really beneficial about that is that typically the regulations have had some high ratio compensations, so they say to the proponent, “You need to build a two-to-one offset” because they know that if you build two hectares of habitat, in five years’ time there really may only be a hectare and half of functioning habitat, or maybe even less, maybe only one hectare of functioning habitat.

So the requirement at the beginning is that you build more because you might have less that’s actually functioning. By banking habitat you actually put it in the bank. It’s functioning habitat and it has to be viable functioning habitat and stable habitat before you can withdraw from the bank. So when you’re withdrawing a hectare of habitat from the bank, it’s established habitat.

Q:     Nathan Pachal: So are you in the business of conservation then and have people working for the Port that are conservationists, much like Metro Vancouver parks people, the stuff with Burns Bog, or do you work in collaboration? Or how are you doing that?

A:     Rhona Hunter: We’re actually going to be working more in collaboration with existing organizations. We anticipate it being a lot of partnerships with First Nation communities, both their businesses as well as their members, because we see that as being a tremendous linkage with their interests and their goals, as well as the Port’s goals. We see that as being probably the biggest component.

Q:     Nathan Pachal: Would you compensate mostly in the Lower Mainland, or would it be like the ALR, where “Oh yeah, I did a project in the Peace River”?

A:     Rhona Hunter: Our focus is in the Lower Mainland. Certainly if we got to the point where we exhausted all options in the Lower Mainland we would start to expand that outside of the Lower Mainland, but our initial look is at the Lower Mainland. And we also see this not only First
Nations, but in communities or Ducks Unlimited or other conservation groups have projects or want to partner with us on projects, and we see that as being a catalyst for developing habitat.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So you could do restorative work in the Nicomekl floodplain and river then? And perhaps the City of Langley could, for example, ask you for a lot of cash to restore stuff?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Right now we are working with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans on this, and so we have some requirements as to what we can bank. It has to meet their requirements. So it’s not just any kind of habitat. We can’t go and build wildlife habitat and make it into this bank. This is a fish-oriented banking system.

So certainly there are opportunities to work with communities and on rivers and marine environments.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* And I guess municipalities must be aware of this? I’m on the parks committee for the City of Langley.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We are only just embarking on our sort of community engagement on this component. But if you’d like to have some more information, we could provide that.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* That would be really good if you talked about that on our committee meetings. We have a lot of fish-bearing waterways and areas that were classified by DFO as being important.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Excellent, and we would love to take an opportunity to get engaged and communicate what our program is and see whether there’s opportunities, and that’s exactly what we are looking for. We prefer to work with existing proponents and existing organizations who have already the ideas and perhaps even the infrastructure to do this sort of stuff and we can help fund it.

C: *Chris Chok:* We’ll note it as a follow-up.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah, absolutely. There is an interesting picture here in the guide further on habitat is that for DP3. This is one of our projects that we did and it’s a salt marsh restoration. So, you’ll see here this is an area on the left-hand side, 2007, that on the foreshore of this TFN you can just see the causeway in the background there, with the trains on it, and it was basically smothered by logs over hundreds of years and we simply went in and we removed the logs. The simple activity of removing these logs then three years later there is a fully functioning salt marsh that exists, and that’s the type of things that we would do in terms of marsh restoration and habitat work.

**Compensation for Agricultural Productivity**

*Rhona Hunter* provided information regarding Port Metro Vancouver’s potential mitigation and compensation options for the loss of agricultural productivity (*page 19 of the Discussion Guide*).

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* With the ALR exclusion, I remember something from a while ago that was already excluded from the ALR. Have you already gotten that land removed or hasn’t been removed but allowed for non-farm use and transportation?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* That’s right. That’s why it’s called the Option Lands.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Because I did a report on the ALR just south of the Fraser and I seem to recall it’s already happened.
A: Rhona Hunter: That’s right. So that happened in 2009 and it was designated for rail use. It wasn’t removed until the land is required, and so in DTRRIP we are using a portion of that option lands for the rail works.

Q: Nathan Pachal: But you don’t see a request for this project to exclude further land from the agricultural land reserve?

A: Rhona Hunter: Final design would dictate exactly how much. We’re currently looking at around 10 hectares, which would be within the existing option lands.

Q: Nathan Pachal: But I guess if you were to do the upland intermodal that would take a lot more agricultural land.

A: Rhona Hunter: We would have to take lands in excess of what we have within the options, yes.

A: Chris Chok: There’s a footnote on page 19 explaining. It’s owned by the Province of B.C. through B.C. Rail.

C: Rhona Hunter: And so if anything more than the option lands was needed it would have to go through a process far more rigorous than using the option lands, which is still an application, but we would have to go through a larger application to use more of those lands.

Environmental Assessment Process

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the environmental assessment process for the project, including identification of anticipated consultation opportunities and categories for environmental study (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Nathan Pachal: For the community legacy benefits, could you do something similar to mitigating traffic with investments and public transit and funding that, or would that be not something you could actually do?

A: Rhona Hunter: I would say if that’s an idea that you have, absolutely put it down. We’ll get to community legacy benefits in a little bit, but none of that really has been defined yet. It’s something that we’re really looking and we look towards communities to provide us with what it is that they want.

We anticipate the environmental assessment process taking up to five years, certainly four years, up to five years, depending on how much additional work the regulators may require of us in terms of studies or assessments. And as I say, the environmental assessment process has its own regulator and consultation process. We will be overlaying that with our own consultation process along that period as well.

We do envision being through regulatory process by 2016, which would allow us to begin pre-construction activities in 2017. It is anticipated to be a six-year construction process. So that would have us coming on-line around 2024.

Q: Nathan Pachal: Is this fully funded?

A: Rhona Hunter: The funding mechanism is something that’s going on in parallel with our design and market review process, and if I were to sort of extrapolate upon that, the Port is a non-shareholder, financially self-sufficient corporation. So we actually have one shareholder only, that’s the federal government, and we pay the federal government.
So the Port doesn’t get funded by the federal government, the Port funds the federal government. However, in a project of this size and magnitude we would be going to the marketplace for funding, and the shape and form of that ask and configuration of what that looks like has yet to be determined. But that’s a process that’s being run in parallel to this.

Q: **Nathan Pachal**: So there are no funds for this right now and you’re going to see funds from the marketplace. Is that like government and people that use the Port facilities kind of thing?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: It would more than likely be private funding. It wouldn’t be government. Not to say that there wouldn’t be funding opportunities that we could take advantage of, much like any other entity that could take advantage of funding opportunities, but we don’t foresee it as being government-funded. Those would be separate or distinct programs that are available through regular channels to other developers of property. We primarily see funded outside of the federal government.

Q: **Nathan Pachal**: So an operator would come and build this facility and take care of it.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: Or a funding partner with an operator. We could potentially partner with a number of operators. We might partner with a private financial institute, maybe a combination of those. So that mechanism is something that’s being determined as we go along, and probably won’t be finalized until we’ve actually got the permit in our hands, because there’s obviously a close tie between the ability to build the project and a funding partner being willing to sign a cheque.

Q: **Nathan Pachal**: Is there a dollar amount attached to this yet?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: Yeah, we’re looking over $2 billion.

C: **Brad Nichol**: Is this the last opportunity to expand for the Port? There’s no other area within the Burrard Inlet area?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: If we were to look at our existing terminals as they exist now, we do see some optimization within the inner harbour that might take place in the late 2020s. That would be based upon existing leases and infrastructure that would have to be put in place in the inner harbour in advance of an increase of capacity there.

Q: **Brad Nichol**: So in the Port Moody area there’s nothing that the Port owns right now that could be used?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: No, there’s no additional capacity increases contemplated outside of those Roberts Bank Terminal 2 and then potentially in the inner harbour.

**Categories for Environmental Study & Community Legacy Benefits**

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

Q: **Nathan Pachal**: So education could be a legacy thing?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: Education? As long as it’s a capital funding scenario. We couldn’t get into an operating-type of scenario.
Q: *Nathan Pachal*: Are there examples of where the Port can come and build the new facility and make the economy go better and provide jobs and also making the environment better at the same time? Because sometimes it feels a bit one or the other.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: I would say yes, and it would depend on what it was.

Q: *Nathan Pachal*: I was just wondering if the Port, once you’re done this project, will the economy and the environment be better off?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: I think the Port’s vision is that it does actually provide both stimulation in a sustainable manner, and that we look at what we do from an infrastructure standpoint, from a sustainable standpoint and we’re looking at putting in shore power, which is something which today is not widely used simply because the vessels that are currently in the fleet are not fit for shore power. But we allowed for it on DP3, as well planning on putting it in Terminal 2, getting ready for ships to plug in as opposed to idle offshore to provide their services.

I would have to say that that whole question of did we come out even or did one come above the other is more the perception from communities and what the person brings to the table in terms of what they value.

I think that’s where the legacy benefits really comes in, is that the Port says, we’re part of this community and this is things that we have to do because that’s what we’re regulated to do, but we recognize that being part of the community means that we give back to the community, and so that investment is an initiative that the Port has to say, we want to give back to the communities because we want to do more than what we have to for regulatory requirement, and it’s not just the environment that needs to be supported, it’s the community.

C: *Chris Chok*: I don’t work for the Port, and I know that the Port has a dedicated environmental programs department and they were the first port in Canada to have that. And so they deal basically with the Port’s operations and act as a regulator on the development of their tenant land projects. And they do have a very good track record. The Deltaport Third Berth Project, for example, included improvements to Highway 17 that separated the truck lanes and so on, as well as the $25 million worth of investment that was done for the habitat compensation.

Q: *Brad Nichol*: Well, it could even be something as simple as the marine mammal rehabilitation fund, which is supported by the Vancouver Aquarium. To perhaps become involved with that, because there is an environmental impact on the sea and then if you are saying, “Okay, we recognize that. But in retrospect we’re giving back in this way.” And you know, that’s appropriate to have in place for a number of years. But we even have, again not becoming involved in operating capital, but a bursary to that, or a bursary to set up a facility or possibly have something in the Delta area that may be able to benefit.

C: *Chris Chok*: That’s a great suggestion and something that we’d love to see in your comments.

C: *Brad Nichol*: Sounds like a great project.

C: *Nathan Pachal*: I guess I liked seeing that there’s a balance that’s going on. There are some projects that seemed to happen overnight in the province, where someone wakes up and “Oh, we’re getting a tunnel and a Port Mann bridge,” and that didn’t come from any document I saw. I’ve seen some of the decisions and how they’re made, and a 15-page document decides it. The Evergreen Line was decided on a 15-page document and it’s a $2 million dollar project, and this is a $2 billion project and you’re spending a decade on it, so that’s really good.
Rhona Hunter: Yeah, and you know, to that point, Nathan, we are really at the early stages and although we hope to be in a regulatory process sometime next year, that’s not definitive either. So, we have an opportunity to provide input and feedback into the process and then again, once we’re in that regulatory process there’s a lot of opportunity for public input in the process then too. So, and as I say, we’re running a separate process in addition, so we really do feel strongly that continual consultation, engagement, information is going to ensure that we have a better project.

We have, as I said, a feedback form here, which covers the questions that were raised in the discussion guide. There is the type of berth structure; the second one is the location of the intermodal yard; the third one is agriculture; fourth one are some questions around the environment and categories for environmental studies; and the fifth one is around those links and benefits.

So, if -- and then we have the last page here, and it’s all online too, so it’s available there, are additional comments. And so anything that doesn’t fit into any of those categories that you’ve heard about or that you would like to provide specific, more information about, or you looking to get some more specific information from us, feel free to add that there.

I do want to let you know that we do take this information seriously, and that we are committed to providing a mechanism for participants to see what comes out of this process and then to see also how we consider it. And so what will come out of this process will be a consideration document, where data has been assimilated by Kirk & Co., and that we would then identify how we’ve taken that information and considered it in our project.

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

The meeting ended at 7:35pm.
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The record notes that the meeting commenced at 1:30pm
KEY THEMES:

- Participants expressed concern about current air quality and the associated impacts from port operations.
- Some participants felt that too many empty trucks come and go from the existing terminal at Roberts Bank.
- Participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver review options for more efficiently moving container trucks to reduce unnecessary truck trips throughout Metro Vancouver.
- Participants expressed the opinion that the Fraser Delta and Fraser River Estuary are the most important bird areas in North America, particularly for shorebirds and waterfowl.
- Participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver consider a significant contribution to the trail system on the foreshore to connect Tsawwassen First Nation land with the rest of Delta and to promote active living.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

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

C: John McDonald: I’ve been to several open house meetings and brought up the point of the empty trucks on Highway 17. Just the other day I was sitting at Highway 10 and Highway 17. Four empties were going to the port. Five empties were coming from the port. Ladies and gentlemen, this makes no sense whatsoever. If a truck goes into that port dumping a box, he should be taking a box out, and I don’t give a damn where. If he’s going to Surrey or Vancouver or Sexsmith, Alberta, that guy gets that box and he’s gone. If the trucking companies do not want to go along with it, they don’t come in.

Just the same as those that are driving rigs that are falling apart aren’t being allowed in. We brought that up two years ago, and I think you’ve done something about that. But these empties, I remember the days of when we paid our toll to get through the tunnel. I remember the tolls on the Lions Gate Bridge, too. We paid for these units. This was our transportation to open the Delta. Now we find it’s full of bloody trucks. It’s not made for all these trucks. So something has to be done. You mentioned that we’re in hearings and you wanted to hear from people. The people I’ve been talking to, this was a fait accompli. It’s done, and they’re not interested in coming out to these meetings. I felt like I was talking to deaf ears about these trucks going empty back and forth, and I’ve mentioned that several times and still nothing seems to have been done.

Number 2. I have been fishing between the ports for crab for multi years. I travel through Canoe Pass. A lot of people don’t. Fortunately enough, I know my way out there. I have a small recreational boat. This is recreational fishing, not commercial. I know the river very, very well and I know its tides and the way the currents run. I remember when there was no big bar below
Westham Island Bridge. And you think that river can’t move material. It sure can. I’ve been under the wrong impression since discussions first started a few years ago regarding the positioning of the port. When I travel out to where I want to crab, I come from Canoe Pass up here, this direction off the corner of the coal port around and over between and set my pots. I know what the currents are like through this corner presently. I’ve been under the impression that this new addition to the port was over here.

And this over here makes sense with the way the river runs. This proposal here creates a dam. The water pressure on this corner of the port is going to be phenomenal, and right now, when we get the current rain on a freshet right in here, and at the outside of the coal boat, it can be some pretty rough waters simply by the depth of the coal boat and the motion created underneath and coming up the outside, but the pressure here is phenomenal. You put a dam here, you’re asking for trouble. There’s no way that that river is not going to undermine this corner of the port no matter what your engineers want to put in there. It will not hold. Water will overcome anything that man can put in.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

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

Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?

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

Q: Mary Taitt: What are these forecasts based on? Because I was looking on the internet today at some very interesting data about what’s going to happen.

“West coast ports will see increased competition from the Panama Canal, which is undergoing a bigger than expected expansion due to be completed in 2014.” That expansion will not only allow bigger ships to go through the canal but it’s really going to make a huge impact on west coast ports in general. Even if global trade returns to its former robust pace.

And this is a company in Britain. Drury said,

“Any new train will probably pass the west coast line. Volumes are unlikely to decline, but the days of strong growth on the Pacific coast are behind us.”

And I was thinking no mention of 2014, the impact here of the Panama Canal. I mean where do these numbers come from?

A: Rhona Hunter: Well, we’ve actually had over the last two years, two independent forecasts done by two separate and independent corporations.

C: Mary Taitt: And how about their names please?

A: Rhona Hunter: Ocean Shipping and Seaport Consultants. And they took into consideration the Panama Canal, much like I’m sure the forecast in the study that you’re talking about there probably was done by a shipping consultantancy.

Q: Mary Taitt: London-based Drury Supply Chain Consultants.
A:  *Rhona Hunter:* So, the interesting thing was although these were commissioned at different times by two separate consultants, the output that they had was consistent. And so we are confident that our current forecasts are accurate as of today, the information regarding the Panama Canal has been incorporated in that, and that we certainly plan on updating them on a yearly basis and that economic situations globally will be incorporated into those forecasts.

Q:  *Judy Kirk:* So what you’re saying is the Panama opening would not change what you’re looking at here.

A:  *Rhona Hunter.* No. The Panama opening has been considered and is part of that analysis.

Q:  *Susan Jones:* Part of the environmental assessment process requires project justification, and when the Deltaport Third Berth was built there was a justification section in the application for the environmental assessment approval. The lowest case scenario projection forecast is still not being met. So basically those figures were wrong. So this could happen again and we could be building a great big massive structure out there for zero need. Even if you look at your graph, it’s really not needed.

So in order to give some comfort to the public, I would like to be able to look at these reports from Ocean Shipping and Seaport Consultants, so can these be put up on the Port Metro Vancouver website for the public to look at to have our independent people look at where are people getting these figures.

A:  *Matt Skinner:* Susan, the executive summary of the first forecast that was done in 2011 by Seaport Consultants is on the website.

C:  *Susan Jones:* I don’t want executive summary, I want to see the map.

C:  *Matt Pitcairn:* It does include the numbers.

C:  *Susan Jones:* Because the numbers are wrong.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* So, Susan, I just want to get at the point about whether it’s available online, but what I hear is some disagreement whether it is. So we’re going to take that back.

C:  *Susan Jones:* It’s all about credibility here.

**Containerized Trade on The Canadian West Coast**

*Rhona Hunter* provided information regarding existing containerized trade on the West Coast of Canada (page 5 of the Discussion Guide).

Q:  *Susan Jones:* When you say Surrey Docks, are they doing any container shipping or a little bit?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Currently they’re doing some container shipping.

Q:  *Susan Jones:* So, but ships went up there before, but you’re saying now they can’t go up because they’re bigger ships?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Ships are getting bigger, yes.

Q:  *Susan Jones:* But they’re not using bigger ships. They’re still using the smaller ships. So there’s no real reason why we can’t be using Surrey Dock for smaller ships.
A: **Rhona Hunter**: Fraser Surrey Docks will operate as long as they are in the market for them and the smaller ships. However, the anticipation is that as those smaller ships become less efficient, both in terms of economic and environmental efficiency, they will be phased out.

Q: **Susan Jones**: That’s what we’ve been told, but actually what happened was the contractors moved I think from Surrey Docks to Deltaport or somewhere else, that the capability is still there but not necessarily being utilized. Because they’ve still got lots of smaller ships coming in.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: That would be that something that would be captured in the annual forecasts.

C: **Susan Jones**: It’s just that the business that was going on is no longer going on and it could be going on, so let’s not be fuzzy in the information here is all I’m saying. There’s potential there for making use of smaller ships to go through and it’s not happening.

A: **Mary Taitt**: Yes, they are getting larger, but unfortunately they’re not coming to Deltaport because there isn’t enough business. For example, Evergreen is sending dirty little ships. They don’t have all the environmental wonderful new controls on board. They’re coming into Deltaport, right now. So it isn’t actually happening. It’s a nice dream. It’s like these numbers.

