Notes from a multi-stakeholder meeting for the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project, December 7, 2011, 10:00am – 12:00pm, at the Hilton Vancouver Airport, Richmond, BC.

**Stakeholders:**

- Ed Gavsie, Tourism Richmond
- Larry Haddock
- Gordon Kibble
- Otto Langer
- Jeremy McCall, Nature Vancouver
- Peter Mitchell
- Myron Rozumiak
- Dianne Ramage, Pacific Salmon Federation
- Arno Schortinghaus
- Nic Slater, BC NDP

**Port Metro Vancouver:**

- Chris Chok, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator
- Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development
- Darrell Desjardin, Director, Sustainable Development
- Evangeline Englezos, Director, Communications & Government Affairs
- Matt Skinner, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

_The record notes that the meeting commenced at 10:09 am_
Key Themes

- Participants expressed concern around the indicated time frames for the collection of input from the public regarding the project description for the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project.
- Participants expressed concern around how existing and planned road infrastructure will mitigate increased traffic from the port without worsening congestion through the George Massey Tunnel.
- Participants inquired about the environmental assessment process, specifically what agencies were responsible for performing a regulatory role.
- Participants expressed concern about the subject and nature of the environmental studies taking place as part of the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project environmental assessment.
- Participants inquired about Port Metro Vancouver initiatives such as shore power, and when and how they will address air quality impacts.

1. Chris Chok, Facilitator – Welcome and Agenda Review

   *Roundtable introductions were undertaken.*

C: **Chris Chok:** We are here today to talk about the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project. My name is Chris Chok I'll be facilitating the meeting this morning. I work for a company called Kirk & Co. and we're helping the Port out with their consultation process on this project. Just before we get started, I just want to touch on a couple of housekeeping things. If you wouldn't mind just check that your phones are on silent or vibrate that'd be great. We've got two hours this morning and if we do finish early we'll do so, also if we need to go the full time if you have a lot of questions, I'll be happy to do that and we can stay a few minutes later. But this is the third of six meetings we're doing and we have another one in Surrey this afternoon, so the team does need to get to that next meeting. Just going to quickly ask the Port team to introduce themselves, and given the number of people in this room we might as well just do a quick round of introductions around, around the table. I'll start with Cliff.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** My name is Cliff Stewart. I'm Director of Infrastructure Development at Port Metro Vancouver and I'm responsible for the Container Capacity Improvement Program, of which the Deltaport Terminal Road and Rail Improvement Project is the first major element.

C: **Darrell Desjardn:** Darrell Desjardin, Director of Sustainable Development. I'm freshly across the border from the Ports of Tacoma and Seattle this morning. I'm responsible for all of the environmental permitting, all of the environmental assessment, and sustainability infrastructure.

C: **Gordon Kibble:** Gordon Kibble, I'm a citizen of the city of Richmond but I'm also with the City of Richmond's Advisory Committee on the Environment, but I'm not here in that official capacity. I'm just here as me.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** Jeremy McCall. I'm with the Vancouver Naturalist History Society.

C: **Otto Langer:** Otto Langer, I guess I'm just a retired old fellow that follows environmental issues.

C: **Ed Gavie:** Ed Gavie, Tourism Richmond. I'm the Director of Visitor and Partner Services.

C: **Larry Haddock:** Larry Haddock, retired Stevedoring DP World.
C: **Myron Rozumiak:** Myron Rozumiak, retired, former Port employee.

C: **Matt Skinner:** My name is Matt Skinner I am also with Kirk & Co. and we're helping Port Metro Vancouver conduct this consultation.

C: **Chris Chok:** And just a quick note about Matt. Matt's going be taking notes of this meeting. They're not verbatim but they're very close. He's very good at what he does and I just want to point out that we are attributing comments, if you make a comment, we're putting your name beside it. If you would prefer that we don't put your name beside it, please let me know either now or after the meeting and we can fix that.

C: **Evangeline Englezos:** I'm Evangeline Englezos, I'm with Port Metro Vancouver and I'm Director of Communications and Government Affairs. I oversee communications, in particular community relations and community investment.

C: **Chris Chok:** Thanks everyone. So just a quick note about what you have in front of you. You should all have a discussion guide, and what we're going to do today is essentially go through this. The discussion guide Cliff will walk through, some of the key elements of the project and then we're going to ask that you fill out the feedback from at the end of the discussion guide, possibly today, because I know if I don't get it from you today my odds of getting it diminish quite greatly, so that's really the purpose. It is also available online if you have any colleagues, family, friends who are interested in looking at this. We also have a few additional copies if you'd like to take with you. As I mentioned, this is the third of six meetings that we're doing like this. We did two yesterday in Delta which I think we had approximately 20 people at each of them. We are also holding two open houses. One is this evening at Coast Tsawwassen Inn and then Saturday at the Delta Town and Country and that information is on the cover of this discussion guide. So, are there any questions before we start?

Q: **Jeremy McCall:** Cliff knows I was going to ask this question. Why are you going through all this trouble to get a few people out into a room like this, when the Vancouver Natural History Society invited the Port to speak to a meeting where about 100 people were going to show up, to talk about Deltaport, why on earth didn't you come to the meeting, why did you cancel at the last minute?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** As we told you, you wanted to have conversation about Terminal 2, which we were not in a position to have, because we were months away from having any substantive information about which to have discussions. So in simple terms that was the reason.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** Cliff, at the bottom of the invitation that was sent listing all the reasons we were having this meeting, it says Robert Banks, Terminal 2 Project – “As part of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project, Port Metro Vancouver is preparing to undertake a comprehensive six-year community, stakeholder and public consultation process, occurring in multiple rounds between January 2011”

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Is that what it says?

C: **Chris Chok:** On which invitation was that?

Q: **Jeremy McCall:** So you've been working on this for nearly a year, and you weren't prepared to come and speak to our members and the public when we offered you the opportunity?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** No.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** And I'm going to say again, I think that was a terrible mistake and incredibly disrespectful. We gave you an opportunity to come and talk to a lot of people about whatever was happening out there and for God's sake, it's getting very confusing 'cause one time you said
you’re doing Terminal 2, then you then you said you’re not doing Terminal 2, and now you say again in this e-mail with the invitation to these meetings, so you’re doing it again. So what are we supposed to think, if you don't come to our meeting and tell us what's happening?

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, I apologize for any email that said we were going to build in January on Terminal 2, because we won't be. Not in January, on Terminal 2.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** Well I think you should get your messages straightened out.

C: **Chris Chok:** Can we follow up with you after and check that invitation that you’re referring to, there?

C: **Jeremy McCall:** Well, we already have exchanged letters with the President of Port Metro Vancouver about that.

C: **Chris Chok:** Right. But I just want to be clear that the Port hasn’t said they’re not doing Terminal 2, I think you participated in our Pre-Consultation in June?

C: **Jeremy McCall:** Yes. So we’re invited the Port, we were invited to a meeting in June... when this brochure was handed out which described all about the Terminal 2 project.

C: **Chris Chok:** Right.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** So as far as we are concerned as naive naturalists... who do our best in a volunteer capacity following these matters, we were invited in June to one of your meetings, to talk about Terminal 2. So we invite you back in October to talk about Terminal 2 and you’re saying you’re coming and then you cancel and leave before the meeting. What are we supposed to think?

C: **Cliff Stewart:** I've already responded to that, at length, in writing. I don't know what else I can add to that.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** Yes, and very unsatisfactory.

C: **Chris Chok:** If I may Jeremy, so the process that you participated in June, and, I'd like to move on after this...

C: **Jeremy McCall:** I'm sure you would. I'm glad we got 2 hours because you couldn't have time for yourself and I want to get my messages out.

C: **Chris Chok:** Sure, absolutely.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** I think the Port is being incredibly incoherent at the moment in the messages it's sending out, it is being inconsistent and along with that, Mr. Stewart and his boss have been incredibly rude.

C: **Chris Chok:** Okay. That will be reflected in the record.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** That is for the record and you can attribute that to me, who tried to organize a meeting at which I invited Mr. Stewart as one of the first guests. So please put it in the record.

C: **Otto Langer:** Can I make one comment? I'm not with Nature Vancouver but as a Fraser River Estuary expert I spent most of my life protecting it for the Federal Government, but just looking at the process unfolding from my own narrow perspective, the message seems to have been split. At least that's my conclusion a few weeks ago that you've split the audience and now you've illegally split the environmental assessment, and that's illegal under the Environmental Assessment Act. None of that gives rise to public relations or trust, and you've dug a big trust hole, so if you're a big public relations consultation firm, you'd better go back and start patching up some big holes that you built over it.
C: **Cliff Stewart:** Well I'm sorry, and if you’re accusing us of illegal activity, I can’t leave that uncommented. You, I think, know the law well enough to know that that's not correct.

C: **Otto Langer:** Well, no I'd say, I don’t know that. I've worked mainly with the Environmental Assessment Act for many years and it says, if you have a significant project, you’re supposed to look at it in its entirety, and not break it up into piecemeal portions, and you’ve started to do that already, so I'd say you’re undermining the intent of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. You call it illegal or whatever.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, we’ll get to that, but there is a comprehensive effect study as part of this environmental assessment.

C: **Darrell Desjardin:** And I think once we get into this project it’ll be clearer that this is a different project than Terminal 2.

C: **Chris Chok:** Which is the one thing that I do want to say just to, you know, to clear up for Jeremy and for others: the process that we embarked on in June is for the Terminal 2 project, a new terminal and that process will continue. However, the project that we’re talking about today is the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** So the point I'm trying to make is you started discussing Terminal 2 in June.

C: **Chris Chok:** And we will continue.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** It actually started way back when with the Third Berth with that whole process and it was a cumulative effect from the Third Berth, but let’s leave that aside. You started the conversation on Terminal 2 in June, selectively on your own, when you could call the shots and call the meetings, but when we invite you to a meeting to talk about it, and you've already started, you turn us down, and turn us down at the last minute, I might add.

