Appendix 3
Small Group Meeting Notes
Notes from a small group meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 8, 5:00pm – 7:00pm, at the Coast Tsawwassen Inn, Delta, B.C.

Stakeholders:

- Julie Hobart, Citizens Against Port Expansion
- Angela Emsley
- Anne Murray
- Barb Wallick, Reach Child and Youth Development Society
- Bob Miller
- Carol Vignale, Delta Environment Advisory Committee
- Cheryl Koskoski
- David Colledge, Colledge Transportation Consulting Inc.
- David Jones, Against Port Expansion
- Don Pateman
- Doug Massey
- Grant Dumbleton
- Farida Bishay
- Fred McCague
- Ian Robertson
- Jean Wightman
- Jim Ormesher
- Ken Koskoski
- Linda McKay
- Nav Brar
- Marty Rempel
- Patrick Thompson
- Peter Duffey
- Peter Miller
- Peter Szikai
- Philip Hochstein, Independent Contractors & Businesses Association
- Ralph Howey
- Ray Christopherson
- Renie D’Aquila, Reach Child and Youth Development Society
- Rob McGreen
- Rodney Asher, Citizens Against Port Expansion
- Roger Emsley, Against Port Expansion
- Susan Jones
- Sylvia Denz
- Ted Leake
- Vic Rivers
The record notes that the meeting commenced at 5:02pm

KEY THEMES:

- Participants asked for more information regarding Port Metro Vancouver’s mandate and responsibilities to the Canadian public.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding the validity Port Metro Vancouver’s container traffic forecast, and requested more information regarding container traffic and forecast data.
- Participants expressed concern that other alternatives to the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project have not been adequately considered, including Fraser Surrey Docks and the Port of Prince Rupert.
- Participants expressed concern regarding the scope and nature of the environmental assessment process, particularly as it relates to justification for the project.
- Some participants wanted more information regarding the consequences of not building the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project if the container traffic forecasts are accurate and the additional capacity is required.
- Participants questioned whether the road and rail network could handle the increased traffic anticipated as part of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

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

1. **Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk**

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

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

   Rhona Hunter reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including ways to participate in the consultation and how this consultation feedback is considered by Port Metro Vancouver. She then gave an outline of the information presented in the consultation discussion guide.
Q: **Paul Miller**: What does “sustainable development” mean to the port of Vancouver?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: Port Metro Vancouver has undertaken to answer that question from a corporate standpoint. I’m not going to say that it’s a simple answer, because it’s a very complex question and we certainly don’t have five or six words that describe “sustainable development” for the port. But we are working on a number of sustainable development initiatives around the port business itself. We also have initiatives that we are working on as part of Port 2050, which looks towards what the port needs to be in order to be a viable entity and business going forward into 2050. We have other initiatives like shore power, which looks at how we can decrease the footprint of the port’s business itself.

There is a lot of information around sustainability that the port has sort of brought together under its sustainable development umbrella. And I think that probably the best thing to do would be to direct you to our website where we have some more details around that. I don’t have a lot of details right here to provide.

Q: **Judy Kirk**: Sarah, do you have any more information about sustainable development?

A: **Sarah McPherson**: To Rhona’s point, there are a number of things that we do corporately as a company. In addition to do that, we’re looking at things to do with air, land, and water. We have the Air Action Program where we look at different incentives for shipping lines in terms of using cleaner burning fuels with lower sulfur levels.

On the land side, we certainly look at working with our tenants and those who do lease property from the Port around their sustainability practices, including the type of equipment that they use on their properties, and how that might minimize emissions or other environmental impacts.

On the water side, we have things as diverse as a marine mammal program looking at some areas of the Georgia Strait, and the inlet in particular, trying to clean up water discharge from ships.

These are a number of the ways that we work with those who lease our lands, those who visit the port, and also ourselves from our own corporate footprint standpoint.

C: **Roger Emsley**: Let’s get down to specifics and basics. The generally accepted definition of sustainable development involves three things: economics, the environment, and socio-community. It then goes on to state that sustainable development means keeping those in balance. Port Metro Vancouver constantly skews their definition of sustainable development towards the economics. The environment and socio-community values come a poor second and third, and if there were another ten, they would be nine and ten.

Q: **Ray Christopherson**: Something caught my eye as I began to read the document here. On page 1 or 2, it says the intent of this discussion guide is to “Provide information about the importance and complexity of container trade through Metro Vancouver, and the reasons why Roberts Bank is well suited to accommodate future growth.” Are you going to talk to us tonight about T3 and T4 further down the road? Or is this just Terminal 2?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: No, we are just here tonight to talk about the Roberts Bank Terminal 2.

Q: **Ray Christopherson**: Who has provided your mandate for what is being proposed? The Minister of Transport in Ottawa? Mr. Silvester, the Chairman of Port Metro Vancouver?
A: **Judy Kirk**: I think it would be fair to say it would be the board of Port Metro Vancouver.

Q: **Ray Christopherson**: I see. Could we have the names of the people on this board?

A: **Sarah McPherson**: The names of the Board of Directors for Port Metro Vancouver are available on the website [www.portmetrovancouver.com](http://www.portmetrovancouver.com).

C: **Susan Jones**: Just a clarification. Terminal 2 is three new berths. Not one berth; it’s three new berths. And that should be made clear and it’s not in here. Its doubling what’s already out there.

Q: **Peter Duffey**: I don’t see in this document any reference to planning for the inevitable and generally accepted sea level rise and possible earthquake. Would you like to tell me how this is being addressed in the design of the port?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: If I can ask you to hold onto that question, we are going to get into the design of the port itself, the actual land mass, and we can address that question at that time.

Q: **Doug Massey**: I was wondering why you are proceeding at the moment without knowing the results of whether or not they’re going to carry out a full environmental impact study on the proposal beforehand. I mean, is it a foregone conclusion? I mean, you’re not even going to act on that? Because, you know, you are moving forward as if they’ve already approved it.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: Again, we’re getting a little bit ahead of ourselves. We’ll get a little bit more into that when we describe where we are within the environmental assessment process. But in order to even initiate the application to the agencies to put forward this project, there is a certain amount of work that has to be done in order to develop what’s called the Project Description, which is the formal document which has been submitted to both the federal and provincial agencies.

Q: **Doug Massey**: Who’s asking to provide feedback by October 15th, whether or not to proceed with a full environmental impact study? I don’t understand why you haven’t determined that first.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: Good question. And it has to do with the fact that there are two separate consultation occurrences that are going on at the same time here. And I think that as we move through the discussion guide, we do actually have a section in there that we talk about what’s happening within the Port Metro Vancouver-led consultation process, and what is being done through the regulator-led CEAA federal agency as well as the BCEAO, which is the provincial agency.

Q: **Linda McKay**: My comment is very specific and it involves the environmental assessment process and what major categories would be included.

One of my major concerns is that the health assessment, where the impact of these operations and the growing container operations with Terminal 2, and possibly going on further to make a Roberts Bank port a major entity. I don’t see any health assessment here, and I think that is a very major factor. I recognize all the rest of the stuff, which is biological, involves our environment in terms of our impact to wildlife, marine and the land. I don’t see any assessment being mentioned here to assess the health impacts. And I really would like that addressed, because it certainly isn’t flagged very clearly, and I think that’s a very major element for us here.
A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Would you be okay if we wait until we get to that section of the discussion guide, to dive a little bit more deeply into that? We can provide some more information around that at that time.

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

*Rhona Hunter* provided an overview of container handling at Port Metro Vancouver, and also described some of the different participants in the supply chain, including trucking companies (page 5-7 of the Discussion Guide).

Q:  *Susan Jones:* Imports by containers are a money-making venture all around. The export containers -- some of that material, am I correct, going out, doesn’t need containers? It’s just more convenient. There is not a lot of money particularly in the container business with exports, it’s a good way to export, but isn’t that a way of getting the extra containers used again? I’m asking about the value of exports in containers.

Q:  *Judy Kirk:* I think you’re asking why lumber, pulp, and wheat are put in containers?

Q:  *Susan Jones:* Well, I know why it’s in containers, because it’s convenient. I’m just saying it’s not particularly economical in terms of making money.

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* So, I’m not a shipper, but I’m going to say that if it’s not economical, they wouldn’t be doing it.

Q:  *Susan Jones:* Could you say how much you make on an export container versus an import container.

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* I can’t. I would say that if the port has a tariff on import and export containers, we can probably find that information for you. But I don’t know what that tariff is on one or the other.

Q:  *Roger Emsley:* You talk about 20-foot and 40-foot containers. I want to talk about 45s and 53s. There seem to be a growing number of 45s, and some 53s as well. Why haven’t you covered that? And can we please get a breakdown of the number of 20s, 40s, 45s and 53s, empty and full? What is the trend? Because that impacts a whole number of things, including the productivity of the port terminals.

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* We do actually talk a little bit further on about 53s when we talk about rail. Because 53-footers have to do with rail transportation. But we can certainly see if we can get some information regarding the breakdown of the container sizes that are going through the port.

Q:  *David Jones:* I was interested in this data on the trucks. That’s pretty interesting. I mean, 8% of the total articulated trucks are actually container trucks? That’s 2,000 out of 24,000?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Yes.

Q:  *David Jones:* But you know, the port’s very quick to claim credit for almost all economic activity in Western Canada. I think they say 128,000 jobs, and there’s really only a tiny fraction of those that are really port jobs. How many of these 22,000 trucks that are not licensed to carry containers would not be running if it wasn’t for the port? Aren’t you trying to have your cake and eat it too?
Q: Judy Kirk: I think what you’re saying is, look, if it wasn’t for the port, and for trade, and perhaps trans-shipment and packing and unpacking, at least some of those other trucks wouldn’t be on the road?

Q: David Jones: Right. You like to claim the port indirectly provides some hundreds of thousands of jobs that are not directly connected to the port. Surely most of those trucks wouldn’t be on the road if it wasn’t for the port.

C: Judy Kirk: Fair comment. I’m not sure Rhona has got the answer.

Q: Linda McKay: I’m not sure if I’m getting ahead of myself, but we have here a current operating statistic saying that there are currently, and I emphasize the word “currently”, 2,000 trucks licensed in the Truck Licensing System. I’m wondering what the projections are with Terminal 2 being completed. How many licensed trucks are there going to be? I think on page 24 it talks about truck trips. But I’m looking for how many additional licensed trucks there would be?

A: Judy Kirk: We have noted that for follow up.

Q: Ray Christopherson: Related to this business of containers, unloading and loading and what-not, do you discuss elsewhere where that kind of activity is going to take place? Has that been planned for as part of the Terminal 2 project?

A: Judy Kirk: We do get to that later in the guide.

**Why Do We Need Trucks?**

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of why trucks are used to transport containers to and from transload facilities in the Lower Mainland, and also described some of the reasons for transloading import and export cargo (page 8-9 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Doug Massey: What difference would it make if you were to have an inland terminal as opposed to handling containers in Vancouver? Would that reduce the amount of handling they have in the port, as opposed to having a central distribution centre?

A: Rhona Hunter: So with the current businesses that we went through on page 6 and under the current logistics system, an inland container terminal would not be viable.

Q: Doug Massey: Is there a study out showing that? Who decides that?

A: Rhona Hunter: I think it’s something that has been a conversation that’s going on. I think Ashcroft is what you’re talking about, right? They’re still trying to figure out how it might work themselves. My understanding is that they still don’t have many answers around the logistics of containers. So I think they’re the ones that probably would have the studies that would show that it either worked or didn’t work.

Q: Doug Massey: Why is everybody going in a different direction, and not combining all of their efforts on this issue?

A: Judy Kirk: You should know, sir, that the Mayor of Delta did raise this issue with the Port today. I just think that’s probably of interest to you.

C: Ray Christopherson: I’d like to make one point clear, or at least have you make it clear. The Terminal 2 Project, or project which is described here and which we’re talking about, is a fait accompli. All we’re talking about are the bits and pieces around the edge.
C: Judy Kirk: I think if you had the environmental assessment people here they would say “no, it’s not”.

Q: Ray Christopherson: Are you meaning to tell me that there is a chance that Terminal 2 might not go ahead?

A: Judy Kirk: Yes. I think there is absolutely a chance of that.

C: Susan Jones: I think it’s erroneous to say that Ashcroft is not a viable business that would solve some of the problems of the trucks on the road. Ashcroft has presented a business case and Port Metro Vancouver should know more about it and should be working with them. I think you err greatly when you say it’s not viable.

Q: Peter Duffey: Many people believe that the port, in its propaganda campaign to justify Terminal 2, the Port has overstepped the figures. And in particular they are confusing in the way they are produced. And I think we all are entitled to see a breakdown of each port, and what the growth rate is in Vancouver, Prince Rupert, elsewhere, and to see how that compares with the growth rate. The figures were wildly out in 2006 when you did an assessment, which quite clearly was completely wrong in terms of the growth rate. This whole project is based on need and I don’t think the need is necessarily demonstrated here.

Why Roberts Bank?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of various geographic options for container terminals, and an overview of the existing and planned infrastructure at Roberts Bank (page 10-11 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Peter Szikai: Are Prince Rupert and Squamish collaborators with Port Metro Vancouver, or are they competitors? Do you work in cooperation with them to solve the entire problem, or are you competing with them for business?

A: Rhona Hunter: They are not really competitors in that the markets are fairly delineated in terms of both who services the Port of Prince Rupert and who services Vancouver. We are two distinct port authorities. We do look towards Prince Rupert as being part of the success of trade on the West Coast and in the Pacific Gateway. Their capacity is required and we are looking to them to be able to bring forward and deliver the capacity that they have planned on their books, because that has been included in the projections and the forecasts that demonstrate a need for this capacity.

Q: Judy Kirk: What about Squamish?

A: Rhona Hunter: Squamish doesn’t have a container port. So they’re not in the container business.

Q: Peter Szikai: So if Prince Rupert and Port Metro are separate authorities, who do these two authorities report to? Do they report to the same body?

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes, they do. They report to the Minister of Transportation.

Q: Roger Emsley: There is little mention in here – although there is some more information in the detailed project description – about possible expansion in the Inner Harbour. There is a rumour that at least one, if not both, of the current operators in the Inner Harbour want to expand, but Port Metro Vancouver keeps brushing them off. Can we get some commentary on that, please?
A: **Rhona Hunter:** There was significant expansion of both Vanterm and Centerm in 2005. We continue to see, at their own initiative, operational efficiencies within their terminals. There are also some major road and rail infrastructure improvements taking place on the south shore of Burrard Inlet, which the Port is leading and which will again address efficiencies on those terminals themselves. There are no planned expansions on those terminals at this date. The primary restrictor is long-term leases of adjacent property and ownership of adjacent property in that area. But no, the Port is not discouraging development there.

C: **Susan Jones:** You mentioned deep water. We don’t have deep water there. We have to dredge, which is just drastic. We have Vancouver Harbour, which is deep. We have Prince Rupert, which is deep. We have no business dredging to create deep water where we don’t have it. Vanterm and Centerm, they do have plans for expansion. DP World is doing a business report in the paper about wanting to do an expansion. They announced to their customers that they’re planning to expand because these individual ports are in competition with each other. So yes, Port Metro Vancouver is squashing them, and not encouraging them, and not helping them. Then there is this cozy deal to try and develop Roberts Bank when it’s not needed. We have plenty of capacity, and they have plenty of plans. Surrey Fraser Docks said with very little money they can take a lot more containers, too.

Q: **Doug Massey:** Well, I guess my point is that it’s quite clear over the last little while, and we’ve got in here, about moving the George Massey Tunnel. I’m trying to understand whether you are at the present time, as Port Metro Vancouver and for the Terminal 2 Project, doing all this in conjunction with the deepening of the Fraser River, so that they can export coal and oil out of Fraser Surrey Docks? That really bothers me here, because billions of dollars of taxpayers’ money is being spent to do just that. If you’re going to remove the tunnel, that’s going to be millions of dollars, if you’re going to dredge it, that’s going to be millions of dollars annually. When does the point arise when it’s uneconomical to have an inside port at the Fraser Surrey Docks when it’s constantly going to require taxpayer’s dollars to make it survive, to make it even exist?

C: **Judy Kirk:** Around your comments regarding the replacement of the tunnel announced by the provincial government, is part of your question “is that being done to allow for greater trade up and down the river”? Is that part of your question?

C: **Doug Massey:** Yes.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I am here to talk about the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

Q: **Doug Massey:** You can’t talk about that and not talk about the Fraser Surrey Docks.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** In terms of additional container trade on the Fraser River to Fraser Surrey Docks, the removal of the tunnel will only address a draft issue. The limitation is actually the length of container ships. Container ships that are currently servicing Deltaport and certainly container ships that we see servicing the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project would not be able to turn in the river, and therefore, there is no growth potential for container traffic at Fraser Surrey Docks even with the tunnel being removed.

Q: **Doug Massey:** Well, what about the coal ships or oil tankers? They wouldn’t be able to turn around either. You’re just talking about two seagoing ships going up that river. It doesn’t make any sense here. You’re promoting the fact you’re going to remove the tunnel so you can deepen
it, and without an environmental study to be telling us what effects it’s going to have on the poor old ecosystem of the Fraser River. That’s wrong.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I’m not familiar with what ships could service Fraser Surrey Docks if the tunnel were removed.

Q: **Peter Duffey:** Was Surrey Fraser Docks in fact part of your investigations into the growth rate and whether you forecast increasing container traffic coming by the Fraser Surrey Docks?

A: **Judy Kirk:** I believe Rhona said she didn’t know that.

**Why Do We Need More Capacity for Containerized Trade**

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the container growth forecast (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).

C: **Ian Robertson:** There doesn’t seem to be any comment in this report about the Panama Canal expansion. And what little reading I have done suggests that better than one-third of the traffic along the west coast would be diverted through the Panama Canal and up to the various ports on the east coast of the U.S. and Canada, starting next year.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** This is a very high-level synopsis of a detailed economic report.

Q: **Peter Duffey:** And when you forecast demand, you have to take into account all the factors. And one of the factors that I would have thought you would have taken in is the doubling of the Panama Canal. Does this economic forecast look at Panama?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Yes. It’s in the detailed report that’s on the Port’s website.

Q: **Roger Emsley:** I’m looking at this graph on page 12. Port Metro Vancouver historically has underperformed against its forecasts. Its compound annual growth rate over the last five years is slightly less than 3 percent. Canada’s GDP is forecast to expand around 2 percent. In order to meet even your low case throughput, you would need to be expanding at 4 percent per year. It ain’t going to happen.

Your base case throughput is 5 percent. Your high case throughput is 7 percent. That’s 7 percent each and every year from now through to 2030. It is not going to happen. How do you expect, with the GDP hovering around 2 percent, to see those kind of increases? What are you smoking? These projections are pure theory.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** So I just want to make one comment on that. In all of the past three years since we’ve undertaken these annual forecasts we have performed on our high case projections. You can see this in the reports themselves.

Q: **Ray Christopherson:** Can you elaborate on the idea that if container traffic does not meet the sort of projections we see on page 12 over the next 10 years, that Vanterm and Centerm downtown would be shut down, and all of the traffic currently scheduled through those terminals would come out here.

But more importantly, I’d like your comment on the idea that I’ve heard booted around recently, that this whole proposal is here in order to free up land on the south side of Burrard Inlet so the developers can build some nice condos. Do you have any comment on that?
A: **Rhona Hunter:** Our projections require the full capacity and optimization of Vanterm and Centerm, and our current economic forecast shows that we need additional capacity in addition to what we already have. That’s why we’re proposing the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

Q: **David Jones:** Well, I’m having trouble with your previous statement about meeting your forecasts. That just doesn’t tally with the numbers you published. I’ve got in front of me, last year was 2,713,160. I can’t read off a bunch of numbers out here, but it works out to a compound annual growth rate of 2.15 percent.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Which is what Roger was saying.

C: **David Jones:** Absolutely. In fact he was being generous to you. It’s not even as high as Roger was saying. He’s a nice, kind guy, I’m not that kind. I think it’s a blatant distortion. Don’t take this personally. But this is what we’ve had trouble with the Port. It distorted the figures year after year, and they’re continuing to distort the figures.

And I have a further problem with this characterization of this report by a so-called third party to assess the growth. Ocean Shipping Consultants are a captive organization. These guys get work from you by giving you forecasts that you want to hear. They tell you what you want to hear, so you can go ahead with it. I’ve worked in engineering most of my life, and I know exactly the situation. If you don’t tell the client what he wants to hear, you don’t get the next job. If you want a true forecast, you’re going to have to let someone who is not paid by you, preferably paid by the Municipality of Delta, an uninterested party, pay the consultant to do a forecast. These forecasts are worthless, in fact, they’re hazardous to our health.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Okay. This is an example of an area that could be included under additional comments or in a written submission. If you’ve got other calculations or your idea about an independent third party doing either an audit or a full-blown separate demand forecast, that’s where we would like to see it. And I encourage you to do that.

C: **David Jones:** Okay. What we’re thinking is that it’s highly unlikely that you’re going to meet the growth, as Roger says. In national or provincial GDP, which has been around 2.15 percent, it’s uncannily similar to the growth in the containers. It correlates year after year and we can’t expect that over the long term, that’s going to happen.

C: **Susan Jones:** I don’t think it’s enough to tell us to make a submission, because we’re being given the wrong information. And it’s very serious. When they built the Deltaport Third Berth, they published some forecasts in 2006. We haven’t even begun to reach the lowest case scenario. We’re not even near what they predicted then. Those were published figures by Port Metro Vancouver. So no, they’re not meeting those forecasts. They keep changing them as we don’t meet those things. I would ask you to look at this graph on page 12 and you make a little dot at 2.5 million. That’s where we’re at 2011. And we go over to 2030, and you make a little dot between 4 and 5. And you draw a line from that 2.5 to that 4.5: that’s the actual prediction for Port Metro Vancouver containers at a growth rate of 2.5 percent GDP annually. It’s way below any of the rest of this crap. And we’re not even reaching that on an average basis over the year. It’s been the same since 2007 to 2011, 2.5 million TEUs in Vancouver. It’s serious! You’re giving us information that is wrong.

C: **Peter Duffey:** I think that if you are derelict in your duty as a Crown corporation, over not meeting normal business standards, I believe that if you’re selling shares, or you’re a publicly traded company, full disclosure is necessary so that we can understand the risks.
Now, the risk would be to those who are backing you, who provide your finances. It may be by bonds, it may be by loans from certain areas. You say that this spinoff may have to be publicly financed. But you’re a Crown corporation, and you have public responsibilities to the Minister, and to the Government of Canada.

Now, I’m amazed that you have not put in here the worst-case forecast. I only give you an example. I was going to show you a book, about the Eden Company and how it came to its demise. Purely on that basis, it is not realistic. The shareholders dropped it and they put it out of business.

Now, you won’t go out of business, because you’re a Crown corporation. But you have a responsibility for not doing an adequate business case. So I ask you to make a proper business case. If the growth rate is not what you expect, what would happen? What would happen to the bonds, what would happen to the infrastructure, what would happen to the equipment and maintenance costs which were still there? It might turn out to be the biggest white elephant in Canadian history.

Are There Other Options for Creating Container Capacity?

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the various options for creating additional container capacity within Port Metro Vancouver’s jurisdiction (page 14 of the Discussion Guide).

C: Roger Emsley: I just wanted to make it clear, because earlier on I asked for some detail. What we need is your actual container count for Deltaport and its three berths, Fraser Surrey Docks, Vanterm, Centerm, Prince Rupert, and then we need forecasts going out. Because as with any business case, whether it’s done by businesses or by governments, that kind of detail is what is required as a minimum. So we need to see where that expansion is going, and the percentages, and then relate it to things like GDP, export/import, and so on. We need a lot more detail. This one page draft on page 12 is useless.

C: Ian Robertson: At a macro level, Port Metro Vancouver exists as an agency of the federal government, and some of the politicians say it’s in the national interest to allow trade to occur internationally. In that context, it’s a day shorter from Southeast Asia to Prince Rupert than it is to Vancouver. It’s a shorter distance by rail from Prince Rupert to Chicago. That route doesn’t have anywhere near the obstacles that are encountered in the southern route on the CPR. And we are talking about congestion in one of the most congested parts of Canada, being the Lower Mainland. And surely to goodness the cost-effectiveness of expanding Prince Rupert, TEU by TEU, is less than it is to expand it down here.

Q: Phil Hochstein: What are the implications if your forecasts are accurate, and we don’t do the expansion? How will we feel the impact of that?

A: Rhona Hunter: We’re only sort of just beginning to look at that as an exploration of what that might mean. I don’t have specifics yet, because it hasn’t been a business case that we’ve looked at in any detail. But it certainly would be some shifts in how cargo is transported, and there would be a movement to the United States of certain cargos.

C: Phil Hochstein: And it would take us longer to get our goods.

C: Rhona Hunter: It would be more expensive. It would also take us longer to get our goods. We may even see additional truck traffic here, because that’s the logistics hub. We don’t have a lot of detail, but it’s something that we are looking at.
Q: Ray Christopherson: If indeed, for whatever reason, Terminal 2 does not go ahead, what thought has been given to where else, a la Prince Rupert, that expansion could go? How much would it cost relative to the proposed Terminal 2?

One of the things that bothers me is that if your projections shown on page 12 really were to come to pass and Terminal 2 went ahead, you’d probably have to double-track CPR all the way through the Rockies. And guess who’d pay for that? All of us around this table. Billions would be required for that kind of activity. Has that been taken into account in your general assessment or planning?

A: Rhona Hunter: There were two questions there. What would happen at Prince Rupert if we didn’t go ahead? Everything that we know of and that Prince Rupert knows of has been included in our projections, so to our knowledge, there is no additional capacity that’s going to come on line in Prince Rupert.

Q: Ray Christopherson: If Terminal 2 doesn’t go ahead and your projections of potential traffic continue?

A: Rhona Hunter: Prince Rupert has limitations, too. They are limited in what they can do there.

Q: Ray Christopherson: It’s just gantry cranes and dock facilities, or is there a seaward limitation or something of that nature?

A: Rhona Hunter: So, I can’t speak for the Port of Prince Rupert. But I can certainly put some information forward on how we can get some more information from the Port of Prince Rupert. We know what the Port of Prince Rupert has on their books in terms of planned expansion, and we have included Port of Prince Rupert’s planned and proposed expansions in our forecasts. So whether they have capacity that we don’t know of probably means they don’t know of it either.

Q: Ray Christopherson: Oh, for goodness’ sakes. Judy, I’d like it recorded that your group, and with all due respect, the Port people themselves apparently do not have any real understanding of what the capacity could be in Prince Rupert if Terminal 2 were not to go ahead.

A: Judy Kirk: But I just want to be clear. Kirk & Co. is here to facilitate. We’re not here to provide information.

Q: Bob Miller: I just wonder whether Port Metro Vancouver would be willing to give an undertaking to generate numbers at a 2.5 percent GDP growth rate, and what impact that would have on these numbers.

Because when I hear at this table, and I’m not an engineer, thankfully, okay? A bunch of people who have spent a lot of time thinking about this, and researching it, at absolute variance to the numbers that have been thrown at the wall by Port Metro Vancouver. And it seems to me that it would be a responsible thing for Port Metro Vancouver to run the numbers and make it available to the public, as to if Port Metro Vancouver grows at the rate of the GDP, what impact that has on Terminal 2? And I don’t think I’m asking for a really complicated thing for you folks to crank out.

A: Judy Kirk: I’m not sure Rhona can make that undertaking on behalf of the Port, but I’ll ensure that it is on the record.

Q: David Jones: So, just picking up on the previous point about the traffic, especially the rail traffic that would result from this Terminal 2 if it’s built and if these growth projections actually did
come true. As I understand it, about 70 percent of the containers coming into the port now leave the Lower Mainland and progress further east. Most of which presumably has to go through the Fraser Canyon on the CP or CN tracks. Correct? So, that’s been a bottleneck for years. They have already doubled wherever they can. I can’t imagine that we can double it again, as it’s a horrendous problem already. Is it even technically feasible to double the track through the canyon and Rogers Pass and the whole southern route? What would be required in terms of an expansion to rail if Terminal 2 were to go forward?

A: Rhona Hunter: We work with the railways to identify infrastructure that’s going to be required. If any improvements are required by the railways as a result of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, these will be determined and brought forward by the railways under their own auspices and their own delivery and programming. We do not have any indication from them at this point that any improvements east of the Lower Mainland would be required in order to address the additional traffic from Terminal 2.

Q: Jim Ormesher: It’s to do with the agricultural land. There is no mention of agricultural land. I have a perception that agricultural land is under threat from the Port and its activities, and even the railroads. Is the Port interested in preserving agricultural land? Where do we stand with regard to the Port and agricultural land?

A: Sarah McPherson: I think some of your concern might come from some recent conversations going around land use, and more planned uses. The Port is not interested in pursuing agricultural land for industrial purposes. I think there is some confusion out there about that. I think more recently there have been conversations around preserving industrial land for industrial use and looking at ways to ensure that industrial land is used for those purposes and that we have enough industrial land for current and future use. That’s the Port’s position.

Q: Susan Jones: The Port is very interested in the ALR. They’ve got great swaths of it in Richmond. They bought the Gilmour farm, so they’re very interested. They’ve made a deal with Tsawwassen First Nations, and that was ALR. And that’s right beside the port. So, they’re very interested in the ALR.

There is an aspect here that worries me, that it isn’t economically feasible or correct to think that all this projection is going to happen. But the Port is going to go ahead because it’s a Crown corporation and it’s accountable to nobody. But if this thing gets built, it could be used for something else other than containers. It could become a port of call for oil, or for coal, or for other commodities. And that might even be a possible agenda behind the scenes. Because I have no trust that the Port and federal government will act in the best interests of the people. So there’s an aspect here that we may be looking at something else in the future. And we have no control over that.

C: Rhona Hunter: I think your question is “what will the permitted uses of this terminal be if it is approved”? The environmental assessment process, which we have recently entered, has very specific conditions, and those conditions will dictate what can be built.

C: Susan Jones: I beg to differ with you. We went through a whole process for a wheat terminal out there. And we did the whole environmental thing. And you know what we ended up with? A container terminal and that didn’t go through any process.

Q: Doug Massey: I’m just wondering about rail capacity in the sense that you’re entertaining additional coal from the United States to Roberts Bank. I think we have about four trains a day
coming in, or maybe it’s two trains a day. They’ve got 50 million metric tonnes of coal down in the Wyoming area, and they want to get up here. They want to get it exported and not one port in Washington state wants to do it. All that coal that they’ve got in Wyoming is going to find its way here, right through White Rock and our designated wetland area. So I’m saying, that will use up a lot of your rail capacity, will it not? And what are you going to do? You’re going to have big marking yards to take care of that? And where are they going to be? On agricultural land?

If you really want to develop the port, why are you entertaining bringing in a commodity that you really don’t need to bring in to Canada? It just doesn’t make any sense to me. I mean you’re basing your whole project on having all this need for more container rail. And I don’t understand why you are using up your rail capacity by bringing in U.S. coal, when you’re saying you need it for containers.

C: Judy Kirk: I’m not sure that Rhona can answer that, since this project doesn’t involve any coal handling.

Q: Linda McKay: I wonder if there is a report that sort of throws everything together. Like we have the proposed Terminal 2, and I’m wondering whether there is a report that gives us a picture of what rail capacity and road capacity and electricity and all that kind of stuff that’s needed for Terminal 2? Because frankly I see bits and pieces and pretty pictures, but I don’t understand the rail component and the roadway structure which obviously is required to feed this beast. And frankly, we’ve got a Terminal 1 where there is a road and rail capacity which appears to be at its peak. What is Terminal 2 going to look like as a total global project? I just don’t see it.

Q: Judy Kirk: So, I want to make sure that everyone hears that. It’s a very good question. What you’re saying is look, if the proposed Terminal 2 were to go ahead, we’re not seeing what would be potentially the additional roads that might be required, the additional rail service to be required, and other infrastructure to handle things like electricity.

A: Rhona Hunter: We are at the early stages of a complex project, and that is part of what the environmental assessment does, is that it puts all of those pieces together and it looks at it from a standpoint of all of the components and how that is going to service the potential port.

Q: Linda McKay: I mean questions are being raised about rail capacity and the infrastructure that’s required to support Terminal 2. We don’t have the total picture. I’d like to see that total picture before we even go to environmental assessment.

A: Judy Kirk: I think what Rhona is saying is that it’s actually the act of the assessment to determine those things in addition to impacts. There is more information on page 28 about the environmental assessment.

Q: Linda McKay: But all those components would have had to be considered in the business case?

A: Rhona Hunter: So, the RBT2 Project Description is a much more detailed document than what you have in front of you, and probably contains a lot more of what you’re looking for. And it is that document that the regulators use to make their determination of how they proceed through the environmental impact assessment. So there is a great more detail in there, and there is a link is available on our website. So I encourage you, if you do want to know more about the details of the project.
Q: *Linda McKay:* Those details? Do they include the railway infrastructure, and the hydro infrastructure, the road infrastructure that’s required to support Terminal 2? I don’t think so.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I think that’s a fabulous segue into the next part of this, because we’re going to talk about what the project is.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I think the fuller answer is that in the process of the environmental review, many of those questions will be answered.

C: *Peter Duffey:* We’ve got until October the 15th to present our views as to whether there should be a major environmental assessment, a full panel review. I think most people here would say there should be. It appears to be in the balance. And we’re talking about minutiae here, as opposed to that decision.

And I would like to make the point that you should zero in on that now. You’ve only got another half an hour, and you need to go away from here knowing that everybody here -- well, maybe there are some people who dissent -- want that review to take place, and a full panel review at that.

And one of the reasons I want it is that there is a possibility of taking in natural gas, of coal, of oil, as well as containers. And there is also the sea-level rise risk. I want those things to be talked about.

I’m fed up with talking about whether or not where this container or that container, or what length of container it is. Let’s get on with the vital decision we have to make.

C: *Judy Kirk:* With the greatest of respect Peter, and I hope you know me well enough to believe when I say that Rhona does not represent the Environmental Assessment Office. And no one here does, at least not to my knowledge. Many of the questions and issues that you raise will be properly dealt with by the Environmental Assessment Office, both provincial and federal.

So I’m going to ask Rhona to continue here. We do make sure that people know that if they do feel as you do, or have other comments and questions with respect to the environmental assessment, that there is very good information and places for them to go to provide that. But Rhona simply cannot speak to that process.

Q: *Susan Jones:* Just what is the deadline to the Canadian Environmental Assessment office to ask for a joint panel review? What’s the deadline?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* The public comment period ends on October 15th. It’s a 20-working-day period. There are no parameters around what the regulator are looking for with comments. It’s simply a comment period for the public.

Q: *Ian Robertson:* I’ve got in front of me a fact sheet that comes from the Ministry of Environment of British Columbia and there’s a series of points on two pages. One of the points is that in total there was -- this is referring to the old federal government process.

“In total, there were 512 projects in B.C. for which the federal government had originally intended to undertake screening assessment. Of the 512, 492 projects will no longer receive a federal environmental assessment under the screening category.”

All 492 of those former screenings fall below the B.C. *Environmental Assessment Act* threshold for environmental review. And there are only 19 of the original 512 that are going to be subject to the joint process. So, one of the real questions for all of us to struggle with is that under the
new Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, the federal government can choose not to do an assessment of this particular project. And it cannot be appealed.

And if it decides not to do it, it is unknown by me as to whether or not the provincial government will mount its own environmental assessment. When you go and look at the categories under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act that require an environmental assessment, such a project as what we’re talking about today doesn’t seem to come in any of the six categories. Now, I may be wrong on that. I’ve asked for clarification.

A: Judy Kirk: I think you should definitely get that from them. And if there are other questions on the environmental assessment process, I’m going to ask you to hold them and ask them of the correct agency.

C: Ian Robertson: Just as a comment if I may. The difficulty that I’m against, and everybody else here is against, is that when asking those questions, there is a long time lag before you get the answers.

