



Proposed Centerm Expansion Project Preliminary Comment Period Consideration Report

January – March 2016

Proposed Centerm Expansion Project: Preliminary Comment Period

PURPOSE

This consideration report provides the Centerm Expansion Project team's response to input received as part of the preliminary comment period held between January 18 and February 12, 2016 as well as additional comments that were received throughout the spring. The purpose of the preliminary comment period was to gather feedback from the public and stakeholders on the scope of the planned technical and environmental studies, and suggestions regarding a potential community amenity for possible inclusion in the scope of the project. Feedback forms were made available in the Centerm Expansion Project discussion guide that was posted online. A project description was provided in the guide, as well as the description of proposed scope of each technical and environmental study. The public was asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of each study as strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

Feedback received as part of the preliminary comment period was compiled in the Centerm Expansion Project preliminary comment period summary report which is available at porttalk.ca/centermexpansion, and was considered in developing the scope of technical and environmental studies, and design development of the project. There would be further opportunities to provide input regarding the project should it proceed through the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority's Project and Environmental Review Process.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Centerm Container Terminal (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 the Port of Vancouver. Centerm is operated by DP World Vancouver.

The proposed Centerm Expansion Project includes a series of improvements and reconfiguring terminal infrastructure. This will increase the number of containers that can be handled at the existing terminal by approximately two-thirds while only expanding the terminal footprint by 15 per cent. The proposed project includes a reconfiguration and expansion of the terminal area, and road and rail access improvements. Vancouver Fraser Port Authority's Centerm Expansion Project team is working in partnership with DP World Vancouver to develop the project. Concurrently, Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is planning to undertake off-terminal road and rail improvements between Clark Drive and Main Street to improve the entire south shore road and rail network.

The proposed project is currently in the preliminary design phase and is subject to review and approval by the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority'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 complete in late 2019. The terminal would continue to operate at its current capacity during construction. Full capacity operations would begin sometime after completion of construction.

PRELIMINARY COMMENT PERIOD (JANUARY 18 – FEBRUARY 12, 2016) – OVERVIEW

The public and stakeholders were provided with the following opportunities to participate in the preliminary comment period.

1. Engagement materials and opportunities for feedback included:

- A dedicated webpage at *porttalk.ca/centermexpansion*
- A discussion guide and feedback form at *porttalk.ca/centermexpansion*
- An online feedback form available at *porttalk.ca/centermexpansion*
- Two small group meetings with stakeholders such as the City of Vancouver, first responders, business associations and community organizations (January 25 and 27, 2016)
- Technical meetings with stakeholders such as the City of Vancouver, DP World Vancouver and port tenants (January – June, 2016)

2. The public was provided with information and opportunities to comment on:

- Information regarding the proposed Centerm Expansion Project preliminary design
- The scope of technical and environmental studies
- A potential community amenity for possible inclusion in the scope of the project

3. 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 and suggested by the City of Vancouver, such as community organizations, stratas, first responders, and residential and business associations, 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 @PortVancouver 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.

More information regarding the preliminary comment period can be found in the [preliminary comment period summary report](#).

INPUT CONSIDERATION AND PROJECT TEAM RESPONSES

Input

Input received during the preliminary comment period was compiled in the preliminary comment period summary report, which is available online at porttalk.ca/centermexpansion. The Centerm Expansion Project team has considered the input received during the preliminary comment period in finalizing the scope of technical and environmental studies, and design development of the project.

The following consideration report summarizes input from 72 participant interactions during the Centerm Expansion Project preliminary comment period, including:

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

Please note that in instances where comments were similar, they have been summarized into themes under the “summary of input” column and addressed through the “Centerm Expansion Project Team Response” column. For more detailed comments please see the preliminary comment period Summary report, which is available online at porttalk.ca/centermexpansion.

The number of comments varies by subject, as not every person who submitted comments commented on every topic. In many cases, comments received by the public indicated that the scope was complete. The Centerm Expansion Project team acknowledged receipt of that comment.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority’s Infrastructure Delivery Team is leading the proposed Centerm Expansion Project and is working with DP World Vancouver to develop a permit application. That permit application would be submitted to the port authority’s Project and Environmental Review (PER) Team for review. In this document, the Infrastructure Delivery Team is referred to as the Centerm Expansion Project (CEP) team.

Canada Port Authorities have been the permitting authority for federal port lands since the introduction of the *Canada Marine Act* in 1998, and they conduct environmental reviews under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA), 2012* and its predecessor act, as do other federal authorities.

As a federal authority, port authorities are required to make a “determination” as per section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* before exercising any power that could allow a project to be carried out, in whole or in part, on federal lands. The federal authority must not allow a project to proceed unless the authority determines that the project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

As a federal permitting authority, the port authority is committed to conducting thorough, robust, science-based project and environmental reviews. Other authorities, including Environment Canada, Transport Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, and Health Canada often provide input to port project reviews.

Next Steps

The project application has not yet been submitted but should that happen, it would undergo our formal permit and environmental review that assesses whether the proposed project would have impacts to such things as traffic, noise, views, air and water quality, fish and fish habitat and other marine resources, and potential effects on tidal flushing in the embayment between Centerm and CRAB Park at Portside.

The preliminary design continues to evolve, and the Waterfront Road Overpass is now no longer being considered.

If an application is submitted, the technical studies would each be separate stand-alone documents. The environmental studies would be compiled in a single environmental study report with a summary of proposed mitigation measures. All these documents would be submitted as part of the permit application. The permit application and all accompanying documentation would be posted on the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority's website once submitted and deemed complete.

