

## Capsule professionnelle 8

---

# Port-city governance: Vancouver Case Study

*Peter V Hall*

*Associate professor  
Simon Fraser University  
Vancouver - Canada*

## Biography

**Peter V Hall** is Associate Professor of Urban Studies at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, Canada, where he teaches economic development, transportation geography and research methods. He received his doctorate in city and regional planning from the University of California at Berkeley, and he previously worked in local government. His research examines the connections between cities, sea-ports and logistics, as well as local economic, employment and community development. His publications include the co-edited "Integrating Seaports and Trade Corridors" (Ashgate, 2011) and "Cities, Regions and Flow" (Routledge, 2013), as well as numerous journal articles, book chapters and reports. > He is an Associate Editor of the Journal of Transport Geography.

## Introduction

Like just about every port city-region in the western hemisphere, Vancouver, British Columbia and its port grew up together. Or more precisely, because of physical geography and successive waves of infrastructure investment, the metropolitan city-region and a regionally dispersed system of port and related logistics activities have developed in concert. This intimate relationship delivers benefits to most urban residents, but also imposes heavy costs on some. Hence port-community conflicts are longstanding. The central goal of this chapter is to understand how the nature of these conflicts has changed as the port-logistics footprint has expanded into the city-region.

First, I describe the Vancouver city-region, in physical and spatial terms, but also as a functional economic region and a major trade gateway. Second, I describe the multi-level governance of the region, focusing on those agencies and organizations with particular importance to land use and transportation decision-making. Third, I describe the port, in terms of its spatial organization as a system of cargo operations and logistics activities, and then fourth as a decision-making and infrastructure investment system. I then put port and city-region together, recognizing that they are not really separable, and I conclude with an extended discussion of some current and emerging issues in the port-city relationship. A central empirical contribution here are the findings of a survey conducted in 2010 with municipal governments in the region about what they regarded as the most important conflicts between community aspirations, and port- and logistics-related activity. What will become clear is that the conflicts between communities and port activities persist as both the port industry and the urban region grow and change. A central challenge is how to design and redesign governance frameworks that can keep pace.

### *The city-region*

The Vancouver city-region, often referred to as the 'Lower Mainland', is home to about two-and-half million people. The City of Vancouver itself occupies a peninsula between the Fraser River and the Burrard Inlet. Suburban municipalities spread out from the region's core; on the north shore of the Burrard Inlet, south along the coast, and inland into the Fraser Valley to the east. Sprawl is however constrained by a combination of natural features, boundaries and policy choices. Urban development on the north shore of the Burrard Inlet is confined to a narrow strip of land due to the mountains that rise there. Southward, urban development is ultimately constrained by the United States border, while to both the south and east, successive provincial and local governments have chosen to limit urban development in agriculturally productive, ecologically sensitive and recreationally valuable lands. The tributaries of the Fraser River, and its delta branches, as well

as the Burrard Inlet, also form barriers that must be crossed by one of the region's multiple bridges.

Hence, despite relatively high urban densities by North American standards, Vancouver faces constraints on the availability of land. For the port and logistics industry, the general shortage of developable land is especially intense because of the city-region's vibrant post-industrial economy. Waterfront land is highly sought after by real estate developers, and the public demands commerce, parks and pathways along the water's edge. These desires play into British Columbian's strong environmental ethos; the region is home to some of the world's most influential environmental organizations. People move to Vancouver from more polluted and industrialized regions precisely so they can enjoy access to nature.

At the same time, Vancouver's post-industrial economy remains reliant on the movement of goods. As in other urban economies in the developed world, manufacturing has declined precipitously in its share of total employment: from over one-quarter of total employment in the 1950s, to less than one-tenth today. However other industries which also rely on goods movement have expanded rapidly. For example, construction in this popular migration destination accounts for as many jobs as manufacturing. Vancouver remains an important gateway for organizing and handling flows of imported consumer goods and exported raw materials. Canada's resource economy in particular both contributes to, and relies upon, the urban economy for physical connections (the port, but also rail and road access), value adding services (such as transloading commodities), and a variety of advanced legal, finance, managerial and consulting services. For this reason, the Federal and Provincial governments take a keen interest in the governance of the port.

