

**PORT METRO VANCOUVER  
DELTAPORT TERMINAL, ROAD AND RAIL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT  
PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

**Open House Question and Answer Session – Delta  
December 10, 2011**

Notes from a question and answer session held as part of an Open House for the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project, December 10, 2011, 12:00 PM – 1:00 PM, at the Delta Town and Country Inn, Delta, BC.

**Stakeholders:** Bob Bowles, Friends of Rail for the Valley  
Eric Bysouth, Valley Transportation Advisory Committee  
Danielle Ferguson  
Barbary Howley  
Vicki Huntington, MLA, Delta South  
Michael Jefferson  
Roy Mufford  
Odete Pinho  
David Serry  
Adrian Whiteman  
Jean Whiteman

**Port Metro Vancouver:** Judy Kirk, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Facilitator  
Sheri Plewes, Vice President, Infrastructure Delivery  
Cliff Stewart, Director, Infrastructure Development  
Darrell Desjardin, Director, Sustainable Development  
Fred Culbert, Planning, Port Metro Vancouver  
Mike Zachary, Project Manager, WorleyParsons  
Mark Bliss, BKL Consulting  
Dan Hrebenyk, SENES Consulting  
Malcolm Smith, Hemmera  
Ashleigh Ballevena, Hemmera  
Eileen Miranda, Hemmera  
Matt Skinner, Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd., Meeting Recorder

*The record notes that the Question & Answer period commenced at 11:55 AM*

---

## Key Themes:

- Participants expressed concern around the infrastructure planning process, particularly communication and coordination between the various organizations involved, including Port Metro Vancouver, TransLink and Metro Vancouver.
  - Participants were concerned about operational practices at Deltaport, and discussed various sustainability initiatives that are being or could be implemented at the terminal.
  - Participants were interested in discussing the rationale around current rail patterns as well as alternate options.
- 

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

*Roundtable discussions were undertaken*

- C: *Judy Kirk:* My name is Judy Kirk. My company has been retained by the Port to assist with their public consultation. We have committed to perform question and answer periods in the community to give you an opportunity to be heard by one another, and also to ask the Port representatives here questions on the record. We have a computer here for my colleague to take notes, so please say your name for the record. We have about an hour. Part of my job is to keep to that, so we will wrap up by quarter to one. I will ask members of the Port team to introduce themselves, and then ask you to introduce yourself, and then we'll get started.
- C: *Cliff Stewart:* My name is Cliff Stewart, and I am the Director for Infrastructure Development for Port Metro Vancouver, and I have responsibility for delivering the Container Capacity Improvement Program, of which the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project is the first major element.
- C: *Darrel Desjardin:* Director of Sustainable Development on the Container Capacity Improvement Project for Port Metro Vancouver, and my role is to lead the environmental assessment, as well as the sustainability initiatives including social, economic, and environmental.
- C: *Sheri Plewes:* I am Sheri Plewes. I am the Vice President of Infrastructure Delivery for Port Metro Vancouver. My portfolio includes the Container Capacity Improvement Program and trade development improvement projects, so I have responsibility on the executive team for capital projects.
- C: *Eric Bysouth:* My name is Eric Bysouth, and I'm from Langley and the Valley Transportation Advisory Committee. I'm very interested in what is going on here. This is my wife Helen.
- C: *Judy Kirk:* Thank you for joining us Helen.
- C: *Bob Bowles:* My name is Bob Bowles, and I am a private citizen advocate, but I am also the incoming president for a group called Friends of Rail for the Valley, which is a South Fraser regional citizen interest group.
- C: *Adrian Wightman:* I am Adrian Wightman, and I live in Tsawwassen and I'm a civil engineer and I commute through the tunnel every day.
- C: *Jean Wightman:* I'm Jean Wightman, and I'm with him. And I've been retired for many years.

