

Larry Colero, Tsawwassen Resident

Conflicts of interest, biases and possible  
ulterior motives undermine the *Roberts Bank*  
*Terminal 2* assessment process

# Primary Concerns with Approval

1. Key proponent reports reflect inherent **biases** and **conflicts of interest**
2. Indications of ulterior motives, i.e., unspecified **alternative uses** - impacts would be assessed piecemeal *after* RBT2 is built
3. High possibility of **irreversible environmental disaster**
4. Exclusion of a wide range of possible **cumulative effects**

# Conflicts of Interest and Bias

- VFPA (d.b.a. PMV) is inherently conflicted in its dual role as both the evaluator and beneficiary of the project
  - VFPA has a “commitment bias” as project proponents and promoters
  - Priority is increased business (vs. protection of nature or public health)
- VFPA contractors provided or packaged information in reports. No impartial reporting by arms-length experts independent of VFPA.
- Limited scope and piecemeal scope changes
  - Disconnected reports on inter-connected potential impacts
  - Climate Change and Invasive Aquatic Species omitted

# Plausible Alternative Purposes

- Overly-optimistic estimates of demand for container capacity suggest a hidden agenda to re-purpose after construction
- Possible future shipping of:
  - Dilbit from the TransMountain Pipeline, or LNG
  - Coal from the United States
    - US coal exporters are losing battles to ship coal from Pacific Northwest
    - N. America's largest coal port could be adapted to ship twice as much
    - Significant potential increase to local health hazard and healthcare costs

# Likelihood of Irreversible Disaster

- Even if occurrence is deemed unlikely, the potential severity of any impact from an environmental incident is high
- Potential severity of incidents higher if RBT2 is later repurposed to ship something other than containers
- Unknown impacts are real, even if impossible to identify or assess. Yet little commitment to the “precautionary principle” required by *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*

# Cursory Consideration of Cumulative Impacts

- Consideration of worst-case scenarios inadequate, (perhaps due to “optimism bias” or “commitment bias”)
- No scenarios to assess combined impact with other projects *planned* for this region
- Linear analysis to assess the impact of a “50-year storm event” appears to neglect compounding/accelerating effects of Climate Change

# Colero's Conclusion

Due to inherent biases and conflicts of interest that very likely influenced the current assessment process, the only responsible actions at this point are to either:

- (a) Abandon the project concept entirely; or,
- (b) Start a new, impartial and more complete assessment of the current situation based on arms-length third-party expertise and analysis