C: **Chris Chok:** I have seen your letter, Jeremy.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** What you’re doing is you’re kind of choosing the conversations you want to participate in, defining the project and going about it in a very manipulative way, and I'll be quite blunt about it.

C: **Chris Chok:** So the last thing that I want to say on that, and I respect that you may have more to say, is that where we were in June, we are asking two questions: “What do you want to be consulted about around the Terminal 2 project?” and “How?” and I believe your meeting was October. By that point, the things that you wanted to talk about, because I did see the letter that you sent...

C: **Jeremy McCall:** Well you look at my feedback form from June. We did want to be consulted.

C: **Chris Chok:** Right. But what I'm saying is the Port was not in a position to discuss the things you wanted to discuss.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** Well why didn’t you come along and tell us what you were prepared to discuss?

C: **Chris Chok:** Well, it would have been the same material that you saw in June, which wasn’t what you wanted to talk about.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** This thing was already printed.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** That's a completely different brochure.

C: **Chris Chok:** This discussion guide was printed last week. The Terminal 2 consultation process is separate from this.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** I don't believe that, I'm sorry I don't believe that, it's all one big project.

C: **Chris Chok:** Okay. We respect you have that opinion and it’s on the record.
Jeremy McCall: If you're choosing to describe it differently, then why didn't you come to the meeting and tell us that. In fact, you've already started an environmental screening yourselves, two weeks before October. You could have come along and told us that too. But we didn't find out about that until it was too late to do anything about it. So I've never even put in a submission about the so-called screening which is being conducted by the Port.

Chris Chok: Well, we can check. We can check our distribution list because I know that an e-mail was sent out.

Jeremy McCall: Well I was busy organizing a meeting, expecting Port Metro Vancouver to keep me informed as to what was happening in its sphere of influence.

Chris Chok: Okay.

Jeremy McCall: And they couldn't be bothered to come to the meeting and tell us what was happening. So we're supposed to run around and follow you guys, and try and find out what's happening and respond to it, because you can't even be bothered to tell us yourselves.

Chris Chok: Okay.

Jeremy McCall: I am very, very angry, and so are some of my fellow members, about what happened in October, as I think you can probably tell.

Chris Chok: Okay. Is there anything else you'd like to say right now, or are you okay with moving along?

Jeremy McCall: No.

Chris Chok: Okay. So I'm going to ask Cliff to walk us through the discussion guide and if you have any questions as we go through, please either ask or raise a hand and I'll come to you. Thanks.

2. Presentation of Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project Discussion Guide

B.C. West Coast Container Demand Forecast

Cliff Stewart: I'm not going to read through the discussion guide with you, that's a waste of your time, but I would like to point out a few key aspects of the guide, in particular on page 5, we have a demand forecast that underlies the explanation for why we're pursuing this project, Deltaport Terminal Road and Rail Improvement Project, the purpose of which is fundamentally to get more capacity out of the existing Deltaport facility, which obviously is environmentally the best next capacity and financially is the best next capacity and which is something that we have certainly heard throughout the various consultations that have been held over the years, which is get the most of what you have before you start building new infrastructure. So that is a fundamental aspect of this project.

Page 5 looks at the various forecasts, a low case, a base case, and a high case, recognizing the changes depending on what's going on in the world economy. The horizontal purple line is the current nameplate capacity of West Coast Terminals - and I say West Coast because it includes Prince Rupert and all West Coast Canadian terminals. The horizontal dotted line is what we call the 85% line. Like most infrastructure, when it starts to approach capacity, it begins to work less efficiently before it reaches its absolute limit. Generally, when container terminals are in growth market, you can try and have new capacity available by the time you get to 85% at the latest.
How are we making use of existing infrastructure?

If you look over to page 6, there’s a hind cast there of existing terminals going back to 1996. The dotted blue again is the 85% line and the red line is the actual throughput. So certainly, that gives you a very clear indication of both the supply and demand of continued capacity up to last year.

South Fraser Perimeter Road & the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program

Two other infrastructure projects that are underway or in construction. One is the South Fraser Perimeter Road which provides significant reduction on road and truck traffic and the other is the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program. That program really is looking to do two things: one is to reduce community impacts for rail activity on the corridor, and also position the corridor to be able to handle the additional volumes that will be coming as part of this project, which, by the way, is about one train a day in each direction on average.

Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project

Then moving over on pages 10 and 11, let me talk a little bit about the actual Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project itself. It consists of four key elements, starting from the lower left on the drawing - the purple item is work on the terminal itself. The vast majority of that is simply purchase of new equipment, key cranes and all of the other various container handling equipment that the terminal uses. There is also some infrastructure work to be done, again, within the existing footprint of the terminal, that involves the rail yard and if I can just flip you over onto page 13 for a minute, before we come back to page 11 - this is a cross-section of the existing rail yard, there are two 4-track pods. Because of the spacing of the tracks, one of the tracks, track 6, isn’t able to be used in current configuration. This project proposes realigning three tracks on that pod to allow track 6 to be used and then adding a fifth track on the other pod. So it takes the effective capacity from 7 tracks to 9, about a 28% increase in pad track capacity. So those infrastructure changes plus the new equipment give the terminal capacity to increase the throughput from about 1.8 million TEUs, which is its current annual capacity, to about 2.4 million TEUs, which is the standard measure in container capacity.

Now, in order to take advantage of that capacity, we need to be able to get more trucks or trains in and out of the terminal. There’s currently a pretty significant bottleneck just outside the gates of the intermodal yard, where the rail tracks access the intermodal yard and the road which most of the trucks exiting from the terminal cross. So the second major component of this project is an overpass to separate that road and rail traffic, calling it the Mid-Causeway Overpass, to differentiate it from the existing overpass at the end of the causeway, and as I said, the main purpose of that is to separate the road and rail traffic. There’s currently about four hours a day that the trains are embargoed from running through the crossing and the rest of the time the trucks generally are being delayed by trains. So by putting that causeway in, or that mid-causeway overpass, this will be able to get more traffic in and out of Deltaport.

The third component of the project is rail works and it includes three sub-components. The first is repair tracks. Currently, the railroads do what are called heavy repairs which is wheel changes on rail cars on the marine terminal and with the increase in throughput, there won’t be space or time to do those repairs there. So the first part of the rail work is the proposal to build a car repair facility adjacent to the main line track, adjacent to Deltaport Way, between the overpass
to the causeway and the overpass at 41B Street. That’s the dotted lines there where it says “repair tracks” on page 11.

The second component is some additional storage tracks at the gulf yard. As the container trains arrive, they are generally in 10,000 to 12,000 foot increments. The storage tracks on the causeway are 6,000 feet long, so the trains need to be broken generally into two components using free space to store the back half of the train while the front half is being put away. So that’s what the additional storage tracks are for. There’s currently one 12,000 ft. storage track there. That is going to be repurposed as a running track and we will be adding four 6000 foot storage tracks. In that same area, we’ll be adding two additional departure tracks where trains are built back up from their 3,000 foot components into the 12,000 foot final departure form, and all of that work is between 41B Street and Arthur Drive.

The additional storage tracks, additional running tracks, and the repair tracks are supposed to take place within a 60 meter wide rail right-of-way called the Option Lands. That right-of-way was created by the Agricultural Land Commission, and BC Rail subdivided and purchased that land in 2009, and the approval to complete that construction for the Agricultural Land Reserve Regulations lies with the Agricultural Land Commission. It’s a quirk of those regulations that a right-of-way wider than 30 meters, although rail is a permitted non-farm use, the construction of the rail requires separate Agricultural Land Commission approval.

And finally, between the base of the causeway, 72nd Street and the solid red line is the construction of an additional siding/lead/running track to allow the arrival and/or departure of trains to go more smoothly, with the increased volume.

The final component of the project is a series of road improvements, one of which is a proposed truck turnaround. There is currently no way once trucks get onto Deltaport Way to turn around if they shouldn’t be there for any reason. Whether they are too early or too late for an appointment, whether they aren’t supposed to be doing business at Deltaport at all, or whether there’s a problem with Deltaport that necessitates them going away because the terminal is shutting down. So we are proposing a turnaround within the jug handle at 41B. It’s just being completed as part of the 41B overpass by Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, a truck turn-around. So if trucks are there and shouldn’t be for whatever reason, security or the Delta police have the opportunity to actually turn them around and send them away.

We’re also proposing two weigh-in-motion scales to be installed as part of the provincial Weigh-To-Go BC truck scaling program and these would be located somewhere around Deltaport way. Several advantages of having those scales there is the community can have some comfort that overweight trucks aren’t coming from or going to Deltaport Terminal. From the truckers’ perspective, particularly if they’re heading east and then north across the Alex Fraser Bridge, once they’ve been through the scale, it means they don’t have to report at the Nordel scale, which has some advantages to the driver, and also some traffic advantages.
And the final element is what we’re calling a vehicle access control system. The port complex is gated to prevent unauthorized access for trucks that aren’t supposed to be servicing terminals – at Deltaport, there isn’t currently a vehicle control access control system and so we’re looking to install one as part of this project, and there are several locations where it may end up being put in. One of them is out near the terminal. The others are at 27B where there’s a discreet access onto the terminal from the Tsawwassen First Nation’s industrial lands, and also possibly at 41B, because east of 41B, there is no other access except the port.

So those are the elements of the project at a high level, on page 10 you’ll see some fast facts about the project – who the partners are, the economic impact, the economic impact of this particular project, the volume associated with it, and the cost of the project.

There are three funding partners for this project. TSI Terminal Systems Incorporated is the terminal operator and will be responsible for all of the costs on the terminal, British Columbia through BC Rail Properties would be responsible for the rail facility upgrades on behalf of the railroads that operate on that port sub, and Port Metro Vancouver would be funding the mid-causeway overpass and the road improvements.

