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1. **BACKGROUND**

Centerm is a container terminal on the south shore of Vancouver’s inner harbour. It is one of three primary container terminals in the Vancouver gateway and handles approximately one-fifth of the goods shipped in containers through Vancouver. Centerm is operated by DP World Vancouver.

The proposed Centerm Expansion Project is a series of improvements to increase the number of containers that can be handled at the existing terminal by approximately two-thirds. The proposed Centerm Expansion Project includes an expansion of the terminal area, reconfiguration of the terminal, and road and rail access improvements. Port Metro Vancouver’s Centerm Expansion Project team is working with DP World Vancouver to develop the project.

The proposed project is currently in a preliminary design phase and is subject to review and approval by Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review Process before any work can be undertaken. Should it be approved, construction of the project is anticipated to start in early 2017 and be completed in late 2019.

2. **PRELIMINARY COMMENT PERIOD: JANUARY 18 – FEBRUARY 12, 2016**

2.1 **PURPOSE**

A preliminary comment period was held from January 18 to February 12, 2016 to gather feedback from the public and stakeholders regarding the scope of technical and environmental studies to be undertaken for the proposed Centerm Expansion Project, and on a potential community amenity for inclusion in the scope of the project. Project materials, including a discussion guide and online feedback form were posted at porttalk.ca/centermexpansion on January 18, 2016.

Feedback received as part of the preliminary comment period, and summarized in this report, will be considered in finalizing the scope of technical and environmental studies, and in further design development of the project.

The project team will provide a Consideration Report to show how feedback was considered, which will be available at porttalk.ca/centermexpansion. There will be further opportunities to provide input regarding the project as it proceeds through Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review Process.
2.2 PARTICIPATION

There were a total of 72 participant interactions during the Centerm Expansion Project Preliminary Comment Period:

- 15 stakeholders attended two small group meetings
- 29 completed feedback forms were received (six hardcopy, 23 online)
- 28 submissions were received through email or mail

2.3 ENGAGEMENT TOPICS

Materials developed for the preliminary comment period provided information regarding the Centerm Expansion Project preliminary design and the technical and environmental studies that will be carried out as part of the project. The Centerm Expansion Project team sought feedback on the scope of the planned technical and environmental studies, and suggestions regarding a potential community amenity to be given consideration by the project team for inclusion in the scope of the project.

2.4 NOTIFICATION

Notification of opportunities to participate in the Preliminary Comment Period included:

- **Invitation Emails and Notification to Stakeholders:** Approximately 150 stakeholders, identified by the Centerm Expansion Project team including suggestions from the City of Vancouver, were notified of the engagement and opportunities for participation.

- **Advertising:** Newspaper ads, notifying the public of the preliminary comment period, ran in the Vancouver Sun and Vancouver Courier on January 14, 2016.

- **Social Media:** Two tweets were sent from @PortMetroVan to notify the public about the preliminary comment period.

- **Postcards:** A postcard was sent to 6,200 households and businesses in the area near Centerm, between Cambie Street and Clark Drive and north of Hastings Street. The postcards were sent during the week of January 11, 2016.

- **Engagement Website:** A dedicated engagement website (<porttalk.ca/centermexpansion>) was available throughout the preliminary comment period and all materials, including a discussion guide and online feedback form, were available on the project website starting on January 18, 2016.

A copy of the notification materials can be found in Appendix 1.
2.5 ENGAGEMENT METHODS

2.5.1. DISCUSSION GUIDE AND FEEDBACK FORM

A discussion guide and feedback form provided information regarding the proposed Centerm Expansion Project to increase the container capacity of the existing terminal by approximately two-thirds, including a map illustrating the expansion of the terminal area, reconfiguration of the terminal, road and rail access improvements, and the scope of technical and environmental studies to be undertaken. The discussion guide and feedback form also provided participants with the opportunity to provide feedback on the scope of technical and environmental studies and the potential community amenity.

A copy of the Discussion Guide and Feedback Form can be found in Appendix 2.

2.5.2. ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

All materials were available on the website porttalk.ca/centermexpansion including electronic copies of the discussion guide and feedback form, and an online feedback form that could be submitted electronically.

- Feedback forms completed online: 29
- Website page views: Approximately 1,200

2.5.3. SMALL GROUP MEETINGS

A total of 15 stakeholders attended two small group meetings held on January 25 and 27, 2016 at the Wosk Centre for Dialogue in Vancouver. Approximately 150 stakeholders, identified by the Centerm Expansion Project team, were invited to attend the meetings. The discussion guide and feedback form was provided to attendees and participants were encouraged to complete the feedback form in hardcopy or online.

Key themes from the small group meetings can be found on page 4.

2.5.4. TECHNICAL MEETINGS

In addition to the small group meetings, the Centerm Expansion Project team held meetings with individual stakeholders outside and during the preliminary comment period to present and discuss technical aspects of the project.

- City of Vancouver, November 10, 2015 and January 25, 2016
- Southern Railway of British Columbia, November 17 and 24, 2015
- East Vancouver Port Lands and Liaison Committee, December 8, 2015
- Alliance Grain Terminal, December 14, 2015
- Canadian Pacific Railway, December 14, 2015
- NAV CANADA, December 17, 2015 and January 18, 2016
- Lantic Inc., January 5, 2016
- City of Vancouver’s Active Transportation Policy Committee, January 21, 2016
- Canfisco, January 29, 2016
- Helijet, February 4, 2016
- Vancouver Aquarium’s Marine Mammal Rescue Centre, February 4, 2016
- Canadian National Railway, February 16, 2016
- TransLink and SeaBus, February 19, 2016
### 3. RESULTS

#### 3.1 SMALL GROUP MEETINGS

The following are key themes from the two small group meetings. As much as possible, the language expressed by participants was retained in the key themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>KEY THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Small Group Meeting #1  
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm  
January 25, 2016 | • Participants expressed concern about the scope of the Traffic Impact Study, including concern about current congestion on local roads, how chokepoints may reduce the efficiency of the terminal and that modeling should be undertaken for the entire Major Road Network.  
• Participants inquired about the percentage of truck versus rail trips originating from the terminal and stated that the Rail Operations Plan should look at ways to accommodate a greater percentage of container traffic.  
• Participants expressed concern regarding potential effects to Gastown and stated that they would like to see a community amenity in the area, in particular an overpass to CRAB Park at Portside to help improve access for residents.  
• A participant inquired about the removal of the Heatley Overpass and stated that they did not want to see truck traffic using the Main Street Overpass.  
• Participants expressed concern regarding the impacts to the view from CRAB Park at Portside.  
• A participant expressed concern regarding the relocation of the vehicle access gates on Waterfront Road and the effect it would have on access for visitors. |
| Small Group Meeting #2  
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm  
January 27, 2016 | • A participant expressed concern regarding the relocation of the vehicle access gates on Waterfront Road and the effect it would have on emergency vehicle access to the Main Street Docks.  
• A participant inquired about the staging for the construction work and requested that workers not use the Main Street Docks.  
• A participant requested that all underwater construction work be clearly marked to allow marine vessels to easily navigate in the area.  
• A participant requested that emergency marine access and docking be maintained on the east side of the terminal.  
• A participant expressed the importance of the heritage façade of the Ballantyne terminal building and requested a statement of significance be undertaken. |
3.2 FEEDBACK FORMS

The following are results from the 29 feedback forms received at small group meetings, online, and by mail. It should be noted that not all respondents provided a response to all questions and that a response may have included more than one theme.

TECHNICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

3.2.1 TECHNICAL STUDIES

3.2.1.1 GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

Overview

- Description of site seismic and geologic hazards.
- Description of construction measures, precautions and corrective actions recommended for preventing structural damage and reducing the risk of geotechnical hazards.
- The report will include a geotechnical assessment of the wharf structure and perimeter dykes.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 28

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this report:

The following are the themes from the 9 responses to this question:

- 3 respondents stated that the scope of the Geotechnical Report was complete
- 2 respondents commented that the study should include how a large earthquake in the next 20-50 years or tsunami could impact the surrounding area
- 1 respondent requested that safety mitigation measures be made public
- 1 respondent asked if the report would examine the effects on CRAB Park at Portside
- 1 respondent requested that the geotechnical study incorporate more information, due to the size of the expansion
- 1 respondent requested that the geotechnical study include an analysis of the rail link between the False Creek Flats and Centerm
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.1.2 TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Overview

- An assessment of current site traffic as well as anticipated truck and rail traffic volumes, on-site vehicle movements, traffic distribution throughout the day and its impact on adjacent and nearby roads, and parking requirements.
- Proposed hours of operation, staffing numbers, and site plan showing on-site vehicle movements, buildings, proposed rail tracks and any other proposed features.
- The study will include an overall assessment and detailed plans of how the new terminal entrance and exit gates operate.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 27

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this study:

The following are the themes from the 20 responses to this question:

- 6 respondents requested that the study incorporate a broader scope, and include specific effects to trips by foot, car and transit in the area
- 4 respondents expressed concern about increased traffic in downtown Vancouver, and that the terminal expansion should not proceed due to these impacts
- 2 respondents requested that the Traffic Impact Study include effects of increased traffic on local roads
- 2 respondents requested that this study include noise of rail traffic, and mitigation measures
- 1 respondent asked if the Traffic Impact Study will be available to the public
- 1 respondent requested that the study provide a breakdown of rail and truck traffic
- 1 respondent expressed concern about public access to roads along the coastline
- 1 respondent requested that Main Street be solely used for emergency access, not a truck entrance
- 1 respondent requested an examination of the overall trucking system in the region
- 1 respondent commented that container traffic should be moved to off-peak hours, specifically at night
- 1 respondent expressed concern about the scope of the traffic study, and that it should include analysis of vessel traffic from the project terminal out to the 12 nautical mile territorial sea limit
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.1.3 RAIL OPERATIONS PLAN

Overview

- An assessment of the anticipated rail operations, including length and number of cars, average number and peak number of anticipated trains per day at the site, how rail cars are delivered to the site and managed while on-site, and total site capacity (length of tracks and total number of trains that can be accommodated on-site).
- Overview of how train car switching is conducted or managed, and review of design speed for arriving and departing trains.
- Description of how long an arriving train would take, from entering the South Shore to clearing the last switch and entering the terminal.
- Description of the design capacity and specifications for the rail improvements that are specified for all on-site rail.
- Expected operations traffic, up to the 10-year horizon.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 26

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

The following are the themes from the 13 responses to this question:

- 4 respondents stated that the scope of the Rail Operations Plan was complete
- 3 respondents expressed concern about increased noise and the effects to the surrounding community
- 3 respondents requested that this study include a study of rail traffic noise and mitigation measures
- 1 respondent expressed concern about unsustainable transportation types
- 1 respondent commented that safety must be paramount in the plan
- 1 respondent requested that the increase in number of containers be assessed in detail
- 1 respondent commented that rail capacity should be a key focus of the plan, and that commuter rail operations be accounted for in that capacity
- 1 respondent requested that the plan extend past a 10-year horizon, to include very long-term impacts
- 1 respondent commented that rail capacity should be a key focus of the plan, and that commuter rail operations be accounted for in that capacity
- 1 respondent requested that the plan include False Creek Flats rail yard, and rail connections
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.1.4 MARINE TRAFFIC STUDY

Overview

- Confirmation of the design vessel range (maximum and minimum size of marine vessels that can be berthed and loaded) and anticipated traffic levels, anticipated anchorage patterns and any other operational criteria.
- Mooring plan for vessels at maximum and minimum size.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 26

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this study:

The following are the themes from the 12 responses to this question:

- 2 respondents requested that the study include environmental and wildlife impacts
- 1 respondent commented that the Marine Traffic Study scope was complete
- 1 respondent requested an analysis of the effects of increased tanker traffic on the marine and atmospheric environment
- 1 respondent noted that the terminal expansion will have significant impacts to marine traffic, and the study should be independently analyzed
- 1 respondent expressed concern about visual impacts due to increased tanker traffic
- 1 respondent noted that environmental concerns, fisheries and noise impacts should be included in this study
- 1 respondent expressed concern about impacts to the shoreline of CRAB Park at Portside due to large vessels
- 1 respondent asked if containers could be barged for redistribution
- 1 respondent requested that the impact of cruise ships should be included in this study
- 1 respondent requested that impacts to the SeaBus and SeaBus terminal be included in this study
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.1.5 DREDGING PLAN

Overview

- Diagram of the proposed dredge area and sediment analysis.
- Description of the proposed dredge volume and method, and anticipated disposal method.
- Timing of proposed dredging in relation to fisheries' sensitive periods.
- Anticipated time frame for the duration of works and hours of operation expected for the equipment.
- Proposed mitigation measures.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 26

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

The following are the themes from the 7 responses to this question:

- 2 respondents expressed concern about dredged materials, its impacts to air quality, where it will be placed, and that the scope of the plan should include an analysis of dredged material
- 2 respondents expressed concern about long-term negative impacts of dredging, and requested an analysis of mitigation measures, and future actions to deal with implications
- 1 respondent stated that the scope of the Dredging Plan was complete
- 1 respondent asked for mitigation measures to dredging the Burrard Inlet
- 1 respondent noted that the scope of the plan should include tidal areas, fish, birds and the environment
- 1 respondent expressed concern about the impacts of dredging on CRAB Park at Portside
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.1.6  ALTERNATIVE SITING OPTIONS REPORT

Overview

- An assessment of alternative siting options of proposed buildings and structures.
- Report to include rationale for each rejected option from an environmental, community and economic perspective.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 26

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this report:

The following are the themes from the 14 responses to this question:

- 6 respondents expressed concern about impacts to CRAB Park at Portside and public access to the coastline
- 6 respondents requested that the expansion westward be reconsidered, and that other alternatives be explored
- 3 respondents commented that the Alternative Siting Options Report scope was complete
- 2 respondents expressed concern about visual impacts due to added structure
- 1 respondent expressed concern about impacts to surrounding communities, and requested that the traffic be rerouted to another port with less impacts to private property
- 1 respondent expressed concern about the destruction of Vancouver’s harbour
- 1 respondent requested additional funding to improve CRAB Park at Portside
- 1 respondent noted that the report should include a review of all port lands
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.1.7 SPILL PREVENTION AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN (ON LAND AND WATER)

Overview

- The existing Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan to be updated, based on anticipated terminal layout changes for the proposed project.
- Inventory of the anticipated hazardous materials to be handled or stored on-site during normal operations.
- A description of spill prevention, containment and cleanup plan for hydrocarbon products (including fuel, oil and hydraulic fluid) and any other substances using standards, practices, methods and procedures to a good commercial standard, conforming to applicable laws.
- Description of proposed employee training, emergency response communication plan, emergency procedures, spill tracking and reporting and records of facilities inspections.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 26

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this report:

The following are the themes from the 14 responses to this question:

