

# **ROBERTS BANK TERMINAL 2 (RBT2) PROJECT WORKING GROUP (WG)**

## **Workshop #3**

**May 27, 2014**

Summary of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project Working Group – Workshop #3 held Tuesday, May 27, 2014 at the SFU Harbour Centre, 515 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, British Columbia.

### **ATTENDEES**

- David Grace, B.C. Environmental Assessment Office (Project Assessment Manager)
- Debra Myles, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (Panel Manager)
- Analise Saely, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (Senior Policy Advisor)
- Lesley Douglas, City of Richmond (Manager, Environmental Sustainability)
- Polly Ng, City of Surrey
- Mike Brotherston, Corporation of Delta
- Bernita Iversen, Corporation of Delta
- Byron Nutton, Department of Fisheries and Oceans
- Harp Gill, Environment Canada
- Garth Mullins, Environment Canada
- June Yoo Rifkin, Environment Canada (A/Head, EA Unit)
- Roxanne Scott, Golder\*
- Tanya Hebron, Hemmera\* (Project Coordinator)
- Pamela O'Hara, Hemmera\* (Senior Project Manager)
- Joe Truscott, Hemmera\* (Socio-Economic Technical Director)
- Ben Wheeler, Hemmera\* (Marine Technical Director)
- Alan Grove, Hwlitsum First Nation
- Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co.\* (Senior Communications Advisor)
- Kathleen Johnnie, Lyackson First Nation
- Leona Shaw, Métis Nation British Columbia
- Francis Ries, Metro Vancouver
- Kathy Preston, Metro Vancouver

- Shelina Sidi, Metro Vancouver
- Donna Underhill, Metro Vancouver
- Helen Berthin, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
- David Crozier, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
- Earl Strueby, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
- Leona Sparrow, Musqueam Nation
- Kathy McPherson, National Resources Canada (via teleconference)  
(arrived at 10:00 a.m.)
- Jody Addah, Port Metro Vancouver (Sustainable Development Specialist  
Infrastructure Development)
- Sharleen Dumont, Port Metro Vancouver (Senior Legal Counsel)
- Rhona Hunter, Port Metro Vancouver (Acting Director, Infrastructure Development)
- Natalie Jackson, Port Metro Vancouver (Project Administration)
- Michelle Lachmann, Port Metro Vancouver (Regulatory Engagement)
- Cindy McCarthy, Port Metro Vancouver (Manager, Project Communications  
Community and Aboriginal Affairs)
- Sean McNulty, Port Metro Vancouver (Env. Project Management Specialist)
- Emir Mehinagic, Port Metro Vancouver (Communications Advisor,  
Project Development)
- Kyle Robertson, Port Metro Vancouver (Manager, EA & Permitting, Container  
Capacity Improvement Program)
- Erika Schade, Port Metro Vancouver (Communications Advisor, Project Development)
- Jemma Scoble, Port Metro Vancouver (Aboriginal Consultation)
- Brittany John, Tsleil-Waututh Nation
- Amanda King, Tsleil-Waututh Nation
- Paul Cordeiro, Township of Langley
- Gina Aitchison, Transport Canada (Senior Environmental Officer)
- Catherine Galbrand, Transport Canada
- Lynne Tolland, Transport Canada
- Andrew Bak, Tsawwassen First Nation
- Celesa Horvath, Ventus\* (Senior EA Advisor)
- Peter Geldreich, Worley Parsons\* (Engineering Manager)

(\* Appearing on behalf of Port Metro Vancouver)

## **FACILITATION / MEETING SUMMARY**

- Malcolm Smith, Hemmera
- Carol Lee, Recording Secretary, Raincoast Ventures Ltd.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project Working Group – Workshop #3 was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

#### **1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Kyle Robertson, Environmental Manager, Port Metro Vancouver (PMV), welcomed participants to the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project (RBT2) Working Group – Workshop #3 (WG#3) and acknowledged that the workshop was being held on the traditional land of the Coast Salish peoples. Mr. Robertson introduced Malcolm Smith, Hemmera, who will be facilitating WG#3.

Malcolm Smith, Facilitator, led a round of self-introductions of the WG#3 participants and reviewed the agenda and logistical and housekeeping issues related to the meeting. Participants were encouraged to ask questions following each of the presentations provided.