C:  Chris Chok: Are there any questions on the project elements?

C:  Cliff Stewart: One of the key aspects of this project is that there are no marine works and no marine impacts, and that was a fundamental design principle right from the beginning. Moving on to consultation topics then, on page 15, and this is not intended in any way to be limiting of things that people may want to talk about, but these are some topics that we have suggested, they may want, or wish to have input into. The first relates to truck congestion. We recognize that traffic is a significant concern and I would preface this part of the conversation by pointing out that yes, SFPR is a fundamental piece of the truck congestion mitigation, and for those who do live in live in Ladner, the Province intends to take the container trucks off of Highway 17 North, of Deltaport Way, once the South Fraser Perimeter Road construction is complete at the end of 2013.

Q:  Jeremy McCall: Can we take them out of the tunnel too?

A:  Cliff Stewart: That’s something you could suggest. Obviously it’s Provincial, not a Port issue but certainly that type of feedback is welcome.

C:  Jeremy McCall: But it’s a Port issue because they’re all container trucks.

C:  Cliff Stewart: Well they are not all container trucks.

C:  Jeremy McCall: The tunnel is awful. My wife drives through the tunnel every day and she says it’s been getting very, very bad for the last few years.

C:  Cliff Stewart: So that would be great feedback and we can certainly pass that on to the Province.

C:  Jeremy McCall: But my question is, does this do anything to reduce congestion in the tunnel?

C:  Cliff Stewart: Not directly, but the South Fraser Perimeter Road we believe will have a significant impact on that because they have an easy alternative to get to the Alex Fraser Bridge, particularly the counter-flow direction. The Alex Fraser is generally fairly free-flowing in the counter-flow direction, whereas the tunnel clearly isn’t because it has a single lane. So the South Fraser Perimeter Road we believe will take a significant amount of rush hour truck traffic away.

C:  Jeremy McCall: I guess I was going to ask a question but I wanted to give other people a chance.
I’m really concerned about trucks and I guess I don’t really understand, you say the South Fraser Perimeter Road would improve things, but at the moment, all those trucks that are going through the tunnel, and 110 trucks that were lined up on the causeway a couple of weeks ago. I don’t know whether they’re idling or whether they have to stop their engines when they’re sitting on the causeway, but one of our members counted 110 in a row, lined up, and obviously there are a lot of problems with the trucks as you pointed out. I wonder why containers need to move from Deltaport to downtown. Why do containers have to go between Centerm and Deltaport, which is what is causing the big problem in the tunnel?

C:  **Cliff Stewart:** Well I would suggest that you could probably find an example to counter my assertion, but I will assert that virtually no containers would move between Deltaport and Centerm.

Q:  **Jeremy McCall:** Really? So where are all those containers going, that are going through the tunnel?

A:  **Cliff Stewart:** Well they go through the tunnel because there are significant logistics facilities in Richmond.

Q:  **Jeremy McCall:** So that will still be?

A:  **Cliff Stewart:** That will still be there. There are significant facilities in Burnaby and in Vancouver. Now as facilities are added, they will almost all be added south of the Fraser River because most of the capacity, most of the available industrial land north of the river has been used up. Pretty much everything that’s available for future development is either in North Delta, Surrey or Langley. The last time there was a truck origin destination study, it was about three years ago and about 37% of the trucks were going through the tunnel at that time.

Q:  **Myron Rozumiaik:** I live in Richmond, close to the tunnel, but my daughter lives in Langley. It’s nine minutes from my house to hers. At 5:30 at night it takes me half an hour to get through the Steveston Highway - never mind through the tunnel. My question with the project, Nelson Road, and the South Fraser Perimeter Road is, can you have rules in the city as to truck access - i.e. you can’t go down go down Benford? I still haven’t seen anywhere, what the plan is, relative to the tunnel. It seems like I’ll go on 17 through the tunnel, over on 91, back over Nelson Road. Is the Port looking at directing truck traffic where you must use the South Fraser, you must use the Alex Fraser and you must use 91 to take that traffic away from all of the passenger traffic that is using the tunnel. I don’t know how many trips there are, but it can only increase as business grows – even in places like Richmond.. The fact that their business is there, it means they are at 100% capacity. So if business goes up, the existing warehouses still will see a rise. So in the plan, how do we maximize the use of South Fraser, Alex, 91 and Nelson, to mitigate truck traffic?

A:  **Cliff Stewart:** We aren’t ruling out the possibility of directing that, but we’re not clear, although we’ve done it in the Nanaimo St. There's things that you can do and there's things you can’t do sustainably, and then there are those who are not in favor of what we’ve done at Nanaimo St. It certainly hasn’t gone through a legal challenge yet, so we’re very carefully not to commit because we may not be able to. We certainly are considering it, and certainly we will facilitate it.

One of the conversations that is ongoing right now, is if a trucker is coming south across the Alex Fraser and they have to report to the Nordel scale and are coming to Deltaport it motivates them not to go there and to take the delay going through because it may be less than the delay at the Nordel scale.
So we’ve initiated a conversation to say “hey, is there an opportunity to put a weigh-in-motion scale north of the Alex Fraser, so that trucks will be motivated to go that way, coming south bound, when north bound the weigh-in-motion scale at Deltaport will actually facilitate that because then they don’t have to report?” So we’re looking at what the other impacts are further up in the community and obviously what we want to motivate trucks to use that route because it is has capacity on it. Not in a position to comment on whether we would sanction them for using the tunnel.

Q: Myron Rozumiak: My second question and I know it relates to Terminal 2 is I read that Vanterm and Centerm are options on the south shore for the next 10 years, but the possibility or an option still exists that those two terminals become a base for Terminal 2? Based on my opinion, because of the options, and lands downtown, (plus whatever opposition the city may have to more a truck traffic) you’re going to reach your capacity there. Would this road and rail project at least address the ability to move that volume over the South Fraser Perimeter Road?

C: Cliff Stewart: Sorry I’m not clear.

Q: Myron Rozumiak: I know we’re dealing with this, the existing terminal and the expansions. Will Terminal 2 also tie in with the expansion here, and accommodate the road/rail project?

A: Cliff Stewart: T2 is completely separate from this project.

Q: Otto Langer: So T2 will never use any of these facilities?

C: Cliff Stewart: I didn’t say that.

C: Otto Langer: Okay. So there’s a connection.

C: Myron Rozumiak: Well, I mean none of these facilities are being built in any way different because there might be a T2 in the future. In other words, they are being built for this project, as is required for this project. So for example, there is a two-lane road on the causeway today. We are building an overpass that has two lanes in any direction, whether or not that overpass would be used as part of T2, which is far from being decided. We are not building a four-lane overpass in case we wanted to build T2 later. So, any rail track that is being proposed for this project is for this project and doesn’t mean that the aggregation of facilities in the future might not share, but we aren’t building our proposing to build anything here that requires T2 later in order for it to have a justification. Does that answer what your question?

C: Myron Rozumiak: Well, I didn't want to throw T2 in, but I needed to throw T2 in, only because you talk about what is happening with the south shore for the next 10 years, but it doesn’t talk long-term.

A: Cliff Stewart: In the overall program we are exploring a Terminal 2, in the early twenties, and we expect to return to the south shore in the late 2020s or 2030s.

Q: Jeremy McCall: About the trucks, there were some real problems a couple of years ago with trip scheduling, and this alone caused a lot of idling trucks and too many trucks on the road at any given point in time. Scheduling between wherever they go, warehouses or yards, and other places that you mentioned. Have those efficiencies been introduced yet? Or is that still part of what we’re talking about today?

A: Cliff Stewart: Some of them have. There are four things, let me just talk briefly about the four truck mitigation measures and then I think that segues nicely into your question. We put them here as consultation topics because they may appear obvious as things that we should be doing
but some may have contrary views, so for example, on diversifying truck trip schedules which really means opening the gate at the terminal longer hours.

Q: **Jeremy McCall**: What page are we on?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: We’re on page 16. On the days when demand calls for additional gate hours, and I think it’s about three days a week currently that Deltaport is open, two shifts rather than one. 40% of the volume that comes on those days is now coming on the afternoon shift. The afternoon begins after 4:30.

Q: **Jeremy McCall**: Sorry, whose gates?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: This would be Deltaport’s gate. One of the obvious issues is Deltaport’s gate we have some control over. The rest of the industry we can only provide guidance, leadership and opportunity, but what we’re seeing is on those days, where there is a demand for it, the rest of the community is responding, so the afternoon shifts and/or weekend shifts offer certain possibilities. The reason it’s a consultation topic is that there are some people in some communities who don’t want trucks on the road outside the traditional 8 to 5, Monday through Friday. So that’s why we’re not simply saying we’re going to do this.

Q: **Jeremy McCall**: Wait, so are there people not wanting them on the roads? Which road?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: They don’t want them in their neighborhood, wherever that is, however they define that.

Q: **Jeremy McCall**: The trucks are going to go through neighborhoods?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: Well, I’m just telling you that if we were simply to say this is what we’re doing, there are people who don’t think it’s a good idea. So we’re putting this out and saying let’s get feedback from interested parties. We think it’s a good idea, that’s why we’re proposing this.

Q: **Jeremy McCall**: Are there any other reasons why PMV wouldn’t be much more liberal about the way it opened its gates? I mean, you’ve got control of it apart from possible neighborhood resistance?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: Well, you’ve got to make sure that there are going to be trucks who will come and use the facility.

C: **Jeremy McCall**: No, I realize that.

C: **Cliff Stewart**: Traditionally the gates were Monday through Friday, eight to four-thirty.