**Opportunities for Creating Container Capacity**

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

C: **Judy Kirk**: To John’s point about empties, is the Port doing anything about that?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: There is actually a fairly significant effort within the Port to look at the issue of all trucking including the empties issue. It’s a little bit of a challenge from the Port perspective because we can incentivize and we can disincentivize in terms of the efficiencies once you come in and once you come out. But I think that one of my colleagues explained it quite nicely the other day when he said that it’s much like single occupancy vehicles. We can do all sorts of things to try and reduce the amount of single occupancy vehicles on the road, but the Port isn’t in a position where they can actually regulate single vehicle occupancy.

Q: **Sylvia Bishop**: So my question is around truck emissions. Is Port Metro relying on air quality monitoring that I believe Metro Vancouver is responsible for, or is there a commitment to actually do some of its own monitoring? I’m here to tell you that the residents in Delta are really concerned about the air quality from all of the activity around the port. They repeatedly were told that the black dust, dirt that we can wipe off our patio tables and see the residue on our fingers is not coal dust. If it isn’t, we’d like to know what it is and we’d like somebody to take the responsibility of figuring out what our air quality is. And I will give credit to MLA Vicki Huntington who raised that question in the local paper recently, but as you know, Robin Silvester came before council a week and a half ago and I raised that question at that time. He said “We’ll look into it.” If this is all going to happen, we need something better to monitor our air quality. We live here.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: I don’t have anything more other than they are part of our baseline studies. Air quality is part of our baseline studies.

Q: **Judy Kirk**: But I think the question Sylvia asked is more than that. Is the Port thinking of having its own air monitoring station?
C: **Sylvia Bishop:** Yeah, the suggestion was there could be roadside emission monitor gizmo gadgets.

C: **Judy Kirk:** And then what about the analysis of this dust that you were talking about?

A: **Malcolm Smith:** Well, I mean, the Port installed and paid for the air quality monitoring station in Tsawwassen, so they have that.

None of the stations, either Metro Vancouver or the one that the Port is supporting right now have the capacity though to figure out whether a residue is coal or from a diesel truck or what have you, and I think we’ve heard that before. So in terms of addressing this, I think it’s something we would look at and as we do our baseline studies and try to figure out what the impacts of the project are. And keep in mind, you know, monitoring programs are often put in place around environmental assessments, so perhaps a longer-term monitoring looks at trying to figure out what the makeup of the material is. But right now nobody’s station actually can sort that out.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Before I come back to you I need to put a finer point on it, which is could the Port do an analysis of some of the residue that Sylvia is talking about? I mean obviously they couldn’t go to her house, but are there some samplings that the Port could do to figure out what that is, or that you have done?

A: **Malcolm Smith:** It is technically feasible. The port hasn’t done it in the past.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Okay, but we’ll take that as a consideration.

Q: **Bernadette Kudzin:** I would just like to clarify what we’re talking about as a baseline study? And the impact of the expansion? I think what people here are saying is that’s fine to do a baseline and then say, “Okay, it won’t get any worse.” We’re saying it’s bad right now. So taking a baseline and saying it won’t get worse isn’t really helping us. We have the issue now and we all know it’s because of Port activity. I mean you may want to dismiss that, but that’s what we believe.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I think I’d just like to address baseline because I think that there’s a misunderstanding about what we’re doing right now. A baseline simply says “what is the condition now?” So there is no exercise going on at the moment to determine what the impact will be. It’s simply establishing what they find.

Q: **Mary Taitt:** Back in the seventies there used to be an air quality monitor on the ferry terminal entrance. When they redid the entrance, it was taken away and the Port refused to put another one out. Nobody put one up. So there was no monitoring at a time which would have been invaluable background data, before DP3 even. I thought in DP3 the Port had to put one of these in. I thought it was part of the whole process.

Q: **Mary Taitt:** Where is that data? Is it available?

C: **Judy Kirk:** I think what I heard Malcolm say earlier is that there is one air quality monitoring station that the Port put up, but not the one that you’re talking about.

C: **Malcolm Smith:** That’s right.

Q: **Mary Taitt:** Is the data even from this one available to the public?
A:  *Malcolm Smith*: Yeah, it’s Metro Vancouver data that I believe, my understanding is the Port has funded it getting set up, but Metro Vancouver runs the system. So yes, the information is available.

C:  *Mary Taitt*: You see, the reason I ask is Mayor Beth Johnson way back when was told by the Truckers’ Association that the transfer of trucks from going to Vancouver Island via Lions Bay would produce so much more pollutants here in Delta, and then listed the tonnage of material that would come from the trucks, simply diverting those trucks that travel on the ferries. Well, they do now, and Delta got dumped with it. So the amount of pollution, air pollution in Delta now I would say is absolutely serious. And as you probably know, PM2.5s particularly are inhaled by people and there is no safe level. Ports all over North America suffer with this. There are all kinds of ailments associated with it. So it’s an extremely serious issue.

C:  *Judy Kirk*: So, Mary, I’m also going to ask Matt to follow-up here, and check whether Metro Vancouver makes its air quality data available on line.

Q:  *Susan Jones*: The baseline. You say we’re establishing the baseline for conditions now. I would say that’s highly unsatisfactory. We want the baseline to go back further to things that historically are there. It wouldn’t give the public much comfort to start a baseline as of today. I make that clarification.

A:  *Malcolm Smith*: Yeah, I mean, Susan, you and Mary both know that air quality in Delta has been studied a lot for the past ten years.

Q:  *Susan Jones*: But it hasn’t, you know.

Q:  *Mary Taitt*: It hasn’t.

A:  *Malcolm Smith*: So, you know, the baseline is not just what we will study today going forward. The baseline will look at air quality conditions in the past. As we’ve discussed, Metro Vancouver is the kind of keeper of a lot of that information. So the baseline is what we collect plus what’s on the record.

I think what I’m hearing is that people are concerned that the existing network of air quality monitoring data, which is partly what we collect but partly what Metro Vancouver has, is not telling the full story of what’s going on in Delta. So, you know, as we set up a baseline program trying to assess the air quality that, as well as potential impacts from the project, that will be one of the things that we have to look at and make sure that the data that is being collected is telling a representative story.

**Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project**

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

Q:  *Mary Taitt*: I thought it was an automatic terminal.

A:  *Rhona Hunter*: The concept as it is currently designed includes automation, but it is not 100 percent automated. That’s something that would have to be determined in conjunction with an eventual operator, whether that’s the choice that’s made. So its size and its sort of operational considerations at this level of conceptual design is what we call semi-automated.

Q:  *Fred McCaig*: Just one question on employment, you’ve got the overall of them, but how much additional terminal employment would be anticipated?
C:  *Rhona Hunter*: I don’t have that number off the top of my head. We can certainly get it if we have a breakdown between terminal and non-terminal.

Q:  *Susan Jones*: At the last meeting we were told right now currently out in Deltaport there’s about 800 to 900 jobs at the terminal, and that would be expected to increase, maybe double or maybe partially double or half because of the automation, we don’t know, they didn’t know. However my question is: 800 or 900 jobs that don’t record right now how many of those are full time, how many are part time?

A:  *Rhona Hunter*: I’m sorry I don’t have that level of detailed information.

Q:  *Susan Jones*: Well, you know what? This information about jobs here, it’s way too broad. I mean it goes right across Canada, those figures. They’re meaningless to people who live here in Delta. So could we have some more specifics?

C:  *Judy Kirk*: Sure, I’ll take that back.

Q:  *Susan Jones*: I think we were talking about a few hundred jobs.

C:  *Judy Kirk*: Well, but just to stay on your point, Susan, I think you’re raising a point that would be of broader interest to people.

Q:  *Susan Jones*: And the nature of the job because they include truck drivers, warehouses, tugboats, even the casino, I mean.

**Marine Terminal**

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

Q:  *John McDonald*: The fill for the centre of the unit, where is going to come from?

A:  *Rhona Hunter*: It will predominantly come from the dredging of the Fraser River as part of the maintenance dredging program. It will be barged from wherever the dredging is taking place on the Lower Fraser River.

**Berth Structure**

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

Q:  *Mary Taitt*: How close is this location to the drop-off into the Georgia Strait?

A:  *Rhona Hunter*: There will be some dredging that’ll be required in the berth, in the berthing base in order to accommodate the ships, but it’s not -- I think it’s around 8 metres that would be required to be dredged right at the berth front. But it drops off fairly quickly after that initial sort of dredging right at the berth face.

Q:  *Mary Taitt*: Because the thing is you totally change the ecology on Roberts Bank. I mean Roberts Bank is no longer an accreting foreshore. It’s eroding thanks to the causeway itself. And so I just am very concerned that you’re going to be producing even more erosion by this process. If this is a huge hole, this is a ship turning basin, and what’s happening is that everything’s falling into the hole with the tide. And what you’re doing is coastal squeezing. We’re losing the foreshore progressively between the two causeways because of the ship turning basins.
C: Judy Kirk: You will see that there isn’t a question in the feedback form about the orientation or position of the terminal. So what I would suggest and to accommodate your comment, is that you put it under Additional Comments on page 31.

Q: George Folz: Lifespan of the two construction methods?

A: Rhona Hunter: The lifespan is comparable, but I believe that there is more maintenance required on the piles.

Q: George Folz: So corrosion protection and things like that on the piles to get the sort of same life spans as a concrete caisson?

A: Rhona Hunter: I would have to say that I’m not an expert on piles so I can’t speak to the corrosion coating on the piles. But I do know that they are comparable in terms of longevity. It was really the maintenance that was a factor, not necessarily the ability. And that maintenance may include having to go back and re-drive piles over a period of time.

Q: George Folz: And the existing Deltaport is caisson.

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes, it is.

Q: Susan Jones: This question about dredging, you say there will be some dredging for this particular structure. Is there ongoing dredging right now at Deltaport on an annual or biennial basis? Does it need continual dredging?

A: Judy Kirk: Susan, since none of the staff are aware of the answer, this is noted for a follow-up.

Q: Garry Horwood: There’s been a number of inquiries as to what is being done like air quality being done, and there seems to be a preponderance -- I’m not trying to be critical, I’m trying to be very careful with my words, but it’s almost cultural, not within the culture of your company but culturally for all of us, that there’s a soft way of saying, “That’s not our responsibility.” And I would just suggest that possibly the Port should be listening to the concerns, and I’m not trying to be sarcastic here, but there are concerns here in this neck of the woods, and it behooves me that the Port should be listening, acutely listening to these little things.

Like this gentleman here, John, asked about where the dredging is. Well, dredging has been a huge issue here. So if you could be acting on our behalf to say, “You know, it isn’t our responsibility what they do on the river but we could make it, you know, like not our responsibility but we could take the responsibility of making that an issue for you,” because we can’t or we have very little influence as individuals in that area. But the Port has huge influence.

A: Judy Kirk: You know, Garry, I can’t speak for the Port, but I will tell you that I have spoken with Duncan Wilson who’s the Vice President of Corporate Social Responsibility for the Port about dredging, and you know what? I’m going to make a note here to talk to him again because my understanding is that indeed the port is doing just that.

Q: Garry Horwood: I would think, with all due respect, that the port would want to know like -- we don’t give a hoot what you guys think you’re doing or what you might be doing. We want to know. And we’d like to be the first out of the chute to say this is what it is or isn’t and then what we’re going to do about it, because you don’t want that hanging around your neck.

A: Judy Kirk: You know, Garry, I can’t speak for the Port, but I will tell you that I have spoken with Duncan Wilson who’s the Vice President of Corporate Social Responsibility for the Port about dredging, and you know what? I’m going to make a note here to talk to him again because my understanding is that indeed the port is doing just that.

Q: Garry Horwood: I would think, with all due respect, that the port would want to know like -- we don’t give a hoot what you guys think you’re doing or what you might be doing. We want to know. And we’d like to be the first out of the chute to say this is what it is or isn’t and then what we’re going to do about it, because you don’t want that hanging around your neck.

C: Judy Kirk: Okay, so something thing like Metro Vancouver saying, “Look, citizens of Delta still have very serious concerns about air quality. What are we together going to do about this?”

---
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Q:  *Garry Horwood:* I like the word “together”, and I appreciate that, I really do. I just think strongly that people in positions of power and leadership have those abilities to do those things.

**Marine Terminal**

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

Q:  *Mary Taitt:* If I may, these projects on page 14, how much agricultural land in the ALR is required for these plans?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* The concept that we have here and that we’re consulting on has approximately 10 hectares, all within the existing Option Lands.

Q:  *Mary Taitt:* Which is ALR land?

A:  *Rhona:* Yes, it’s Option Lands in the ALR that’s already been designated for rail use.

Q:  *Susan Jones:* I have three questions. One is the size of the intermodal yard, ballpark figure?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Well, we only have the size of the intermodal yard as it’s on the marine terminal, and it currently is --I think it’s approximately 90 hectares.

Q:  *Susan Jones:* And the other options would be similar?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* It would depend on optimization. My understanding from the rail experts is that you can be more efficient if you’ve got fewer constraints, which you do on the terminal, and so it’s not a straight trade-off in terms of land, but close enough.

Q:  *Susan Jones:* Okay, the other question is page 14, these Fisher Yard rail improvements and the Gulf Yard rail improvements; can you tell us specifically what they are? I think they’re a widening of the rail tracks?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* If you let me turn the page, on page 17 there’s more specifics around those. So, that would be a good opportunity to segue onto the next page. But briefly I’ll just speak about some of the causeway widening, which also will have some improvements. On the causeway under the current design, we’ve got an additional two lead tracks, as well as a new overpass. There’s an additional seventh support and switching rail track, as well as an additional access road to Terminal 2. There will be some vehicle access gate controls and an emergency road is being contemplated as well. There is a new repair yard, and there’s a realignment of some of the coal tracks that are there, which would be done on the causeway. On Deltaport Way, there will be widening to four lanes.

Q:  *Susan Jones:* So cars on the causeway. Is that in addition to the rail/road improvement project?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Yes. So if you go to again page 11, which has the picture, you can see just as you’re coming off the causeway around the corner towards the new terminal, there’s an overpass on the rendering. So if you look on the causeway, closer towards the mainland, you’ll see there’s another overpass. That’s the DTRRIP’s overpass. So there are three overpasses in total.

Q:  *Mary Taitt:* Right. You’re trying to claim DTRRIP wasn’t setting you up for Terminal 2. You know, it should have been part of this whole environmental assessment.
C:  

**Judy Kirk:** You asked about Fisher and Gulf Yards.

Q:  

**Susan Jones:** Yes, what is the end result of the width and the number of tracks at Fisher and Gulf?

A:  

**Rhona Hunter:** So in Fisher yard there’s going to be one new rail siding. Through the DTRRIP program it will be adding a second one, and one more for Terminal 2 for a total of three.

And the Gulf yard, there currently are three. There will be an addition of four from DTRRIP and an addition of six from Terminal 2, for a total of 13. There will also be a turning wye as well. Now, that all takes place within the existing option lands.

Q:  

**Bernadette Kudzin:** I think that just as a point of clarification. We’re talking about the consultation with regard to the location of the intermodal yard. So this isn’t the intermodal yard you’re talking about?

A:  

**Rhona Hunter:** No.

Q:  

**Bernadette Kudzin:** So if the intermodal yard was put on the uplands, that would be on top of the 13 tracks?

A:  

**Rhona Hunter:** Yes, it would be.

C:  

**Bernadette Kudzin:** Right, which we’re all really keen about in this area of the woods on the ALR land. I find the question kind of -- I won’t use the word “disingenuous”, but I find it kind of disturbing because I think that the Port’s already decided it’s going with Alternative 1A and they’re just saying look, we could do so much worse. This is just my opinion, okay?

It could have been so much worse, look what we’re not doing to you, and then we turn the page and we see that, but what we are doing to you, you still have thirteen, you know, tracks on existing, as you say, Option Lands. And that’s the section that BC Rail already has its option on it.

A:  

**Rhona Hunter:** Yeah.

Q:  

**Garry Horwood:** Thank you. So did I hear you correctly on this, that it’s more efficient to have the rail intermodal yard on the uplands?

A:  

**Rhona Hunter:** You can be more efficient if you’re in the uplands because you’re not constrained by the geometry of the terminal.

Q:  

**Garry Horwood:** Okay. With the work being done on the uplands property, does the total efficiency of moving a can from the ship to the rail, has that been taken into consideration?

A:  

**Rhona Hunter:** It would require more trucking. What I meant by efficient is that it uses less total land.

Q:  

**Fred McCaig:** Where precisely is the Fisher yard?

A:  

**Rhona Hunter:** The Fisher yard is over by 72nd Street, just west of Boundary Airport.

Q:  

**Sylvia Bishop:** The bottom of page 16 talks about hydro transmission line on the causeway, and so my question would be the statement about anticipated increased need, and I realized you’re in consultation with BC Hydro to determine the extent of the upgrades, but are we talking about putting those transmission lines underground?

A:  

**Rhona Hunter:** No.
Q: Sylvia Bishop: We’re not talking about it or not going to do it?
A: Rhona Hunter: We’re not talking about it. This does not contemplate putting those power lines underground. It would just be an extension of it to Terminal 2.

Q: George Horwood: In deciding this intermodal layout, what’s the operation of the intermodal yard? Is it not getting things off of the ship and onto either rail cars and vice versa? So when it happens upland, what’s the transport to and from the dock?
A: Rhona Hunter: No, it would be by shuttle. It would be by truck to take it from the storage yard to an intermodal yard that would be somewhere other than on the terminal, and then there would be transfer onto the rail from those trucks.

Q: George Folz: So the farther you get away from the shore the more truck traffic you have to do the shuttling back and forth?
A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.

Q: Mary Taitt: Yes, one quickie about the Fisher yard. Why does it need to be there at all?
A: Rhona Hunter: It’s an existing yard. I don’t have the exact answer as to why there was an increase in the design there.

Q: Mary Taitt: Because a very expensive bridge was built over the railway line to Boundary Bay Airport, at great cost to Delta, $3 million, plus the farm land and the federal government and some, I guess the Province. Very expensive, and it’s always been a little bit strange why this incredible great bridge to the Boundary Bay Airport.
A: Craig Jones: That’s for fire and safety, pure and simple. You cannot have an airport without having direct access.

C: Sylvia Bishop: If I were a cynic connecting the dots, I should say that the Fisher yard, plus the Boundary Bay Airport and further east where a huge million square foot warehouse distribution centre is going to be built have a relationship. But only if I were a cynic. It’s not a question, and it’s no reflection on you Rhona. It’s just an observation.