The purpose of WG#3 was reviewed:

1. Seek feedback from the Working Group on intermediate component and valued component selection, based on descriptions and supporting rationale provided for components and assessment areas;
2. Describe the requirements for and proposed approach to cumulative effects assessment; and
3. Seek feedback from the Working Group on socio-economic topics of interest for Working Group – Workshop #4.

#### **2. Recap of Working Group #2**

Mr. Smith reported that comments were received from Working Group – Workshop #2 (WG#2) and focused on environmental assessment (EA) methodology, valued components, intermediate components and cumulative effects assessment. The interest expressed by the Working Group members to better understand these aspects of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) informed the development of the agenda for WG#3.

Attendees were informed that the meeting record from WG#2 have been distributed to WG participants.

Following the June 17, 2014 Workshop #4, the meeting record will be summarised and made available to all WG participants. At the conclusion of all of the working groups, meeting summaries and presentation materials will be posted on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEA Agency) website.

### **3. ISSUES SCOPING PROCESS FOR CANDIDATE VALUED COMPONENTS**

Pamela O'Hara, Senior Project Manager gave an overview presentation on consultation and engagement activities conducted to date and summarising key interest and issues guiding the selection of candidate valued components.

Comments were offered on: issues scoping for RBT2; key aboriginal interests and issues raised to date through consultation and engagement; key local government, public and stakeholder interests and issues raised to date through consultation and engagement; and potential federal permits required for the RBT2 Project.

#### **Discussion Session**

Questions and comments from WG members are summarised below, with responses from PMV representatives (or those attending on PMV's behalf) in *italics*.

- 1) Has the impact of the project on migratory birds been reflected in the key Aboriginal interests and issues?

*More on this topic will be covered in the biophysical valued components later in WG#3. We will add it to the list of key Aboriginal interests and issues.*

- 2) There are other projects using the same commercial shipping lanes as RBT2. Has PMV considered undertaking a Termpol process, similar to that conducted by the TransMountain pipeline?

*Port Metro Vancouver has engaged with Transport Canada on this issue. Because RBT2 is proposed to support container shipping, a Termpol process is not required. The RBT2 Environmental Assessment will include a quantitative risk assessment of the increase in the container traffic that would consider the potential probability and consequences of marine accidents and spills associated with the Project.*

- 3) What is the Termpol process?

*TERMPOL is a voluntary review process led by Transport Canada that may be requested by proponents involved in building and operating a marine terminal system for bulk handling of oil, chemicals and liquefied gases. It focuses on the marine transportation components of a project and examines the safety of tankers entering Canadian waters, navigating through channels, approaching berthing at a marine terminal and loading or unloading oil or gas. It is not legally binding. A description of the Termpol process is available on Transport Canada's website (Gina Aitchison, Transport Canada).*

**Post Meeting Note:** <http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/marinesafety/menu-4100.htm#k>

#### 4. RBT2 PROPOSED APPROACH TO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

##### (a) Recap from WG#2 Proposed Approach to EA Methodology

Celesa Horvath, Senior Regulatory Advisor gave an overview presentation to clarify aspects of the proposed approach to assessing effects related to RBT2, based on the questions from WG#2.

Comments were offered on: EIS focus on the assessment of valued components (VC); proposed VC selection process; an example of a pathway of effects for RBT2; tendency of intermediate components (ICs) to relate to many effects on the VCs; proposed VCs and ICs to be addressed in the EIS; and assessment of ICs and VCs that will be described in the EIS.

#### Discussion Session

Questions and comments from WG members are summarised below, with responses from PMV representatives (or those attending on PMV's behalf) in *italics*.

- 1) With respect to the pathways, you have broken up the assessment into biophysical and socio-economic effects. There are some environmental effects that cause economic effects, such as the impact to salmon. Does this information get factored into the EIS?

*There is a lot of interconnection amongst all the disciplines that will be articulated as the EIS is being prepared. These interconnections will be clearly presented in the EIS. The challenge with any EIS is the volume of information and the need to make it accessible.*

- 2) You mentioned that if there are residual effects, then you would do a cumulative effects assessment. Are you saying that if there are no residual effects, you would not be doing a cumulative effect assessment? What about cumulative effects of other marine traffic in the area? I want to be sure that cumulative effects assessment is not limited to the RBT2 project.