## *Urban-regional governance*

In British Columbia, as in most parts of Canada, municipal governments are relatively weak. They have no independent constitutional standing and limited fiscal authority; instead, they are created by Provincial legislation. But they do have control over land use planning as well as certain service delivery responsibilities that make them important actors in urban development. The 23 local government entities which comprise the Vancouver metropolitan region range considerably in size, from less than 1,000 residents to 600,000 living in the City of Vancouver. Although they all form part of the same functional metropolitan economy, they have very different physical and economic relationships to the port and related industries. The port's physical jurisdiction touches a majority of the local governments, but in very different ways. Municipalities such as Vancouver, North Vancouver, Surrey and Delta host major marine terminals; others such as Richmond and New Westminster host major logistics and warehousing facilities; and others are traversed by rail lines (e.g. White Rock, Port Coquitlam) and

truck routes (e.g. Coquitlam, Burnaby). Only a few municipalities are not directly impacted by port activities.

An important layer of government sits between the local governments and the Provincial government. Metro Vancouver (official known as the Greater Vancouver Regional District) is a federation of the local governments responsible for bulk services, regional parks, and regional land use planning. In Metro Vancouver's most recent regional plan, the 2011 'Regional Growth Strategy', the municipalities committed themselves to protecting industrial land from being rezoned to other uses. This was in response to clear evidence that industrial activity (including that which is port related) has been displaced from the core urban areas over many decades. However it is not yet clear whether the new policy will succeed. Also central to the port-city relationship is Translink, a regional agency responsible for transportation planning, transit and a major roads network that is important for goods movement.

With respect to urban governance, it is also important to note that other actors which also exert influence. Higher levels of government can and do intervene in urban affairs, and in keeping with global trends, private sector actors play an increasingly important role in urban governance through organizations such as the Vancouver Board of Trade and the Greater Vancouver Gateway Council. Canada is a confederation of Provinces, with a complicated division of powers and responsibilities between the federal and provincial spheres of government. The Canadian constitution makes the federal government responsible for international and inter-provincial affairs, trade and infrastructure; hence the port authority is an agent of the federal government. The major railways are also regulated by the federal government. In contrast, the provincial government is responsible for highways, and so often becomes involved in the provision of port-related road infrastructure.

## *The port*

Vancouver's port is diverse in terms of the mix of commodities handled, which ranges from containers, automobiles and passengers, to breakbulks (wood, paper and metals) and bulks (coal, grains, metals and minerals, chemicals and fertilizer, forest products and petroleum). In 2013, the terminals of the port handled 135 million tonnes of cargo, involving trade with over 160 nations (see Table 1). And the port is also diverse in terms of its terminals; although the major marine terminals are clustered in a few locations, the port has jurisdiction over 600km of coastal and river shoreline, creating a diversity of operating and local land use contexts for port operations. The region's marine terminals are generally well serviced by rail, either by one of three continental railroads (CP, CN, BNSF) or a regional railway (SRY).

Bulk and breakbulk commodities form the historical backbone of the port's business. However, the real shift in port cargo handling in recent decades has been the growth in containerized cargo. A five-fold increase in container units handled since the late 1980s has seen the port rapidly move up the west coast container port rankings. It now lies third behind Los Angeles and Long Beach, having overtaken Seattle, Tacoma and Oakland. This growth has not resulted in the displacement of bulk and breakbulk commodities. Indeed, one of the successes of the port has been the transloading of some exported commodities into containers, so slowing growth in the region's empty container mismatch problem.

What growth in container handling has meant is that the port's regional footprint has expanded considerably. There are two major container terminals in the Burrard Inlet and one minor one on the Fraser River. But in 1997, the Deltaport container terminal at Roberts Bank opened. Located almost 40 km south of the Burrard Inlet, this facility was originally developed as a coal terminal. Container operations there have expanded rapidly, and future growth is expected. The terminal now defines one end of a west-east axis of container movement, transloading, storage, and intermodal transfer that extends from the marine terminal, along the new South Fraser Perimeter Road (SFPR), past the Fraser Surrey Docks and CN continental railyards in Surrey, to warehousing and logistics clusters in the suburb of Langley. Port regionalization in Vancouver has, for the most part, proceeded via expanded road transportation because efforts to stimulate short-sea shipping have fallen short. Roadway expansion, as we shall see, is a key source of tension between the port and local communities.

**Table 1 : Key operating statistics, Port Metro Vancouver 2013**

	Tonnage	Units (vehicles, TEU, passengers, vessels)
Auto	378,883	378,883
Breakbulk	17,051,196	n/a
Bulk	92,735,975	n/a
Containerized	24,843,824	2,825,475
Cruise Passengers	n/a	812,398
Foreign vessel arrivals	n/a	3,166

Source: Port Metro Vancouver.