Q: Bob Miller: This has to do with the veracity of the numbers that are generated by Port Metro Vancouver. It says on page 17 that once operating at capacity, there would be direct employment of roughly 10,000 jobs, $440 million in wages annually, which comes out to $44,000 a year.

Now, if you look at indirect and induced employment, there is $180 million, or say roughly 10,000 jobs, which is about $20,000 a year. Then if you look at total direct and indirect, you get $620 million by roughly 20,000, and you get $30,000 a year.

So what you have is such a wide range -- from $20,000 to $40,000. It’s like they couldn’t get their shit together even on such a fundamental thing as price per hour. They’re projecting roughly $10 an hour as the wage. And you know, I don’t know about most people around this table, but I think $10 an hour as an objective to try to work with for wages for people is sadly lacking. The last one you’ve got here is $20 an hour.

I’m using the numbers right here, on page 17. Just run the numbers. The gross payables, divided by the number of employees, it gets you earnings per year. It’s not a really complicated concept to get across.

Q: David Jones: But I think they’re assuming it’s a full-time job, and that may not be true. So you should have full-time equivalents. So you should have full-time equivalents. Can you not restate this as full-time employment?

A: Judy Kirk: Possibly, I really don’t know.

Q: Nav Brar: How does your job count here with Terminal 2 compare with the current jobs at Deltaport right now?

A: Rhona Hunter: I think your question is around how many more additional on-terminal jobs there would be with Terminal 2. We don’t have them broken out specifically for the terminal itself. That’s going to depend on the operator and what kind of technology is available at the time.

Q: Nav Brar: So it’s an automated terminal?

A: Rhona Hunter: Our numbers are based upon a semi-automated system. So it’s sort of middle of the road depending on what the final terminal operator determines they want to put on the
terminal there. My understanding of terminal operations in an automated environment is that it’s not necessarily less jobs, it’s just different types of jobs. They’re more IT and technology jobs, because you’re operating IT systems. But that is something that would be determined by the terminal operator.

**Marine Terminal**

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the terminal design and orientation (page 18 and 19 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Carol Vignale: Earlier tonight a gentleman asked what would be the result if Terminal 2 did not go ahead, and what could we see as the potential outcomes. And I think that’s a really central question, because as you come before us to talk about the forecast and the necessity for Terminal 2 based on the import and exports currently and projection of growth, I’d like you to clarify what we can expect if this Terminal 2 doesn’t go ahead? What are the consequences to our economy, as well as the socio-economic consequences?

A: Rhona Hunter: As I indicated to Philip here, we’re only just starting to look at the details of that. We’ve looked at it with an economic forecast to see we would be out of capacity. But if we do not actually have Terminal 2 developed to address that capacity when it comes on -- we’re only beginning to get an understanding there, so I don’t have that information right now.

Q: Carol Vignale: This is one of the missing links for me. There is a stronger case in terms of the present economic and community benefits of the port. You have one short paragraph on page 16 about the general economic benefits. But I don’t think many of us realize, and certainly I don’t, what role the port plays in our lives in terms of that economic development, especially in terms of our lifestyle today in the Lower Mainland. I’d like to see more evidence of that, because if it is a clear, strong argument, then it sort of would put a very different spin on all of these concerns people have. All of us are wearing clothes. And what is the port doing for our lives? Can we do without it, or is it a huge benefit for our lifestyle and for the livability of Metro Vancouver?

A: Judy Kirk: All right. Just one comment before I go to you, Ian. My economics degree is pretty old, but with that caveat, I would assume that the consequences of not doing Terminal 2 would be to not realize the jobs in construction and benefits that are noted on page 17. Carol, I know that doesn’t address everything you’re saying, but at least that would be one assumption.

C: Carol Vignale: Okay, I just wanted to raise that all of us don’t have the same point of view that many people here have voiced.

Q: Ian Robertson: I’m going to ask a question, and I ask for indulgence, because I’m not an expert in this. My understanding is that at about the middle of the coal port, or maybe at the tip of the coal port, the underwater ground changes its complexity significantly. And from the shoreline out to about where the coal port sits is fill from the Fraser River. A report about ten years ago suggested that beyond that there is a fairly steep precipice which during an earthquake would be quite unstable and could cause things that were above it to slide into a much deeper channel in the Salish Sea. I’m wondering if you folks have done any studies of that?

A: Rhona Hunter: In 2010 we did an extensive drilling program in the area to get some hard, concrete information around the quality of the soil and the subsoil in that area. And it was through that information and looking at the seismic requirements that the engineers were
confident that this proposed location would provide a balance between allowing the terminal to be as far off-shore from that intertidal zone, which is far more sensitive, and into the deeper water, while still maintaining seismic stability and reducing the amount of dredging that would be required in the pocket. There is a trade-off study on the website that provides an overview of this process.

Consultation Topics

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the Pre-Design Consultation topics that Port Metro Vancouver is looking for feedback on, including: habitat mitigation, road and rail traffic considerations and community legacy benefits (page 22-29 of the Discussion Guide). She then provided information regarding the environmental assessment process (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Peter Duffey: I’d just like to know whether Port Metro Vancouver is on record through the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency recommending that a full panel review is undertaken. I think they should be on record asking for that. Has the port asked for a joint review panel? And if not, why not?

A: Rhona Hunter: The Port has not requested a joint panel review. The Port is not, under CEAA 2012, able to make that request. We have asked that the agencies make their determination, and we are here to manage whichever process the agencies have determined is best to put forward for the project.

Q: Peter Duffey: I would ask you to go on record about this subject in your public documents and further consultation. I think you will look very badly in the public view unless you come out and say that there should be an assessment on a joint panel basis. That will leave everybody feeling that you are not in support of examining all the possible ecological and environmental problems.

C: Roger Emsley: It is my understanding, under the new federal regulations, there is a section on Canada port authorities, that such authority can request a review panel. I stand to be corrected but I would like a response similar to Peter’s. If you haven’t done so, why not? Because I have looked at the new regulations within the last few days and from my reading, a port authority can ask for a review panel.

Q: Nav Brar: In your previous materials, you also mentioned a separate or parallel consultation going on with the TFN. Are First Nations going through the same process? And how come we don’t see those materials on your website?

A: Rhona Hunter: We do have a separate and parallel process with the First Nations communities.

A: Sarah McPherson: The materials are the same. We use the same materials in both processes. They’re just separate processes meaning that they’re invited to participate in these processes should they want, but in addition, there is a separate process, and we have a legal obligation to have that with them. So they see and use the same materials, the same media related documents.

Q: Nav Brar: So now the feedback, the summary reports from those consultations, how come we’re not seeing those?

A: Sarah McPherson: So, we don’t necessarily produce a summary report of consultation in the same style. The meetings don’t necessarily happen in the same way. And sometimes some of the material that they might share -- they might prefer to share as part of the EA process, where
they have a very designated role. And so you can actually see that in the EA process, documented with other feedback from other stakeholders.

But in the process that we have with them, in the same outreach that we do with you, we don’t necessarily complete it in the same way or have the same number of meetings. The feedback from First Nations from our process has not been published to date.

A: Judy Kirk: There are different legal requirements with respect to confidentiality with First Nations’ discussions. So, you know, really it’s not up to the Port. There are legal requirements and there are things that First Nations can ask for vis-à-vis confidentiality that are completely separate from this.

C: Peter Miller: What I’ve heard at this meeting revolves around that people here and the people in the community don’t believe the forecast that Port Metro Vancouver is putting forth. Whether the forecast for the GDP, the forecast that the consultants use, the forecast relative to limiting or capacity of New Westminster, Vanterm or Centerm, or the maximum potential of Prince Rupert, or the rail capacity outside the metro area, or the integration of the total infrastructure required. They don’t believe that you’ve done the work. They don’t believe that you’ve done a solid approach. And my recommendation would be for you people to listen. To listen what people are saying. Go back and answer those questions in a public and forthright manner so the people believe what you’re saying. Because right now, what I’m hearing around here is they have no confidence in what you’re saying.

A: Judy Kirk: Thank you

Q: David Jones: This suspicion that this Terminal 2 isn’t being done on a purely business basis, since at the third berth hearing of this kind, about six or seven years ago, it appeared they had never done a feasibility study, from what we can make out. There was no justification for it from the straight economic grounds like a normal business would. And it would appear that this is the same thing happening here. There’s no mention of a business case. Like, you’re going to invest a bunch of money, going to be spending money during this operation. Is there any case that’s been made, and if so, can we see it, as to whether or not this project is economical, as opposed to being just a good thing for Canada.

Q: Vic Rivers: On the assumption that Terminal 2 goes ahead, is there any plans to put shore power in for the three dock positions? And I ask that on the basis that when Terminal 1, DP3 was built, the cable troughs and everything were put in. It was five, six years ago. And at this point we still don’t have any shore power going to the vessels that are tied up at that dock.

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes. You will see within probably the next year or two, DP3 being serviced by shore power, and the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 has also shore power in. The holdup has not been on the Port’s side, it’s been on the ship side, and the number of ships that actually have the capability to plug into shore power.

Q: Rod Asher: If the project goes ahead, what would be the estimated cost to build the island, as well as all the related infrastructure? Who’s going to fund it?

A: Rhona Hunter: Project cost currently now is just over two billion dollars. We’re going through a process to determine the financial structure, but it will be a combination of private investor and the Port will put some money in, and it will be a terminal operator, more than likely. But that’s to be determined. But mostly it will be private money.
C: **Bob Miller:** You didn’t answer the question. The question was broader than that. If you’re talking about the Fraser road being a billion dollars, you’re talking about the cost of the new bridge being 1.4 billion dollars. His question, that I heard, was the overall cost.

C: **Judy Kirk:** I heard ‘project’, sir, but fair enough, in terms of the other aspects as well.

Q: **Marty Rempel:** Continuing the question, 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 of ask that question in a gut sort of way. It’s not about having more containers in, because that would be about a 10, 12 percent increase in productivity. So, you don’t even need a new port.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Marty, were you here when Rhona said they’re assuming a semi-automated?

Q: **Marty Rempel:** Yeah, but they can’t automate the port and everything else, and the new port is being pushed to be completely automated with about ten operators. And there are probably about 250 on a shift there right now.

Q: **Ray Christopherson:** Can you tell me if the Abu Dhabi Investment Authority has been brought into the picture on providing finance, since they already are involved in port developments and operations, in a number of places around the world?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** No, nobody has been brought in.

Q: **Doug Massey:** Well, I mean, the studies that have been done in the past by an independent body and another one in 1979, and another one in 2011 by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans all say that the Terminal 2 Project was really very dangerous to the Fraser River estuary. And yet, in that period of time, the federal government has pulled all the teeth out of the Department of Fisheries. Pulled all the teeth out of the Department of the Environment, too. Because they were standing in the way of these major projects such as this one. And I just wonder with any environmental review now, would it really have any teeth that would really do environmental studies, when the federal government has done this to two departments. But it’s very critical of this proposal. I really am concerned about this. There was to be some current flows and patterns, that they should have breached the causeway. So that there was a current flow there. There is no suggestion in this project that there’s a breach between the two parts. At least I don’t see any. And if there is a problem with currents, why isn’t this on a dock, as opposed to a land bridge so that a dock, a cement pile dock, would in fact give that flow.

Because it’s going to cost you two billion dollars to build this, and I suppose if it had been built that way, it would have cost you three billion dollars. But in one sense of the word, this would in fact solve that problem, would it not?

Q: **Judy Kirk:** Why not a dock? Do we have an answer to that?

A: **Mike Zachary:** It could be.

C: **Doug Massey:** At least that answers part of the flow, but there’s more for clarification. Open up the causeways and breach them a bit, too. And put in the overhead lines that come in there, so that a lot of big birds don’t hit them. Why aren’t you doing these types of things?
Susan Jones: Just a point of information. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, in terms of the question about First Nations, has a separate area where we have separate consultation with First Nations. However, Tsawwassen First Nations, nine or ten years ago, signed an agreement with Port Metro Vancouver, that they would not use that special dispensation. They can consult just like I can. And they have a business agreement for Terminal 2, and they will receive, I think it’s a million dollars if Terminal 2 is approved. It’s a Memorandum of Understanding that they have. Just so you know.

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 7:03pm.
Notes from a small group meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 9, 5:00pm-7:00pm, at the Coast Hotel and Langley Convention Centre, Langley, B.C.
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*The record notes that the meeting commenced at 5:05pm*
KEY THEMES:

- Participants expressed concern regarding the local impacts of the growing volume of container trains travelling through Langley and requested that the effects of this increased rail traffic be properly considered in the environmental assessment.

- Participants were interested in understanding the scope of the project and the environmental assessment process.

- Participants questioned the relationship between the Port Metro Vancouver-led Pre-Design Consultation and the CEAA-led comment period for the Project Description.

- Participants expressed concerns that existing transportation infrastructure would not be able to accommodate an increase in traffic resulting from the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

- Participants said that Port Metro Vancouver, as a customer of the railways, should be able to do more to regulate or influence the railway’s operational and environmental practices.

- Participants expressed concerns regarding the movement of containers loaded with hazardous goods through their communities.

- Participants expressed concern that the jobs and other economic benefits created during construction and operation of the project might go to workers and companies from outside British Columbia.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Chris Chok
   
   Chris Chok welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting, and also introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Chris Chok informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All
   
   Rhona Hunter reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including ways to participate in the consultation, the list of information items and consultation topics.

Q:  
   Rudy Storteboom:  What are we hoping to accomplish today?

A:  
   Chris Chok:  We are here to hear from you, Rudy. The purpose of the consultation is for the Port to present information regarding the proposed project and to get feedback from you in whatever form that is. Whether you have specific questions about the proposal, the consultation process, environmental assessment, or anything of that nature, we are certainly here to take your questions. We do have material that we’d like to get through, and Rhona Hunter will do that in a second.
What is Port Metro Vancouver?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the importance of trade to British Columbians, container trade in the Asia-Pacific Gateway, the container supply chain, the use of containers and the movement of goods to and from Port facilities (pages 4 - 9 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Rudy Storteboom: One question about those empty containers: are they simply stored at their destination when they are offloaded, or are they reintroduced into the network and shuttled off to some intermodal yard?

A: Rhona Hunter: They are re-introduced as they are needed. Export markets require containers, import markets produce surplus containers. Often what happens is that you have a container where it’s not needed and it then has to be transported from one facility to another because that is where it needs to be. We will get into some of the initiatives Port Metro Vancouver is working on with the trucking companies, and logistic centres to try to optimize this so that containers are where they need to be on a more consistent basis to reduce the number of containers that are being stored, as well as trucked.

Q: Rudy Storteboom: Are there a lot of empty containers rolling around in the system, or do they all have a purpose when they are on the line?

A: Rhona Hunter: The containers are shuffled only when they have a specific location where they are required.

C: Lee Lockwood: I think you should clarify the fact that most of Canadian exports such as potash and grain are actually all shipped bulk. They don’t even go into containers.

C: Rhona Hunter: There has been a movement over the last ten years for specialty grains, and for both lumber and pulp to go into containers. The market for containers for bulk products is certainly something which is specialized and not all grains are put into containers.

C: Lee Lockwood: That is why containers are so cheap here. You can get them because nobody wants them. It is not worth hauling them back across the water.

Q: Cal Jeske: Do we make any containers in Canada?

A: Matt Skinner: Cal, my understanding is that most of the containers are actually manufactured in Asia. I am sure you can find examples of them being manufactured all over, but the bulk of them are sourced over there.

Q: Ed Kolla: What percentage of the containers coming and going, are for the Metro Vancouver area only?

A: Chris Chok: On page 8, 10% is staying in B.C. So then the question becomes, what percentage stays in Metro Vancouver?

Q: Ed Kolla: So the 90% is going out. Now is it going out on rail? Or is it going out on truck?

A: Rhona Hunter: So, 70% goes directly out on rail. 30% would go to stuffing/ de-stuffing. Of the 30%, around 10% stays here, and another 20% goes out.

A: Marcus Siu: To clarify-- the 70% that goes off the deep sea terminal, by rail, may go to a transload facility which then may introduce another trip. It might get out by truck, but a portion of that would still go out by rail.
Ed Kolla: 70% of 90% is going by rail, and the balance is being moved by truck? I am just curious because of the additional rail traffic and truck traffic there is going to be.

Marcus Siu: If you would like more specific information, I think we may actually have a diagram.

Rhona Hunter: We do have some information a little bit further on about some specifics around both rail and truck traffic.

Chris Chok: Can I just clarify the question so that we have it for the record and we get back to Ed? You are asking: of all the containers that come in, how much of it is leaving by rail, how much is by truck, and of all the containers, what is staying in the Lower Mainland, and what is going elsewhere?

Ed Kolla: I am more interested in how much is leaving the terminal on rail, and how much is leaving on truck.

Why Roberts Bank?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of why Roberts Bank is well positioned to accommodate future growth in trade activity. She discussed the two major infrastructure projects that link Roberts Bank with important port-related logistics facilities in the Lower Mainland (pages 10 and 11 of the Discussion Guide).

Rudy Storteboom: The Premier’s announcement about replacing the tunnel is good news, but I can’t help but wonder, why is a bridge preferred to another tunnel? Is that just economics?

Rhona Hunter: We have not been consulted to that level. We don’t have any more information as to why a bridge as opposed to a tunnel at this point.

Chris Chok: Rudy, we provide a link, on page 10, for the provincial government’s website for that project. If that answer isn’t on the website already, hopefully you can email someone there, and they could get that for you.

Rudy Storteboom: Thanks Chris.

Lee Lockwood: When we had this first go around two years ago, the question of “why is Prince Rupert being given the short shift?” was tabled. We have three million people plus in the Lower Mainland, another half a million are going to be here over the next ten years, and the concept of Prince Rupert is completely being ignored as an alternate facility. It is a day closer on the great circle route to the orient, and you would diversify your facilities from a labour perspective. In other words, if there is a strike down here, up there they are ready to fly. There is also the seismic perspective, too.

Rhona Hunter: We do actually speak a bit about that further on in the Discussion Guide, but I can address that right now. Prince Rupert has some planned growth on its books, and the planned growth that Prince Rupert has put forward and is in the planning stages for, has been included in our projections in terms of capacity. We still require additional capacity over and above what Prince Rupert is going to be providing. This is not either Prince Rupert or Vancouver, it is both.

Nathan Pachal: Which transportation corridors are key for you to move forward, or where do you expect the most traffic to go once it is expanded?
A: *Rhona Hunter:* Well, as you can see on page 11, many of the logistics facilities are along the south side of the Fraser River, and the South Fraser Perimeter Road is leading in that direction, so that is the major corridor that will continue to be used for truck traffic. The rail corridor is established, and that would be the rail corridor that would be used.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* When we get the almost doubling of the container traffic, then that will be a doubling of traffic going on those tracks?

A: *Marcus Siu:* I wouldn’t go as far as to kind of relate the doubling to a direct correlation in terms of number of truck trips or rail trips. I think part of the Discussion Guide is looking at policy options that we can actually make sure that we are doing business more efficiently to ensure that we only have the number of trucks on the road that are required to service that amount of volume that is being proposed here in this case.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* Sure, and what about rail traffic though?

A: *Marcus Siu:* Rail traffic likewise. We would have to work with the rail companies to determine that. Certainly a lot of the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor improvements have accounted for that growth.

Q: *Dave Moffatt:* Considering the various ports you have throughout the Lower Mainland to service container traffic, do you see the expansion of Roberts Bank having an effect on Centerm, Vanterm, with respect to the volumes that are there?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Would the volumes there be affected by this? Our projections are full capacity at Centerm, full capacity at Vanterm.

C: *Dave Moffatt:* There are major problems on Commissioner street, servicing of container traffic out of the Vancouver area. I represent a number of container hauling companies, and the frustration that we have in dealing not only with the concerns that these people have, but also concerns with getting in and out of the various terminals. It’s a nightmare quite frankly.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* And there are some improvements. The south shore trade areas are seeing some substantial improvements in both road and rail infrastructure that service all the terminals that exist on the south shore of Burrard Inlet. So, those are coming on-line next year, and we should see some improvements to the logistics and the movements of both rail and trucks in that area to address those congestions and those challenges.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Can you tell me how many level crossings there are between Fort Langley and Deltaport?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* I can get that information for you, I don’t have that information off the top of my head.

Q: *Nathan Pachal:* So, did you say that later on we will be talking about how you plan on shipping the extra goods in this discussion today?

A: *Marcus Siu:* I don’t want to get ahead of myself. I think we are here today to understand what ideas are out there as to how we can achieve that. Certainly we are not suggesting that we have that answer right now, and we’ll get into that.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Part of our Discussion Guide actually aims to get some feedback from you on specific options that we are looking at to mitigate road traffic for the most part.
C: **Nathan Pachal:** You say that we are going to be talking about truck traffic, but one of the things I am sure people in this community are concerned about is also rail traffic.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** We will get a little bit into the scope of the assessment, where it lies and how it will be determined. Just for a clarification, the work that Marcus Siu’s team leads, and the mitigation topics we are seeking some input on, are not specifically related to this particular project. Rather it is work that the Port has undertaken and continues to undertake Port-wide. Because it is not project specific, and because Port Metro Vancouver is not in the trucking business and we are not in the business of building railways, we work very collaboratively with those partners on an ongoing basis, to look at how we can address concerns around efficiencies and congestion. It is an ongoing program that we are seeking some input on now. It is not a requirement in terms of mitigation specifically for this project. This is not a predetermined mitigation or offsetting for our project impacts. Specific mitigation will be considered as we go through the environmental assessment and explore options that would reduce our impact. It is not a requirement in terms of mitigation specifically for this project, it will be considered as we go through the environmental assessment as options that are looking at reducing our impact and our footprint as a result of the project, but it certainly is not something that we want anybody to be misguided right now, that this is predetermined mitigation, or offsetting for our impacts.

Q: **Ed Kolla:** Are you saying there will be road and rail improvements to mitigate the impact of Terminal 2?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** What I am saying is that in this Discussion Guide, we are seeking some feedback, on predominantly trucking issues that the Port is currently working on with various partners and entities within the logistics chain to address current and future increases to container shipment in the Lower Mainland. That conversation is not directly related to the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project. Any mitigation or offsetting that we are required to do as a result of this project will be determined through the environmental assessment process.

C: **Ed Kolla:** I would like to just correct. I don’t quite agree with what you have on page 10. The South Fraser Perimeter Road, and more importantly Roberts Bank Rail Corridor program, those two projects -- and I can’t speak totally for South Fraser Perimeter Road, but Roberts Bank Rail Corridor program, all of that work came about when the Port was expanding broader. It was after consultation, out here in Langley where we were saying, what is going on here and at that time Port Metro Vancouver, or your predecessor, went back and worked with the different agencies to put those improvements in place. Those improvements were put in place for the expansion of the existing terminal. They were not put in place for Terminal 2. At that point in time there was no talk about a Terminal 2.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** They also addressed general increases and increases in traffic as a result of additional capacity at the terminal. It was not specifically Terminal 2 at that time, but there was an increase projected as a result of further growth at Roberts Bank. South Fraser Perimeter Road did contemplate Terminal 2.

C: **Cliff Caprani:** Well, we don’t even know whether that is going to be successful yet. I mean, South Fraser hasn’t even been opened yet.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** Right. Perhaps what I can do is take a little bit of a step back to the environmental assessment process and that might sort of address some of the issues here.
Environmental Assessment Process

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the environmental assessment process and explained the role of the regulator in determining the scope of the project and the scope of assessment (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).

C: Ed Kolla: But the last time around, the first assessment didn’t take into consideration the impact. It was only after Langley, and I can’t speak for Surrey, had numerous discussions that we got a public meeting out here. There was a presentation out here, grievances were put forward, and the traffic impacts associated with that expansion were then re-looked at as part of the project. All I am saying is, that those improvements that were done, satisfied an earlier expansion, and that depending on the amount of truck and train traffic, potentially there will be additional requirement for mitigation along the rail and on the roads, to compensate, appease, the community that is being affected.

C: Rhona Hunter: And that will be determined through the environmental impact assessment.

C: Ed Kolla: Good.

Q: Roy Mufford: Are we to understand that it hasn’t been decided yet whether this is a linear or a non-linear project?

C: Chris Chok: Is the question “What is the project?”

Q: Roy Mufford: Well, this is what happened to us last time. It wasn’t until we saw a little ad in the Vancouver Sun that said Deltaport was going to double in size. Langley wasn’t notified, and the reason they weren’t notified, according to the rules of engagement here, was that if it is a non-linear project they only had to address and discuss these things with the local township, which was Delta at the time. A linear project according to their definition, crossed municipal boundaries -- for instance, the Golden Ears Bridge and Sea-to-Sky Highway were linear projects, so they had to have a hearing in each municipality. They told Langley that Langley didn’t count because the port expansion didn’t affect them, so they didn’t advertise in Langley that they were going to do this to the port. They classified it as a non-linear project. We raised hell and that is why we had the meeting in Newlands. We went to people like Rich Coleman, and said, “What the hell is going on here? We are tired of this nonsense, please do something about it.” So he had a meeting convened in Newlands, it was a packed house, and the first thing that Jan Hagen from the environmental assessment office, said was, “Folks, it is nice that we are having this meeting, but it is going to have no effect on the outcome because this is a non-linear project. Langley isn’t included in the study.” And Langley never did get included in the study. What I would like to know is if it is going to be a non-linear project again, why are we all sitting here? Everything you are going to do has been predetermined.

A: Rhona Hunter: Well, we have just entered the environmental assessment process. At this stage, the Project Description has been issued. The Project Description is available through a link on our website, as well as through the federal agency’s website. You are welcome to take a look specifically at what we have submitted to the regulators. We are in a public comment period through the regulators until October 15th. The regulator is seeking input on the project from the public, so you are welcome to provide your feedback to the regulators if you have concerns. That is the regulator’s domain.
Let’s go directly to page 15, and we can talk about what the project is, and that might give you some idea about where and how you might be fitting in to the process.

Q: **Bob Bowles**: My name is Bob Bowles. If we may go back to page 10, I understand that 300 million dollars in total is being spent on the rail corridor project, of which 50 million dollars is being spent by Port Metro Vancouver, its tenants and stakeholders. So that is one-sixth of the project. So, am I to understand that the other five-sixths of the project is being funded by taxpayers and various others?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: I believe the other funders included local, regional, provincial, and federal governments, as well as industry and railways. I would have to get a breakdown of exactly where the funding came from. I don’t know that answer off the top of my head.

Q: **Bob Bowles**: That is what I am asking. Local, regional, provincial, and federal governments, they all dip in to our pocket. Are railways not included as being tenants and stakeholders? I have asked this question before and the answers still have not been provided.

C: **Chris Chok**: Okay. I would like to suggest we send out the answers to those questions to everyone’s email addresses from the sign-in sheet, so that you all will have the same information.

Q: **Cliff Caprani**: Will those answers go out in a timely manner?

A: **Chris Chok**: Well, we will do it within this consultation period, certainly before November 12th.

Q: **Roy Mufford**: Can you find out as soon as possible if this is linear or non-linear, so we know whether we are wasting our time or not?

A: **Chris Chok**: Rhona is going to talk about what the project is from the Port’s perspective. Your question about linear or not is a question about the environmental assessment process and what is happening right now. So the Project Description is in, and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency is asking for comments on what you see as the effects of the project. If you want to say, “we want this to be defined as a linear project,” your opportunity to do that is actually right now. The agencies have a public comment period until October 15th for you to submit comments saying “we want it studied out to Langley” or “we want the effects of rail and/or trucks studied out to whatever the distance is”. You can do that right now but not through this process. The process that Port Metro Vancouver is here leading, is helping to determine mitigation measures that they would put forward in their application, later on down the road. There are two different things happening right now, but to your point about is it linear or not, Rhona will explain what the Port has proposed, and then you have an opportunity to tell the regulators what you think.

C: **Roy Mufford**: Well, with all due respect, Rhona can explain to me what it is all about, but unless you guys take the message back that we are not going to sit by and wait for them to decide whether we count or not, that doesn’t wash. We want you to go back to them and tell them point blank, we need to be involved with this because we have a mess here.

Q: **Nathan Pachal**: I guess it is a bit tricky because in one regard we are here to solicit feedback on what we believe some mitigation measures should be, but it feels like, and maybe I am just hearing it wrong, we don’t know the scope of where the mitigation measure should be. So, it is just the area around the Deltaport facility, that’s a lot different, as far as what we can suggest here, than if it is mitigation measures that can include the health impacts of rail and truck traffic.
throughout the region. For the sake of tonight, since we don’t know the scope, you don’t know the scope, and we are waiting for the regulator to define the scope, can we put feedback on what we think should be mitigation measures depending on the outcome?

A:  *Chris Chok:* Absolutely, and regardless of the outcome, you can put forward what you think should be mitigation measures.

C:  *Rhona Hunter:* We have tried to be quite defined about where we are talking about mitigation to get some meaningful impact but absolutely, please provide any other comments around the mitigation and the scope. That’s why we are here.

Q:  *Bob Bowles:* As part of the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program there will be a rail crossing information system. On my cell phone I can view road traffic flow densities simply with an app. Can we not get the same thing from the trains running through our town?

A:  *Marcus Siu:* Certainly one of the projects as part of the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor is the implementation of intelligent information systems, i.e. messaging if you are on the road, when the train would cross to help you plan your routes. In terms of getting that on your phone, certainly it would not be something that the Port could do. But we are always working with other agencies to make sure that different types of roadway information are explored whether or not they can deliver that to the road users. For example Translink, is one of those agencies that we work with to coordinate planning in the region.

Q:  *Bob Bowles:* There are two things that really are factors, first is how long the train is, and second is what speed it is going at. I have literally sat at a train crossing for ten full minutes because the train is going so slow. So, to tell me the train is allowed to be x amount of length is definitely information, but really it is how long does that train take to cross a single crossing, and how long is that train blocking, and what could be construed as a maximum time that the crossing can be congested?

C:  *Chris Chok:* Do we have more information about the intelligent traffic information? Can we include that with the answers?

A:  *Marcus Siu:* Yes.

C:  *Rudy Storteboom:* Intelligent signage is part of the project, so we will see that on the side of the road. But not on your phone, you can’t access your phone while you are driving.

C:  *Bob Bowles:* So if you don’t need to access your phone, it will be on your map. I should be able to know when I am leaving my house whether a train is coming through town or not.

Q:  *Rudy Storteboom:* Bob brings up another good point. How long is a train allowed to block a level crossing? There are restrictions, federal regulations, and these long trains are taking longer than is allowed, that could be a potential for public safety to be compromised. If you can imagine a fire engine waiting for the train to cross, siren and lights on.

A:  *Marcus Siu:* Yeah, so as you mentioned, those are federal regulations. So those regulations are out there, railways generally have to follow those rules.

C:  *Rudy Storteboom:* But that’s an environmental impact on us, the people, who are as important as any other environmental component you might be studying. You may be wanting to consider the scope of your environmental study, and the footprint around the terminal. To Roy’s point--there is a linear effect. The environment is being affected. It is not just coal dust either.
A: **Rhona Hunter:** One of the things that comes out of the regulatory process is those things that the Port actually has the ability to control, and those that the Port does not have the ability to control, such as the speed that a train goes through. That may be identified as being an issue that other agencies have to manage.

Q: **Rudy Storteboom:** But the Port is the customer, and their railway is a service provider, so you have input, right?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** We work with the railways yes, but we don’t regulate them.

C: **Cliff Caprani:** But I’m sorry, it is a bit disingenuous to suggest that the Port is not somehow tied in with the railway. This is kind of a Field of Dreams scenario. If you build it, they will come. If you double the size of the port, you know that train traffic is going to increase as a result. So you can’t really honestly say to us that somehow the two are connected, but to say that you can’t have a say, that’s very convenient for you, I’m afraid to be able to say that, to sort of put that out to somebody else. But you’re part of the problem if you are going to provide a situation that allows double the amount of stuff to come into the country or go out of the country.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** And part of what we do is work with all of the logistic partners on providing solutions, but they don’t work for us, we don’t work for them. So, it is really just a partnership that we need to continue. The Roberts Bank Rail Corridor is an example of working with many, many partners to deliver a project.

Q: **Roy Mufford:** Well, are we going to discuss safety later on as a specific issue? There are some very significant issues with the railroad and what is coming through that port from the safety point of view. My son lives on Crush Crescent, and recently, there has been several times where an ambulance has been stopped in the line, waiting for the train, and had to turn its lights off. How would you like to be in that ambulance? There is no provision for anything on Crush Crescent in terms of traffic mitigation one way or the other. There is a whole range of topics like that, that I would like to discuss with you after we have gone around this table, because there are some very serious things that are going to happen if we don’t deal with it.

C: **Chris Chok:** I have made a note of that Roy, and we’ll come back to it.

Q: **Terry Lyster:** In terms of the anticipated traffic coming out of the port, is it possible to provide at least the rail component of what the cross product would be for traffic crossing 200 Street in Langley?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I think that at this point, that is part of our transportation study that would be part of the EA process, so, we don’t have that information yet, but that will be part of the EA process.

Q: **Nathan Pachal:** That will be coming in that document?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** The EA will have a transportation study in it, and the scope of the EA has yet to be determined by the regulators, so I don’t have the EA or the documentation in front of me.

Q: **Terry Lyster:** But in this process I’d like to make a formal request for those projections.

A: **Chris Chok:** There is information in here, on page 24, about how many additional trains would come as a result of the project.

Q: **Ed Kolla:** As part of this process, are you having separate meetings with the different municipal jurisdictions that trains are passing through?
Rhona Hunter: Yes, we are.

Dave Moffatt: I find it quite interesting that you are able to legislate and regulate the comings and goings of truck traffic in your various locations, but you can’t make arrangements on a fairly concise basis as to train traffic, length of trains, and the volume during normal daytime work routines versus evening train movements. To me, that doesn’t add. If you can regulate the trucks, you can surely impact on the train traffic to Roberts Bank, and the effect it would have on these folks that live out here in Langley.

Economic Benefits of the Project

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the proposed project including the economic forecasts that indicate growth through 2030 and the economic benefits of the project for British Columbians (pages 16 and 17 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Rudy: How many terminals will there be in total? I suspect there will be 4.
A: Rhona: We are here to discuss Roberts Bank Terminal 2 and I don’t know of any future plans beyond that at this point.

Q: George Anderson: How many of these proposed jobs come out of British Columbia because I remember hearing the same story when they opened Golden Ears Bridge, and I understand a good portion of those jobs went to workers from outside of British Columbia. If we are here talking about British Columbia, then let’s at least talk about jobs because I think lots of times these jobs aren’t created here. We are always talking about importing tradesman because we don’t train tradesmen, and all these projects we’ve got, we don’t have our local people on the good paying jobs, because we don’t train them. So, part of this whole planning, pre-planning stage should be on how we are going to get skilled workers to do the jobs, so that we can have an economic benefit to this country. The economic benefit of the country is not going to the working people, but they are paying the taxes. The people that are making huge profits off of imports and exports are the owners of Deltaport and the rails and the people in the large trucking and shipping companies; the poor people that are making basic wage are paying the cost of these things.

A: Rhona Hunter: Well, we do have time between now and the construction of the project that there certainly is an opportunity for training to occur.

C: George Anderson: Well, that is what we always hear, even Christy Clark is always talking about training our people, but it isn’t happening. I sat in the same room here, when they inquired on the Port Mann Bridge, and the feedback I got was really relevant to anything that I see in here. I am not sure on the Port Mann Bridge how many workers -- British Columbia workers built that bridge. If we are going to talk about economic growth and all of this stuff in the country, we need to get it more than in the pockets of the investors and we need to get some in the people that live here.

C: Rhona Hunter: Well the people that will be operating it, will be living here, and that is 18,000 jobs a year.

C: George Anderson: Okay, if we accept that as being factual, just a couple of minutes ago you talked about 4,500 jobs on the construction. Whether it is to bridge over and replacing the Deas Island Tunnel, or any of these other infrastructures or railways, or anything else we are building
here if we are bringing workers in from outside we really are losing a big economic benefit to this province.

C:  *Chris Chok:*  Point taken.