- 4 respondents cited the container fire incident that occurred at Centerm in 2015
- 3 respondents expressed concern about mitigation measures in the event of a fire, and potential health impacts, and noted that the plan should include improvements to emergency protocols
- 3 respondents noted that hazardous materials should not be shipped through the port
- 3 respondent requested that the plan include wording to improve, and exceed commercial standards for spill prevention and emergency response and requested identification of the funds to be allocated to spill prevention and emergency response
- 2 respondents requested a detailed and rigorous plan to instantly mitigate potential spills
- 2 respondents expressed concern about the environmental impacts to CRAB Park at Portside
- 1 respondent stated that the scope of the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan was complete
- 1 respondent expressed concern about this plan accommodating the two-third increase in traffic
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

3.2.2.1 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS REPORT FOR DEMOLITIONS

Overview

- Inventory of any hazardous materials including asbestos, drywall, the contents in aboveground or underground storage tanks, and any on-site chemicals.
- Description of hazardous materials storage and handling methods.
- Table of applicable regulations.
- Hazardous materials reuse, removal, recycling and disposal plan, prior to demolition of structures in accordance with all relevant regulations.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>レベル</th>
<th>合意度</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 25

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this report:

The following are the themes from the 8 responses to this question:

- 4 respondents commented that the scope of the Hazardous Materials Report for Demolitions was complete
- 2 respondents cited the container chemical fire at Centerm in 2015, and expressed concern about the health and safety of surrounding communities
- 1 respondent noted that impacts to tidal flows and fish should be included in the scope of this study
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.2.2 STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

Overview

- Description of daily terminal operations as they relate to stormwater management, given the local climate, and water capture and treatment systems.
- Consideration of effects of the Centerm Expansion Project on stormwater management for the existing site.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 24

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

The following are the themes from the 6 responses to this question:

- 2 respondents commented that the scope of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan was complete
- 1 respondent noted that the effects of hydrocarbon leaks from truck engines on stormwater should be included in this plan
- 1 respondent expressed concern about environmental impacts to CRAB Park at Portside
- 1 respondent expressed general environmental concern, and requested that mitigation measures be implemented
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.2.3 NOISE STUDY

Overview

- An assessment of how the proposed development will affect the noise levels experienced by the adjacent community.
- The boundaries associated with the assessment include a local and regional area. The local study area extends 1.5 kilometres from the project footprint. The regional study area extends up to 5 kilometres from the project footprint.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 25

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this study:

The following are the themes from the 17 responses to this question:

- 9 respondents expressed concern about current noise levels, impacts to the surrounding communities and requested that noise levels be decreased and sufficiently mitigated
- 1 respondent asked for the construction timeline, specifically when pile driving will commence
- 1 respondent commented that the scope of the Noise Study was complete
- 1 respondent expressed concern about health impacts due to noise
- 1 respondent asked about a specific alarm noise that occurs at night, and if this will be addressed in the study
- 1 respondent expressed the importance of this study for users of CRAB Park at Portside and surrounding communities
- 1 respondent requested that the consultation process include all residents within a 1.5 kilometre radius of the terminal, as they are most significantly impacted by noise
- 1 respondent requested that the study include all access streets, including Clark Drive, and noise increases from train and container traffic
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.2.4 AIR ASSESSMENT

Overview

- An assessment of contributions to air quality associated with the facility and related off-site operations.
- Modelling to be consistent with the Guidelines for Air Quality Dispersion Modelling in British Columbia (BCMOE, 2008) in consultation with regulatory agencies as required.
- The assessment area is to be between 10 and 50 square kilometres, centred on the dominant emission source, as stated by the B.C. Ministry of Environment guidelines.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 26

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this assessment:

The following are the themes from the 11 responses to this question:

- 3 respondents requested that the possibility of shore power be explored in this assessment to reduce pollution, and improve air quality
- 2 respondent expressed concern about potential health impacts due to air quality, including increased levels of pollution
- 1 respondent asked if this assessment would be available to the public
- 1 respondent requested that impacts of increased emission from truck traffic be included in this assessment
- 1 respondent requested that the geographic scope of the assessment be extended to include Port Moody and Indian Arm
- 1 participant cited the container fire that occurred at Centerm in 2015, and noted that no hazardous materials should be shipped through the port
- 1 respondent requested that the assessment include particulate in the air, and increasing levels of dust falling inside homes/apartment units
- 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.2.5 ENERGY EFFICIENCY STUDY

Overview

• An assessment of how the proposed development (buildings, motorized equipment, and lights) will affect electrical energy consumption levels.
• An assessment to include energy modelling, demonstrate selection of BATNEC (best availability technology not entailing excessive cost) energy-efficient equipment.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 28

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this study:

The following are the themes from the 7 responses to this question:

• 2 respondents commented that the Energy Efficiency Study scope was complete
• 1 respondent requested a numeric dollar value for energy-efficient equipment
• 1 respondent noted that Centerm should become the greenest port in the world
• 1 respondent requested that alternate sources of energy, including solar and wind should be included in the scope of this study
• 1 respondent expressed concern about the effects on climate change
• 1 respondent requested that this study include the impacts of increased truck and train activity
• 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.2.6 VIEW AND SHADE IMPACT ANALYSIS

Overview

• An assessment and renderings of potential view and shade impacts of the proposed Centerm improvements.
• An assessment to be completed with a focus on the proposed Centerm improvements.
• Determination of visual impacts of the upgraded facility, including lighting.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 25

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this analysis:

The following are the themes from the 9 responses to this question:

• 4 respondents expressed concern about the environmental impacts to CRAB Park at Portside, and that an expansion to the west should not proceed
• 3 respondents expressed concern about potential visual impacts, and requested that an in-depth analysis include mitigation measures
• 1 respondent commented that the scope of the View and Shade Impact Analysis was complete
• 1 respondent expressed concern about negative impacts to surrounding communities, and that an expansion would result in degradation of the environment
• 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
3.2.2.7 MITIGATION SUMMARY

Overview

• A report section outlining all potential effects from the proposed project on the environment, the public, Aboriginal groups and heritage resources during construction, operations, decommissioning and reclamation, and proposed mitigation strategies (avoidance, minimization of impacts, on-site restoration, offset).

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 27

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this section:

The following are the themes from the 9 responses to this question:

• 2 respondents expressed concern about negative environmental impacts to CRAB Park at Portside, specifically regarding First Nations
• 1 respondent requested a broader scope for the Mitigation Summary
• 1 respondent commented that the scope of the Mitigation Summary was complete
• 1 respondent requested that the study outline public benefits, including the development of a public plaza near the SeaBus terminal
• 1 respondent requested that this summary be made publically available
• 1 respondent objected to the use of the word ‘offset’, and expressed concern about environmental pollution and increased road traffic
• 1 respondent requested that residents associations and service providers in the Downtown Eastside/Strathcona/Chinatown areas be included in the consultation process
• 1 respondent expressed concern about negative visual impacts to CRAB Park at Portside
• 1 respondent noted that there has been insufficient time to explain the meaning and implications of these studies to the public, and that the timeline for the public comment period was unrealistic
### 3.2.2.8 ARCHAEOLOGICAL OVERVIEW ASSESSMENT

**Overview**

- An assessment of archaeological resource potential or sensitivity within the proposed project area, including recommendations for any subsequent archaeological work.
- Identify the location of the proposed project in relation to the original shoreline, river/stream banks, or (historic or current) drinking water sources.
- Review archaeological, ethnographic, historic, environmental and geological data; and maps, including airphotos and hydrological charts.

#### Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Responses: 25**

**Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this assessment:**

The following are the themes from the 5 responses to this question:

- 2 respondents expressed the importance of this assessment, and generally agreed with the overview
- 2 respondents commented that the scope of the Archaeological Overview Assessment was complete
- 1 respondent requested that long-term impacts on public access to the shoreline be included in the scope of this assessment
- 1 respondent commented that CRAB Park at Portside should be regarded as a heritage park
- 1 respondent noted the importance of the history of the area, and that there is potential to capitalize and add value to Vancouver’s tourism industry
3.2.2.9 CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Overview

- Description of how the site will be managed during construction to mitigate adverse effects on the environment, heritage resources, the public (municipal, stakeholders, community) and Aboriginal groups, including potential effects from limiting noise, vibration, light, dust emissions and odour.
- To include key measures to mitigate effects of construction on the environment.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 26

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

The following are the themes from the 5 responses to this question:

- 1 respondent requested that this plan be made publically available
- 1 respondent expressed concern that the mitigation measures outlined in the Construction Environmental Management Plan would not be implemented
- 1 respondent expressed concern about environmental impacts
- 1 respondent requested that the plan include potential impacts/disruptions in daily commute
- 1 respondent noted that they look forward to reading the reports
3.2.2.10 VEGETATION PLAN

Overview

• Description of topography, hydrology, and soil cover and quality.
• Description of current vegetation types, characteristics and relative abundance, including native, listed and invasive species.
• Description of vegetation removal and details as to proposed location, and species and ratio of replacement planting, including a vegetation management, monitoring and control plan.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 24

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

The following are the themes from the 6 responses to this question:

• 2 respondents expressed concern about implementation and follow up enforcement of the vegetation plan
• 2 respondents requested an in-depth analysis of the vegetation changes to CRAB Park at Portside, and inclusion of potential enhancements to vegetation in the area
• 1 respondent expressed concern about the environmental impacts of dredging
• 1 respondent requested that native species be replanted once construction is complete
• 1 respondent asked which report includes implications on community gardens
3.2.2.11 SOIL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Overview

- Outline how the Centerm Expansion Project will appropriately handle, limit migration/runoff and dispose of contaminated soils.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 24

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

The following are the themes from the 6 responses to this question:

- 2 respondents commented that the scope of the Soil Management Plan was complete
- 2 respondents requested clarification on whether the existing soil would be negatively impacted by development activities, and how impacts would be mitigated
- 1 respondent requested that information about the levels of run off and migration of contaminated soils be included in the scope of this plan
- 1 participant expressed concern about environmental impacts to CRAB Park at Portside
3.2.2.12 BIOPHYSICAL SURVEY

Overview

- An assessment of species and habitats that will be affected by project activities such as infilling, vegetation removal or shoreline modification.
- Assessment of the potential effects on both physical habitat and food resource for marine invertebrates, bottom fish and demersal species.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 23

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this survey:

The following are the themes from the 6 responses to this question:

- 2 respondents expressed the importance of this survey
- 1 respondent requested that vertebrates be included in the scope of this survey
- 1 respondent commented that the Biophysical Survey covers all areas
- 1 respondent expressed concern about negative impacts to species and habitats in the area, specifically citing water fowl
- 1 respondent requested that the impact of high and low tide for wildlife and vegetation be included in the scope of this survey
- 1 respondent requested that Fisheries and Oceans Canada be consulted, along with active environmental groups in Metro Vancouver
3.2.2.13 **NESTING BIRD SURVEY**

**Overview**

- An assessment of nesting birds using non-intrusive methods (i.e., determine the presence of birds in habitat through observation of singing birds, alarm calls, distraction displays, nests).
- Assessment will include a description of existing conditions, potential effects and proposed mitigation strategies.

**Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this survey:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 25

**Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this survey:**

The following are the themes from the 6 responses to this question:

- 2 respondents expressed concern about bald eagle nesting habitats, and cited previous projects that have disrupted habitats
- 1 respondent noted the inclusion of vertebrates in this survey
- 1 respondent commented that the Nesting Bird Survey covers all areas
- 1 respondent expressed concern about endangered species, and cited previous projects, such as the Sea to Sky Highway Improvement Project, that disregarded impacts to endangered species
- 1 respondent expressed concern about implementation and accountability for mitigation of potential implications to nesting birds or fish
3.2.2.14 SPECIES-AT-RISK ASSESSMENT

Overview

- Identification of all federal and provincial listed species at risk that are associated with the proposed project.
- Assessment will include a description of potential effects and proposed mitigation strategies.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 24

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this assessment:

The following are the themes from the 3 responses to this question:

- 2 respondents expressed the importance of this assessment
- 1 respondent expressed concern about the implementation and accountability to follow through on mitigation measures
3.2.2.15 INVASIVE SPECIES ASSESSMENT

Overview

- Assessment of existing invasive species types.
- Mitigation plan to prevent spread of invasive species during construction.
- Invasive species monitoring and management plan.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 24

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this assessment:

The following are the themes from the 5 responses to this question:

- 2 respondents commented that the Invasive Species Assessment covers all areas, and expressed the importance of this assessment
- 2 respondents expressed concern about the ability to control migration plans of invasive species
- 1 respondent expressed concern about invasive species in CRAB Park at Portside, and requested a monitoring and management plan be included in the scope of this assessment
- 1 respondent requested that an in-depth and broad scope be analyzed in this assessment
3.2.3 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS REGARDING THE TECHNICAL OR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding the scope of technical or environmental studies proposed for the Centerm Expansion Project, including any additional studies that you feel should be included:

The following are the themes from the 15 responses to this question:

- 3 respondents requested a more detailed study of the traffic patterns, and noted that the current port traffic is significant
- 2 respondents commented that all aspects of these studies need to be thoroughly reviewed and vetted, and that the studies should include long-term impacts, including planning for future transportation across the metro area
- 2 respondents expressed general support for the project, and noted the importance of improving the port’s productivity
- 1 respondent requested that a health impact assessment, in which air and noise impacts are considered, be included in the scope of the studies
- 1 respondent expressed the importance of safety mitigation measures to project human health and the environment
- 1 respondent requested a thorough analysis of social impacts to the surrounding communities, CRAB Park at Portside, and visual implications of this expansion
- 1 respondent requested construction of a pedestrian walkway/overpass connection Gastown and CRAB Park at Portside, to benefit community members and tourists
- 1 respondent requested that long-term impacts of climate change and rising sea water levels in the Burrard Inlet be included in the scope of the studies
- 1 respondent requested noise mitigation measures to reduce noise levels in the area
- 1 respondent requested that the proposed expansion to the west be reconsidered, and other alternatives be presented
- 1 respondent requested a study to outline how the expansion will help the community and increase livability of the area
- 1 respondent requested that compound effects of adding activity to the harbour and risks associated with fog be included in the scope of the studies
- 1 respondent expressed concern about the consultation process, and requested site tours to better understand the scope and impacts of the proposed expansion
COMMUNITY AMENITY

Please indicate your level of interest with a proposed community amenity under each of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Amenity</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Not Very Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested at All</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Social/Community Programs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian, Cycling and Transportation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/Park Improvements</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding a proposed community amenity as part of the Centterm Expansion Project:

The following are the themes from the 14 responses to this question:

