

**Minutes of Community Information Forum (CIF) Meeting  
Inn on the Harbour  
Wednesday, February 28, 2018  
5:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.**

---

<b>Members present</b>	Luanne Roth Dan Harris Bill Mounce Michal Sluka Harry Young Jesse Palmer Ken Shaw Mike Slubowski Don Scott
<b>PRPA staff Present</b>	Ken Veldman Irene Mills
<b>Regrets</b>	Christine Danroth Sebastien Pacquet Mark Rudderham Ralph Weick Bob Payette Sheila Gordon Payne Sarah Dantzer Brian Musgrave Ken Lippett Peter Freeman Richard Mellis

**1. Call to Order**

Ken Veldman called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM.

**2. Last Meeting**

○ **Minutes**

The January 24, 2018 minutes were circulated, Ken Shaw was not present at meeting, correction noted and accepted as amended.

**3. Business Arising from the Minutes**

## **a) Port Development Overview**

Veldman reviewed the presentation from the February 28 meeting.

Topics of discussion include:

- Volume forecast of 55M T by 2027
- Significant potential for import/export container relies on growth in 'value-added' logistics (i.e. port-based transloading and warehousing services)
- Port's role in 'common user' gateway infrastructure investment and development will be needed to ensure continued capacity and fluidity available for growth
- Realization of forecast could result in 3500 direct jobs in northern BC (50% of which have historically been Prince Rupert based)

**Q:** Half of the 1750 direct jobs mentioned, would half of that go to First Nations?

**A:** Right now about 35% of Rupert-based port-related labour force identify as First Nations, reflecting the community's demographics. There is no quota for First Nations employment, but we would expect that reflection to continue.

**Q:** Is the opportunity for shipping autos through Prince Rupert an import or export opportunity?

**A:** The opportunity would likely facilitate trade of autos manufactured in Asia and imported to Canadian and US markets.

**Q:** As rail capacity is increased, would that facilitate the mainline into the downtown yard being changed?

**A:** Difficult to say until we complete a master plan with CN, but most capacity discussions are being discussed as it relates to the Zanardi bridge and Ridley Island area. There is no expectation the mainline into the downtown yard would be eliminated.

**Q:** Would the Port need more railyards to handle more manifest trains in the future?

**A:** The efficient handling of manifest trains (i.e. multi-cargo trains, as opposed to single-cargo unit trains) would involve an objective to separate those trains off the mainline as quickly as possible to avoid congestion. No determination yet as to the best way to achieve that, but solutions could involve Ridley Island facilities.

**Q:** Rail-based reefer traffic involves power generators for containers, does that raise the possibility of increasing generator noise in residential areas?

**A:** Its unlikely to see reefer containers off the Fairview terminal, and longer-term expanded cold storage would likely be based at a logistics park on Ridley Island in an industrial area. Residential noise is not expected to be an impact from this cargo.

**Q:** The Port completed its Land Use Plan in 2011, is there consideration to reviewing/renewing the plan soon?

**A:** The Port expects to review the Land Use Plan in 2019, which will involve public engagement in the process. Much has changed since 2011, and we need to ensure the Land Use Plan reflects current and future opportunities and challenges.

**Q:** How much land is currently available on Ridley Island?

**A:** Both Ridley Island and Lelu Island have land available for port-related development. Considerations for future infrastructure development are also considered in terms of land that can be made available.

**Q:** Has the Port changed the manner in which it markets terminal development opportunity?

**A:** Not fundamentally changed, but the Port's view of where the most significant opportunities are available are dynamic, and this impacts which projects we would be willing to pursue and/or investigate.

**Q:** Isn't CN responsible for Zanardi Bridge?

**A:** Yes they are, and would need to be the key partner in expanding capacity related to it. However, any rail infrastructure expansion shouldn't be looked at in isolation, it also involves other port objectives and infrastructure that the port authority may be directly responsible for, so we're very involved in the planning and execution of the project.

**Q:** Is Lelu Island still being looked at for development?

**A:** Yes it is. However, Lelu Island has large development cost challenges and does not have rail or road access, so there are a limited number of large scale projects that can economically develop there.

**Q:** Any updates on Wolverine's fuel service project?

**A:** The draft Environmental Effects Evaluation is nearing completion, and will be provided to the public for comment soon.

**Q:** What alternatives to Ridley Island are available to terminal liquid bulk like diesel, preferably further from the Skeena River estuary?