C:  *Matt Skinner:*  George, if I might quickly respond to your question, there are job numbers in the Discussion Guide that relate to the jobs that will be created as a part of construction, and as a part of operations. In large part, those numbers were developed from information that comes from an economic impact report that was prepared for Port Metro Vancouver by InterVISTAS, and that was actually released this year. And there is a lot of relevant information in there, about what these jobs are, where these jobs are, how many are in British Columbia, and how many are in the Lower Mainland. That information is available on the Port Metro Vancouver website, and if any of you are interested in finding out more about the jobs that are existing right now, you will find a lot more information there. Some people can be pretty skeptical about it. But this work was done by professional third parties for the ports. So, you are welcome to take a look at it.

Q:  *Rudy Storteboom:*  Could you find that for us and email it? That would be great.

A:  *Matt Skinner:*  We can follow up and make that available to all of you.

Q:  *Cliff Caprani:*  Just wondering if you can tell me how many full time jobs will be on the new port? How many guys are we clocking on every shift to go and work on this facility? A hundred? A thousand?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:*  We don’t have that number, that will be dependent upon the operator, and the operator obviously hasn't been selected. We've used a semi-automated terminal as the design criteria, but it will really depend on what the actual final operator chooses to implement.

C:  *Cliff Caprani:*  Okay, so you take my point then, that if you don’t have any guys you are starting with, it makes it kind of hard to come up with a number of 18,200 jobs. One of the things I’m really interested in is understanding the methodology behind that. This is a great number, but I don’t understand how you go to it, and I’d really like to be able to understand that.

C:  *Rhona Hunter:*  I would have to say that I don’t know off the top of my head, but that InterVISTAS report will articulate fairly clearly exactly which of those jobs are where, and which of those jobs have been tied to the terminal.

Q:  *Cliff Caprani:*  I’d really like to understand the methodology. Is that also part of the report? Do you know, Matt?

A:  *Matt Skinner:*  The report does explain how they arrived at the numbers that they did.

Q:  *Cliff Caprani:*  So you will email that to us?

A:  *Matt Skinner:*  Yes.

Q:  *Nathan Pachal:*  Just a quick question. You said that there are 9,200 direct jobs here. What do you define as a direct job then?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:*  Direct jobs are direct jobs that are actually attributed to the terminal and the operations of the project itself. It includes the trucking, it includes the rail, it includes everybody who has a direct contact, and those are all defined in the InterVISTAS report. Indirect being -- “indirect employment” refers to employment in industries supported by port business, “induced
employment” refers to jobs generated by expenditures by those employed directly or indirectly. Those are all fairly standard terms within these types of studies that are used to define the various types of employment and jobs.

**Marine Terminal**

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the proposed project including scope of the project and the construction of the marine terminal. She discussed the construction methodology that will create the berth face versus the terminal island itself (pages 18 and 19 of the Discussion Guide).

**Q:** Cal Jeske: Is part of the environmental assessment going to take a look into dredging or what they are doing with the waste water?

**A:** Rhona Hunter: Yes.

**Q:** Cal Jeske: Where are they planning on dumping all the dredging?

**A:** Rhona Hunter: The material used to create the land will be from a combination of the dredging that will occur in the berth face, as well as Fraser River sand dredgeate, to provide some stability at the berth face that needs to be there for the ship movement. Our current design has a portion of the dredged material, which is very fine particles that can’t settle out once it is put into the island to settle out. That would be then disposed at sea at an approved disposal site.

**Q:** Cal Jeske: So at sea versus land?

**A:** Rhona Hunter: Yes.

**C:** Cliff Caprani: Incredibly fortuitous.

**A:** Rhona Hunter: I am not involved with the Surrey Fraser Docks, I am here talking about the Terminal 2 project and the removal of the tunnel does nothing for our project.

**Q:** Lee Lockwood: So you are trying to tell me that in the back room, the master plan for 30 years down the pipe, none of this converges at some point?

**A:** Rhona Hunter: I can’t comment on that. I am not involved in it.

**C:** Cliff Caprani: But you would take the point though that the reason for Terminal 2 could be challenged if significant traffic could be diverted up the Fraser to Surrey Fraser Docks. It would tie in.

**C:** Rhona Hunter: No. The limitations on the Fraser River are two-fold—the current draft because of the tunnel, and, of equal and going forward probably greater significance, the width of the river does not allow the size of ships currently servicing Deltaport to be able to turn around. The size of ships that we are actually going to see coming in the future, which are going to be larger and fewer ships, will absolutely not be able to turn in the Fraser River. For these reasons there is no long-term potential for Fraser Surrey Docks to be a container terminal.

**Q:** Bob Bowles: Does it become an intermodal yard?
A: **Rhona Hunter:** It is not part of the Deltaport network. It’s limited for containers because of the size of ships that can make it in there, and certainly that is not going to increase over time. So its future is not containers.

Q: **George Anderson:** Can you help me understand the purpose for the Deltaport and the new Highway 17 perimeter road? It parallels the river and the tracks, right?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** It is to take traffic off local roads and to allow for traffic to service the logistics and industrial facilities that are adjacent to that road. The purpose of the road is to tie Highway 1, Highway 99, and Deltaport to each other.

Q: **George Anderson:** So a lot of containers are going to be on that road. Are barges on the river an option?

C: **Rhona Hunter:** I think you are referring to short-sea-shipping, where they would take the containers from an offload facility, put them onto a barge, and then offload them again at another facility.

Q: **George Anderson:** From Deltaport to the CN station where there are a lot of containers at the end of 176 Street. That is about the same end of the Highway 17 other than going to Highway 1. Is that not an option to move containers by that?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** It is not within our current project scope. We are not looking at that as an option.

C: **George Anderson:** For us in this room to come here because the purpose of this meeting again was for us to give input, it’s pretty hard for us to give input on just one little island like Deltaport 2, when it interacts with everything else in the Lower Mainland. Half of our input and concerns here appear to be rail and trucks.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** We are here to hear your input. Some of our discussion topics do address trucks and trucking initiatives.

C: **Chris Chok:** So your question is why aren’t containers put on barges sent up the Fraser River to the CN Intermodal yard?

Q: **George Anderson:** I guess my thinking is Deltaport number 2, is probably going to double, or pretty close to double, depending on how much it is used and the increase traffic in rail and truck from what we have now. Even though Highway 17 or Perimeter Road, and the overpasses that are being built for the trains presumably to allow Deltaport 1 smooth running, is that not correct? So, what is coming next when Deltaport 2 becomes functional? How many more railways and bridges are we going to need?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** So, this goes back to Bob’s question about the scope of the project. Both the South Fraser Perimeter Road, and the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program considered growth at Roberts Bank. Through the regulators’ determination as part of the EA process, the scope of the assessment will identify the direction as to where and what we may be looking at providing for additional mitigation. Once we go outside of the scope of our project footprint, it is a different kind of assessment. We have direct control and direct responsibility for everything that is within our project itself. Once we move into the scope of the assessment which is a much broader geographical area, then we need to work much more closely with partners. The Port doesn’t own, manage or run all of the various components of the logistics business, and that is where
we would be working with our partners to deliver any of those mitigations that the regulator determines are required.

Q:  *Rudy Storteboom*: How big is that footprint?
A:  *Rhona Hunter*: It is our project scope. It is the terminal and the causeway. That’s the project; that’s what we are building.

Q:  *Nathan Pachal*: So basically is that where the red line ends here on page 21? Is that your project?
A:  *Rhona Hunter*: Yes. That is right.

Q:  *Nathan Pachal*: And then it’s up to the regulator to figure out what the impact is if there are three times as many trains once you get past that point. It might not really be the Port’s responsibility?
A:  *Rhona Hunter*: What we are saying is that there is scope of the assessment. That will look at impacts such as air, noise, congestion, safety, wildlife strikes, and those sorts of things. So that is the scope of the assessment, and that occurs outside of the footprint.

Q:  *Nathan Pachal*: All of the work you have done so far has been focused on the Project Description-- because I read the executive summary. It was very focused on this area here, and when you were talking about pollution and air quality, it seemed like you were concerned about the air quality happening here and if it flew over to the United States or something like that, but it wasn’t focused on other areas within the Lower Mainland.
A:  *Rhona Hunter*: No, it does include other areas of the Lower Mainland.

C:  *Ed Kolla*: I think you answered my question. The point I am going to make is that the scope of the project you are talking about is strictly the terminal and the roads leading out from the terminal to the end of the where you get back to land. And I guess we here, and I think I can speak for this group, are more concerned about the impact that this is going to have on the infrastructure that is out to Langley and beyond.

C:  *Nathan Pachal*: But even the human health and all that and beyond.

Q:  *Ed Kolla*: Who is going to be preparing the terms of what the Port’s role and responsibility is and how far it is going to look? I come back to the previous expansion where the assessment was basically just focused on the Deltaport and Delta, and it was raised by a number here. We want to make sure that the assessment that is going to take place subsequent to what you are doing, is going to go out and take into consideration the impacts out in this area and beyond.
A:  *Rhona Hunter*: The regulator, the federal regulator has a public comment period open until the 15th of October, and that is an opportunity for anybody who has a concern or issue to provide that input to the regulator. The regulator uses that and the project description to then develop the scope of the assessment.

Q:  *Rudy Storteboom*: And we are providing that now, so that is being recorded now, is it not?
A:  *Rhona Hunter*: What you are providing now is for the Port. So, it is a very important distinction.

Q:  *Rudy Storteboom*: So all of our concerns associated with a linear scope of environmental impact study are not for the record?
A:  **Rhona Hunter:** It is for the record.

C:  **Chris Chok:** It’s for the record and it will be reported in the consultation summary report that my firm will produce. But, I think the point that Rhona is making is that you also do need to tell the regulator directly.

Q:  **Nathan Pachal:** Will the regulator be reading the record of this meeting before they make a decision on the scope? Or will you be submitting it to them before the deadline?

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** No. We don’t submit this. This is a separate process.

Q:  **Nathan Pachal:** Okay, so if we were concerned about defining the scope, talking to you about it right now -- I don’t want to use the word waste of time, but if we are saying we are concerned about the scope, you can say, “We understand, but we really need to actually be telling the regulator that we want the scope to be expanded?"

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** I think that if you have concerns around the project or you wish to express concerns, then absolutely the regulator is the place to do that. In the Project Description, you will notice that we provided all of our previous consultation summaries to the regulator. The information you provide today will eventually end up with the regulator as well. They are fully aware that we are doing this. They are very keen and interested to know what the community concerns are. We do provide that to the regulator; however, they have a federal process that requires them to operate within their federal process. If there are concerns that the communities have, they have been invited to provide that input until October 15th. There will be many opportunities to participate in both a provincial and federal process. This is just one of them.

C:  **Nathan Pachal:** I just sent them an email today.

C:  **Rhona Hunter:** It is 20 days total, so it has already been open for 10 days.

C:  **Cliff Caprani:** Yeah, but that’s been kind of moot in the sense that this stuff hasn’t been available. I mean one needs to go with the other. But I just wanted to state in the strongest sense, that if anybody in this room is concerned about the issue, they need to go to the CEAA website and have a word with them, and ask for the strongest possible review. If you want Port Metro Vancouver’s feet to be held somewhat to the fire, you need to ask for the strongest review. If we don’t, they get an easy pass, and that is not what I am in favour of. So it is up to us. We have some ability to perhaps set the tone of that review. I’m not saying that we can decide, but we at least can influence it. So I would urge people, if they are serious about it, don’t wait the long weekend, do it there tomorrow and right away.

Q:  **Terry Lyster:** I thought it was a heck of a great meeting, but then they told me about this. So, this regulator, the whole time I have been here, we’ve used the word “the regulator” in the abstract. Is it CEAA?

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** So there are two regulators-- a federal regulator, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, CEAA, and the second agency is called the B.C. Environmental Assessment Office, BCEAO. They don’t have a prescribed process, and so they don’t have the same open period for consultation. The federal process is very prescribed in terms of “this is when we do this”, “this is how long we do this, and then we do this and this is how long we do this”. The BCEAO process is not as prescribed. So, currently there is no general invitation to the public for comment from the provincial government. They have been provided with the Project
Description at the same time on September 12th. Their process will unfold on its own timeline and there may be other opportunities within the provincial process, too.

Q: **Terry Lyster:** Have they been open for business regarding this since the 12th of September?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Yeah. Our hope and our goal with the agencies is that there is one process for the public. When that actually happens, when those two federal and provincial processes converge and align then the public will have just one process. This is probably still a few months away. We don’t have a definitive timeline when that happens, but we have been advocating for that to be the case to remove some of this uncertainty and confusion.

C: **Terry Lyster:** For a little context, you’re touching a nerve that was first exposed in the mid-60s here, before the rail was actually here. When there was another railway, it wasn’t dedicated for freight to the port. And on an ongoing basis there is an issue that has come up, and we sort of see some reaction to the issue, but it’s been pointed out what is down the line from the port has kind of been ignored. And you are dealing here with really the only urban centre that is traversed by the rail. I can tell you that it has really skewed the way this community has developed and grown, and what opportunities are available. I think if I really believe in the Port, about half of what I am wearing probably came in on a container one way or another, so thank you very much, but it really has to operate well, and it has to operate well in the context of this whole region. And it has got to be a good steady firm part of the region and well designed and integrated. I appreciate that you have a limited scope and it is a fairly well defined project, but it is very complicated out here, so be patient with us.

C: **Chris Chok:** The point is well taken.

Q: **Rudy Storteboom:** Thanks Chris. I want more information about the regulators as well. You’ve identified the two agencies involved. Are there a certain number of people who are specially assigned to this task, or those entire agencies are involved? Would those individuals be interested in meeting with us to hear first-hand our passion about our concerns?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** There will be opportunities. I am not the regulator, so I don’t want to commit them to anything, but as part of the regulatory process, there are working groups with municipalities, public engagement opportunities, and I am certain that if you put that request in it would certainly be heard, whether they respond to it or not. I think this public comment also is a very valuable opportunity for the public to provide their concerns and feedback to them, and they do use that. That’s why it is there. They give people a set amount of time to provide their comments so they can then move on and make a decision and start rolling out the process.

C: **Rudy Storteboom:** Now, we are running out of time here and I know Roy wanted to touch on safety, is that available to give him some time to talk about that? Because I have that concern as well.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** Okay, we don’t have specifically a safety part in the Discussion Guide, but if you would like to speak about safety, we certainly can.

Q: **Rudy Storteboom:** Is there any point if it’s not part of the scope of the project.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** It’s part of the scope, it is just not part of the Discussion Guide. The Project Description’s executive summary is 30 or 40 pages. The entire document is a binder and a half. It provides a lot more information than we can’t possibly put in the Discussion Guide or talk
about in a two-hour period. This Discussion Guide is by no attempts or intention to summarize the Project Description.

C:  **Rudy Storteboom:** I am okay with the expansion, but I am not okay with how it is impacting me and mine. And I think with good communication we can fix it. But it is a two-way street, it is not just them telling us what is going to happen, it is them listening to what our concerns are.

C:  **Chris Chok:** Roy, you brought up safety. I had in my note regarding safety the example you raised was first responders being stuck behind trains, waiting behind trains as they pass by. Are there other examples that you wanted to provide?

C:  **Roy Mufford:** Yes.

C:  **Terry Lyster:** Here is a picture of an ambulance which has just turned its lights off. The photo is taken from Kwantlen.

Q:  **Roy Mufford:** I was just going to follow up with what Terry asked-- who is this regulator? Does this guy live in Langley? I wish he did. It would sure be nice to talk to these people that are the regulators, because what concerns me is that they are going to look into these issues, and a lot of them have predetermined outcomes, and we experienced this after this last roll around. They realized they hadn’t looked at Langley, and then they decided that they’d hire somebody to do a Roberts Bank rail corridor study. We were told that we’d have some input into this.

Well, the first I heard about it was at a CPR meeting I was at. The engineer for Langley City mentioned that the tender had been called for the company to do the study for the Roberts Bank rail corridor situation. And I said, “Well, can I have a look at that tender call?” I said I didn’t understand how this process worked. And he said certainly. He went into his office after the meeting and photocopied the tender call. It was a fairly thick document. What really upset me was that on the third page, it said it had to be understood that the consultant who was going to do this study into the Roberts Bank rail corridor was not allowed to look at alternate routing as one of the options. We’ve always said, back in 1968 when the port was built, Bennett found the cheapest way to get to the port was to go through Langley, and the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board, which predated the GVRD in the central Fraser Valley, took him on and said no, go down the CN mainline, and out the industrial corridor to the port. I’ve got the maps. They had beautiful colour maps of what they proposed and everything. Bennett fired the entire board just because they opposed him on how they should get to the port in the first place. Well, we found this document hidden in the special collections library in UBC and we brought it out and said, “Well why can’t we look at this now?” And they said no. Whoever set the parameters said the consultant is not allowed to look at that. Right off the bat we knew we were had.

There is no good reason why Surreyport and Deltaport shouldn’t be tied together. There is traffic coming from Surrey that has to go to Delta at some point or another, or they are going to put that ‘Y’ in at Fort Langley, and then we are going to really see some traffic. And don’t tell me you haven’t heard about that. Now, the point is, why aren’t they taking that new bridge there, instead of the Massey Tunnel for instance, and putting a new rail bridge into New Westminster? Then they could drill it right around the port, down the Burlington Northern, across that bridge and all the way to Kamloops on the north side, without ever coming near Langley. That is because all the outbound trains go on the north side from Mission, all inbound trains come to Mission on the CN main line, and then they come down through Langley. Well, if they went straight out to CN Mainline to Delta, and out to the port, Langley wouldn’t have this
problem. Well, this study that was commissioned, nobody got any input from Langley at all, and
the next thing we know there was an announcement made that in the Township of Langley
Council that there was going to be a signing of a document that dealt with a Roberts Bank rail
corridor and all the brass and the Minister from Ottawa showed up. Kevin Falcon showed up,
too. All the partners showed up to sign this document. So we are going to go and watch this.
You know they wouldn’t let us in the council chambers? They came out and said, “No, you can't
go in.” So, a couple of people that I was associated with started raising their voice, and finally
they opened the doors and somebody came out and said, “You are welcome to come and watch
the formalities, but you have to give us an undertaking that you will ask no questions.” That is
the gospel truth; that is exactly what happened. The mayor at the time was Kurt Alberts and
Kevin Falcon and the fellow who used to look after one of the big lumber companies. The
Minister at the time, he was there. They all signed this document, and what we called for ended
up being all these overpasses on all the roads that nobody was travelling on. There was no
overpass on the bypass, Langley Bypass, no overpass on 200th Street, no overpass on Fraser
Highway. No overpass where the traffic existed, and still exists today. They were all put in
obscure locations like Mufford Crescent and 192nd, and they were wonderful -- the brand new
one just going up here, the overpass to the White Spot we call it. Why weren’t they prepared to
listen to the public? And it would be really nice for a change to have you folks go back and tell
them that they have really screwed up. Because it doesn’t matter where you live now in
Langley, you are living on the wrong side of the tracks. I just wish somebody could take that
message back to them and say, “Look it, maybe it is time you did listen to us.”

C: Chris Chok: We’ve got it on the record. The Port can certainly pass on the message to the 12
partners of the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program.

C: Roy Mufford: Well there is still time to, for instance, replace the New West bridge which has to
be replaced. They could put in a high lift rail bridge and replace the Patullo Bridge at the same
time. They did a study about 10 years ago into replacing that bridge, and it was peanuts
compared to this $300 million dollars that they ended up spending on the overpasses. And if
they put it in at that time, they could have pulled the trains out of Deltaport, either going down
the Burlington Northern, or the map the Lower Mainland Climbing Board proposed, going across
that bridge, and never, ever come through Langley with the outbound trains. The inbound
trains could still go down the CN mainline and out through Delta. Nobody is listening, because it
is just destroying this community. You get 38 trains, some of them 12,000 feet long, going
through this town, and nobody is going to want to live here. What do you think is going to
happen on that blasted bypass? You know, when you get a 12,000 foot train going through? It’s
like ten minutes.

C: Terry Lyster: I am making the assumption that you guys really want the Port to work and to work
well. I think that’s got to be somewhere in your mandate. That means it has to be plugged into
a really robust transportation system which is really multi-modal. I think there is capacity on the
Fraser River that is really being wasted, not just for freight, but for a bunch of other stuff. But I
was excited to see this map here, which isn’t my map, it is your map, because you’ve got all of
these dots and they are running along the little flat bit of the landscape which is the Fraser, and I
was also excited by what we used to call the North Perimeter Road in Surrey, now it is the South
Perimeter Road, but it’s the same road. It is doing that thing that the map Roy is talking about
was proposing, back in 1968, which was to have an industrial corridor along the river, on both
sides of the river, and then you only have to worry about the little community of Fort Langley,
which is already under the oppression of rail. I don’t think any of it is headed toward Deltaport. And there is a solution, which I will not show you now, as to how you deal with that, which would have been a lot cheaper than putting a lot of concrete down in Langley, and I think just for contingency, the Port really should have more than one rail route for people to get at it.

C:  **Chris Chok:**  Is there something you could submit to this consultation process that is written up?

C:  **Roy Mufford:**  This is the map he is talking about that was in the actual brief done in 1968, showing the rail corridor going down to the port along an industrial corridor. Believe it or not, the railways also provided a map in that brief incorporating the BNSF. They recommended this line. There was two options and the government didn’t take either one of them.

Q:  **Terry Lyster:**  But in the event of a problem in Langley that lasts for a while, it is going to be pretty awkward keeping the same volumes and associated stuff getting around trucks. It is going to potentially impede the operation of the port, and that’s clearly within your mandate.

C:  **Chris Chok:**  I would encourage you to write it up and submit that into this process.

Q:  **Nathan Pachal:**  Is Langley the only way out for Deltaport for rail traffic?

A:  **Terry Lyster:**  It is my understanding that an alternative is to head down into the States and then try to get back up through Abbotsford.

A:  **Marcus Siu:**  So generally that’s our understanding. That is the way the current railway companies do business at Deltaport, but we work with the railways all the time to see if there is possible optimization. We can’t say at this point what changes might be.

Q:  **Tony Bisig:**  While there have been some concerns regarding safety, one thing I haven’t heard yet is what the effect these long trains are going to have on businesses in Langley City, and the people sitting there in traffic. People are going to think twice about doing business in Langley if they can go elsewhere to do business. I am sure that there are going to be effects and people just decide that they will pack it in and not do business here. So, while, Port Metro Vancouver is making these great decisions, it’s going to have quite a negative effect on some of the communities along the railroad tracks.

C:  **Rudy Storteboom:**  In light of Lac-Mégantic and the fact that we’ve had train derailments here in the city before, I think it would be appropriate for us to discuss safety issues, especially with the recent evidence about the Chinese shipping fireworks through our community, with the sign on the side of the container that says “Kaboom.” That is not what we want to see. That’s not safety at all.

C:  **Rhona Hunter:**  I was with your engineering staff last week and they brought up the same concerns around that particular container, and I think the general consensus was the railroad said that there is no such container. Containers have shipping lines on them, they don’t have private facilities. I believe there is a photo.

C:  **Roy Mufford:**  This picture shows what was on the train. There were 10 containers in close proximity, some of them double stacked. And if you’ve got WiFi in here, I’d like you to go on your computer and type in “container fireworks test.” It will scare the daylights out of you. What they did was they took 20 foot containers of fireworks and they set them out, went back a couple miles and they just hit them with one spark and it would make what happened in Quebec look like a picnic.
C: **Rhona Hunter:** I think that what you are talking about is the transportation of dangerous goods in containers. The transportation of dangerous goods is not regulated by the Port but it is regulated by Transport Canada and other provincial agencies. There are certain requirements that all of those goods have to adhere to. I am not speaking specifically to this because I have no knowledge first hand of this, and I only became aware of it in the last week.

C: **Roy Mufford:** Well, people in the municipality were denying it happened. They tried to say these pictures were photoshopped. It would have been much safer for them to have shipped dynamite through town, because dynamite requires a blasting cap. This is what is called a primary explosive. It only requires a spark. So we now have Fraser Highway, 200 Street, and the Langley Bypass, with hundreds of thousands of cars going across there. Anyone could hit that train and cause a fire. And you know, Langley used to be called Langley Prairie before it was a city. We’ll be able to call it Langley Prairie again if this happens.

C: **Rudy Storteboom:** When it comes to public safety, we should all be on the same page.

C: **Marcus Siu:** Obviously this is a safety concern. We have received this for our information and can work with the railways and the regulator.

C: **Lee Lockwood:** This brings us to a similar topic- the transportation of crude oil by rail. This is a huge concern for people out here. With speculation that oil could be transported by rail if the proposed pipeline is not approved, I think we have good cause to worry about safety. You are probably hearing a fair amount of cynicism and criticism here in this room but I think you are reaping what you have sown.

C: **Terry Lyster:** Around Langley, there are big safety practice operations that take place annually with local government and first responders. Of these, 4 to 6 of these scenarios are around rail emergencies. Any problem that comes up here will seriously affect the Port’s ability to efficiently do their business.

C: **Nathan Pachal:** We’ve talked a little about the studies that Port Metro Vancouver is undertaking for the project that must be completed; however, I think that the Port has a moral obligation to do mitigation and studies that reach farther than the minimum required by the regulator. This would really show the public that the Port is serious about exceeding basic requirements.

C: **Chris Chok:** Noted

Q: **Nathan Pachal:** Again, how is it that you can do more about trucks than you can about trains?

A: **Marcus Siu:** We regulate the trucks that are allowed to do business with the Port. They must meet our regulations in order to access the Port property. On the rail side, I don’t know the answer but it is a larger commercial operation which requires us to work with our partners.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** The railway companies themselves are regulated by the **Canadian Railway Act**, so we don’t get to regulate them. We work with them as partners that interface with each other. We certainly love to have them at the table but they are not always at the table with us. They don’t have any obligation to be at the table with us. From a business perspective, we do understand that we are symbiotic and their business thrives if our business thrives. But they are not subservient to us, and they have a lot of regulations that they themselves adhere to.

Q: **Dave Moffatt:** The size of the trains, the length and the speed all relates to service at the ports? If you were to say to the railway, “We can only accept X number of trains of certain length over this period of time,” are they going to say, “No” and then you’re going to take them all anyway?
A: **Rhona Hunter**: I’m not sure whether we have that authority, so I’d have to say that I can’t really comment on that.

C: **Dave Moffatt**: Well, you do with the trucking industry.

C: **Rhona Hunter**: I understand. Trucks and rails are different. So if there is a need for greater understanding about the interface between the Port and rail, we can certainly try and get that information to you.

C: **Nathan Pachal**: Well, that relationship would be something really interesting to understand. It seems like with trucks you have a position of authority over them, or rather you can put incentives in place to make work toward the goals you’d like them to meet, where you might not be able to use incentives with the railways.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: And I don’t have enough of a sense and understanding from the legal standpoint what the Port’s interface is with railways to comment on that.

C: **George Anderson**: I’m not sure if we’ve satisfied what we come here for but from what I’ve heard around the table here -- I’m not saying they are incorrect, I’m saying they aren’t really satisfying me. I don’t know if they are satisfying anybody else.

The fact is that the federal government looks after the railways and we can’t control them. But through my life I’ve always heard that if I’m the customer, which the rail company should be for Deltaport, it’s now the client. They are hauling Deltaport’s goods. So if they can’t stipulate where the trains are going to be going or what they are going to be hauling, or Deltaport can’t be responsible enough not to ship that stuff through Langley, if that’s what the rules are, somebody needs to enforce them.

We got the same problem in this town with bicycles and helmets for a very simple reason: there’s no enforcement. Talking on cell phones is a major issue in this province. I think it’s the third cause of fatalities now, and not because the rule isn’t there, it’s because we don’t enforce the rules. My vote on this whole project is -- I’d love to see Deltaport expand and create a lot of good paying jobs, but if we can’t meet the safety standards and if we can’t control how the railways or the trucks are doing their business, then let’s put the project in Prince Rupert.

**Feedback Form**

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the three feedback discussion topics- Habitat Mitigation, Port-Related Truck Traffic Improvement and Community Legacy Benefits (pages 31-37 of the Discussion Guide).

C: **Lee Lockwood**: I’ve heard the Port refer to the railroads are your customers in the past. You so get a chance to dictate that relationship. For example, there are many airlines like, the Boeing Corporation, who will not sell aircraft to some operators because they are incapable of operating safely, and I think that you are in a position to buck up and reinforce a few things a little bit more bluntly than you say you can do.

I mean, in a previous lifetime, Canadian Pacific owned their own port because they had their own fleet of ships. They didn’t care. They are out of the ship business. There is no railroad business. They are in the hotel business and all that stuff. So I think that your ability to deal with the railroad is a little more than you are letting on here.
Q: **Bob Bowles:** The Port Metro Vancouver project that we’re looking at now is actually part of a larger project called the Gateway Project. My late grandfather was all about the integrated traffic and transportation planning and model. I see on page 24, on the 4th paragraph it is talking about developing the transportation plan for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project. He was calling for that very information at the beginning of this, from the Minister of Transportation. I got the email, after my grandfather’s passing, that they could not provide that information because it was too complex. Until you can provide a comprehensive traffic and transportation plan, then all of these overpasses that you’ve built on what is being called the Port Metro Rail Corridor here in Langley, you’re not even going in the right direction. You’re trying to approve plans that are not in the right direction.

And Roy has brought that to light from the 1960s, and I’ve heard this all around the table.

You’re talking about the future without regard to the true meaning of what we are doing here. It’s part of the Gateway Project. This isn’t just Port Metro Vancouver or Roberts Bank. This is the Gateway Project. If we’re here and we need to be in a different meeting, at a different location, with a broader context, then we need to know about it as citizens. To read it in a trade magazine, that if you don’t happen to get, you won’t know about, that is not serving the general public. And if you’re looking for feedback from the general public, you need to address the general public rather than just a little trade magazine ad for the entire Gateway Project. As citizens -- these folks here take a lot of time out and we end up at the same meetings, never talking to each other, and then here we are again. So are we at the wrong meeting?

A: **Chris Chok:** Well, this meeting is for this project, Port Metro Vancouver’s project and this process certainly was advertised quite heavily. With respect to what I think you are referring to as the whole notion that the federal government has the Asian Pacific Gateway Corridor strategy, that’s not this project.

Q: **Rudy Storteboom:** Has this meeting lived up to your expectations?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Our only expectation is that you participate. That’s what we come here for.

C: **Rudy Storteboom:** Well, I think I can speak for the group when I say we were expecting something more. And if you can take that feedback that we provided you today back to the regulator, we’d sincerely appreciate it. Some follow up would be nice. You’ve got our contact information. We’ve provided you with input and we’ve provided you with some questions that we’d like answers to. And we trust that that information is going to be passed along to the regulator, and we’re hoping that we’re going to get some more opportunity to get information and possibly communicate directly with the regulator.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** So I need to be clear again. This process is not part of the regulator’s public consultation process. The regulator’s consultation process is a federal process. So I ask that you provide that feedback to the regulator. This overall, multi-phased, consultation process that Port Metro Vancouver has undertaken is a separate process and outside of the environmental assessment process, both federal and provincial. We provide this feedback to the regulators, but it is not a requirement of the EA process that we do this, or that we provide that information to them.

C: **Rudy Storteboom:** I understand. You don’t want to be part of the process.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** No. The regulator has a prescribed process. The public comment period started September 23rd and it will finish October 15th. There is a 20-day regulated process that the
federal agency, CEAA, has opened up the Project Description, which is online and available to anybody who wishes to look at it to comment. They will receive public comments into the formal environmental assessment process for twenty days at this stage. There will be subsequent stages for public comment as they go forward as well.

This meeting that we are having here today is a Port Metro Vancouver led multi-phased public consultation process to do specifically with gathering feedback from communities about how we can develop this project going forward. It is not an integral part of the EA process. It’s sort of like a feed into the EA process because we share this information with the regulator. But we are not using this venue here to provide formal comment to the regulatory process in this 20-day window. This meeting is not a feed into that public comment process. This meeting is a separate and distinct Port Metro Vancouver led public engagement over multiple years as this project proceeds.

Q:  
Terry Lyster:  You have our emails. Can you email us contact information?

A:  
Rhona Hunter:  All of that is in the Discussion Guide.

C:  
Rudy Storteboom:  It’s about people and the environment being protected and it seems like it’s so chopped up that it’s not people-friendly at all.

C:  
Rhona Hunter:  It’s actually a simple process to provide feedback to the regulator. You click on the link and you can fill in a form online directly and provide feedback to the regulator.

C:  
Rudy Storteboom:  Okay, I’d like to say thank you but I’m not happy with the process.

C:  
Terry Lyster:  Well, I’ll say thank you for coming all the way out to Langley.

Q:  
Cliff Caprani:  Yes, we haven’t talked about the environment or habitat at all, so there’s one very quick question. Figure 13 in the Project Description, a lovely map about what all is going on. I just want ask a quick question around habitat and scouring. There’s a real concern that with the building of the new port that a significant amount of scouring is going to take place in the causeway and on the area west of that. Someone was very concerned about the Western Sandpiper. It’s all a bit touchy feely. But if the scouring occurs there’s a bit of biofilm that is there which is absolutely essential to it. If scouring occurs to the degree that the Western Sandpiper significantly drops off or disappears, what’s the Port going to do about something like that?

A:  
Rhona Hunter:  We’re not in a position to say what our project would impact. We are still doing baseline studies. We are doing baseline studies to determine what the current situation is, from an environmental perspective, in all of the environmental components. Then the project is placed into that baseline and its impact is determined. We then modify the project to minimize those impacts as much as possible and the process then puts forward mitigation to offset the remaining residual impact. If the remaining impact after mitigation is done is insufficient to satisfy the regulator, the project would not be approved.

C:  
Cliff Caprani:  Okay, you talk about not knowing the effects of certain things. The log removal at Boundary Bay recently... I’ve got some friends who walk there every day. They haven’t seen a raptor there since. Normally there would be. So clearly there has been some effect. They may eventually arrive, but currently when they would normally be there, they are not there anymore. So what you’ve done does have an effect, and certainly in that case it appears to be negative. So we are a bit concerned going forward.
C:  *Rhona Hunter:* The log removal at Boundary Bay was examined by both federal and provincial wildlife, as well as the Department of Fisheries, as were the other log removal projects that we’ve undertaken on TFN land adjacent to Roberts Bank. It was determined that it was a beneficial project and in the past these projects have been beneficial and they have not adversely impacted the environment. They actually do enhance the environment.

C:  *Roy Mufford:* There was one thing that we haven’t talked about, maybe it isn’t part of your mandate, but what is it costing Langley to watch these trains go by? When we went through this process before the group sat down and we went out and took the crossings from 232nd and 56th Avenue and counted the number of people waiting for the trains. They took ten of the eighteen trains a day that are going through. There were 890 vehicles waiting for any given train. They waited an average of three minutes, which we know is light now. The average vehicle occupancy was 1.5 people. These are the figures that were used. Fuel consumption 1.66 litres per hour in the average vehicle. This was calculated at 90 cents per litre back then. The lost time to individuals was only $9 per hour. Total this all up. At that time it worked out to $6,600 per day to the residents of Langley in lost productivity watching the trains go by. This translated to about $2.5 million dollars a year for the privilege of witnessing these trains.

Well, now we are looking at $1.20 or $1.30 for a litre. We’d like to think we’ve got more than $9. I think minimum wage is higher than that. And the average train now is taking at least, what seems like, five minutes. Maybe it’s only three minutes. The point is we only took ten trains and there’s going to be 38.

Who is going to pay Langley for watching all these trains while they sit on the bypass on 200th Street and Fraser Highway? Has that ever been considered? You see what I’m getting at. There are issues here that probably aren’t part of your mandate but they are very real to all of us. Something has to happen. You’ve got to fix this.

C:  *Chris Chok:* That is noted.

*Chris Chok thanked everyone for attending and encouraged participants to provide feedback to both the Port Metro Vancouver-led consultation process and the CEAA regulator-led consultation process.*

*The meeting ended at 7:18pm.*
Notes from a small group meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 10, 1:00pm – 3:00pm, at the Delta Town & Country Inn, Delta, B.C.

