

**Minutes of Community Information Forum (CIF) Meeting
Prestige Prince Rupert Hotel
Wednesday, March 30, 2016
5:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.**

Members present

Brian Musgrave
Don Scott
Luanne Roth
Peter Freeman
Mike Slubowski
Bill Mounce
Ken Shaw
Michal Sluka
Sheila Gordon-Payne
Ken Lippett
Harry Young

PRPA staff Present

Ken Veldman
Maynard Angus
Charlene Hamilton

Regrets

Henry Clifton
Sebastien Pacquet
Dan Harris
Bob Payette
Richard Mellis

1. Call to Order

Maynard Angus called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM. (Ken Veldman assumed the Chair's role at 5:10 PM.)

2. Guest Presentation: Ridley Island Sentiment Issues

- PRPA staff present:
 - Jack Smith, Director, Environmental Assessment
- A historical perspective was provided on the proposed “superport” for Kitson Island in the 1970s. The proposal consisted of a causeway off Lelu Island and through Flora Bank, and a terminal being developed on Kitson. A federal assessment of the project concluded that the project would be unsuitable because of its expected impact on marine habitat and the high environment values present there. However, it was also specific to say that *its findings were specific to that proposed project*, and was not a comment on general development in that area.
- A historical perspective was provided on effluent disposal in the Ridley Island area, especially with relation to the Watson Island pulp mill operations. In particular, there was a discharge up to the early 1980s of dioxyns and furans into Porpoise Harbour. In addition, the mill discharged ‘red liquor’ through a line across Ridley Island into an area north of Prince Rupert Grain (“Discharge Cove”)—while this had significant environmental impacts, it should be noted it did not contain dioxyns and furans. As a result, Porpoise Harbour has the highest concentration of dioxyns and furans in sediment, and the concentrations decrease moving to the west side of Ridley Island.
- The Port’s Ridley Island Disposal site was originally developed for the disposal of overburden and organics associated with the original development of Ridley Island in the early 1980s. (Given the history of the site, while the material was not suitable for disposal at sea, there is no evidence it was contaminated by dioxyns and furans.)
- The disposal site is currently used for the disposal of sediments that meet industrial soil guidelines (but usually unsuitable for disposal at sea). It was most recently used for disposal of sediment dredged in the Fairview expansion project. The sediment was sampled in place, and was found to meet industrial soil guidelines, and was therefore suitable for disposal in that site.
- *QUESTIONS and ANSWERS:*
- Why did the proponent indicate that the Flora Bank area was not of high environmental value?
 - The proponent’s investigation of the area found that environmental values were not as high as expected based on previous research, but it shouldn’t be interpreted as having low environmental value.
- Has the Port conducted dioxin testing on Discharge Cove or Porpoise Harbour?
 - Most of the testing done has been conducted by proponents as part of public regulatory processes. The Port has conducted limited testing outside of regulatory processes, but the results have not been made public.
- Is the Ridley Disposal site an intertidal area?
 - The disposal site is not intertidal. The water that discharges off the site into Porpoise Harbour is ‘surface runoff’—i.e. the sediment material ‘settles’ and

is contained within the pond. Water from Porpoise Harbour does not enter the disposal site.

- Will the Ridley Disposal site continue to be used for sediment disposal?
 - The Port will continue to use the site for material that meets the industrial soil guidelines.
- Does the Port test the water that is discharging into Porpoise Harbour from the disposal site?
 - It has been tested previously on an ad hoc basis, and no issues were found. The discharge is essentially rainwater.
 - Testing has not occurred since the disposal of Fairview material.
- What are the challenges involved with the development of a 'port-wide' solution that deals with sediment-related issues, instead of having to deal with solutions on a project by project basis?
 - The legacy issue of toxins in the Ridley Island area are being faced by several proponents, and impacts their ability to use disposal at sea as a development option. However, the size of the issue and ability for a developer to manage it varies greatly from project to project. This makes a single strategy difficult to rationalize.
 - Environment Canada has the responsibility for regulating this issue, and not the Port.
- What is the ongoing working group looking at disposal at sea practices that is referenced in the PNW LNG environmental assessment?
 - The working group includes the Port, local First Nations, DFO, Environment Canada that is looking at how dredging might be best managed on future projects within the jurisdiction of PRPA. The group was initiated through consultations between the federal crown and First Nations.
 - It does not have the authority to change Disposal at Sea regulations, or select disposal locations, but may influence future regulatory decisions.
- **IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT THE PORT OF PRINCE RUPERT CONSIDER A WATER TESTING PROGRAM FOR THE WATER DISCHARGING FROM THE DISPOSAL SITE INTO PORPOISE HARBOUR; AND TO PROVIDE FURTHER CLARITY AS TO THE POTENTIAL INFLUENCE OF INTERTIDAL FLOWS ON THE DISPOSAL SITE.**