Q: **Jeremy McCall**: Four-thirty?
A: **Cliff Stewart**: Probably about six or seven years ago we started opening evenings and weekends. Now I think about three days a week Deltaport is open two shifts. They open occasionally on Saturdays. Certainly there is significant scope to increase that to 24/7 eventually. But there has to be enough demand for that to work.

Minimizing empty truck trips - this is one that certainly we think would be a very good thing to have out. Currently, about 37% of the trucks that go out to Deltaport carry a container in each direction. The remainder are empty, either going out or empty coming back. So there is certainly some scope to that. One of the challenges that often happens in this type of thing is various companies have developed a competitive advantage in exploiting inefficiencies in the system. So while it would seem obvious that coming along and suggesting that we improve the system would be met with open arms, the people whose livelihood depends on the status quo find all sorts of ways to be opposed to it. Doesn’t mean that we can’t or wouldn’t work to sort that out, but again, it’s something that we are interested in feedback in on.
Q: Myron Rozumiak: On both subjects, I want to diversify the truck trip schedule, relative to five years ago, to today. How far along that bar have we risen to? How much further can we go with businesses?

A: Cliff Stewart: It’s an interesting question and one of the things that we are inquiring into is exactly that, do the off-docks support businesses? And those really fall into three categories. Those who store empty containers, those who discharge import containers, and those who stock or load import containers. So part of the question that we are trying to come to grips with is: “Do they achieve greater capacity by being open and running seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day?” Because in theory if they do, then there is an incentive for them to actually do that. But if there is an inherent sloppiness in the system, in other words, an export facility depends upon the railroads delivering boxcars full of pulp or center-beam cars full of lumber or boxcars full of pallet products. And if they, being open seven/twenty-four doesn’t give them any more business because it’s their storage capacity that’s limiting it, it comes a certain time it goes out a certain time, then they’re not really interested. So that means that we need to build more capacity in order to be able to be open longer hours. So we’re still in the process of trying to more fully understand that business. It’s not a clear, and it’s also a very dynamic business.

I’ll give you the example of lumber stuffing. There are all sorts of little mum and pop lumber stuffing operations that have sprung up in the last year. Anywhere that has a rail spur and a level gravel parking lot frankly can be in the lumber stuffing business. You’re seeing huge demand because of the lumber demand in China. I think that’s been in the paper in the last few months. Lumber exports are growing in the 20-30% range, so it is a very high growth business. Being able to predict what that would like in the long-term is challenging. But certainly we are looking very closely at this. I would suggest that if you were to go back three or four years, maybe five years, a good portion increase is in container truck traffic, actually as being handled on the afternoon shifts. In other words, the overall volume has gone up significantly but the amount that is handled on the afternoon shifts accounts for most of that increase.

The third thing that we are working on and we actually have a pilot program that we’ll be launching early next year to outfit initially about three hundred of the trucks initially. There is about 2,000-3,000 trucks that do the vast majority of the container hauling in the lower mainland and we are looking to outfit initially about 300 trucks, ultimately the whole fleet, with a form of GPS-enabled, real-time two-way communication capabilities. That will do a number of things for us. It will begin to give us some history on where the trucks actually go and how long they spend in the various places. We have good information on what they do while they’re on Port land, we have very bad information beyond that. So ultimately, if this technology proves workable, it would begin to address a number of these other things that people are talking about so if there were an opportunity to tell trucks that you can’t go through the tunnel during rush-hour, this facility would enable us to know if they were following that prohibition. It would enable us to remind them if it looked like they were going to do something that they shouldn’t be doing. It enables us in the event that there are operational problems at any of the terminals, whether it be at a marine container terminal or an off-dock facility to give them heads-up in advance. These drivers are paid by the move, so anything that we can do that enables them to be more productive in their move, they are going to appreciate. So ultimately, if there was some form of centralized dispatch, having that type of technology in the truck would make a lot of sense. And I go back to my time as a terminal operator, it’s bad enough when you have a truck
from Company A show up with a container and a truck from Company B showing up empty to pick up a container, but when you have a truck from Company A drop a container off and another truck from Company A showing up empty - you know there’s lots of efficiency opportunities to be rung from the system.

The fourth one is having a designated truck waiting area and somebody mentioned the trucks idling and I know that the current practice on Deltaport Way is problematic because everybody inches forward but even something as simple as saying you know, breaking up the Deltaport way-staging area, it’s only about 1% of the time that that full-length of the causeway gets used, and notwithstanding your comment about 110 trucks the other day, as a general rule, it’s about 1% of the time that the whole thing gets used so there is an opportunity to say, much as they do at, you know BC Ferries, if you’re not getting through the gate, you get parked, you turn your engine off and then when they’re ready for you, they move you forward you’re not creeping, you’re not running your engine the whole time, so we are looking at that.

We are also looking at whether there are opportunities for a satellite gate or a waiting area or something else. The challenge in that one is the GPS information will become useful and it’s not intuitive where those facilities should be. Some people say well it should be as close to the marine terminal as possible and I was talking to someone in the meeting yesterday who is in the container stuffing business and he was talking about the fact that, when his facility gets busy, trucks are lined up out the gate and around the corner and down River Road, and he was saying well “it should be somewhere near my facility.” So these are opportunities that we think are worth considering, we’re looking for input on them and ideas about how to make them best working.

And another interesting thing that has come up in conversation, one of the issues in Surrey is, has nothing to do with the operation of the container trucking industry, it has to do with the parking of those trucks after hours, because a lot of those truck drivers live in Surrey. So Surrey’s big deal is container trucks parked on residential streets. So again, there may be an opportunity to have a facility which serves one purpose during the day and serves another purpose at night. So these are all things that we are looking into with partners interested in feedback on it.

Q: Jeremy McCall: You sure do know a lot about trucks and they are very important but I guess other people in the room probably have some other questions. Can I just ask a question about coal? To what extent does this program take into account the fact that there seems to be a plan to double the throughput of coal through Deltaport, according to the Province’s news release on November the 7th? Does that mean there’s going to be more coal trains? Is that all taken into account in this project?

A: Cliff Stewart: Westshore Terminals is currently undertaking a project to increase their capacity from 29 to 33 million tonnes/year, and the only thing that really benefits coal from this project is the additional running track that runs between 72nd St. and the mouth or the neck of the causeway means that most of the time they’ll have a clear path into or out of their storage tracks. In fact, if you look on the front cover here, this is in fact a rendering of what it would look like in the future and the coal tracks on the right-hand side of that drawing is what exists today. There are 4 tracks. Most of the length of the causeway is a bit down where the rail in the yard
begins. There’s actually only space for three tracks and this project doesn’t make any changes to that.

Q: *Jeremy McCall*: So the two systems on the causeway don’t interact? It’s like they’re like two independent systems.

A: *Cliff Stewart*: Yeah, it’s interesting. Although I’m always told they don’t interact, if you look on Google Earth you’ll see a coal train sitting on the container side but as a general rule the 4 tracks on the North side are dedicated to coal.

C: *Darrell Desjardin*: But certainly Westshore’s increased capacity would be picked up in cumulative effects assessment for the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project, and the information we have from Westshore is that, their increase in coal capacity to just a shade under 33 million, which would be an extra train every other day, is what they are looking for. So that will be included in the final assessment.

C: *Cliff Stewart*: Thank you, Darrell. But I hadn’t heard the Provincial news release about doubling coal.

C: *Chris Chok*: So the Port of Prince Rupert is actually undertaking an expansion of the Ridley Terminal, it’s actually going through the preliminary EA stages

C: *Cliff Stewart*: Yes, just to put it in context, that’s going from I think 6 to 12 million tons. And Westshore is going from, as I say, capacity of 29, I think they did 25 last year and they are on track to do about twenty-six this year.

C: *Darrell Desjardin*: Yeah, their theoretical capacity is 29. But last year was 25, so yeah they have a ways to go before they meet their capacity and their current goal is to take it up to 32.5.

Q: *Myron Rozumiak*: Cliff, these consultation topics we've gone through before, these are the priorities?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: And certainly we are very interested if there are other things people would like to give us input on relative to trucking.

Q: *Myron Rozumiak*: These are priorities in terms of what? If you had to rank them in terms of importance, how would you rank them, for you?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: That’s what we’re asking you to do. That’s what we’re asking your input on. So we’re going to take this opportunity to plug the feedback form. On page 29, we’re asking for your level of agreement with each of those items and essentially what we’re looking for is community feedback on which of these should Port Metro Vancouver pursue further. I think what the port is committed to do is look at that in conjunction with what makes sense and go from there.

A: *Darrell Desjardin*: Yeah, and any additional ones. These are intended to be thought provoking, so rank those how you feel they are relevant in your own ranking but you may have another mitigation suggestion.

Q: *Myron Rozumiak*: But you’re working on them now?

A: *Darrell Desjardin*: Yes.

Q: *Myron Rozumiak*: Right. So what is most important in your view?

A: *Cliff Stewart*: I think they all matter. I don’t think any one of them by itself will get as much as all of them working together, but providing designated truck waiting areas is one of those issues which pretty much everyone can agree that it should happen, but as to where it should happen
then you start to have very different opinions. So I want to move on because there are a number of other issues that we are looking for feedback on.

C: **Myron Rozumiak:** I just want to say that you didn’t answer my question.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** And again, because we’re here to get your feedback.

Q: **Myron Rozumiak:** I don’t like that, personally, because maybe a little bit of knowledge is dangerous, but having worked at the port for a long time I have seen the truck dispatch system they’re talking about now for seven years. Do you need everybody to buy into that or is it part of the project with four or five major players? So I know you’re working on it, you have to be. I know you’re looking for what we think should be the priorities but I’d like to know what you’re working on. So, I agree with you, say “hey, that looks pretty good.” I wouldn’t mind that feedback as a reference point, but personally...

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Part of the reason that these are here as consultation items is because none of them are universally embraced. So for example, designated truck waiting areas, whoever ends up as the neighbor of the designated truck waiting area may not like it. The truck notification tracking system, sounds like a no-brainer right? But the people who don’t follow the rules aren’t in favor of that, for example.