Road and Rail Traffic Considerations

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding Port Metro Vancouver’s initiatives to address increased road and rail traffic at Roberts Bank (page 18 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Mary Taitt: In Germany, no trucks travel on the weekends, so the public can move freely. I was wondering if there’s any way the Port can time it so that they’re not sending trucks at the time of peak rush hour. Is there any way for the Port to influence when those trucks operate?
A: Rhona Hunter: I think a number of these programs that are listed here, Mary, are working towards addressing the scheduling and timing. For instance, there’s truck notification and tracking.

A: Malcolm Smith: I think that’s the kind of studies you would do that would eventually allow the Port to find ways to incentivize people to use roads at less busy times.

C: Mary Taitt: Because you’re talking about basically doubling what we have today, which is gridlock.
Sylvia Bishop: About the South Fraser Perimeter Road, it’s already been stated for several years now that not all truck traffic will be on the South Fraser Perimeter Road. That truck traffic still does want to travel to south Vancouver area and we will still have trucks lining up at the Massey Tunnel, which goes to Mary’s point of gridlock. So I appreciate Rhona’s suggestion that, you know, the South Fraser Perimeter Road is there to alleviate, and it may, but it’s not the magic wand we think it’s going to be.

Susan Jones: Yeah, on this page 18 and the discussion of trucks, there was earlier discussions about truck shuttles, regarding intermodal and the need for an intermodal and earlier discussion about sustainable programs, empty trucks. I don’t see anything here about the option of sustainable program by having an intermodal inland and a partnership inland by Ashcroft. You’ve probably heard of that option.

They have produced a slide that shows a truck goes to the Port, one trip picks up the container. Second trip delivers the container somewhere in the Lower Mainland. Third trip it goes home, and then it goes another day and picks up an empty container and it takes it to a site and picks up something and then it takes it out to the terminal. Anywhere from five to seven truck trips per container, whatever. It’s like a spider web, and they actually have a diagram showing all these trucks going everywhere in the Lower Mainland.

Whereas a good percentage of goods are moved outside the Lower Mainland anyway. There’s an option of bringing in containers, shipping them up to Ashcroft with two rail lines. They’ve got land there for an intermodal. You can unload a container, put it on a train, whether it comes back here or goes back east, goes wherever, and this gets rid of a lot of that truck traffic. It’s a very sustainable option that we should be looking at, in which case we wouldn’t even need an intermodal yard. It would get rid of a lot of those empty trucks that Rhona was talking about earlier. There are options here that could be looked at and would be very efficient.

And it would also take business where there is land available much cheaper and where people are setting up business already doing this. So I would like to see that considered.

Rhona Hunter: I just wanted to clarify one thing, Susan. Even with that consideration you would still need an intermodal yard. You still need to get the containers from the storage yard onto a rail car.

Susan Jones: But they can go directly from ship onto a train, can they not?

Rhona Hunter: No they can’t. So you’d still need that intermodal yard.

Compensation for Agricultural Productivity

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding Port Metro Vancouver’s potential mitigation and compensation options for the loss of agricultural productivity (page 19 of the Discussion Guide).

Sylvia Bishop: Does that require all that BC Rail land along there? BC Rail has bought up a lot of land.

Rhona Hunter: DTRRIP requires some and T2 will require the remaining.

Sylvia Bishop: That’s a lot of land.

Mary Taitt: I’m surprised there isn’t a point in here or, you know, additional place to put any compensation. The Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust has been operating in Delta for the last 20 years or it’s just coming up to its twentieth year, and that has become a vehicle for some
compensation in the sense that everything you do here, not only reducing farming in Delta, it reduces habitat and it makes it much tougher for the remaining farmers because those geese, whoever, the birds have to go onto the other land. So it makes it even tougher for those farmers to exist farming.

What the trust does, through a stewardship program, is attempt to pay farmers so that they can provide some habitat, you know, thereby reducing some of that pressure on other agricultural land. Go to the website, beautiful website, Delta Farmland, www.deltafarmland.com.

**Environmental Assessment Process**

Rhona Hunter and Malcom Smith provided an overview of the environmental assessment process for the project, including identification of anticipated consultation opportunities and categories for environmental study (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Mary Taitt:** The independent panel, is this going to be an independent panel, not something appointed by the Port?

A: **Judy Kirk:** Correct.

Q: **Mary Taitt:** And what guarantee do we have that the recommendations of that panel will be followed? And I’d like to read you the recommendation from the previous panel, a panel on Roberts Bank, 1979.

"An expert panel concluded the potential impacts on the Fraser River estuary are too great to recommend that Port expansion be approved as proposed. The extent of ecological significance to the Fraser River estuary, particularly as used by fish and wildlife, make it unique in North America."

With the completion of DP3 the Port got all that it had applied for in ’79. So the independent panel couldn’t do it, so what comforts do we have? And I would like to read the statement as you said I could later, Judy.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Sure.

C: **Mary Taitt:** Environmental values of Roberts Bank, 2012: Just a month ago, there was an announcement of the designation for the Fraser River estuary as a wetlands have international significance. There’s 20,682 hectares in the Fraser River delta estuary gives full international recognition for this priceless world class ecosystem.

In 2004 its value to shore birds was amplified in a hemispheric designation by the Western Hemisphere Shore Bird Research Group. In 2001, Bird Life International declared the Fraser River estuary, Boundary Bay, Roberts Bank, Sturgeon Bank an important bird area. The Fraser River estuary is a number one important bird area in Canada out of 597 sites. It’s a major Pacific flyway stopover and wintering area for millions of shore birds and thousands of water fowl.

In 2000 a wildlife management area plan was drawn up for Roberts Bank, and it was to join the others that have already been declared in the Fraser River estuary, 1991 Southland marshes, 1995 Boundary Bay, 1998 Sturgeon Bay and then finally, it took a decade before it was declared in 2011.

However, the WLA declaration for Roberts Bank was delayed 10 years by the Port, who managed to get a large area excluded for their port development, in the middle of a protected
tidal marine habitat, which ecologically is total nonsense, of course, to have a hole in the middle with port activities.

The WMA status was finally given last year. So that’s scandalous that was allowed to take place, over the years.

The Port was more successful with the designation this year. They managed to get Roberts Bank, the front and centre of this wetland of international significance, excluded. Outrageous is the word to describe it, especially given this process the Port is going through right now, the land-use work shop, which I attended in this building yesterday, where they had the nerve to suggest as a goal the port is a global leader among ports in environmental stewardship of lands and waters it manages. How disingenuous to bring this project forward now on Roberts Bank.

Twice what the panel said they could have before, and now quadrupled. Shocking.

Community Legacy Benefits

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

C: Judy Kirk: So Leon, not to pick on you, of course, but earlier in the week there was a representative who came, who was very interested in asking the Port whether they would consider a contribution to the Great Blue Heron Trail. So I just thought I’d let you know that, so that if that’s something you think is of interest or others think of interest – as an example, there may be other things, such as a pedestrian overpass or something else.

Q: Leon LeBrun: Well, as a legacy and also as for community wellbeing, we’re really promoting active living and that kind of thing, and trying to get away from cars and traffic and all the rest of it. There’s a tremendous opportunity, of course, along the foreshore there to connect the Tsawwassen lands with the rest of the Roberts Bank dykes and so on. Right now it’s kind of interrupted by a railway that’s there and we need to get past that in order to make that a continuous path, which would be well used by the community, no doubt about that, and it connects us with Tsawwassen and so on.

So, we would dearly love to find a solution to getting past the railway, and the only way we can see right now is that it would be some sort of overpass and somehow along with that there would be some education about the port, what’s going on in the port, that that would, of course, be in addition. Because we feel that people who are slower moving are more apt to take in what’s around them, and this is definitely an opportunity. And we know that the Tsawwassen First Nations are onboard with this, and love to see a path.

Q: Mary Taitt: I wondered if the terms of reference for these studies is available to the public?

A: Malcolm Smith: Currently they’re not. Mary, what we’ve been anticipating to date is certainly the EIS guidelines, when they’re drafted they would include all the information including the scope of our studies and also some information on kind of the methodologies. I haven’t had a chance to attend some of the earlier stakeholder meetings, but my understanding is that the question has come up about seeing the kind of methodologies sooner, and so that’s something we’re going to take back and consider within the Port.

Q: Susan Jones: Just as a footnote to that, it’s not the methodologies and all that general stuff we get in the EIS, it’s the specific terms of reference for any scientists.
Q:  *Bernadette Kudzin:* Just one quick question. Where will we access all the answers to the questions and the questions that have been made in the last three weeks?

C:  *Judy Kirk:* What we’ll do is send them to the participants that were here, because they’re the ones that understand the context.

Q:  *John McDonald:* Malcolm, you mentioned baselines as of today. The baseline should be as of when the port first started, and then into say, well this is what we’ve got today compared to what we know of before the port was even built.

C:  *Judy Kirk:* We’ve heard that comment quite a bit, and I would encourage you to put it down.

Q:  *Judy Kirk:* Now, can I ask this question on your behalf. Is that looked at under cumulative effects?

A:  *Malcolm Smith:* It is not, not in terms of going of going backwards. Typically with environmental assessments and cumulative effects assessments, the starting place is the existing conditions.

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

The meeting ended at 3:35pm.
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KEY THEMES:

- Some participants were interested in Port Metro Vancouver’s container forecast and asked questions about the assumptions that determined these projections.

- Participants were interested in the environmental assessment process for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, which included questions about any geographic locations outside of Roberts Bank that might be included as part of the assessment.

- Some participants were interested in increased road and rail traffic that could result from the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, asking questions about mitigation, emissions and truck routes. Participants urged the use of rail to transport containers instead of using trucks.

- Some participants were interested in the field studies Port Metro Vancouver has been undertaking.

- Participants asked about the project construction and design, including questions about construction material sources, layout and configuration.

- Some participants were concerned about the loss of agricultural land and Port Metro Vancouver’s plan for mitigation.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

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

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

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

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

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

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

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.
Q: *Liz Walker:* I’m wondering what parameters you base low cases and high case on?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I don’t have all of the details around exactly which assumptions go in there – but it’s factors like economic growth, what kinds of ships are going to be available, projected import/exports.

Q: *Liz Walker:* It would be interesting to be able to have a look at that. You know, especially the way things are going these days, the validity of those kinds of material.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We do have a document library on our Port website now. The first page you’ll come up to is past improvement plans, Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. There’ll be current documents and historical documents will be another icon. This forecast was done last year and we updated it again this year. We did take into consideration 2008, where we had some substantial drops in the economy, and both of those forecasts still showed the same information.

Q: *Judy Williams:* Rhona, what I’m concerned about there is it sounds like what you’re doing is you’re using these former studies to get your forecasts. And my concern mirrors Liz’s, because I am very concerned about what you’re using as your underlying assumptions to make your forecasts. And so much of what Port Metro Vancouver, and for that matter Prince Rupert can handle, doesn’t stay. There’s a certain percentage that does not stay on the west coast. It’s headed for other areas. And my concern is, as I mentioned in a former stakeholder workshop last spring is consumerism gone mad. Why should we be potentially threatening our environment and our own local economy by making our role as a pass-through facility, for which our environment is going south and the people on the east coast and other points across Canada and for that matter in the United States, are benefitting at the expense of our environment? Coming back to Liz’s question, the underlying assumptions, is it based on extrapolation?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* The assumptions are based upon both historic and future projections. So certainly we look at the history to validate our current assumptions, and we look to projections going forward. They are done on a yearly basis, and they will continue to be done on a yearly basis, if not more, as we develop this project. We’re in very early stages on the project. We’re in a pre-environmental stage, and we haven’t even fully defined the project to go into the environmental assessment stage. Certainly as those forecasts are done and updated we will be checking to see that our previous numbers and assumptions were correct, to inform our future projections. So we wouldn’t be looking at going ahead with the project if the projections and the forecasts are not telling us that information.

Q: *Hardy Wolfram:* Well, it’s actually a projection. Now, under the current transportation system you cannot make any projection whatsoever because you haven’t got it. We need railroad tracks to begin with. We have to twin the lines, which we have right now, and then this little highway, which is being built is absolutely nothing. I have just been around in the world, and I would say that this few streets and this one track we have going from A to B, we cannot project anything. We have to build the infrastructure first and then you can say, okay, now we deliver.

C: *Judy Kirk:* Okay, and when you said highway, did you mean South Fraser Perimeter Road or Highway 1?
Hardy Wolfram: Well, it takes some traffic away, but it doesn’t. You know, everyone is against it and of course the current attitude people have, well you get nowhere. You have to build it. Just like I said, I been around in the world and we are so far behind here in North America it is just awful.

Judy Williams: You’re referring to Roberts Bank, but I saw a study somewhere, put out by PMV, that that also includes Sturgeon Bank. When you’re looking at the Roberts Bank area are you also including Sturgeon Bank in that?

Judy Kirk: Do you mean in environmental studies, Judy?

Judy Williams: No, I mean in any way. When you’re speaking of that expansion, are you also including Sturgeon Bank?

Neil Turner: Sturgeon Bank is included in the environmental assessment because it’s regionally affected, but as far as I’m aware, in terms of development proposal, it’s nothing.

Judy Williams: Then why is it being included in the environmental assessment unless there is no future plans for it?

Neil Turner: Because of the regional impacts. Environmental study is not just concentrated on the footprint of the actual development, it goes beyond that. It depends on the scope of the study and what environmental component you’re looking at. If you’re looking at, for example, migratory birds, it’s an extensive area. So that’s probably what you’re making reference to - in the field study publications that went out. There were references to studies in Sturgeon Bank and Roberts Bank for a number of the studies. So that’s what that’s in reference to, the environmental studies are wider than the project.

Opportunities for Creating Container Capacity

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

Pat Pollock: When you said replace the grade-level crossings, what does that mean?

Rhona Hunter: There will be either an underpass or an overpass constructed, depending on the local configuration. The at-grade crossing will be replaced so that the trains won’t have to stop and traffic won’t have to stop. So the whistling will be removed, as well as the interface between cars and trains.

Judy Kirk: Patrick, page 8 shows the location of those crossings.

Rhona Hunter: The black line with the red dots. They will be online in 2014.

Pat Pollock: What’s the percentage of the containers coming in by truck and by rail?

Rhona Hunter: It’s around 70 percent by rail, 30 percent by truck.

Mirjana Petrovic: I am from Europe, so my point of view is kind of different than North Americans. We actually didn’t have big trucks coming through residential areas. We have very few routes for trucks that big and they were all licensed and with a permit to do that. I really don’t understand how we can allow every single arterial road to transport them with the dangerous goods and things like that. I live in Vancouver, and I see it everywhere. Main,
Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project

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

Q: Al Schulze: What I marvel at is, 4,500 jobs are paid by $1 billion, and then 18,000 jobs only make 620 million, which is roughly half. Yet the number of jobs is four times. Are they that much more expensive to operate -- to construct? Do they make four times as much money?

A: Rhona Hunter: The projections there would take into consideration much of what you’re saying - the type of jobs during construction as opposed to more jobs but less wage. The 1.1 billion in wages is for the six year period. So, it’s a six-year construction period, so it’s 4,500 jobs and 1.1 billion.

Q: Judy Williams: What’s the capacity of these vessels?

A: Rhona Hunter: I don’t have that off the top of my head, but we certainly can get that to you, Judy.

Q: Judy Williams: How many of these do you anticipate being for hazardous goods? Two?

A: Rhona Hunter: I do not have a breakdown of that, and I can see whether we have a breakdown. We probably don’t. We would only be able to look at our existing inventory to determine a projection of the future inventory.

A: Neil Turner: No, I don’t think we’ve got that level of detail.

C: Judy Kirk: We’ll make a note of that, Judy.

Q: Judy Williams: Okay. We’re sitting here in a stakeholder meeting. You’ve got a number that you’ve already concluded and a number more to go. We’re about mid-way through the process. If you get public feedback that this is not wanted and not needed, is there any chance that this might not go forward?

A: Rhona Hunter: We’re very early in the process, so a decision as to whether it’s a go or no-go is still up to the board of Port Metro Vancouver. But we are very early and we certainly are looking to see what the communities’ opinions are about the project.

C: Judy Kirk: But you know what, Judy, I would add, because Kirk & Co. has been asked to help with the consultation, what Rhona said is absolutely true. That said, the Port is a proponent, and once they file the Project Description, which they haven’t yet, but in a couple of pages you’ll see where the Port is in terms of the environmental assessment process. When they do file that Project Description, as you know that triggers the beginning of an environmental assessment. They are then officially a proponent and they are saying essentially to the regulators, we intend to proceed with this project if it is environmentally certified to proceed.

Q: Judy Williams: But one of the problems, particularly with the fuel tanks on the south arm and the transportation of jet fuel up the south arm of the Fraser is that the Port is like the fox in the hen house. The port is the one who is also very strongly involved in the environmental assessment.
C: **Judy Kirk:** In that case -- what Judy is referring to is a jet fuel pipeline proposed, where the Port has regulatory authority because there’s land that the port is responsible for. They have delegated federal authority to be an agency permitter. But in this the federal and provincial regulators, both CEAA and BCEAO, will be the permitting authorities, not the Port.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: **Rhona Hunter:** No.

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

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Yes.
Q: **Al Schulze**: Okay, so this in a sense will double. However, you've got some ships that will be bigger, probably they're moving more containers that can be handled right now.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: I believe that these berths were designed for the same sized ships.

Q: **Al Schulze**: You see, one of the problems that some of the people in Surrey face is the coal dust, and that will not increase because of the expansion, because I know that one of the committee members lives in Panorama Ridge which is just off the railroad track.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: That’s right, there won’t be an expansion to the coal facility.

Q: **Liz Walker**: When I looked at this picture it talks about options of the orientation. So I’m wondering, especially if we go to an open house - could you not have an overlay that shows us which way the water currents and that flow without this?

C: **Judy Williams**: That’s a very good suggestion.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: Speaking to your point, Liz, we did look at a number of trade-offs in terms of the orientation and the positioning of the terminal, and interestingly enough, often in these sort of trade-offs the environment and the engineering sort of are at oppositions. But in this case the environmental consideration and the engineering considerations clearly led us to the current design, which is to have it as far off from the foreshore as possible. And so although we did look at the W2 as its presented in the diagram on page 12, it was not as favorable, both from an engineering and an environmental perspective to the one that we have proposed to go forward with.

C: **Liz Walker**: Okay, I just think that a lot of us here are already aware of those sorts of issues, right? So much of the public just sort of assume that everything is being taken care of. They don’t know that that’s a change that could occur. So in the interests of public education, I’m always trying to push the limits of it, saying let’s provide the information - it gives us something to ask questions about too, because if they’re not aware that those changes could occur, then it’s never going to occur to them to ask those questions now or in the future.

Q: **Steve Robinson**: Just a question back on the rail traffic. Does that correspond to the doubling of road and rail traffic?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: We will be increasing both the rail and road traffic. It’ll approximately be double.

Q: **Al Schulze**: Does the existing facility as it stands now silt up and do you have to dredge it?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: There would be some maintenance of the berth structure, in terms of maintaining the berth face.