Stakeholders: Bernadette Kudzin, Carol Thibault, Don Paulson, Gary Zabenski, Harvey Thibault, Jako Krushnisky, Jerry Cherwonick, Jim Northey, Jim Ronback, Judy Williams, Leisa Yee, Peter Holt, Robert Butler, Tom Bearss, Walter Zmud, Wilma Haig


The record notes that the meeting commenced at 1:03pm
KEY THEMES:

- Participants stated that any additional port expansion to meet forecasted growth should be pursued in Prince Rupert, and not at Roberts Bank.
- Participants expressed a preference for containers to be transported by rail, as opposed to being transported by truck.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding Port Metro Vancouver’s assessment of alternative options to create required container capacity, and inquired as to Fraser Surrey Docks’ plans in light of the announcement to replace the George Massey Tunnel with a bridge.
- Participants requested a thorough social-economic analysis of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project that studies the social impacts of the project, not just the economic impacts.
- Some participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver consult with local naturalists and environmental groups regarding habitat mitigation and enhancement efforts to determine local preferences regarding what habitat projects should be undertaken.
- Some participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver consider opportunities to preserve and showcase the natural environment and wildlife at Roberts Bank.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

   Judy Kirk welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting, and also introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Judy informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy, and outlined how participants could provide feedback. Roundtable introductions were then undertaken.

Q: Harvey Thibault: Are you under contract with Port Metro Vancouver?

A: Judy Kirk: Yes. Kirk & Co is under contract with Port Metro Vancouver but we are an independent firm being paid by them. We are contractors, not employees.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

   Cliff Stewart reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including the role of Port Metro Vancouver (page 4 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Walt Zmud: It is something about the nature of Port Metro Vancouver. I am assuming that if this project goes forward, some of that money would be forthcoming from the government. Or would it be forthcoming from the ability of Port Metro Vancouver to raise money? In other words, how is the second terminal being financed?

A: Cliff Stewart: The intention at this point is that this project would be financed primarily by private money.

Q: Walt Zmud: So you have to go out and raise the money? Offshore money?

A: Cliff Stewart: We have to go out and raise the money. So primarily pension funds and that type of money.
Q: **Walt Zmd**: In other words, at this point in time there is no way to know because you have not yet gone through that effort?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Well we certainly haven’t finished that effort. It is ongoing. I think the important fact is that this project will only proceed if there is a business case that supports it. It is not dependent upon either provincial or federal money.

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

**Cliff Stewart** provided an overview of the importance of trade to British Columbians, as well as container handling at Port Metro Vancouver (page 5 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Walt Zmd**: What happens to all those empty containers that arrived full?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: They go back empty. And the reason for that is that the ships actually reach their gross weight quicker with exports than they do with imports, and they have to top off with empty containers.

**Who is Part of the Container Supply Chain?**

**Cliff Stewart** provided an overview of container handling logistics, and also described some of the different participants in the supply chain, including trucking companies (page 6-7 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Jim Ronback**: Are you telling me that 9 chances in 10 a truck on the causeway won’t be a port truck?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: No, I am not saying that on the causeway, I’m speaking generally. Interestingly, we were hearing a lot of complaints about container trucks in Langley. We have GPS on half of our fleet. We know that almost no container trucks go to Langley and yet we were getting a lot of energy from the room about truck traffic in Langley. In most instances, it isn’t port truck traffic because the trucks don’t go out there.

C: **Jim Ronback**: The problem is in Delta.

C: **Cliff Stewart**: Well, in Langley people felt that there was a problem in Langley. We know that there are a lot of container trucks here.

**Why do We Need Container Trucks?**

**Cliff Stewart** provided an overview of how container trucks are used in the supply chain, and described the various types of transload activities that take place in the Lower Mainland, as well as the advantages provided by Roberts Bank (page 8-10 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Harvey Thibault**: What about Prince Rupert?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: It’s not a case of “either/or”, it’s a case of “and”.

C: **Wilma Haig**: In 2008 the federal government issued a report commissioned by Minister Emerson at that time, and that was a stakeholder report and it clearly stated that no further containment port expansion in the Lower Mainland should be undertaken until the port of Prince Rupert had been maximized. And that has not happened.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Within the context of the Lower Mainland, there are no other available lands or places to build lands that offer the required combination of deep water access, road and rail access.
There are two other projects that have been under development for several years, which have the dual purpose of both mitigating the impact of past developments and also creating opportunity for Terminal 2 to be brought on line without further impacting road and rail traffic. Those are the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which I think you are all aware is going to be opening sometime in the next few months here. And the other is the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program, collectively about 1.5 billion dollars of infrastructure designed to reduce truck congestion, traffic congestion and to reduce the impact of the rail line on the communities that are on either side of it.

Q: Wilma Haig: I heard you say that it had to be Delta because there was no other place with enough land. Just exactly how much land, given that the land here is agricultural land, are you planning to take?

A: Cliff Stewart: We’re not planning to take any. We’re planning to build about 108 hectares, give or take. So it’s not the land in Delta, it’s the land for the terminal that’s important.

The other thing I want to mention is that on the 20th of September, Premier Clark announced the replacement of the George Massey Tunnel and that for people who commute through that tunnel, it’s obviously a good news story.

C: Wilma Haig: Not necessarily.

Q: Judy Williams: The timing of the announcement comes at a rather suspect time since the provincial government is trying to consider whether or not they’re going to go ahead with allowing jet fuel into the estuary on the south arm of the Fraser or any arm of the Fraser River estuary. I am not talking about expansion so you can bring coal to the Surrey Fraser Docks or bring more Panamax freighters of jet fuel up into the sensitive estuary. The rumour I’ve heard is that they’re going to remove the tunnel itself instead of leaving it to silt over. And if they do remove it that means a deep keel hull freighter will be able to come up the river. Now is it going to be removed or is it not going to be removed?

A: Cliff Stewart: I have been told that it is going to be removed but I can’t confirm that.

Q: Judy Williams: And what is the reasoning behind that removal?

A: Cliff Stewart: Because they are building bridge.

Q: Judy Williams: I know they are building the bridge. I’m asking about why they can’t just leave it in place and build a bridge?

A: Cliff Stewart: For the reason that you just said.

Q: Judy Williams: So it is because they’re anticipating more traffic up the river?

C: Judy Kirk: Judy, I think what you’re saying is that taking out the tunnel would allow for more ships and deeper ships, is that it?

Q: Judy Williams: Yes, deep keel hull like for the Panamax oil tankers.

A: Cliff Stewart: So let me very quickly explain this because we could spend a day talking about it. The Panamax-class vessels that you mentioned tend to be dry bulk vessels, but are a good proxy for some tanker types. About 80 percent of the world’s Panamax fleet could go up the river fully loaded today without any problem. So removing the tunnel certainly does have an impact
because if you remove the tunnel and slightly deepen the channel then the other 20 percent of the Panamax vessels could also go up there.

While the tunnel is currently a limitation to container vessels going up the Fraser River, if the tunnel were removed the next size of container vessel that could get up because of the draft restriction being removed is too long to be turned in the river. So the replacement of the tunnel doesn’t have anything to do with containers. In terms of both dry or liquid bulk, while the tunnel might be a slight impediment to some parts of the world fleet, the types of vessels that I think people have in mind, which is what we would call on the liquid side Aframax, or on the dry bulk side Capesize vessels. Capesize is the sort of 100,000 tonne vessel that you see out at Roberts Bank loading coal.

C: Judy Kirk: Judy, just for everyone else’s benefit, I think Geoff Freer is the Project Director for the Massey Tunnel project, and Cliff may well have been told that the tunnel is coming out but I think your question and anyone else interested in that would be better directed to the Ministry of Transportation.

C: Jako Krushnisky: There several different layers you can look through and figure out on this thing. I have lived here 47 years, and I’ve seen some changes so far but nothing as dramatic as what the port is driving right now and there are several reasons why it is happening. And you can look at a lot of different things going on that point to the port as the reason it’s all happening. The treaty that Tsawwassen First Nation achieved where we now have a fairly good chunk of very good farmland is now being classified as commercial/industrial. Coincidentally, I listened to some of what the Tsawwassen First Nation said in our rotary meeting earlier this morning. It was a very poor presentation, poorly informed, it’s just a bad presentation and there’s really not a lot of expertise over there. They decided at their last election with 89 votes that they are going to build a 1.8 million square foot mall in the middle of nowhere, and they’re going to convert a major chunk of farmland to industrial use to support the port.

Replacing this tunnel is not about the need for residents to move through the tunnel. It’s not really Delta that’s grown, it’s areas to the south but it is primarily truck traffic. I thought when they put the new connection to Highway 17 that the idea was to take it over through this industrial area and over the bridge to locate it closer to the Knight Street Bridge or something like that. The way they show in the picture is very misleading. It is not going to be this low-slung structure. It blows right by Steveston Highway. There is no way this bridge works in this area. The Massey Tunnel was configured at a different cost rate because it fit the area. The new bridge is connected to the port.

Q: Walt Zmud: My question is about what’s likely to be shipped out of the Fraser Surrey Docks? Now as you probably know and I am assuming that most people in the room already know as well, they made a proposal for shipping coal from that location.

A: Judy Kirk: Walt, we’re here to talk about Terminal 2.

Existing Containerized Trade on the Canadian West Coast

Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the existing opportunities for containerized trade on the Canadian West Coast (page 13 of the Discussion Guide).

C: Judy Williams: Fraser Surrey Docks is only mentioned on the map, it’s not mentioned in the text.
A: *Cliff Stewart*: That is because it doesn’t have a viable container future and is not going to be a facility in the future. It currently handles a few containers but it is almost out of that business simply because there are so few ships calling Vancouver that can actually get up the river.

Q: *Judy Williams*: Yes, but what if the bridge goes through?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Still doesn’t have a viable future. The ships are too long to turn around. The biggest ship that can viably be turned up there was about 280 metres. Most of the bigger ships calling now or over 300 metres and a number of them are already at 350-metre length so they just don’t have a future in the river.

So that, and virtually all of Burrard Inlet is already either developed or is a park or is planned for development. The river’s not an option, and that really leaves only Roberts Bank.

Q: *Walt Zmud*: If in fact the container business leaves, what would that facility do?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: That is why they are pursuing the coal proposal because they are no longer going to be in the container business.

Q: *Judy Williams*: You say others already are planned for development so they’re not available. What development?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Do you mean in Squamish and Kitimat and Rupert? There is no land available in Squamish.

Q: *Judy Williams*: No, I’m thinking of the inner harbour, at Vanterm and Centerm.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: There is a stretch on the North Shore that’s currently vacant but Richardson Terminals are in the process of building a grain facility there. So if that’s something you’re interested in, the Port is doing consultation on the Land Use Plan, and we’ve got lots of stuff on the website. Nothing is ever cast in stone, but there are no other existing opportunities for container terminals.

### Why Do We Need More Capacity for Containerized Trade

*Cliff Stewart* provided information regarding the container growth forecast (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Jim Ronback*: How accurate have their projections been in the past?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Interesting question. They did a similar forecast in 2002 for us, with a base case, low and high case, and when you looked at the actuals they were within the cone even through the world economic crisis. The cone is between the blue and the green lines, and as you go out, uncertainty grows so you have a range. They have a pretty good track record.

Q: *Gary Zabenski*: Let’s say all things being equal and this goes forward. Do your figures take into account the extra business that would come in? Since the container traffic is being deferred to Seattle because we’re not able to handle it efficiently, so they are docking in Seattle instead of Vancouver and then trucking it up. So if this comes available, then we become more efficient and therefore reclaim some of the shipping that we’ve lost going to Seattle. Because people forget that Vancouver used to be the busiest port on the pacific coast and now it is being lost to San Francisco and possibly Seattle because of the proximity to Asia.
A: **Cliff Stewart**: Actually it’s pretty much the opposite of that. In the container business about one percent of our cargo leaps across the border and goes to American ports and about one percent of their cargo leaps across the border and goes to our ports.

When our one percent gets down there, and since their economy is ten times the size of ours, our one percent becomes about point one percent of theirs. It’s a rounding error. Their one percent comes up here and it’s about 10 percent. So about 10 percent of the volume that we handle today and have handled historically is American. We have assumed that that same proportion would carry on into the future. The capacity we’re talking about building is primarily for Canadian business though.

Prior to the opening of Deltaport in 1996, about 30 percent of Canadian import containers went through American ports primarily in Seattle and Tacoma. As soon as Deltaport opened, those containers came back up here, and the reason they came back up here is because it was much more efficient, much more cost effective for the logistics chain for getting Canadian destined goods into Canada and getting Canadian originated exports out of Canada.

Q: **Gary Zabenski**: So if Roberts Bank is built, you’re assuming there would be no additional traffic coming to Vancouver that used to go to Seattle? Is that what you’re suggesting?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: If I understand the question, we expect that the cargo coming to Terminal 2 would be 90 percent Canadian cargo and about 10 percent American cargo. This is pretty much what we have today. So there is container growth but the split will still be 90/10.

Q: **Walt Zmud**: Is the forecast for the port available for any kind of independent scrutiny?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Yes, it is online at [www.portmetrovancouver.com/RBT2](http://www.portmetrovancouver.com/RBT2).

Q: **Don Paulson**: When was the forecast started and completed by Ocean Shipping Consultants?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: They did a forecast in 2012 and they updated it again in 2013.

Q: **Don Paulson**: So it was after the big economic turn down of 2008?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: The one I was mentioning that they did in 2002, obviously that was before, but this is a completely new forecast done in 2012 and then updated in 2013.

Q: **Harvey Thibault**: The question I have actually relates back again to Prince Rupert. You said there is no opportunity to expand Prince Rupert, that you can’t grow there?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: No, what I said was they have two projects scheduled. So they currently have about 700,000 TEUs in capacity and they’re pretty much full. Once those are completed that will take them to about 2 million TEUs, which will make them just slightly smaller than Terminal 2 or Deltaport would be.

Q: **Harvey Thibault**: I guess what I am trying to sort out is you said the expansion has to be here. Can Prince Rupert not take up the extra growth that would be here and also what is there.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: So let me just tell you what you’re seeing on this graph. This is the West Coast of Canada so it is both Vancouver and Prince Rupert. The horizontal purple line is the capacity of existing terminals today and then each of the vertical lifts is a project either here or in Prince Rupert that is forecast to add capacity. The dotted purple line below it, we call it the 85 percent line. In any thing you have a certain ultimate capacity but when you hit the ultimate capacity it’s
not running very well. You can stuff more through but it doesn’t run very well. Eighty-five is sort of the free flow, and it’s where you want to be most of the time, there or below.

The green, red and blue lines are the demand forecast lines. So in other words, any time the demand line crosses either the 85 percent that means you’re running a bit rough or if it crosses the true capacity line you actually have to turn cargo away.

Q: Don Paulson: So what are they doing in Prince Rupert?
A: Cliff Stewart: So they built their first terminal, and their future projects are Phase 2, and they have split them into stage 1 and stage 2. And those two projects together will take the total capacity in Prince Rupert to 2 million TEUs.

Q: Don Paulson: So Phase 2 doesn’t exist yet? It’s a planned initiative?
A: Cliff Stewart: Stage one doesn’t even exist. They have permits but they haven’t actually started construction, which is a bit problematic for us because we are kind of depending on them building their stage one by about 2015 or so. Otherwise you can see it’s going to be a little bit tight.

But those are both notional projects. Those are projects for which there is land available, beyond that there is no other land available in the Prince Rupert, since it’s already been earmarked for other purposes.

Are There Other Options for Creating Container Capacity?
Cliff Stewart provided information regarding the various options for creating additional container capacity at Port Metro Vancouver (page 14 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Walt Zmud: So what you’re saying is that you’ve squeezed some efficiencies out of the system and increased the capacity to handle more terminal traffic. But it seems to have reached the point where there is some degree of dissatisfaction, at least as part of the trucking community. The turnaround problem is becoming critical again.

Has there been any consideration given to a multi-shift operation? My observance is at this point that you guys are basically operating on one shift. My question is why not two, why not three?

C: Jako Krushnisky: You can’t sleep at night around a port when they do that.

C: Judy Kirk: Before I ask Cliff to answer that question I am going to ask Judy and Jako to go and then if you could answer Cliff.

Q: Wilma Haig: I’m wondering what the premise is for all this growth that you’re forecasting. I mean do you really think that we’re all going to need so many more television sets. You know the planet is not growing. It’s seems high to me. I don’t know why you think we’re going to grow and grow and grow and grow and grow. It just can’t happen.

A: Cliff Stewart: I guess the premise is growth. If growth doesn’t materialize then the terminal won’t be required and if it is required then it will be built.

Q: Wilma Haig: But it doesn’t sound like that. It sounds like you’re building it anyways. It sounds like it’s build it and they will come.

A: Cliff Stewart: No. It’s ‘build it if they’re coming’, NOT ‘build it and they will come’.
Q: Judy Williams: How are you going to determine and who’s going to determine if they are coming?

A: Cliff Stewart: That’s the demand forecast. If you go for the next four years and you’re on the demand forecast lines that you have here then I think you’ve got some rationale to say “yeah, it looks like it is still happening, we best get started”.

If for the next four years you don’t see any growth then you would say, “well, I guess it’s not happening and therefore we don’t require it”. Therefore we don’t need to be rushing to build it. The challenge that we face is we don’t have the luxury to see. In four years we can pause but if we pause now and we discover that we needed it, we can’t make up those four years. So that’s why.

C: Judy Williams: You can’t make up the biofilm either that will be destroyed.

C: Cliff Stewart: But we won’t be destroying anything for the next four years, we’re in a permitting process.

Q: Judy Williams: I guess I would like to know what the determinants are. You mentioned earlier that if the expected growth didn’t occur or develop, and you’re talking now of a ten-year span of time, that you could either delay the development or abandon it all together. Now what would it take – besides everybody on this planet getting smart about sustainability and not buying throw away goods from Asia – what would it take to abandon this project?

Would you be able to, after all of the I’s are dotted and the T’s are crossed, would you be able to extricate yourself from any of those commitments that you’ve already made? It seems to me that it’s a done deal. Why are we even sitting here?

A: Judy Kirk: We will come back to that. I think what Cliff said earlier was the business case would have to be there. The demand would have to be there.

C: Jako Krushnisky: To your question about is the world going to keep growing, and of course people do keep needing goods, it’s true. But if shipping goods and moving things across the planet like we do were to accurately reflect the carbon footprint shipping fruit from Israel to here, we wouldn’t be doing it. I will say that.

C: Cliff Stewart: There are three main parts to the terminal. There is the shipside berth, there is the rail side, and there is the truck side. Ship and rail work seven days a week, 24 hours a day, and trucks tend to work Monday to Friday, day shift only. There are several reasons for that. The main one is that it’s a pitch and catch business. So if you want to open your marine terminal truck gates at night everybody else has to be open at night as well. And at this point in time we’re just on the cusp where I think you are going to start to seeing that happen again.

I say “again” because it did happen in the early part of the last decade. We ran a lot of night shifts and then as the gates got more efficient and the terminals got expanded there was enough capacity to do it during the day shift, then nobody on the pitch and catch side outside the terminal wanted to be open at night anyway. So as soon as there was enough capacity, the night gates went away. And we’re going to talk about that in a minute here.

C: Walt Zmud: But you will agree that as a practice it is something that is being in fact practiced in other jurisdictions, such as Long Beach.
C: **Cliff Stewart:** Yeah, and there is a whole other department in our organization that is working on the operational side of trucking. And we will talk about that in a few minutes.

Q: **Gary Zabenski:** I would like to know how many thousands of truckloads of sand and rock will be required for Terminal 2 and where is it coming from?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** That’s a great question. Ultimately, whoever ends up being the design-build-finance-maintain contractor to build it will make that decision. But in all likelihood, the vast majority of the sand that’s used will either be dredged on site or it will be surplus sand from the annual Fraser River maintenance dredging program. About 10 of the 14 million cubic metres that’s required to build the terminal is that type of material. I don’t know where the large rock that is required to build the dykes would come from, but it is likely that it would come from quarries that are accessible by sea. It is too early to say what else would come by truck, but the majority of the material to build would likely come by barge.

Q: **Gary Zabenski:** I would like to know whether structures like the South Fraser Perimeter Road are all being done for Roberts Banks as it is today or is it being done because you’re going to build another terminal at Roberts Bank? If it’s just for Deltaport, if Terminal 2 is built will the infrastructure be adequate to support all the additional traffic being used on the infrastructure that’s being built today?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** The federal government put about 4 or 5 hundred million into the South Fraser Perimeter Road. They did that on the premise that it was to support international trade, which includes both the existing Deltaport and a potential future Terminal 2. There are several intersections that are currently being built as intersections, which could be converted to interchanges at some point in the future. That may be required before Terminal 2 or it may be required after Terminal 2. It is obviously too early to answer that, but the provision is there for it.

Q: **Gary Zabenski:** So you are suggesting that the infrastructure that’s being built will support the additional traffic from Terminal 2?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yes.

Q: **Jim Northey:** In order to build this, you’re going to have to have banking and what I want to know is how much of that banking is required for a project like this and will there be third party companies offering to bank habitats for Port Metro Vancouver?

A: **Judy Kirk:** Thank you for asking that because within 50 minutes we have to get to that topic because it is an important topic to this. There is information in here and we’re going to come back to it Jim.

C: **Peter Holt:** This is a linear project serving Deltaport. The question was whether the South Fraser Perimeter Road is built with current operations or for future ones. I know from my time when I was with the Surrey Board of Trade, the situation of moving heavy traffic through Surrey and the Centre of Surrey along the urban roads was long overdue in their view. It was very much to serve the current size of the port as it is today and down the future as well.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Yes, if you go back and look at all the literature and rationale for that project, it was current and future.
**Marine Terminal**

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including economic benefits and jobs generated by the project (page 16 and 17 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Bernadette Kudzin**: Some time ago when you had other consultation and meetings about this, one of the discussions was about having more intermodal yards and space. And there was talk about whether it was going to be on the causeway or whether there was going to be the need to get more ALR land to do that. Am I right to assume that the decision has been made that it’s just going to be provided for in the widening of the causeway?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: So you are absolutely correct that this design assumes the intermodal yard is on the terminal. Right out on the pod in fact.

Q: **Judy Williams**: I know that Dr. Royanne Pettrell up at UBC has been working on what to do with petroleum derivatives in terms of run-off from the roads or the asphalt. I see your asphalt grading there, what are you going to be doing about controlling that going into the waterways?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Obviously the detailed design of that is yet to come, but the best practice for that is to have what are called oil/water separators so that if there is any hydrocarbon runoff, those will be captured and disposed of properly.

Q: **Judy Williams**: Would they be using charcoal? You really need to talk to Dr. Royanne Pettrell at UBC because anything less than what she would advise you would be absolutely useless.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: And those sorts of details probably won’t be dealt with until we go through the environmental assessment process and we understand what the regulated components or best practices are.

Q: **Walt Zmud**: Insofar as the terminal is concerned, the new one will require the creation of a new turning basin to house the vessels?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Let me talk about that. You will notice that the orientation of the terminal is at 90 degrees to the orientation of Deltaport. So where the front edge of the terminal is, the low water level at that point is about 10 metres. The berth pocket has to be about 18 metres. So that is dredged down to about 18 metres and it simply goes out to the point where the natural depth is already that deep.

Q: **Walt Zmud**: So you’re suggesting that whatever dredging occurs, begins at the terminal itself, and will have no effect on the foreshore?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: In essence it begins at the terminal face and it goes out in a bit of a wedge shape out to deep water. And in fact that is a really good point because the zero tide line runs behind the terminal, so the entire terminal is being built in deep water. It’s all subtidal waters for the island.

Q: **Don Paulson**: If you look at the front cover, which is a good illustration for what it will look like, you notice the coal port at Roberts Bank. They have a conveyor system out to a pier with a ship on the right-hand side extending toward us. And we have a lot of water with no docking facilities there. So what is that? Is that water in there an allowance for West Shore Terminal for expansion?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: When the first part of Roberts Bank was built in the ‘60s, they didn’t have as good an understanding of seismic issues and they were afraid they might have a problem if they got
too close to the edge so they built the island back a bit and then they put the dock out where the deep water was. In the intervening years, fish habitat has been developed in that water area. So much of that water now has special habitat features, particularly reefs.

C: *Don Paulson:* Well, from a business case it just seems like an awful lot of wasted water where you could have ship loading facilities. So you’ve got two pads or two islands out here and you’ve got about a quarter of the foreshore here that’s not being used. It just seems very inefficient. I’m not going to tell you to build more dock. I am just saying it doesn’t look practical.

**Habitat Banking Program**

*Cliff Stewart* provided an overview of Port Metro Vancouver’s Habitat Banking Program (page 22 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: *Jim Northey:* With it being a bank, can it be treated as a commodity? Secondly how much banking is required for this project?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* I think the bank analogy is a good one. It’s a bit like saying “I want to save money for a car”, and then you put money in the bank. Whether you actually use it for a car is another question when the time comes to take the money out. Yes, it certainly is a commodity in the sense that you can sell credits. In fact the banks that have been developed historically have been used for that purpose. Port authorities are in a much better position to manage the creation and the management of habitat than developers are. And DFO is much more comfortable having something like the port authority managing the bank. But there is certainly the opportunity to then have those habitat credits used by third parties.

How much would be required for Terminal 2? That is a question, which ultimately will be decided by the regulators, particularly Department of Fisheries and Oceans, but it is likely to be hundreds of hectares.

Q: *Carol Thibault:* Would this banked habitat be in this area or could it be anywhere?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It’s about the species that are going to be impacted at Roberts Bank. So if those species can be benefitted with habitat that’s up the river a ways, then it could be. Somebody asked me, “Are you going to put this in the Kootenays?” and the answer is absolutely no. It’s about the species that are being impacted.

So if the species goes through Roberts Bank in its lifecycle and there is an impact there and you can offset that impact somewhere else then we could do that. But it is not just about creating habitat willy nilly.

A: *Ben Wheeler:* Cliff is right. Once we understand what the effects are of the project, and which species potentially are affected, we’ll have a better sense of how much habitat or offsetting would be required and where. Right now we’re just collecting baseline information and just beginning the actual analysis of the effects.

Q: *Harvey Thibault:* Two points about the habitat mitigation that bothers me, and I think it is a little bit of a double-edged sword because if you’re creating and encouraging some ecosystem to move into a new area, we all know that can lead to rabbits in Australia or the zebra mussel. There’s that concern. But also if you successfully created a new habitat then you decide we’re going to sacrifice this other one that functions just as well as your new one does. So are you going to do away with a natural habitat? You’re robbing Peter to pay Paul and you’re getting cut in the process.
A: Ben Wheeler: It’s a good point and it’s something DFO actually looks at. They actually look at what the baseline property value of that habitat would be in comparison to what we wanted to build on or improve. That is part of the accounting mechanism that Cliff was talking about. So absolutely it is something that DFO endorses.

C: Judy Kirk: Harv, on page 31 in the feedback form there are very specific questions looking for just the kind of feedback that you gave right now about what you think about the habitat mitigation ideas. And there is room here for your comments and if you think it doesn’t make sense to rob Peter to pay Paul, I would just really encourage you to put it in there.

C: Tom Bearss: On this habitat banking, which I didn’t know very much about, I would like to suggest that Port Metro Vancouver consult with some of the local groups, such as the Delta Naturalist Society. Or have some expertise on habitats before they go about doing their banking and what they are going to exchange for what, because we were kind of caught by surprise with this logging thing. In our mind, it wasn’t a fair or even a reasonable thing to do. You did it very quickly, and then we find out it’s banking for something that we don’t know what’s going to happen in the future. So it just looks bad for you guys and it might be helpful if you used some local expertise to tell you whether what you’re wanting to exchange or what you’re wanting to do is good or not, be it logging, foreshores or whatever.

C: Judy Williams: Okay I want to go back to something that Cliff or Ben said about the great successes of habitat banking and mitigation in the past. I would like to challenge that because that is not so. Take a look at the Surrey Fraser Lands Area for example. A lot of that did not take. Habitat banking can work if it’s in an area that is going to enable the current species. Just as you said it has to be species specific. And going up the river for Orca habitat mitigation or lack of siltation, how the hell are you going to stop the siltation getting into the resident Orcas. You cannot use some riverine or estuarine areas or the areas that are along in the area where you now have some mitigation going on. On the cover, this one right here, in here you say you have something going on in there to protect the species. Well, so if you take and put in industry in there you’re going to ruin whatever you might have been able to establish for the resident Orcas or the juvenile salmonids.

So I just wanted to caution you about habitat banking and habitat mitigation. FREMP would have told you it doesn’t always work, if the feds had still left FREMP in place. It may have only had gums but it still was a very valuable organization. As Tom just said, you have to involve the locals who know the area and know the species.

C: Jim Northey: I just wanted to comment further on what the last two speakers said. For the reed grass that was planted by the ferry terminal, I think 95 percent of it ended up rotting on the beach a little bit after the first storms. And I know we’ve seen the logs being removed from Boundary Bay., I happen to live in Tsatsu Shores. We have residents sitting waiting for them to come and remove our logs. The communications in my opinion has been absolutely abysmal.

Habitat Mitigation

Cliff Stewart provided details for the Habitat Mitigation consultation topic, including options for mitigating impacts from the project (page 23 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Jim Northey: My concern is that how do you justify removal of logs in a foreshore beyond the high tide line as compensation for fish habitat? You are affecting a different species.
A: **Ben Wheeler:** Yeah, that’s something we actually talked about a lot with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. We do know from our literature that there are juvenile salmon and other species using that area.

Q: **Jim Northey:** You don’t have logs above the high tide line though.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** So by definition if the logs were brought in by the tide they are not above high tide line.

Q: **Jako Krushnisky:** When the first aspect of the project was built, what conclusions did the authority responsible for approving this thing come to in terms of not having water flow underneath the causeway? And how has it impacted the flow? Because I understand it’s had a great negative the cumulative effect with the ferry terminal and the causeway. If that’s true, then there has been significant damage or some cause and effect from this. Could the addition of Terminal 2 involve correcting that problem that has been created by this?

A: **Ben Wheeler:** It is something that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans looked at and suggested investigating a breach along the causeway. Some work was done which determined that by breaching the causeway you actually have more of a negative impact. It affects the way the sediment moves as well as the way the water moves and that actually can have a larger effect than what exists right now. That’s the short answer.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** It’s a great question because I asked the same question. The experts don’t want it done.

Q: **Jako Krushnisky:** So water doesn’t flow right now?

A: **Ben Wheeler:** No, it does not.

C: **Judy Kirk:** They said that if they did breach the causeway, it would be worse than if it was not breached, is that correct?

A: **Ben Wheeler:** Yes. You are probably aware that there is eel grass on either side of the causeway and sensitive habitat there as well.

C: **Jako Krushnisky:** Dirk Brinkman is an environmental minded forester. He has knowledge of what’s been done and he said that if it initially had been done that way that would have been good but because of what has now occurred with the causeway being solid, it would impact things that are now okay.

C: **Judy Kirk:** So, Ben, let me just ask because I think it’s a good question. Will that be looked at again in the process of evaluating Terminal 2?

A: **Ben Wheeler:** Absolutely. Studying how water moves at Roberts Bank is a very important part of our studies.

Q: **Judy Williams:** I just want a point of clarification. Roberts Bank is a loosely used term here. I just want to know if that is also inclusive of Sturgeon Bank? Can you just answer that briefly?

A: **Ben Wheeler:** No, Sturgeon Bank is very clearly separate from Roberts Bank.

Q: **Judy Williams:** But in the study on the biofilm they’re going right straight through and also assessing Sturgeon Bank are you not?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Yes, it is true, we have studied both Sturgeon Bank and Roberts Bank.
Q: **Judy Williams**: Does that mean you intend to expand into Sturgeon Bank at some point?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: That is not a part of the project or the design here.

**Road and Rail Traffic Considerations**

Cliff Stewart provided an overview of road and rail traffic considerations, as well as the traffic mitigation opportunities being considered as part of Pre-Design Consultation (page 26 - 27 of the Discussion Guide).

C: **Peter Holt**: I think one of the main considerations with this truck traffic is optimizing the flow so it moves efficiently. I think there are some easy ways as well as awfully complex ones, and the easiest ones have to be by the interchanges on the South Fraser Perimeter Road. At the moment, there is apparently a cost saving by putting in traffic light stops on there, rather than an interchange. I think that is definitely going to have a measureable effect on the air quality in the area. And as you know, should this go ahead to its full extent, and should the increase in traffic occur, then the lack of those interchanges will have an increasing effect on the air quality in the region. I just think it’s a no brainer.

C: **Don Paulson**: We haven’t seen the impact of the opening of the South Fraser Perimeter Road yet because is it not finished. But a lot of people really wonder how successful that is going to be. We still have a huge volume of trucks right now that plague the tunnel and the streets of Delta.

And one of my good friends who is in the same business as you said “Trucks are not the answer, you should be looking at rail”. Railing everything out of Delta to a central location like Kamloops with CN and CP terminals where you can segregate your shipments, you’ve got two thirds going east and so forth. I realize that there is some issue with rail going through the Fraser canyon that may make that impossible. But how about Langley or somewhere else? Get it out of Delta. We don’t have the capacity.

We’re talking about the tunnel, which won’t be ready for seven or eight years, and maybe we need to have a moratorium so that Deltaport trucks don’t go through the tunnel until that facility is complete in seven or eight years. We have a real problem and even when I go through the tunnel at 10 o’clock in the morning it’s all clogged up with Deltaport trucks. It’s just a terrible bottle neck. There are too many trucks going through the tunnel and they need to control it.

Q: **Robert Butler**: On page 24 it mentions that the proposed 2.4 million TEU terminal results in 3,700 total truck trips and generates between and eight and 10 container trains. Is this in addition to the current numbers?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: Yes.

**Environmental Assessment**

Ben Wheeler provided an overview of the environmental assessment process for the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including the baseline studies that are currently underway. (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).

C: **Judy Kirk**: Thanks Ben. So the only thing that I would add is that the terms of reference for these baseline studies that Ben has just mentioned are available on the project website. People asked here in Delta for that level of information. It took a while but it’s now on the site.
Q: **Jim Northey:** It states here that it’s going to be a thorough and independent environmental assessment. I find it difficult to see how independence is achieved when Port Metro Vancouver is going to do the environmental assessment on their own project. There is going to be a conflict of interest.

A: **Judy Kirk:** As with any project in British Columbia that is assessed environmentally, the proponents are required to provide the expertise to do the studies but the regulators review that information.

Q: **Jim Northey:** But Port Metro Vancouver is the regulator... They’re conducting the environmental assessment? If not, who is? How do they vote for harmonized projects?

A: **Judy Kirk:** It’s the federal government and the provincial government departments. It is not the Port.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** We assume they are the regulator. We’ve applied and the federal government will make that decision on the 7th of November. We assume that they will be the regulator.

Q: **Jim Northey:** What determines that Port Metro Vancouver is not allowed to do their own environmental assessment?

A: **Judy Kirk:** As I said at the beginning of the meeting, you really need to talk to the regulators about that.

Q: **Judy Williams:** Who are they though?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency.

Q: **Carol Thibault:** Okay, just in the case that these environmental assessments are done by the federal government and provincial government, I take it that the federal one would be the one that would supersede the provincial one. But in the end would they truly be respected or would there be other interests that would override the environmental assessments?

A: **Judy Kirk:** These people can’t answer that question, Carol, they really can’t.

Q: **Judy Williams:** I forgot to mention that one of the hats I am wearing today is the BC Surf Spawners Association. These fish are the building block of the rest of the life chain. We’re talking about the surf smelt in particular. We’re talking about some of the other five fish in there. But the question that I have is: when you did your studies on Roberts Bank, I remember asking you if you were going to be determining whether there were any surf smelt spawning going on in there. And can you simply tell me ‘yes’ or ‘no’ whether there is or not?