There would also be another round of public consultation. The purpose of the application review consultation period would be for the public and stakeholders to receive more detailed information about the project, the results of the technical and environmental studies, any proposed mitigations and to provide comments on the proposed project.

Both the preliminary comment period and application review consultation period are formally required under the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority's Project and Environmental Review Process.

It's important to us that those who are concerned get involved, look at the proposal and have their concerns heard. Information about our review process, timelines and the guidelines for consultation are available on our website.

1. Geotechnical Report

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the geotechnical report. Of the 28 participants who completed the question, 21 strongly/somewhat agreed, 6 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 1 strongly disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the geotechnical report:

1.1 The report should include how a large earthquake in the next 20-50 years or tsunami could impact the surrounding area, and that safety mitigation measures be made public.

1.2 The geotechnical study should incorporate more information, including the effects on CRAB Park at Portside and an analysis of the rail link between the False Creek Flats and Centerm.

Response to comments:

1.1 The geotechnical study would focus on the investigation and determination of the subsurface conditions at the site for the design and construction of new infrastructure. It would outline the size of the earthquake considered for the various structures, which would be based on seismic events having various probabilities of exceedance in 50 years. An assessment of a potential tsunami impact would not be included within the scope of the report, as Burrard Inlet is largely protected from such an event. Safety mitigation measures would be included in the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan.

1.2. The geotechnical study would focus on the investigation and determination of the subsurface conditions at the site for the design and construction of new infrastructure. This project does not propose new infrastructure in CRAB Park at Portside or a rail link to False Creek. The proposed project does not physically touch CRAB Park at Portside.

2. Traffic Impact Study

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Traffic Impact Study. Of the 27 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed, 2 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 6 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Traffic Impact Study:

- 2.1 Request that the study should incorporate:
- a) A broader scope, and include specific effects to trips by foot, car and transit in the area;
 - b) A breakdown of rail and truck traffic and mitigation measures;
 - c) Effects of increased traffic on local roads;
 - d) An examination of the overall trucking system in the region;
 - e) Forecasted container truck traffic growth to 2030;
 - f) Outline the impacts to Vancouver's current and future street network; and
 - g) The impacts of the proposed extension of the vehicle access gates on Waterfront Road to Main Street.

Response to comments:

- 2.1 The Traffic Impact Study would include the roads managed by the port authority as well as the City of Vancouver street network north of Hastings between Main Street and Clark Drive and the Powell/McGill corridor between Clark Drive and Commissioner Street.
- a) The Traffic Impact Study would consider vehicle traffic, including cars and transit. Pedestrian access to the port would be provided, and pedestrian traffic outside the port would not be impacted by the Project.
 - b) The study would assess 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. Mitigation measures are being considered and would be documented in the Mitigation Summary, which would be submitted as part of the permit application.
 - c) See above.
 - d) Though not anticipated, should the results of the traffic impact study find that significant impacts to the overall trucking system may result from the project, the scope would be revised to determine the extent of the traffic impacts.

<p>2.2 Concern about increased traffic in downtown Vancouver.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) The Traffic Impact Study would be based on truck volumes associated with the terminal operating at full capacity following expansion. Unless a subsequent project is implemented on the South Shore, this is the maximum container growth anticipated between now and 2030. f) The Traffic Impact Study would consider the effects to the local City of Vancouver street network as noted above. The CEP team is not aware of any proposed changes to Vancouver’s street network within the study area. g) The CEP team is reviewing the effects of the proposed extension of the vehicle access gate on Waterfront Road to Main Street.
<p>2.3 Request that the study should be made available to the public.</p>	<p>2.2</p>	<p>The CEP team is reviewing the effects of the proposed extension of the vehicle access gate on Waterfront Road to Main Street and the results of this review would be included in the Traffic Impact Study. As noted above, the Traffic Impact Study would consider impacts to the local road network adjacent to the terminal, which includes the port roads as well as the City of Vancouver street network north of Hastings between Main Street and Clark Drive and the Powell/McGill corridor between Clark Drive and Commissioner Street.</p> <p>In addition, the project also provides more opportunity for goods to be shipped via rail. By increasing the number of cranes (one large and some smaller cranes) and the length of rail tracks, the capacity of the Intermodal Yard to ship containers by rail almost doubles.</p>
<p>2.3 Request that the study should be made available to the public.</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>The study results would be made available to the public as part of the permitting process.</p>

Summary of Input**Centerm Expansion Project Team Response**

2.4 Request that Main Street should be solely used for emergency access, that container traffic be moved to off-peak hours, and expressed concern about public access to roads along the coastline.

2.4 As currently proposed, Main Street would serve as a direct replacement for the functionality of the Heatley overpass, and would continue to be used as an access point for workers, emergency vehicles and smaller commercial vehicles. The main route for container trucks would continue to be east of the terminal along Centennial Road to either Clark Drive or Commissioner Street. Most container truck traffic is currently outside the AM and PM peak hours, and this would not change if the project proceeds, since container truck traffic is dispersed throughout the day from 7AM to midnight, Monday to Friday. Note that this project does not change public access to the waterfront.