Q: **Al Schulze**: Because it will fill in and the ships can’t dock there?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: That’s right.

Q: **Al Schulze**: Well, the same thing would happen with the new terminal. Have studies been done to see whether or not the requirement will be higher?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: Yes. Consideration of the dredging requirements were certainly taken into that trade-off. In fact, there’s less dredging requirements in its current configuration because we were able to push the berth as far into the deep water as possible.
Q: **Al Schulze:** And where would the material to build the port come from?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** The material to build the port will be coming from the dredging activities within the Fraser River.

Q: **Al Schulze:** Okay. So in other words, it won’t be shipped, say, by rail from far away.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** The majority, with minor exceptions, will be coming in by barge.

C: **Mirjana Petrovic:** I just wanted to suggest something. Usually when we go to public meetings for the residents, and that’s the trickiest part of everything, we will have all the things that are bad. I would suggest that you have a list of good things that people will get from this kind of a big project, because everybody wants progress but not in their yard.

It’s extremely important to put it on the understandable level, to have somebody that can directly answer their questions, have a list of benefits, for the society or that particular area.

C: **Judy Kirk:** It’s really important that we are as clear as we can be about how early in the process we are here. None of the effects assessment studies have been done yet. The port is only at the baseline studies.

And so part of what you’re saying, explaining to people clearly, what are the potential effects, those studies haven’t yet been done. But they will be done. But with respect to the benefits, Rhona did summarize the jobs and some of those things, but again, not all the studies around socioeconomic costs and benefits have yet been done.

A: **Neil Turner:** I think the issue is the studies. These are the areas that are commonly part of an environmental assessment process. So the Port has said, “go off and look at these particular areas” and to your point, it may be positive, it may be negative in some of these areas. Once we actually conduct the baseline studies and actually have that information submitted as part of the process, it will then be talked about as part of the environmental assessment process and brought out.

And today part of that, Judy, also is that to get some feedback in terms of everyone’s impressions of the study areas that we’re currently undertaking, and also to see if there are any here that perhaps we should put more emphasis on, less emphasis on or is an area of study or area of investigation that somehow we’ve missed.

Q: **Liz Walker:** Well, if I could comment. Earlier when we were looking at that page of economic benefits and the prominent title at the top, and I said, okay, are there going to be any environmental benefits, because that’s something I question.

C: **Judy Kirk:** And it’s too soon to say because those studies haven’t yet been done.

Q: **Liz Walker:** Because we’ve heard about the federal government changes and is there a time limitation here?

A: **Neil Turner:** Well, basically, the clock doesn’t really start in terms of the federal CEAA process until we submit the Project Description, which is not going to be at the earliest until next year. The actual scope of this study or these studies will actually be dictated by the federal and provincial governments. So we’re proposing these areas, we’re undertaking the baseline, but it will be validated and confirmed by the federal and provincial governments that we study all the right study areas and to the right extent.
C:  **Judy Kirk:** And Liz, you know, often organizations do not start this early. They start in fact once they file the Project Description. And what often residents will say is, “Why didn’t you start earlier than that?”

**Marine Terminal**

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

Q:  **Judy Williams:** How toxic is the concrete that you’re going to use for the caissons?
A:  **Rhona Hunter:** Concrete isn’t typically toxic. It does, certainly, wear well. Probably better than the piles, which would have to be maintained and replaced, and that was one of the considerations for using the caissons as opposed to pile driving because of the long-term maintenance of piles.

Q:  **Judy Williams:** What are they coating it with?
A:  **Neil Turner:** I don’t think there’s any coating on the concrete itself. There’s no other additional coating that goes on other than pouring concrete in form.

Q:  **Hardy Wolfram:** In regards to concrete, we are living in the mountains. Wouldn’t it be better to take natural rock and kind of fill it in?
A:  **Neil Turner:** I don’t know if it would be cheaper, with the extraction of the rock and the transportation of the rock and you have a lot more issues with getting rock through the city.

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** There is a tremendous amount of land for the terminal that will be rock and sand based. Only the caissons will be concrete, because you need a vertical berth face. The fill will be coming from the Fraser. It will be built primarily from the Fraser River dredging programs. And there will be rocks. The whole mechanism for building land is a combination of rock and sand.

Q:  **Liz Walker:** Where is the container storage yard on this?
A:  **Rhona Hunter:** The container storage yard is on the terminal.

**Marine Terminal**

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

Q:  **Al Schulze:** Since ships can’t dock at Alternative 2 and 1B, how do you get the containers from there to the ship? It has to be on rail.
A:  **Rhona Hunter:** So there is equipment that is used to transport from the storage yard to the rail yard, and that equipment would then have to be transporting longer distances. It would likely be some form of truck. So what it would mean is that there would be no rail on the terminal at all. The rail would either be on the causeway if the intermodal yard was on the causeway, or it would stop for the new terminal.
C:  **Judy Kirk:** So that is one of the questions that Rhona talked about, which I think people should clearly understand, is a trade-off between going in the water or marine works versus utilizing agricultural land within the Option Lands.

Q:  **Judy Williams:** Don’t forget wetlands, because it’s not just agricultural lands, there’s wetlands between them.

C:  **Judy Kirk:** In the Option Lands? I don’t think in the Option Lands, though, Judy. I don’t think in the Option Lands, which is the lands that they’re talking about here.

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** No, it’s agriculture.

Q:  **Judy Williams:** Even right beside the water?

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** It wouldn’t be right beside the water.

Q:  **Judy Williams:** Doesn’t that come to about 500 acres? I’m asking how many acres would be involved in that option.

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** No, we don’t have a number for that. Our current design has around 10 hectares being utilized in the upland improvements.

C:  **Judy Kirk:** So you don’t know the exact use in the uplands, but what you’re saying is it could be more efficient in the upland environment.

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** It could be more efficient in the upland environment. Obviously in a terminal we have much more constraints in terms of operation.

Q:  **Judy Williams:** You looked at terminal options—yes? Did you look at the option of putting in that third terminal versus going to Prince Rupert and expanding Prince Rupert? Now tell me why those other two options were not viable for the Port Metro Vancouver.

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** So Port Metro Vancouver doesn’t control Prince Rupert. We require both the Prince Rupert operations as well as what we anticipate expanding for in Port Metro Vancouver. They’re both needed in order to meet the future west coast of Canada throughput of containers. So they’re both required. In terms of whether we would look at other opportunities within Port Metro Vancouver, we have looked at other opportunities within Port Metro Vancouver. We’re currently optimizing the existing facilities at Deltaport through the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project. We’ve done efficiency and expansions within Centerm and Vanterm. Fraser Surrey Docks has limited potential for long-term growth, primarily because of the river, the size of the river and the depth of the river and the size of ships that will be servicing the west coast. So that’s why we got to the point where really our last opportunity for expansion is going to be at Roberts Bank.

Q:  **Judy Williams:** Why couldn’t Prince Rupert expand? It doesn’t have a migratory flyway, Pacific migratory flyway running over it, and it does not have the bread basket of the Lower Mainland there. I don’t understand why you couldn’t be working in concert. You’re all doing the same thing. You’re all moving goods and services elsewhere. So why not pick an area that isn’t going to impact so dreadfully?

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** Prince Rupert is expanding.

C:  **Judy Kirk:** No, but I think that Judy’s point is, and tell me if I’m wrong, Judy. You’re saying that why not have Prince Rupert expand even more than is talked about here?
Judy Williams: I just think that it is dreadful that you’re going into agricultural land as a possibility, and that you’re putting in a third terminal at all.

Peter Maarsman: What you’re talking about is moving somewhere else? But you’re already building the South Fraser Perimeter Road. You can’t stop the road being built. It’s almost complete.

Mirjana Petrovic: Its connection between Highway 1 and Highway 99 and Highway 91, and it’s the kind of road that can handle lots of traffic.

Hardy Wolfram: I say that Alternative 2 is absolute nonsense. You have to bring everything out into the ocean, and we should even eliminate the Fraser dock in the river. There’s too much pollution being brought up. So we have it right in the Georgia Strait, farther out we have nothing but soil. You can dig it up. Rocks, you can do everything. I mean, we have to plan ahead.

Al Schulze: Just to come back to the capacity, what will stay here in the Lower Mainland or in the vicinity and what goes out east?

Rhona Hunter: So, 70 percent of the containers leave the terminal on rail, 30 percent on truck.

Al Schulze: Okay, so the rail would actually be long distance, more so than the truck.

Rhona Hunter: Yes.

Al Schulze: No, no, that’s if Prince Rupert expanded, it’s a more efficient way of shipping the stuff east, because here you have the bottlenecks. The elevation and so on over the Rockies, what have you. Whereas Prince Rupert is more level and it’s a shorter distance to go east.

Chris Clutchey: You were saying that it’s shorter to ship it back east, and that’s not true. It’s shorter -- it’s closer to Asia, but it’s not shorter to ship back east from Prince Rupert.

Al Schulze: I would think it is.

Road and Rail Infrastructure

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

Judy Williams: What’s a turning wye?

Rhona Hunter: A turning wye is a rail configuration that allows a locomotive to change direction and go back again.

Hardy Wolfram: We should be utilizing more rail. Look at Europe, look at other countries. It’s way more efficient and less polluting.

Chris Clutchey: You have to move bulk traffic in terms of pollution or use of fuel. There’s nothing that beats the railway in terms of moving volumes.

Judy Williams: It says that you could replace those 210 hectares, which is about 500 acres, with the creation of new habitat such as inter-tidal marshes and submerged reefs? We’re losing the wetlands so fast with the Fraser River now, that I just don’t see where you’re going to be able to create more.
Rhona Hunter: We’re looking both in the Roberts Bank and Boundary Bay area. There are additional sites, for example the salt marsh restoration, we’ve got some on the TFN lands that we’re looking at. We’ve got some land on Boundary Bay that we’re looking at. Other programs which aren’t marsh restoration, they’re marsh creation are taking place within the Fraser River Estuary.

Q: Judy Williams: Where?

A: Rhona Hunter: There are some sites on Westham Island that we’re looking at. We’re looking at some sites out towards the airport. We’re identifying sites as we go along. So we will look, as much as possible, from a banking perspective, around the area and in the region. So as was done with Deltaport Third Berth we will also be creating habitat opportunities directly in and around the existing new terminal.

Q: Judy Williams: Are you aware of what’s coming down the pipe from the federal government about the airport about the new runways that they’re going to create? So they’re going to have to go out over the water, which is over Sturgeon Bank, which is where salmonid populations rest before they head for the open sea. It’s precious land, precious habitat, and to say that you’re going to create marshes around the airport, when they’re trying to get rid of the marshes to discourage the birds, so there’s no bird strikes, that’s not productive. I sit on the Airport Environmental Review Committee. They have a bird kill program in place. So you create marshes, you’re going to create more birds.

Q: Al Schulze: Could I just ask a question about the 210 hectares - does that include the widening of the causeway?

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.

Q: Chris Clutchey: Given that the bulk of the rail traffic goes east and south would it be safe to assume that those trucks just service the Lower Mainland?

A: Rhona Hunter: Much of the trucks will service the Lower Mainland. There are some that will continue on. My understanding logistically is that many of the trucks that continue on are packed and re-packed locally, stuffed and re-stuffed locally in the Lower Mainland.

Q: Chris Clutchey: So there’s no real way to lower that number if it’s servicing Metro Vancouver?

A: Rhona Hunter: Right, and even if it’s not servicing Metro Vancouver, as I say, typically they would go to a stuff and de-stuff facility.

Q: Pat Pollock: I work at Rogers Sugar. And since they increased their capacity at Vanterm we’ve had nothing but problems. I don’t know how many times I’m late for work because I’m sitting there behind a kilometre worth of trucks and I’m just wondering when this will be fixed? When are they going to get their act together to get the trucks scheduled properly.

A: Rhona Hunter: There’s the trucking coordination issue and then there is the infrastructure, I think, and they really work in tandem. We actually have a sister division that is working on optimization looking at how we can provide truck staging, how we can reduce the road/rail interface, how we can make the road and rail systems on the south and north shore more efficient, so that there’s less congestion. So there’s a number of programs in that area of the Port’s infrastructure program dealing with that exact issue.
Q: *Judy Kirk:* Rhona, are you saying that it’s underway or that it’s being looked at?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* No, actually it’s underway. Those programs will be complete by 2014. Once we’ve got some of the infrastructure, then enforcement of some of the truck strategy, and the Port does have a truck strategy group that’s working on dealing with the congestion of trucks, both within the inner harbour as well as at Deltaport.

Q: *Pat Pollock:* Certainly it would be a relief to see congestion reduced. Also I’d like to raise a concern with the tolling of the Port Mann. Trucks are going to be able skip off the South Perimeter Road and head over the Pattullo Bridge creating congestion.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I would have to say I don’t know the interchange on the South Fraser Perimeter Road to answer that directly.

C: *Pat Pollock:* I’d like to see some instructions to trucks. Because that just becomes a nightmare.

Q: *Mirjana Petrovic:* How many hours daily is the Port open? Twenty-four hours?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah. I think it depends on the terminal and it depends on the operation, the hours.

Q: *Judy Kirk:* What about Roberts Bank?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Roberts Bank I believe operates for twenty-four hours.

Q: *Mirjana Petrovic:* I think this kind of added capacity is extremely important. I personally see an opportunity at night to reduce congestion. I know that’s a big deal with union, but we cannot build so many roads to accommodate every single type of vehicle who not experience congestion. Because there is no way that we can widen, widen more and more. We have to utilize what we have, and there is a mechanism to do it in the process of management working out.

C: *Judy Kirk:* And certainly, Mira, I know that Port Metro Vancouver, the City of Vancouver, Metro Vancouver, the regional district, and other agencies have all heard that from people, that people would like 24-hour operation and therefore to move trucks from peak to off-peak hours. I would encourage you to add that into the additional comment section at the back.

C: *Mirjana Petrovic:* One thing that Port of Vancouver controls is actually how many hours they’re open. So truck drivers should have opportunity to make their trips in off-peak hours.

Q: *Hardy Wolfram:* The only thing is, if we rely on truck transportation and the increasing population, we are always behind. We have to look at different ways. We only have few bridges. We only have one tunnel. How do we bring the traffic through those - it’s impossible. We have to definitely work on trains.

Q: *Judy Williams:* I had the privilege of going down to Port Metro Vancouver’s headquarters and looking in on their command centre, and I believe that the command centre anyway, I don’t know about the trucks, the command centre has these screens of every area covered by Port Metro Vancouver, right up Burrard Inlet and they are monitored 24/7.
Compensation for Agricultural Productivity and Environmental Assessment Process

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

Q: **Judy Williams:** I’d like to know where this proposal falls? When they came in with the changes to the Fisheries Act and the Navigable Waters Protection Act, which is just more recent than the Fisheries Act changes, it is pulling any authority that Fisheries might have had, and that the Waterways Protection Act might have had. So, would this project, the third terminal, fall under the old EAO process, or is it going to fall under the two new Acts or is it some hybrid in between? What I’m hearing is it sounds like it’s a hybrid in between.

C: **Judy Kirk:** No, I don’t think that’s right. It would be the new regulations and correct me if I’m wrong, because 2013 is the submission of the Project Description, and that Judy, is the trigger for the regulators to review and determine what the scope of the environmental review will be, and under what legislation and regulation. So it’s not until that application is made via the submission of the Project Description that they determine the scope.

Q: **Chris Clutchey:** Will they also be the ones to determine what efforts are made to mitigate the impacts?

C: **Judy Kirk:** Yes, that’s right.

Q: **Chris Clutchey:** That’s too bad.

C: **Judy Williams:** It’s sort of like the fox and the hen house, and again it comes back to -- it sounds very good on paper to say that you’re going to do some mitigation work and compensation, but like the airport, I can’t stress enough how hard they are working to discourage birds from landing. They’re filling in ditches, they’re doing all kinds of things, and they would never allow you to build a marsh there.

Categories for Environmental Study

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

Q: **Judy Williams:** Well, I’d say every one of these topics is important, but one of the questions I have is you’ve got biofilm listed here, and I know that on October 9th Adrian Pollard of the Vancouver Airport Fuel Facilities Corporation (VAFFC) wrote a letter to the EAO office about the biofilm study. Would you be utilizing their biofilm study or doing your own?

A: **Neil Turner:** The biofilm studies that were conducted as part of that will be taken into consideration. Whether it’s the same in terms of Deltaport or to the same extent is yet to be determined. I mean, the issue of biofilm is quite a new study area of importance. It obviously is important in terms of the environment, but it’s come to light in terms of a study area onto its own because of the importance for migratory birds and Western Sandpipers.

C: **Judy Kirk:** So just for clarification, would the port be undertaking its own biofilm study?

A: **Neil Turner:** Correct. It would. But it will also take into consideration the past studies.

Q: **Liz Walker:** When you look at marine fish are we just looking at commercial fish or are we...
looking at the whole gamut?

A: *Neil Turner:* The whole gamut.

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

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

**Community Legacy Benefits**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C: *Hardy Wolfram:* We have to come to a conclusion otherwise Seattle will be taking over. We’ve
lost a lot of passenger traffic to Seattle and Seattle is always asking "What can I do better?" So we have to keep the money here.

C: **Mirjana Petrovic:** I would say that’s true. I am in the working group in the International Mobility Trade Corridor between U.S. and Canada, and they are really watching us, and they are so into development. My suggestion really for this group to look into the future and think about future generations, protecting the environment but still supporting the economic development of this region.

Q: **Pat Pollock:** Quickly, on the community legacy benefit, have they earmarked any dollar figure for that?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** There’s no dollar figure but it will be substantial.

Q: **Judy Williams:** And who will determine where it goes?

C: **Rhona Hunter:** The Port, but in consultation with the communities. That’s why we are out early at this point to try and solicit some feedback.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** And talking to local government too.

Q: **Liz Walker:** I can talk to Neil later perhaps, but I will have questions on how broad the field studies will be, because you did mention that, you know, it’s not just the footprint of this project, but you have to look more realistically at the Fraser River Estuary.

A: **Neil Turner:** Depends on the study area - the scope of those studies vary considerably.

Q: **Liz Walker:** Yeah and there’s things I would like to know more about. Like road edge effects - because you talk about habitat banking - is that really looking at only the footprint that’s taken up, or will that mitigate for road edge effects?

A: **Neil Turner:** There are the direct impacts and the indirect impacts. The bank is for the marine environment.

Q: **Liz Walker:** So nothing for upland?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** There will be mitigation but one is a marine and it’s going to be banked. The other one would be in consultation with the Agricultural Land Commission.

Q: **Liz Walker:** I’ve been out bird watching for the last couple of months, something that’s bothered me a great deal as I walk around Boundary Bay is looking at more and more little pink flags. I’m not sure if you guys have been looking at the encroachment of the *Angelica Spartina* that’s growing in our bay, but you know, that’s an invasive species that’s come into our areas and if there’s no money to help get rid of that, that is going to severely impact our coastal region here.