- C: *Michael Jefferson*: My name is Michael Jefferson. I'm a concerned citizen, and I also work at Deltaport and I have some concerns and suggestions and comments about this craziness that is going on.
- C: *David Serry*: My name is David Serry, and I have been a marine surveyor in BC for 30 years, and I am of the opinion that Deltaport had to happen, vital to the future of the economic future of Canada.
- C: *Roy Mufford*: My name is Roy Mufford, and I'm one of the directors of the Fraser Valley Heritage Railway Society and I'm also part of the same organization that Eric Bysouth is part of.
- C: *Mark Bliss*: Mark Bliss, BKL Consultants working on the environmental noise and vibrations assessments.
- C: *Dan Hrebenyk*: Dan Hrebenyk, working with SENES Consultants working on the air quality studies.
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: Vicki Huntington, I'm the local Member of the Legislative Assembly.
- C: *Barbara Howley*: Barbara Howley, I live in Ladner, I'm really glad I came today because I've been talking to a lot of people who work down at Deltaport, and I think that they need to be listened to by the council and by everyone here.
- C: *Danielle Ferguson*: My name is Danielle Ferguson
- C: *Odete Pinho*: My Odete Pinho and I work with HB Lanarc Consultants on the Port Land Use Plan Update.
- C: *Elaine Fisher*: My name is Elaine Fisher, and I am an Environmental Specialist for Port Metro Vancouver.
- C: *Paul Christie*: Paul Christie, I'm a professional agrologist, and I'm working on the DTRRIP team in an agricultural advisory capacity.
- C: *Malcolm Smith*: Malcolm Smith, and I'm with Hemmera and I'm leading the environmental assessment team for this project.
- C: *Eileen Miranda*: Eileen Miranda. I'm with Hemmera as well, and I'm on the terrestrial environment side.
- C: *Ashleigh Ballevena*: Ashleigh Ballevena, I'm also with Hemmera and I'm also working on the environmental assessment.
- C: *Fred Culbert*: I'm Fred Culbert, and I'm an engineer, economist and planner with Port Metro Vancouver.
- C: *Mike Zachary*: I'm Mike Zachary, and I'm the Project Manager for the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: There is nothing formal about this. What we want is for you to have an opportunity to provide comments or questions. The one thing I might add is that the basis for the consultation that we are discussing now is here in this guide. I'm going to talk to you about the importance of this feedback form. We want to get the feedback form back from you today. We have it in print and online. Please do ensure that you get it to us, and here is why. This is the second open house, and we've also had 6 small group meetings. We do take very good notes, and they are important, and they form part of the consultation record. The difference between group discussion and your feedback is important, as you may not agree with everything that is said here, so please do both. With that, I would like to open it up. Please let me know if you have any questions or anything you would like to tell them.

## 2. Q&A Period

Q: *Eric Bysouth*: This address on the back of the thing. Who do we mail it to the attention of?

A: *Judy Kirk*: You don't have to. If you put on it "Consultation, Container Capacity Improvement Program", it will get to the right place.

Q: *David Serry*: I have a comment. I have listened to the feedback since I came down here. It's total BS. Vis a vis, every time Deltaport says they want to something, they say it shouldn't be done here, do it up in Prince Rupert instead. This is a total and downright lie, and it should be addressed. Prince Rupert was created by Brian Mulroney, who used Rupert to break the union in Vancouver because they couldn't get the farmers grain shipped out. That's the only reason that Prince Rupert has been mentioned. They keep telling you that Prince Rupert is a viable option. Absolutely untrue. You guys haven't addressed that and haven't put that out there that Prince Rupert is totally unacceptable due to the costs of demurrage and by the fact that ships are tied up there for weeks and cannot move, roads are shut down, rail is shut down. End of story. Why haven't you addressed that?

C: *Judy Kirk*: I appreciate your comments. I'll ask Cliff if he would like to respond, but these people are not responsible for Prince Rupert. Before that I would like to ask whether there are any other comments about the Deltaport Terminal, Road and Rail Improvement Project if that's okay with you.

C: *Eric Bysouth*: I would just like to say that as far as I'm concerned, Deltaport is a very important part of the Canadian economy and the BC economy and the local economy. It's very important for trade, and it's a facility that is needed. What we need to and from it is efficient transportation, so containers and coal can be moved in a cost effective way. But this has an impact on the natural environment. I've been studying this thing for some time. You have a plan here for a lot of it, but it doesn't fit in with a master transportation plan for the whole area. We need to build our roads around a master transportation plan. We need to preserve our farmland, and we need to do it in an environmentally friendly way. What is lacking is an overall master transportation plan for the whole thing. It's not there. This is another piecemeal addition. The piecemeal additions cost us all more money than if it was properly coordinated.