3. Rail Operations Plan

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Rail Operations Plan. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed, 5 neither agreed nor disagreed and 2 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Rail Operations Plan:

Response to comments:

- 3.1 Concern regarding the effect of increased noise to surrounding communities.
- 3.2 Request that the scope of the Rail Operations Plan should include:
- a) A study of rail traffic noise and mitigation measures;
 - b) A detailed assessment of the increase in the number of containers;
 - c) A horizon of more than 10 years;
 - d) A forecast of the split in east/west versus north/south rail traffic to the False Creek Flats; and
 - e) The impact to at-grade crossings in east Vancouver.

- 3.1 The Noise Study would evaluate the effect of increased noise within approximately 5 kilometres of the terminal and explore potential mitigation measures.
- 3.2 The Rail Operations Plan would be made available to the public when the CEP team makes a permit application.
- a) The Noise Study would evaluate the effect of increased noise within approximately 5 kilometres of the terminal and explore potential mitigation measures.
 - b) An assessment of the increase in the number of containers has been undertaken; available modelling supports the estimate of a projected two-thirds increase in capacity at the terminal.
 - c) The Plan would consider all currently known rail developments that are proposed for the South Shore Trade Area. Known rail developments are within an approximate 15-year timeframe.
 - d) Unless CP Rail and CN Rail re-negotiate their operations agreement, the Rail Operations Plan would be based on the current rail operating agreement, whereby CP Rail operates all trains belonging to both parties on the South Shore. Current operations do not move Centerm containers north/south along the Burrard Inlet Line between the terminal and False Creek Flats.

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| 3.3 | Request that the rail capacity should be a key focus of the plan, and that commuter rail be included in the assessment and mitigation measures. | 3.3 | e) Centerm container traffic does not utilize at-grade crossings in east Vancouver outside the port area, and this is not expected to change unless the railway companies amend their operating agreement in the future. |
| | | 3.3 | Rail capacity would be a key focus of the Rail Operations Plan. All current and known future track use would be considered, including West Coast Express. |

4. Marine Traffic Study

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Marine Traffic Study. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed, 5 neither agreed nor disagreed and 2 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Marine Traffic Study:

Response to comments:

4.1 Concern regarding the impact to the environment, including the effects of increased marine traffic and noise on fisheries and marine wildlife.

4.1 The Marine Traffic Study is a technical study specific to navigational aspects and does not include environmental impacts. The project is not expected to result in significant increases in marine traffic and as such, an evaluation of the potential marine traffic impacts on fisheries and marine wildlife is not proposed. If the results of the Marine Traffic Study show significant increases in marine traffic, then the CEP team would consider expanding the scope of the environmental studies.

4.2 Conclusion that the terminal expansion will have impacts to marine traffic, including cruise ships.

4.2 The Marine Traffic Study would evaluate impacts to marine traffic. Cruise ship simulations would be carried out to look at the potential impacts that the project may have on cruise ship operations at Canada Place.

4.3 Concern about visual impacts due to increased traffic.

4.3 As noted above, the Marine Traffic Study is a technical study specific to navigational aspects and does not include environmental impacts. The View and Shade Impact Analysis does not consider view impacts of container ships transiting the harbour because these impacts are temporary. View and shade impacts of container ships berthed at the terminal are also not considered since there would not be any change to the position of container ships berthed at the terminal.

Summary of Input**Centerm Expansion Project Team Response**

4.4 Request that potential impacts to the SeaBus and SeaBus terminal be included in this study.

4.4 The CEP team has met with TransLink and is working to identify any potential effects the project may have to the SeaBus or SeaBus terminal.

5. Dredging Plan

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Dredging Plan. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 17 strongly/somewhat agreed, 8 neither agreed nor disagreed and 1 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Dredging Plan:

- 5.1. Concern about dredged materials, its impacts to air quality, where it would be placed and that the scope of the plan should include an analysis of dredged material.
- 5.2 Concern about long-term negative impacts of dredging, and requested that the scope of the plan include tidal areas, fish, birds and the environment, mitigation measures, and future actions to deal with implications.

Response to comments:

- 5.1 The Dredging Plan would include a diagram of the proposed dredge area and sediment analysis, a description of the anticipated dredge volume and method, and anticipated disposal method. If there are any concerns about the dredged materials impacting air quality, they would be included in the Air Assessment in the environmental study report.
- 5.2 The scope of the plan would include impacted areas in the project area. There are no anticipated long-term adverse impacts associated with the dredging for the Centerm Expansion Project. The environmental study report includes assessments of impacts to water and sediment quality, birds, and marine resources including fish, fish habitat, and intertidal areas. The environmental study report would outline potential effects and proposed mitigation strategies.

The effects of disposal at sea on the marine environment will be reviewed by Environment Canada since the disposal site is proposed to be in waters outside of the port authority's boundaries.

6. Alternative Siting Options Report

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Alternative Siting Options Report. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 20 strongly/somewhat agreed, 5 neither agreed nor disagreed and 1 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Alternative Siting Options Report:

Response to comments:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>6.1 Request that expansion westward be reconsidered, and that other alternatives be explored.</p> | <p>6.1 The Alternative Siting Options Report would include a rationale for the selection of the expansion layout, an assessment of constraining features which determine the siting arrangement and any alternative siting options considered including proposed buildings and structures, and different harbour infill alternatives, including the rationale for each rejected option. This report would also indicate why the existing Centerm container terminal was chosen for expansion.</p> |
| <p>6.2 Concern that the Centennial Road Overpass poses a loss of view towards the Rogers Sugar Building.</p> | <p>6.2 It is acknowledged that a Centennial Road Overpass would partially impact the view of the lower portion of the historic Rogers Sugar Building. A statement of historical significance would be prepared for this building and views of this building would be considered in the View and Shade Impact Analysis.</p> |
| <p>6.3 Concern about visual impacts on Vancouver's harbour due to the added structure and that the report should include a review of all port lands.</p> | <p>6.3 The CEP team will be undertaking a View and Shade Impact Analysis as part of the environmental study report. The analysis will include an assessment and renderings of potential view and shade impacts of the proposed Centerm Expansion Project. A review of the visual impacts from all port lands is not in the scope of the project, however, the assessment of project effects would take the context of the current conditions into account.</p> |

7. Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan (On Land and Water)

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed, 4 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 3 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan (On Land and Water):

Response to comments:

- 7.1 Concern about mitigation measures in the event of a fire, and potential health impacts, and that the plan should include improvements for future protocol.
- 7.2 Request the plan should include wording to improve, and exceed commercial standards for spill prevention and emergency response and request identification of the funds to be allocated to spill prevention and emergency response.
- 7.3 Concern about this plan accommodating the two-thirds increase in traffic, and the type of materials being transported.
- 7.4 Request the plan should include emergency access on the water side of the Ballantyne Dock.

- 7.1 The existing Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan would be updated based on anticipated terminal layout changes for the proposed project.
- 7.2 The Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan would include a description of spill prevention, containment and cleanup plans using standards, practices, methods and procedures to a good commercial standard, conforming to applicable laws and would outline which agencies deal with the different aspects of the plan.
- 7.3 The plan would consider the increased terminal footprint and the increase in container traffic. Note that the types of materials being shipped through the terminal are not expected to change as a result of the proposed expansion.
- 7.4 Measures to provide emergency access from the water would be given consideration.

8. Hazardous Materials Report for Demolitions

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Hazardous Materials Report for Demolitions. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 18 strongly/somewhat agreed, 6 neither agreed nor disagreed and 2 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Hazardous Materials Report for Demolitions:

Response to comments:

8.1 The container chemical fire at Centerm in 2015 was cited, and concern was expressed about the health and safety of surrounding communities.

8.1 The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority regularly works with first responders and other agencies to ensure efforts are closely coordinated. This includes local fire and police departments, the Canadian Coast Guard and others to ensure proper emergency preparedness and response. Safety in and around the harbour is a core function of the port authority.

The terminal operator DP World Vancouver, Vancouver Fraser Port Authority Operations, and first responders are aware of the community concerns stemming from the incident and have implemented a number of changes to their emergency response procedures in case of a similar event. Should the project be approved, the terminal's existing emergency response plans and fire safety plans would be further updated, based on input from other emergency response agencies.

8.2 Request that impacts to tidal flows and fish be included in the scope of this study.

8.2 This report would deal specifically with the handling of hazardous materials during building demolitions. The environmental study report would include an evaluation of impacts to tidal flows in the embayment between Centerm and CRAB Park.

9. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 18 strongly/somewhat agreed, 6 neither agreed nor disagreed and 2 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:

Response to comments:

- 9.1 Request the effects of hydrocarbon leaks from truck engines be included in this plan.

- 9.2 General environmental concerns, and requests that mitigation measures be implemented.

- 9.1 The plan would consider terminal operations, including potential hydrocarbon leaks from trucks and other equipment while on site.

- 9.2 The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will describe the systems and operating procedures that will be implemented to manage stormwater during construction and operation and to prevent the release of pollutants into the marine environment.

10. Noise Study

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Noise Study. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed, 4 neither agreed nor disagreed and 3 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Noise Study:

Response to comments:

10.1 Concern about current noise levels, including impacts to the surrounding communities, health impacts, and request that noise levels be decreased and sufficiently mitigated. Request that the results from the Noise Study be included in a risk assessment or health impact assessment.

10.1 The Noise Assessment includes model predictions of the potential effects of the project in the context of the current conditions. The project effects are not considered in isolation, rather they are considered on top of the current conditions. The overall effect on noise is then compared to established standards by Metro Vancouver and Health Canada. Based on initial predictions of project effects, a risk assessment or health impact assessment is not currently under consideration. A more rigorous assessment may be carried out if warranted by the results of the various environmental studies.

10.2 More information was requested about the construction timeline, specifically when pile driving would commence.

10.2 Should the project be approved, construction could start as in 2017 and be substantially complete in late 2019. At this time, it is uncertain if pile driving would be part of the construction activities.

Summary of Input	Centerm Expansion Project Team Response
<p>10.3 Request the consultation process should include all residents in a 1.5 kilometre radius of the terminal, as they are most significantly impacted by noise.</p>	<p>10.3 Post card notification for the preliminary comment period was sent to 6,200 residents and businesses between Cambie Street and Clark Drive and north of Hastings Street, roughly a one kilometre radius from the terminal. The mail drop area was selected as it included residents and businesses near Centerm and the main transportation corridors for the terminal. The area of the Canada Post mail drop is attached for reference. The consultation process has included, and would continue to include notification in local papers, online material and mail drops to residences and businesses in the surrounding areas. Based on feedback received, the CEP team is considering revising aspects of the notification process and area.</p>
<p>10.4 Request the results from the Noise Study should be included in a risk assessment or health impact assessment.</p>	<p>10.4 Based on initial predictions of project effects, a risk assessment or health impact assessment is not currently under consideration. A more rigorous assessment may be carried out if warranted by the results of the various environmental studies.</p>