C: **Judy Kirk:** And are they marked by pink flags?

Q: **Liz Walker:** Well, the volunteers, as I understand are going to be doing that, and those flags have been increasing and when you look at a flag, what was a small area is now very large. I have been on a field trip where we spent a day removing that stuff and it almost killed me as a volunteer. So you know, as that encroaches and destroys more of our area, the amount of suitable habitat is being reduced. So unless that’s taken care of as well, the increasing impacts are huge, as we look at more development in the area.
A: **Neil Turner:** We have been considering this. Invasive species are part of the compensation package. It’s not just creating new habitat, it’s enhancing what you’ve got or basically preventing what you’ve got.

Q: **Liz Walker:** Yeah, I’m involved in too many things, so I’m not able to keep up with everything, but I’m not sure what’s being done right now regarding invasive species that come in with container traffic and what’s being done right now to avoid that.

A: **Neil Turner:** We look at what’s actually there and establishing itself as an invasive species. **Spartina** is one that basically we spend quite a bit of effort to look at the opportunities for removal and to enhance that environment. To protect what we’ve got, restore what we’ve got.

Q: **Judy Williams:** Neil we’re talking about the roadside -- the effects on the roadside ditches and swales and whatnot. I wrote to the federal department of transportation and told them about Professor Royann Petrell at UBC who has done state of the art research on how to collect aeromatic hydrocarbons off the roads. They basically wrote back and told me that wasn’t their purview. So I would give you Dr. Royann Petrel’s name if you want some help.

A: **Neil Turner:** That would be great actually.

Q: **Judy Williams:** So, you have a separate process ongoing with First Nations - how much does the process parallel the one we’ve just gone through and are going through, and how much weight will the First Nations be given over ours? Particularly how much attention is going to be paid to the Agricultural Land Reserve?

A: **Judy Kirk:** Judy, there’s two things. I want to make sure people know that some other questions have come up with respect to the First Nations consultation regarding confidentiality and the things you’ve just raised. And as I know you know, there is legislation in Canada that puts an onus on organizations like the Port to consult. There are what’s called consultation agreements that are negotiated with First Nations and there are some confidentiality requirements within that. The point about weighting, the environmental agencies themselves, CEAA and BCEAO, would need to answer that question, but certainly there is no preconceived weighting of input. But you need actually to ask them that, Judy.

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

The meeting ended at 3:20pm
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The record notes that the meeting commenced at 6:02
KEY THEMES:

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

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Chris Chok

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

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

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

   Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?

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

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

   A: Rhona Hunter: No.

   Q: Bob Miller: Is there any plan to expand Fraser Surrey Docks?
A:  Rhona Hunter: No. Fraser Surrey Docks has a limited ability to service containers in the future due to its location in the inner river, the size of the boats, as well as the depth and width of the river.

Q:  Otto Langer: And nothing to be developed at Richmond Fraser?
A:  Rhona Hunter: There are no plans for container expansion in the Fraser River.

Q:  Otto Langer: Does that make sense with the VAFFC plan to bring Panamax tankers up that part of the river? Why would they do it?
A:  Rhona Hunter: I can’t speak to tankers going up the river.

Q:  Otto Langer: And nothing to be developed at Richmond Fraser?
A:  Rhona Hunter: There are no plans for container expansion in the Fraser River.

Q:  Otto Langer: Does that make sense with the VAFFC plan to bring Panamax tankers up that part of the river? Why would they do it?
A:  Rhona Hunter: I can’t speak to tankers going up the river.

Q:  Victor Wei: Fraser Surrey Docks, is that under your control?
A:  Rhona Hunter: It's a facility within Port Metro Vancouver, yes.

Q:  Victor Wei: Is someone coordinating among all of these four ports?
A:  Rhona Hunter: Absolutely.

Q:  Victor Wei: My second question is: what kind of economic conditions will be considered as low case, base case, and high case?
A:  Rhona Hunter: So, when we do forecasts, that there is any number of factors that go in to it - current trade, projected future trade, economic stimulus, and all those factors have a range. So when the forecast is done, the upper range would be the high case and the lower range would be the low case. We do have our 2011 forecast online, and so if you are interested in the specifics of what those criteria were, and how they led to a low base and a high case you can look on our website.

Q:  Victor Wei: Looking 30 years down the road, because right now global trade is increasing, is the current trend still sustainable? Also 20 years from now, there is this conversation about international trade versus local products — what kind of effects would that have on the future?
A:  Rhona Hunter: When we do a forecast – it’s looking into the future and it’s saying, “based upon what we know today, how do we project something that happens in the future?” That’s why it’s called a forecast. The rationale for doing forecasts more than once is that what we know today is different than what we knew last year, so theoretically we can forecast more accurately things on the current knowledge base and situation. So the forecasting allows us to ascertain whether we do need something based on our current situation. Knowing that we are very early in the project, we’re probably looking at a five-year environmental review process, at which point we would then be in a situation to decide whether we would go or no-go. So at that point we would have another forecast that would say “okay, are we still looking a situation where our forecasts said we would be five years ago, three years ago, two years ago?” We also will be going to the marketplace for capital to build this and there are certainly limitations on what an investor would invest in. It won’t get any investment if there isn’t any return on it.

Q:  Otto Langer: Is Squamish at all getting into the diagram on page four?
A:  Rhona Hunter: Squamish is not here. Squamish is not a container terminal.

Q:  Otto Langer: So there are no plans there for containers there?
A:  Rhona Hunter: There are no current plans for container shipping through Squamish.
Opportunities for Creating Container Capacity

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

Q: **Bob Miller:** What is the purpose of Port Metro Vancouver? Is it a profit centre for the federal government? Is it a profit centre for B.C.? Is it a privately-owned operation? Could you just tell us a bit about who or what is Port Metro Vancouver?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Port Metro Vancouver is federal Crown. It’s got one shareholder, that’s the federal government. Unlike most Crowns, though, Port Metro Vancouver actually pays the federal government. So we pay the federal government a percentage of our revenue that we bring in. The remaining revenue that the Port brings in is reinvested in the port. So the Port does not take federal money to provide the services. It is a self-sustaining Crown corporation, and when it needs more money, as I mentioned to Victor, on a project like this, it will have to go to the marketplace.

Q: **Bob Miller:** So what is the determination of profit? Or when is it revenue? How do you account for revenue and expenses in a form that a normal financial statement would present? Do you do that sort of thing? Can you help us understand the costs of moving one TEU through the port and what the revenue is generated from that? I’m trying to get my mind around the size of the dollar volume that Port Metro Vancouver is generating in Roberts Bank.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I don’t have the business numbers for the Port in terms of the revenue generated by the Port, but I can give you some information about how the Port is structured. So, the Port is like a landlord. It doesn’t operate containers or terminals itself. It has long-term lessees who are the operators of the terminals. So the Port is the landlord.

Q: **Bob Miller:** So who operates Roberts Bank?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** TSI and Westshore. Westshore is a coal terminal, and TSI is the container terminal operator.

Q: **Bob Miller:** Okay. Can you tell me what TSI stands for?

A: **Chris Chok:** Terminal Systems Incorporated. Terminal Systems Incorporated is the operator of Deltaport, and I believe the parent company is Global Container Terminals.

Q: **Bob Miller:** Thank you. Is there someone available from Global Terminal Systems?

A: **Chris Chok:** No, but we can get you this information. The Port produces an annual report, which is available on the website.

Q: **Bob Miller:** I’d appreciate that. Because it’s three profit centres—one for the federal government, one for Westshore and one for TSI. Is that a fair comment? And by profit centre I mean a place where you monitor the revenues coming in and the costs going out to determine whether or not the amount of revenue coming in is in excess of the cost of running the terminal.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** So each terminal has a business agreement and a lease with the port. I wouldn’t necessarily say that they’re all structured the same way.

Q: **Bob Miller:** Is it possible for us, as individuals, to determine the amount of profit that is coming out of those terminals? Or is that private?
A: **Rhona Hunter**: The annual report is probably the best place to get that information.

Q: **Bob Miller**: Is it your understanding that there is a breakout of this?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: I don’t believe that there will be a breakout in every case per terminal, as you are asking. But I would suggest that if you take a look at the annual report, and then if you have any more specific questions, then we can put those directly to the appropriate person at the Port. Some of the information is business information, and I’m not sure exactly what gets released publicly.

Q: **Bob Miller**: But from a person who is impacted by the operations of the Port – it would be very useful to know whether the costs that I believe that I might be carrying, as an example, because of the actions of the port, I need to paint my house every four years, not every 14 years. So that’s the impact that I have to absorb because of that activity. So, it would be useful for me to know whether or not I can make a determination as to whether I’m being treated in an equitable fashion. And without access to the numbers, you can understand that it’s quite difficult to come to any conclusion on that.

A: **Chris Chok**: We’ll get you a copy of the annual report.

C: **Bob Miller**: Thank you.

Q: **Victor Wei**: I suspect it runs much like the Vancouver Airport Authority which operates the airport, pays rent to the federal government for the use of the airport lands and the facility and then invests the remaining revenues it collects into additional facilities within the boundaries of the airport. It sounds to me like that’s more or less what you guys do.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: It’s a similar model.

Q: **Bob Miller**: When a freighter comes in to the terminal, they turn on the generators and we see plumes of black smoke which is enjoyed by everybody in the Lower Mainland basin. Because the prevailing winds move that stuff off towards Hope. So one of the questions running through my mind is, why don’t they plug in? Why don’t they plug in to electricity, because it seems that one of the things that B.C. has to offer the world is cheap power? I’m all in favour of people making money. I’m not in favour of people making money if they’re peeing in the stream uphill and I’ve got to drink the water downstream. If it’s all clean water, then I’m all in favour of them making money. If I had to pay a price for what they’re doing, then I question it. Is this making any sense to you?

A: **Chris Chok**: Yeah, I understand. You’re feeling that someone who lives in the vicinity of the port facility is impacted by the operations.

Q: **Bob Miller**: Yeah, and I have no problem with that, okay? So as long as that impact is not fouling up the environment that I’m living in. If it’s possible to do it and then if it’s too expensive to provide the power, then one answer might be, well, then, I guess the Port is not economically viable. So, I have some questions to ask later about standards at the Port.

A: **Chris Chok**: So perhaps what I’ll do is ask Rhona to speak to the ship-to-shore power, and then if we could move through the project.

Q: **Bob Miller**: Sure, okay. One other comment before we go. It would have been so helpful to have the discussion guide mailed it to us so I could be prepared, I think you would be better served and all of us would be better served, because people who are prepared do a better job.
A: **Chris Chok:** We certainly did post it online and we emailed notification of that. But I can take note of that.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I think what I’ll do is just quickly talk to shore power and then we will move on through because there is certainly a lot of information and perhaps some of those questions may come up. Shore power was incorporated into the design for the Deltaport Third Berth Project and it will be included in the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project as well. There are a number of issues. We can provide the facility, but the ships also have to be able to plug in. So that is something that we’re working with our shipping partners to encourage that conversion. There is also this standard plug – the standard for that plug has yet to be established, and so we are working towards establishing that standard. I would anticipate that by the time that we are looking at the proposed Terminal 2 project, we will have most of that reconciled and we’ll see a greater number of ships being able to plug-in than we do today.

Q: **Vic Rivers:** For the three years that I sat on that community liaison committee we were talking about shore power. The whole time they were there, they were sort of waiting for the ISO to come up with some decision about the type of connection that was going to be used to connect to the ship, and standardize it. It’s my understanding that Long Beach has already got shore power connected to ships so it makes me wonder why it’s taking so long. If it’s already being done in California, why can’t it be done in Vancouver? The problem seems to be is they’re standing behind the IMO, but I don’t really get the feeling that the Port really wants to go ahead with this, or wants to do it very quickly, because if they did, they could put a spec together and in six months go to General Electric and they’ll be quite happy to prepare a cable system and a connecting system to connect to the ships. I guarantee that within six months they’ll come back with whatever you need to meet whatever spec you want to draw up. And if General Electric won’t do it, Siemens will do it, and if Siemens won’t do it, Philips will do it. So somebody will do it if you just put your head down and say, “This is what we are going to do, we’re going to do it by a certain date and we’re going to be leading in this thing, and we’re not going to be sitting back and waiting for Mongolia or Panama or some other country to get onside with whatever kind of connector they want to put on board their ships.”

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

**Why Roberts Bank?**

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

C:   **Bob Miller:** The current Premier did not make a commitment to replace the tunnel. She said something vaguely like sometime in the next generation we’ve got to get around to it.

A:   **Chris Chok:** You are right. She made a commitment to study it.

C:   **Bob Miller:** Just to study it, yes, but not necessarily replace.

A:   **Chris Chok:** Yes, you are right.

**Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project**

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

Q:   **Bob Miller:** What are the existing Option Lands?

A:   **Rhona Hunter:** They are lands adjacent to the current rail corridor that were acquired by BC Rail.

Q:   **Bob Miller:** Is that options in the real estate sense that somebody has paid somebody for an option? Or does it mean that they’re optional, that the federal government can come and expropriate because the rail use is considered more appropriate than agriculture?

A:   **Neil Turner:** What happened was BC Rail acquired the land and then they leased it back to the farmers and said you could use it so long as required, until we need to pull it back.

C:   **Bob Miller:** When you go back long enough, all that land out there, including the land that became part of the TFN by treaty, was land that was expropriated by the provincial government.

C:   **Neil Turner:** Okay. I understand that there were expropriated lands, but I don’t believe the BC Rail lands were expropriated. I believe it was purchased from the farmers. I could be wrong but my recollection is it wasn’t expropriated. At any rate, the Option Lands that we are referring to now are provincially-owned and are currently leased back to the farmers.

Q:   **Jennifer Wilson:** How many jobs will be created for the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project?

A:   **Rhona Hunter:** So for construction, it’s 4,500 jobs. Once it’s fully operational at full capacity it will be 18,000 jobs.

Q:   **Jennifer Wilson:** So without Terminal 2, what is the number right now on the current terminal?

A:   **Rhona Hunter:** I would have to get back to you on that. I don’t have the number for what the current jobs on the terminal are.

Q:   **Jennifer Wilson:** What’s the difference between what’s currently on the existing terminal and what would be in terms of jobs on the new automated terminal?
A: *Rhona Hunter*: Our planning is for a semi-automated facility, which certainly would probably have fewer jobs than the current facility, because it’s not as automated. The final configuration will depend on the actual operator who’s on that facility, and what they choose to have.

Q: *Otto Langer*: You have numbers for the actual jobs employed at the Terminal 2, without all of the multiplier spin-off jobs?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: I don’t have it at the top of my head, but I think that we certainly can get it.

C: *Otto Langer*: Yeah, that’s easier to relate to really, because a lot of us disagree with these multiplier factors.

Q: *Bob Miller*: What’s the cost of the project?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Over $2 billion dollars.

Q: *Bob Miller*: Okay and how much of that is to mitigate the environmental damages?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Well, that will depend on the regulator. The current project cost projections are based upon what we anticipate. It’s a round budget – when I say the project cost is over 2 billion dollars, it’s very, very round numbers. So, we don’t have costs associated specifically on what it will be, because it will be the regulator that will dictate exactly how much is in there. It’s certainly in the hundreds of millions of dollars for habitat compensation.

Q: *Vic Rivers*: You mentioned this was going to take six years?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Six years to construct.

Q: *Vic Rivers*: Six years. Is that going to be like it was for DP3 which is 24 hours a day, seven days a week type of construction? Or is it going to be nine to five, Monday to Friday?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: We don’t have a construction plan at this point.

Q: *Vic Rivers*: When they built DP3 it was a 24-hour operation, seven days a week. Delta, in order for us to have the quiet enjoyment of our homes and properties, has bylaws that restrict construction between 7 in the morning and 7 at night weekdays, 9 in the morning to 5 in the afternoon Saturdays, and no construction noise on Sundays. However, when you guys are building these great ports, you work 24 hours a day, seven days a week. And for months on end, and for almost years on end, 200 homes that face the Gulf of Georgia either on the top of the bluff and one block back, and those that are down on the bottom are subjected to all kinds of unacceptable noise in the middle of the night, like the Columbia dredge. If you don’t know what a Columbia dredge looks like, it looks like a big shoebox with a bunch of steel sticking out of the front. It dredges the bottom of the ocean, and dumps it up on a barge or something else. The problem with the Columbia dredge is it’s probably one of the noisiest pieces of equipment in the whole Lower Mainland and they run that months on end, at night. It’s only two and a half miles between my place and that Columbia dredge. When it’s the summertime and you have an inversion over the water, you might as well be sitting next to it, because the noise just comes screaming across the water and into the bedroom. A scientist friend of mine at UBC and I went out with some noise measuring equipment when the dredge was operating and we were within 200 metres of it. It had the side doors open, and it was doing its thing out there. We were measuring about 95 decibels, 200 metres away. Back in my bedroom, sitting on my bed, with a noise meter equipment, it was reading anywhere from 75 to 78 decibels. This is at night, and it
goes all night long, month in, month out. There is nothing we seem to be able to do about it. I think that that’s something that has to be taken care of, if they’re going to do it.

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

C:  *Chris Chok:* What the port is saying is that they are not looking to drive piles. And we’ll get to that in a second.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* But before you get to that, can I ask a broader question? How does the Port determine the environmental effects from one of its projects? I read your statement about the environment on your site, it said nothing. So I’m interested in if you could describe how you determine the environmental impacts of your projects? And I’ve talked to people about the effects of your project on the disbursement of sediment from the Fraser River and the response I’ve heard is “We are not responsible for anything that’s south of the ferry terminal.” Also, when do you decide whether what you’re doing requires mitigation. Are you in a position to answer that?

A:  *Neil Turner:* The environmental assessment begins with the submission of the Project Description. Through the environmental assessment process, we’ll actually sit down and study by study determine where the bounds of those studies are.

Q:  *Jennifer Wilson:* Who makes that determination?

A:  *Neil Turner:* The regulator. In this case they will likely be the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and the B.C. Environmental Assessment Offices.

Q:  *Jennifer Wilson:* Just wondering if those two organizations are the same people who are assessing the environmental factors for Enbridge?

A:  *Otto Langer:* It’s the National Energy Board and CEAA. It’s joint with two federal agencies whereas here it’s a joint federal/provincial.

A:  *Neil Turner:* But that’s under a slightly different regime as well.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* So in an observational way, one would say that Port Metro Vancouver has been very successful in persuading the regulators that anything that they’re doing has no impact beyond the ferry terminal.

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* I think you might be talking about the Fraser River discharge? I’d have to go back to my colleagues on the dredging program to determine the bounds of the scope of their work, and it may be absolutely correct that for some reason, they don’t have to go south. I can’t speak to that because I’m not clear. But I think if we come back to this project, as Neil said, the physical bounds of our study area and our impact will be verified by the environmental regulators who are reviewing the project, and whether it’s a panel process and a federal/provincial panel process, that would be the federal and provincial government that would make that assessment. But we’re not drawing those boundaries.
C: **Bob Miller:** It’s up to people like us to raise hell with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Office. They don’t have a wide enough terms of reference, and it’s an iterative process, but those processes are all highly questionable at this stage of the game.