C: *Judy Kirk*: Sheri Plewes on my right has a long transportation history in her work, so I am going to ask her to say a few things about what you've just said.

C: *Eric Bysouth*: If you do have a long range transportation plan, I would like to hear it.

C: *Sheri Plewes*: In my past I spent 10 years with the City of Vancouver. I have spent 10 years with TransLink. I was responsible for the Transport 2040 Plan, which was the master plan for the public transportation and major road network.

Q: *Eric Bysouth*: When you say major road network do you mean in the valley as well?

A: *Sheri Plewes*: I'm talking about Metro Vancouver. I know that there is a transportation group in the Fraser Valley that is doing a similar type of process because I did liaise with them. What Transport 2040 did is outline exactly what you were talking about. The pieces of the transportation network that you need to have in place. You need that coordinated plan. And then there is the provincial plan. The South Fraser Perimeter Road is part of that provincial network, but is accounted for in the local transportation plan. One of the things for this project is that there are 2 related projects that I think are really essential for this project to work efficiently, and that is the South Fraser Perimeter Road and Roberts Bank Rail Corridor Program, and we do show them on page 9. These are some coordinated

elements of transportation infrastructure that I think are essential for the success of our project. These programs are underway and have funding. The DTRRIP Project is being built in coordination with some other pretty significant transportation projects. Do I think that the transportation planning in the region is totally sufficient? No, but we're professionals and we're working on it. The challenge is always money. For this DTRRIP project, we are well served by other transportation infrastructure improvements.

- C: *Bob Bowles*: I second what Eric said about the whole Deltaport project. And to put it in slightly different words, I view that there is the entity of Port Metro Vancouver, Metro Vancouver and TransLink. But I don't think that they all look at the same picture in the same way. I'll use one small illustration, and there are many others. I'm considering the Mufford Crescent grade separation. The proposed as it stands is not a truck route. It is a viable alternative to get over the tracks when a train is coming through, but it is not a truck route. They have not designed the access routes North, South, East or West.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I think it was South Fraser that was built for the trucks, not that route.
- C: *Bob Bowles*: That's absolutely correct. I agree with you. But not every truck will be going South Fraser. You have a rather large logistics operation... take for example Atlas Logistics, which provides all food sources for all the food chains, and they are based in South Surrey. There is no rail service to them whatsoever, so all trucks must travel through the neighborhood. It's not getting any better. Trucks in my opinion, and it has been proven by rail officials, are not nearly as efficient at moving goods or services as rail. That is one aspect, and the other, while I have the floor, and that is the electrification of the rail network from the Fraser Valley to the ocean.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Any other questions or comments?
- C: *Michael Jefferson*: I might as well get it out while I still can. My name is Michael Jefferson, and I am here as a citizen of British Columbia. I live in Mission and in the Thompson River Valley, and I work at Deltaport. I value my job and it's a great place to work but I fear for the future, because what I see is the whole design of the third berth and this truck rail expansion project is doomed to failure and doomed to be a stranded asset, because you're building a high carbon, high cost operation, and these costs will not be supported by the economic world out there. We're looking at \$100 barrel oil. A lot of this golden goose container traffic will cease, because a lot of the manufacturing is going to be coming back to North America. Another thing is that it is diesel dependent. There was a \$400 million expansion of the Third Berth and it doesn't have any shore power. All the ships out there have to idle, adding to the carbon. There is a lot of the new equipment, but also still lot of junk on the dock. The RTGs are diesel powered. The trucks are diesel powered. The top stacks are diesel powered, and a lot of them are worn out. The air quality is horrendous. I pack a respirator for when the coal pile catches on fire and pollutes. Nobody ever talks about that, so that's why I'm here, to talk about that.

The other thing, in the context of building high carbon infrastructure, is this whole thing is designed to move trucks and containers. You're building the South Fraser Perimeter Road for what reason? To move trucks. You're one guy, one cab, one truck.