Summary of Input	Centerm Expansion Project Team Response
------------------	---

11. Air Assessment

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Air Assessment. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed, 5 neither agreed nor disagreed and 2 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Air Assessment:

Response to comments:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>11.1 Request that the possibility of shore power be explored in this assessment to reduce pollution, and improve air quality.</p> | <p>11.1 The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is undertaking a shorepower initiative throughout its jurisdiction, separate from the proposed Centerm Expansion Project. The CEP team currently plans to take the conservative approach of excluding these air quality benefits from the assessment of the proposed Centerm Expansion Project.</p> |
| <p>11.2 Concern about potential health impacts due to air quality, including increased levels of pollution and emissions from truck traffic, and that the assessment be made available to the public.</p> | <p>11.2 The modelling would consider truck traffic in the vicinity of the terminal. The assessment would be publically available should a permit application be submitted for the project.</p> |
| <p>11.3 Request that the geographic scope of the assessment be extended to include Port Moody and Indian Arm.</p> | <p>11.3 The assessment area is between 10 and 50 square kilometres, centred on the dominant emission source, consistent with the port authority's air assessment guidelines. Port Moody and Indian Arm would not be included in the assessment because the project effects are not likely to extend that far.</p> |
| <p>11.4 Request that the diesel particulate matter emissions from the project be included and compared to historic levels.</p> | <p>11.4 Particulate matter released from diesel combustion would be included in the scope of the study. Historical levels from Metro Vancouver air quality stations would be used for comparisons to ambient background levels.</p> |

Summary of Input**Centerm Expansion Project Team Response**

11.5 Request that the results from the Air Assessment be included in a risk assessment or health impact assessment.

11.5 The Air Assessment includes model predictions of the potential effects of the project in the context of the current conditions. The project effects are not considered in isolation, rather they are considered on top of the current conditions. The overall effects are compared to health-based national, provincial, and Metro Vancouver ambient air quality objectives.

12. Energy Efficiency Study

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Energy Efficiency Study. Of the 28 participants who completed the question, 17 strongly/somewhat agreed, 8 neither agreed nor disagreed and 3 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Energy Efficiency Study:

Response to comments:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>12.1 Request that a numeric dollar value for energy-efficient equipment to be installed at the terminal.</p> | <p>12.1 While commercial information such as numeric dollar values cannot be provided, since the project is a partnership with DP World Vancouver which is a private company, the majority of the new terminal equipment budget would be spent on energy-efficient equipment. The new quay and intermodal yard cranes would all be zero-emission electric cranes. LED terminal lighting would be utilized and the new operations building would be developed with sustainability targets in mind.</p> |
| <p>12.2 Request that the alternate sources of energy, including solar and wind be included in the scope of this study and that Centerm should become the greenest port in the world.</p> | <p>12.2 While much of the existing infrastructure would continue to be powered as it is currently, this project does take into consideration renewable energy sources for many of the proposed new infrastructure elements. Solar and wind power are not feasible, given the footprint of the terminal and the energy required to run it. Any source of energy would need to be both reliable and able to provide large amounts of energy. An example of how the project is utilizing renewable power, is the new cranes would be powered using BC Hydro electricity, rather than diesel.</p> |

13. View and Shade Impact Analysis

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the View and Shade Impact Analysis. Of the 25 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed, 5 neither agreed nor disagreed and 1 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the View and Shade Impact Analysis:

- 13.1 Concern about potential visual impacts and requested that an in-depth analysis, including impacts to surrounding communities be carried out and that mitigation measures be implemented.

Response to comments:

- 13.1 The View and Shade Impact Analysis would include an assessment and renderings of potential view and shade impacts to surrounding communities. The studies will indicate if any mitigation measures are warranted. The design concept for the proposed Centennial Road Overpass will be developed with consideration of view impacts on the Lantic (Rogers Sugar) building.

14. Mitigation Summary

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Mitigation Summary. Of the 27 participants who completed the question, 21 strongly/somewhat agreed and 6 neither agreed nor disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Mitigation Summary:

Response to comments:

14.1 Request that a broader scope be developed for the Mitigation Summary and that it be made public.

14.1 The environmental studies would be compiled in an environmental study report, which would include a summary of proposed mitigation measures. The environmental study report and the mitigation summary outline the measures that are proposed to mitigate effects from project activities. The environmental study report would be submitted as part of the permit application. The permit application and all accompanying documentation would be posted on the port authority’s website.

14.2 Request that the study outline public benefits, including the development of a public plaza near the SeaBus terminal.

14.2 The focus of the mitigation summary is on potential impacts of the project and how those impacts are mitigated. As an amenity is not a mitigation, it would not be included in the mitigation summary. It is a key part of the project and a benefit of the project. More consultation would be done to determine what kind of amenity the community would like to see, and this information would be publicly available. The CEP team would take the suggested creation of public spaces as a community amenity into consideration.

14.3 Objected to the use of the word ‘offset’, and expressed concern about environmental pollution and increased road traffic.

14.3 The objection to the use of the word ‘offset’ is acknowledged, as is the concern about environmental pollution and increased road traffic.