## *Port governance*

For almost 100 years, Vancouver area marine terminals fell under the jurisdiction of one of three port authorities, each with slightly different histories of governance, and vastly different operations. A 2008 merger brought together the large Vancouver Port Authority (responsible for the Burrard Inlet and Deltaport/Roberts Bank), the mid-sized Fraser River Port Authority, and small North Fraser Port Authority into a single entity which goes by the name 'Port Metro Vancouver' (PMV). Integration of the region's port authorities reflects, and has reinforced, the expansion of the port's footprint in the metropolitan region. PMV is a non-shareholder corporation owned by the Federal government, with a mandate to promote Canadian trade. The preponderance of power in the governance structure is held by industry; seven of 11 seats on the Board are appointed by the federal government from lists of nominees created by port users. The region's municipalities, provincial government, other western provinces and federal government each have one seat on the Board.

As a government-owned corporate entity, PMV enjoys considerable independence and regulatory authority. It operates as a 'landlord port', leasing its holdings of federal waterfront and submerged lands to tenants, and providing supportive hard and soft infrastructure. PMV has substantial borrowing powers, and retains a considerable surplus. In 2013, PMV generated consolidated net income of \$94 million from \$211 million in total consolidated revenue. It is also largely insulated against revenue claims by other governments. It pays the Federal government an annual stipend of about 3% of gross revenue instead of income taxes, and it makes Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) to municipalities instead of paying property taxes. In 2013, the stipend and PILT accounted for less than \$11 million.

Protection of the port authorities' revenues for operations and infrastructure investment is however a double-edged sword. While PMV's spends generously on a variety of environmental and community initiatives and events, a fundamental challenge is that municipal governments have little direct financial stake in port growth. While the indirect benefits of port activity are undeniable, PMV's regular economic impact studies are not persuasive in comparison to arguments about the value alternative uses of waterfront land (e.g. residential developments), the small number of really good jobs created in direct cargo handling (e.g. longshoring) and the increasing number of less desirable jobs (e.g. port trucking), as well as the traffic and pollution externalities of cargo handling activity.

## *Port-city relationships*

All of this means that today we have a port with an increasingly regional impact, with considerable regulatory power and huge commercial success, but with a profound problem maintaining its 'social license to operate'. This is because

local governments do not have a strong incentive to support a port which is not accountable to them, and which delivers small net benefits in comparison to other economic activities. And, as long as the goods keep arriving (whether by ship, rail or road) and most people are employed in the service economy, residents of the post-industrial city see little reason to support what is (incorrectly) perceived to be a dirty activity.

There have been some efforts to improve the dialogue between municipal governments and the port via a series of consultative forums. Often these forums concern specific development projects. Attempts to create a permanent consultative forum between PMV and Metro Vancouver have been less successful, although this effort did reduce conflict around the level of PILT. The provincial government, which has a direct financial stake in many of the resource industries exporting via the port, also helped in this regard by capping property taxes on port industrial land, and compensating municipalities accordingly.

Indeed, what the port authority (PMV and its predecessors) and port-related industry lobby groups, such as the Gateway Council, have done with considerable success in the past decade is to turn to higher levels of government for political support and public resources for port-related infrastructure projects. The Asia-Pacific Gateway and Corridor Initiative (APGCI), officially launched in 2006, is the prime example of the success of this strategy. APGCI attracted considerable federal investment (and provincial funding, under a related strategy) to a series of highway, rail corridor and related projects to the Lower Mainland and beyond. But it also attracted negative attention, resulting in new port-community conflicts.

### *Community-port conflicts*

In this physical, economic and governance context, what types of conflicts arise between communities and the port-logistics industry? Which conflicts are felt in the different parts of the region, and which conflicts are regarded as more serious than others? When have governance structures been able to deliver results that leave both communities and port interests satisfied with the outcomes? In order to answer these questions, in 2010 we undertook an iterative research process that allowed us to identify the various types and sources of conflict related to port-logistics activity in a systematic fashion. It was especially important to avoid putting words into the mouths of respondents because port-community conflicts, while sometimes attracting media attention, are not widely understood. Hence the research faced the danger when asking municipal employees, let alone members of the public, what they viewed as conflicts of getting severely over-inflated (“everything wrong in our community is because those port trucks”) or under-inflated (“we don't have a marine terminal in our community so the port doesn't affect us”) responses.