- The following comments were received regarding CRAB Park at Portside:
  - 2 respondents expressed concern about environmental impacts to CRAB Park at Portside, and requested expansion of the park, as well as expansion of the seawall from Stanley Park to New Brighton Park
  - 2 respondents requested that park management for CRAB Park at Portside be reinstated, which would include security and a full-time gardener
  - 1 respondent requested construction of a pedestrian friendly walkway from CRAB Park at Portside to Gastown
  - 1 respondent requested public art for CRAB Park at Portside and the introduction of port tours
  - 1 respondent requested facilitation of a community garden next to the park partially funded by a user fee
  - 1 respondent expressed interest in introducing history walks, art talks, environmental artists, and a self-sustaining gardening for the community
  - 1 respondent requested expansion of the area with a market for fisherman to allow the public to buy fresh fish by leasing the pier out on weekends
  - 2 respondents commented on the need to protect heritage buildings in the area, including the Canfisco Cannery and Seafarers building
  - 1 respondent expressed the importance of ensuring the community amenity positively impacts the entire community, not just one segment
  - 1 respondent requested collaboration with the Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation, local schools and community centres to provide the best input and feedback on the expansion
**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding any aspect of the Centerm Expansion Project:

The following are the key themes from the 8 responses to this question:

- 4 respondents expressed general opposition to the Centerm Expansion Project to the west due to environmental and community impacts, specifically CRAB Park at Portside, and requested that other alternatives be considered
- 1 respondent expressed support for the project
- 1 respondent asked for the construction timeline, specifically when pile driving will commence
- 1 respondent expressed concern about noise levels in the area, and requested rubber tired gantry beeping volumes be mitigated
- 1 respondent expressed concern about the overall consultation notification process, and requested that all property owners be notified
- 1 respondent expressed concern about car traffic in the neighbourhood, and requested that transportation improvements include pedestrian and cycling alternatives
- 1 respondent expressed concern about visual impacts
- 1 respondent expressed concern about a decrease in the livability and marketability of the area due to the expansion
- 1 respondent commented that the port should be in favour of increased passenger rail trains
- 1 respondent requested increased regulation of train activity to conform with city noise bylaws and environmental/pollution bylaws
- 1 respondent stated that they do not wish to be located within the secure area, due to negative impacts and financial harm on their business, however, they are very supportive of the expansion project
3.3 WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

During the preliminary comment period, 28 open ended submissions were received through email and mail. The following is a summary of themes from these submissions.

- 3 submissions asked about rail traffic impacts, including capacity and congestion, and what mitigation measures are planned to improve rail service on the South Shore
- 3 submissions expressed concern about trucking impacts, including congestion on Clark Drive, and cited the intersection as a safety and environmental concern
- 3 submissions expressed concern about environmental impacts to CRAB Park at Portside, including interference of tidal flows, visual impacts, health concerns about the future water, and requested a preliminary study by the City of Vancouver’s Health Department to analyze the effects
- 2 submissions expressed concern about environmental impacts, specifically truck emissions and greenhouse gases
- 2 submissions expressed general opposition to the expansion
- 2 submissions expressed concern about noise impacts of the Centerm Expansion Project
- 1 submission asked about noise mitigation measures, including implementation of soundproof windows or blinds
- 1 submission requested that no hazardous or dangerous goods be transported through the port
- 1 submission requested that an expansion to the west be reconsidered, in order to protect the waterfront and further Vancouver as a “green city”, and expressed concern about noise, environmental and health impacts
- 1 submission expressed concern about the review process, and that it lacked an independent party
- 1 submission expressed interest in the development of a community garden
- 1 submission noted that the comprehensive structure of the review covered all areas
- 1 submission expressed interest in introducing an education component to the project
- 1 submission asked for an outline of potential opportunities the project would bring to the waterfront area, and surrounding communities
- 1 submission noted technical design improvements, including moving the front gate, making the north pier a straight line to improve dock and storage space, and provide a secure pedestrian overpass for dock and ship staff
- 1 submission requested access through the proposed vehicle access and control system at the Main Street overpass gate, and noted support for the new gate as it would improve security and eliminate unwanted vagrant activity
- 1 submission expressed concern about impacts to the Ballantyne heritage façade, and noted the historic importance of the pier
- 1 respondent requested a review of the heritage buildings and sites be undertaken, including opportunities to minimize impacts and fully retain heritage resources
- 1 respondent stated several heritage buildings may be impacted, including Mission to Seafarers, Ballantyne Pier, BC Sugar and Alberta Wheat Pool
• The following seven submissions were received from residents of Washington State
  • 7 submissions expressed concern about increased container shipping traffic, environmental impacts, and the implications for those living in the San Juan Islands
  • 7 submissions requested a general broader scope of assessment, that would include compounded impacts from other projects, a broader geographic scope, and address the impact to orcas
  • 6 submissions commented on the Species-At-Risk Assessment and requested the inclusion of all U.S. federal and Washington state species that are listed as threatened or endangered
  • 6 submissions commented on the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan and requested that the study include transboundary spill prevention and emergency response planning
  • One submission included the Memorandum of Understanding Between the Washington State Department of Ecology and the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office

3.3.1. Local and Regional Government Submissions

The following is a summary of the submissions received from local and regional government organizations.

• Expressed concern about impacts to the Ballantyne heritage façade, and noted the historic importance of the pier
• Asked about employment opportunities for the downtown eastside residents and First Nations
• Expressed concern about the timeline of the consultation process, and noted that the window to provide feedback was too short
• Requested the development of a joint project review team, that follows the ‘shadow permit process’, for thorough analysis of the application and supporting technical studies
• Identified various key interests including traffic and rail movements, impacts to the adjacent communities, impacts to CRAB Park at Portside, protection of various heritage sites, environmental impacts (noise, light, vibration, habitat, etc.), emergency response and public safety, and adequate public engagement
• Requested that a human health risk assessment or health impact assessment be undertaken, with special consideration to vulnerable populations living and working in the local study area
• Requested that an assessment be conducted on the greenhouse gas emissions from the project’s construction and operational phases, and compare these with regional data
• Expressed that the project include measures to adapt to climate change (sea level rise, more frequent storms, etc.) and minimize associated infrastructure and environmental impacts
• Commented that the proposed project effectively uses industrial lands to increase the capacity of the terminal and asked about the effects of the project and the number of jobs created
• Stated they understood the need to meet growing demand for trade, improve the efficiency of goods movement to grow the economy, while considering environmental, social and economic factors
• Stated that the proposed project was a significant capital undertaking that would have long-lasting effects for the region, the province, and the nation
• Requested that project consider effects, both positive and negative, as it advances through the consultation, design, assessment, and approval processes
• Inquired about impacts to rail and road traffic, and whether these increases would impact the regional transportation system
• Commented on the Traffic Impact Study, and requested that the assessment include impacts to bus operations and the adjacent major road network, as well as requested a traffic management plan for the duration of the construction period.
• Commented on the Rail Operations Plan, and expressed the importance of West Coast Express service operations maintaining reliable access to the Burrard Inlet Line, and requested that the assessment include impacts to the West Coast Express and mitigation measures.
• Requested that the scope of the assessment include potential impacts to SeaBus operations, and expressed concern about additional marine traffic.
• Provided detailed comments regarding the technical and environmental studies.
Centerm Expansion Project
Preliminary Comment Period:
Scope of Technical and Environmental Studies

Appendix 1:
Notification Materials
Invitation to Provide Comment
Centerm Expansion Project

January 18 – February 12, 2016

Centerm is a container terminal on the south shore of Vancouver’s inner harbour, operated by DP World Vancouver. The proposed Centerm Expansion Project is a series of improvements to increase the number of containers that can be handled at the existing terminal by approximately two-thirds. These proposed improvements include an expansion of the terminal area, reconfiguration of the terminal, and road and rail access improvements.