Q: **Myron Rozumiak:** I understand what you’re saying and I agree. I just don’t hear you answering my question.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Your question was which do I think is the most important? And I said I think each one of them is equally important because none of them by themselves will ultimately give as much value as all of them pursued. Using the 80%/20% rule, we can get 80% there on every one of these, that’s far better than getting any one of them perfect.

**Agricultural Land**

C: **Darrell Desjardin:** Okay. So one of the project elements, is the rail development being undertaken by BC Rail. It’s part of the Provincial undertaking, or part of the project. The port, as part of our commitment to corporate social responsibility, is working with BC Rail and we want to more than meet the intents of the Agricultural Land Commission and we actually want to add social value to the agricultural offsets. That’s why you see under the consultation topics some of the elements of how the agricultural productivity could be compensated for. We also recognize that agricultural land has wildlife on it, and in the wildlife assessments we’ll talk about are actually looking at that component. One of the key elements that the Port has undertaken, working with the Agricultural Land Commission, the Delta Farmers Institute and the affected farmers, is to actually identify for them what they feel are the most relevant compensation topics to pursue, but we also recognize that agriculture resonates with the community of Delta and resonates with the citizens of British Columbia. So that’s why put out there as a consultation topic. So my answer to your question is the top soil relocation well that’s good practice. We’ll do that. Other elements of that will be sort of dictated by what the local farmers say, what the Delta Farmers’ Institute and perhaps actually any comments we get from the community and how they value agriculture and this requirement does require approval from the Agricultural Land Commission, so the submission will be going in once we finish the public consultation on DTRRIP. So certainly the element of the agricultural offsets will be included in the CEAA screening.

Q: **Jeremy McCall:** Could you just explain the Option Lands? Do you own some land out there? Who has got the Option?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, they are actually no longer optioned, they are owned but they are called the Option Lands by BC Rail and it’s a 60 metre (200 foot) wide strip, immediately south of the existing 100 ft wide right-of-way, running essentially from the BC Rail yard office at the neck of the causeway east to Arthur Drive. And if you want to know what it looks like, the new 41B overpass straddles and the mid-column is pretty much on the boundary between the existing 100 ft right-of-way and the new 200 ft right-of-way.

Q: **Jeremy McCall:** So what are the widths of the existing and the addition?

A: **Cliff Stewart:** The existing is 100ft wide, and the new one is 200 ft wide, or 30 and 60 meters.

Q: **Jeremy McCall:** So tripling?

A: **Darrell Desjardin:** Yes, tripling. It’s an artifact of how the lands when Robert’s Bank was developed, starting in the 70s, was actually built by the national Government and the National Harbours, and the Province, the Premier of the day, Prime Minister W.A.C Bennett, actually created the BC Harbours Board and expropriated all of the farmland adjacent to the terminal with the intent of actually blocking access to tide-water. It was the Corporation of Delta that actually provided access for the original rail line to come down into the terminal. In 1996, under the NDP Government, all of these lands which had actually been farmed by the various farmers had been there since the expropriation and then eventually sold back. However, as part of that, there was identified this 200 ft strip, and it was always referred to as the Option Lands. And BC Rail went to the Agricultural Land Commission and exercised that option in 2008.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** In 2009, the option was set to expire. So in 2008, it required the approval of the Agricultural Land Commission because it required a subdivision of that land to and that land has been farmed, and continues to be farmed today.

A: **Darrell Desjardin:** And in fact, the best practice will be to continue to farm that land until the project actually receives a favorable environmental assessment. We don’t want it to lie fallow in that period. So that’s the agricultural land and part of that component is we will have an agricultural impact assessment looking at the relative productivity of those lands as well as a wildlife impact assessment. So jumping ahead into the environmental assessment process, this is probably the second of two unique projects that the Port, as a regulative authority under the Canada Marine Act is more or less standing alone. The other project is the Vancouver Airport Fuel Consortium, where the port actually has to issue a lease. When we ensure lease for the project to proceed, that triggers the Environmental Assessment Act review, a screening. In that case, no other federal agency identified that they were a regulated authority or responsible authority and that’s the case for this project. This project is actually being built within the existing footprint of the road or the rail or actually on lands that don’t have an impact on fish-bearing waters or on migratory birds and as such, our notice of commencement. So, and maybe this might answer the question as part of the commencement notice that was released in the middle of October, was within 14 days of making a decision that we actually have a project, we have to issue a note of commencement. What we realized, when we were doing the environmental screening because this project actually triggers a screening, which is the 90% of the Environment Assessment reviews go through, is that the public and the community would be much more familiar with the comprehensive study process which is a step process where the public gets an opportunity to comment on the project description and the factors and the scope of the factors to be considered in the project assessment, as well as the comprehensive study assessment report. We released the project description and the scope of the assessment and
the comments we received back, because it was a comprehensive study which was a 30-day
time period, ours was 16 days or 18 days, which is a very short time.

C: *Jeremy McCall:* It's very short.

**Environmental Studies and Assessment**

C: *Darrell Desjardin:* So we’ve learned from that journey, actually what we are going to do when
the Environmental Assessment is completed, and I’ll walk you through the studies of what we’re
looking at, the target is to hopefully have the CEAA screening completed by the end of January,
in draft form. That will then be released for public review. And there would be a 45 day
commentary on that document.

Q: *Jeremy McCall:* Isn’t Environment Canada the responsible authority for the wildlife aspect? For
the loss of the agricultural land?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* No, their act is the *Migratory Birds Act* which involves taking of the animals
and therefore not impacting. However, as part of the requirement for the Environmental
Assessment, we issue what is called a Federal coordination letter, which is a letter that goes out
to all of the federal authorities as well as the provincial agencies identifying the project
description, the factors and the scope of factors to be considered, and asking those agencies to
declare whether they are either regulatory authority or responsible authority, i.e. they have to
issue an authorization or permit, or, in the case of the *Environmental Assessment Act*, can
provide federal technical advice via federal authority in the process. So to date, and the review
comments for the federal agencies close around the middle of December just after the public
comment period, DFO has confirmed that they are not a regulative authority but they would be
providing advice. Transport Canada has confirmed that they are neither a regulative authority
nor providing advice. Health Canada has confirmed that they will provide technical advice and
we are awaiting responses from environment Canada, and actually Environment Canada is two-
fold. It is environment Canada under the CEPA (*Canadian Environmental Protection Act*) as well
as the *Migratory Birds Act*. And we are also waiting for comments on the *Environmental
Protection Act*. And we are also waiting for comments back from the Community of
Transportation Agents. So those comments once we identify all of the agencies that are present,
we would actually form a technical review committee where we’d invite the federal agencies,
the representatives from the municipalities, Corporation of Delta, Tsawwassen First Nation, to
actually sit down and review the draft screening document before it’s released to the public.

Q: *Jeremy McCall:* That’s like the report?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* Yeah it's the Environmental Assessment Report.

Q: *Jeremy McCall:* And there are no provincial triggers on this project?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* Yes, there are no provincial triggers, however, we actually have invited the
British Columbia Environmental Assessment Agency to actually observe the process and
participate.

Q: *Jeremy McCall:* They haven’t got the resources?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* There are no provincial triggers even though the railways are on provincial
lands, it is actually below the threshold for a BC trigger.

Q: *Jeremy McCall:* Is the public going to get an opportunity to comment on the screening report?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* Yes, and I'll walk through the studies. The screening report will be one
document, which is the Environmental Impact Assessment, and all of the technical studies will
be made public documents. In fact actually one of the things we’ve learned about this project, and we did this with Deltaport Third Berth is because there are so many technical studies that have been done by the Port and by government agencies -we provided a central clearing house for all of these documents to be obtained electronically so all of the panel reviews that have taken place at Roberts Bank either by the Port or by Environment Canada of DFO as well as any information that’s been used to inform the process from SFU or UBC are online. Early in the New Year we are actually hoping to have all of the studies on the website. All of the Deltaport Third Berth studies are actually on the Port’s website but we wanted to provide a central clearing house for all of the historical studies.

Q: **Dianne Ramage**: They’re not posted to the CEAA website and I couldn’t find them. Are they posted there as part of the review?

A: **Darrell Desjardin**: No. The CEAA Registry only requires you to post the Notice of Commencement and the Decision Statement.

Q: **Dianne Ramage**: So this is voluntary disclosure that you are doing with these legal documents?

A: **Darrell Desjardin**: Yes. It’s voluntary.

Q: **Jeremy McCall**: Which website?

A: **Darrell Desjardin**: That’s the CEAA Registry website. We’ll actually give you a link to that as well as to the Port website.

Q: **Dianne Ramage**: If I was on the website right now, there’s a loop, it takes you right back to the homepage, it doesn’t give you anything

C: **Evangeline Englezos**: You mean that you can’t access it?

C: **Dianne Ramage**: Your website doesn’t take you to it, it gives you PMV applications but it doesn’t disclose any of the things that you’re applying for, only people that are applying for applications from you. But not your applications.

C: **Darrell Desjardin**: That’s because they are actually in a separate section of the website.

C: **Dianne Ramage**: Yeah, but when you try to search it, it just sends you back to the home page. Just to let you know that there’s some kind of loop.

C: **Evangeline Englezos**: So it’s our search mechanism within our website? I’ll take that back. It’s under Projects, like on our home page, there is a section on Projects and it’s all there but we’ll take that feedback back and see, it must be something to do with our search.