Summary of Input	Centerm Expansion Project Team Response
<p>14.4 Request that the environmental study be expanded to include monitoring of project-related greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>14.4 Metro Vancouver maintains and operates a network of air quality monitoring stations. The new cranes that would be purchased for the project would be electric. Other smaller Centerm terminal operations equipment would be outfitted with modern engines that are designed to meet emissions requirements.</p> <p>The port authority conducts a comprehensive inventory of port-related air emissions, including criteria air contaminants and greenhouse gases. The inventories are conducted every five years, to coincide with emissions inventories prepared by Metro Vancouver for the region and Environment Canada for marine activities.</p>
<p>14.5 Request that the Mitigation Summary identify all potential effects from the project.</p>	<p>14.5 The Mitigation Summary would identify potential effects from the project and outline the proposed mitigation strategies.</p>
<p>14.6 Request that a social impact assessment (SIA) be undertaken with particular attention to the effects on vulnerable populations.</p>	<p>14.6 As the project is within the secured port area, a social impact assessment is not being considered. All trucks and trains that service the terminal would utilize pre-established truck routes and rail corridors.</p>

15. Archaeological Overview Assessment

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Archaeological Overview Assessment. Of the 25 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed and 6 neither agreed nor disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Archaeological Overview Assessment:

Response to comments:

15.1 Request that long-term impacts on public access to the shoreline be included in the scope of this assessment.

15.1 The project would not change public access to the shoreline.

16. Construction Environmental Management Plan

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 20 strongly/somewhat agreed and 6 neither agreed nor disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Construction Environmental Management Plan:

Response to comments:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>16.1 Concern about the environmental impacts and implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the Construction Environmental Management Plan.</p> | <p>16.1 The CEP team is committed to identifying potential environmental impacts, developing mitigation plans, and enforcing contractor compliance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan.</p> |
| <p>16.2 Request that the plan include potential impacts/disruptions to daily commutes and that this plan be made publicly available.</p> | <p>16.2 The project is not expected to impact commuter traffic. If there are anticipated construction impacts to traffic outside of port roads then the public and stakeholders would be notified in advance of any traffic changes. The Plan would be part of the permit application and would be posted publicly.</p> |
| <p>16.3 Concern about the impacts of construction staging to the City of Vancouver's Emergency Services Facility on the Main Street Docks.</p> | <p>16.3 Construction staging is not expected to be an issue as the construction contractor would be required to maintain access for marine traffic and vehicles in the vicinity of Main Street Docks at all times.</p> |
| <p>16.4 Request that non-road equipment used on the construction site comply with the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority's or Metro Vancouver's non-road diesel program.</p> | <p>16.4 The port authority's Non-Road Diesel Emissions (NRDE) Program was implemented to reduce diesel particulate matter emissions associated with port terminal operating equipment. All new terminal operations equipment purchased as part of the project would be required to meet NRDE Program requirements. The CEP team would consider applying the NRDE Program or something similar for construction equipment should the proposed project be permitted.</p> |

17. Vegetation Plan

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Vegetation Plan. Of the 24 participants who completed the question, 17 strongly/somewhat agreed and 7 neither agreed nor disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Vegetation Plan:

Response to comments:

17.1 Concern about implementation and accountability to follow through on the vegetation plan and requested that native species be replanted once construction is complete.

17.1 A Vegetation Plan would be submitted, however, as this is an existing industrial site with little vegetation, replanting is not anticipated. Should replanting be required, consideration will be given to native species.

17.2 Concern about the implications to community gardens.

17.2 There are no community gardens within or immediately adjacent to the project area.

18. Soil Management Plan

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Soil Management Plan. Of the 26 participants who completed the question, 20 strongly/somewhat agreed and 6 neither agreed nor disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Soil Management Plan:

Response to comments:

18.1 Asked for clarification on whether the existing soil would be negatively impacted by development activities, and how impacts would be mitigated.

18.1 The purpose of the Soil Management Plan is to specify how soils are moved and managed during construction. Both the Construction Environmental Management Plan and the Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan outline processes that will be used to prevent and mitigate impacts to, among other things, soils. Any contaminated soil encountered during construction excavations would be either treated on-site or taken to an approved facility for treatment or disposal.

18.2 Request that information about the levels of run-off and migration of contaminated soils be included in the scope of this plan.

18.2 The plan would consider run-off and migration of contaminated soils.

19. Biophysical Survey

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Biophysical Survey. Of the 23 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed and 4 neither agreed nor disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Biophysical Survey:

Response to comments:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>19.1 Concern about negative impacts to species and habitats in the area, specifically citing water fowl and requested that vertebrates be included in the scope of this survey.</p> | <p>19.1 The Biophysical Survey would include a terrestrial component covering both birds (waterfowl included) and wildlife. Note that the project is located on an existing industrial site with very little wildlife.</p> |
| <p>19.2 Request that the impact of high and low tide for wildlife and vegetation be included in the scope of this survey.</p> | <p>19.2 The study would be focused on the existing habitat and how it may be impacted by the proposed project. Tide levels influence the existing habitat and would be considered.</p> |
| <p>19.3 Request that Fisheries and Oceans Canada be consulted, along with active environmental groups in Metro Vancouver.</p> | <p>19.3 The CEP team would consult with Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Note that a Fisheries and Oceans Canada Authorization under paragraph 35(2) of the Fisheries Act is likely required.</p> |
| <p>19.4 Consider impacts from other existing, planned and foreseeable projects within and outside the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority's jurisdiction.</p> | <p>19.4 While there is no legislative requirement to explicitly consider existing, planned and foreseeable projects within and outside the port authority's jurisdiction (cumulative effects), the past and current effects of development on the environment provides the context for the assessment of project effects. The consideration of cumulative effects of existing projects is inherently integrated into the studies and assessments that would be completed for the proposed Centerm Expansion Project.</p> |

20. Nesting Bird Survey

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Nesting Bird Survey. Of the 25 participants who completed the question, 20 strongly/somewhat agreed and 5 neither agreed nor disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Nesting Bird Survey:

Response to comments:

- 20.1 Concern about bald eagle nesting habitats, and cited previous projects that have disrupted habitats.
- 20.2 Concern about endangered species.
- 20.3 Requested that vertebrates be included in this survey.
- 20.4 Concern regarding implementation and accountability for mitigation of potential implications to nesting birds or fish.
- 20.5 Requested that impacts from other existing, planned and foreseeable projects within and outside the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority’s jurisdiction be considered.