*If there is a measurable residual effect resulting from the Project, and there is interaction with other projects, then that component would be carried forward into the cumulative effects assessment.*

- 3) When we look at the description of existing conditions, is there an examination of carrying capacity of a particular event? There are several projects going on and the effects, such as underwater noise, will overlap, especially in a marine environment. To whom does it fall to say that there is a certain level of impact that a resource can sustain? Is there going to be failure point and how do we measure which project is responsible?

*We do that in a number of ways. We describe the effect and consider that*

*information in the context in which that effect is occurring (i.e., when looking at existing conditions, is some threshold already being approached?).*

*In addition, the EIS will include a defined threshold of significance for each valued component. Where possible, we use thresholds that have already been defined. However, if a threshold has not been defined, the scientific experts will define a threshold of significance. Ultimately, the decision about the significance is made by the regulatory agencies.*

**Follow up comment by Debra Myles, CEA Agency:** *The person to determine the likelihood of a significant adverse effect is the Minister of Environment. The proponent can suggest what the significant environmental effect would be. Significance determination will be done on Project effects as well as on the cumulative effect.*

- 4) Mitigation measures are only listed under VCs in your presentation. Would all mitigation measures for all ICs be addressed in the VC chapter of the EIS?

*Mitigation measures can be applied anywhere on the pathway of effects. They are usually most effective if they are applied closest to the source of the effect. As such, mitigation can be applied to potential effects to ICs. There will be an entire summary of all the mitigation measures, by component, in the EIS.*

## **(b) Cumulative Effects Assessment**

Celesa Horvath, Senior Regulatory Advisor, gave an overview presentation on the proposed approach to undertaking cumulative effects assessment.

Comments were offered regarding: *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act 2012* requirements with respect to cumulative environmental effects of a project; when a cumulative effects assessment is required; and requirement for a cumulative effects assessment of the Project in combination with other projects and activities that have been carried out and will be carried out.

Comments were also offered on: assessment of effects of projects and activities that have been carried out; draft Project Inclusion List provided in the handout material; assessment of effects of projects and activities that will be carried out; definitions of spatial boundaries (Local Assessment Area (LAA), Regional Assessment Area (RAA) and Cumulative Effects Assessment Area); and IC and VC cases that will be described in the EIS.

### Discussion Session

Questions and comments from WG members are summarised below, with responses from PMV representatives (or those attending on PMV's behalf) in *italics*.

- 1) When you separate discussion of Section 19.1 from Section 5.1 (a) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act 2012*, it weakens the analysis of cumulative environmental effects on First Nations.

*Noted and we will look into this further to clarify that 5.1 (a) is being addressed.*

*In addition, there is a meeting currently scheduled for June 6, 2014 to have a more detailed discussion with First Nations.*

- 2) How does the parallel path analysis affect Aboriginal rights, title and other interests, including use of land and resources for traditional purposes?

*The issues that have been raised by Aboriginal groups to date are also included in the proposed VCs. The effects on Aboriginal rights and title and land use will follow the same as the other VCs, except for the assessment of cumulative effects.*

- 3) Some of the projects included on the draft Project Inclusion List are no longer designated since the change in the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* in 2012.

*We have not taken projects off of the Project Inclusion List because they are no longer designated as projects under CEAA 2012. Projects do not need to be reviewable under CEAA 2012 in order to be included in a cumulative effects assessment.*

- 4) When you make the conclusion on residual effects, will it be based on existing or expected conditions?

*It will be done on a case-by-case basis. For projects that are included and are currently underway, the condition of the VC that we assess the Project against will be those that are expected at the time of the RBT2 Project. For those projects where we do not expect a change to the condition of the VC, we would use the existing condition.*

- 5) Many resources such as biofilm and eulachon have already been impacted by past development. How will that be taken into account?

*From a methodological point of view, we use the existing condition to assess how things are and we describe the change caused by the RBT2 Project relative to the existing conditions. We are looking at significance in terms of the integrity of the component, and whether it is sustainable or not. The existing conditions are not a baseline but provide information in terms of measuring the effect of the Project.*

- 6) Section 5.1 (a) of CEAA 2012 is important to everyone, not just First Nations. I am concerned that you will only be considering Section 19 of CEAA 2012.