C: **Darrell Desjardin**: On page 19, there’s actually the Port website. So one of the requirements under the CEAA Registry is that every document posted must be translated in French and English, so one of the documents we will be posting is the full project description once we finish the translation. That project description is on our website and we will then publish any notifications on where you can actually obtain the reports to review and then if there is a request, we will translate the sections if people want to see them in French. But what we did for Deltaport Third Berth, the technical studies remained as English documents and was just the final screening report. That is the process and what we are also doing is that we’ve received a number of comments on the project description. We are actually contacting those individuals, unlike the **British Columbia Environmental Assessment Act** process, where it’s implied that when you submit an application, it is a public document, under the federal process there is a privacy issue. So we are contacting those individuals that provided documents and once we have received affirmative acknowledgement, we will be posting those letters in their entirety on our site, the project site.
Q: Jeremy McCall: But the BCEAA doesn’t do that, do they? They just put that stuff up right away.
A: Darrell Desjardin: It’s a different privacy law and it’s implied in the writing of the Process, so if you look at the federal CEEA Registry, they don’t post any of the letters.
Q: Jeremy McCall: Well the Joint Review Panel, they’re posting stuff right away. The JRP?
A: Darrell Desjardin: Yeah, that’s a panel process. So under a panel process, and that is a slightly different process, and our experience with panels is that when you submit something to a panel, it goes into the public domain.
Q: Otto Langer: Terminal 2 will be a panel?
A: Darrell Desjardin: Yes, it will, Otto.
A: Cliff Stewart: Well we assume it will be a panel, it will be up to the ministers.

Environmental Studies Currently Underway

C: Darrell Desjardin: Turning over to page 20, what we decided to do based on the extensive work that we did for Deltaport Third Berth is that we’ve continued with the environmental study process. We are looking at a lot of valued ecosystem components, so for example, the terrestrial environment, this is wildlife, vegetation, species at risk, and as a federal authority, we are captured by the Federal Species at Risk Act. As Cliff mentioned, there is no direct impact to the marine environment, however, there are indirect effects to the marine environment. Some of the watercourses adjacent to some of the rail yards go out on the causeway, with a potential accident or malfunction could have a discharge to marine waters. So this particular assessment is picking up on that aspect.
Q: Jeremy McCall: Is the footprint of the causeway unchanged?
A: Darrell Desjardin: Yes, it’s unchanged. At least there are no works beyond the high water mark. The works are about 3 meters in from the high water mark. Another aspect of the marine environment, and this actually relates to the cumulative effects assessments, is that Roberts Bank is within the Southern Resident Killer Whale critical habitat. DFO and the Port have been working with Environment Canada on a number of operating procedures and monitoring programs, so the effects of the project, and any increase in vessel traffic and the impact on the marine mammals would be considered in this. Of note, is with the increased capacity of Deltaport, we have not seen an increase in vessels. In fact actually, the number of vessels, coming to Deltaport is eerily similar to what was actually coming in 1998-99. And the reason for that is, that the vessels are getting bigger.
Q: Dianne Ramage: Darrell, could you compare that number to what it was previously in 2008 when the economy started to slow down globally and your container traffic slowed down as well? So is this what you’re saying, that there has been no increase from ’98, but from July 2008?
A: Darrell Desjardin: We have vessel numbers for every year.
A: Cliff Stewart: Yes, but to put it in context, in 2010, which was the busiest year in Port history for containers, there were fewer vessel calls in total, for 2.5 million TEUs than in 1999, for 1 million TEUs.
Q: Dianne Ramage: But when the global economy improves, what do you anticipate that to mean? In ten years from now, when they say that this recession has passed. Could you anticipate, could you calculate the increase based on your forecasts?
A: Darrell Desjardin: Oh yes, the increase in the number of vessels.
Q: Dianne Ramage: What is that number?
A: Cliff Stewart: The vessels are still getting bigger and will continue to get bigger.
Q: Dianne Ramage: What do you anticipate that to be?
A: Darrell Desjardin: I couldn’t quote you that Diane.
Q: Dianne Ramage: You have done those though?
A: Darrell Desjardin: Yes, we have. It is a critical component in the cumulative effects assessment as it drives both the air quality assessment as well as the impacts on the marine mammals so what we did was, we had a couple actual a combination of marine economists doing a prediction of what the forecast would be and then marine engineers looking at the world-wide container fleet make-up and looking at composition of our fleet calling on our port and then prince Rupert and then we did a high, medium, low case scenario, similar to what is shown in here for the forecast for the vessel calls. So that’s going to be a key element for the assessment.
Q: Dianne Ramage: That will that be part of what is published?
A: Darrell Desjardin: Yes, those numbers will be published.
Q: Dianne Ramage: On the website?
A: Darrell Desjardin: Published on the website. We now have an opportunity to look at those projections and if there are any changes, provide an explanation as to why those changes have occurred due to a change in how marine carriers are actually deploying their fleets or how terminals are handling. On page twenty-one, some key studies with coastal sea birds and water fowl. Again, the agricultural lands are the ones that are being used. And terrestrial habitat, however, the proximity of Deltaport, to the Roberts Bank and International Bird Area is a significant study. One of the benefits that we have is that we can do bird surveys and bird studies and we have been doing those since 2003, which we have continued through our adoptive management strategy through our Deltaport Bird Project. And we will continue going forward into this project as well so we will be looking at what those facts will be.
Q: Jeremy McCall: Are you taking advantage of bird counts by Bird Studies Canada or the Christmas bird count?
A: Darrell Desjardin: We are. Actually that data is being factored into and we are sharing data as well.
Q: Jeremy McCall: But the most useful data for that would be the Bird Studies Canada and the Coastal Water Bird Survey.
A: Darrell Desjardin: Yes.
C: Jeremy McCall: Which is eight months a year and gives pretty good indication of trends. It is much better than spot studies like this, snapshots, so make sure you get that. It is readily available from Bird Studies Canada
C: Darrell Desjardin: These studies were done in snapshots but they are following the others.
Q: Jeremy McCall: They haven’t been done year after year after year, have they?
A: Darrell Desjardin: These studies have actually been done since 2003. But depending on the location of it, they are actually seasonal. They are every two weeks.
Q: Jeremy McCall: Year round?
A: Darrell Desjardin: Year round. I believe we are sharing our data and bird studies data. That was certainly the agreement we reached earlier but I will confirm that. Water quality. Obviously we are concerned about both surface quality and ground water issues like the track and rail.
maintenance area that Cliff mentioned. It also gives us an opportunity, with recent developments with the airway, the only refilling that took place is the switch locomotive on the causeway. Now, CP Rail is refuelling their line-haul locomotives because they have no place to refuel them between here and Field, BC. So we have an opportunity to actually have a designated refueling facility as part of this project.

Q: **Dianne Ramage:** Are CP Rail’s works going to be reviewed separately?
A: **Darrell Desjardin:** No. That’s all part of this application. So for example, the CP fuel spill and fuel management plan would be part of the submission and we are anticipating that the environment counting will be advising us as well. That’s one of the components that we have asked for in the past. Any potential discharges under the Fisheries Act, that’s where the management plans come in to this component as well.

Q: **Jeremy McCall:** Sorry, where is the fuel?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** It’s on this map. It ends up as being part of the rail car repair facility.
Q: **Jeremy McCall:** It says repair tracks. They can’t find anywhere else to do that?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well their facilities in the lower mainland are in Coquitlam, not in Deltaport.
Q: **Otto Langer:** Yeah, when you said CP’s only facilities are here, that’s just for this track system?
C: **Jeremy McCall:** So yes, well it seems a pity that they have to use this area to refuel.
A: **Darrell Desjardin:** Right now and there is no prohibition that they refuel all along Deltaport Way whenever they can actually bring a fuel truck in. This has been a complaint that has been brought forward to us by a number of residents in the community. CP Rail is regulated by Transport Canada so they aren’t breaking any regulations or rules. However, this can be a better practice by actually having a proper facility that has containment and control.
C: **Cliff Stewart:** And just be clear, it’ll probably still be truck-based fuelling but it will have a spill-catch facility.
C: **Darrell Desjardin:** Yeah, from our perspective it is better to have a truck there than having storage of fuel.
Q: **Jeremy McCall:** It is within a couple hundred meters of the highest concentration of biofilm, which is what the sandpipers feed on. You have a fuelling depot or whatever you want to call it. Well, probably the biggest hot spot for migratory birds in the mainland. It doesn’t make a lot of sense.
A: **Darrell Desjardin:** And Jeremy, to be clear, we are still in the early stages of trying to find the best place because and we need to find the best operational place. Also we are well aware of the biofilm proximity in that area. That is identified as one of our key valued ecosystem components.

So turning over to page 22, fish and fish habitat, and again, there are no direct effects. Some of our early fish work has confirmed that there is no salmon up there. We can identify how we are treating these fish-bearing waters during construction and also operation. On the air quality side, one of the legacy projects from Deltaport Third Berth is that we now have an air quality station at Tsawwassen. It was funded by the Port, and the Port actually pays for the maintenance of that facility. It was cited by a technical advisory committee that involved Environment Canada, the Province, Metro Vancouver, the Corporation of Delta, and Tsawwassen First Nation. And an air quality expert from the port was involved in that as well. So
one of the benefits is that we actually have real-time air quality data that we can now compare to our models in the past. Happily, we were over-predicting the effects of Robert Bank on the community but this actually will serve to make a very robust air-quality assessment. So we are looking at all the air-quality containments that have greenhouse gasses. The reason I was a tad late is I was just meeting with Seattle and Tacoma. We are working with Seattle and Tacoma on initiatives to produce criteria for containments and greenhouse gasses. We are part of the Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy, and we report annually on that. One initiative is the anti-idling technology, and focuses on our Truck Licensing System. The container truck platform which is the cleanest engine platform out there requires all of our trucks have to have annual testing. Then depending on the results, they may get a one year exception. We have to watch for air care and at the same time you also have to pass a safety requirement and this is in addition to the safety inspections required by the Province.

Q: Jeremy McCall: With ship to shore power – is it going to be available at Deltaport?