A: **Ben Wheeler:** While I can’t tell you what the results of the studies are, I can tell you that we have conducted a study to answer your exact question. And I can also tell you that that was something that was raised as part of the Deltaport Third Berth process. So we understand the importance of the forage fish and we are looking at that.

Q: **Judy Kirk:** So in the analysis of the proposed Terminal 2, you will also be looking at surf smelts?

A: **Ben Wheeler:** Absolutely.

Q: **Walt Zmud:** I am assuming that it will be a blended effort between the federal and provincial government. Whichever one of those two agencies that is responsibly to perform the assessment. But I understand the assessment will largely consist of the proponent actually doing
the studies, subject, to whatever kind of regulations and stipulations, Canadian Environmental Agency might stipulate. Is that correct?

A:  *Ben Wheeler*: The studies are actually done by third party experts.

Q:  *Walt Zmud*: So is the suggestion that the agency itself is going to be performing the assessment or would your people do the assessment?

A:  *Cliff Stewart*: No, it would be done by people like Ben, who are professional biologists and scientists.

Q:  *Walt Zmud*: Subject to whatever kind of rules and regulations that the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* imposes?

A:  *Cliff Stewart*: That’s right.

Q:  *Walt Zmud*: Now the other thing that interests me is, because it is something that we have tried to promote in the past, and I am quite delighted that it shows up in this discussion, is that there is supposed to be a cumulative effects assessment done. So in other words, the facility is being created, and the effect that it might have on the general animal population, as well as the effects it might have on the community itself. By that I suggest that there would have to be some consideration of the effects on the community, of things like traffic, air quality and so on. So it’s not just the port that’s being assessed. It’s an assessment of the effects on the community, is that correct?

A:  *Judy Kirk*: So Walt, these guys can’t speak on behalf of the regulator. I’ve heard that comment and we’ve got it in the record. I recommend that those of you who are very interested should make the time to participate with the regulator, in this case the federal and provincial agencies, to help define the scope of the studies that you’re talking about.

Q:  *Judy Williams*: How do we do that?

A:  *Judy Kirk*: First, you need to get in touch with the regulator directly, but there are two or three ways. One is that you ask. Judy, you wear several hats with organizations, right? They establish a working group early on in the process and you could ask for a seat in that working group.

Further you can participate directly in what’s called the information requirement stage. And that’s the stage where the scope and nature of studies are determined.

Now I am not going to go any further because I’m not a representative of the BCEAO or CEAA but I am just saying that I encourage you to go to these websites and learn about where you can get involved in that process.

C:  *Judy Williams*: These are very closed groups, and by invitation only.

A:  *Judy Kirk*: I’ve given you my advice. There are sometimes community organizations that are also involved in the working groups.

C:  *Peter Holt*: I’ve been in a similar situation myself. You need to find a chap who is on that group and you get invited in. It must feel like a closed shop from the outside but sometimes they are actually quite happy to have new people in because it is often the same old people who are there.

Q:  *Carol Thibault*: Excuse me. Why trucks and not rail?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: So pages 8 and 9 are really the answer to the question “why containers are on trucks and why they are not on rail?” Most of them actually end up on rail shortly after they go on a truck. But it has to do with the nature of the business, with the logistics chain, with simple things like you can’t run a container train that’s full of 24 tonne export boxes like you can run one full of 14 tonne import boxes. Things like that. So there are very good reasons why it just doesn’t work.

Q: **Carol Thibault**: You mean the engines can’t pull it, is that what you’re saying?

A: **Cliff Stewart**: The loading and unloading is more expensive. That’s not what the railroads do. Basically, in simple terms if you’re going less than about 500 kilometres you’re going to go by truck. It’s the economics. No one is going to load a train to go to Langley to unload a train. And then there is the stuffing and unstuffing, which is what this page talks about. It happens here so they can then get off the train quickly and get to where they want to go. So if you look at page 8 and 9, they explain what it is that the containers you see running around on trucks are actually doing here. And if you followed them, you will see that the import ones almost all eventually go to either the intermodal facility in Surrey for CN or the intermodal facility in Maple Ridge for CP and then they leave.

Q: **Gary Zabenski**: Did you do any calculations to see what the returns to Delta itself would be if Terminal 2 is built?

A: **Judy Kirk**: We’ll come back to that Gary.

Q: **Judy Williams**: Have you looked at the true costing? In other words, the environmental budget as well as the economic one? Some things cannot be measured with economics alone.

A: **Judy Kirk**: So, if I could, the socio-economic analysis associated with the environmental review is the mechanism whereby the social negatives and positives and the economic negatives and positives are measured or assessed. But the scope of it is determined by the regulator.

Q: **Harvey Thibault**: How do you quantify the efficiency, profit-making opportunities of Port Metro Vancouver vis-à-vis the negative and positive effects on the quality of life in the community? Back to that little truck question where you say, “Well, it just doesn’t work.” Well damn it, it could work if that was all you decided was the option. So somewhere the issue about the money to some corporation and the quality of life of a whole community has to be addressed.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: That’s the balance that we have to try and find as the Port Authority because our mandate is in the best interest of all Canadians, but being mindful of the impacts on both industry and communities.

**Community Legacy Benefits**

**Cliff Stewart** provided an overview of community legacy benefits as part of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including categories and examples that are being presented for feedback as part of Pre-Design Consultation. (page 29 of the Discussion Guide).

C: **Wilma Haig**: Economics just isn’t everything. Why is everything about economics? Why not about our local food systems? Why not about our quality of life?

Q: **Jako Krushnisky**: Okay, we’ve had the benefit of looking at the existing part of this development in operation. I live on the point so I look over on the bluff. And, you know, as activities ramped up, in particular over the past number of years, I look at that thing. There are several things for
the communities that would make us be comfortable to going forward to be accepting of any addition of this facility. One of them is addressing ship noise. Ship generators are absolutely serious and horribly noisy. I wore earplugs many nights, particularly in the summer depending on which way the wind blows. The noise actually penetrates buildings and it actually can reverberate inside structures louder than it is outside. It’s a real challenge.

So you have the noise from ships and the ensuing pollution in the air from running diesel constantly. And then you add to that the diesel trains, you add to that the coupling and uncoupling, and you add that to the chiming of gantry cranes, as well as the light pollution. When you add all those components and then you start layering on the rest of it cumulatively, there is a pretty big footprint that the port, as it exists, imposes on a human now. And so to consider further incursions into our environment in this area, which includes not only those things but also bridges, additional highway infrastructure, the loss of farmlands, and it’s a pretty significant impact. I am very significantly interested in how the Port can deal with the existing issues relative to health, and noise is part of that. Air quality and coal dust as well, because no matter what the Port says, everyone knows that their stuff is coated in coal dust. It just is.

A: Cliff Stewart: So the noise front, particularly on the ship generator issue, our expectation is that Terminal 2 will be fully shore power equipped. The studies that we’re seeing say that by the time Terminal 2 is up and running, most, if not all of the fleet and ships calling here will be capable of using shore power. We also hope to be announcing shore power for the Third Berth at Deltaport. I would say that it’s not unreasonable to expect that there will be ships plugging in at Deltaport in the next 2 or three years.

For air quality, Port Metro Vancouver financed the installation of an air quality station as part of the Metro Vancouver network in Tsawwassen. It’s been operating now for about 6 or 7 years. Interestingly enough, the work that was done for the Deltaport Third Berth Project, which projected what air quality would look like at that station, the air quality is actually better than what was projected and it is the second best in Metro.

But some really good news from an air quality perspective is there is an initiative called the Emissions Control Area, which is expected to come into force sometime in the next year in Canada. This means that when the ships are within 200 nautical miles, and certainly when they are in port and at berth, they will be required to burn ultra-low sulfur diesel. So the air quality is already amongst the best and it is going to get better.

Q: Jako Krushnisky: For your station, do you think that’s an appropriate location almost halfway across the peninsula?

A: Cliff Stewart: It was located in consultation with community and with air quality experts to be the place that would be most representative based on the winds that are here. Most of the time the wind is blowing up or down the straight, which doesn’t have an air quality impact on the shore. But when it does blow on the shore that was the place that was determined best capture the air quality conditions.

C: Walt Zmud: You said something about wanting to dig a little further into things like community and legacy benefits. I think this suggestion would win a lot of credibility for your proposal. You’ve heard the concern expressed before about biofilm? It’s significant concern because it affects a population of birds. You’ve probably done enough research on it to know that the Western Sandpiper can be affected and as a matter of fact, you guys almost didn’t get the
certificate for Terminal 2 because of concerns in that area. If you were seen in some way promoting the health and the sustainability of that, you would do yourself a big favour.

Second, there is a colony of herons that people have probably noticed as they drive out to the ferry. A very significant and large colony that most people don’t even know exists because they go by in such a hurry. But it’s very significant and it means something to the people in this community. If you could be seen as supporting that as a legacy you would be doing yourself a favour.

C: Tom Bearss: Good point, Walt. That colony out there is Great Blue Herons. There are about 400 nests there and they even could possibly be a unique species of Great Blue Heron only found in the Lower Mainland.

As you know the port is built on the Pacific Flyway and it is designated as an important bird area internationally. And it’s a RAMSAR site so it’s actually the most important bird area in Canada of all the 600 sites across the country that have been designated. It’s the most important because of the types of birds and species and numbers that come there. Anyhow my point is I see you might have plans for a bird area or a bird-viewing platform, which is good. But I might suggest that you even go further because this is such an important area you could have an information centre there, a nature centre on this new place and have access to that port for visitors, like naturalists like me or bringing my birding groups. I get on to the port now but I have to sneak in, because I know people so I can get in there and they know what we are so I can see stuff if I want. You’ve got a lot of different cormorant nets and there is all kinds of species out there that are, you know, they’re pretty neat. But I don’t like to do that. I don’t like to go into “no entry” places.

My point is if you’re talking about legacy benefits, make this place accessible, broadcast that Port Metro Vancouver are doing wonderful things for the environment. We’re not harassing and ruining it we’re doing these good things, look at what we’re promoting around here. Look at our information centre. Look at our big study of Orca whales and vagrant whales and that we’re saving their habitat here rather than decimating it. You can flip it around.

C: Don Paulson: Okay, this shore power issue is really basic stuff. Canada is not a third world country, we should not be tolerating the ships coming in here, which are tin cans in the summertime heating up to 95 degrees and then running their diesel generators. A lot of them are really dirty diesels or old ships, and pollution, noise pollution, the whole works.

Why does Delta put up with this? Because people are not complaining to the right people. We’re told to phone the port authority or the port and they’re not going to do anything. The situation can be resolved very quickly. Port Metro should be active in this area. If you can’t solve this problem I don’t have a lot of faith you can do the environmental studies properly. This is real basic stuff. You can’t do this in California. Long Beach doesn’t tolerate it. California doesn’t tolerate it. Why the hell are we?

The solution is if you have 50 cycle equipment, electrical equipment and so forth as a lot of European and Asian craft or vessels that are coming into Vancouver. You need a step down or a step up transformer to convert it to our voltage or to their voltage so they can run the equipment. We can’t have this.

Q: Judy Williams: Okay, first of all I caution, yes, we need to protect that heron colony. I have gloriied in its wonder and in fact, even though the eagle predates on some of the chicks, it’s what
keeps the other eagles away from the whole colony. What we have to be very careful with, just like the Experience the Fraser Project, is access to the colony because they spook real easily and they could just pack up and fly away if too many people are brought in there. I mean I can see the same fiasco we see in Boundary Bay with the Great White Owls.

My question is, this air Emission Control Area 200 nautical miles out, when is that supposed to come into effect?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** That’s a really good question. Canada signed a treaty with the United Nations. It was supposed to have come into effect last August and I think that is a great question for you to ask the government.

Q: **Judy Williams:** When you say, that it was supposed to come in last August, will this include all vessels or only the larger vessels that are polluting the air? I mean jet skis and such.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** This has nothing to do with jet skis. We’re talking about vessels that are registered with the International Maritime Organization. These are big freighters that burn bunker fuel or similar types of fuel.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Okay, I am going to ask you to, Cliff, attempt to answer Gary’s question about economic benefits of trade to Delta.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** There are a number of benefits to Delta, The first and most obvious is taxation. The second one is jobs. As you will notice from the map on page 11, a significant portion of the off dock facilities - which is where a lot of the economic activity occurs - are in North Delta. So those would be the two main economic benefits to Delta.

C: **Gary Zabenski:** Is there a projection as to how much the taxes are?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No, but we can get that for you.

Q: **Gary Zabenski:** The side issue that you said that these ships are coming in fully loaded but going back empty?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No I didn’t. What I said was that for every hundred containers that these ships bring in loaded, they take about 85 to 90 back loaded and 10 empty and the reason they take less loaded is they are so much heavier when they are going back.

*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 3:12pm.*
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*The record notes that the meeting commenced at 1:01pm*
KEY THEMES:

- Participants questioned the economic benefits of port-related activities in the Lower Mainland, particularly the tax revenue generated by port businesses.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding the rationale and business case for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.
- Participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver pursue other options for increasing container capacity on the Canadian West Coast, including expansion in Prince Rupert and efficiency improvements at existing container terminals within Port Metro Vancouver’s jurisdiction.
- Participants questioned whether the removal of the George Massey Tunnel would allow Fraser Surrey Docks to address additional container capacity requirements in the future.
- Participants expressed concern regarding potential impacts on the Fraser River estuary, particularly with respect to bird and fish species in the area.
- Participants expressed skepticism regarding Port Metro Vancouver’s Habitat Banking Program and the manner in which the Program could be used to mitigate project impacts elsewhere in the region.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Anna Wright

Anna Wright welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting, and also introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Anna informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy, and outlined how participants could provide feedback. She then explained the difference between the port-led consultation process and the environmental assessment process.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – Rhona Hunter

Rhona Hunter reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including ways to participate in the consultation and how this consultation feedback is considered by Port Metro Vancouver. She then gave an outline of the information presented in the consultation discussion guide.

Why is Trade Important to British Columbians & Why Do We Use Containers?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the types of import and export goods that travel through the Pacific Gateway, and also described some of the different participants in the supply chain, including trucking companies. She then explained how containers move around in Vancouver, including how transloading enables various logistical efficiencies (pages 5-9 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Wayne Mills: How does 120 feet go into 106 feet? I’m just curious, since you said that three 40-foot containers can fit into two 53-footers.

A: Rhona Hunter: Right.

Q: Wayne Mills: So there is some left over?

A: Rhona Hunter: I would imagine that they have got it down to a science that they can make the three 40s into two 53s.
A:  *Michael Zachary:* Quite frequently, they can actually get two 40-foots into one 53-foot high cube because they’re taller and are carrying lighter clothing or something versus heavy materials, since the 53-foot containers are not as strong as the 40-foot containers.

C:  *Rhona Hunter:* The diagram shows 5% is for local delivery, and I imagine that would be a portion of the goods they are offloading onto a truck.

Q:  *Eoghan Moriarty:* What is the value of the goods?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* I don’t have that off the top of my head, but I can certainly get that number.

Q:  *Rob Terris:* With the 53-foot containers, why can’t you use these on the ships? Why transfer the contents in Vancouver?

C:  *Rhona Hunter:* The question is why are there 40-foot containers on the ships and not 53-foot containers on the ships?

C:  *Rob Terris:* Yes. In Canada they have a bigger one, because it fits our rail.

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* It’s the international standard, so it is what is used on the international waterways, is the 40-foot container. So, our rail standard is a Canadian rail standard, so we’ve just learned to adapt those two standards together.

A:  *Michael Zachary:* Most of the ships, from the 1970s and 1980s, were built with cell guides that were 40-foot. The largest marine container is 45-foot, you have got to put them on the deck. But the domestic containers Eoghan started talking about were 53-foots and the 48-foots on the trains. The double stacked trains you see have containers that stick over on the end and within the turning radius. They found they could put the bigger containers on the top, and that is what generated the longer container in North America. But right now, the bays and the cell guides within the bays of the vessels, are geared toward 40-foot or two 20-foots.

Q:  *Deb Jack:* It seems to be an incredible waste of resources in so far as these steel containers are concerned, to having them reduced to 40-foot. Why not adjust them into the ships to accommodate bigger ones and conserve steel?

A:  *Michael Zachary:* Well, the biggest issue is in China. You can’t have a 53-foot there, since there is no room for it in the cities or where the factories are. It is just too big a container. Most of them come on little tiny lorries. In Hong Kong for instance, there is close to 60,000 lorries coming into Hong Kong every hour, getting stuffed and de-stuffed. Part of it is the tradition of the industry, part of it is that they found a very economical way of doing it. Remember, containerization has only been around effectively since the late 1980s.

C:  *Deb Jack:* The community in which I am is constantly berated for saying things like “traditionally”.

C:  *Mike Zachary:* I understand. But there is a system that’s built around it, and so part of it is, you can change one component of the system, and they are slowly getting through, you are slowly starting to see more 53-foots. You are starting to see more 45-footers on the deck of some ships. But right now, the structural integrity of a 53-foot container can’t hold heavy weights.

Q:  *Deb Jack:* The question I had was, there is so much truck traffic going on in the Lower Mainland, and if we just regard the entire Lower Mainland as a port, I am wondering what the compensation is with regards to the wear and tear on the infrastructure? We are paying for all of this stuff out of the local tax dollars. Where is the compensation back to the taxpayers with regards to the use
of the road and bridge infrastructure we have here in the valley for goods that are not even going to stay here in B.C.?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Well, all of the businesses that support the logistics chain also pay taxes as well.

Q: **Deb Jack:** That is local. I am talking about all of the goods that go to the States and go to Eastern Canada. Where is it that they provide us compensation?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Railways pay taxes. All of the businesses all pay taxes like you pay taxes as well.

Q: **Deb Jack:** Do they come to B.C. specifically?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I would imagine that there is tax revenue that comes to the province.

C: **Deb Jack:** It might be a good PR position for you to get those kinds of figures, because we keep shelling out humongous amounts of money for what is relatively a small population for both Canada and certainly for the North America. It would be nice to know what comes back in so far as that shelling out is concerned.

Q: **Judy Higginbotham:** Related to that somewhat, when we look at compensation and we say “taxes”, for example, my understanding for Port Metro Vancouver is that it has special compensation, special prices. They don’t necessarily go along with the average price of the land, and they get a more or less flat rate for some of the port facilities as well as railroads.

And secondly, I think that the funding does go to the province. I guess my question is how much tax revenue does go to the provinces, and then again back down to the cities that are looking after the infrastructure? And I guess mixed in with that question is if we are able to look at who is responsible to federal government for transportation? The Department of Transportation is often a law unto itself. And it is sometimes the jurisdiction and the ability for us to understand that it is somewhat complicated, and we would have the opportunity to honestly make any type of meaningful input.

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I can’t speak to other businesses and the logistics and what their tax structure is. Port Metro Vancouver does pay taxes. It pays taxes to the local communities in which it operates.

Q: **Judy Higginbotham:** Who makes the assessment and is it based on the assessment of the value of the land? Or is it based on a special compensation assessment from the province?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I can’t answer that.

Q: **Anna Wright:** So, the question is, and we can look into this for you, but is the port paying the same amount that another tenant or another user of the land would pay the cities in property taxes?

Q: **Rhona Hunter:** Port Metro Vancouver is accountable to the federal Minister of Transportation.

C: **Mike Isinger:** Just on page 8, it says trucks getting all the containers leave the terminal on trains, I think it’s going to be extended quite a bit, because it says the remaining one-third leave the terminal by truck and are transported to a transload facility or warehouse in the Lower Mainland where goods are unloaded, sorted, and reloaded for further transportation.

That is simply not accurate. There’s tens of thousands of intermodal rail containers that go out of Deltaport specifically by truck and go to CN’s yards since CN got in the intermodal business. For example, in the last two years every inbound and outbound reefer container at Deltaport container terminal has gone to CN’s yard by highway truck. And there is absolutely no reason for
it. You know? So this should be expanded a bit, because that statement in here is not accurate. There are tens of thousands of unnecessary truck trips in and out of Deltaport every year. It should go on the train.

C: **Anna Wright**: Mike, that feedback will form part of the record, but feel free to write things like that into your feedback form.

Q: **Cliff Caprani**: But I mean does the Port have any comment about that? Is that accurate or not? Is Mike correct in what he is saying?

A: **Michael Zachary**: What Mike is saying is true. It fluctuates depending upon the time of the year, it fluctuates depending on the congestion that occurs down at the railway, but there is a tonne of containers that are transported like he says.

Q: **Cliff Caprani**: Unnecessarily? It almost sounds like there is a better way to do it.

A: **Michael Zachary**: Well, if you can easily put them on at the on-dock intermodal facility at Deltaport, they are going to go to Montreal, they are going to go to Toronto, they are going to go to Chicago, you know, wherever they are going to go. And the only times that they really get congestion is when the railroad itself is congested on the causeway at Deltaport and they have to meet a deadline or meet a train. This is what Roberts Bank Terminal 2 is hoping to mitigate. So yes, with RBT2 coming on line, and the fact that you are going to have a wider causeway and get rid of that train congestion, those trucks that Mike is referring to will disappear.

Q: **Cliff Caprani**: Who makes that decision whether they go on trucks or train?

A: **Michael Zachary**: The railroad and the terminal operator. I want to go back to something that Deb said. You said 2,200 trucks. It was 22,000, so the port trucks are about 10% of the total trucks. And so all those other trucks are paying taxes, the port trucks are paying taxes, so your point is well taken, but the port component of the trucking is 10% of the total picture.

Q: **Eoghan Moriarty**: Does that include CN?

A: **Michael Zachary**: That includes all trucks.

C: **Anna Wright**: I think the question is, do the CN trucks make up that 10% of what you are saying for trucks?

A: **Michael Zachary**: They are part of the 2,000 licensed trucks.

Q: **Kent Webster**: With reference to returning the empties, where is the mathematics done about the paying of returning that empty back to China or wherever they are coming from? They have got to go back on a boat somehow. Is the cost of taking it back tagged onto when they are coming over full? Or where does the split come as to take them back empty?

A: **Michael Zachary**: Yes, the ocean carrier pays for the repositioning. There are two aspects of it. As Rhona said, it is heavier going out, so they can’t load the ships full of loaded containers, so there is room to put empties on which are very light, but it is a repositioning. About 80% of the containers in the world are owned by the steamship lines. And they control their inventory of containers throughout the world. So that is the repositioning component of it. And the other part of that is that they lose control if it goes inland. So, part of it is keeping control within the Lower Mainland. But the fact that I can put it on at 53-foot which is owned by the
railroads, or a logistics company, and I now, if I am Hyundai or Maersk, I can control that container, bring it back to the port, put it on a ship, and reposition it.

Why Roberts Bank?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of various geographic options for container terminals, as well as the existing and planned infrastructure at Roberts Bank (page 10-11 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Deb Jack: What are you going to do with Fraser Surrey Docks? It’s going to be coal?
A: Rhona Hunter: Fraser Surrey Docks is looking to repurpose itself. I am not in that business.

C: Deb Jack: You guys must have some very clear notion if that’s the case because certainly it’s generally thought that removing the tunnel is in order to get the deep draft container ships up to Fraser Docks if not further up the river.

C: Rhona Hunter: The length of the ships is actually what limits the ability of the container ships to go into the Fraser River. They are too long to turn in the river so even if the tunnel is removed and the draft issue is taken away; it is still the length of the ships that would prevent container ships from going up the river. We will continue to see the large container ships at Deltaport, and will see larger ships coming in in future and not smaller ships.

Q: Deb Jack: Right. So what do you see Fraser Surrey Docks doing?
A: Rhona Hunter: I know that there is a proposal from them to look at a coal facility there.

Q: Cliff Caprani: But just to clarify again. There has not been a proposal from Fraser Surrey Docks for containers?
A: Rhona Hunter: No, there is no proposal from Fraser Surrey Docks for containers.

C: Mike Isinger: So is that what we’re discussing now the lack of a business case for T2? Because there are a lot of us—port workers included—that do not believe that T2 is necessary. The current container terminals in British Columbia are not being used to their maximum capacity. For example the ships are worked 21 shifts a week, the rail yards work 21 shifts a week, and we have street trucks bringing and taking away containers from the container terminals five shifts out of 21. We’re not even using our existing terminals to their maximum capacity. We will get double the capacity with the existing terminals we have. Is that what we’re talking about now the business case, because we don’t believe that T2 is necessary. There is no business case for Terminal 2 and the port is not using the assets that are currently online to their maximum utilization at all and no will to do so.

C: Anna Wright: We can talk about that or do you want to ask another question? I think that’s in the information that comes on the next page.

Q: Rob Terris: Yeah, part of the problem with the big ships is the dredging issue. There is not enough federal money coming in for dredging on the Fraser River right at Fraser Surrey Docks. Is that part of the problem?
A: Rhona Hunter: So I’m talking here about containers so I can’t speak to dredging in the Fraser River. I can say that the limitation on container ships to access the Fraser River is their length. That the size, the length of ships that currently are coming into Deltaport and the length of ships, as those of you who worked in the business know, they will become longer, cannot access the Fraser River due to their length. So it’s not it’s not the dredging. It’s not the tunnel. It’s the
length of the ships that is limiting the ability for container expansion or development within the Fraser River.

C: **Rob Terris:** Another thing they are proposing at Surrey Fraser Docks is putting another facility there on a little island there. It’s included in the transportation plan for the Fraser River.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** If you would like to talk about Fraser Surrey Docks, I can certainly get somebody from the Port to speak to you about some issues around Fraser Surrey Docks. I’m here to talk about the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project, which is a container project. And we cannot expand container business within the Fraser River due to the length of the ships that are currently servicing our facilities, as well as the ships that we anticipate coming into our facilities in the future.

Q: **Rob Terris:** Can I make a statement about the containers that go through on the Fraser Docks? Is there a way like a garbage container that you have a lid over and you tip it, the lid lifts up and it dumps in? So it keeps the dust down when it comes through.

Q: **Rhona Hunter:** You’re talking about coal?

Q: **Rob Terris:** I’m talking strictly about coal. And vents on the front and rear so at least you can vent it, so that the dust stays within. Is there something like that that can be done? Because if you can do that, that’s a huge environmental concern and it would reduce a lot of people’s concern about the dust flying.

A: **Anna Wright:** Yeah, I think through this process we have heard this input from various community members. It’s not directly related to the containers. The Port has a number of avenues where you can talk about the coal issue. And certainly we will note it here but there’s going to be a more direct way to get to the Port about the coal.

C: **Rob Terris:** I’m talking about containers, strictly containers.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** Coal is not in containers. We do not transport coal in containers at Deltaport.

C: **Rob Terris:** Well, you have it in the rail cars. Maybe even a roller thing that can slide over and stop a good portion of the dust. Something like that makes a huge difference, and it cuts down the concerns in the community. It’s strictly coal I’m talking about.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** I know and we’re not talking about coal here; we’re talking about servicing a container facility and a container port. We don’t transport coal in containers.

Q: **Cliff Caprani:** Can I ask you a question about Prince Rupert? You said that they were at capacity for now and into the future. Do you know what their capacity is? How many TEUs?

A: **Michael Zachary:** Two million TEUs. What you see here includes a total of 2 million which is a full expansion of what they call Phase 2, Stage 1, which is coming on board in 2015 and then their Phase 2, Stage 2 which takes it up to just under 2 million TEUs.

C: **Cliff Caprani:** My information is they actually have plans funded to go to 5 million.

C: **Michael Zachary:** Well, you have to tear down a complete mountain to do so, so it’s going to be very, very expensive.

C: **Cliff Caprani:** Fair enough but they have plans to do it though; it’s actually on the books. So that’s one of the things that I think might be possible with the capacity available at places other than Deltaport.
C: *Michael Zachary:* There is capacity and then there is reasonable capacity to take a look at. They have to move a complete mountain. It’s huge.

C: *Cliff Caprani:* But, as I said, there are plans to do that.

**Why Do We Need More Capacity for Containerized Trade**

*Rhona Hunter* provided information regarding the container growth forecast (page 12 of the Discussion Guide).

C: *Mike Isinger:* I wanted to discuss the lack of the business case. The independent container traffic congestions I believe have been superseded by newer information. In August in the *Journal of Commerce*, August 5th edition, Bill Mongelluzzo has a detailed name for it in which he quoted Mr. Nye. Mr. Nye says that Pacific Coast Ports in the U.S. and Canada handled 23 million TEUs last year. Their capacity under their current operating conditions is 35 million TEUs. If they operated more density on the European model they could handle 52 million TEUs and we’re currently only handling 23.

Well, we’re having a problem with the ex-CEO of Port Metro, Norman Stark, up till three years ago said that there would be a fourth berth at Deltaport before T2 was ever considered. And the federal government in their own report, 2008 said that the expansion of Prince Rupert prior to any additional dollars. It seems as soon as we hired Robin Sylvester to head up Port Metro, all the old way that we were going to progress with additional container capacity, the fourth berth at Deltaport and increasing Prince Rupert, all of a sudden it is T2 and we’ve got to have it.

We suggest to you as port workers that it’s not necessary. We should improve our current efficiencies at the ports in British Columbia that handle containers. And there are a lot of efficiencies that are available just sitting on the table waiting to be grabbed.

And I would like to know from Port Metro why Port Metro Vancouver is subsidizing customers to call Deltaport when their business is closer to the inner harbour terminals? And we were up at Prince Rupert two months ago and the terminal manager was begging for additional business that is being steered to Deltaport. So I just put those questions out.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* And certainly in your response to us, you could give us some ideas about where those efficiencies are. I think that is very valuable information for us to receive from you.

C: *Mike Isinger:* Well, I did make that comment previously that a 100% reservation system currently is running 70% of reservations. In the inner harbour, the trucks are waiting four hours for containers because there is no will on the part of Port Metro to show some leadership on developing a 24-hour a day truck delivery system.

Like I said, the ships work 24 hours a day, the rail lines work 24 hours a day and we’re expected to handle all that cargo. It’s like a big choke point in all the terminals here in the Lower Mainland because trucks are only picking up during the Monday to Friday dayshift. And other than putting GPS in the trucks, which didn’t do anything to improve the efficiency.

It is wrong what’s happening to the truck drivers that haul these containers on behalf of these companies. Some of those guys are working for $50 a day because of the inefficiencies getting in and out of the port because they are supposed to pick up all their containers during the Monday to Friday day shift. Reservations open up at midnight; by 12:01 all the reservations are gone for picking up the containers for the Lower Mainland container terminals because there is no will on the part of Port Metro to resolve this long standing trucking issue.
C:  *Rhona Hunter*: We do have a section later on in the guidebook that will speak about some specific feedback that we would like to have from you on trucking. So certainly we can dive into that a little bit more at that time.

C:  *Mike Isinger*: Okay, thank you.

Q:  *Deb Jack*: Everything that is being discussed right now is highly important and once again environmental issues are right at the very end. And we have an hour left so I wonder if we could have at least a minimum of 20 minutes to discuss the environmental issues? Too often it goes maybe the last five minutes.

A:  *Anna Wright*: Yes.

Q:  *Wayne Mills*: Currently there is 3.3 million 20-foot units going through and they say by 2030 it will go to nine-and-three-quarters, so it is going to triple through Vancouver and through the B.C. Coast in the next 14 years. Now is this traffic because the U.S. ports are running out of space? Because from what I gather out of Rupert, 90% of it is heading straight to Chicago, so that’s all heading to the States. It’s not anything to do with Canadian economy or a very small bit, so this isn’t because you don’t need this because the American economy you believe is going to keep going?

Q:  *Michael Zachary*: 10% of the cargo that comes through the Lower Mainland through Centerm, Vanterm and Deltaport goes into the U.S. That’s all. Prince Rupert, because of CN is geared to hit the heartland of both Canada and the U.S. but our target market is the eastern Canadian market.

**Marine Terminal**

*Rhona Hunter* provided an overview of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including the anticipated economic and job benefits of the project (page 16 and 17 of the Discussion Guide).

Q:  *Deb Jack*: Excuse me. We’re British Columbia, we’re the Lower Mainland. When it says $1.63 billion to the Canadian economy, quite frankly that doesn’t appear to be very much, but how much of that occurs here in the Lower Mainland? That’s the kind of stuff that we need to know here so that we can make accurate responses and certain decisions if there ever needs to be a decision made by us citizens. So all of these things need to be broken down.

A:  *Erin Bishop*: Part of the environmental assessment is a detailed economic impact assessment, and that's where you'll find a detailed analysis of that kind of breakdown that you're looking for, including exactly where the economic contributions will be nationally, regionally and locally. It will also include a section on government revenues, so that's where you'll see the details of the tax that Port Metro Vancouver will pay provincially and federally and what happens to that tax revenue, to the best of our knowledge. And that's being done by an independent economic impact assessment expert.

C:  *Deb Jack*: Well, I'm a little bit skeptical. I don't appreciate the reason why when for the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which is really a super highway, the environmental assessment said that, yes, indeed there would be an impact on the health of seniors and children because of the particulates as a result of all the truck traffic but that would be compensated by more jobs in the health sector in the future. If that's the type of thing that we can expect from this environmental assessment, then I'm wondering about its real sound utility. I wish that what I just said was not so, but really an exaggeration. I thank you very much.
Q: **Cliff Caprani:** Can we have a comment about that? Are you just going to note that down and put it in the report?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Yes, we've noted a concern. We will take that concern. I didn't do the environmental assessment for the South Fraser Perimeter Road.

Q: **Cliff Caprani:** Okay, so then it comes back to what Mike just asked a second ago about the fact that terminal is not running at capacity. Again, no comment from the top table about that? I mean is this accurate? Is it just the ravings of a wild man here from the lowly union? What's your take on that, please?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** So we have done economic forecasts and we have determined based upon our operational understanding of the terminals and the capacity that we currently see them and that we project those terminals to be provided that Terminal 2 is required.

Q: **Cliff Caprani:** Okay, and I ask you then for the snapshot that Mike provided of today, that it's not running at capacity. Is that accurate?

A: **Michael Zachary:** If we go back to what Rhona said for DTRRIP, Deltaport is at about 1.6 million TEUs. You're doing 51,000 or 38,000 feet of train a day and DTRRIP within two years is going to take up to 2.4 million TEUs and close to 70,000 feet of trains a day. So, yes, right now they're not operating at the true capacity. They're getting two more brand new ship-to-shore gantry cranes. They're getting four more rail mounted-gantry cranes. They're getting 48 more hostlers, you know, they're getting a whole bunch of more equipment and so just by the numbers, they're not increasing any land area, and they're going to have to operate 24/7.

Q: **Cliff Caprani:** But no I'm just trying to get an honest assessment of whether the snapshot that Mike provided is accurate or not. You're telling me that it is?

A: **Michael Zachary:** It is today. I don't know what your throughput per TEU is, but he's talking about L.A./Long Beach being about 4,500 TEUs. Seattle-Tacoma about 3,000 TEUs. That's where he's coming up with. You guys are much higher than that, as you're already densified. With the stuff that's coming down online for DTRRIP, they're going to be at where Terminal 2 is absolutely required.

C: **Cliff Caprani:** I don't agree with that I think. Thanks.

**Marine Terminal**

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the terminal design and construction (page 18 and 19 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Rob Terris:** The sand, does it come and silt in where the ships are? Is it a dredging issue, or is that not a problem there?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** It hasn't been a problem at Deltaport and we do not anticipate that there's going to be a need here but that's something that we would have to determine once it's operational. Our current design and understanding is that the continual dredging of the berth front is not going to be required.

C: **Michael Zachary:** That's correct. We're also doing hydraulic modeling.

Q: **Deb Jack:** One of my concerns is just generally for anything, is that if adequate research and everything else is not done before plans are made, then one organization winds up being in
constant repair mitigation. Was a very thorough environmental assessment, with a hydrological and all of the different kinds of issues assessment done before this proposal was put out there?

A: Rhona Hunter: Good question. There was an analysis done on the actual location of that land mass and it was a balance between the environmental considerations with the sensitive foreshore and staying out of what's called the zero tide line, which is the area where, once you start to cut into it, you get substantial scour and you get little channels in the mud flat. This was balanced with the seismic requirements and stability of the island the further out into the deeper water that we go.