*When we go through the presentation on cumulative effects, I think it will address that concern.*

*If it is not addressed during WG#3, we can include it on the agenda for June 6, 2014 meeting.*

- 7) Would the Project Inclusion List include initiatives that might increase the sensitivity of the environment, such as the establishment of a marine park and conservation area in the Gulf Islands archipelago? It seems that the federal family is working at cross-purposes by creating a marine conservation area while looking at RBT2.

*This would not be the sort of thing that would typically be included on a Project Inclusion List. It does not fit within the methodology typically followed when completing cumulative effects assessments.*

- 8) Will you be describing ICs and VCs in a quantitative or qualitative manner?

*Both. It will depend on whether quantitative information is available, as is normally the case for existing conditions. For those effects in the future, it tends to be more qualitative.*

- 9) When describing the area of effects generally, there is usually a concluding statement that describes the economic impact of a project. The bigger the assessment area, the more I have a concern that things (effects) that cannot be measured will be left out and the counterbalance to the economic benefit will be understated.

*There is a need to balance the size of the assessment area. If it is too large, the impacts are diluted but if it is too small, the impacts are too concentrated.*

- 10) How do the cumulative effects assessments that are being done by overlapping projects affect the RBT2 EA?

*If information is available at the time that the EA is done, we will use it to the extent that we can. There are cumulative interactions that may not be applicable to RBT2 and we need to tease out those that are relevant and include it in RBT2 EA.*

**Break:** The Workshop recessed at 10:45 a.m. and reconvened at 11:03 a.m.

Mr. Smith invited participants to complete and submit the "Roberts Bank Terminal 2 WG #3 Question Form" provided with the handout packages, if there are questions that are not answered during the day. In addition, participants were encouraged to identify additional projects and activities to be included in the draft Project Inclusion List.

**Post Meeting Note:** At this stage, PMV is seeking to develop a comprehensive list of reasonably foreseeable projects for the draft Project Inclusion List for consideration in the cumulative effects assessment. It is important to note that only those projects and activities that are determined to have potential effects that would cumulatively interact with RBT2 will be included in the RBT2 cumulative effects assessment.

## 5. PROPOSED INTERMEDIATE COMPONENTS

Pamela O'Hara, Senior Project Manager, gave an overview presentation on each proposed IC, including the rationale for selection, linkages to other proposed ICs and proposed VCs and proposed study areas.

Comments were offered regarding: proposed ICs; identification and quantification of potential changes in air quality, noise and vibration, light, coastal geomorphology, surficial geology and marine sediment, marine water quality, underwater noise and population demographics resulting from the proposed RBT2 Project; and IC linkages.

### Discussion Session

Questions and comments from WG members are summarised below, with responses from PMV representatives (or those attending on PMV's behalf) in *italics*.

- 1) Where are the protection dykes that you mentioned?

*Dykes that have been constructed in Delta adjacent to the Project area to protect upland areas. They follow very closely to the shoreline.*

- 2) Coastal geomorphology would need to look at what would happen to the dykes as a result of climate change and sea-level rise.

*We are looking at the extreme events as well as looking at high water mark points and future climate scenarios.*

- 3) Will you be looking at submarine landslides?

*Yes, that is also being addressed in the EIS in the section which considers effects of the environment on the Project.*

- 4) Philip Hill did a study regarding expected sea level change over the next 100 years. Would the results of those studies be accounted for in this area of the study or in another area?

*Yes, the Dr. Philip Hill study is considered in this section of the EIS and in the associated modelling. It has been taken into account in terms of engineering and design including determining terminal elevation. Dr. Philip Hill was a member of one of the Technical Advisory Groups for the Project.*

- 5) What are the linkages for air quality? There has been a lot of discussion on the impact of air quality on human health. There does not appear to be a linkage to the visual resources. Because air quality is an IC, will there be an assessment of criteria air contaminants? What is happening to greenhouse gases (GHG) and where are they linking in?