Q: **Vic Rivers:** Environmental Assessment Agency – wasn’t that the lead agency in the last go-round, when they did their last construction work?

A: **Otto Langer:** Oh, I don’t think so. But the BCEAO is generally not taking a lead where there is a big federal mandate, but the feds seem to be backing out, retreating as quickly as they can.

Q: **Bob Miller:** And that goes back to my first question – that there is always a balance between revenue and expense. So you’re saying that if the damage is such that we would have to step in and do something – do you have a policy on that? Or do you wait for the regulators to tell you? Because Rhona has mentioned that you make a proposal, which presumably you defend? Then the regulator and us ‘Joes’ don’t have that much of an opportunity to review?

A: **Neil Turner:** No, the process establishes the timing and you will have an opportunity to be consulted, an opportunity basically to look at the terms of reference for the scope of the studies, and the extent of the studies. There is a consultation period after the project description is submitted.

C: **Bob Miller:** Good. Because I have talked to one of your planners and wrote a letter to him, about the fact that Tsawwassen Beach Bay is filling in. He had no interest or care because it’s out of his terms of reference - it was just cut and clear. There is no small fish out there to speak of now, as compared to 1915 — my family has been involved in this area for a long time. So we have some history as to how the environment has been damaged.

C: **Mike Isinger:** I think everyone is aware of this Against Port Expansion community group. They have a flyer out here. Apparently there has already been an assessment done. It says:

“Location now identified by Port Metro for the new T2 was turned down previously by an independent panel that concluded significant environmental damage and risk would result from the proposal. The panel recommends that the expansion as proposed not be permitted to proceed. And the Department of Fisheries and Oceans has told Port Metro Vancouver there is no possible amount of mitigation projects DFO could envisage that would compensate for the environmental damage that T2 would cause. Environment Canada has gone on record as saying they are concerned that the chain of the Pacific flyway could be broken for shore birds at some point, given the ongoing Port development in Delta.”

I’ll just enter the entire document in for the record. You know, we’re going at it again. A lot of us that work on the waterfront, we’re very concerned that it’s unnecessary. For the people in the room that don’t know, there is a travelling road-show that’s going around globally, comprised of the automation companies and the container steamship lines. What they’re trying to do is entice individual port authorities into building over capacity and preferably automated docks that are not good for the workers. There are hardly any workers there. That’s where our concern comes in. So we believe that T2 is not necessary. We believe that they should expand in Prince Rupert and the Inner Harbour, and go along with the fourth berth that was supposed to happen prior to T2 but we don’t see any of that in the table. This is not good for us. Our people are working in fear now because our companies told us “Oh, yeah, T2 is going ahead and there is nothing you could do. And two-thirds of you are going to lose your jobs.” A lot of people think longshoremen, they’re all this and all that, but we waived our automation protection provision...
of the Canada Labour Code some years ago. Where are the good-paying jobs for Canadians? A lot of those people live in the community. I live in Richmond. A lot of them live in Tsawwassen, Delta -- there’s a lot of money generated by those good-paying Canadian jobs, and those won’t exist if T2 goes ahead. So a lot of us not in favour of T2. Number one: because of the environmental damage. Number two: we don’t believe it’s necessary.

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

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

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

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

Marine Terminal

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

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

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

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

A: Rhona Hunter: We’re early. We don’t have a project that’s being put forward yet. So part of that process is that once we propose a project, federal and provincial regulators determine whether
our assessment is indeed valid, or whether we do need to do additional studies, or whether what we have currently is sufficient.

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

**Berth Structure**

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

Q:  *Bob Miller:* Can you describe whether or not the one you have chosen is the most economical to build?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* It is, and it comes down to long-term operation and maintenance of the piles, as opposed to the caissons.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* One of the problems you read from people in Point Roberts is that they believe part of Point Roberts is being eroded, and flushed back into the Tsawwassen Bay, because of the actions of the water due to what you folks are building, which you claim do not have any impact south of the ferry terminal. It’s really scary to think about how we are going to affect the sediment distribution out of the Fraser River.

Q:  *Vic Rivers:* What’s the thinking of making it like a hockey stick rather than just continuing on going northwest in terms of the existing area?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* If you look back on page 12, there were a number of configurations, and it was the design and the environmental considerations around those two configurations that led to the preferred one which would be, as you say looks like a hockey stick. Bob, just speaking further to your question, no, there is no consideration in the proposed design for breaching the causeway.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* And why would that be?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* My understanding of the foreshore area is that any disturbance of the foreshore area has geomorphic implications—the coastline gets further eroded by impacting the coastline. So by simply providing a bridge over there, and providing water flow through that causeway, would have greater impact to leaving the causeway as it is.

A:  *Neil Turner:* There has been concern in the past from DP3 with both channel formation and erosion. We’re actually looking at the movement of sediment and the speed at which water is moving in and out of these various areas. So we’re going to find out the baseline data on how sediment is moving, and how is it accumulated, and where is it going to accumulate, and where it’s eroding.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* My relative wrote to the government when the ferry terminal was first put in. He spent his life on the ocean, saying we need a breach in the ferry terminal.

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

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

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

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

**Marine Terminal**

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

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

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

Q: **Vic Rivers:** This intermodal yard, is that where they assemble the trains?
A:  *Rhona Hunter:* It’s where the trains are loaded and unloaded.

Q:  *Vic Rivers:* Well, you already loading and unloading them down here already with those moving things that run along and put the container in the train.

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* No. So the intermodal yard is that specific component of the terminal operation that takes it from the storage racks and puts them onto the trains. So under the current configuration, it can be done on the terminal. For example, on the Deltaport terminal it is done on terminal.

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

Q:  *Vic Rivers:* How do you get the containers from the storage yard to wherever you’re putting them on the train?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* It would have to be by truck.

C:  *Cara Kerins:* If you’re doing it off-site and you’re trucking it out on a semi-trucks and you’d have noise from all that too. So I don’t know.

C:  *Bob Miller:* Doesn’t make much sense to me. I don’t think that part of it is particularly noisy. I’m pretty conscious of what kind of noise we hear, and you drop the hatches from three feet under the ground, it makes a hell of a bang as it comes across the water. But when you put the containers on to the train that way, that’s nothing. When you went to bells, it made a big difference.

Q:  *Otto Langer:* But when you look at a highly stressed estuary and more and more pressure being put on, the airport’s talking about new runways, jet fuel up the Fraser River, we start sacrificing more of it for a parking lot, whether you’re BC Ferries or Port Metro Vancouver, and to be quite honest, I think that’s stupid to even consider it.

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

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

**Road and Rail Infrastructure on the Roberts Bank Causeway**

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

C:  *Mike Isinger:* It behooves me, on behalf of the people that I work with, we have a very dangerous situation on Deltaport causeway. There’s been over a dozen people killed on that causeway, and lately, even since Evergreen’s left, and I don’t know if you’re aware, Evergreen
was one of the largest customers. It’s temporarily in the inner harbour. In December, it’s coming back out your way.

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

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

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

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

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

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

C: **Jennifer Wilson:** I was just going to say the speed limit is 80 kilometres an hour, and I realize you just added on to the flip side of the traffic concerns on that road, but again, with the truck lineups someone is going to die on that road one day.
C:  *Mike Isinger:* They have. There have been a dozen people being killed on that road. There have been no improvements, and it’s our members that are getting killed going to work.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C:  
**Otto Langer:** When I directed in 1986 study on the no-net loss in the Fraser estuary, the old port was identified as the biggest loss. I think it was 78 hectares of sub-tidal loss which was never
replaced. No one’s going to compensate for the loss of this additional Terminal 2, no one’s going to create sub-tidal habitats.

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

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

C: 

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

A: 

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

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

Q: 

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

Compensation for Agricultural Productivity & the Environmental Assessment Process

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

Q: 

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

A: 

Rhona Hunter: No

Q: 

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

A: 

Rhona Hunter: Right.

Q: 

Raymond Kan: So that in essence means that the project will go ahead and you’re going to go through the EA process to look at mitigation efforts, compensation, but in essence, that project is going ahead.
A: **Rhona Hunter:** Just a clarification. The Port will make that decision and decide whether they will go through with the submission in the environmental review process. That is the first decision point.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: **Victor Wei:** Since I’m with the city of Richmond, obviously my interest will be on the Richmond side, the north end of the tunnel. We’ve had the chance to review the truck traffic study that the Port has just completed, and the conclusion of that study basically have indicated that the
largest portion of truck traffic will actually continue to use the tunnel, particularly trying to access the Richmond logistics hub.

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

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

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

C: Bob Miller: That’s a good point.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: Bob Miller: How many truckloads per day do you think you have now?
A:  *Rhona Hunter:* I don’t have the exact number, but I’d say probably around 3,000 trucks. We do have a tracking study that is on our website, that Vic was referring to, that speaks to the current situation.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* What were projections that were on it?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* We’re looking at approximately 3,700 total trucks that’s 1,800 in and 1,800 out of Terminal 2 at full capacity.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* Ah, 3,600. I thought I read somewhere where you were about that now. Am I wrong? What have you got now?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Right, and I said I don’t have those numbers in front of me. I believe they’re between 2,000 and 3,000 trips.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* So you’d go up to about 7,000.

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Yes. That would be three and a half thousand in, three and a half thousand out.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* So you’d go up to about 7,000.

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Yes. That would be three and a half thousand in, three and a half thousand out.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* Fair enough. So do you think you know or have you determined in your study the tonnes per day of effluent, of carbon and stuff that those trucks are currently putting into the atmosphere? I mean, do you have a concerned about that, firstly, and secondly, can you tell me what it is?

A:  *Neil Turner:* I don’t know that it actually got down to the calculation of GHGs, but I want to address your first question about your concern the port has for GHGs. I would suggest the Port is very concerned about GHG emissions and whether it’s from ship, truck, rail, the whole port operation have programs in place to reduce the GHGs.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* Oh, like electrifying the ships so that they don’t run their generators in port?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah, that’s one of them, but we actually have ones that deal with the fact that ships aren’t all electrified. We have the Eco-Action Program, and it is looking at reducing ship emissions. It’s an incentive program with our shipping operators for clean fuel burning. We also have a Truck Licensing System. And the truck licensing system will require that by 2015 all trucks are achieving a 2007 emission standard or better.

C:  *Chris Chok:* The consultation period runs until the end of November, and so what I would invite you to do is to go through, read it. If you have further questions -- we have a couple of documents that we need to send you. The annual report and the truck report.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* There is a company in Vancouver called Westport Innovations. They have a program to convert diesel trucks to natural gas. Kind of leading in the world, that type of thing. Is that somewhere on your radar? A rule that all trucks coming to the port would have to be running on natural gas?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* So we don’t have them having to run natural gas, but we do have a current program that by 2015 will have them at 2007 emission standards.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* Your goal is to have them be one generation behind?

Q: **Bob Miller:** That to me is awful close to dragging the anchor behind what we’re trying to do. I got to tell you, everything I hear you say is “Do the least we can to skim through. If we screw up the environment and we get away with it, it’s a win.” That’s what I’m hearing.

And I don’t know whether these people have that sense, because one of the problems, I believe, that Enbridge is having is that they seem to have a head space that’s very similar. And perhaps there are repercussions to that behavior, and maybe you folks want to think about that.

Q: **Otto Langer:** Just on that subject matter that Bob brought up, you mentioned Long Beach. They had a clean air truck program initiated in 2012. They’ve reduced their emissions by 90 percent. As of now, at 2007 or newer trucks only. So they’re already six, seven years ahead of what we just heard here, and it’s 11,000 trucks in Long Beach.

Q: **Raymond Kan:** In terms of port scope, particular the scope of community impact from trucks and the implications of infrastructure, there’s the Pattullo Bridge and the traffic that is going through right now. There are also the discussion between the City of New Westminster and City of Surrey about the location of the bridge and also the capacity of any new bridge. So there are serious implications from a financial perspective, and also from a transportation pattern perspective.

So I would encourage the port, whether through an EA assessment or some other process, and I read that a transportation plan is being prepared right now. So I don’t know how that would link with this process and the EA process in the future. There’s a transportation plan that’s referenced on page 18. So I don’t know what the scope of that is and whether this consultation is related to that process and where folks can chime in.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I’m not sure whether the transportation plan has a consultation component it. I would have to get back to you on that specifically. But certainly it integrates to all the infrastructure development that the Port will be doing.

Q: **Jennifer Wilson:** I was just wondering about reducing truck congestion, just to add on that. South Fraser Perimeter Road, that was initially supposed to be no lights on that, is that correct?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I can’t speak for the South Fraser Perimeter Road, but I understand there are some traffic lights.

Q: **Otto Langer:** The first habitat compensation harbour management agreement was signed in 1987 with North Fraser Commission and Fraser Port Authority liked it and did a similar one. Now you’re all one group. Do you have a modern habitat compensation or management agreement with the environmental agencies?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** We have a habitat banking agreement with the DFO.

Q: **Otto Langer:** That’s all? Because banking was about 20 percent of the agreement. Can we get a copy of that?

C: **Chris Chok:** We’ll mark that as a follow-up.
**Categories for Environmental Study & Community Legacy Benefits**

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

C:  *Mike Isinger:* We’d just like to keep our jobs. An automated terminal doesn’t benefit anybody. Building over-capacity doesn’t benefit anybody, especially not us.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* Baseline studies—it’s an intriguing term. Can you help me understand what it means?

A:  *Neil Turner:* Basically it’s considering the existing conditions. And also take into consideration historical records as far back as we can.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* So would you give an undertaking here to commit that your baseline studies would include the nature of the estuary of Roberts Bank prior to the ferry terminal and up to today?

A:  *Neil Turner:* Baseline studies related to the sediment issues, the erosion issues and everything you talked about?

Q:  *Bob Miller:* Yes.

A:  *Neil Turner:* So that is part of what’s called coastal geomorphology. So in that we’ll look at past conditions, current conditions.

Q:  *Bob Miller:* Beyond the ferry terminal. So south to, and including, Point Roberts?

A:  *Neil Turner:* So I can’t commit to that. What I’m saying is we heard your comment that you need to consider the entire area to the extent you’re suggesting south of the terminal.

C:  *Otto Langer:* Bob, just for your information, an oceanographic study showed that the Fraser Rim which goes right into Juan de Fuca, around Vancouver Island, even though the current is going the opposite direction, so that’s all the more reason why you can’t look at this little area. You’ve got to look at a giant area or else you’re not going doing justice to anything.

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

The meeting ended at 8:22pm.
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The record notes that the meeting commenced at 9:05am
KEY THEMES:

- Some participants asked questions about Port Metro Vancouver’s container forecast, wanting to ensure it accounted for changes to shipping patterns that may occur following the opening of the expanded Panama Canal.

- Some participants were skeptical of whether fish would use the marine refugia within the caissons, stating that they felt that fish would not want to enter a dark, enclosed space.

- Some participants asked about the viability of short-sea-shipping—moving containers from Roberts Bank to other facilities in Metro Vancouver via barges.

- Participants asked about constructing the proposed terminal and its impact on birds, noting that the Vancouver Airport Authority (YVR) was trying to move birds away from the airport, which would push them south towards Roberts Bank. They were concerned that if birds were not able to find habitat at Roberts Bank, it may cause them to move back towards the airport.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Chris Chok

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

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

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

Why Do We Need More Capacity For Containerized Trade?

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

Q: Anne Murray: What effect would widening the Panama Canal or the Northwest Passage have on this?

A: Cliff Stewart: We don't believe the Panama Canal has really any significant impact on the trade through Vancouver and the reason for that is the majority of the trade going through Vancouver goes primarily to Toronto, Montreal or Chicago and if you look at the time and cost to get to those three destinations, there's a significant rail component, even if you go through the Panama Canal and the time and cost to get there, going through the Panama Canal is still longer and more expensive than going through Vancouver.

So, yes, there are certainly destinations where the Panama Canal will have a significant impact, but the cargo that comes primarily through Vancouver and through Prince Rupert doesn't fall within that sort of area.

Q: Anne Murray: And what about the Northwest Passage Route if it opens up?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Northwest Passage is an interesting question because if it opened up to be ice free and not requiring ice-strengthened ships year round, that would certainly by a very different conversation. Within the project life of this terminal, that’s not likely to be a conversation. Dave, you’re in the shipping business.

A: **Dave Bedwell:** Yeah I think if and when it ever does get sunny and warm in the north and it can go without ice-strengthened ships that it would be more prone to Asia-Europe trade link and not Asia-North America trade link. They might swap at New York but probably would head over to Europe directly.

Q: **David Grigg:** Is there any coal being shipped through Roberts Bank, and if so, how much of that is, portion wise, roughly is coal from United States? Isn’t it likely to change? So part of the question is it likely to change with capacity, and the last question, does it require an increase in the width of the rail access by Tsawwassen First Nations?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yes, there is coal being shipped through Roberts Bank.

Q: **David Grigg:** Is some of it from the States?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** I think some of it may be from the States currently. Western Canadian demand would indicate that within the next five to ten years it’s likely all to be Canadian.

Q: **David Grigg:** Is the capacity likely to be altered or diminished as a result of the Americans increasing their capacity on the Pacific side? Has that been taken into account?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** We have to a little bit careful here because we’re actually container folks, not coal folks, so I don’t want to start speculating about the coal business.

Q: **David Grigg:** That’s fair enough. So maybe come back to the fourth question, which is are the sidings at the causeway that leads through Tsawwassen First Nations, are they likely to be expanded in width to accommodate any further increases?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** With respect to containers, yes.

Q: **David Grigg:** But we don’t know what it means in terms of coal? I guess the issue is aggregation of bulk and container traffic. Has that been taken into account in the equation?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yes, and so the widening is required for container traffic but not for bulk traffic. We talk about that in here. We’ll come to that later.

C: **Ruth Sol:** We did some work in 2008 and I know 2008 is a long time ago but west coast container demand was drawn from retailers and freight forwarders and the number was over 8 million TEU and I see that your top case there is in the 6 million TEU range. Now I don’t know how things have changed in that time, but it seems like a very conservative forecast.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** This demand is based more on economic fundamentals then on specific user targets. So the fundamental information underpinning this would be economist intelligence unit, GDP growth and GDP per capita growth. Both in the key markets in North America but importantly in the key markets in Asia because the container trade through the west coast of Canada is a two-way trade, unlike many in the world.

Q: **Eric Adernac:** On the chart here, is there the opportunity to increase the capacity at Prince Rupert or the inner harbour beyond what’s shown here to occur?
Cliff Stewart: For Price Rupert, our understanding is no. They’ve got dibs on every bit of flat land that they have. So this reflects all the capacity out there for the foreseeable future.