I wrote in 2005 when the container truckers stopped working, and they were off for about 6 weeks, and they put a big dent in the operations. I took my thoughts, sent a letter to Michael Henderson who was the Director of Transport Canada. I don't know what ever

happened to it. I suggested that we adopt what Federal Express does. This is the hub and spoke model. I can't remember his name, but the main man behind Federal Express was writing his thesis for his PhD in Geography, and he came up with the idea for a hub and spoke distribution network. If you send a package from Vancouver to China, it goes through Atlanta, Georgia before it goes anywhere. If you send a package from this meeting to Toronto, it goes through Atlanta, Georgia. You can apply it to mail; you can apply it to Deltaport, because Deltaport is nothing but a big post office... It's all under the authority of the port, which is the post office globally.

I will speak in the positive. I advocate for an intermodal yard in the interior of BC. If there is a container that comes off a ship and on to my truck, and gets put on a street truck or anywhere in between, these goods have to be put on a truck because there are not any intermodal yards in the interior of BC. In Chilliwack you have this interface between the freeway and Southern Rail which these container trains run on through the Lower Mainland. You have Gloucester estates, 264<sup>th</sup> and the freeway: It's all served by Southern Rail. In Abbotsford by Sumas, you have an interchange between CP, Burlington North, and Southern Rail. So Annacis Island doesn't have an intermodal yard, instead trucks are coming up and over the bridge all the way down to the beach instead of getting put on rail. There is no need for street trucks, there should be zero. There is no need for trucks to be here. By maintaining this model, we are dooming this to failure.

- C: *Judy Kirk*: Can I ask Cliff to respond, and then we will come back. Is this doomed to failure or should we have no trucks on the road?
- C: *Michael Jefferson*: It's going to be a nice real estate development in 3-5 years. Take all that junk out of there, put golf courses and condos and nice marina for yachts, and cruise ship facility and casinos. You watch.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: About 70% of the containers that leave Deltaport do it by rail. This expansion assumes that this will continue to be the case. If that ratio increases we can handle that. The nature of the business is that of the 30% that leave by truck, there is a value-add in the Lower Mainland. That cargo is transloaded into 53 foot rail domestic containers. You can carry about three 40 foot containers worth of cargo in two 53 foot containers. Within 72 hours the transloaded containers leave the Lower Mainland by rail. Effectively 90% of what comes in over the docks at Deltaport leaves by rail. If you drew a 40 km radius around Deltaport, 90% of the containers leave that by rail within 72 hours. I don't think that you will get much more efficient than that. Certainly if you were to take things into the interior, you would end up bringing some back. The nature of the business is that it is about 10% stays local and 90% goes elsewhere.

Certainly in term of the comments around the high carbon economy, I would argue that this facility is designed to transition to a low carbon economy. Certainly today we live in a high carbon world. You mentioned shore power, and when the Third Berth at Deltaport was constructed, it was outfitted to allow for shore power. As soon as the IMO comes out with its standard, then we will be in a position to handle that transition. There are currently three standards in the world, and as somebody said recently in another meeting, "nobody wants to be the Betamax". Prince Rupert has taken a risk on which one will win. They have installed that in Prince Rupert, though they haven't plugged it in. It has to be developed in a sensible manner. The capacity has to happen at the same time as the