*Yes, changes in emissions and ambient concentrations of criteria air contaminants, as a result of the Project, will be assessed in the Human Health VC.*

*In terms of visual aspects of air quality, this was previously discussed at the Air Quality Working Group (meetings held in 2013) with local government, First Nations, and regulatory representatives. There are no applicable standards for visibility to permit a meaningful quantitative assessment. A qualitative discussion will be provided in the Air Quality IC and Visual Resources VC sections. It is relevant to note that visibility is anticipated to improve in the future due to technology modifications and fuel specification changes. In addition to these changes that will lower emissions and improve visibility effects, RBT2 will be equipped with shore power, reducing auxiliary engine emissions.*

*With respect to greenhouse gasses, they will be identified in the EIS and quantified in the Air Quality IC section. As there are no emissions standards for GHGs, PMV intends to compare total annual Project-related emissions to total emissions in 2010 for the Lower Fraser Valley (inventory conducted by Metro Vancouver and report issued by Metro Vancouver in 2013).*

- 6) If a quantitative assessment (of GHG emissions) is not available, a semi-qualitative assessment needs to be discussed somewhere. Which VC is the GHG going to be discussed under?

*Greenhouse gases are one of four compounds of potential concern groups that will be quantified in the Air Quality IC section. The assessment will be based on 20- and 100-year GHG changes and expressed carbon dioxide equivalent tonnes/year. As there are no regulatory criteria associated with GHGs, PMV intends to compare total annual Project-related emissions to total emissions in 2010 for the Lower Fraser Valley (inventory conducted by Metro Vancouver and report issued by Metro Vancouver in 2013).*

- 7) I am concerned that if it (information on GHG emissions) is not fed into a VC, this information will be buried in the EIS.

*As previously mentioned, it is one of the four compounds of potential concern groups, and therefore the changes will be described for GHGs (carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) expressed as carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2e</sub>)), as well as for gaseous and particulate criteria air contaminants, trace organic contaminants known to be emitted from combustion in engines, and climate forcing particulate matter (black carbon).*

- 8) The impact of underwater noise and vibration is currently being felt through the sandstone on the east side of Valdez Island. The potential effect of this on human health should also be included in that proposed VC.

*An assessment of underwater noise from the RBT2 Project will be included in the EIS. Also, potential effects from in-air noise and vibration as they relate to human health will also be included in the EIS.*

- 9) What is the interaction between biophysical effect and the parallel analysis of Aboriginal use?

*Just as there are pathways between ICs and VCs, many of the proposed VCs are relevant to the analysis of the effects of the RBT2 Project on Aboriginal rights and interests. There will be reliance on that analysis in the assessment of the effect to Aboriginal rights and interests.*

*The EIS chapter on Aboriginal rights will follow the same methodology as the other VC chapters, except it will not include a determination on significance because the Minister of Environment will make that determination.*

**Follow up comment from Analise Saely, CEA Agency:** *In the EIS, the proponent will provide their opinion of the significance of adverse environmental effects and a separate analysis on the severity of impact of the Project on Aboriginal rights. The Panel will consider the proponent's opinion, produce a report and make recommendations on the significance of adverse environmental effects. The final determination on the severity of the impact of the Project on the exercise of Aboriginal rights and of the significance of adverse environmental effects will be made by Minister of Environment.*

- 10) I am not sure it is appropriate for the Minister of Environment to make that determination. It is also not appropriate for the proponent to be making a suggestion on the significance and severity of impact.

**Response from Analise Saely, CEA Agency:** *Typically, this is an iterative process where the input of the First Nation is sought throughout.*

- 11) When you do the marine sediment test, I would suggest you work with First Nations harvesters to see if there is any coal dust in the crabs for example.

*That is one of the measures being taken in work being done to support the assessment of surficial geology and marine sediment.*

- 12) I suggest that you have a First Nations harvester witness your testing.

*Noted.*

- 13) Have you listed all the proposed ICs that will be studied? There might be some others.

*Port Metro Vancouver has listed eight ICs that are proposed to inform other ICs and VCs in the Environmental Assessment. There are also seven proposed biophysical VCs, four proposed economic VCs and six proposed social VCs.*

- 14) How would the traffic effects that were mentioned earlier today be included in the ICs?

*The assessment of the potential effects of increased traffic is captured in the proposed ICs (i.e. Noise, Air Quality) and they are captured in the proposed human health VC. Port Metro Vancouver will also consider the effects of traffic outside of PMV's jurisdiction where these effects are cumulative with those from the Project.*

**Post Meeting Note:** As discussed in WG#2, PMV recognises the need to continue working with key stakeholders to identify shared emerging and future transportation infrastructure needs in key goods movement corridors that are outside the scope of the Project as determined by the Federal Minister.