Interestingly enough, it was a balance that the engineers and the environmentalists sort of came together and said, “This is the best place for it,” and it happened to be the same place for each side.

C: Deb Jack: I ask because I do remember in the ancient olden days when they were initially talking about the original terminal, and there were supposed to be all sorts of ways in which the water would flow through and the animals could go underneath the causeway. As I understand, these are not existing, so there are some serious consequent issues on the south side of that causeway.

C: Rhona Hunter: So to the question of why is there not a breach in the causeway, it causes more damage because you’re cutting into the intertidal zone and there's lots of scientific reasons and I think there's a memo that’s out there that speaks to it. We can certainly get that to you. It speaks to why breaching that causeway is actually is more detrimental than the good that it would provide.

C: Deb Jack: Okay, as I said, I remember that being discussed in ancient things and it wasn't done. So thank you very much.

Q: Rob Terris: Have you communicated with YVR to see if there are any flight issues, especially with the south terminal?

A: Rhona Hunter: That's probably part of the environmental impact assessment. Currently there has been a red flag raised at this time.

C: Rob Terris: Well, sometimes it’s an emergency and somebody at the terminal may have to land and sometimes they come in pretty low.

C: Rhona Hunter: That's part of the environmental assessment process.

A: Michael Zachary: The answer is yes to your question. The land that you have here right now, not only to count the two items that Rhona talked about, but we're also looking specifically at aircraft landing patterns and the winds and the currents.

Q: Rob Terris: And you have communicated with YVR?

A: Michael Zachary: Yes. So that portion of it has been done and I think when Rhona gets into the process of the environmental assessment and who is doing what to where, a lot of these questions are going to come up.

Q: Judy Higginbotham: Just listening to the conversation, am I hearing that in the long term you're looking less and less at using the Fraser River for any container shipping?

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.
Q: **Judy Higginbotham**: So you're moving it more away from the river. And what's the capacity you're looking at? We fly into Singapore and there's a city of shipping containers. It boggles your mind when you see it in daylight. When you see it at night, you think it's a city. It's mind boggling to see the amount of container traffic. I guess this is often my concern that "long term" in politics is five years, and port containers and so on look 20, 50, 100 years down the road. And will this still be a terminal in that time according to whatever studies we do have? Because it still is a sheltered area, it still is and has its limitations.

Q: **Rhona Hunter**: Are you talking about the Fraser River?

Q: **Judy Higginbotham**: I'm talking about the port itself. Like what is the overall capacity that you're putting there? I quite agree with putting the ports along the Fraser River. But you're saying that the ships are getting larger, so any of this container traffic is then going to more and more go to Roberts Bank and away from the existing ports. That's more my question.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: In the future, we do not anticipate Fraser Surrey Docks growing their business. In fact, we would see their container business declining because of the size of container ships that are coming to the West Coast of Canada and the United States cannot navigate in the Fraser River.

Q: **Judy Higginbotham**: Okay, and I like the answer to that question. But having said that, I guess I'm looking at the entire sort of passage of Terminal 2 and Terminal 1 in Tsawwassen. This is where you're doing most of the major port activity. We would also be moving away from the Vancouver area? Is what you're saying?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: No. Centerm and Vanterm remain and will be optimized and in fact if you go back to page 12, you'll see around 2028 we have inner harbour improvements, so we do anticipate that Centerm leases and potentially some land could be acquired that we would be looking at some further expansions within the inner harbour.

Q: **Judy Higginbotham**: And you know, I think one of the challenges is that you have to look at the Lower Mainland as an overall system because of the shipping. Just so inextricably linked and if one is out of whack then you have problems in the entire Lower Mainland. And we fought for the South Fraser Perimeter Road. We didn't have a whole lot of ability to make sure that the route was pristine because it does have some environmental challenges. And we need a North Fraser Perimeter Road and if you don't get some of those things, you're going to be somewhat hamstrung and crippled. These are the things that I think when I look at the picture; I'm trying to sort of figure out down the road how long is this going to play on. The best place to put it is where we should be looking at expansion.

So I guess basically I am asking you how much lobbying have you done? How much have you worked with some of the other stakeholders to look at the entire picture in the long term. And this is why I'm listening to the conversation and I am learning a great deal. I don't know how you answer some of those questions.

A: **Rhona Hunter**: So big projects like this take a long time to come to fruition. We are still quite a ways out from even having the necessary permitting to even begin to construct it. And it's a six year construction period. So we're quite a ways away from actually having this capacity and this project on line, if it is approved. So there is a tremendous amount of work that continues to go on in the port to look at exactly what you're talking about: What are the other requirements that are going to be needed in order to facilitate making these terminals that already exist more...
efficient? What are some of the other infrastructure that needs to be looked at to ensure that the logistics chain operates efficiently? So yes, we continue to look at all of those in a more holistic way for the port and the adjacent communities and businesses. Put that feedback in a written submission as well so we can capture those comments.

C: Judy Higginbotham: Oh absolutely, because there is such definition around Vancouver and the Lower Mainland. You’re talking about mountains, which control certain things like dredging, which if you don’t have the federal government bridge then the rivers are still too much.

Q: Deb Jack: How high do they anticipate the sea levels are going to go at which time? The reason I ask that is because just lately we’ve got the latest WCC report which says that things are heating up much faster than they thought, even 10 years ago. And it looks as if all of that is happening much sooner, which means of course we’re going to have seas rising faster. I understand that Surrey in its assessment is taking approximately 1 metre increases. It looks as if it is probably going to be sooner than later.

A: Michael Zachary: 3.5 metres in a hundred years. That’s what this is designed at, but we’ve got a problem called the causeway, so unless we go back and rebuild the causeway, which you can dyke. So when we looked at this we looked at the sea rise at the 20-, 40- and 100-year marks and we got all sorts of numbers. The high number was 7 metres, the low number was 1 metre. So the engineers right now, based upon what we’re all saying in terms of the analysis, we’re looking at 3.5.

Q: Deb Jack: And those numbers were determined when?

A: Michael Zachary: Within the last six months.

C: Deb Jack: Okay, that’s interesting.

C: Michael Zachary: Again, the process that we’re going through in this environmental assessment, as Rhona said, there’s a lot of studies that are going on now. Erin just mentioned three or four different studies. Whoever the final ultimate decision makers are is going to tell us what studies need to be done. This is the preliminary design.

Q: Al Schulze: Since we’re talking about the causeway, will there be an increase in the width of the causeway?

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.

Q: Al Schulze: So it will get wider?

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes. The causeway has been strategically designed to be widened where it actually has infrastructure on it that requires it. So we actually use an undulating shoreline. In some places it gets widened as much as a 100 feet and in other cases it only gets widened by 50 feet. So it’s going to depend on what infrastructure is required at that place along the causeway. We’ve done engineering to avoid as much of that sensitive foreshore area where the biofilm and intertidal marsh is.

Q: Al Schulze: That begs the next question, is there any plan for increasing the coal capacity? I know this has nothing to do with containers.

A: Rhona Hunter: No.

Q: Al Schulze: Are there any plans to get rid of the coal capacity?
A: Rhona Hunter: No.

Q: Al Schulze: Because if you build a bridge and then it would be impossible to bring those ships up the Fraser, the ones that move the coal, to say the Surrey Fraser Docks. Is it possible that might be the plan?

A: Rhona Hunter: There is no plan to change the operations at Deltaport. Those are long term leases.

C: Al Schulze: Because currently there is a movement to bring more coal in from New West. I know it is not going to go to Deltaport as it is right now. In fact none of it as far as I know.

C: Rhona Hunter: I can’t say because I’m not in that business.

C: Al Schulze: Because I get the coal trains going by in South Surrey.

**Habitat Mitigation**

Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the habitat mitigation work that Port Metro Vancouver is contemplating as part of the project (page 22 and 23 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Cliff Caprani: Just two quick questions. The exchange rate at the habitat bank, you take out an acre and you want to use it somewhere else, is it a one-for-one or is it a two-for-one where you have to replace twice what you took out?

A: Rhona Hunter: It will depend on two things. It will depend on the [Federal Fisheries Act](#) that is going through revision and we don’t quite know what the new fisheries regulations are going to say. Our understanding is that they are going to change from this “one-to-one” that’s currently in place. In the past it’s been one hectare that you either offset for two-to-one or three-to-one or four-to-one and therefore for every one hectare of impact you would offset with two or three or four depending on what the environmental review process had stipulated.

We don’t know what that is going to look like so it will be whatever is required in accordance with the new regulations as well as what the regulator then determines through their approval process.

Q: Cliff Caprani: Okay, second question: Sometimes land is destroyed in such a way that it can’t be replaced. For instance, I am thinking of the biofilm around that area that we’ve spoken of. If that gets destroyed and can’t be replaced, what happens there? I mean, not everything that’s removed from here can be rebuilt over there. What happens in that case?

A: Rhona Hunter: So, it really comes down to the regulators and the environmental assessment process. It wouldn’t be for me to make that determination; it would be up to the regulators and the environmental process to determine how they could offset that impact and what other things might be value added to offset the impact.

Q: Cliff Caprani: All right, so just one last question: Does that happen before or after the project is completed?

A: Rhona Hunter: The assessment happens before the project is completed. The mitigation, anything that is not in the bank would be done either in conjunction with the project or after the project in accordance with the approvals from the regulators.

C: Cliff Caprani: So, it’s going to be kind of difficult if something gets destroyed and late in the project. If the Port wreaks havoc in some area later on in the project and, you know, the agency
that’s responsible is not going to say, “Cease and desist. You can’t build the port now. You’re 90% completed, okay, so you destroyed something that can’t be replaced.”

C:  **Rhona Hunter:** Well, there is integrity within the process itself and the regulatory process is supposed to prevent that type of situation.

Q:  **Cliff Caprani:** Well, how can it?

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** So that’s what the regulatory process does. We work very extensively determining what the baseline conditions are. So the first stage that we’re in is that we do extensive work in environmental studies that determine what the existing baseline is. What the conditions are out in the environment as we stand now. What’s done then is the project itself, after we come to consensus what the regulatory process is, and then it is determined what the impact of that project is on the environment. There are then refinements to offset and reduce that input. The mitigation of any residual impact that the project has then becomes part of the approval process within our permit to build.

C:  **Cliff Caprani:** I am not terribly heartened by that.

C:  **Rob Terris:** Yes, I agree with the federal government, too. I did work at the ports, and the Canadian Environmental Assessment is unbelievably strong and strict. All of my projects, that is part of the process, and I have to say it is a benefit in B.C. environmental assessment process. You know that. And Fisheries and Oceans, Transport Canada, Environment Canada, they are so stringent on everything. When they do this process, it is very strong, and it is there for the environment and for the better, that is my feeling.

Q:  **Cliff Caprani:** I mean, you are aware that DFO have been gutted in recent years, right?

A:  **Rob Terris:** The Canadian Environmental Assessment process is very good.

C:  **Deb Jack:** With respect, nothing now is the same as it used to be. Nothing now is.

C:  **Rob Terris:** It is even better.

C:  **Cliff Caprani:** Oh, stop.

C:  **Rob Terris:** In the past there was none.

C:  **Cliff Caprani:** There is a federal gag order on the scientists for crying out loud.

Q:  **Deb Jack:** I wish I had more information than just what was written here. As I listened to you talk, what went through my mind was the Pacific Carbon Trust, which when I first saw it, my perception which never got changed by what happened subsequently was, “This was a scam.” I am concerned when it says here “creating and improving fish and wildlife habitat in advance of potential port development projects.” So, on the top of it I can see, okay, that it is done, and it may look like a very good thing, but then that would provide the allowance for destroying stuff? Because you would be able to say, “But we did this ahead of time, and this is our bank.” But that is assuming that the bank has the exact same environmental value on a specific and a general basis, as what it is that is being destroyed in the process of construction.

A:  **Rhona Hunter:** So it’s a very good question. The bank is not a panacea. The bank has not been licensed to do anything; the bank simply is a depository for habitat which could be used in accordance with an environmental review process, and in approvals through the regulatory agencies to offset or to mitigate a future project. So the bank doesn’t give a license to do
anything. The bank is just a place that a project can go and say, “Through the environmental assessment process, we have determined that you need X,” whatever X is, “in order to mitigate your project.”

Q: Deb Jack: So, perhaps I misheard you earlier. Would this solely be for Port Metro Vancouver, not for any other organization to draw on?

A: Rhona Hunter: No. This is the Port Metro Vancouver’s bank. We have the understanding that the first user will be Port Metro Vancouver, because it’s our bank, and we will certainly look to our bank for any port project or any of our tenants’ or proponent’s projects, but we are absolutely open that if there is availability in the bank that those people don’t need, and suits the needs of another third party. They certainly would have access to that bank at a cost.

Q: Deb Jack: Okay, then I did hear, and my concern with regards to a replication of the carbon trust has some validity. And on the face of it, as I said, I would have to do a great deal more reading and consideration. That raises concerns.

Now, let me just push over. I think you’ve got two good illustrations here on your graphs at the bottom. I just heard of the instance where a huge amount of log debris was removed from the bank and all the rest of it. This has currently been done in another area because the port has been able to do that?

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.

C: Deb Jack: One of the interesting things, and it was mentioned to me because I am not a birder, is that virtually nothing was left for providing a habitat for the snowy owls which are now coming down in huge numbers compared to what they used to, and they are going to go back there and there won’t be any place for them to perch. And indeed, according to what I have been told, there is no place in the greater Vancouver area for them to go and perch.

C: Rhona Hunter: So there were strategic logs and perches left in place, and in fact, Carolyn here is the expert on those exact projects. They were left there strategically for perches and for birds to utilize in the area. Environment Canada and the Ministry of Forestry, Lands and Natural Resource Operations was part of the conversation around that, and they raised concerns, and they were very, very happy with the work that was done. So there are a lot of people who are involved in approval and the proceedings of that project in Boundary Bay, including regulatory agencies, wildlife, marine people, all who move forward with this as being a very positive for both birds and fish.

C: Deb Jack: You will appreciate that so many people who are concerned about the living environment here in the Lower Mainland are extremely skeptical, and based on previous experience, not very confident. And one of the concerns expressed by many is that the people who know the area best, who are those who are actively in the field all the time making observations in the course of doing the things that they enjoy aren’t ever consulted. So these kinds of things have been happening out of the consultation, actively and intensively by these regulatory people and the people who work for the governments. Because quite frankly, all of the people who work for the governments are so clearly politically driven that people who are on the field and live as residents are concerned about the kinds of things that are produced as a result.

C: Anna Wright: So Deb, we do have a number of meetings upcoming and if you know of anyone that would like to participate in this process and provide very specific input about areas that, as
you say, they know because they’ve been living in those areas, please let them know about how they can participate in this.

Q: **Al Schulze:** We are talking about the current area of 72nd Street, 64th Street and so on. There are some logs sticking out to be sure but it will take time for this to mitigate itself, if it does. What do the birds do this winter, because the logs do release food for them as well because there are moles and whatever living in the logs? My question is: how is this financed?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** By Port Metro Vancouver.

Q: **Al Schulze:** So they have a bank where they get money from to pay for the bank?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** It comes out of our capital projects, yes.

C: **Rob Terris:** Reifel Island is a huge area of habitat for birds. Some of my projects were there. You just have to go look and you’ll see the snow birds there. And T1 is in their flight path, they virtually land in that area, and it’s massive.

C: **Cliff Caprani:** You’re talking about the geese.

C: **Deb Jack:** You are talking about the geese; we are talking about the owls.

C: **Rob Terris:** I mean there is every type of bird there.

C: **Deb Jack:** Rob, I am fully aware of Reifel. What you are talking about is condensing everything into the small area of Reifel when the natural habitat is the entire Lower Mainland.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** So we do have some consultation topics around mitigation, it’s not just some sort of smaller banking projects, we do have some questions that we are asking specifically around preference in terms of whether we do want to look at a lot of smaller projects or whether there is a preference that we look at some bigger projects or if we actually look at some infrastructure like a fish hatchery. So, on page 23, we do have some more details around some of the things that we are currently looking at from a mitigation standpoint that we would like to have your input on preferences or where you think there should be an emphasis placed.

Q: **Cliff Caprani:** In the Project Description what you don’t have, on page 36 there was something about potential trans-boundary effects. Underwater noise with soil density based on pile driving during construction. My question is how long is that underwater noise going to last?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** There is minimal pile driving. There might be some around the tug basin. That is it.

Q: **Cliff Caprani:** Well, I am more interested in the actual underwater noise itself, and soil densification, underwater noise in berthing, all that stuff. How long is that going to go on for?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** The construction period is six years, and I would say that the berth face would probably be one of the first areas, so I don’t have detailed plans now on the construction sequencing.

Q: **Judy Higginbotham:** But you also have an environmental window that you can build in each year?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** We will have all sorts of constraints put on us that we don’t know right now. We will work around SRKW and marine mammals, but we don’t have that yet. We are not there in
the environmental process, so we can’t speak specifically as to what those windows are, what we would do to work around them.

C: Rob Terris: The new pounders now that they have are very quiet. When they built the new bridge is was unbelievably quiet, and it went down so fast you could virtually see it in the water. I was almost in shock because I have lots of trepidation on the pounding and the banging and the loud noise. I say it is one-one hundredth of the old way. If you had a chance, you could have gone down there and seen the pounding working, and you’d be surprised and in shock at the quietness. So the new methods now they are really good.

C: Cliff Caprani: I am more interested in the underwater stuff. Not just above ground.

C: Rob Terris: This is the water stuff I am talking about.

Q: Eoghan Moriarty: I just want to confirm that the Terminal 2 project will not handle anything besides containers? It won’t handle coal; it won’t handle oil and gas by the barrel? It will only handle container traffic?

A: Rhona Hunter: Only containers.

**Road and Rail Traffic Considerations**

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the road and rail traffic considerations, as well as the various options for mitigation that the port is looking for feedback on (page 24-29 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Al Schulze: On page 24, you talk about eight to 10 container trains. Is this in addition to the current trains? Or is this the total?

A: Rhona Hunter: No, that is eight to 10 additional trains, four to five in, four to five out.

C: Al Schulze: So, because the way it reads, it looks like it is for the whole. You know, it doesn’t say “additional” it just simply says, “would generate between,” and so on.

Q: Mike Isinger: So, a trip in and a trip out is classified as two trains?

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.

Q: Al Schulze: Okay, well fair enough. My question is, currently, there is also many trains go in and out. This is in addition. So, if you have 10 trains a day now, it will be 20?

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.

C: Al Schulze: Maybe that should be indicated somewhere.

C: Rhona Hunter: Good point. Thank you.

C: Deb Jack: This is where it is frustrating that you are only dealing with one and not dealing with the holistic thing. Because I fortunately live in the centre of Surrey, so depending on the winds, I don’t get the impact of all of the trains going through. What is going to happen with regards to Surrey port and the coal issue, then we would have a really much better picture on what it is that we are going to be facing and could then better comment and feedback. If we only had an isolated thing, that makes it very, very difficult.

**Environmental Assessment**

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the environmental assessment process (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).
Q: Deb Jack: So, when you do these cumulative effects assessments, do you also consider that which is being proposed by other organizations?

A: Rhona Hunter: Reasonable, foreseeable projects are not just port projects. They are reasonable and foreseeable within a geographic area. So it doesn’t matter whose project it is.

C: Deb Jack: Because one of the things that I would like to see is some kind of an assessment of what the increase in all of the shipping is going to be in the entire Lower Mainland. That includes over in Vancouver, on the North Shore, in the harbour there, going all around to the port part of the river, as well as other ports so that we can see.

C: Rhona Hunter: So the scope is determined through the regulators. I can’t say that as part of our project we would do a, you know, northwest coast of Vancouver Island assessment of all shipping. That’s probably out of our scope.

Q: Deb Jack: No, I appreciate that, but we are getting so much that is isolated, we have so many things as citizens with which we have to deal. And if you all live here in the Lower Mainland, you also know our citizens are going to be impacted. It’s very difficult to get a summative number. So I would anticipate now that we would get some kind of a number through your studies that will give us an idea of what the anticipated increase in marine traffic would be with regards to expansion that is going to happen on the North Shore, the expansion that is going to happen with regards to Kinder Morgan, with regards to just regular stuff that is going into Vancouver, all the stuff that is proposed for the river, and all the stuff that is proposed for the port, so that we could see the increased demand with regards to here, what is going to happen here to all our waterways, and indeed, what is going to happen at the entrance to the Salish Sea. Because that is also an issue with regards to all of this traffic, and where is it going to go, and how is it going to go through. And there would also be an impact on the increase that has been forecasted for Victoria, because it uses the same outlet to the ocean. So, I would hope that we would see all of that?

A: Rhona Hunter: The scope of the assessment is determined by a regulator, and so that will then determine the geographic area which we would do cumulative effects.

Q: Deb Jack: I guess what I am doing is asking at the very least you might be proactive.

A: Erin Bishop: Deb, I can speak to that. So, in addition to the cumulative effects assessment that looks at planned projects and separate projects that don’t exist now, each study in every environmental assessment includes a local study area, or local assessment area, that looks at where the anticipated effects of the project are, and a regional assessment area or study area that provides context to the impacts of the project. And I think that is what you are speaking to. And that will tell you what is happening in a broader area. Even if there isn’t a new planned project, just with the growth of our other facilities, that will be the context for the impacts that are anticipated as a result of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project.

So, short answer is yes, you will see what you are looking for in the environmental assessment.

C: Deb Jack: It is perhaps an issue of semantics of the definition of “local” and “regional”. I would suggest that “local” encompasses the entire mouth of the Fraser River, and that “regional” would then encompass the impacts of the Salish Sea going out to the ocean. We are talking about an international port, and that has been emphasized constantly, so I think we have to expand the definition of “region”.

---
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C: Judy Higginbotham: When I look at that over a period of years what we’ve experienced in the City of Surrey, not just more trains, but longer trains, and then a different mix of goods that are coming on the trains. All too often a lot of stuff we don’t know about, and many of that goes around the South Surrey area, right around and cuts off Crescent Beach, quite regularly when it stops, and we do understand that any impact or the doubling of whatever you do in the port area, or in the airport, deals a lot, deals a tremendous amount with trucking. Their increase is where they impacts us, but they are not increasing their facility particularly.

We know you have an intermodal yard in North Surrey, but the trains that are coming up to those intermodal yards are government linked and they weren’t ten years ago. And they are certainly carrying goods. Many of them are not proper and uniform. They’re sometimes a little sloppily looked after. And you don’t have jurisdiction over them. But the impact of those things on which you don’t have control can be very great on community, and those are part and parcel I think of many of the concerns and many of the things that the community thinks of. Because you have to look at environmental as well as the social impact, and too often I think we are called emotional.

And sometimes we may be. If I hang up a white washing on the line, which we haven’t done for 20 years, but if I did, and it was black from the coal trains going by. I mean, there is so much that I know you are trying to do, and I certainly know that you are dealing with the issues that you have control over. But it’s the issues that you don’t. The capacities of the trains, the length of trains, the frequency of trains, and so on and so forth. What you are talking about here is just one issue and then you look at the building and the capacity of the trucks and the frequency of trucks, and those are all issues.

And I know you have indicated, and you have spoken about it, but you have control over 2,000 of the 24,000 trucks. You also will be putting new containers and more containers on trains, which I agree with. I mean I think it’s not a bad thing, but unfortunately we do have a lot of challenges and problems with rail regulations and how they regulate their goods in transport and so forth. And that’s a big issue to us. So we need your help, and we need your voices making sure that you are dealing with those issues in a very practical way. Thank you

Community Legacy benefits

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the types of community legacy benefits that Port Metro Vancouver is looking for feedback on (page 22-29 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Deb Jack: What kind of money are you talking about?
A: Rhona Hunter: We don’t have a dollar figure at this point but it will be substantial and significant.
C: Deb Jack: Because the kind of money that would be expended in what’s being suggested here under environment is certainly nowhere near comparable to some of the others.
C: Rhona Hunter: We would love to hear from you if you would have some ideas. So please provide any comments or additional suggestions on the feedback form under those sections.
C: Deb Jack: Because I also have a concern where it suggests essentially that the community benefits would be replacing or supplementing what government levels are supposed to be doing as a matter of course, for example, additional air quality monitoring stations. That’s the responsibility of government, and this should not be considered for community benefits.
C: *Rhona Hunter:* This kind of feedback would be greatly appreciated. We're out here in the communities. We want to hear from the communities what their desires and needs and what their ideas around community legacy benefits are.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Just a quick question on the graph on page 29. I just sort of noticed it now and in brackets they have number of respondents. So for the question of the environment you asked 40 people?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We didn't actually ask 40 people. We asked everybody who participated and provided a feedback form. Everybody who came to an open house, everybody that came to a small group meeting, and anybody who filled out a form.

Q: *Cliff Caprani:* Do you have a sense as to how many that might be? Is it like in the thousands?

A: *Matt Skinner:* It was in the range of a hundred people, Cliff.

C: *Cliff Caprani:* Because I obviously I'm sort of making a point that it's only us in the room to decide for everybody else, that's what you get, it's strange.

C: *Matt Skinner:* And Cliff, you can actually find that specific information in the Consultation Summary Report for Project Definition Consultation, which took place last fall. We recognize that it's a small number and it's not just these people making the decision. However, it was a question that was asked and as a follow-up, and is being posed now as a continuation of the conversation. That's the context for the information.

C: *Rhona Hunter:* But you raise a good point about participation and that's why we have to encourage you to please tell your friends, colleagues, neighbours and business associates. If you're not able to make it out to a consultation event, all this is online and we'd love to hear from more people than what you've identified.

Q: *Judy Higginbotham:* They can answer online?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes, you can read this online and you can answer it online.

Q: *Eoghan Moriarty:* So when the facility is up and running, how many people are going to be employed at Terminal 2?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So if you go back to the beginning of the guide and we look at page 17, that's our current sort of high level projections that we have in terms of economic benefit. As Erin indicated, as part of the environmental impact assessment we'll have a great delineation of where those are regionally, locally, and community-wise.

Q: *Eoghan Moriarty:* But how many people are actually working on projects? And separated from indirect and future employees? How many employees will there be at the work site?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* So it is 9,200 total.

Q: *Eoghan Moriarty:* There's 10,000 working at the facility?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* That's direct employment, so that's not on the facility. So that would be on the facility that would be truck drivers, rail drivers, anything that's considered by definition direct. So indirect refers to employees in industries supported by port business. Induced employment refers to jobs generated by expenditures by those employees directly or indirectly.
C:  *Eoghan Moriarty:* Well, here's my point, that it's misleading to claim 9,000 jobs when you don't actually have a figure for how many people are working at that facility.

C:  *Rhona Hunter:* So you want to know how many people are going to be on the terminal?

C:  *Eoghan Moriarty:* Yeah, on these facilities.

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Okay, so the number of people who will work on the terminal will depend on the terminal operator. Our current projection that is used to develop all of this economic data is that it is a semi-automated terminal. Who the eventual terminal operator is and how they choose to operate their terminal will actually then dictate how many jobs are on that terminal.

Q:  *Eoghan Moriarty:* So compared to Deltaport 1, which is the same type of automated as well, there are seven hundred jobs there?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* No.

C:  *Mike Isinger:* Well, just in supplementary. Currently for eight rubber tire gantries now they employ over 20 people. In an automated terminal, one person will operate all the rubber tire gantries.

C:  *Michael Zachary:* We won't go that far.

C:  *Mike Isinger:* Which is current practice in North America, 24 jobs translated into 1 job. So we're concerned about the total man hours of support workers per TEU moved, and there will be a significant reduction and then once again we believe that the figures don't substantiate the business case, the metrics are flawed and we don't believe it's necessary and it won't be necessary for a long time.

The Global Alliance moved, for you that don't know, moved from Seattle to Tacoma. You drive down to Seattle down the I5 you can see all the docks are empty. There's lots of capacity in the Pacific Northwest for containers for years to come and if we improve our efficiencies in our current container terminals here in British Columbia, there's no necessity for Terminal 2 whatsoever. It's been manufactured by Port Metro Vancouver and it continues to be pushed and manufactured. I would suggest to you that there's international interest outside of Canada that are pressuring for this upgraded terminal.

Q:  *Eoghan Moriarty:* So do we have an idea roughly what that number would be?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* I don't have it so I would have to get you the number that we've used. We do have all of these economic reports on our website and it's in there so if you want to, you can certainly look at the economic reports that we currently have on our website and it will provide you with an assumption of how many on terminal jobs there are strictly from the terminal.

Q:  *Eoghan Moriarty:* From the terminal operator?

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* Yeah from the terminal operator, yes.

Q:  *Mike Isinger:* A question on the clean truck program, since we're finishing up on environmental. The clean truck program, LA/Long Beach 2007 Trucks, I believe January 1st, 2012. I wonder what percentage of dirty trucks are still running around the Lower Mainland being that Port Metro's program is contrary to LA/Long Beach's January 1st, 2015, no more pre-2007 dirty trucks driving around. I'm wondering what percentage of the total fleet that are licensed by Port Metro right now are dirty trucks running around the Lower Mainland?
A: **Erin Bishop:** I know we had some information about that and there was a stepwise program that the port initiated as part of its partnership with the ports of Seattle and Tacoma. It’s called the Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy and there’s information online about that as well.

The port initiated a program to phase out older engine model years based on some regulations and industry practice and to reduce the opacity of the emissions of those trucks and so information was provided to the trucking companies about engine retrofit options or engine replacement options and I remember I was involved several years ago, but 2017 is another year for cut off and I believe after 2017 no trucks will be able to access the port unless they have an engine model year of 2008 or newer. The information is online.

Q: **Mike Isinger:** I’m wondering what mitigation fees are attached to trucking companies that are still running those dirty trucks. I know they use the mitigation fee of $35 per TEU to move the trucking companies into purchasing 2007 or newer engines. I wonder what the mitigation fee is that Port Metro is using to encourage those companies to upgrade their fleet?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** You know, Mike, I’d probably have to get somebody from our port operations to get back to you on that because it’s a port operations question around the trucking business, and so we don’t get into the fees that would be there or the incentives that would get there. But we’d certainly be able to provide you — if there was a fee, we’d certainly be able to provide that for you.

Q: **Mike Isinger:** That’s just a means to an end. I’m more concerned about what percentage of the Port Metro Vancouver licensed trucks are dirty trucks running around the Lower Mainland. That’s the question I want. Leading up to 2015 banning all pre-2007 trucks?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** So we can get that data for you, yeah. We can get that data.

Q: **Deb Jack:** Just a quick question for Mike. Are you including the 22,000 articulated trucks that transport different cargos all around that relate directly to what it is the port brings in?

A: **Mike Isinger:** No, being a waterfront port worker, I’m more concerned about the trucks that are licensed by Port Metro Vancouver.

C: **Deb Jack:** I’m just wondering about these 22,000 other trucks. Because every time Ministry of Transport does one of their truck checking things, they take 50% of them off the road because they’re in bad shape.

Q: **Eoghan Moriarty:** Are the trains still exempt?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** It’s just trucks.

Q: **Eoghan Moriarty:** It’s only trucks?

A: Erin Bishop: There are some initiatives around rail and ship traffic as well. Ocean going vessels as well as container handling equipment as part of the Northwest port Ports Clean Air Strategy. It is a collaborative effort in place to work towards lowering emissions from locomotives, but as you indicated, the Port doesn’t have jurisdiction or control around that so that I don’t know the status of those ongoing conversations.

C: **Eoghan Moriarty:** It’s diesel particulate matter we’re talking about. Because I think since 2007, all trucks have emissions controls, and the trains should have the same thing. It’s a huge number of trips.
Q:  Deb Jack:  I don't know what the terminology is for the electrical plugs for the ships that are at port can plug into?

A:  Rhona Hunter:  So shore power is part of this proposed project, yes.

Q:  Deb Jack:  But it won't extend to port 1, will it?

A:  Rhona Hunter:  Yeah, probably within the next two to three years you're going to see Deltaport service for shore power. It's not our ability to have shore power; it's the ability of ships to plug into shore power.

C:  Deb Jack:  Yeah, I appreciate that. But maybe that would be a restriction on the ships that you would have coming. That you say you have to have the capability of being able to plug in. Because after all, we are in a bowl that is funnel shaped and so the air issue here is going to get much more precarious as we increase in terms of the volume of all of the industrial activities as well as population.

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

The meeting ended at 3:11pm.
Notes from a small group meeting for the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, October 15, 5:00pm – 7:00pm, at the UBC Boathouse, Richmond, B.C.

Stakeholders: Craig Jones, Richmond Chamber of Commerce
Dan Overmyer, Nature Vancouver
Dave Makay, Seaspan Ferries Corporation
Doug Jesson, Seaspan Ferries Corporation
Matthias Heinzemann, Modern Engineering
Roger Emsley, Against Port Expansion

Port Metro Vancouver: Anna Wright, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
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The record notes that the meeting commenced at 5:03pm
KEY THEMES:

- Participants were interested in information about the movement of containers in the Lower Mainland, particularly related to the split between truck and train traffic.

- Participants questioned Fraser Surrey Docks’ future container handling plans in light of the announcement to replace the George Massey Tunnel with a bridge.

- Participants questioned the relationship between the Port of Prince Rupert and Port Metro Vancouver as it relates to providing additional container capacity.

- Participants expressed skepticism regarding Port Metro Vancouver’s Habitat Banking Program and the manner in which the Program could be used to offset impacts from the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project elsewhere in the Lower Mainland.

- Participants expressed concern that the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project would not be subject to an appropriate environmental assessment process.

- Participants expressed concerns regarding current noise impacts from truck and train movements to and from existing port facilities, and asked how these impacts could be mitigated by Port Metro Vancouver.

- Participants asked about how short-sea-shipping might be incorporated into the existing container supply chain in the Lower Mainland, as well as into the operations of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Anna Wright

Anna Wright welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting, and also introduced the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Anna informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy, and outlined how participants could provide feedback.

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide – All

Kyle Robertson reviewed the introduction to the Discussion Guide, including ways to participate in the consultation and how this consultation feedback is considered by Port Metro Vancouver. He then gave an outline of the information presented in the consultation discussion guide.

Environmental Assessment

Kyle Robertson provided an overview of the environmental assessment, including opportunities for public comment as part of this process (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Matthias Heinzemann: I have a question on the timelines. If it goes as planned, when would it be finished?

A: Kyle Robertson: We anticipate a multi-year environmental assessment process and then a six-year construction window, so it would be early 2020s.

Why is Trade Important to British Columbians & Who is Part of the Container Supply Chain?
Kyle Robertson provided an overview of the public consultation process, and also described the role that containerized trade plays in the British Columbian economy and the types of participants who form the supply chain (page 2-6 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Matthias Heinzemann: They’re not just going by rail right now?
A: Michael Zachary: Coming directly out of Deltaport right now about 65% goes directly onto rail. Kyle will talk about some of the transloading issues, which raises that up to about 80% total going inland on rail.

