

Results of March 3, 2016 – Conference Call with G3 Terminals

-----Original Message-----

From: Parker [mailto:gepa@telus.net]

Sent: Friday, March 4, 2016 2:45 PM

To: Tiffany Koberstein <Tiffany_Koberstein@g3.ca>; ecosystem@shaw.ca; jan lander <jan.lander@shaw.ca>; 'Zo Ann' <zoann@pskf.ca>; Barbara 'Frisken' <barbara.frisken@gmail.com>; Janet 'Dysart' <mervynd@telus.net>; Karen 'Munro' <karen-munro@shaw.ca>; Sandra 'Hollick-Kenyon' <Sandra.Hollick-Kenyon@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Ken Ashley <Ken_Ashley@bcit.ca>

Subject: Notes from Conference Call: Streamkeepers/G3 - Thursday, March 3, 2016

Tiffany: Thanks for the call and thanks to Andrew and Mark for joining in. Jan, summed up our feelings after the call; “Sounds like G3 Terminals are a very progressive business and paying attention to the environment. Learned a lot today and of course will be paying attention as things come along.”

I have consolidated the notes of the Streamkeeper participants. (Zo Ann, Jan, Ken, Dave and myself). The items are in no particular order and I may have missed a few things so everyone feel free to add or comment on these points.

1. Hooding or keeping the lights off the water can help protect fish as seals use the lights as a way to more easily find their food. We noted you would look at this and get back to us.
2. There was an unanswered question about how much dust from operations is expected to settle on the water. The concern was that this dust could be eaten by fish and the impact this may have. It was noted that monitoring could be valuable to separate the background dust (pollen), which can be significant, from dust from operations. Your comments on the dust to be expected and potential impact would be appreciated.
3. Thanks for confirming that fire water (without foaming agents) is contained within the train tracks and drained to the plant drainage system which discharges on the west side of the site.
4. Thanks for the clarifications that existing man made debris will largely be removed as part of the plant construction and that G3 operations are unlikely to contribute new debris into the water.
5. We had concerns about the construction road and storage/staging areas and actions to prevent runoff/silt into Lynn Creek. This is an issue of great concern as there have been significant negative impacts from other construction sites on Lynn Creek fish. We note that you will forward the applicable sections of the construction or “temporary works” drawings for us to comment on.
6. There was a discussion on the use of electric yard goats for the trains to minimize the diesel particulates in the area. It was noted that this may not be applicable to G3 operations and may relate more to other port facilities but that you would confirm the type of train use at G3.
7. Thanks for your commitment to investigate the existing outfall on the east side of your property that drains into Lynn Creek. We hope this will confirm that this outfall will be decommissioned and the flow directed into the new plant drainage system to the west side of the G3 property.
8. We had on our list, but forgot to bring up, how has climate change has been incorporated into the design. We are aware of rising sea levels and as the facility would be expected to have a design life beyond 2050 we understand the facility should be designed to be resilient to a 0.5 meter sea level rise. We are also aware that the stormwater runoff should be designed based on future climate models, not historic IDF curves. Please let us know how climate change is being incorporated into the design. APEGBC has more information on this if needed.
9. We would like reinforce our concern for appropriate riparian buffer zones and that they be consistent with current setback requirements. Our goals include having them expanded along Lynn

Creek and that native vegetation replace invasives. The desire to have trees that could shade Lynn Creek along your east property edge was expressed. One of the Streamkeeper priorities with respect to climate change is to find ways to cool the creek waters.

10. A concern about construction dewatering activities was raised, specifically where/how the water would be managed. This is expected to be part of the construction/temporary works information to be provided for review when available.

11. We may not yet have enough information on the "construction window" on when are the best times to minimize the impact on fish but with the "bubblers" during piling and diligent efforts to manage construction/temporary works, significant impacts should be able to be eliminated. We will continue to consult with DFO and other stakeholders and share updates on our thinking with you.

12. If you would like more information on the BCIT Rivers Institute enhancements to Lynn Creek please let us know.

Thanks again.

Glen

Thanks Glen, one discussion point missing.

13. BCIT Rivers Institute, Tseiwauth Nation and the District of North Vancouver will spend over \$250,000 in 2016 to restore the residual 5% of the Lynn Creek estuary near Gravel Bar 2. Gravel Bar 1 is too close to the CN rail bridge and may cause Lynn Creek backwatering, hence no works will be initiated on Bar 1. To date, \$50,000 has been spent on placement of large woody debris, eelgrass transplants and pre-restoration monitoring. The southernmost gravel bar (Bar 3) is an ideal site for future estuary restoration.

Cheers,

Ken

<http://www.dnv.org/news/restoring-fish-habitat-lynn-creek-estuary>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rJn9AluriX4&feature=youtu.be>