*Port Metro Vancouver, the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, Transport Canada, our Municipal partners, TransLink, and other supply chain stakeholders and funding partners have achieved major results by working together to address transportation infrastructure needs associated with the expansion of our Asia-Pacific Gateway.*

*The pending completion of existing infrastructure projects (South Fraser Perimeter Road, Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program, etc.) provides another opportunity for all partners to come together in a coordinated way to identify and address transportation infrastructure needs that will support regional development and future gateway expansion.*

*Building on this, PMV, with support from the B.C. MOTI, will be developing a framework for engaging with the partner agencies and will facilitate discussions that allow all involved parties to:*

- Identify shared emerging and future transportation infrastructure needs in key goods movement corridors;*
- Develop criteria for establishing priorities and shared solutions for infrastructure needs; and,*
- Identify funding sources that could support development of infrastructure including, but not limited to, the New Building Canada Plan.*

*Port Metro Vancouver is looking to convene a meeting with all key stakeholders in early summer 2014.*

15) There is a lot of information presented at the WG meetings. It would be useful to have the information provided a week in advance.

*Noted. The team is trying to do that as much as possible but we are working on tight timelines. We will take this into consideration for the WG#4 meeting and provide more information in advance if possible. Feel free to include this comment on the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 WG #3 Question Form.*

16) There is an important linkage between air quality and visual air quality, not just human health. Under the Canada/U.S. Air Quality Agreement, Annex 1 #4, there are provisions for the protection of visibility." How is this being addressed?

*To assess potential changes or deterioration in air quality and visibility in Canada and the U.S. from Project-related activities, the EIS will discuss emissions that relate to visibility for current and future conditions with and without the Project. Project-*

*related changes in these emissions will be used to interpret potential changes in visibility. Port Metro Vancouver will engage with Environment Canada to better understand the visibility requirements of the Canada/U.S. Air Quality Agreement in the development of the RBT2 Environment Impact Statement.*

**Lunch:** The Workshop recessed at 12:05 p.m. and reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

## **6. PROPOSED BIOPHYSICAL VALUED COMPONENTS**

Ben Wheeler, Marine Technical Director, gave an overview presentation on the seven proposed biophysical VCs including the rationale for selection as a VC, sub-components to support VC assessments and assessment areas.

Comments were offered regarding: proposed biophysical VC sub-components represented by focal species or groups; and identification and quantification of potential effects to marine vegetation and biofilm, marine invertebrates, marine fish, marine mammals, coastal birds, Roberts Bank ecosystem productivity and ongoing productivity of commercial, recreational and Aboriginal (CRA) fisheries resulting from the proposed RBT2 Project.

### **Discussion Session**

Questions and comments from WG members are summarised below, with responses from PMV representatives (or those attending on PMV's behalf) in *italics*.

- 1) How would spartina (i.e., as an existing threat to habitat) be incorporated in the assessment? This is very important from a local government perspective.

*We understand the importance of this to local governments and it will be considered in our assessment.*

- 2) The focus of the proposed VC is on southern resident killer whales (SRKW), humpback whales and stellar sea lions. Are those all that will be assessed?

*We will be looking at all the marine mammal species that occur in the area. By doing a fulsome assessment on the three focal species, we will have a better understanding of the effect on the other marine mammal species in the area.*

- 3) A grey whale and a basking shark have been sighted off the eastern shore of Valdez Island. I want to ensure that things like that will be assessed in this process.

*That is good information for us to have. We know that grey whales are in the area and are very similar to humpback whales. By assessing the potential effect of the RBT2 Project on the humpback whales, we will also be able to understand the potential effect on grey whales.*

*With respect to the potential basking shark sighting, we understand this to be a rare sighting and based on this input are looking at available information on basking sharks. Though PMV is not currently considering shark species as a VC or focal species in the environmental assessment we are considering the potential for an interaction and potential effect to sharks.*

**Post Meeting Note:** The Basking Shark is listed as Endangered under the Species at Risk Act (SARA) (listing in 2010), and the EA will address potential effects to all listed species.

- 4) Since the Deltaport Terminal was built, fewer fish are travelling along Canoe Passage. With the RBT2 Project there is a fear amongst First Nations that fish will bypass Canoe Passage altogether. Will you be looking at the effect of the Project on the use of near-shore habitat by marine fish?

*The effect of the (existing) causeway on fish movements was identified quite some time ago and will be considered in the assessment.*

- 5) Will you be looking at the cumulative effects of ship movements on marine fish?