C: Matthias Heinzemann: I remember when this first container terminal was built and it was said 90% of it was supposed to go on rail.
C: Michael Zachary: Well we’re up to 80% but there are some things in the industry that are changing. We’ll talk about transloading and the different components of that.
C: Matthias Heinzemann: I see on River Road there’s a lot of container storage happening. I haven’t seen any storage that is done with a rail station or where they have automatic cranes happening. I’ve seen that in Europe and a lot less goes on to trucks.
C: Kyle Robertson: Okay, well, in the pages that follow we’ll speak specifically of transloading and I think we’ll address some of those issues but I’m curious to hear a little bit more about your experiences as well.
C: Michael Zachary: I think it’s important to note that, as Kyle mentioned, out of these six components, the Port does not control or have financial interest in any of those six.
C: Matthias Heinzemann: Well, it’s in the interest of the Port to grow.
C: Kyle Robertson: We’re operating under the Canada Marine Act and our interest is to facilitate that growth in trade in a sustainable manner.
Q: Matthias Heinzemann: Who owns Deltaport? Deltaport or the Port Authority? Who makes the money?
A: Kyle Robertson: Port Metro Vancouver is a non-shareholder entity. There are fees that are associated with it when containers come into the port but those fees are put back into the development of the port activity.
C: Michael Zachary: The port leases the terminal to TSI. TSI operates the terminal, TSI charges the users for the operation of terminal. They charge a loading fee, they charge a discharge fee. They operate the rail yard. Once it gets on the train, CN and CP charge the shipping line for it. So the port gets its revenue from basically dockage, wharfage or lease.
Q: Doug Jesson: I’ve just got a quick question. Do you see any changes in cross-docking operations in terms of relocating Vancouver to the prairies like we’ve seen recently?
Q: Michael Zachary: You’re talking about like for Prince Rupert where they’re putting grain in containers?
Q: Doug Jesson: Like Target and Wal-Mart. You said they have a cross dock and then they truck everything to Alberta. And some of the cans go into Toronto but I’m hearing that the growth in eastern Canada is sustainable, so there’s going to be more rail activity in terms of cans going there? Is that a forecast which you guys have seen?
Michael Zachary: Yes, we're forecasting more rail. So the transloading operation that occurs in the Lower Mainland will be to get it into the 53-foot containers to go inland versus trucking it like they used to truck it. So the inland trucking is down substantially versus the rail is up. That's why I'm saying it's about 80% of the total going to rail.

Doug Jesson: So the trend is definitely strong to rail?

Michael Zachary: Yes.

Why Do We Use Containers

Kyle Robertson provided an overview of how containers are used for the movement of goods, as well as expanding on the role that trucks play in the Lower Mainland (page 7 of the Discussion Guide).

Roger Emsley: I asked this question previously but what worries me, I have seen more 45s and 53s taken from road transport, and indeed in those statistics you show 45s and 53s. Not very many, but it's certainly growing. That changes the whole dynamic as well. What do you see as a forecast in terms of more 45s ultimately? Perhaps less 20s?

Kyle Robertson: I think the 20s and 40s are associated with ships primarily due to the spacing in their bays.

Michael Zachary: So the bay itself is geared with cell guides for 40-foot containers. On the newer vessels you can get some 45s on deck. There used to be a 48-foot. That never picked up. That was more of a railroad and the 48 to 53-foot, as Kyle is going to point out on the next page, you can get three 40-foots into the two 53-foots, you can get two 40-foots into a high cube 53-foot. So your point is well taken, but that's on the inland component and after the transloading. You still have got to get them off the dock into the inland component.

Roger Emsley: I do see 45s on the trains leaving Deltaport.

Michael Zachary: Yeah, you'll see 45s on there and you might see one or two 48s. You won't see any 53s leaving Deltaport because you can't put them on a vessel.

Kyle Robertson: As far as the forecast and the amount coming to the shore, we count those in TEUs and that's how we quantify the forecast numbers.

Why Do We Need Trucks?

Kyle Robertson identified how transloading works at off-dock facilities in the Lower Mainland, and also described some of the reasons for transloading import and export cargo (page 8-9 of the Discussion Guide).

Matthias Heinzemann: How much gets reloaded?

Kyle Robertson: 30% leaves Deltaport in trucks but roughly 5% stays in the Lower Mainland. Roughly 80% of imports are moving out of the Lower Mainland on rail.

Michael Zachary: So depending on the time of year. It's either 10-15% or 15-20%, depending on the season.

Matthias Heinzemann: How many are reloaded from 40-footers into 53-footers?

Michael Zachary: About 15-20%.
Q:  *Matthias Heinzemann:* Where are those reloading facilities?

A:  *Kyle Robertson:* Page 11 illustrates some of those off dock facilities here in Richmond and then on the southern edge of the Fraser and speckled throughout the mainland.

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

*Kyle Robertson described how transloading works at facilities in the Lower Mainland, and also provided an overview of the container traffic forecast and existing marine container terminals (page 10-13 of the Discussion Guide).*

Q:  *Dave Makay:* Are there any options for the Fraser River if the Massey Tunnel is removed?

A:  *Kyle Robertson:* There are some constraints to ships getting up to Fraser Surrey Docks, aside from just dredging, and that is simply the length of those container ships. And when I say length I mean turning around. So the physical ability to turn some of these ships around in the Fraser River would be a constraining factor, in addition to requiring dredging. So, yeah, I don’t think there has been any consideration for increased container movement up the Fraser River.

C:  *Michael Zachary:* We are actually taking all of the containers out of Fraser Surrey Docks.

Q:  *Matthias Heinzemann:* They want to get rid of the tunnel for the bigger boats?

A:  *Michael Zachary:* The tunnel and the boats have nothing to do with each other.

C:  *Matthias Heinzemann:* That is what it said in the paper.

C:  *Michael Zachary:* The tunnel replacement is due to road congestion. And right now, there is a restriction on depth for some of the larger vessels. What Kyle just said was, the container vessels - and we are only talking container vessels - cannot turn around, and the pilots will not bring a ship down the Fraser River backwards.

Q:  *Roger Emsley:* That kind of raises the question of why then did Fraser Surrey spend many millions of dollars expanding their container handling facilities?

A:  *Kyle Robertson:* I can’t speak for Fraser Surrey Docks and their rationale.

Q:  *Matthias Heinzemann:* Are containers coming out of there?

A:  *Roger Emsley:* Well, they were handling 85,000 TEUs not many years ago.

C:  *Michael Zachary:* I think in terms of the economics of shipping. 8,000 TEU now is a standard size vessel. Fraser Surrey Docks caters to 3,000 TEU sized ships, and they found a little niche, and that niche can be handled by the bigger terminals.

Q:  *Roger Emsley:* So didn’t they see that coming when they spent hundreds of millions of dollars expanding?

A:  *Kyle Robertson:* Our executives do talk to each other, and that is also what is illustrated in this forecast really. It’s not really competition, because we see increased container growth that requires both Prince Rupert and Port Metro Vancouver to respond to this. So, we are talking, but
this isn’t a zero sum game. We both need the increased capacity in Prince Rupert and Vancouver. And if one doesn’t happen, then it is really challenging for both.

Q: **Matthias Heinzemann**: It is functioning as competition then?

A: **Michael Zachary**: More like “coopertition”.

Q: **Matthias Heinzemann**: Is it cheaper to unload in Prince Rupert than it is here?

A: **Kyle Robertson**: This is somewhat similar to the question you brought about Fraser Surrey Docks. It goes back to these supply chain folks, right? So you have shippers that are making decisions and saying “Okay, well I can make a deal with CN or CP, and up in Prince Rupert I can only make a deal with CN, because there is no CP up there.” There is also the trans-load facilities, so how many empty containers are going to end up in your area, and is there enough trans-loading facilities? So, these players are going to determine what is the most efficient way to move these commodities, and we are just responding to demand.

C: **Michael Zachary**: There is no local market in Prince Rupert. Anything coming to the Lower Mainland is not going to go to Prince Rupert. Prince Rupert has proudly said that they offer direct access to the heartland of Canada and United States. So, their market, their target market is what they call first port of call and then send it to Chicago and even the Memphis and even down into the middle of the U.S. Vancouver’s market is Eastern Canada. And so it is a different market and a different concept.

C: **Craig Jones**: I’ll give you an example here in Richmond with the Hudson’s Bay Company. A great deal of our trade today is with Asia for the goods coming in to our department stores. Those goods are coming into the ports here, and are being offloaded and consolidated in the facilities here in Richmond. In Richmond the containers are destuffed, and then reloaded based on the destination throughout Canada. So, it could be a department store in Edmonton, it could be a department store in Saskatoon, it could be a department store in Halifax. And the goods are shipped from here. In the old model years ago, they were offloaded here in Vancouver, shipped back east to Montreal or Toronto where they then were destuffed, and then they were shipped back out west if the goods had to come back out west. So, it wasn’t very cost effective. But today, with our trading routes being very much more global and very much Asian-Pacific focused, it is very important that the port facilities here receiving the goods destined for the rest of Canada are handled appropriately to keep our costs competitive. That is very, very important.

C: **Michael Zachary**: Good point, thank you.

### The Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project

Kyle Robertson provided information regarding the various options for creating additional container capacity at Port Metro Vancouver, and also provided an overview of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project and the economic benefits that it would provide (page 14-17 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Matthias Heinzemann**: Employment, what area does it include? The Lower Mainland?

A: **Michael Zachary**: Well, it’s also national. You are talking about people on the terminal. You are talking about the railroad folks working on the trains. You are talking about the truckers. You are talking about the Hudson’s Bay guys that are destuffing the containers, and you’re talking about the counterparts back in Montreal and Toronto. It’s jobs for Canadians.

### Marine Terminal
Rhona Hunter provided information regarding the terminal design, orientation and construction (page 18 and 19 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Dan Overmyer:** Will the environmental assessment include an analysis of the effects of moving the sand around?
A: **Kyle Robertson:** Absolutely. The environmental assessment will look at all the components of construction and operation, including the movement to and from a temporary storage pit. Once it moves into the containment facility, there will be a certain portion of the sand that is not good for seismic issues, that would have to be disposed of at sea, and this will be considered as part of the environmental assessment. There is an associated disposal at sea permit that would be required for this action as well.

Q: **Matthias Heinzemann:** How deep is the water there right now?
A: **Kyle Robertson:** If I turn your attention to the cover actually, the cover provides a little bit of an overview. Basically really at the tail end of the existing facility, the low water mark is really not very far above it. It is really an intertidal zone, and the high water mark really comes up to the edge of that facility, and then it drops off quite a bit. So that is why between the north end of the terminal and the south end it really drops off quite readily. There would be some dredging of the berth pocket that would be required and this too would be considered in the environmental assessment project. And this is where the ships come in, but ultimately the dredging would go down to 20 metres and then there would be some compaction, and refilled up to 18 metres. So, where you see the ships in the Roberts Bank Terminal 2, that would be at a depth of 18 metres, but really, you are only one or two metres deep on the shore side of this at low water.

**Consultation Topics**

Kyle Robertson provided an overview of Port Metro Vancouver’s Habitat Banking Program mitigation, as well as the various habitat mitigation options that the Port is looking for feedback on (page 22-23 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Matthias Heinzemann:** How was the feedback regarding log removal you did on the salt marsh? I saw some demonstration when I was riding my bicycle at 6 o’clock in the morning.
A: **Kyle Robertson:** It is a one million dollar project that is under development. It’s a large habitat development program that we have done in concert with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and identified that as a benefit. Whether or not that specific parcel of land would ultimately be used as mitigation for a Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project if it were to go to ahead and if the agencies identified a need that compensation could be identified through that project is not known. It could be used for any port development projects as part of a separate group in our organization that’s looking at developing habitat. So that project will go ahead and if Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project doesn’t go ahead, that habitat banking project will continue to go ahead and be available for other uses.

C: **Roger Emsley:** As a community, we are still curious as to why you rushed it into Boundary Bay. The project you’ve carried out down there was almost universally panned by any of the community that have experience in birding and the ecology of the salt marsh. We had contact with somebody in Washington State who is an expert on salt marsh restoration and his basic advice was “don’t do it.” I’m down there most days on the dyke, and this time of year you should
be seeing raptors. There are none. There are raptors in the field behind the dyke, there are raptors further up the dyke toward Beach Grove but there are none there.

Somebody who walked by the artificial perches the other day stopped and said, “What the hell is going on” they said, “It looks like a piece of modern art, it looks so artificial. Why did they do this?” The answer was, “I have no idea.” We’re just now hoping that ultimately the wildlife returns because at the moment it is a dead zone. This time of year it should be rich in raptors.

C: Kyle Robertson: Thank you. I mean the program in general is to look at these things. In this particular case, excessive logs in that area were identified as not creating the best value for habitat. So the idea was to remove a portion of those logs to allow the salt marsh to recover. And during the construction period, we probably anticipated some noise levels and whatnot, but in the long term this is anticipated and through the discussions with the agency, to really benefit the area and improve the habitat both for fish and wildlife and birds. There is monitoring that will continue on further to this to make sure that we are getting that.

C: Michael Zachary: We had a session like this about three hours ago and Deb Jacks was at the meeting. And she basically echoed what you said, Roger, and one of the things that we were talking to her about afterwards is, you know, Kyle’s mentioned down at the bottom of page 22 are the agencies that we have to deal with. And there is a disconnect between what the agencies think is right versus what the local experts and the community think is right. And the problem is you coming to the Port doesn’t really solve that issue. You need to go to those agencies and get the agencies, including the Corporation of Delta, to listen to you, and then they can direct the Port to do what is right.

C: Roger Emsley: Well, had we had the opportunity at the time we would have done that. The reality is the agencies, DFO as an example, have been decimated and those who are left are afraid to speak up because they can get shut off and they will be scared to speak up. We have been in touch with some of them. The only substantive reply I got was from the Minister in Victoria and really it was a non-comply.

If we had an opportunity as a community to dialogue with you to point out some of the experts we contacted and have the opportunity for dialogue. Instead you rushed in there, which was why it did show up as so much of a surprise.

Q: Dan Overmyer: We began this discussion with your question, “Should there be an environmental review on this whole process?” And I can only say that in Metro Vancouver, everybody else in the field that I know of were horrified the question even had to be asked. I mean it is obvious and it’s a huge project involving expansion and millions of dollars and alteration of large areas of land and waterfront, so obviously the answer to that is we need a thorough and highly professional environmental assessment on this whole business. And I don’t know what the mindset behind that question is in the first place? It’s a non-starter question.

A: Kyle Robertson: I was just describing the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency process. That’s how they do it for all projects. And that’s how early we are in the stages. We do anticipate that an environmental assessment would be triggered because under their process they indicate what projects do trigger and our project anticipates a new marine terminal that can handle ships of 25,000 dead weight tonnes, which is a trigger. So we anticipate that the answer to your question is “yes”.

C: Dan Overmyer: Yeah, it is a rhetorical question.
C: **Kyle Robertson**: It’s a rhetorical question. We believe it is a rhetorical question because we are in the very early stages and they just haven’t checked that box at this point.

C: **Dan Overmyer**: We couldn’t believe it when we saw that question. Should we have an environmental review? Well, hell yes!

C: **Kyle Robertson**: Well, say that. Say that to them.

Q: **Matthias Heinzemann**: A lot of people will say it is a waste of money. What is going to happen when people really want this thing, it doesn’t matter what the environmental costs are? A lot of people will say you’re wasting your money on this thing.

A: **Kyle Robertson**: The environmental assessment is intended to answer that question. What is the incremental increase to potential impacts to the environment and to the community associated with the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project? But also, today is the last day for public comment period on CEAA’s website so say “Hell, yes.” It should be written right into that because that’s the whole purpose of this step in the very early stages.

And Roger, just to your comment earlier about the ability to inform or help develop mitigation strategies or habitat banking, particularly in the case of the salt marsh. There again when we look at the discussion guide and these potential options or ways that could be identified, the agencies are going to hear the feedback from the community on this. We’re going to respond to this both through a consideration document, but also through a summary of our public consultation. The agencies will hear it through our forum, and you can provide comments directly to agencies as well about processes. But this is something that our Habitat Banking Program within Port Metro Vancouver will be exposed to and it will help their understanding of how habitat mitigation might be considered from the lens of the community, in addition to their agencies that they do work with. So please, feedback on this particular component it will be valuable.

A: **Anna Wright**: We welcome written submissions. We welcome attendance at all of our meetings and filling out feedback forms. So the more people that want to provide us with feedback, the better.

**Road and Rail Traffic Considerations**

**Kyle Robertson** provided information regarding Port Metro Vancouver’s current truck traffic initiatives, including the Smart Fleet Strategy and TLS (page 24 and 25 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: **Matthias Heinzemann**: What about noise control? Have you considered like putting walls up? Even at idle, the engines on the trucks have a certain noise.

A: **Kyle Robertson**: Yeah we are initiating noise monitoring out at Roberts Bank. We’re actually in the process of that right now and a permanent noise monitoring facility out at the Roberts Bank terminal project.

A lot of the truck movement happens beyond our gate, and it is Ministry of Transportation that regulates that activity. I mean we can put conditions on who comes into our gate and whatnot, but as far as noise beyond our gate and on provincial roads, that’s beyond Port Metro Vancouver.

C: **Matthias Heinzemann**: Well, you could have some influence.

C: **Kyle Robertson**: And there again when we speak of this discussion guide and some of that feedback that we are asking for, we work with all these partners and so if there’s issues that are identified, they will be summarized in our consultation documents and we can bring that to them.
Q:  *Matthias Heinzemann*:  You hear those trains all over Tsawwassen?  So if you double the amount that’s going to need to be part of the noise reduction.

A:  *Kyle Robertson*: Right and so the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program with the overpasses to reduce the whistle noise going through intersections and whatnot is one component to reduce some of that noise component.  We would consider noise as part of this environmental effects assessment in addition to air quality and traffic congestion in the areas of key corridors.  So this would be looked at as part of what Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project would contribute to the existing conditions.  So that's there as well.

**Road and Rail Traffic Considerations**

*Kyle Robertson* provided an overview of the various types of mitigations that Port Metro Vancouver is seeking public comments and feedback, including infrastructure improvements, operational improvements and technological improvements (page 26 and 27 of the Discussion Guide).

Q:  *Craig Jones*:  You cite examples there.  Are some ports throughout the world operating today on the 24-hour clock?

A:  *Michael Zachary*: Well Singapore operates 24 hours but they're basically a trans-shipment facility, so not going inland.  I think the most common example is L.A./Long Beach with the Pier Pass Program where they attempted to do it.  Right now it’s kind of quiet but that handled off-hours and the problem is that it’s a pitch and catch system.  If the terminal is pitching it, you've got to catch it which means your distribution facility has got to be open at 1:00 in the morning or else the truck goes and sits and idles outside his facility and you’re not getting the turn.  So no one in North America is a full 24-hour facility.  Rotterdam is close.  That’s about it.

Q:  *Doug Jesson*:  What about Hamburg?  I saw them working.  I was just there actually.

A:  *Michael Zachary*: Hamburg and Sarroch will both, at times of the season, operate in that manner.

C:  *Kyle Robertson*: So again, lots of different stakeholders.  It’s not an easy thing to just make happen but we’re certainly getting direction from the communities, from the public that that is something that the Port should be looking at to mitigate against the impacts of port-related traffic.

Q:  *Doug Jesson*:  Do you have any shipping customers that are looking at the Fraser River as an alternative linking interior cross-dock operations with the river?

Q:  *Kyle Robertson*:  Short-sea-shipping?

Q:  *Doug Jesson*:  Short-sea-shipping.  You haven't heard any customers wanting this service?

A:  *Michael Zachary*:  Not directly other than what you guys have been doing.

Q:  *Doug Jesson*:  Have you heard anybody talking about maybe a similar situation where you come to the terminal and smaller box containership down to the US?

A:  *Michael Zachary*:  That’s been looked at by both the Port and the U.S. ports in terms of looking at that.  Port Alberni was named as a potential hub for that but again, you’ve got to have some synergy around the capability, and if you have a viable land transport system.

Q:  *Doug Jesson*:  If it’s 2020 and we built the terminal and now we’re starting to attract freight opportunities like Rupert.  They found a niche in servicing the cross continental trains.  Is there a chance this super terminal would now facilitate some small shippers down in Seattle?
A: *Michael Zachary*: Your new self-contained vessel is probably the answer to that because the U.S. Department of Maritime Administration did a whole analysis of the M5 core which looked exactly like that and if it wasn't a component to come up to Vancouver, and part of it was is just because of the vessels. And if they build your proposed vessel, it may be.

C: *Kyle Robertson*: The Roberts Bank Terminal 2 project is really to address container growth in Canada. This Port Alberni proposal and this sort of thing wouldn't really reduce the capacity requirements or the trucks that you would see here in the Lower Mainland. The proposed Roberts Bank 2 Terminal is to respond to Canadian growth. As I said, there's a small percentage that goes down to the U.S. but our forecast reflects Canadian growth.

C: *Craig Jones*: But on that note about the short sea opportunities, right now the biggest impediment is the rail bridge that is a hundred and seven years old. The Pattullo is not the issue, it's the rail bridge right next to it. There's a sandbar out there in the Fraser, and basically Sapperton Island could be infilled and connected into the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which then you're allowed that movement inland to connect up because there was no South Fraser Perimeter Road years ago when they talked about it. But with the South Fraser Perimeter Road, there could be an opportunity in the future, but right now it's not even considered because you got a rail bridge, the Pattullo Bridge and who knows what's going to happen in that corridor in the foreseeable future.

Q: *Roger Emsley*: So they're saying they can't get enough trains over there?

A: *Craig Jones*: Well, you got train traffic. You can't get boats coming up the river to make it work because you've got congestion of rail traffic and you've got a swing bridge that operates currently. So there's too much at stake on the rail system to -- so right now you're really restricted at that point.

Q: *Kyle Robertson*: This is barging? Short-sea-shipping?

A: *Craig Jones*: Yes. But if we look to the future, it's definitely something that is on the horizon.

Q: *Roger Emsley*: Why don't they build another bridge for the railroad?

A: *Craig Jones*: Well, the rail has to be replaced. It is almost 115 years old. It has to be. It's a choke point today. The plans are with the federal government. They control that bridge.

Q: *Roger Emsley*: Back to trucking. Do you count the number of empty rigs going in and out of Deltaport? If not, why not?

A: *Michael Zachary*: The old count was 1.89 gate moves per container. So if you do two gate moves per container, you're going in with a load and coming out empty. So three years ago that was 1.89. It's currently just less than 1.7 and the target is to get it down to 1.2

Q: *Roger Emsley*: So it is going down?

A: *Michael Zachary*: Yes and part of it is this truck licensing thing where again, just like Pier Pass, you get fined for it, but you paid extra if didn't -- if you came in empty or left empty.

C: *Kyle Robertson*: And this speaks to reducing the number of empty truck trips and the single-handed trips.

Q: *Matthias Heinzemann*: Do trucks have a problem with the noise too? They rattle like crazy. Anything they can do about that?
Community Legacy Benefits

Kyle Robertson provided an overview of community legacy benefits as part of the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including potential categories for feedback (page 29 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Doug Jesson: Ports have struggled in other parts of the world where there hasn't been a land base for cross dock operations or distribution centres. I guess there is probably some thought now to the foreshore away from this development that would be the area for that type of activity. I guess that's already on the way, isn't it?

A: Michael Zachary: Yeah, that's part of that page 11 with the orange dots.

Q: Doug Jesson: And that's in conjunction with of course the First Nations? I guess what I'm referring to is these dots that are all over the place. They should actually be out near Deltaport, since other successful ports around the world have when the cross docks are close to the port.

A: Kyle Robertson: Port Metro Vancouver does have a land use plan. I didn't really speak to that but there is a land use planning division and we're currently doing consultation on that land use plan. And, we anticipate next year we'll have a report out on that and more opportunities for public consultation on that.

Q: Doug Jesson: Will this development threaten other stakeholders in the port like Vanterm and Centerm?

A: Michael Zachary: We don't think so.

C: Kyle Robertson: Again, when we're looking at the forecast, we need all the capacity on the west coast of Canada.

Q: Matthias Heinzemann: Maybe they shouldn't build a mall there. They should be making some container handling facilities. Is the Richmond Chamber of Commerce in favour of it?

A: Craig Jones: That's a pretty loaded question. We're here to listen just like everybody else. We're part of the process. We're part of the economy. We're in the global supply chain and we've got to protect our land. We have to protect the environment, but we have to create jobs to have a sustainable future.

So all of that comes into play and we're observers in this process and we're concerned about the Fraser River just like everybody else is. We want to make sure that our congestion is dealt with and it's good to see the improvements in the rail corridor out there because communities were being affected and we had situations where we had a fire in Langley that the Langley fire department couldn't get there but Surrey had to go in, you know because we had a train going through at the time of a critical incident.

Over time we're seeing those situations improve where we get cooperation. It's all about livability as well. We all have to live here.

Q: Matthias Heinzemann: How many dangerous good containers are going through there?
A: Kyle Robertson: There are no specific numbers. Can’t say but there’s certain regulations as to what can go into a container and we comply with those regulations.

C: Michael Zachary: But I think there’s a key component. No, the Port does not know because the Port is not part of that supply chain. So CBSA knows, and there are federal agencies that know what’s moving through. The Port itself does not know what’s moving through.

C: Craig Jones: There are controls and measures in place. Every day you have 35 tankers of fuel leaving Cherry Point for YVR; that’s 50,000 litres per tanker just fueling the airport. That’s dangerous goods. It’s not going through the tunnel. It has to be controlled.

C: Dan Overmyer: Well, just a follow up with what I said earlier. The whole area where the terminal is proposed to be built is what’s all known as an Important Bird Area which is an area designated by the United Nations. That whole area is extremely important for water bird migrations. And so this proposal smashes right through an environmentally sensitive area that’s been there for thousands of years and it needs our maximum protection. What you folk are discussing, however you mitigate it, it’s still going to be very destructive and I guess I just wish that there wasn’t so much concern to increase the economic viability at expense of the natural world. It’s just not good. It’s not a proper trade-off. I mean we’re all from the natural world. We depend on it for our life. I mean, and if we don’t protect it in projects like this, where are we going to?

I’m just a retired UBC Prof working with the strength I have left to try to protect the natural world around me where I live. You keep those seven considerations in mind please. It is not just how to make more money, or how to make large projects work, it’s also how to take care of our place in the natural world which we are busy destroying. Thank you for your patience.

C: Anna Wright: Thanks, Dan.

C: Matthias Heinzemann: I personally think it doesn’t cut as much into the environment as other projects, like a chemical plant in the middle of an agricultural zone. This is strictly far out in the water, where there is something already. It has some benefits for the region as employment, but extra traffic is a concern obviously, and the noise pollution in my opinion is a big concern.

Also for the birds, wildlife in general, they don’t like the noise, so if you can do something about that, if the trains can to be quieter. I have never seen these loud trains as there are here. I don’t know why that is. I guess electric is not an option. But you could put walls up on the side to protect a little bit. They do that in Europe a lot. And same with the roads.

I mean, we do get already more noise from the planes now, too. I don’t know what is going on with the jets. They must have changed something in YVR.

C: Craig Jones: YVR doesn’t change it, Transport Canada changes. Again, on the air noise front, there are efficiencies with modern aircraft that are not as noisy as some of the older aircraft. They are more fuel efficient and those improvements continue to be made.

C: Matthias Heinzemann: In general there is more noise. And it will continue, but you can do stuff about it.

C: Craig Jones: I would like to control right that at about 5:30 in the morning about five or six thousand snow geese that land next to my house every morning. It is a nice alarm clock. It is actually only once a year at this period that you get to experience it, but it is a lovely sight to see. I have a great big agricultural field right opposite me that is a sea of white right about now, and it
is a wonderful sight to see. That migratory path is very important; you have to be considerate of that.

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

The meeting ended at 6:42pm.
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KEY THEMES:

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

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

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

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide- All

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

What is Port Metro Vancouver?

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

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

A: Rhona Hunter: Okay. I heard a couple of questions in there. I heard “what number of trucks are actually required in order to service the port business?”, and “are container ships going to be going up the Fraser?”. I’ll answer the second question first.
Container traffic up the Fraser River is not expected to grow. In fact, we see it as being something that will cease to occur, simply because, as you mentioned, the ships that are currently servicing Deltaport, and will continue to service the container facilities in Port Metro Vancouver, are not getting smaller, they’re getting bigger. The ship’s length actually dictates their ability to use the Fraser River as a waterway to access ports. They simply can’t turn in the river because of their size. So, container ships will not be going up in increased volumes. In fact, we anticipate that the container ship traffic volume will go down travelling up the Fraser River.

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

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

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

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

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

C: Katherine Hammod: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: Katherine Hammod: Do you feel that there are additional lands available in Delta? Is that what you’re saying?

A: Rhona Hunter: No. We will be developing some lands in Delta at Deltaport.

Q: Katherine Hammod: Okay. So you’re going to take our farmland, basically. So you consider that available land?

A: Rhona Hunter: No. We’re building a marine terminal.

Q: Katherine Hammod: Everything will be contained on the marine terminal?

A: Rhona Hunter: We’ll go into the Project components in the next section.

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

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

Q: Ray Kan: In terms of the projections, I know that 2011 and 2012 reports are on your website. Is the 2013 report also on it?

A: Matt Skinner: It is there. It’s in the same place as the other reports.

**Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project**

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

C: Judy Kirk: To answer your question, Katherine, this does not speak to any agricultural land. It’s just the widening of the causeway and the creation of a pod.

Q: Katherine Hammod: Nonetheless, the South Fraser Perimeter Road, which is actually an industrial superhighway, has already taken a lot of land. Will the rail systems expand their perimeter?

A: Rhona Hunter: The scope of this project does not include rail expansion in the uplands. It includes only rail that is required as a result of the port and the port business. The railways themselves will determine how they tie into this project. And the railways will determine when and if additional infrastructure is needed. They will then work within the appropriate regulatory environment, and appropriate mechanisms, in order to put forward any additional capacity or rail infrastructure that would be required. At this time, it’s not part of the scope of this project, and we’ve had no indication from the railways that they are moving ahead with anything.
Economic Benefits of the Project

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

Q: Terry Burgis: When do you think you’re going to start construction? How is it going to fit in with other projects in the province, and the capital size of the project?

C: Judy Kirk: Terry, do you mean assuming that the project receives environmental certification, what do you think the start date of construction would be?

A: Rhona Hunter: We’re currently forecasting between three to five years for an environmental review process. So it has a little bit of a window there with a six-year construction period. The soonest would be a three-year scenario, so we would be looking at 2017. The latest would be 2018, or 2019, depending on when that approval would come through.

Q: Terry Burgis: It’s probably too early to ask this question, but do you perceive it as one big contract or multiple contracts? I don’t know how you’ve structured those.

A: Rhona Hunter: We haven’t finalized any of that yet. We are working on getting our operators on board and figuring out what the business model for developing it would be. It would be likely something that we would be able to share in a year or two from now when we have more details around how that construction staging might work.

Q: Judy Kirk: Rhona, is there a business directory? In some other infrastructure projects there is a place where people like Terry can sign up and get information.

A: Rhona Hunter: I don’t think we have that yet, but that’s something certainly we can put forward as a possibility, and I know that there would be interest going forward for people to get more information.

C: Terry Burgis: That would be great.

Q: Katherine Hammod: I have a question about environmental reviews. And I’m new to this situation, but I understand when the existing Roberts Bank Terminal was built, there were two definite recommendations that were the result of the environmental review process. One of them was that all of the overhead lines should be buried, because they’re in the path of migratory birds and cause a huge amount of destruction. Second was that there should be free water flow through the causeway, I guess, in the form of large culverts or something. But neither of those was ever carried out. Why is that?

A: Rhona Hunter: We are currently doing our baseline studies, which include looking at birds. I don’t know about whether there was a specific requirement to look at them as part of an EA.

A: Ben Wheeler: Actually, I think you’re right Katherine, that the historical EA had some recommendations around birds, and bird strikes. The port is aware of those. Like Rhona was saying, we’re actually studying that to understand what that effect would be. So in our environmental assessment, which will come up in about a year or two, you’ll see what those effects are, and what mitigation measures can be put in place to actually reduce or minimize that.

C: Judy Kirk: Will you be looking specifically at whether those power lines should be buried?

C: Ben Wheeler: Absolutely. It’s been raised in the past. Do you want to know about that?
Q: Katherine Hammod: How long have the power lines been up?
A: Rhona Hunter: I think the power lines have been there as long as the causeway has been there, since the mid-1960s.

Q: Katherine Hammod: This recommendation was made some time ago. Why hasn't it been followed up on sooner?
A: Ben Wheeler: Well, I think the short answer is, parts of it have been followed up. There have been some mitigation measures put in place. There have been some bird diverters, and there has been some success around minimizing the strike risk with birds. That's all I can really say at this point; I’m not that familiar with more details.

Q: Judy Kirk: Is there more information on the Port website about birds and the bird program?
A: Ben Wheeler: I think mainly it's around the studies that we're actually executing. So the terms of reference of the studies would provide information to understand that.

C: Rhona Hunter: It will be coming out as part of the environmental assessment.

Q: Katherine Hammod: The other question about the water flow through the causeway?
A: Rhona Hunter: So, we’re actually going to be putting out some information on that because it is a question that has been raised before. It was an idea that was put forward but, in fact, once the modeling took place, and the experts looked at it, the negative impact to the sensitive foreshore area as a result of creating water flow in that constricted environment through the causeway far outweighed any potential fisheries benefits.

C: Ben Wheeler: It is something that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans raised with Port Metro Vancouver in the past so the regulators are aware of that, and they have asked those questions. I think that from what I can tell, they understand what the reality is there.

Q: Ray Kan: Just going back to economic benefits. These are the economic benefits nationwide right now?
A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.

Q: Ray Kan: In terms of the direct employment jobs, is that in addition to what exists now?
A: Rhona Hunter: Yes.

Q: Ray Kan: What is the current jobs number from port operations at Deltaport?
A: Rhona Hunter: I don’t have that at the top of my head.

Q: Katherine Hammod: Back to my question, are you going to be getting written approval from DFO, and from the Department of the Environment, to proceed with this? Is that going to be sort of a report that’s available?
A: Judy Kirk: Let me speak to this process as we move forward because the Port can’t really speak to it.
**Environmental Assessment Process**

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

**Q:** *Katherine Hammond:* I noticed that air quality stations in Delta have significantly lower air quality objectives than regional, even though all of the pollution that the ships, containers and the coal is creating in and around Port Metro Vancouver blows up into the Fraser Valley. We have huge air pollution problems up there; that’s where I moved from. What’s the point of checking air quality in Delta when we’ve got strong westerly winds blowing all of the pollution that’s created into the Fraser Valley and Hope?

**C:** *Judy Kirk:* Well, we have two guys here from Metro Vancouver who have the authority for air quality. I’ll put you guys on the spot. I know they’re the ones that regulate the relationship between Metro Vancouver and is it the Fraser Valley Regional District? They have responsibility for air quality, too, do they not? Or is it just delegated to Metro Vancouver?

**A:** *Bob Wilds:* I think it’s just delegated to Metro Vancouver. In fairness, I think, there are a significant number of things already being done and put in place to mitigate that you might not be aware of. I think that the port does deserve credit for their programs put in place to reduce emissions and the types of fuel burned while ships are in port. They have plug-ins for cruise vessels and all kinds of things that are being done to lower that impact. There are strict diesel requirements to promote movement away from diesel fuel to power things. Significant improvements have already been made, and continue to be made. We all live here and we all have the same issues.

**C:** *Judy Kirk:* Thanks Bob, your background is in trucking, so you know that stuff and we appreciate that comment.

**Marine Terminal**

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

**Q:** *Eric Aderneck:* For the construction materials that will be used for construction of the new terminal, where are those going to be sourced, and what impact will that have on the local construction market?

**A:** *Rhona Hunter:* Dredged sand from the Fraser River will make up the majority of the fill. Here is also some dredgate from the actual berth face that will be used in the fill. There is a certain portion of the dredged material that comes out of the Fraser River that has to remain available for local market, so we will not be able to use the entire amount from the Fraser River dredging program. In fact, that supply is one of the reasons why there is a six-year construction period because we can only get so much material over a period of time.

**Q:** *Eric Aderneck:* And for the crushed rock on the perimeter?

**A:** *Rhona Hunter:* That hasn’t been sourced yet.
Q:  *Eric Aderneck:* Will containers be loaded directly from ship to rail or directly from train onto ships? Or do they stop on the ground first?

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

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

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

**Habitat Banking**

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

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

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

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

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

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

A:  *Rhona Hunter:* For the list on page 28, there are probably ten sub-categories of baseline studies under each of those categories, so there are many studies going on. In our study design, some studies require us to go out to the public to ask questions and some of them do not. The Port contracts environmental specialists on various subject areas, such as air quality, to conduct these studies and most often they are not conducted all at one time. These specialists design and determine who to ask questions. Additionally, the regulator has not yet determined the scope of our assessment. We are early in the process. I would suggest that if there is something that you feel you really want to provide some input on, this Discussion Guide is a fabulous place for you to give us that feedback.
C: Katherine Hammod: I think people are feeling jaded about the experts. It’s just like a trial where lawyers hire the experts with the opinion that they seek. And we, as a community, are concerned about this. Is there any arm length’s distance between the experts of Port Metro Vancouver since they are actually hired by the Port, and not employees for it, or in fact are they completely impartial third parties?