The proposed project is currently in a preliminary design phase, and is subject to review and approval by Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review Process before any work can be undertaken.

You are invited to provide feedback regarding the scope of technical and environmental studies to be undertaken for the proposed Centerm Expansion Project.

Learn More and Provide Feedback By:

• Reading the Centerm Expansion Project discussion guide and completing the online feedback form, available on January 18, 2016 at: porttalk.ca/centermexpansion

• Calling Tanya Howes, Communications Advisor, Centerm Expansion Project at: 604.665.9577

• Providing a written submission by:
  Email: centermexpansion@portmetrovancouver.com
  Mail: Port Metro Vancouver
        Attention: Centerm Expansion Project Team
        100 The Pointe, 999 Canada Place
        Vancouver, BC, V6C 3T4

How Feedback Will Be Used

Feedback received by February 12, 2016 will be considered in finalizing the scope of technical and environmental studies, and will be considered in further design development of the project. There will be further opportunities to provide input regarding the project as it proceeds through Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review Process.
Invitation to Provide Comment

Preliminary Comment Period

January 18 – February 12, 2016

You are invited to provide feedback regarding the scope of technical and environmental studies to be undertaken for the proposed Centerm Expansion Project.

Proposed Centerm Expansion Project

Centerm is a container terminal on the south shore of Vancouver’s inner harbour. It is one of three primary container terminals in the Vancouver gateway and handles approximately one-fifth of the goods shipped in containers through Vancouver. Centerm is operated by DP World Vancouver.

The proposed Centerm Expansion Project is a series of improvements to increase the number of containers that can be handled at the existing terminal by approximately two-thirds. These proposed improvements include an expansion of the terminal area, reconfiguration of the terminal, and road and rail access improvements. Port Metro Vancouver’s Centerm Expansion Project team is working with DP World Vancouver to develop the project.

The proposed project is currently in a preliminary design phase. The proposed project is subject to review and approval by Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review Process before any work can be undertaken. Should it be approved, construction of the project is anticipated to start in 2017 and be completed in late 2019.

Learn More and Provide Feedback By:

- Reading the Centerm Expansion Project discussion guide and completing the online feedback form, available on January 18, 2016 at: porttalk.ca/centermexpansion
- Calling Tanya Howes, Communications Advisor, Centerm Expansion Project at: 604.665.9577
- Providing a written submission by:
  Email: centermexpansion@portmetrovancouver.com
  Mail: Port Metro Vancouver
  Attention: Centerm Expansion Project Team
  100 The Pointe, 999 Canada Place
  Vancouver, BC V6C 3T4

How Feedback Will Be Used

Feedback will be considered, along with technical and financial information, as the Centerm Expansion Project team develops a project permit application for submission to Port Metro Vancouver. Feedback will be summarized in a Summary Report, and the project team will provide a Consideration Report showing how feedback was considered. Both documents will be available at porttalk.ca/centermexpansion. There will be further opportunities to provide input regarding the project as it proceeds through planning and development.
SOCIAL MEDIA

Port Metro Vancouver @PortMetroVan Jan 28
Preliminary comment period for the Centerm Expansion Project runs until Feb 12. More info: portalk.ca/centermexpansi...

Port Metro Vancouver @PortMetroVan Feb 10
Learn about the Centerm Expansion Project and preliminary comment period held until Feb 12: portalk.ca/centermexpansi...
Centerm Expansion Project
Preliminary Comment Period:
Scope of Technical and Environmental Studies

Appendix 2:
Discussion Guide and Feedback Form
Centerm Expansion Project

Preliminary Comment Period:
Scope of Technical and Environmental Studies

DISCUSSION GUIDE AND FEEDBACK FORM

January 18 – February 12, 2016

Online Feedback Form Available at porttalk.ca/centermexpansion

A part of the CONTAINER CAPACITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PRELIMINARY COMMENT PERIOD: SCOPE OF TECHNICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

JANUARY 18 – FEBRUARY 12, 2016

You are invited to provide feedback regarding the scope of technical and environmental studies to be undertaken for the proposed Centerm Expansion Project.

LEARN MORE AND PROVIDE FEEDBACK BY:

- Reading this discussion guide and completing the feedback form at: porttalk.ca/centermexpansion
- Providing a written submission by:
  - Email: centermexpansion@portmetrovancouver.com
  - Mail: Port Metro Vancouver, Attention: Centerm Expansion Project Team, 100 The Pointe, 999 Canada Place, Vancouver, BC V6C 3T4
- Calling Tanya Howes, Communications Advisor, Centerm Expansion Project, at: 604.665.9577

Please provide your feedback by February 12, 2016.

HOW FEEDBACK WILL BE USED

Feedback received by February 12, 2016 will be considered in finalizing the scope of technical and environmental studies, and will be considered in further design development of the project. Feedback will be compiled in a Summary Report, and the project team will provide a Consideration Report showing how feedback was considered. Both documents will be available at porttalk.ca/centermexpansion. There will be further opportunities to provide input regarding the project as it proceeds through Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review Process.
ABOUT THE CENTERM EXPANSION PROJECT

Centerm is a container terminal on the south shore of Vancouver’s inner harbour. It is one of three primary container terminals in the Vancouver gateway and handles approximately one-fifth of the goods shipped in containers through Vancouver. Centerm is operated by DP World Vancouver.

The proposed Centerm Expansion Project is a series of improvements to increase the number of containers that can be handled at the existing terminal by approximately two-thirds. These proposed improvements include an expansion of the terminal area, reconfiguration of the terminal, and road and rail access improvements. Port Metro Vancouver’s Centerm Expansion Project Team is working with DP World Vancouver to develop the project.

ABOUT DP WORLD VANCOUVER

DP World Vancouver has operated on Vancouver’s waterfront and provided clients with safe, efficient and reliable cargo handling for over 90 years. DP World Vancouver is part of a global network of 65 marine terminals spread across six continents, with a team of over 36,000 employees.

ABOUT PORT METRO VANCOUVER

Port Metro Vancouver is a port authority established by the Government of Canada, and is responsible for the stewardship of federal port lands in and around Vancouver, British Columbia. The port authority’s mandate is to facilitate Canada’s trade objectives, ensuring goods are moved safely while protecting the environment and considering local communities. Port Metro Vancouver is accountable to the federal Minister of Transport.

CONTAINER CAPACITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Container Capacity Improvement Program is Port Metro Vancouver’s long-term strategy to deliver projects to meet anticipated growth in container capacity demand. Container traffic through Canada’s west coast (Vancouver and Prince Rupert) is expected to double by 2030. The program looks at opportunities to create container capacity through improvements at existing terminals, conversion of existing terminals and development of new infrastructure.

The Centerm Expansion Project is being delivered under the Container Capacity Improvement Program.
WHAT IS THE CENTERM EXPANSION PROJECT?

The Centerm Expansion Project is a series of improvements to increase the container capacity of the existing terminal by approximately two-thirds. These proposed improvements include an expansion of the terminal area, reconfiguration of the terminal, and road and rail access improvements.

The project is currently in the preliminary design phase, which includes undertaking technical and environmental studies, analyzing project data and developing the design. During this phase, the design is subject to further refinement. Should it be approved, construction of the project is anticipated to start in early 2017 and be completed in late 2019.

WHY IS THE PROJECT NEEDED?

Trade of goods shipped in containers through Canada’s west coast is increasing. Current forecasts indicate approximately four million twenty-foot equivalent units (TEUs) of additional container capacity will be needed to meet Canadian west coast container demand by 2030.