*The EIS will consider the potential effects of underwater noise associated with ship movements within PMV jurisdiction and SRKW Critical Habitat in Canada.*

- 6) Why do the SRKW have that name?

*It is a distinct group of killer whales and Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) Resident Killer Whale Recovery Team have given the name to this group. The group's name reflects the fact that they reside in marine waters in the southern Strait of Georgia. There are also northern resident, off-shore and transient killer whale groups.*

*One of the key food sources for the southern resident killer whales is the Chinook salmon. Seals are the primary food source for transient killer whales.*

- 7) Will the RBT2 Project be subject to the SRKW recovery strategy?

*Yes, the recovery strategy for SRKW provides important context with respect to how potential effects to SRKW are considered and addressed. The development and implementation of the recovery strategy is a requirement under SARA and also provides direction on how potential effects to SRKW are considered in the EIS.*

- 8) The Aboriginal Aquatics Research and Management group commented on the potential of vessel strikes on whales. Will this be addressed in the EIS?

*Vessel strikes are generally not an issue with container ships and the types of whales in the area. However, this will be considered and addressed in more detail in the EIS.*

- 9) Will there be a permit required under SARA for killer whales?

*The permit requirements of the Project, with respect to SRKW, will be determined by DFO and will be informed by material presented in the EIS.*

- 10) We heard about the importance of hunting migratory birds to First Nations. Will the EIS gather that material and make that connection?

*The EIS will include a consideration of the traditional use of wildlife such as migratory birds. It has not been confirmed, at this stage, exactly how this type of information will be presented in the EIS. However, sections considering hunting of migratory birds may include: Human Health, and Current Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes.*

- 11) What is the context for providing the information on the key interests and issues raised by Aboriginal groups?

*Port Metro Vancouver has provided this information to acknowledge the issues and interests that have been raised to date through consultation and engagement activities.*

- 12) There will be a whole chapter on Aboriginal people in the EIS. Port Metro Vancouver needs to make sure that key interests and issues are addressed in the EIS.

*Aboriginal Group related issues and interests, and how they have been addressed, will be included in the EIS.*

- 13) Do you have a schedule of when all the processes and hearings will merge? There are many other processes for major projects that First Nations organizations will need to be involved and engaged in?

*Port Metro Vancouver expects to submit the EIS document in early 2015. The consultation and engagement with First Nations will continue with the draft document prior to that. Port Metro Vancouver does not have specific dates at this time but are working to establish those dates.*

- 14) Are you still looking for information on coastal birds in the Regional Assessment Area from the Canadian Wildlife Service?

*Yes, the information that the Canadian Wildlife Service has provided thus far has been very helpful and PMV would appreciate any additional information they can provide.*

- 15) What are some of the metrics used for assessing changes to the Roberts Bank Ecosystem VC?

*The EIS will include a calculation of ecosystem productivity that considers the biomass produced and that considers the range of species associated with the Roberts Bank ecosystem.*

- 16) How did the Technical Advisory Group assess the current state of the Roberts Bank ecosystem?

*The Technical Advisory Group on Productive Capacity did not comment on the current state. It provided PMV with a list of 25 species to focus on when considering ecosystem productivity. This general topic will cover this in more detail at WG#4.*

17) A number of the Regional Assessment Areas include the United States. Were you required to do any baseline sampling in the U.S.?

*That has not been a requirement to date.*

## **7. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC VALUED COMPONENTS**

Joe Truscott, Socio-Economic Technical Director, led an overview presentation on the proposed social and economic VCs in order to identify social and economic VCs to be discussed in detail at WG#4.

Comments were offered regarding: the four proposed economic VC of labour market, economic development, local government finances and marine commercial use; and the six proposed social VCs of services and infrastructure, outdoor recreation, visual resources, land and water use, physical and cultural heritage and human health.

It was emphasised that PMV is seeking input on topics of interest for detailed discussion at the WG#4 scheduled on June 17, 2014.

### **Discussion Session**

Questions and comments from WG members are summarised below, with responses from PMV representatives (or those attending on PMV's behalf) in *italics*.

1) One of the big issues for local government is transportation. The City of Richmond is trying to determine how to deal with the traffic impacts. Will it be dealt with directly or indirectly in the VC?