- demand for it. The terminal is ready for it. As soon as there is an opportunity and we have a world standard available, we will move to it.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Darrell I will come to you in a minute, and then Adrian I don't know if you wanted to add anything?
- C: *Darrell Desjardin*: I just want to add to what Cliff said. The Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy has committed to reducing air contaminants and greenhouse gasses. Deltaport is the first terminal in North America to have rail powered gantry trains. The second terminal that now has rail powered gantry cranes is the BNSF SIG (Burlington Northern Santa Fe Seattle International Gateway) Yard in Seattle. Deltaport has had rail power and has been electrified for well over 15 years. In addition to the conduits that have been provided at the dock face to electrify the ship to shore gantry cranes, the Third Berth also has the conduit to allow for the electrification of the gantry cranes. And one of the projects that TSI and the port have worked on is the hybrid RTGs that are out on the terminal.
- C: *Michael Jefferson*: I've seen them. They don't use them.
- C: *Darrell Desjardin*: Alpha technology, when it first came out, and then Rail Power, which is a Vancouver company, was using lead acid batteries, and there is about a 70% reduction in emissions. We are now working with TSI and a company called Corbus to replace the batteries with a lithium hydride system. The intent is to actually bridge to the electrification. As Cliff said, the expansion and this project lower the carbon footprint at Deltaport, and put us in a position where we can leverage ourselves with other ports around the world.
- C: *Cliff Stewart*: It is also worth mentioning we have a Truck Licensing System for the trucks that haul to and from the port. One of the advantages is that we are able to insist on a significantly higher environmental standard for these trucks than would otherwise be required. In fact by 2015 when this project opens, all the trucks hauling to and from the port will need to have a 2007 engine platform. To put that into perspective environmentally, that is like taking 59 of every 60 trucks off the road. Lots of things have happened and continue to happen with respect to reducing air quality concerns around port operations
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Any other comments or questions?
- Q: *Michael Jefferson*: Thank you for that, gentlemen. My day to day reality out there is that the carbon emissions at Deltaport are horrendous. I've never seen the electrical RTGs work, the ones that do work are diesel electric, and they take 10 minutes to fire up with huge plumes of smoke wafting about. How many RTGs are out there? 50?
- A: *Darrell Desjardin*: I think there are 49 for the entire terminal. One of the initiatives the port has worked on developing an emissions footprint for Deltaport. Starting in 2005, we did a complete land based emissions inventory of all of Vancouver. That was just updated for 2010.
- C: *Michael Jefferson*: We'll call it 50 for arguments sake. RTGs are cranes that travel on rubber tires. They go up and down the lanes as mobile cranes. They are a source of carbon emissions, they're filthy. Some of the reach stackers, they are new, I'll give them credit for that. But there are several of them way past their service life, and old ones put out more emissions in unburnt fuel than they consume. They blow out more black smoke than energy that they need on a given shift. Another concern of mine is plastic and Styrofoam contamination of the marine environment. TSI provides paper cups and Styrofoam cups

and they are everywhere all over the dock and they get blown into the ocean. They give out earplugs which get thrown away. There is no housekeeping at all, and the plastic bags, pop and juice, food packaging, it ends up all getting into the ocean. My suggestion, and I've spoken to Darrell Desjardin about this is ear muffs or personal earplugs. Why doesn't TSI give everyone an aluminum water bottle? Look at all the crap around there. That is totally unacceptable.

- C: *Darrell Desjardin*: I know that Michael has brought this to my attention and we have talked about this.
- C: *Michael Jefferson*: It irks me. I am constantly picking up trash. I was mentioning to Elaine that when I work, after you're done, you have a vehicle and cleaning supplies with stuff like Windex and paper towels and you clean it out. Then you put all this stuff in a bag and toss it in a dumpster. But me, I'm kind of weird and I take it home. I pick up stuff along the way, anything that is a contaminant. I take the metals home, and I've got a collection. The thing is that there is a lack of dedicated maintenance to clean the dock face on a daily basis.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: I'm going to let Vicki respond, and Darrell if there is anything that you would like to add, please let me know.
- C: *Vicki Huntington*: I want to say that Michael has been in to see me twice. I've tried to follow up on his issue with the contaminants and the garbage. And there's nowhere to go. It's frustrating to have a real issue that is solvable like that. And I think personally, the Port needs to deal with that, because it is in a very sensitive area. His other concern about the emissions, it is too easy to say that's how it is. I think these are solvable.
- C: *Michael Jefferson*: There are two rules in business: Cost control and risk management. That's all that executives exist to do is minimize your costs. TSI is putting out boxes and boxes of earplugs and contaminating the marine and foreshore environments, as well as throwing away thousands and thousands of paper cups. Wouldn't it make more sense to provide them with one pair of earplugs and cup? And the other thing is idling equipment. So you've got hundreds of vehicles and equipment idling because management out there is non-existent. They do not specify to shut your truck off when you leave. People are really lazy and really stupid, and it doesn't matter where you go. We need to teach them a different way of doing it. I hope the people at TSI look at this, and really do something about it.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Thank you. You've made it very clear.
- C: *Darrell Desjardin*: Your issues have been raised, we have raised it with TSI. We were dealing with Simon Daniels, who was the Director of Engineering, and we did have a waste management audit and a safety assessment. You hit on one of my pet peeves, which is that the longshoreman leaves their equipment running at coffee breaks and lunchtime, yet we are shutting the container trucks down. We continue to work on this with TSI. It's a combination of management and the union. Simon Daniels is no longer with TSI, Roy Christianson has now come in a picked up that portfolio. I have forwarded these concerns to Roy, and he is putting together a response and feeding that back into the Port's environmental programs department. Those are three excellent examples of labour working with management can actually address the on-site environmental issues.
- C: *Michael Jefferson*: I can make that work in a heartbeat. Want to ask me, ask me how.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Hold on, we can take this offline. David you can go.