The research process began with the identification of geographic clusters of port-logistics activity. Using address-matching of a commercial database of port, trucking, warehousing and port service firms, we identified preliminary clusters of activity. These were refined and more clearly identified through multiple site visits, resulting in the identification of 18 separate clusters. The clusters were geographically defined, including major nodes (e.g. the Burrard inlet marine terminals), industrial estates (e.g. Annacis Island, located in the Fraser River) as well as corridors (e.g. the route of the SFPR).

The second step was to search for cases of port-logistics conflict in each cluster using secondary sources, including media, planning documents and studies, and other published reports. Through this process, we identified 44 instances of conflict, and were able to create narratives of each. These narratives then allowed us to identify – using content analysis of the manifest and latent structures in each narrative – eight types of conflict and 12 categories of impact.

The type of conflict (see Table 2) refers to the nature of the site, infrastructure, corridor or triggering event; for example, the purchase or proposed conversion of farmland within the Agricultural Land Reserve by the port authority or port-logistics related industrial developers triggered conflict in three instances. The category of impact (see Table 3) refers to the substance or the content of the conflict between the community or municipality and the port-logistics industry; for example, many conflicts revolved around road and rail traffic impacts on communities, whether they are driven by the volume or emissions of current traffic, or the expected effects of infrastructure designed to affect traffic movements.

**Table 2: Types of conflict (8)**

Conflict type (# of instances)	Examples
ALR Farmland Conversion (3)	Gilmore Farm purchase, East Richmond
Highway expansions (10)	South Fraser Perimeter Road, Delta and Surrey
Mill Site Conversions (3)	Canfor, New Westminster
Parks, Habitat and Access (4)	Barnet Marine Park, Burnaby
Port Expansion (5)	Burrardview Cement, Vancouver
Rail (6)	Langley-Glover overpasses, City of Langley
Truck routes (8)	208th Street, Langley Township
Other (3)	



**Table 3: Categories of Impact (12)**

Traffic	This broad category includes concerns, complaints or protest over truck traffic, truck routes or enforcement of truck violations; and calls for traffic safety upgrades, traffic engineering projects, or congestion relief. Also included here are rail traffic concerns such as safety and congestion at road-rail crossings, or calls for overpasses or other grade separations.
Air Pollution	This includes any concerns about air quality, dust, particulate matter, diesel or other emissions, from industrial sources or vehicles, including trucks, trains and marine vessels.
Public Health	This category is often closely related to the first two issues. It would include any environmental health concerns because of industrial or vehicular pollution, or objections over residential proximity to industries and truck routes.
Light Pollution	This includes concerns or complaints about bright lights or light trespass from industrial areas or specific sites/businesses.
Land ownership / jurisdiction / use	This is a broad category, include issues such as: the conversion of agricultural land for port or industrial use; the conversion of industrial land for development (residential or commercial), or recreational use; the purchase of land in your municipality by the port authority; instances of land use designation or zoning changes involving industrial or waterfront land; or cases of conflicting jurisdiction over lands involving port or port-logistics activities.
Noise	This encompasses concerns, complaints or protest over noise from trucks (including engine brakes), trains (incl. whistles), industrial facilities, or noise pollution in general.
Parking	This issue involves concerns or conflicts over industrial or truck parking in residential neighbourhoods or vice-versa, including calls for related parking restrictions, enforcement, or the creation of additional parking opportunities.
Views	This includes any instance of objections to port-related or logistics projects or industrial uses because of because of view obstruction, or efforts to protect existing views or view corridors.
Wildlife Habitat / ecosystem	This category includes classic environmental concerns related to industrial activity, development, traffic, and/or related infrastructure such as: the destruction of or damage to wildlife habitat (including fish, bird, mammal, plant and other species) and/or ecosystems (particularly rivers and streams, wetlands, estuaries, and riparian areas); impacts on climate change or greenhouse gas emissions; and concerns about environmental sustainability.
Public Consultation	This issue would be flagged if public consultation was a point of contention or debate during a decision or planning process involving port-related activities. This would include calls from residents or public officials for more, better or different means of consultation.
Property Values	This would include instances when local residents, businesses, or others have concerns about the impacts of port-related activities or development on their property values, or on land values in general in the municipality.
Livability / quality of life	This is probably general enough to always be an issue for residents, but would be flagged if residents or others specifically identify impacts of port-logistics activity to their quality of life or the livability of their communities as a concern. In addition, many concerns can be considered as livability issues such as the need for parks, green space or waterfront access; or the promotion or preservation of neighbourhood walkability, safety or character.