The decision to close Ballantyne Cruise Terminal (just east of Centerm) and consolidate cruise operations at Canada Place provides an opportunity to expand Centerm to meet the near-term demand for increased container handling capacity.

WHAT WILL BE THE INCREASE IN CENTERM’S CAPACITY?

The Centerm Expansion Project will increase container capacity at Centerm by approximately two-thirds, from a current maximum annual capacity of 900,000 TEUs to 1.5 million TEUs.

WHO IS LEADING THE PROJECT?

Port Metro Vancouver’s Centerm Expansion Project Team, working with DP World Vancouver, is leading the Centerm Expansion Project. The project team is made up of staff from Port Metro Vancouver’s Infrastructure Delivery Group and a number of subject matter experts.

WHO IS FUNDING THE PROJECT?

Port Metro Vancouver will fund the project and subsequently recover the investment through a revised lease-fee arrangement with DP World Vancouver. The initial budget for the project is $320 million and includes an extension of the terminal area, reconfiguration of the terminal, and road and rail access improvements in the surrounding area.

WHAT APPROVALS ARE NEEDED?

The project is subject to review and approval under Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review Process. Other approvals from Fisheries and Oceans Canada and Transport Canada are also likely required. For more information about Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review, please visit: portmetrovancouver.com/working-with-us/permitting/.

HOW LONG WILL THE PROJECT TAKE TO BUILD?

The Centerm Expansion Project is currently in the preliminary design phase. This phase will be completed in 2016, prior to submitting a project permit application as part of Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review Process. Should the project be approved, construction of the project is anticipated to start in early 2017, with completion estimated for late 2019.
1. PROPOSED PROJECT IMPROVEMENTS

Based on the current preliminary project design, and subject to change, the proposed project may include the following off-terminal and on-terminal improvements, which correspond to the map on page 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL ON-TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Westward Extension of Centerm</td>
<td>Expansion of the terminal footprint to accommodate an extension of the container yard and intermodal yard to the west. This would include a larger wharf structure, rock dykes and earth fill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Eastward Extension of Centerm</td>
<td>Expansion of the terminal footprint to accommodate additional container storage, a new in-gate, parking and a new administrative building. This would include the rehabilitation of the existing Ballantyne Pier with rock dykes and earth fill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Extension of the Terminal Intermodal Rail Yard</td>
<td>Expansion of the intermodal yard through the addition of a fifth rail track and rail track extensions to the west and east, to improve the efficiency of rail operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Reconfiguration of the Container Yard</td>
<td>Increased capacity and efficiency for container yard operations, including loaded containers, empties and refrigerated container stacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Modernized Gate System</td>
<td>Reconstruction of the terminal entrance and exit gates using modern gate technologies to increase container truck throughput.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> New Operations Administration Building and Parking</td>
<td>Construction of a larger operations administration building and additional parking for staff and terminal vehicles. Studies are underway to determine the feasibility of repurposing the vacant Ballantyne cruise ship terminal building or, at a minimum, incorporating the brick façade into a new building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## POTENTIAL OFF-TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>Removal of the Heatley Overpass  &lt;br&gt;Removal of the Heatley Overpass to accommodate the eastern extension of the intermodal yard. The functionality of this overpass will be replaced with items 8 and 9 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>Waterfront Road Extension  &lt;br&gt;Extension of Waterfront Road to Centennial Road, thereby providing a connection to the Main Street Overpass and effectively creating a continuous roadway through port lands between downtown Vancouver and Highway 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9a</strong></td>
<td>Construction of either:  &lt;br&gt;A Centennial Road Overpass or  &lt;br&gt;A Waterfront Road Overpass  &lt;br&gt;Reinstatement of grade-separated access to the Centerm Terminal entrance for first responders, workers and commercial vehicles, from either Main Street via Waterfront Road to the west or Clark Drive via Centennial Road to the east.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, DP World Vancouver would procure additional container handling equipment in a phased manner as demand for terminal throughput increases. In addition to one quay crane that is already scheduled for replacement in 2016, one additional quay crane may be replaced and another added, to bring the total number of quay cranes at the terminal to seven. The rubber-tired gantry cranes that currently operate in the intermodal yard would be moved to the container yard, and the intermodal yard would be serviced with, ultimately, up to five new electric rail-mounted gantry cranes. The fleet of inter-terminal transfer vehicles would also be increased from 47 today to approximately 67 at maximum capacity.
2. TECHNICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES – WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU

The Centerm Expansion Project team is working with subject matter experts to develop and undertake studies required to inform preliminary design and project permit applications. Port Metro Vancouver’s Project and Environmental Review Process requires that the Centerm Expansion Project application include the following technical and environmental studies. Further details on Port Metro Vancouver’s scope requirements for many of these studies are available at portmetrovancouver.com/working-with-us/permitting/.

The Centerm Expansion Project Team is seeking feedback on the scope of technical and environmental studies, including additional scope that you feel should be included in these studies.

2.1 TECHNICAL STUDIES

Proposed Technical Studies include the following:

2.1.1 GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

Overview

- Description of site seismic and geologic hazards.
- Description of construction measures, precautions and corrective actions recommended for preventing structural damage and reducing the risk of geotechnical hazards.
- The report will include a geotechnical assessment of the wharf structure and perimeter dykes.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this report:

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this report:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
2.1.2 TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Overview

• An assessment of current site traffic as well as anticipated truck and rail traffic volumes, on-site vehicle movements, traffic distribution throughout the day and its impact on adjacent and nearby roads, and parking requirements.
• Proposed hours of operation, staffing number, and site plan showing on-site vehicle movements, buildings, proposed rail tracks and any other proposed features.
• The study will include an overall assessment and detailed plans of how the new terminal entrance and exit gates operate.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this study:

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Somewhat Agree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this study:

________________________
________________________
________________________

2.1.3 RAIL OPERATIONS PLAN

Overview

• An assessment of the anticipated rail operations, including length and number of cars, average number and peak number of anticipated trains per day at the site, how rail cars are delivered to the site and managed while on-site, and total site capacity (length of tracks and total number of trains that can be accommodated on-site).
• Overview of how train car switching is conducted or managed, and review of design speed for arriving and departing trains.
• Description of how long an arriving train would take, from entering the South Shore to clearing the last switch and entering the terminal.
• Description of the design capacity and specifications for the rail improvements that are specified for all on-site rail.
• Expected operations traffic, up to the 10-year horizon.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Somewhat Agree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

________________________
________________________
________________________

________________________
________________________
________________________
2.1.4 MARINE TRAFFIC STUDY

Overview

- Confirmation of the design vessel range (maximum and minimum size of marine vessels that can be berthed and loaded) and anticipated traffic levels, anticipated anchorage patterns and any other operational criteria.
- Mooring plan for vessels at maximum and minimum size.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this study:

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Somewhat Agree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Somewhat Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this study:


2.1.5 DREDGING PLAN

Overview

- Diagram of the proposed dredge area and sediment analysis.
- Description of the proposed dredge volume and method, and anticipated disposal method.
- Timing of proposed dredging in relation to fisheries’ sensitive periods.
- Anticipated time frame for the duration of works and hours of operation expected for the equipment.
- Proposed mitigation measures.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Somewhat Agree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Somewhat Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:


2.1.6 ALTERNATIVE SITING OPTIONS REPORT

Overview

• An assessment of alternative siting options of proposed buildings and structures.
• Report to include rationale for each rejected option from an environmental, community and economic perspective.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this report:

☐ Strongly Agree    ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree    ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this report:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