- 20.1 The Nesting Bird Survey would consider bald eagle nesting habitats, if found in the vicinity of the project.
- 20.2 If encountered, the Nesting Bird Survey would address any issues related to endangered bird species.
- 20.3 Birds are one group of vertebrates. Other vertebrates (e.g., fish, mammals, etc.) and invertebrates would be included in the Biophysical Survey.
- 20.4 The Nesting Bird Survey will include proposed mitigation strategies for any nests that may be encountered. If the project is approved, the CEP team would implement all permit conditions, including any mitigations measures, as required by regulatory agencies.
- 20.5 While there is no legislative requirement to consider existing, planned and foreseeable projects within and outside the port authority’s jurisdiction (cumulative effects), the past and current effects of development on the environment provides the context for the assessment of project effects. The consideration of cumulative effects of existing project is inherently integrated into the studies and assessments that would be completed for the Centerm Expansion Project.

21. Species-at-Risk Assessment

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Species-at-Risk Assessment. Of the 24 participants who completed the question, 19 strongly/somewhat agreed and 5 neither agreed nor disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Species-at-Risk Assessment:

Response to comments:

21.1 Concern about the implementation and accountability to follow through on mitigation measures.

21.1 The CEP team is committed to finding ways to alleviate possible impacts from the project to the surrounding environment and community. If the project is approved, the CEP team would implement all permit conditions, including any mitigation measures, as required by regulatory agencies.

21.2 Request consideration of impacts from other existing, planned and foreseeable projects within and outside the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority jurisdiction.

21.2 While there is no legislative requirement to consider existing, planned and foreseeable projects within and outside the port authority's jurisdiction (cumulative effects), the past and current effects of development on the environment provides the context for the assessment of project effects. The consideration of cumulative effects of existing projects is inherently integrated into the studies and assessments that would be completed for the Centerm Expansion Project. In general, assessments are focused on species and habitats of concern. These would include species of conservation concern, such as species at risk, as these tend to be the species that have been subject to cumulative effects on the environment.

22. Invasive Species Assessment

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the scope of the Invasive Species Assessment. Of the 24 participants who completed the question 18 strongly/somewhat agree, 5 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 1 strongly/somewhat disagreed.

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding the Invasive Species Assessment:

22.1 Request that the assessment include the detection, monitoring and management of invasive species.

Response to comments:

22.1 The Invasive Species Assessment would include an assessment of existing invasive species. Mitigation measures to control spread of invasive species during construction would be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

23. Community Amenity

Respondents were asked to rate their level of interest with a proposed community amenity under each of the following categories:

- Pedestrian, Cycling and Transportation: of the 26 participants who completed the question, 24 were very/somewhat interested
- Recreational/Park Improvements: of the 25 participants who completed the question, 24 were very/somewhat interested
- Environmental: of the 25 participants who completed the question, 20 were very/somewhat interested
- Local Social/Community Programs: of the 25 participants who completed the question, 17 were very/somewhat interested
- Educational: of the 25 participants who completed the question, 18 were very/somewhat interested

Some respondents provided the following comments regarding a proposed community amenity as part of the Centerm Expansion Project:

23.1 Stated the need to protect heritage buildings in the area, including the Canfisco Cannery and Seafarers building.

Response to comments:

23.1 There are three buildings in the project area that are on heritage registries: the Mission to Seafarers, Ballantyne Terminal, and Lantic (Rogers Sugar) buildings. The plan is to incorporate at least the Ballantyne Terminal building façade into the new Centerm operations administration building. The proposed project does not physically touch either the Mission to Seafarers or the Lantic buildings. The Canadian Fishing Company cannery is not on any heritage building registry.

Summary of Input	Centerm Expansion Project Team Response
------------------	---

23.2 Stated the importance of ensuring the community amenity positively impacts the entire community, not just one segment.

23.2 The CEP team is considering input received during the initial consultation. The CEP team would continue to seek further input from stakeholders (including City of Vancouver and local community organizations), members of the public, and Aboriginal groups in the development of a potential community amenity.

23.3 Asked for collaboration with the Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation, local schools and community centres to provide the best input and feedback on the expansion.

23.3 The CEP team would continue to seek further input from stakeholders (including City of Vancouver and local community organizations), members of the public, and Aboriginal groups in the development of a potential community amenity.