**Containerized Trade On The Canadian West Coast**

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding existing containerized trade on the West Coast of Canada (page 5 of the Discussion Guide), as well as an overview of opportunities for creating additional container capacity (page 6 of the Discussion Guide) and related infrastructure at Roberts Bank (page 7 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Anne Murray: Yeah, a lot of people come up to this because it is more to do with the highway, but where Highway 17 currently meets Highway 99, is that junction remaining as the access through the tunnel?

A: Cliff Stewart: Not for trucks. For cars I would assume so, but I don’t know.

Q: Anne Murray: That should be made clear to the public whether it is going to be or not, because I have asked a few places and people don’t seem to know, and it is really quite an important consideration, because if we’re coming from South Delta if you are going to have to go up the South Fraser Road to access Highway 99, then we are not separating the container trucks from a lot of people’s travel for that southern portion of the South Fraser Perimeter Road. Whereas if we can continue up Highway 17 and then access Highway 99, then there has been a separation.

C: Mike McLellan: I sit on the South Fraser Perimeter Road Committee, and Cliff is absolutely right. There will be no access to trucks other than local trucks making deliveries in that area. There will be access to private vehicles, and they are not closing that interchange.

If I am driving along from Deltaport in a truck, if I normally would go through Highway 17 and then into Vancouver, I will be forced to go out and onto 99 south of the Highway 17 interchange and then back. But if I am a local resident or say I work Deltaport and I am going to Vancouver, I would still go the existing way, or I could also go the new way.

**Sustainable Development In Canada’s Pacific Gateway**

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of Port Metro Vancouver’s initiatives and programs that further their commitment to sustainable development and operations (page 7 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Eric Aderneck: And what would be the traffic impacts on the Massey tunnel or Highway 99 going into Richmond?

A: Cliff Stewart: So, that is an interesting question. And I think we’ve provided a copy of a traffic report to some of your colleagues. It is available on the website, but the answer is that port container truck traffic at peak travel direction is about two percent of total traffic, and even with no other changes to the Massey Tunnel, and all of this traffic coming, truck traffic coming, it peaks out at about four percent. Interestingly, we did some work to say “what if we took all of the container truck traffic off that route and said no more? What is the impact for the average resident?” And in 2025, 2030 range, barring any other changes, that would change the average commute from Tsawwassen to north of the tunnel by two minutes. So, although it is trucks on Highway 99 through the tunnel are a bugbear for the population, it is one of those perception versus reality issues in terms of how much impact container trucks actually have.

The other thing to mention about that, because, and you will know this, Eric, the majority of available industrial land for increasing container support facilities is south of Fraser, so while...
today about 35 percent of Deltaport origin or destined truck traffic goes through the Massey Tunnel, by the time Terminal 2 comes along, we think that will have dropped to somewhere closer to 20 percent.

Q: **Anne Murray:** Is that two percent, four percent, based on the number of vehicles? Or the actual length of the vehicles? Because one truck is equal to something like four cars.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** It is actually not, it is actually only equal to two cars, and the reason is that cars tend to leave a car length between them, so by the time you put two cars in, each with a car length between them, you have got the same space consumed by one container truck. So, it is in throughput capacity. So in other words, it is in car equivalents.

**Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project**

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

Q: **David Grigg:** Very quickly, the artist rendition, you can see that where the rail line meets the overpass? Is that narrowing of the sidings representative of today? Or do you expect some widening in that area?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** So, under the overpass itself, there are projected to be I think there is two tracks there today, and it goes to either three or four, and the specifics of that I don’t remember, but I think this rendition is actually fairly accurate in that when you are on the causeway, you are in a large number of multiple tracks. Through under the causeway, it is relatively small, it is either three or four. And then when you get back up into the area sort of west of 41B it is wider again. In fact, much of what you are seeing in that area is already proposed for construction as part of the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project. That work actually has been approved by the Agricultural Land Commission, subject only to negotiation of mitigation. So, what you are seeing in that artist rendering between the two overpasses at 41B and on the neck of the causeway, will likely be in place by about 2015. The incremental width for T2 is actually east of 41B, between 41B and Arthur Drive.

And if I can just address that quickly, the current operating rail right of way, is 100 feet, or 30 metres wide. There is a 60 metre, or 200 foot wide strip called the Option Lands, which were subdivided with Agricultural Land Commission approval in 2008 and purchased by B.C. Rail, and designated at that time as rail right of way. And it runs from the neck of the causeway east to Arthur drive. The Deltaport Terminal Road and Rail Improvement project takes about eight of those 18 hectares and converts them to rail use. And the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project would take the other 10, and convert those to rail use.

Q: **Ruth Sol:** Is there any impact on the Vancouver International Airport?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No. Well, I am saying no based on the fact that it is not on flight path, and it is a fairly significant distance from the airport.

Q: **Murray Manson:** Yeah, I am interested to know what the depth of this area is? Are you going to need to dredge for the berths to access them?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** So, if you look at where the ship is, the red ship, which is part of the Westshore complex, that is in natural deep water at about 18 metres or so. So, the terminal is very close to the deep water. There is a minimal amount of dredging required to get an 18-metre berth pocket from the existing contour. The face of the berth is sitting in water that current is about
10 metres deep, at lowest low tide, and it needs to be dredged down to about 18 metres, so there is some dredging in front of the terminal, but very limited.

Q: *Murray Manson:* So, what do you intend to do with that material?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* For the current design as it is proposed here, there are two types of onsite dredging that are required. One is to get the berth pocket from the deep water to the face of the berth, the other is for the berth itself. And if you look on page 13, the right-hand picture which is a cut-away side view of the caisson structure, the area underneath that needs to be dredged to a depth of about 30 metres below the current seabed, because the material in there is what they call ‘geotechnically incompetent’. It is a polite way of saying that is kind of muck.

So all of that material, both the stuff that is dredged for purposes of accessing, and also for the purposes of building the berth structure, the intention is that would be dredged and deposited within the island footprint.

So the way that the thing would be constructed as currently designed is you can start by building a perimeter dyke around the entire island. Then the other materials would be dredged and placed in the footprint of the island. As I mentioned, they are geotechnically incompetent, but by putting them at the bottom of the island, spread out across the entire footprint, and then covering them with Fraser River Sand, clean sand, the engineers have determined that the fact that that material is problematic can be dealt with. So essentially, all the material dredged on the site gets put within the island. In contaminated sites parlance, if this were a contaminated site, it is confined in cap disposal.

Q: *Murray Manson:* Have you guys done the testing on the sediments for contamination?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We have done some limited testing on it, we haven’t done Environment Canada standard. So the answer is essentially no, but if there is a problem, it is addressed.

Q: *Murray Manson:* And then will you need to maintain the dredged area?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* We don’t believe so. The coastal geomorphologists tell us that it is likely to be self-cleaning.

Q: *Anne Murray:* More comment on what Ruth was saying, she asked if there was any impact on the airport, and I thought that was an interesting thing because one of the current ways of maintaining safety at the airport is to try and drive birds south of the banks off the airport, particularly birds like the snow geese, which are in very large flocks -- there’s now probably 50,000-60,000 out there on the banks. All of their efforts are to keep the geese away from the airport, and away from the planes. Also other birds like shorebirds and so on, so they are driving them down into Delta, and organizations like the Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust are working with landowners to provide feeding grounds on the uplands, but of course this area of Roberts Bank is also used extensively by migratory birds such as the geese and the swans and the shorebirds. So, anything that were to drive the birds away from this area, could potentially drive them back into the other areas, which is back towards the airport, so I would imagine that it should be looked at whether there is an impact on the airport, and that it can’t quite so easily be dismissed as no there is no impact, because everything that went -- seeing in terms of the successful almost hazing of the birds to get them to be down this end, could be affected by activities in this end.
A: **Cliff Stewart:** So, one of the things to point out, and you can’t see it obviously in this drawing, but the zero tide line is inshore of the terminal, so the terminal is all built in what is currently sub-tidal area. So, in fact, the project increases the length of shoreline. Because now you have additional shoreline length along the back and side of the island itself, so from the perspective of creating shore and intertidal area, that actually is increased by this. And certainly the proclivity of the birds to inhabit that area today with industrial activity would tend to indicate that they are not significantly disturbed by that. But again, that is an important part of this study work that needs to be done.

C: **Anne Murray:** Yes, I think so, because we are looking at a different configuration that is becoming an enclosed bay. So, I am not saying necessarily will have an impact, but it certainly might. I don’t think it can be dismissed.

**Marine Terminal**

*Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the terminal orientation and structure options (page 12 & 13 of the Discussion Guide).*

Q: **David Grigg:** The concrete caissons are precast somewhere else, towed in, and then filled in the center?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** That is the expectation.

Q: **David Grigg:** So this can be very deep structures. 100 feet deep?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** They are in range of 30 metres. You dredge the material below it, down about 30 metres below the existing sea bed, and then you fill that back with clean competent material, and then you set the caisson structure on top of that and fill it with rock. As to where they would be built, whether that would be nearby, offsite, or somewhere, you know, else, somewhere else in the world, that is yet to be determined.

Q: **Murray Manson:** The material that you dredge down for the footing of the caisson, goes in the caisson?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** That is the current design, yes.

Q: **Murray Manson:** Also, I am looking at these fish refugia, like little portholes in the caisson?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yeah, that is the standard sort of design that is developed for caissons in this area over the past 20, 35 years.

Q: **Murray Manson:** Have you done monitoring to show fish actually going in there?

A: **Neil Turner:** The understanding is this is based somewhat on what was provided in DP3. I don’t know if it exactly the same design, but this is certainly the conceptual design have similar properties to what occurred during DP3.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** I believe the answer is yes, but we will get that answer for you whether there’s been monitoring.

Q: Murray Manson: I haven’t seen monitoring from Deltaport, but from Canada Place, the fish don’t go under these structures, salmonids in particular. So, I’d be pretty surprised if any fish is going to swim through a porthole to exist in a pitch black cavity within a caisson. I am pretty skeptical of that particular design.
A: **Cliff Stewart:** The Deltaport Third Berth project has what is called an Adaptive Management Strategy which I think is an annual review for five years on the various aspects of habitat that were developed. That is one of them.

Q: **David Grigg:** What fish want is a place to mate and feed, none of which exist in this caisson. It is a bit of a stretch.

Q: **Andrew Robinson:** Could you perhaps give a little bit more around the considerations and tradeoffs on the engineering side between the W1 and W2? I can appreciate the dredging but I am guessing it is more technical considerations that were considered.

I am not an engineer but a couple things that come to my mind is that certainly for W2 you have more infrastructure built. Pardon me, for W1, you have all the causeway, you are in deep water, which versus a tidal environment might be trickier engineering-wise. This is tradeoffs and I’m just curious to understand and appreciate what some of those might be?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, if you ignored environmental impacts for a moment, and if the material at Roberts Bank in this area was good construction material, then you might look at W2 as being a good option, because you need to dredge a ship channel, which you could then use to build the island. But from an engineering perspective, that material is not good construction material, so you would find yourself in a situation where you were dredging a large amount of material which you would need to dispose elsewhere, and then import the fill material. So, from an engineering perspective, in fact, given what actually exists out there, W2 isn’t preferred.

The other aspect of W2 which is problematic, is because of the predominant storm wind directions, although it would appear as though the ships would be more protected on W2, in fact it is more problematic for ships in big storms, because of the wind loading on the ships in a south east wind. So there are a number of things that were certainly counter intuitive to me. But it was a very interesting process to go through, because the teams were working independently, coming towards what we call the tradeoff process, and there was no tradeoff. And the engineer stood up and said, “This is what we think,” and the environmental team stood up and said, “This is what we think,” and kind of looked at each other and said, “Oh, okay,” and that was it.

The other thing about W2 from an environmental perspective is that dredge cut would intersect the zero tide line, and the best advice that we are getting from the coastal geomorphologist, is you really don’t want to have a dredge cut intersect the zero tide line if you can avoid it, because that can cause unpredictable geomorphological impacts.

So yeah, it was a very interesting process to go through because of -- and one of the things we did very early on, because when I first started working on this project about three years ago, and I was reading all of the old studies, and they all said you really should do some deep geotechnical work, because nobody quite knows if the whole thing is going to slide into the abyss when the big one hits. And so one of the first things we did was go out and do that work, because that was pretty fundamental. And the good news was, not only would the new terminal not slide in, but nor would the existing terminals, so that was nice.

And then the next thing we did was go out and do a very significant drilling program to see what the nature of the material was out there, because that was critical from an engineering perspective to how you built it. The engineers all said, “Gee, it would sure be nice if that was nice clean sand and we could just do a cut and fill balance and stick it inside the rock wall and you’re done.” Unfortunately that is not what is out there. It has got a lot of silt, so that is where
this sort of process of saying, ‘well, what do we do with this stuff we have to dredge that really isn’t very good material?’ and that is where this idea of putting that material on the bottom and then capping it. So, the average depth of the terminal is about 18 metres, and so on average, there will be about 6 metres of local material capped with about 12 meters of the river sand.

And so this project actually over the period of its construction, as designed, would consume material that is currently disposed at sea, surplus to construction demands in the Lower Mainland, and Fraser River freshet dredge material. That is where most of this will come from.

Q: David Grigg: Did they find, from that that the soils had been subjected to glacial sublimation?
A: Cliff Stewart: Are you talking about the tills?
Q: David Grigg: Yes. Oh, there are tills down there?
A: Cliff Stewart: There are tills down there, but they are very little. Everything above the tills is appeared in the last 9,000 years.
Q: David Grigg: Right, and that is going to be taken out, basically?
A: Cliff Stewart: Well, underneath the caissons it is taken out, I think it is about 30 plus metres of material taken out.
Q: David Grigg: So are we down to till level?
A: Cliff Stewart: Sorry, let me back up, we are not removing the 30 metres, we are removing a significant amount, but we are densifying the material below what is being removed. Not all the way down to till, but far enough down to prevent liquefaction, as well as lateral movement as a result of liquefaction.

Marine Terminal
Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the terminal layout and elements (page 14 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Eric Aderneck: What proportion of goods are coming and going through the Roberts Bank now on train versus truck, and is that going to change in the future?
A: Cliff Stewart: Currently it is 65 to 70 percent direct to rail on the terminal for imports. It depends, it is a little higher Roberts Bank, a little lower at the inner harbour terminals, but that is the direction we see this growing. For the cargo, for the 30 to 35 percent which leaves by truck, about five to ten percent leaves the region by truck. The other 20 to 30 percent goes to some form of value added handling in the region, and then direct to rail, usually within 72 hours. And there two types of value-added handling, called ‘transloading’. The first is where you take three existing marine containers, with sort of three types of commodity, and you transload them into three other marine containers where you do a mix of each of the three. So you take a container full of beach umbrellas, a container full of bathing suits, and a container full of beer coolers, and you transload them into three containers for three different destinations in each of which have beach umbrellas, bathing suits and beer containers. So that is one type of transloading.

The other type of transloading is the one where you take three marine containers, and you transload them into two 53-foot domestic rail containers. The bulk of the containers that leave
the terminal by truck are going to go through some form of transload. So that is the import question.

The export question, of those 70 boxes that went east by rail, plus the other 20 to 25 that got loaded to rail after being handled locally that come back to the marine terminal, about a third of them have export goods in them. The other two thirds come off as empties on the marine terminal. Of that, the majority then go back out the gate on a truck, empty, to be stuffed with an export commodity whether it be pulp, or lumber, or panel products, agricultural products in the local gateway, and then they come back by truck again, and they leave by vessel. The balance is about 52 percent imports, to 48 percent exports. The imports are almost all loaded, and the exports are, probably depending on which shipping line you are talking to, somewhere between 75 and 85 percent loaded. And the limitation on that tends to be that import boxes weigh about 14 tonnes, and export boxes weigh about 24 tonnes, so the ships tend to gross out before they cube out. So they put as many paying containers on as they can, and then fill up the rest with empties.

Q: Eric Aderneck: So when the new ships come here, are they at capacity in terms of the number of units they can weight or carry?

A: Cliff Stewart: Yeah, they tend to be, but not by weight, but cube. So, in other words, every slot is full, with a loaded container, and when they leave, every slot is full, and they weigh just as much as they did when they came in.

Q: Eric Aderneck: Because we export stuff that is heavy?

A: Cliff Stewart: Exactly. There is about a 10 tonne differential in the gross weight of the container for a loaded import, to a loaded import. So you bring in a container full of running shoes, and you are sending out a container full of lumber.

Q: David Grigg: The latest projection for climate change effect on wave structures, is that the height will increase roughly 0.7 - 1 metre including wave effect. So, has that been taken into account on the causeway?

A: Cliff Stewart: Yes. Not on the causeway, because we are not rebuilding the causeway.

Q: David Grigg: The direct offset from that is what happens in terms -- I presume we are talking about double stacked containers on train yards.

A: Cliff Stewart: Yes.

Q: David Grigg: The clearing between the double stacking and the underside of the overpasses, are we going to lose the ability in time to -- or do we have to change the infrastructure?

A: Cliff Stewart: No, there isn't an expectation of increasing the height of the causeway, because the majority of the impact is a wave impact, and the causeway, the part that we are building, tends to be on what I will call the protected side. So, we've looked at that. The terminal itself is being built with that in function, so it will be slightly higher than Deltaport, but the causeway itself, there isn't an intention to do a general increase in height of the causeway.

Marine Terminal

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the tradeoffs between potential locations of the terminal intermodal yard (page 15 of the Discussion Guide).
Q: *Eric Aderneck*: How many acres is all of T2?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: If you look on page 17, top right, there is about 210 hectares of which about 190 is direct impact. I think the terminal itself is about 150 hectares, and the causeway I think is about 40 give or take. And then the coastal geomorphologists have said that there is probably another 20 hectares of indirect effect, so that is something that would result from coastal processes.

Q: *Murray Manson*: So that is Alternative 1A, right? 210 hectares?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Yeah, 1A and 1B aren’t significantly different.

Q: *Murray Manson*: Okay, and then what about Alternative 2?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: We haven’t done a lot of work on it, but it is probably about, I think it is 80 to 90 hectares in total. So where alternative 1A would impact about 10 hectares give or take of uplands in addition to works already proposed for other projects. For Alternative 2, we haven’t designed it, so we don’t know for sure, but in theory it would be about another 80 hectares uplands, and an equivalent reduction in the marine environment.

C: *Murray Manson*: In terms of looking at marine environment impacts, it seems pretty attractive to me to try and minimize that. Assuming that no net loss policy continues with Fisheries and Oceans, there is significant cost to the compensation requirements for 130 extra hectares by building it in the marine area.