2.1.7 SPILL PREVENTION AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN (ON LAND AND WATER)

Overview

• The existing spill prevention and emergency response plan to be updated, based on anticipated terminal layout changes for the proposed project.
• Inventory of the anticipated hazardous materials to be handled or stored on-site during normal operations.
• A description of spill prevention, containment and cleanup plan for hydrocarbon products (including fuel, oil and hydraulic fluid) and any other substances using standards, practices, methods and procedures to a good commercial standard, conforming to applicable laws.
• Description of proposed employee training, emergency response communication plan, emergency procedures, spill tracking and reporting and records of facilities inspections.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

☐ Strongly Agree    ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree    ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES
A number of environmental studies will be carried out in support of the environmental assessment of the project. The sections of the environmental assessment report and the associated studies include the following:

2.2.1 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS REPORT FOR DEMOLITIONS

Overview
- Inventory of any hazardous materials including asbestos, drywall, the contents in aboveground or underground storage tanks, and any on-site chemicals.
- Description of hazardous materials storage and handling methods.
- Table of applicable regulations.
- Hazardous materials reuse, removal, recycling and disposal plan, prior to demolition of structures in accordance with all relevant regulations.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this report:

- [ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Somewhat Disagree
- [ ] Somewhat Agree  [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this report:

2.2.2 STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

Overview
- Description of daily terminal operations as they relate to stormwater management, given the local climate, and water capture and treatment systems.
- Consideration of effects of the Centerm Expansion Project on stormwater management for the existing site.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

- [ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Somewhat Disagree
- [ ] Somewhat Agree  [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
2.2.3 NOISE STUDY

Overview

- An assessment of how the proposed development will affect the noise levels experienced by the adjacent community.
- The boundaries associated with the assessment include a local and regional area. The local study area extends 1.5 kilometres from the project footprint. The regional study area extends up to 5 kilometres from the project footprint.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this study:

- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Somewhat Agree
- □ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree
- □ Somewhat Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this study:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2.2.4 AIR ASSESSMENT

Overview

- An assessment of contributions to air quality associated with the facility and related off-site operations.
- Modelling to be consistent with the Guidelines for Air Quality Dispersion Modelling in British Columbia (BCMOE, 2008) in consultation with regulatory agencies as required.
- The assessment area is to be between 10 and 50 kilometres square, centred on the dominant emission source, as stated by the BC Ministry of Environment guidelines.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this assessment:

- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Somewhat Agree
- □ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree
- □ Somewhat Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this assessment:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
2.2.5 ENERGY EFFICIENCY STUDY

Overview

• An assessment of how the proposed development (buildings, motorized equipment, and lights) will affect electrical energy consumption levels.
• An assessment to include energy modelling, demonstrate selection of BATNEC (best availability technology not entailing excessive cost) energy-efficient equipment.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this study:

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this study:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2.2.6 VIEW AND SHADE IMPACT ANALYSIS

Overview

• An assessment and renderings of potential view and shade impacts of the proposed Centerm improvements.
• An assessment to be completed with a focus on the proposed Centerm improvements.
• Determination of visual impacts of the upgraded facility, including lighting.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this analysis:

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this analysis:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
2.2.7 MITIGATION SUMMARY

Overview
• A report section outlining all potential effects from the proposed project on the environment, the public, Aboriginal groups and heritage resources during construction, operations, decommissioning and reclamation, and proposed mitigation strategies (avoidance, minimization of impacts, on-site restoration, offset).

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this section:
- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this section:

2.2.8 ARCHAEOLOGICAL OVERVIEW ASSESSMENT

Overview
• An assessment of archaeological resource potential or sensitivity within the proposed project area, including recommendations for any subsequent archaeological work.
• Identify the location of the proposed project in relation to the original shoreline, river/stream banks, or (historic or current) drinking water sources.
• Review archaeological, ethnographic, historic, environmental and geological data; and maps, including airphotos and hydrological charts.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this assessment:
- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this assessment:
2.2.9 CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Overview

• Description of how the site will be managed during construction to mitigate adverse effects on the environment, heritage resources, the public (municipal, stakeholders, community) and Aboriginal groups, including potential effects from limiting noise, vibration, light, dust emissions and odour.

• To include key measures to mitigate effects of construction on the environment.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________

2.2.10 VEGETATION PLAN

Overview

• Description of topography, hydrology, and soil cover and quality.

• Description of current vegetation types, characteristics and relative abundance, including native, listed and invasive species.

• Description of vegetation removal and details as to proposed location, and species and ratio of replacement planting, including a vegetation management, monitoring and control plan.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
2.2.11 SOIL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Overview
• Outline how the Centerm Expansion Project will appropriately handle, limit migration/runoff and dispose of contaminated soils.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this plan:
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this plan:

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

2.2.12 BIOPHYSICAL SURVEY

Overview
• An assessment of species and habitats that will be affected by project activities such as infilling, vegetation removal or shoreline modification.
• Assessment of the potential effects on both physical habitat and food resource for marine invertebrates, bottom fish and demersal species.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this survey:
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this survey:

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
2.2.13 NESTING BIRD SURVEY

Overview

• An assessment of nesting birds using non-intrusive methods (i.e., determine the presence of birds in habitat through observation of singing birds, alarm calls, distraction displays, nests).

• Assessment will include a description of existing conditions, potential effects and proposed mitigation strategies.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this survey:

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this survey:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2.2.14 SPECIES-AT-RISK ASSESSMENT

Overview

• Identification of all federal and provincial listed species at risk that are associated with the proposed project.

• Assessment will include a description of potential effects and proposed mitigation strategies.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this assessment:

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Somewhat Disagree
☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this assessment:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
2.2.15 INVASIVE SPECIES ASSESSMENT

Overview

- Assessment of existing invasive species types.
- Mitigation plan to prevent spread of invasive species during construction.
- Invasive species monitoring and management plan.

Please rate your level of agreement with the scope of this assessment:

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Somewhat Agree
- [ ] Somewhat Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree

Please provide your reasons for your level of agreement, including any additional scope you feel should be included for this assessment:

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding the scope of technical or environmental studies proposed for the Centerm Expansion Project, including any additional studies that you feel should be included:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
3. COMMUNITY AMENITY – WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU

The Centerm Expansion Project Team is exploring the possibility of including a community amenity as part of the project and would like to gather your thoughts on the type of amenity that you would like to see. Suggestions provided during this preliminary 20-day comment period regarding a potential community amenity will be given thorough consideration for inclusion in the scope of the project.

Please indicate your level of interest with a proposed community amenity under each of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Not Very Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/Park Improvements</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian, Cycling and Transportation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Social/Community Programs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding a proposed community amenity as part of the Centerm Expansion Project:
4. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding any aspect of the Centerm Expansion Project:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Please provide your feedback by February 12, 2016.

You can return completed feedback forms to the Centerm Expansion Project team by:

Online: Feedback form: porttalk.ca/centermexpansion
Email: centermexpansion@portmetrovancouver.com
Mail: Port Metro Vancouver
Attention: Centerm Expansion Project Team
100 The Pointe, 999 Canada Place, Vancouver, BC V6C 3T4

Please provide your contact information (optional):

Name:
Organization (if applicable):
Address:
Postal Code: Phone:
Email:

If you would like to receive regular updates about the Centerm Expansion Project, please tick this box. □

Any personal contact information you provide to Port Metro Vancouver on this form is collected and protected in accordance with the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act. If you have any questions regarding the Container Capacity Improvement Program or the Centerm Expansion Project and/or the information collection undertaken on this form, please contact Port Metro Vancouver Centerm Expansion Project team at centermexpansion@portmetrovancouver.com.