Summary of Input	Centerm Expansion Project Team Response
------------------	---

24. CRAB Park at Portside – comments provided in addition to those regarding the scope of technical and environmental studies:

Response to comments:

- 24.1 Some respondents expressed the importance of CRAB Park at Portside to the surrounding communities and concern about the potential impacts of the project, including impacts to the shoreline/environment from large vessels and dredging, public access to the coastline, vegetation changes at the park, and the view at CRAB Park at Portside.
- 24.2 One respondent requested that the park be regarded as a heritage site.
- 24.3 Some respondents requested funding to implement park improvements such as:
- Enhancements to existing vegetation;
 - Expansion of the park and the seawall;
 - Park management, including security and a gardener;
 - A pedestrian-friendly walkway from the park to Gastown;
 - Public art for CRAB Park at Portside and the introduction of port tours;
 - A community garden next to the park;
 - History walks, art talks, environmental artists, and a self-sustaining gardening for the community; and
 - Expansion of the area with a fish market.

- 24.1 The importance of CRAB Park at Portside to the community is acknowledged by the CEP team. The CEP team is undertaking studies to review the effects of the project. CRAB Park at Portside would be included as part of the geographic scope of the Noise Study, Air Assessment and View and Shade Impact Analysis. An additional modelling analysis that looks at the circulation of water adjacent to Crab Park would be undertaken.
- 24.2 The City of Vancouver leases the property from the port authority and operates the park. Currently, the park is not on any heritage registries. The proposed project does not include any physical changes to the park.
- 24.3 The CEP team is reviewing options for a potential community amenity and would consider the suggestions regarding enhancements to CRAB Park at Portside.

Summary of Input**Centerm Expansion Project Team Response**

24.4 One respondent requested that an expansion to the west should not proceed.

24.4 The westward expansion is critical to the proposed project. In order to gain the efficiencies in the use of the terminal, the berth face would have to be extended to the existing mooring dolphin, and the container yard and the intermodal yard tracks would have to be expanded to achieve operational efficiencies. Note that even with the removal of Heatley overpass, various constraints prevent extending the Centerm intermodal yard to the east by more than approximately 500 feet. The western extension would allow the intermodal yard to also be extended 500 feet to the west. The proposed five 3,000 foot track lengths, in comparison with the four 2,000 track lengths today, allow for longer, more efficient trains to service the terminal. These elements provide for a two-thirds increase in terminal capacity, with only a 15% increase in land area.

Summary of Input	Centerm Expansion Project Team Response
------------------	---

25. Heritage Buildings – comments provided in addition to those regarding the scope of technical and environmental studies:

Response to comments:

- 25.1 Concern about impacts to the Ballantyne heritage façade, and the historic importance of the pier.
- 25.2 Request for a statement of significance to identify the historical comments of the area.

- 25.1 The CEP team recognizes the historical significance of the Ballantyne heritage façade, and is exploring ways to re-use at least the Ballantyne façade.
- 25.2 There are three buildings in the project area that are on heritage registries: the Mission to Seafarers, Ballantyne Terminal, and Lantic (Rogers Sugar) buildings. The plan is to incorporate at least the Ballantyne Terminal building façade into the new Centerm operations administration building. The proposed project does not physically touch either the Mission to Seafarers or the Lantic buildings.

26. Consultation Process – comments provided in addition to those regarding the scope of technical and environmental studies:

Response to comments:

26.1 Some respondents stated 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 too short.

26.1 The CEP team sought feedback during the preliminary comment period, from January 18 to February 12, 2016, on the scope of the planned technical and environmental studies, and suggestions regarding a potential community amenity to be given consideration by the CEP team for inclusion in the scope of the project. The public and stakeholders were notified of opportunities to participate in the preliminary comment period through newspaper ads, emails, tweets, and a postcard notification was sent to approximately 6200 residents near the terminal. There would be further opportunities to provide input regarding the project should it proceed to the permitting process. Based on feedback received, the CEP team will be revising aspects of the notification process and area, to provide additional ways for the local community to be advised about upcoming public consultation events.

Summary of Input	Centerm Expansion Project Team Response
------------------	---

27. Review Process – comments provided in addition to those regarding the scope of technical and environmental studies:

Response to comments:

27.1 Request the development of a joint project review team with the City of Vancouver that follows the “shadow permit process”, for thorough analysis of the application and supporting technical studies.

27.1 The City of Vancouver is a key project stakeholder. The CEP team would continue to work with the City of Vancouver regarding a potential community amenity and provide opportunities for the City of Vancouver to continue to provide input into the project.

27.2 Request that the project team consider effects, both positive and negative, as it advances through the consultation, design, assessment, and approval processes.

27.2 The CEP team is committed to considering both positive and negative effects that the project has on the environment, stakeholders, and the public, and aboriginal groups through the consultation, design, assessment, and approval process.

Summary of Input	Centerm Expansion Project Team Response
------------------	---

28. Downtown Eastside – comments provided in addition to those regarding the scope of technical and environmental studies:

Response to comments:

28.1 Some respondents asked about employment opportunities for the downtown eastside residents and First Nations.

28.1 The CEP team would consider this request.

28.2 Request 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.

28.2 Based on initial predictions of project effects, a risk assessment or health impact assessment is not currently under consideration. Additional assessment may be carried out if warranted by the results of the various environmental studies.

28.3 Request that residents associations and service providers in the Downtown Eastside/Strathcona/Chinatown areas be included in the consultation process.

28.3 Based on feedback received, the CEP team will be revising aspects of the notification process and area, to provide additional ways for the local community to be advised about upcoming public consultation events.

Postcard notification was sent to approximately 6,200 households and businesses in the area near Centerm, between Cambie Street and Clark Drive. The postcards were sent during the week of January 11, 2016.



Please note that the highlighted lines above represent the postal routes where postcards were delivered.