*The assessment of the potential effects of increased traffic is captured in the proposed ICs (i.e. Noise, Air Quality) and they are captured in the proposed human health VC. We will also consider the effects of traffic outside of PMV's jurisdiction where these effects are cumulative with those from the Project.*

**Post Meeting Note:** As discussed in WG#2, PMV recognises the need to continue working with stakeholders to identify shared emerging and future transportation infrastructure needs in key goods movement corridors that are outside the scope of the Project as determined by the Federal Minister.

*Specifically, PMV, with support from the B.C. MOTI, will be developing a framework for engaging with the partner agencies and will facilitate discussions that allow all involved parties to:*

- Identify shared emerging and future transportation infrastructure needs in key goods movement corridors;*
- Develop criteria for establishing priorities and shared solutions for infrastructure needs; and,*

- *Identify funding sources that could support development of infrastructure including, but not limited to, the New Building Canada Plan.*

*Port Metro Vancouver is looking to convene a meeting with all key stakeholders in early summer 2014.*

- 2) How will the socioeconomic analysis of First Nations be conducted? The Lyackson First Nation had done a socioeconomic profile but I do not expect that any other First Nations have done so. I would like technical experts to be at the June 6, 2014 meeting to have more discussion on the EIS at it relates to First Nations.

*Noted.*

- 3) Some First Nations cultural practices, such as a bathing ritual that is carried out when an important member dies, are impacted by skyglow in these areas. The socioeconomic profile developed for the EIS may not reflect these sorts of rituals.

*Port Metro Vancouver is working with First Nations on this directly and this can be discussed at the meeting on June 6, 2014. Some of this information will be in the proposed physical and cultural heritage VC and the EIS chapter on Aboriginal rights.*

*Port Metro Vancouver is working to develop First Nations community profiles for those First Nations close to the Project. There will also be a broader assessment of current use of Aboriginal land and resources. Some of the intangible cultural uses will also be included in the EIS.*

*The meeting on June 6, 2014 is intended to have a more detailed discussion on the proposed biophysical VCs. If desired, we could have a similar process on socioeconomic VCs after the June 17, 2014 meeting.*

- 4) Will the Métis be included as well? Will there be a separate section on Métis?

*We have erred in referring to First Nations in the context of the EIS. The correct term is Aboriginal Groups. Métis are included in the Aboriginal Groups.*

- 5) The First Nations have lost a whole run of eulachons as a result of past development. This needs to be addressed in the EIS.

*Noted.*

- 6) **Comment by G. Mullins, Environment Canada:** Aboriginal groups can make direct evidentiary submissions to the review panel for consideration and to ensure it is put on the record.

- 7) Is the meeting on June 6, 2014 only open to PMV and Aboriginal groups?

*Yes.*

## **8. CLOSING AND NEXT STEPS**

Mr. Smith thanked the attendees for their participation and advised that PMV will consider

what it has heard during WG#3 as the agenda for WG#4 is developed. It was noted that the agenda has not been set for WG#4 and input on topics to be included in WG#4 are welcome.

Mr. Smith advised that the presentations will be distributed along with the meeting record of WG#3. At the end of the process, the material from all the Working Group meetings will be synthesised and the summary document will be submitted and posted to the CEA Agency registry.

It was requested that future meetings start at 9:30 a.m. to accommodate those individuals who do not live in the Metro Vancouver region and must travel to the meetings.

Mr. Robertson noted that as currently conceived, WG#4 is expected be the last working group meeting and asked for comments on topics of interest to be addressed at WG#4 to be included on the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 WG#3 Question Form that was provided in the handout material. It was noted that PMV plans on conducting a public consultation period in the fall to discuss additional issues such as potential mitigation measures and PMV may propose reinstating the WG at this time. Mr. Robertson thanked the WG participants for their time and participation.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project (RBT2), Working Group – Workshop #3 concluded at approximately 2:45 p.m.

## **INFORMATION PROVIDED**

The following information items were provided at the meeting:

- Agenda for the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, Working Group (WG) Workshop #3 scheduled Tuesday, May 27, 2014
- Flowchart titled “Proposed Valued Component Selection Process”
- Chart titled “Proposed Intermediate Components”
- Chart titled “Descriptions for Social and Economic Proposed Valued Components”
- Document titled “Roberts Bank Terminal 2 – Draft Project Inclusion List
- Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Working Group #3 Question Form