- C: *David Serry*: Very quickly, the mention of vessels today, and the picture of them belching out smoke into the environment is fictitious, it's actually vexatious, and there's no place for it in today's modern shipping. It's being legislated all to hell by every country. You're seeing ships coming in here bigger and bigger with less pollution simply because there is less ships. The second part of that is that they are using diverse fuels. The Maersk ships use three fuels: LNG which they use in the harbor, and black bunker fuels. This idea of the belching smoke is bullsh\*t. It never had any basis and if you did you'd be shut down by Canada Transport, they would be right up your ass. The pollution from ships is going down forcibly.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Eric, did you have anything you wanted to add.
- Q: *Eric Bysouth*: I want to add about your rail connection going out to Matsqui. Why have you not been listening to rerouting heavy rail up Burlington Northern and down the CN double track? Why are you spending money trying to upgrade the old BC Electric right-of-way when it's needed for public transportation in the valley? This has been completely overlooked. You could save millions and billions by doing it the right way. It would get the heavy rail where it needs to be since it's already double tracked. We would need to upgrade the Burlington Northern line and put another extra turn in. It would free up the whole BC Electric right-of-way, and we could have light rail up and down the valley. It hasn't been considered in your plans. We've looked into this, and all it would take is you people to ask the Provincial government. The Provincial government could then go to a Federal Minister to issue an order. Why don't we do it efficiently and cost effectively, saving ourselves a lot of money and get it so it works in the future. None of your plans show any of this. Why not?
- A: *Cliff Stewart*: I think we have a fundamental disagreement as to what the appropriate place for heavy rail is. There are significant congestion issues if you were to go through the BNSF line. The existing heavy rail along the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor has capacity for the work that is being proposed. It would be a hugely expensive exercise to try to reroute that heavy rail with coal and containers through the northern route. It doesn't make any sense from a transportation prospective.
- Q: *Eric Bysouth*: Why doesn't it make any sense? It makes a lot of sense to a lot of people.
- A: *Sheri Plewes*: I just want to talk about using heavy rail corridors for light transit, because I have some knowledge of that. That is a TransLink issue and we have done studies on that. I'm a very strong advocate for public transit, particularly light rail and automated light rail systems that deal with people movement. We're talking about goods movement, so I just want to briefly touch on it, and the difficulty with those rail corridors is that they don't exist where people live now. You have to serve where the population bases are now. TransLink has done a study of these urban corridors and their appropriateness. That's an area where I would encourage you to go talk to TransLink about that.
- C: *Roy Mufford*: TransLink is a waste of time.
- C: *Bob Bowles*: A bit of a simplification of what Eric was saying. The pinch point is at the intersection of Highway 91 and Highway 99. At that point freight traffic is running straight through. It does not have the ability to move eastbound to northbound, which runs along the edge of Highway 91. When you stand there at the playing fields, it seems to me as a private citizen, to be so much more doable then spending \$300 million to separate road and rail. And I am agreeing, as opposed to Eric and Roy, with respect to where urban rail

needs to run. A significant portion of the interurban line from Cloverdale to TWU is vitally needed.

C: *Judy Kirk*: Any other comments or questions?