3. Last Meeting

- **Minutes**

The February 24, 2016 minutes were circulated and accepted.

- **Business arising from the minutes**

- **AltaGas/RTI LPG project:** Clarification was asked regarding the classification of the project as a 'non-designated' project under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. Smith explained that the Act outlines a set of minimum thresholds that trigger an environmental assessment led by CEAA. If a threshold is not exceeded (the AltaGas project does not exceed a threshold), CEAA can make the determination that it is a non-designated project. The non-designated project is then undertaken by the federal agencies that have direct regulatory authority under the project, and is approved by those agencies (as opposed to the Minister).
- **PNW LNG wetlands compensation:** In followup to a question from last meeting, clarity was provided regarding the Port's role in implementing federal policy regarding wetland compensation as it relates to the PNW LNG project. Smith explained that the policy requires the proponent to compensate for the function provided by wetland that is impacted by project development. The oversight responsibility is designated to the federal land manager, which is the Port Authority on crown land within its jurisdiction. While framework and priorities have been developed, a specific compensation plan for that project has not been determined. The plan will consider input on valued components through community engagement, and can consider things like bug biomass.
- **PNW LNG harbour porpoises:** Clarification was asked regarding DFO's comments on harbour porpoises within the PNW LNG environmental assessment's draft report. Smith explained that subsequent to the release of the draft report, the Port provided comment that questioned the environmental assessment methodology used by DFO as it related to 'significant impact' in this case.

Jack Smith left the meeting at 6:15 PM.

- PNW LNG/Lelu Island: CEAA's comment period on its draft report has closed. Subsequent to that, CEAA has asked PNW LNG for additional information, and the timeline for response has been estimated at three months. A question was asked regarding a recent ruling that granted a Smithers individual the right to challenge the National Energy's Board decision to have the TransCanada natural gas pipeline evaluated as a provincial project (i.e. arguing it should have been evaluated by the NEB as a federal project.) Veldman noted awareness about the report through media, but did not have any further comment beyond that.
- Community Information Forum Membership: It was noted that four members have been contacted about continuing membership, and it was determined that three will no longer be members. The Port will be advertising for four new members in the upcoming weeks.
- Ship Anchorages: Veldman noted that this item has not been followed up, but the Port is embarking on an engagement with commercial fishing interests in the next couple of months, and shrimp trawlers will be included in that exercise.

4. Roundtable

- **Dust from road between Kwinitza and Westview**

It was noted that as the weather gets dryer, multiple users are using the road and road dust becomes an issue for the neighbourhood.

Veldman noted that dustfall measurements at the Westview site have revealed that road dust is the primary dust issue in that area. Angus also noted that last year there were issues with the water treatment services that were contracted for the road.

IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT THE PORT FOLLOWUP TO ENSURE THE ROAD IS TREATED MORE ACTIVELY THIS SUMMER, AND THAT ALTERNATIVE TREATMENTS BE INVESTIGATED IF REQUIRED.

- **Business Climate**

It was noted that while there has been more media coverage of the success of Fairview and intermodal services, more media coverage from DP World on the ongoing development of the terminal expansion would be advantageous.

IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT THE PORT FOLLOWUP WITH DP WORLD AND ENCOURAGE THEM TO BE MORE ACTIVE WITH PUBLIC UPDATES.

5. Next Meeting

- a) **Next meeting date** - Wednesday, April 20, 2016 at a location to be determined.
- b) **Waterfront Access** will be the primary agenda topic.

Meeting adjourned at 6:35 pm.