A: Judy Kirk: So, I think that’s fair comment. But part of the environmental assessment process is government oversight on any and all of the work that’s done. One of the things that is established in this process is what’s called a working group. In a working group, there is local government representation, and local government brings with it experts, engineers and others. There is also First Nations representation, and various agencies that may have an interest and expertise to first of all determine scope, and then review results. If there is a panel, which as I mentioned earlier hasn’t yet been determined, there would then be that additional layer. So there is a layering of objective review. I would accept that there is also criticism of the environmental review process, but I wouldn’t want the impression left with the group that somehow it stands only on one or a series of studies.

Q: Katherine Hammod: Are you aware that there is a perception in the community that Port Metro Vancouver is basically autocratic? That it’s not interested in dialogue? Certainly they engage in the exercise of consultation but is it actually meaningful? I’d just like to ask you a specific question, touching on government oversight. I’m wondering why in 2008 the federal government issued a report commissioned by then-Minister Emerson, which clearly stated that no further container port expansion in the Lower Mainland be undertaken until the port of Prince Rupert has been maximized? It talks about how Port Metro has continued in the interim to increase in volume and now it wants to increase by three fold or something. So, why is Port Metro Vancouver ignoring the recommendations in this federal report?

A: Rhona Hunter: I don’t have the specifics of that in front of me; you’re quoting something that I don’t have the background on.

A: John Parker-Jervis: This does go back to page 12, and the container projections that we’re seeing. And our scenario does take into account both Prince Rupert and Port Metro Vancouver. My understanding of what is happening in Prince Rupert is that there is a planned capacity increase, which will essentially max out Prince Rupert. It’s not a scenario where we can just do Prince Rupert and then we would be okay to support the local and Canadian economies.

A: Bob Wilds: I think it’s a little more complicated than someone just saying if you did something here versus there, in that where the cargo goes is determined by shippers and by shipping lines. And it’s very difficult to try and direct everybody where they’re going to ship their cargo to. I mean, we have facilities here. We have shipping lines right now. There are about one or two shipping lines that call in Prince Rupert. Whereas we have every major shipping line in the world calling in Vancouver. This is where people come. This is where we get export cargo far greater than Prince Rupert. And you have a domestic population to service, which doesn’t exist in Prince Rupert. So, it’s not just that simple to say everybody should go to Prince Rupert.

Q: Max Gotz: Regarding the Habitat Banking Program, is there a breakdown of how the units are calculated and how many units are currently in the Port’s account, and what deposits and withdrawals have been made? It seems to me that it’s very good and the log removal program, I think was fantastic. It was long overdue and has a lot of benefits. But it’s not on Port land, a lot of it, and I fail to see the connection in a lot of ways. For example, if the Port helped to mitigate
or recover extremely sensitive habitat in the south Okanagan, would that count towards this project as well?

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: Rhona Hunter: Yes. The Port does look at optimizing and creating efficiencies within its existing footprint on an ongoing basis. There actually is a section in the Discussion Guide that speaks to that on page 14. In 2008, we looked at creating some additional efficiencies on the existing
terminal footprints at Centerm and Vanterm. We’ve looked at Deltaport and the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project is an efficiency project on that existing footprint.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: Rhona Hunter: The proposed Massey Bridge has not been considered in any business case at this point. We can’t get bigger ships up the Fraser because they can’t turn around.
C: **Bob Wilds:** I think if memory serves me correct, as far as maximizing the use of the existing container terminals, we have one of the highest densities in North America for our facilities because we go five high. Most of the facilities on the west coast are chassis and trailer operations where they have massive land use, whereas we have RTGs and we go high as opposed to going out wide on massive land plots. We did that because of the land use, right? Originally Centerm was built for something like three or four hundred thousand TEUs and there are over 800,000 TEUs today. All of that is being done at the same time. It’s trying to meet the growth that’s projected long term and it can’t continually be done on the existing footprint. It’s a lot cheaper for the operators if we can do it on the same footprint rather than creating new facilities. That’s all investigated before we build anything.

Q: **Eric Aderneck:** You mentioned Squamish earlier. What is the capacity for Squamish? What is the limitation there?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Squamish does not have a container port. They don’t have any facility that’s available for evaluation, plus they don’t have the rail and road infrastructure to facilitate a container port in Squamish.

Q: **Eric Aderneck:** Conceivably could that be an investment to be developed? Or is there no room, and it can’t be done?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** There is just no road and rail infrastructure.

Q: **Eric Aderneck:** Okay. I know Port Alberni, on Vancouver Island, has made a proposal that they need a deep-sea port, and then there would be short-sea-shipping from there to here. Any comment on the viability of that or how it fits in?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Once there is a robust business case on the table, we’ll certainly look at any of these projects that might be viable. At this point, we’ve seen no business case from them, it’s just a conceptual idea. In our opinion, it does not address the issue of capacity because you’d still have to get it to shore somehow. So, until there is a business case at their end that they can actually come forward with, it has not been considered at this point.

Q: **Eric Aderneck:** And what about the Ashcroft inland port proposal?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** Once there is a business case and they’ve gotten to the point where there is something to talk about we would certainly study it. We have dialogues with these people on a regular basis but we haven’t actually seen anything that says there is a business case there.

A: **Bob Wilds:** I guess the whole issue here is short-sea-shipping. We can’t find a way to economically do it within the region, so why do we want to do it from Port Alberni? You’re double and triple moving of the cargo. If you’re going to be a competitive port, you can’t do that and be competitive. I think another issue, which hasn’t been included here and needs to be included as far as trucking is concerned, is the whole issue of intermodalling that could be set up under the port’s leadership out in Richmond. This is where they develop five major import/export facilities under one site and eliminate a significant amount of movement of empty containers around the region by keeping it confined within that big site that they’ve developed out there. So a lot of these things that are going on to try and mitigate, as much as you can, the negative impact that may result as a result of economics. Reducing the number of empty container moves. Discharge the container into an inbound facility, move it over on the
export facility, and avoid that truck container load. Even moving it within the same confined facility out in Richmond.

**Road and Rail Traffic Considerations**

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

Q: **Ray Kan**: I just would like to go back to our discussion around the 2,000 trucks that are licensed at the ports. Is the current licensed capacity of 2,000 trucks related to the container business here enough to deal with the growth projected from the development of Terminal 2?

A: **Dennis Bickel**: We don’t have the answer to that yet. We’re looking into that in terms of what is the optimal number of trucks that would be required to deal with the amount of containers. What we’re trying to do by working with a number of industry stakeholders and partners is to try to facilitate the improvement in movement of goods. What that really means is: matching up what’s happened within the terminals themselves with the trucking community, as well as industry. There are a number of examples where we’ve been able to trip match, so that container trucks moving around the region have containers for all legs of their movement and actually reduces the number of truck trips. We would have a better idea as to how many trucks would be required to move containers around if improvements can be successful at this for a period. We’ll continue to work with Metro, Translink, and all of the government offices and industry as well.

Q: **Ray Kan**: When do you think you would arrive at some estimate in terms of any increase in trucks?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: This would be part of the environmental assessment but as Dennis said, it is contingent on the success of many of these programs put in place to manage the existing fleet, because those would then be in place to manage any additional trucks that would be required.

Q: **Katherine Hammod**: If Terminal 2 is approved, what’s the percentage increase in terms of volume with container traffic? Is it doubling? Is it tripling?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: 2.4 million. So the existing Deltaport, once it has the improvements through the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project, will be around 2.4 million. The capacity for Terminal 2 is 2.4 million.

Q: **Katherine Hammod**: So, doubling?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: Yes.

Q: **Neil Gillespie**: Just to clarify. The 2,000 truck licenses are for the whole Port area, not just the City of Vancouver?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: It is for Port Metro Vancouver. So everywhere Port Metro Vancouver has lands and terminals.

C: **Neil Gillespie**: Oh. Well, that’s much lower than I thought.

Q: **Max Gotz**: When is the federal government expecting to tell us what level of review this will be subject to?

A: **Judy Kirk**: The federal government will tell the Port the level of review in January.
**Community Legacy Benefits**

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

C: **Max Gotz:** I have one suggestion, because I see these types of things all the time and there is no way to mitigate a project like this by little community projects. I mean, impacts are environmental and the benefits will be economic, hopefully. So instead of giving us sports fields, why not just give the groups a percentage of your profit, so they can do with it what they wish? I mean, if the community really is behind what you’re doing there, why shouldn’t they also benefit directly instead of just one-offs? Give them a percentage of it. They can do with it what they wish, whether it’s environmental or what have you.

C: **Judy Kirk:** Max, the Port also has a local government liaison program, where things like that are being discussed. On the last page there is room for “Additional comments,” which is a perfect place for things like that, or any other thing that you might want to add that are not asked here specifically. Also I’d recommend writing to your Council about what your view is, in terms of wanting some financial benefit to flow directly to the community, or to organizations.

Q: **Eric Aderneck:** I did have just one question. I’ve always wondered, wouldn’t the world be more efficient if there was just one sized containers like 40s and 52s rather than stuffing and destuffing them?

A: **Rhona Hunter:** I don’t think there’s one simple answer. Mike Zachary, who is a rail and container business expert on our team, was at my meeting yesterday, and he gave some good insight. The international shipping business sticks to 40-foot containers. All the ship bays are built and designed for 40-foot containers. My understanding of why we can go to bigger with containers on railways than ships is that those containers are actually far less robust. They are not as strong as the shipping containers, they sit on a rail bed and get transported on or off a rail bed so they can be bigger, whereas a shipping container has to go through a lot more movement. I don’t think there is one answer. I think it is something that over time one has evolved, and we may see ships being built for larger shipping containers over time.

Q: **Katherine Hammond:** I just have a quick comment about the remediation that’s being done in salt marshes. I walk on the dyke a lot and that is the only place I’ve ever seen raptors, northern harriers, red-tailed hawks, and snowy owls. The only place they ever land on the marshes is on logs that are there. So when all of the logs are removed, I’m concerned about how that’s going to impact them. Is that not in the consideration?

C: **Max Gotz:** I can comment on that, actually. The snowy owl especially lives in tundra, so of course there is no wood in their natural habitat whatsoever.

Q: **Katherine Hammond:** So you think they’ll choose to just land on the marsh down here?

C: **Max Gotz:** They’re perfectly fine without the logs as well.

Q: **Katherine Hammond:** I wonder why I’ve never seen one just on the marsh.

A: **Max Gotz:** It’s usually because they’re hidden in the tall grass. But in Boundary Bay, and in the salt marsh, they are like barn owls, short eared owl, snowy owl, and a lot of species that will
pounce into the grass after a rodent or a small bird in their talons, and they can sit there for hours and you’ll never see them.

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

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

A:  *Judy Kirk*: That’s right.

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

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

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

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

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

*The meeting ended at 10:53am.*
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*The record notes that the meeting commenced at 2:02pm*
KEY THEMES:

- Participants questioned why various transloading activities were required to take place in the Lower Mainland, as opposed to their place of origin, which could allow the preservation of agricultural land.
- Some participants expressed concern that other economic factors might render the proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project unnecessary.
- Participants suggested that Port Metro Vancouver consider providing waterfront access at Roberts Bank, including a public boat launch with viewing and washroom facilities.
- PCLC participants questioned whether the proposed design of the project provided sufficient capacity for the anticipated volume of truck traffic travelling to and from the facility.
- One participant suggested that as part of the project’s design, the Port should consider the provision of facilities for water safety and rescue vessels, such as those used by the Lifeboat Society.
- One participant suggested that the Port consider potential synergies between the need for sand and material (as part of the construction of the terminal and various habitat improvements) with the need to dredge navigation and local channels on the Fraser River.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions – Judy Kirk

Judy Kirk welcomed participants to the small group meeting and explained the format of the meeting and the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form. Judy Kirk informed participants that the meeting was being recorded for accuracy. Roundtable introductions were undertaken.

Environmental Assessment

Judy Kirk provided an overview of the environmental assessment process for the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, including an update regarding the status of the process and where additional information can be found (page 28 of the Discussion Guide).

2. Review of Consultation Discussion Guide- All

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

What is Port Metro Vancouver?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the importance of trade to British Columbians, container trade in the Asia-Pacific Gateway, and the container supply chain (pages 4 to 6 of the Discussion Guide).

C: Judy Kirk: It’s been very interesting facilitating these small group meetings all over the Lower Mainland, in Delta, Langley, Surrey, Richmond and Vancouver. People are very interested to learn about this. They don’t have much knowledge about the port and its activities. Giving people a sense of the supply chain and who is involved has been really neat.
Q: **Leslie Abramson**: Were most of the questions all the same from the different groups?

A: **Judy Kirk**: No, not really. The concerns that we have heard in Delta focus more on truck traffic, air quality and noise. Other communities like Surrey and Langley are more concerned about trains going through their communities.

### Why Do We Use Containers?

*Rhona Hunter detailed the rationale for using containers for transporting goods and provided an overview of the use of trucks to transport goods in the Lower Mainland and the difference between Port trucks and other articulated trucks (page 7 of the Discussion Guide.)*

Q: **Michael Owen**: Are you trying to say that one is on a chassis and one is a box?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: What I’m trying to say is that there are 2,000 trucks that are licensed to move containers in and out of the port, and that this is what they look like.

Q: **Michael Owen**: To me, as a layperson, I see the same truck. What is the difference?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: It is a subtle difference. On the container truck, you will notice that the box can come on and off the chassis. It’s a very valid point though.

Q: **Michael Owen**: So it’s not in the ability of the truck to articulate. It’s the ability of the box to separate from the trailer?

A: **Judy Kirk**: Yes, and the reason that we have included this in here is A) to show you just how similar they are; and B) let you see the stamp and the branding on the side of the container, which is a cue that it is indeed a marine container.

### Why do we need trucks?

*Rhona Hunter detailed the need for both trucks and trains to service the Port and explained the process of import and export transloading, and the general movement of goods to and from the port facilities (pages 8 to 9 of the Discussion Guide).*

Q: **Michael Owen**: Why can’t the local stuffing take place overseas? Are they going to the same Walmart or consumer destination? You say that you take 3 and make it 2. Does one of these boxes go to Walmart in Richmond and one of them goes to Walmart in Calgary? Or can they be restuffed and repackaged at their point of origin? Does it have to be done here?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: So the information here refers to the movement of goods on rail. A 53-foot container is not a shipping container; they are only used for rail.

Q: **Michael Owen**: So when you see them on the highway behind a CN truck, they are not going to a specific destination, but instead they are going to another destuffing facility?

A: **Rhona Hunter**: I’m not familiar with 53-foot containers travelling on trucks. Typically they are loaded on trains.

A: **Peter Geldreich**: When 53-foot containers are stuffed at a transload facility, they will often be trucked to a rail intermodal facility in Pitt Meadows or Port Kells to be loaded on to a train. Conversely, these containers can come back empty from out east and then be trucked a short distance back to the transload facility to be stuffed again.
Q: Judy Kirk: Peter, what about Michael’s question, which was “Could these three containers be dealt with at the point of origin?”

A: Peter Geldreich: Shipping companies can handle only three sizes of containers. They store containers inside the ship and on top of the deck, and the only three sizes they can handle are 20-foot containers, 40-foot containers, which fit where two 20-foot containers would go, and 45-footers, which go on top of the deck. The 53-foot containers are too big, and wouldn’t fit on a ship.

Q: Judy Kirk: What about Michael’s question, which was “Could these three containers be dealt with at the point of origin?”

C: Lloyd Sim: There are consolidators that load containers with mixed cargos. I’m an importer, and my cargo will be in a container with other cargos. It’s consolidated, and when the container gets to LA or Halifax, it’s unloaded and restuffed, and my stuff ends up here.

Why Roberts Bank?

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of existing and planned infrastructure that supports the growth in trade at Roberts Bank, including the South Fraser Perimeter Road, the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program and the replacement of the George Massey Tunnel (pages 10 and 11 of the Discussion Guide).

Q: Leslie Abramson: Has there been much discussion on the replacement of the tunnel or the bridge? Was it too late after your open houses? Was there much discussion?

A: Judy Kirk: The announcement was prior to our consultation events this month. Most people have said that they’re glad that there will be a bridge, with perhaps the exception of a recent small group meeting here in Delta with 38 people, where they asked whether the new bridge was to enable larger container ships to access the Fraser River.

Q: Leslie Abramson: And the answer was?

A: Rhona Hunter: No. There are two limiting factors for ship movement in the Fraser River. One is the George Massey Tunnel and the resulting draft limitations, and the second factor is the ability of container ships to turn in the river. The size of container ships calling on Deltport and other terminals is only getting bigger and longer. Already many of the current ships could not turn around in the river, so for that reason we don’t see any container ships serving the Fraser River.

Q: Michael Owen: On page 9, it says that empty containers come back from the Maritimes, and I presume at Roberts Bank. Why can’t they be stored somewhere else?

A: Rhona Hunter: The containers are stored at a number of places. Sometimes they are stored at the intermodal yard, and they are sometimes stored on the marine terminal. Essentially they are usually stored where they end up, so empty containers at the terminal are usually there because they are destined to be loaded on a ship and repositioned to Asia. The location of empty containers is such that they support the movement of goods, which is usually destuffing or restuffing goods here.

Q: Michael Owen: Okay, so just so I understand it, the containers that come here by train end up at the marine terminal where they are stacked until they are needed for export. That suggests to me that they are going to sit on the terminal, and then be trucked somewhere to be stuffed, and
then trucked back to the terminal and put on the ship. They might even be sent somewhere up in the interior because they are needed for lumber or something. Have I got that right?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: Yes, apart from the part about getting sent up in the interior. Typically these export goods are stuffed down here in the Lower Mainland. Storage of empty containers occurs at all three of those locations. Sometimes they will end up on the marine terminal, and are then sent to a transload facility for repackaging.

Q: *Michael Owen*: Is it impractical to say that 25% of those could sit at Revelstoke or at Cache Creek until they are needed, instead of sitting on valuable farmland here? They’re going to be handled at the port anyway.

A: *Rhona Hunter*: The logistics around the movement of empty containers is something that our operations group is continuing to look into to see how we can optimize it. There are a number of players that are involved, and there is no simple answer, but we are having that discussion about how we improve the system. Certainly how and where we store these containers is part of that.

C: *Allan Baydala*: Rail transport is the most expensive part of moving a container from Asia to somewhere in Central Canada, or vice versa. So the most important thing is minimizing the rail handling. So what you’re suggesting is different locations like Ashcroft, and that’s where the business model becomes difficult.

C: *Lloyd Sim*: Are there any plans to double track the rail line out to Langley? With the huge increase in rail traffic, I was just wondering if you’re planning to keep it single track?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: No, there have been no discussions with the railways about this.

Q: *Leslie Abramson*: Can you give us the simple answer that we should be providing when people ask us why we’re not using Prince Rupert?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: The simple answer is that Canada needs it all. We need increased capacity in Prince Rupert and we need increased capacity in Vancouver.

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

*Rhona Hunter and Allan Baydala provided an overview of Port Metro Vancouver’s container traffic forecast and all of the planned infrastructure improvements over the next 2 decades (pages 12 and 13 of the Discussion Guide).*

Q: *Michael Owen*: What percentage of the containers that come in through Roberts Bank stay in Canada, and how many go elsewhere?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: About 90% of the containers stay in Canada.

Q: *Michael Owen*: If I may, what’s going to drive this growth? Everybody is getting older and buying less. How are these projections going to get there? My kids can’t afford to live in the Lower Mainland because it’s too expensive, and they’re living more frugal lives. How are these projections going to live up to where projections for consumer spending are going? If our spending isn’t increasing, why do we need this capacity?

A: *Judy Kirk*: If you went online to read some of the reports behind this graph, you would see what some of the projections were about economic growth.
A: *Allan Baydala*: This forecast is based on GDP growth. So notwithstanding what you’re seeing on a personal level, GDP is still forecast to increase.

C: *Judy Kirk*: And it is pretty modest projections around GDP growth as I understand it.

Q: *David Crook*: Will the Panama Canal have any effect on these projections?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: It was certainly considered in this analysis, yes.

C: *Allan Baydala*: Going back to Mike’s question, and I realize that it is sort of hard to see on this, but you can see a slowing of growth in the high, base and low cases after 2020.

C: *Cecelia Lawson*: From a banking perspective and the stats we see, we can tell you that there is a lot of money out there, and it is going to be transferred to the younger generation.

**Are There Other Options for Creating Container Capacity**

*Rhona Hunter* provided an overview of the options that could address future trade growth (*page 14 of the Discussion Guide*).

Q: *Lloyd Sim*: From what I have heard, Prince Rupert is stagnant right now. I used to work up there, and I’ve heard the hype, but the port expansion is stagnant, is that correct?

A: *Allan Baydala*: It is not moving ahead right now.

Q: *Michael Owen*: Further to what was said before, if trade is going to be increasing, are you going to be shoving all those trains down one track?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: We do get into some more details of the road and rail infrastructure later.

**Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project**

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

Q: *Leslie Abramson*: Any talk about safety and the Lifeboat Society out here? They have to go to Point Roberts. Are we looking ahead at what might be needed?

A: *Rhona Hunter*: The environmental assessment looks at risk and safety.

Q: *Leslie Abramson*: And that’s to do with the port, but I’m thinking outside the box whether there is an opportunity to put something in to help people out in the chuck?

A: *Malcolm Smith*: Are you talking about infrastructure to help recreational boaters?

Q: *Leslie Abramson*: I’m talking about whatever the Coast Guard used to be. There’s nothing around here. Is there no talk about starting something?

A: *Judy Kirk*: I think your point is an interesting one, and I would like to suggest that you include this in the feedback form under “additional comments” to suggest that that kind of integration is looked at.

C: *Allan Baydala*: There are two things here: One is the Coast Guard, and we all remember the closure of the station in False Creek. And then there is the Lifeboat Society, which offers support to any ship, including recreational ones, and they are the ones that have been doing fundraising. That could be considered as a community amenity.
Q: Michael Owen: It used to be there, and now it’s not. It was a security issue. The Lifeboat Society has a moorage in Ladner.

**Economic Benefits of the Project**

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

Q: Michael Owen: Who did these numbers? I mean, Obama said there are only 150 permanent jobs from the Keystone pipeline. Whose statistics are these and how reliable are they?

A: Rhona Hunter: The report was done by InterVISTAS, and is online. All of the information and assumptions are included as part of that report. If there are any other questions about this, we would be happy to talk about those.

C: Naomi Horsford: One of the other things that the project team has done is create a historical documents collection on the website. It includes information about studies that were done not just for the Port, but other projects and studies as well.

Q: Cecelia Lawson: I see where you got the total employment here, but it would be nice to know the increases from the existing number.

A: Rhona Hunter: These are all new jobs.

Q: Michael Owen: We just attended a meeting with Sediment Group, Public Works Canada, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Port about the slippage of Roberts Bank, and how a large volume of material disappeared into the Gulf some years ago. They even got rid of some of the pilings out there. What engineering reports can you lead us to, because that slippage is all along the face.

A: Peter Geldreich: About 3 years ago we did detailed geotechnical work in the general locations where the terminal could be located. We only went out as far as the -10 metre contour for the conceptual engineering.

Q: Judy Kirk: Is that information available online?

A: Ben Wheeler: No, they aren’t. It is just numerical data tables, and so unless you’re a geotechnical engineer, it wouldn’t mean anything.

C: Rhona Hunter: There was a significant amount of engineering and geotechnical work that was taken into consideration as we determined the final location for the terminal. Interestingly enough, when we undertook a trade-off exercise with different disciplines, where a location is chosen according to their interests, both the geotechnical considerations and the environmental considerations aligned to put the proposed terminal as far out as possible to stay away from the sensitive foreshore habitat and maintain the required geotechnical stability.

C: Peter Geldreich: If you look at the two drawings on these pages here, you can see the berm area where we are talking about densifying native soil. In the analysis in that area, it was identified that the condition of the soil required adding rocks or using vibro-densification and so on, and that has all been taken into account.
**Marine Terminal**

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the elements of the marine terminal, including the container storage yard, rail intermodal yard, and improvements to the tug basin (page 20 of the Discussion Guide).

**Q:** Lloyd Sim: What size of ships are planned for the terminal?

**A:** Rhona Hunter: The terminal is capable of handling the largest ships that will be coming to Vancouver. They are about 18,000 TEUs. WE can handle one of those, as well as two 13,000 TEU vessels at the same time.

**Road and Rail Infrastructure Improvements on the Roberts Bank Causeway**

Rhona Hunter provided an overview of the planned improvements on the causeway (page 21 of the Discussion Guide).

**Q:** Leslie Abramson: One of the mandates of this committee is to look out for the welfare of Delta and to keep the Port accountable. There is a great need for public access to the water on the Deltaport causeway. It burns my inside when I see people squatting on the side of the causeway covered in sand. Has there been any thought given to make the Delta citizens think you do care and build this grand facility with picnic tables and a boat launch? Something to show Delta that you care and you’re going to do something for us.

**A:** Rhona Hunter: The current design does not include that, but like your previous comment, I encourage you to include that in your comments in the feedback form.

**C:** Judy Kirk: In the meetings we have held so far, some people have asked “why can’t you breach the causeway and allow water to flow through it?” Rhona, I think it would be good to answer that here.

**A:** Rhona Hunter: This is something that has been talked about previously at a few points, and we have had geomorphologists look at this, and they determined that any benefits would be outweighed by the negative impact that it would do to useful habitat like intertidal marshes and the sand flats. Essentially it would cause dendritic channels, and so from a geomorphology standpoint, it was determined that it was not an appropriate solution.

**C:** Michael Owen: I look at that road on the causeway, and you talk about one east-bound lane connecting to the terminal. Every time I open up the Optimist, there is an accident out there, there is trucks trying to get around, people cutting through Ladner because they can’t figure out 41B. I get a vision here of something like the Lions Gate Bridge that was built in 1936 and has 3-lanes. So any problems going out, or even coming in and you’ve got mayhem in Ladner. I just really think that you need to look at this. We’re the gateway for B.C. and for Canada, and these issues need to be resolved, not at the end when there are problems, but at the beginning before it’s built. I have a hard time going down 41B, and watching the morning rush hour with the employees ignoring that red light. One lane of traffic for those trucks reads insanity to me. It doesn’t talk about the future. You’re planning a tremendous increase in capacity, and my brain is saying to me that there is going to be an equal amount of new trucks.

**Q:** Judy Kirk: How many trucks?

**A:** Rhona Hunter: The amount of new trucks that will be coming online hasn’t actually been determined.
C: *Michael Owen:* If you’re going to have that many containers coming though, you’re going to have that many new trucks.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Not necessarily. We will get into this a little bit later in the discussion guide. We do see some optimizations with trucks coming. As those operational changes come online to optimize existing truck capacity, we will see that effect the number of trucks that are required to service this new facility. It’s not a straight doubling of trucks. Once these improvements are tested and tweaked we will have a clearer picture of what is required.

C: *Michael Owen:* People that ask us questions are skeptical of that.

C: *Bernita Iversen:* In your Project Description that you submitted to the regulators you haven’t provided a number for truck volume.

A: *Rhona Hunter:* What we have said is that we know that number of truck trips. We can calculate the number of trips that are required to service the terminal, but the actual number of additional trucks remains to be seen. We don’t have a number for that.

Q: *Judy Kirk:* Are you studying that?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* We will be studying that on an ongoing basis. I really depends on trucking practices.

**Road and Rail Traffic Considerations**

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

Q: *Bernita Iversen:* How many ins and outs?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* There will be an additional 1,800 trips in and 1,800 trips out at full capacity per day.

Q: *Bernita Iversen:* That’s quite a lot, even with extended gate hours. Is that number in the discussion guide?

A: *Rhona Hunter:* Yes, on page 24. And there will be an additional 8-10 trains: 4-5 in and 4-5 out.

C: *Allan Baydala:* I’m speaking as a Delta resident right now. I care how many trucks are out there that I have to fight with on the road, so the truck trip figure is a much more important statistic than the number of trucks that the Port has licensed, as long as we manage where those trucks are so that they aren’t on Delta streets.

C: *Judy Kirk:* I think the reason that the 2,000 trucks figure is important is because those are the trucks that the Port has the most control over.

C: *Allan Baydala:* The trucks have to be licensed to service the terminals. There are two things that are important. One is the reduction of empty truck trips. Right now you get a truck carrying a container to a terminal, and leaving without anything, and then another truck arriving empty to pick up a container. So you get 4 truck trips for 2 containers. That’s something we’re working to address, and it requires working with the industry, because it’s the shippers who decide what goes where. We don’t have that control. There’s real opportunity to maximize efficiencies. The other one is extending the hours of terminal operations. And there’s a lot of talk about that. There’s a trade-off there, since there would be less trucks during the day when people are...
driving and more trucks at night and during the weekend. It spreads it out, but it’s a discussion that we need to have.

C: Michael Owen: I share that view with Allan. You need somewhere to put these trucks 24 hours a day. One accident is all it takes to back it all up, and you’ve got 300 trucks at 65’ a piece. That means you’ve got 1,800 linear feet of trucks just sitting there for one incident. I can appreciate that “X” shipper doesn’t want to use “Y” trucker. I don’t want to use Lloyd Sims trucks, it might not even get to my place, and he might not want my guys to stuff his container. I understand the logistic problems you face, but it’s not Delta’s problem. It’s your problem.

C: Allan Baydala: And we’re spending millions of dollars trying to solve it.

C: Michael Owen: What we see is those trucks. If you stand at Highway 17 and Highway 99, there are 10 per light. That’s container trucks, not dump trucks. Don’t tar the Port with the problems from construction on the First Nation lands. That’s the reality. The logistics of moving that many cans by road or by rail are yours to bear. Solve it now, or live with it for the next 20 years.

C: Judy Kirk: To that point, one of the important questions in the discussion guide is getting your feedback on that question. I would encourage you to put that into your feedback form.

C: Rhona Hunter: These are initiatives that are moving ahead now, and that are independent of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, so we will see these implemented in some form before we bring this capacity online. So we do want to get your feedback and suggestions so that we can move ahead with this work and see the results.

Q: Leslie Abramson: I know how many people we had in Delta. How was the participation in other communities? Have you received a lot of feedback?

C: Judy Kirk: We have been receiving feedback, but the participation has been higher in Delta than anywhere else.

Q: Lloyd Sim: Are you receiving any pushback?

A: Judy Kirk: Not a lot, to be honest. But I’m not going to report out before the consultation is through. There hasn’t been overwhelming opposition to this project. There have been questions and concerns.

Q: Lloyd Sim: What is the efficiency of these trucks? I seem to remember it being around 1.4?

A: Rhona Hunter: I don’t have that information, but I can get it for you.

C: Lloyd Sim: I’m prepared to take a deep breath on that one, because until the South Fraser Perimeter Road comes online, it’s hard to know what the impacts will be without speculation.

**Habitat Banking**

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

C: Leslie Abramson: if these pictures were in the paper, everyone would have shut right up, because they could see what it’s going to look like when it’s done. You should have done that. Everyone was saying how awful it was, but if they could have seen this, all that would have been gone.
C: **Rhona Hunter:** We had a really interesting small group meeting in Vancouver, and two individuals were not in support of the projects, and one was probably more aligned with Roger Emsley and the opposition to the project. The other person was just an enthusiastic birder, and wanted to talk about bird issues. It was raised that no Snowy Owls had been seen since the log removal, and the other gentleman piped up, and said that snowy owls are grassland creatures, and that they do not normally sit on logs. Instead, they usually sit in the grass, which is their natural habitat. So it was an interesting observation by two people not generally in support of the Port.

C: **Lloyd Sim:** The Ladner Sediment Group had a presentation on the habitat banking, and we supported it, with the proviso that if you’re going to require 17 million cubic metres of materials to build the terminal, and you’re going to need it to build the habitat. We want some relationship between annual dredging and maintenance, not just of the main navigation channels, but of the local channels too. We want you to think about bigger projects, other than the smaller ones that are identified here.

C: **Rhona Hunter:** I have seen some of that correspondence, and the project team is very much interested in capitalizing on the synergies between available material and location of projects, including larger projects.

C: **Lloyd Sim:** If the Port is going to be tasked with managing the river and this port, there is about 30 million cubic metres of material coming down the river ever year. It’s an ongoing problem, just like traffic. You’re going to have to manage that sediment, just like truck traffic and people’s perceptions.

**Environmental Assessment Process**

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

**Community Legacy Benefits**

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

C: **Leslie Abramson:** I love my Delta. I really was upset when you gave the last big chunk of money to Delta for the park. No one knows that the Port had anything to do with that park.

C: **Bernita Iversen:** Which park is that?

C: **Leslie Abramson:** I’m talking about Association Park in Ladner. I think that if the Port is going to put money in, they deserve to take some credit.

C: **Judy Kirk:** So just before we close up, if you look on page 30 you can see the consultation rounds described. We are in Pre-Design Consultation, and there is plenty of time to get feedback in before November 12. You can see there are two other rounds, as well as the public comment rounds that I described as part of the environmental assessment. There are still a lot of opportunities for public input. In addition, the Port is conducting consultation with First Nations.
Q:  *Cecelia Lawson*: What role do you see this committee taking as the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project evolves?

A:  *Judy Kirk*: I think that it is really important that we keep you solidly engaged in the environmental assessment process and in the Port-led consultation. You are highly informed, and you take your commitment to Delta seriously. I would certainly encourage you to be involved in the environmental assessment. There will be issues that are grounded in science and engineering and financial analysis. I think it will be a very important discussion for you to be involved in.

C:  *Allan Boydala*: Leslie was at the open house on Thursday night, and relayed to us a missed opportunity. In the DCLC days, committee members actually stood beside the Port at open houses, and that provided an opportunity for people to hear from a familiar face in the community. It wasn’t just a Port message. The trade-off is that the consultation is a very formal process where we record questions so that we can respond in a formal document, and this being a very informal thing, but it provides the opportunity for the community to see what we’re doing, so that we can show that the committee is providing value.

C:  *Judy Kirk*: I think that’s a great idea. I would like to consider that in the design of the next phase.

C:  *Leslie Abramson*: There was one person there who had concerns about coal dust, which doesn’t have anything to do with this project, since it’s coming up from the States, and I said “technology is changing and the Port is getting better. Didn’t you read the paper?”, and it turns out that he was from Panorama Ridge, and so I asked my new friend to get a copy of the paper. The Delta Optimist had coverage about the coal dust and what the port is doing. He was quite satisfied, and it helped him understand a little better.

C:  *Judy Kirk*: I think that’s a great idea. It allows people to hear from you, and you to hear from them. I don’t see any downside, and would like to look at how that could be incorporated into the next round of consultation. The one thing that I would need to put out to you is that you would need to, at a minimum, assign one person to every Delta meeting, and perhaps consider a person to all of the other meetings.

Q:  *Michael Owen*: We just had a brainstorming session about what we want to do next year, and there is only so much that 8 or 9 volunteers can do well. I would need to hear a little more about what would be expected of us.

A:  *Judy Kirk*: Absolutely. I would need to take this away to think about some scenarios, and also recognizing that we need to be respectful of your time, but make it meaningful.

C:  *Leslie Abramson*: You were at a couple when we were on the DCLC. We were there to just say “Hi, did you get all your answers?”. We’re not there to give all the answers. We were there to make sure that they were satisfied, or to take them over to the right person.

C:  *Naomi Horsford*: One thing that you did do was track the concerns.

C:  *Judy Kirk*: And we could manage the record for something like that. I don’t see that as a barrier.

C:  *Michael Owen*: Dr. Collier called me one day and asked me to sit on a BC Transit committee. Four years later we’re still dealing with it. At least they gave you a small per diem. It was less than $100 per day. But you actually made a commitment to go to those sub-committees, as opposed to not showing up.
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 3:42pm.