C: *Roy Mufford*: I've been looking at this for many years, and if you go back to 1968 when the decision was made to use the route through lower Langley, the Lower Mainland planning board took on the Provincial Government over the issue and did a substantial document that we found in buried in special collections at UBC, which recommended using the SFPR alignment. They said put the heavy rail down the CN mainline out through Delta. The railroads actually suggested using the BNSF route and putting a wye in at Colebrook. Bennett fired the board, and they were all dismissed because of their opposition to putting it through Langley. They made the decision in the Langley council minutes without telling Langley what they were doing. I can show you the documents. The rest is history. They chose to go through Langley because it was cheaper to go through Langley. Now you're going to spend \$300 million for 9 overpasses. In 2006 or 2005 the GVTA studied putting a bridge in at New Westminster that would cost at that time \$140 million. We're saying take the \$300 million and put in a new bridge at New Westminster. What this would allow you to do is to travel east all the way from the port to New Westminster, and then all the way to Kamloops on the North side of the river. All inbound trains coming from Kamloops come in to Mission. From Mission they travel east on the CP line. From that point, they share each other's tracks in each direction. We're having trains coming out of Coquitlam and North Vancouver, coming all the way to Mission, across the Mission bridge and back through Langley to get to the Port. It makes no sense. I'm blaming the Provincial Government largely because they are not even on the page. We need this interurban corridor from Scott Road all the way to Chilliwack for the people, and to say that it doesn't go where the population is BS. The whole Lower Mainland south of the Fraser was built around that railroad. It runs through all the universities. It runs through the middle of Trinity College for pete's sake. Kwantlen University in Langley and Newton would take a short shuttle bus. UFV is walking distance to that line. Its runs through the middle of most of the communities. There was a station at Trinity College at the Jardine Crossing for the people of Fort Langley. Run a shuttle bus there from Fort Langley to the line, and you run a bus from Aldergrove to the line at Gloucester Properties. You have 10,000 people working in Gloucester properties, and TransLink doesn't have a bus that goes there. This is obscene, and you're taking the interurban line, being used for heavy rail. It should be taken off and run down the CN mainline, down through Delta, down through the BNSF line. If anybody had any brains, it would have gone along the SFPR alignment right from Tilbury on. It's so simple and just so frustrating. What has happened is the Provincial Government has put Deltaport ahead of the people in the Fraser Valley. This line should be kept for the people of the Fraser Valley and you guys should be using the CN mainline and the Burlington line or the South Fraser Perimeter Road to get to the port. There was a wye in at Colebrook if you would believe, John Van Don Glen said his father used to own the land in Colebrook where the wye would go in and he said they came in and surveyed it.

C: *Judy Kirk*: Now Cliff, that's way too much to respond to in one breath, but is there anything that you want to say before we move on?

- A: *Cliff Stewart*: I would just say that the capacity of the mainline east of Hydro, which is where CN and Roberts Bank Rail Corridor meet, would be significantly adversely affected if the trains were taken off the Roberts Bank line and put on the CN system.
- C: *Roy Mufford*: Can I just say something? It was a political decision in 1968 to put these trains through Langley and use this route. All that it will take to change it is a political decision.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Fair enough.
- C: *Michael Jefferson*: I would just like to support what was said about the Southern Rail line that runs through the valley. All this technical talk about routing of rail, it adds on to what I've been saying about my concerns, and that is you've got to take this back to the drawing board and stop what you're doing here right now. Deltaport will cease to exist as you know it. You're building infrastructure to move trucks. You're not moving people, and you're not moving containers, you're moving trucks. And one more point before I leave, on the lamp standards. There are 140. I would like to see, and I will suggest you Google Honeywell. You will see a 6 foot diameter radial wind turbine, and I would like to see one of those on top of every light at Deltaport for two reasons: it generates clean power to offset the carbon emissions at Deltaport, and it also acts as raptor control because eagles and ospreys like to nest up there. They are 6 feet around, and generate power in about 2 MPH of wind. I would suggest that if you gave them an invitation, Honeywell would install them for free just to see them work. It would generate clean energy and also great PR for TSI and Deltaport to show we really care out here and we're going to do something smart for a change and clean up our act.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: Thanks for that suggestion Michael. Any response to that Darrell before we wrap up?
- A: *Darrell Desjardin*: We have looked at that. There are two issues. The posts, the way they have been designed, it's a weight issue. The nests are an issue too. The other aspect is concern from migratory birds going through there, but one of the studies we have embarked on with TSI is to look at opportunities for green renewable energy within their footprint.
- C: *Judy Kirk*: What I would like to encourage you to do is to fill out your feedback form. Thank you for your taking the time to sit down with us and to hear each other, as well as to ask questions. We will be here for another 15 minutes. Please do know that it is also online, but we would very much like to get it from you today. Thank you very much.

*The question and answer session ended at 12:45pm*