C: *Cliff Stewart*: It is interesting. We actually did that as a ‘thought exercise’, because the assumption is that it is cheap to do it upland and expensive to do it in the water. And when you look at the combination of acquiring the land, uplands, doing all the fill and geotechnical work that is required, because really what is currently farmland upland is floodplain, and you can’t build on a floodplain, so the cost of acquiring land, the cost of essentially improving the land uplands, doing the agricultural mitigation because there is agricultural mitigation upland, just like there is habitat mitigation in the water, it is more costly to build in the marine environment once you figure in the mitigation, but it is only a factor of about a third to a half more. So it costs about -- for every 67 cents that it costs you to build the land uplands, it costs you a dollar to build in the marine environment. So it is not a cost driver, particularly. Certainly that is not an insignificant difference, but there are other considerations, and that is why we are asking the question, because certainly from someone who is in your line of work, that would be obvious. For people who are very interested in farmland, their answer might be obvious, and we just want to get feedback from the community at large. We think we know what the answer is, but we are interested to know what everyone thinks.

Q: *Murray Manson*: Do you have any other avenues to reduce the size of that terminal area, even with alternate 1A? I mean, I notice you have got parking out there. I don’t know how significant the area designated parking would be?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: The driver for the footprint tends to be the length of the berth and the depth required for the container yard and the rail facility. You know, there certainly could be nibbles here and there, but you are not going to have a significant impact on the overall footprint.

Q: *Murray Manson*: So that the artist’s rendition, that big picture, and there is two -- it looks like the road on the north sort of splits the two areas, it seems to be little tiny dots, what are those?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Those are rail tracks with container trains on them.
Q: Anne Murray: I just need a bit more clarification too. On the artist rendition, is the part in the middle then is that part of the intermodal yard?

A: Cliff Stewart: No, this part in the middle, this area here is what is called the container yard. So that is the place the containers go to rest between modes. So, if they are coming off the ship, they land there. If they are coming off truck or rail they land there, and then they move in the opposite direction, either to the ship or from the ship.

Q: Anne Murray: So that is not the part you are talking about putting upland?

A: Cliff Stewart: No, the part we are talking about possibly putting upland is this area in the back, so these two parallel lines here. But you don’t give up all of that land, because if you are going to put the rail upland, then you still have to have somewhere to load the whatever vehicles are moving the containers from the terminal to the upland, and it is definitely a tradeoff, as between land operating costs, greenhouse gasses – there is a whole range of tradeoffs that have to be considered for that. But in general, it is about 80 hectares that could move, not only from there, but also from the causeway, if you were to put an uplands facility.

Q: Anne Murray: So, have you got studies ongoing on the impact of the different alternatives?

A: Cliff Stewart: No, because at this point we aren’t proposing alternatives. All we are proposing is this, but we are asking whether there is an interest in us pursuing that further.

Q: Anne Murray: Okay, so you are adopting alternative 1A unless you hear otherwise? That is your favorite one, is 1A, which is have you have shown there?

A: Cliff Stewart: Yes.

Habitat Replacement

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding environmental impacts and habitat replacement (page 17 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Murray Manson: I think an additional component of this is the Species At Risk Act, which is relevant because of the critical habitat for the southern residents.

A: Cliff Stewart: Right.

Q: Murray Manson: The preconditions for issuing a SARA permit, for impacting critical habitat, would require a few questions be answered. And one of them I think that is important is have you considered all alternatives, all reasonable alternatives to the proposal. So, you know, that is going to be a significant component of DFO issuing a SARA permit is to how well we can answer those questions. You know, in some cases, you know, where SARA is not relevant, because there isn't critical habitat, there may not be as close attention to those issues, but that is something that needs to be considered here.

A: Cliff Stewart: Absolutely.

Yeah, and just a reminder for everybody, this consultation is very early in the process. At the earliest we wouldn’t expect to be commencing the formal EA process until sort of the middle of next year, sort of late spring, early summer. And so a lot of the things that Murray is talking about will need to be addressed during the EA process which we expect will take probably about four to five years. And certainly species at risk is one of the critical issues, is inextricably linked to habitat for their food sources, and obviously that is an issue here at Roberts Bank, as well as
coastal and migratory birds and bird species at risk. So, what I would like to do is maybe move in to that conversation a little more.

Q: *Dave Bedwell:* On the railroad and rail traffic considerations, we say we are doing 1,850 trips in and out today?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* No, that is what we expect to be doing by the time DTRRIP is in place. So today it is about 1,500. By the time DTRRIP is built, we expect it will be about 1,850 and then T2 would add another 1,850 trips.

Q: *Dave Bedwell:* So my question is: has short-sea shipping been considered, with an underutilized terminal in Fraser Surrey Docks?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes.

Q: *Dave Bedwell:* Today, we are running at 80 percent capacity of the terminal space. And terminals today have more or less reached their capacity. We have a huge issue with trucks today. We have got Fraser Surrey Docks which is underutilized. Has the port considered the potential to work with the terminal operators to move empties off the dock by a barge, out to terminals that are underutilized? Bring exports back to those off docks, Fraser Surrey, Coast 2000? Bring those barges back to the terminal? Reducing the green impact, reducing the number of trucks?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* What we’ve done with respect to Terminal 2 is we’ve designed it to allow for. It doesn’t show on the artist’s rendering but on the left-hand side of the terminal as you are facing it from the ocean, the north end if you will, it is designed to allow for the implementation of a short-sea shipping barge facility.

I know the federal government just announced yesterday additional funding to incent short-sea shipping. Until the market believes that there are fundamentals that make that work, or until the right combination of road and rail and facilities comes to pass -- Fraser Surrey is a good example, it is a good alternative.

C: *Dave Bedwell:* It is a good alternative. You know, your timeline here is 2020 - 2024.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Yeah, so the facility is designed to allow that, if that makes sense in five years, but at this point, if you take those boxes up by barge, and you still have to load them on a truck and drive them somewhere else, the economics kind of don’t work.

Q: *Dave Bedwell:* Yeah, see I think that is something that has to be challenged. Because you know the truck rates are relatively expensive going to and from, so the more truck moves versus the number of cans you can put on a barge, there might be some logistics there?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* The numbers that we have here for traffic are worst case. They are assuming no change from current behaviors. Fifty percent of trucks are running empty, so you can get a significant increase in container movement without adding any more truck trips, simply by having each truck go out to the terminal with a box on, and come back from the terminal with a box on.

There is a whole separate initiative that the port is undertaking and it talks about it on page 19. I am not the right guy to talk about it because there is a team whose full time life that is. But if people are interested, we are happy to set something up that is looking to deal with exactly that problem: How do we make better use of the truck trips that are out there today. If we were to
increase to 80 percent utilization of the existing trucks today, we could do the DTRRIP project for example, not with an increase in traffic, but with a reduction in traffic.

And I mentioned earlier, a decade ago there were 4,000 trucks doing all this work. Today we are doing it with 2,000 trucks and doing a lot more of it. So there is lots of additional work to be done there. To a certain extent, although we are showing worst case numbers here, our expectations is that we will have solved that problem, or we will have wrung all of the efficiencies out of the trucking system and if short sea-shipping is an answer, that answer will have come to pass long before T2 comes along. And the design allows for it, so if it makes sense, it can simply be essentially bolted on as part of what gets built.

Compensation for Loss of Agricultural Productivity

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding compensation for loss of agricultural productivity (page 19 of the Discussion Guide).

Q:  
David Grigg: The upland area is or was in the Agricultural Land Reserve?

A:  
Cliff Stewart: It is.

Q:  
David Grigg: Is it not correct to say that that's within the Tsawwassen First Nations land and therefore not subject to the ALR regulations?

A:  
Cliff Stewart: No. That's a whole separate conversation. There are lands within the Tsawwassen First Nation which are industrial lands. Previously agricultural but now industrial. There is an opportunity, again we've assumed that all the traffic that is needed to support T2 goes driving right by those lands to somewhere else. Obviously if those lands come into industrial use in support of container traffic for container works, that significantly reduces traffic impact. We haven't made that assumption.

Again we've taken the most conservative case which is current practices, trucks are going somewhere else, North Delta or Surrey or Richmond, and so there are lots of opportunities to reduce or mitigate from that base. But with respect to agricultural land being converted to industrial use, it is strictly -- for the purposes of this design it's strictly those rail lands within what's called the option lands that are owned by BC Rail. And some very minor other bits.

Q:  
David Grigg: So it's difficult for me to understand who owns what here. So those optional lands are not in the TFN?

A:  
Cliff Stewart: No. They're owned by BC Rail. They are within the Agricultural Land Reserve but they actually have been designated as a rail right-of-way by the Agricultural Land Commission and then there would need to be an approval to actually construct the rail on them.

And it's an important distinction but transportation is an improved use of agricultural land but the construction of it is subject to approval by the Land Commission and part of the quid pro quo for that approval is some form of mitigation and so the purpose of that question is what do you think is in? And I'll give you some examples.

Irrigation is a problem in Delta. The majority of irrigation water comes into those irrigation ditches from low down the Fraser River. There's solidity issues so there's a program in Delta now, in Ladner, to develop a better quality -- it's a deep, deep-drilled water wells. So one of the things that people are talking about today is if we could extend that system to Westham Island, we can improve agriculture in Westham Island. So that is the type of mitigation that some
people are proposing. Put money into deep wells, which gets good irrigation water to Westham Island so you take an existing agricultural footprint and you increase the productivity of it by increasing irrigation.

So for those who are in the know on agricultural issues, what do you think is the best way to increase agricultural productivity?

C: *David Grigg*: You're probably aware of that report by UBC that suggests that that area of Delta, in time, will become inundated by saline water. It's going to be a problem.

C: *Cliff Stewart*: And that's what the program is designed to do, is to actually improve the quality of the irrigation water, because what's happening today is it's being irrigated with slightly brackish water. So if you start irrigating with clear water, you stop that problem and over time you begin to clean it up.

**Environmental Assessment Process**

Rhona Hunter and Cliff Stewart provided an overview of the environmental assessment process (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Anne Murray*: Has there ever been any consideration of a feasibility study on opening the causeway to allow tidal flushing?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: You're talking about breaching the causeway? I know there's been conversations about it. I don't know what the results of those are.

A: *Neil Turner*: I don't know if there's a specific feasibility study that are being created and conclusions reached but I know the question has been raised. It hasn't advanced any further than discussion at this point that we're at.

C: *Cliff Stewart*: We can certainly get the answer for that.

Q: *David Grigg*: I guess it's kind of somewhat the same question. It's likely that there'd be a greater amount of siltation between the new terminal and the shore. I'm not saying it's definite that that's been what happened in Phase 1. So what that does, I guess, is reduce the opportunities for small fish to be protected from the sun and you know, there aren't more opportunities for the birds there to feed on the fish. There is no requirement to directly protect that area for small fish to rest before migration. How are you going to adjudicate the net benefits there? I mean I'm sure that the birds will get an increase in biofilm opportunity feeding habitat but for the fish, it seems like a bit of a negative. How are you going to mitigate that?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: So we are in early stages of the process and we're establishing baseline. So we're not at a place now where we're establishing mitigation or even impact at this point. So it's premature to speculate what the potential mitigation or in fact what the impact would be as a result of the baseline but considerations to coastal geomorphology, considerations to fish, fish habitat are all part of that assessment and will be address and proposed as part of our environmental assessment process.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: And the coastal geomorphologists have identified about 20 hectares of what you've just described. These are areas that would likely change as a result of this construction, over and above the construction itself.
And certainly not withstanding what you said about C-38 not requiring specific protection of the habitat, the fishery itself, you may not have to protect their habitat, you have to protect them. So it effectively nets out to the same result.

Q: **David Grigg:** Yeah and I was really thinking in terms of the resident cutthroat in the salt marshes areas. They’re not really considered a commercial species of direct consequence to people required to live to live on them. So they have perhaps less protection than say chum or coho. So I’m just wondering how the heck you can do that.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, that would be a great feedback comment from you for us to recognize and then we would respond to that as part of the consideration memo.

C: **Murray Manson:** A little clarification. The new act, I mean it’s a change as to how fish habitat is protected but it still contains the same definition of habitat. It still has provisions for protection of fish habitat.

Q: **David Grigg:** Even though they may not be commercial or economic value?

A: **Murray Manson:** Commercial, recreational and aboriginal. So coastal cutthroat, they are still a recreational fishery. It remains to be seen how well the new wording in the act is going to protect fish like coastal cutthroat. But I mean they’re still intended to be protected. I think we’re not going to know the extent to which they’re protected until cases go to court and then there’s case law which is where the ultimate test is going to be.

Q: **David Grigg:** And it’s a species at risk to some extent, is it not?

A: **Murray Manson:** Not federally, no.

**Community Legacy Benefits**

*Cliff Stewart provided an overview of the community legacy benefits consultation topic (page 20 of the Discussion Guide), as well as information regarding the timing of future consultation phases (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).*

Q: **Eric Aderneck:** Obviously there’s growth in trade but there’s also the trend for more container use. So on this chart, how much of this is because of the trend towards more container use versus more trade coming in, and what about the other terminal s that are non-containers?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** It is all built in there. The kind of trade you are talking about that converts from primarily what is called break bulk. And break bulk tends to be on the export side, and be things like packaged lumber, pulp, ingot metals, what is called project cargoes. So if somebody is building a manufacturing plant, equipment comes in, it is palletized. That is the type of thing that has tended to convert in recent years. Most of things that 30 or 40 years ago was what I would call ‘goods movement’, that is pretty much already in containers. So although there is some scope for transition to containerization, most of the growth in the next two decades is expected to be simply from growth and trade. Although there is some conversion left, there is not much more.

Q: **Eric Aderneck:** And then for the capacity for T1 at Roberts Bank, is there potential to have more throughput there with increases to the road, infrastructure, other equipment?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yeah, so that is a project called the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project. And we are working with TSI – and Mike is here from TSI – and BC Rail,
and the operating railways as partners to develop that project. It is shown on this graph as DTRRIP. We expect to deliver about a 33 percent increase in the capacity that is there today.

We have about a million and a half TEUs running through Deltaport last year and this year. There is some work that can be done in advance of DTRRIP, we think that the capacity of that terminal is about 1.8 million TEUs. So there is about another 300,000 TEUs of growth that can happen between now and 2015 if the demand is there. DTRRIP then takes that from 1.8 million, up to 2.4 million TEUs.

We think today, and for the foreseeable future, that 800,000 per berth is about the capacity of a three-berth terminal. That is what these guys have is a three-berth terminal. So when you unpick the other bottlenecks, you can get up to about 2.4 million, and then the next place you need to go is to build a new terminal. Unfortunately, while it would be a good idea, particularly for existing operators to build those terminals one berth at a time, it is very difficult to operate a one-berth terminal, because shipping lines want the flexibility to come in when they are supposed to come in, or some other time, so you need at least two berths. So, we are assuming that the second terminal would be delivered as a three-berth terminal in 2024. It is possible it would open slightly earlier as a two-berth terminal, as there is flexibility there.

Q: Shelina Sidi: I have a question related to the use of shore power for vessels while they are at anchor. If there is any consideration as part of the design to have that --

A: Cliff Stewart: Yes, the Terminal 2 has been designed with shore power as an integral part of the facility. Our assumption is that sometime between now and then, shore power will become a reality here. There will be some form of retrofit. When the third berth was built at Deltaport, it was built to accommodate shore power.

There are a number of hurdles that need to be cleared before shore power becomes a reality. The irony of, I mentioned earlier, the Emissions Control Area, which reduces sulfur content. So, ECA from an emissions perspective reduces the need for shore power, but because it makes the fuel so much more expensive, it makes it more attractive to a shipping line operator.

Q: Shelina Sidi: Yes, but there are also other contaminants that are of concern, like nitrogen oxides as well, so can kind of take care of that if you had shore power available.

A: Cliff Stewart: Yeah, and frankly, noise is a big, big issue. And shore power addresses the noise issue. So we expect that shore power for existing facilities will be a reality in the timeframe of developing this facility, and this facility is designed with shore power in mind.

Q: Shelina Sidi: In terms of the studies, we already have a lot of activity going on at Deltaport, so are you going to be looking at the cumulative impacts of all the activities going on there?

A: Neil Turner: Yes, this is formally part of the EA process, is to consider the cumulative effects.

Q: David Bedwell: Who is funding the project?

A: Cliff Stewart: Well, I can tell you who is not funding it. Taxpayers are not funding it.

Q: David Bedwell: Okay. And my second question is: What is the forecast percentage of funding from each of those people who are going to be proposed funders, i.e. federal, provincial, port metro, stakeholder, railroads etcetera?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: Federal: zero, Provincial: zero. Railroads need to provide their own infrastructure to the gate, and the actual facility plus mitigation of the facility will be some combination of Port Metro and private investors, but it is effectively private.

Q: **David Bedwell**: So you are going to build a brand new terminal?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Well no, we are not going to build a brand new terminal until somebody says they want to fund that brand new terminal.

Q: **David Bedwell**: Right, okay, but the groundwork of making an island that is ready to have gantries and be paved -- what is your completion, before you put it out to Maersk or, you know, APM or somebody like that?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: The port’s commitment is to take it through the environmental permitting process. What we would invest in during that time, independent of that process, we are investing in a habitat bank. But beyond that, the third-party commercial financing needs to be there.

And that is a really good question, because I know there are a lot of folks who think that the fix is in, and this is going to be built no matter what. This will only be built if the market demand satisfies private investors that there is a return on that investment.

Q: **Eric Aderneck**: So that party would own the facility, not the port?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: It is expected that the port would ultimately own it, but the business model in this port tends to be long-term leases, so in essence, it would be in return for some combination of partners who would build and operate the facility, they would get a long-term tenure to do that.

Q: **David Grigg**: My question relates to the causeway, particularly the rail traffic. The access is through the BC Rail right-of-way, is that correct? Now how does that work with CN or CPR? Do they have the right to use that corridor without any kind of levy or a tax or freight payment charge?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: So that was two questions, let me answer those first. Any railroad that signs an agreement has a right to use that corridor, and they pay to use it.

Q: **David Grigg**: So, you know, the change with CPR in that direction, and the competitiveness with CN, and is there a possibility at a future date that CPR will say, “We’d like to build our own rail corridor to the terminal?”

A: **Cliff Stewart**: I couldn’t speculate on what they might want to do. I am not sure why they would want to do that, given that there is a rail corridor that they can use for the price of paying to use it.

I personally can’t foresee a situation where someone could put a new rail corridor through the communities of Delta, Surrey, and Langley. I may lack vision, but I can’t see how it would happen, or frankly why it would happen, because there is enough capacity on the existing corridor for anything anybody has ever envisaged. I mean it is a single track today. There is sufficient width in that corridor to double track it, but nothing that is being proposed here would drive a requirement to double track it. So that would be likely to happen long before anyone would build another corridor.

Q: **David Grigg**: Only if BCR decided to hike up the rates, they’d basically have the monopoly to the terminal?
A: Cliff Stewart: The nature of BC Rail, as a government entity is designed exactly to protect against that. It is designed to provide open access essentially at the cost of providing it.

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

The meeting ended at 10:50am.