A: Darrell Desjardina: At Canada Place, both our east and west berths have ship-to-shore power capabilities. In 2011, we had six ships that had the ability to connect to shore power. They were Princess Cruise Lines and Holland America. Certainly from the cruise line perspective, we have standardization for shore power. So one of the projects that the environmental programs embarked on last year was working with all of the terminal operators: Vanterm, Centerm, Deltaport, and Fraser Surrey Docks. This was based on some work that had been done with the US ports -Seattle, Tacoma, but also LA Long Beach. One of the challenges that we have on the container side is that there is no international standard yet for shore power unlike the cruise lines. Prince Rupert, which was the first port in Canada to have shore power for container vessels was installed in March of 2011. They have not connected to a ship because no ships have shore power capability. I think it is less than 6% of the world’s container fleet has the ability to connect to shore power. However, the program that we are working on right now is to actually accelerate that.

A: Cliff Stewart: Short answer is yes, as soon as it makes sense. As soon as there are ships that can use it, we’ll see that in place.

C: Darrell Desjardina: Another significant component, Jeremy, and this may actually drive shore power, is that in 2011 under the International Maritime Organization, Canada, the US and France signed onto the North American Emission Control Area which set requirements for the control of sulphur dioxide emissions and nitrous oxide emissions. Specifically, this was a commitment that the Port had undertaken for Deltaport Third Berth with Environment Canada and Transport Canada to accelerate it. We are very pleased that starting in 2012 the regulations will be in place. And specifically in 2012, it starts at 1%. And then of course, 2015 and 2020, there are some substantial reductions in those fuel requirements. One aspect that they are looking at is the ability to have shore power to actually result in a blended fuel mixture throughout the voyage resulting in overall emission reduction. Shore power also addresses noise issues. The generators on these container vessels run at a certain frequency that causes concerns to residents in Delta and Vancouver. So moving to shore power and having the ability to, as the industry calls it “cold ironing”, addresses both noise and air quality.

C: Cliff Stewart: The beauty is once the technology issue is settled, we can get plugs that fit, the low sulphur fuel requirement making a very strong business case for shore power.

Q: Myron Rozumiak: How much does it cost to put in shore power and how long does it take them to do it?
A: **Cliff Stewart:** When we redeveloped Centerm in 2003, we installed all the technology. There’s a space in the electrical room for the switches, there’s a space for the transformers, but none of it has been installed because we still haven’t got it on the ship side. We don’t know what it cost Rupert, but it would be in the millions.

A: **Darrell Desjardin:** So for the east and west berths, including the transformer, not including landside costs, it was $4.5 million per berth. And that took us five years, but the biggest component was working with BC Hydro to get acceptable rates because container vessels have big power demands. Their power draw is anywhere from 10 to 13 mega-watts and for container vessels, from 3 to 5 depending on the size. And so, BC Hydro, obviously, in order to provide that power, has to develop what is called an interruptible rate. But they also gave us a forty-five minute window so if they are losing power in the system we have to disconnect. So that’s what Prince Rupert used to get their commercial rates, otherwise, it would cost you more to plug in than burning fuel at dockside.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Technology is the hurdle right now, and as soon as that hurdle is cleared, there will be a strong push to get that to happen. Part of the reason we didn’t explicitly include it as part of this project was because of the time frame. We weren’t clear that the technology hurdle would have been settled because it has to be agreed upon first and then the ships will get retrofitted. All new ships that are being built are being built to allow for it, but they haven’t actually sorted out the last piece because they haven’t agreed on what that looks like.

C: **Dianne Ramage:** Nobody wants to be the Betamax versus the VHS.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Exactly and that’s why this work with the IMO is so important because that is what will then unleash the opportunity.

C: **Darrell Desjardin:** Prince Rupert rolled the dice and went with one of the three systems that are front-runners. The Cavotec system, which they installed, is the one that Cosco had installed and actually used. And certainly the basis, as Cliff mentioned, Centerm and Vanterm are fully equipped, and the Deltaport Third Berth is. So our thinking was if the ships are going to Prince Rupert and coming here, then it is a matter of us putting that cable in, but they haven’t got the ships yet. It’s something we’re working on, and certainly one of the studies that will be available which looks both at the technological challenges but also the power supply as well.

Further studies include, noise and vibration studies, archaeology studies, noise and light visual impacts as well as impacts on the community to emergency response and hospital issues. A fairly significant component of this project is the cumulative effects assessment, which is going to look at this project, based on past projects and any future projects. So it would include Terminal 2 as the Deltaport Third Berth did and these are a list, on page 25. It’s entirely possible we may have a much more fulsome list once we complete the studies. But certainly the cumulative effects system is maybe the most robust study looking at past, present and future.

Q: **Jeremy McCall:** I don’t want to be disrespectful, Darrell but I believe that Terminal 2 was pulled out of the Deltaport Third Berth cumulative effects assessment.

A: **Darrell Desjardin:** It is actually in the cumulative effects assessment for Deltaport Third Berth. When we did it for T2 we didn’t use an ECA, we didn’t know it existed, and so now one of the tasks we’ve asked our consultant to do, is to go back and look at the cumulative affects assessment that we did for T2 and compare for DP3. And try to explain, the regulatory changes as well as the technological changes that have resulted.
Q: **Otto Langer:** So when it comes to cumulative effects from the past, they are being fully addressed? The agencies like DFO say they are not the responsible authority on this issue. So they are accepting the status quo on power lines? They are saying those issues have been resolved? And since they are withstanding, until they are resolved, no improvement should be made to the site? How is that being handled, I’m confused?

A: **Darrell Desjardine:** Well it the case of DFO, we have done a number of cumulative assessment studies, which started in 2000, and one of the recommendations that came out of the 90s. Port authorities prior to that were not subject to the federal environment process, they were subject to a different process and therefore cumulative effects were not required for port authorities. So starting in 2000, the port convened a working group which involved all the agencies, Corporation Delta, First Nations, and the industries in and around the port produced sort of a baseline of what the cumulative effects are going forward. You identified the overhead power lines, and we have been working on this. DFO signed off on the DP3 environmental assessment.

Q: **Otto Langer:** And to look into the future projects, what do you presume as Terminal 2? You have to know what it looks like and my impression is that you don’t know what it looks like. So how will you assess the impacts of Terminal 2?

A: **Darrell Desjardine:** Well, we’ve got some concepts that we’ve shown in 2003, that Jeremy has actually alluded to. We think it’ll be a 3 berth terminal, we’ll have a land area and we would rather be precautionary so we will take the larger land areas and assume a worst case scenario in regards to trucks and trains and no optimization. The purpose of cumulative effects is to say: “Is this project that we are doing today in any way affecting the environmental baseline such that future projects will have a higher burden to reduce the environmental impact?” Or this project cannot proceed until you actually meet your environment needs.

Q: **Otto Langer:** And I have an overall, question which I have been asking for quite a while, about the Vancouver Airport Fuel Project. You handled that quite differently. You got into a harmonization agreement with the Province. They were doing a voluntary review of a project that didn’t have any triggers. Why did you go that direction with that project and go a totally different route with this project?

A: **Darrell Desjardine:** It was the proponent that opted in. It was the VAFFC that opted in.

Q: **Otto Langer:** But to some degree, you are the responsible authority because those are federal lands?

A: **Darrell Desjardine:** Certainly when they opted in, DFO, Transport Canada, and Environment Canada, were at the table in some way, shape or form as responsible authorities and they pulled away. So basically, it is a report to who has to issue a lease and the BCEAA Process.

Q: **Otto Langer:** Should the Port be doing an assessment of themselves? It’s the wolf looking after the sheep. You can say “no comment”- I appreciate that.

A: **Cliff Stewart:** Well, it’s really not up to us. We are only responding to the regulations, which exist.

A: **Darrell Desjardine:** The environmental assessment has to stand on its own merit. We subscribe to corporate responsibility when we do environmental assessments.

Q: **Jeremy McCall:** But who judges it, if it isn’t satisfactory? If there’s no over-riding authority to say that passes or it doesn’t?
A: **Darrell Desjardin:** One, it’s the court of public opinion Jeremy. If you don’t think it actually addresses issues then we’ll hear about that. Also, engaging with the regulatory agencies, they actually bring their concerns to the table. So everyone has license to challenge us.

C: **Jeremy McCall:** I see.

C: **Darrell Desjardin:** In an ideal world, there would be a super regulator that would actually regulate all products.

Q: **Jeremy McCall:** How come it doesn’t fall into a terminal fuel process?

A: **Darrell Desjardin:** Because we are not actually shipping oil. Terminal pollution is related to the shipping of the hydrocarbon based projects. Or it could be a bulk, if there was a certain amount of bulk. So if you were building a new bulk tunnel you could have terminal fuel process.

C: **Chris Chok:** I certainly learned a lot from this discussion over there. Turning to page 26, just before we wrap up here.

Q: **Dianne Ramage:** I’d like to make a couple comments that are not necessarily linked to any particular regulation or any regulatory government agency but about sustainability and looking at 50 and 100 year plans. I’m concerned about damage that is being done, and the U.N. World Report on water which was published in February of 2009 talks about how 700 million people need support.

We were concerned about the language in the press and as you said, the court of public opinion, which I’m really glad you mentioned Darrell. This is where the ultimate decision should come from, well it won’t be, because the decision is going to be made by the government. The language that is used in the press about “the ability to make revenue and move goods could be throttled by the public”. According to public opinion, if we decided that we wanted to be under scenario three or four. We are talking about public opinion forcing change and restrictions upon Port Metro Vancouver. We need community, everyone to be together to accommodate and adapt to the changes that are coming, and the incoming immigrants. Someone representing the Port saying that we don’t need to have farmland, or that we are here to import your groceries for you from around the world, actually causes people to be against the project.