**A:** The cargoes and volumes that are likely to be traded are most economically handled by rail, i.e. volumes are too small for pipeline investment. Rail access makes Ridley Island a practical solution, and terminals there would be subject to the regulations, practices and procedures that are expected in a world-class terminal.

**Q:** Is CN looking at rail on Ridley to move bitumen in a dry bulk form (i.e. Canapux)?

**A:** Yes that's a consideration, and the expectation is the product could be moved in a similar fashion to coal and would use existing terminal assets. However, there's still a way to go to prove the economic case for the commercialization of the manufacturing process and the supply chain.

**Q:** Are the LPG's forecast include those shipped from Port land only or with City land as well?

**A:** The forecast is based on the market opportunity as opposed to a specific terminal project and its location.

**Q:** What other infrastructure needs would need to be considered outside of Port lands?

**A:** The Port is obviously focussed specifically on its responsibilities within port land, but one of the objectives is to minimize the need to impact public infrastructure. CN would also have a larger view on its mainline capacities and capabilities throughout northern BC.

**Q:** How is the Tanker moratorium going to impact liquid bulk opportunities or fuel services?

**A:** The proposed tanker legislation (Bill C-49) would create a moratorium on tankers carrying cargoes (of more than 12,500 tonnes) of 'heavy oils' from entering Canadian waters from northern Vancouver Island to the Alaska Panhandle. Existing tankers moving from Alaska to Washington have voluntarily recognized a 200 mile 'exclusion zone' for decades and are not impacted. The liquid bulk opportunity is for cargoes that are not included in the legislation's schedule of banned products (e.g. refined

fuels, natural gas liquids, methanol, etc.). Wolverine's fuel service project meets the 12,500 tonne limit for liquid storage.

**Q:** Do forecast projections include LNG?

**A:** The forecast does not include LNG, but its important to note that because an LNG terminal is supplied by pipeline, the impact on port infrastructure capacity and fluidity is relatively minimal.

**Q:** How does the Fairview-Ridley Connector interface rail and road?

**A:** The rail capacity in the connector project is dedicated Fairview Terminal sidings that will be developed to increase the speed and capacity to bring containers on and off the terminal and onto the CN mainline. These sidings will be developed to the water side of the existing CN mainline and siding along the mouth of the inner harbour. The road capacity is dedicated to import and export logistics operations that will need truck to move containers on and off the terminal. The road will be located to the water side of those sidings—i.e. the closest to the water.

**Q:** Is compensation for marine habitat impact still being considered for Seal Cove.

**A:** Seal Cove is still a consideration for marine habitat compensation if the Fairview Connector moves forward, but would need to be approved by DFO as suitable compensation. While other rehabilitation projects are available in Prince Rupert, habitat compensation must involve both public land ownership and equivalent habitat for it to be considered.

## **New Business Roundtable**

**a) Q:** Does the Atlin Promenade development in Cow Bay include the large public space considered in the Port's Cow Bay Master Plan?

**A:** The large public space in the master plan was considered in the context of a larger Atlin Terminal redevelopment, which won't be considered for at least 5 years. However, the Atlin Promenade development, which is the development of a linear waterfront pedestrian access, was advanced in order to make a short-term investment and recognize public appetite for improved waterfront access in the area.

**b) Rushbrook Update** – Rotary's Rushbrook Trail project is coming along and look to opening later in the spring, and will be another addition to increased waterfront access in the community.

c) **Potential new member:** Colleen Fitzpatrick put forward by Luanne Roth. The Port will follow up.

d) **Harbour habitat revitalization:**

Salmon use the inner harbour as a migration corridor, but industrial use over the decade has degraded marine vegetation that serves as protection for them. Could we start a discussion about the potential of developing a project that could revitalize that?

Veldman committed to following up on this idea.

e) **New federal Impact Assessment Legislation**

Bill C-69 refers to the development of regional and strategic assessments that could help respond to the interest in cumulative effects, far better than considering cumulative assessments on a project-by-project basis. Those assessments will take a strong commitment of time and resources to complete.

How will existing regional processes and cumulative impact work feed into this?

Veldman will commit to sharing any public analyses of the legislation in the future.

#### **4. Next Meeting**

a) **Proposed next meeting date** – Wednesday, April 4, 2017 at the Inn on the Harbour.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 PM.