Now you’ve got all of these people and it’s amazing the negative backlash by the language that is used. It could be your biggest challenge, people that are going to challenge you on peak oil and say that you are building up a huge industry that is going to be dependent upon people. That’s why, our concern is about cumulative impacts. And that taxpayer money comes to this. There is a lack of looking at a 50 year plan and a 100 year plan and being able to explain that to the public so that they did support you but telling people that is polarizing.

C: **Cliff Stewart:** Okay.

C: **Dianne Ramage:** Is this a smart thing to do to the farmland with the resources that we have? This might be avoided.

C: **Darrell Desjardin:** Certainly, we are taking the impacts to agricultural activity seriously in this process. And under the mantra of sustainability we want to not only replace the agricultural productivity, we also want to have some social value associated.

Q: **Dianne Ramage:** Some of the dry land port option that were suggested, would they not in any way require just the trucks to put them on the trains? We will sort your containers here because they aren’t going to Vancouver anyway. Do we need to pay for farmland, when we can truck it? Or put it on a train so we don’t truck it? Put it on a train that is fuel-efficient and use land that is less arable and create economy and drops in other areas.
A: **Darrell Desjardin**: In fact, actually it’s the majority of containers go by railway. It balances between 60 and 70%.

Q: **Dianne Ramage**: We want to know if the rail will be reviewed as part of this process, as well as the South Fraser Perimeter Road?

A: **Darrell Desjardin**: Yes that will be part of the cumulative effects assessment. And any rail upgrades, for example, in many ways it’s spoken in this document, the overpass, which will also be there and that is actually separating road and rail. So that will also be a factor in the cumulative effects assessment.

A: **Cliff Stewart**: And conversely, when the South Fraser Perimeter Road was assessed it looked at significant large increases in container traffic.

Q: **Dianne Ramage**: The public has been involved with Metro Vancouver for over a decade, developing their sustainability plans and updating them and there is concern that some of the plans may not agree with what has gone on with the Regional Sustainability Plan. There seems to be a public document and value that is expressed is not being addressed in the project and that the project may actually harm some of the intended public goodwill and the desire of values.

A: **Darrell Desjardin**: Well, we did sit down with Metro Vancouver, particularly on Deltaport, and the Third Berth and the expansion of Deltaport, and it was consistent with the plan at that time. And it tied into SFPR, and I think one of the port elements is that the protection of the ecosystem, the FREMP coded areas, as well as the agricultural land and I think this project is consistent with that.

Q: **Gordon Kibble**: I have a question on page 24. You were talking about the country folk, and some different archaeological sites. Now that would be village areas in the broader study area. Appropriate archaeological monitoring. What exactly do you mean by that and how are these sites going to be protected?

A: **Darrell Desjardin**: Well, first of all the sites – and this project does not directly affect the sites. However, because we are actually stripping away topsoil on the farmland, we will have an archaeologist oversee that excavation work and that archaeologist will be shadowed, and in this case would be by First Nation. So yeah, that study will be looking at whether there are any features to report on. That will all be public.

Q: **Gordon Kibble**: So you say there is a map, now will that be public?

A: **Darrell Desjardin**: Yes. All of the documents at this stage will be public. Nobody has actually taken a CEAA screening to this level of community engagement. We are engaging the feedback from these sessions to determine how best to engage with the community on the actual technical studies.

Q: **Gordon Kibble**: That’s why I’m asking this. If something is discovered. What is going to be the next approach to taking care of it?

A: **Darrell Desjardin**: Well, if it is a site of significance then it would be excluded for the area and recovered. We’re fortunate that this area has been farmland, so we don’t expect anything.

Q: **Otto Langer**: Do you have a list of all your consultants that will be working on the project?

A: **Darrell Desjardin**: I could certainly find that.

Q: **Otto Langer**: I’ve been through 40 years of a lot of these studies, and when it comes to agricultural capability, we don’t want to hear consultants say that it’s wet soil or it’s cold or not worth much. We don’t need bullish*. It’s the best agricultural land in Canada. Why didn’t we
have the public comment on the consultants, because there are consultants and then there are real consultants? I’m confused by the process. Shouldn’t these sessions have been held before the cut off for the public comment period on the studies?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* There will be another public comment period. The professionals doing the work will be identified. Certainly the feedback we have taken will ample time for more comments. Otto in a perfect world, you can always design a perfect consultation, this is a dialogue and we are open to suggestions.

Q: *Otto Langer:* One of the technical public comments was cut off but committee has continual input. I considered that a big mistake, and legally challengeable.

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* The intent is to publish this and share it. We are still trying to map out this process and how best to communicate this.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* I’m sorry - you just said something that left me a little confused. We are allowing the agencies to comment after the public comment period has closed. Are you saying that is happening here?

C: *Otto Langer:* No, that is for the airport fuel facility, but it could happen here.

C: *Jeremy McCall:* We were cut off on November 10th from an official standpoint. But the agencies are still commenting.

C: *Darrell Desjardin:* No the agencies are just declaring whether they are a regulatory body.

Q: *Otto Langer:* I don’t know if they are, but don’t fall into that trap. Who will chair the technical review committee?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* We have asked CEAA to do that, so we have someone watching that wolf or the fox.

**Opportunities to provide input regarding the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project**

C: *Chris Chok:* I just want to draw your attention to page 26 and just want to tell you what happens next. This explains what our process has been and where it is going. As I said earlier, we have three more meetings and two open houses as part of this consultation. We would very much like your feedback form. Open feedback until January 6. To close off this process, my company will be doing a consultation summary report, presenting to the port.

Q: *Dianne Ramage:* Open houses are not legal consultation. Why are they not called consultation meetings?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It is important to understand how this is voluntary. None of this is a requirement.

Q: *Dianne Ramage:* So how is this considered and decisions made? Is this part of corporate social responsibility? I think Cliff may have reference this?

A: *Darrell Desjardin:* The Canadian Port Authority regulations, these are the regulations that oblige the Port to follow CEAA.

A: *Cliff Stewart:* It doesn’t change anything. Under a CEAA screening there is a responsibility to post the notice of commencement, if you look at the inside cover, it might look like that.

C: *Darrell Desjardin:* The basic requirement of CEAA is to post a notice of commencement and the results.

Q: *Dianne Ramage:* It has happened differently in other consultations. Are other processes different?

A: *Cliff Stewart:* Small “c” consultation as opposed to large “C” consultation.
A: *Chris Chok:* The open houses will be very much like what we’ve done here with a drop-in format. Cliff and Darrell will be there.

C: *Otto Langer:* There is lots of room for confusion. I’m still confused. There are three levels of CEAA review.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* We are not elevating to a higher level. We are using many different process elements from a comprehensive study, but it isn’t. It’s a CEAA screening with significant voluntary elements of the community outreach and consultation process.

C: *Otto Langer:* Okay, you used that word and confused me.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Yes, and Darrell and I argue about that all the time.

C: *Darrell Desjardin:* Sorry Otto, I probably shouldn’t say that. It has to be defined as such. A CEAA screening with enhanced elements. A CEAA screening can go to a panel if there are significant impacts.

C: *Otto Langer:* If you can never again say comprehensive study, we’ll be happy, and if you can get Robin Silvester to say that farmland is good, we’ll be winning.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* Have a chat with the Delta Farmers Institute, because he had a talk with them last week. As he puts it, he was not misquoted, but taken significantly out of context.

Q: *Arno Schortinghaus:* Just a quick question. I’m with the Vancouver Cycling Coalition. A few years ago the Premier announced a project called “Experience the Fraser”, which was a cycling path along both sides of the Fraser. The south portion would extend down towards the ferry terminal. My question is: are there any plans to extend that path across the project?

A: *Evangeline Englezos:* I can probably talk about the river access a bit. We did have some meetings with folks from Metro Vancouver about this project. These were high level talks, but there were elements that were designed to showcase the river and the working port. This is quite an industrial area.

C: *Arno Schortinghaus:* We are working with the Tsawwassen First Nations to extend the path all the way down there. This port access way is quite a barrier. It would be quite desirable from a tourism and local point of view to have access along the shoreline.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* So you’re talking about having something where the dyke intersects the road and rail.

C: *Evangeline Englezos:* We will take that input because it is our planning department that is actually working with some folks right now to “Experience the River” and we had offered up to them that we would be interested to showcase, have the public access provided that safety concerns are addressed. So I’d be happy to talk to you about it.

C: *Cliff Stewart:* So first of all thank you very much for taking the time, to come out and just reiterate the importance of the feedback form and certainly we have on page 29, an additional blank open form if there is other things that we have not raised that you would like to talk about. And Arno that would be a great place to put that comment. And if that is not enough, we are certainly happy to take a written submission if that is easier for you as well. If you do have the time to do it today, that would be great because as Chris says, we assume most people if we don’t hear from at the meeting, we assume we won’t hear from.

Q: *Jeremy McCall:* Could I register a question with you please. I don’t expect an answer right now but this is about Port 2050. Robin Silvester wrote an article in the Vancouver Sun. I don’t think we were consulted on Port 2050, and I would like to know which environmental groups were
consulted for Port 2050 please. If you could get me a written answer to that question maybe Darrell.

A: *Evangeline Englezos*: We would be happy to let you know, it wasn’t a full-on public, it was a stakeholder group that was probably under one hundred people. In terms of looking at the scenarios, and where we will be going with it, the next step on that is consultation with the general public throughout 2012.

C: *Jeremy McCall*: Someone made the comment in the article about stakeholders being consulted, sustainability was important, we were not consulted. We have been a stakeholder as Darrell knows for ten years now, so we would like to know who was consulted.

C: *Evangeline Englezos*: No, absolutely, we’ll let you know that but we’ll also let you know how to participate in land use plan, because that is the next step for Port 2050. So we’d be happy to let you know about that.

C: *Chris Chok*: Thank you everyone.

*The meeting ended at 12:10pm*