Up to this stage, we had relied on secondary sources, but of course we could not assume that media and documentary records were complete or even accurate. Hence in the third step, we conducted interviews with municipal planning officials. We secured responses from 17 municipalities in the Lower Mainland region, representing most of those within Metro Vancouver (with the exception of the very smallest), as well as two mid-sized and rapidly growing municipalities in the Fraser Valley, namely Abbotsford and Chilliwack. These municipalities are traversed by the major continental rail and road corridors, and have seen increasing growth in warehousing activity linked to the port-logistics industry.

Open-ended interviews with planning and transportation officials in each of these 17 municipalities allowed us to confirm the nature and content of the identified conflict, as well as further refining the categories of impact. Based on these interviews, we removed 4 and added 2 instances of conflict to the list, resulting in a final list of 42 instances of conflict (these are the instances shown in the Tables).

Table 4 indicates which categories of impact were associated with which instances of conflict. Traffic and land impacts were the most common in port-community conflicts, but concerns about quality of life and public consultation were also associated with a majority of instances of conflict. In each type of conflict, these four categories of impact were experienced in at least one instance (i.e. no zeros in the column). Highway expansion, mill conversions and truck routes were always associated with traffic impacts; farmland conversions and parks/habitat conflicts were always associated with land impacts; and port expansions always raised public consultation impacts. Other categories of impact that were associated with a relatively high proportion of conflicts were air quality and noise. In contrast, impacts around lighting and views were associated only with specific instances of port (terminal) expansion, and parking impacts were associated only with conflicts over truck routes.

**Table 4: Types of Conflict (8) by Categories of Impact (12)**

Impact Conflicts (42)	Traffic	Air Quality	Public Health	Lighting	Land	Noise	Parking	Views	Habitat-Ecosys.	Public consult	Property Values	QOL
ALR Farmland Conversion (3)	33%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	67%	67%	67%	33%
Highway expansions (10)	100%	70%	50%	0%	90%	40%	0%	0%	60%	70%	20%	80%
Mill Site Conversions (3)	100%	67%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%
Parks, Habitat and Access (4)	25%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	50%
Port Expansion (5)	80%	60%	20%	40%	80%	80%	0%	20%	60%	100%	60%	20%
Rail (6)	67%	50%	17%	0%	83%	83%	0%	0%	17%	33%	33%	83%
Truck routes (8)	100%	50%	25%	0%	25%	75%	13%	0%	0%	38%	50%	38%
Other (3)	67%	33%	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%	67%	67%	0%	100%
All conflicts	79%	48%	24%	5%	74%	45%	2%	2%	38%	55%	33%	60%

Finally, we also developed a simple questionnaire to quantify the scale of the conflicts generated in each municipality in each category of impact. For each category of impact (i.e. traffic, air pollution, etc.) they were asked whether this was a,

- (a) Major Issue = 2. A major issue would be intense and/or was raised frequently, and became a focus of staff work and Council attention.
- (b) Minor Issue = 1. A minor issue would be something that has been raised but has not generated a great deal attention or staff work.
- (c) Non-Issue = 0. A non-issue would be something that has not been raised in the municipality.

This exercise allowed us to generate an average score for each category of impact, as well as an average score for each municipality. These results are presented in Tables 5 and 6. Note that here we made a methodological choice to ask questions about categories of impact in aggregate, rather than about specific instances of conflict. This is because not all municipalities could potentially experience all types of conflict: if you have no agricultural land, you cannot experience conflict over its conversion. Hence the results should be interpreted as a quantitative indication of a set of impacts resulting from port-community conflicts in municipalities in the greater Vancouver area.

Table 5 shows that municipalities located to the south and east of the region, essentially along the axis of port-logistics development anchored by Deltaport in the south-west and the continental railyards and highway-related logistics parks in the north-east, reported the highest average impact scores. These include the Tsawwassen First Nation and Delta, the municipalities hosting Deltaport; and Surrey, Coquitlam and New Westminster, the municipalities that host important truck routes, transloading facilities and railyards.

In contrast, municipalities to the north of the region (North Vancouver city and district) reported lower average impact scores, while centrally located municipalities had a more mixed set of reports. Low impacts were reported by Richmond which occupies an island in the Fraser River delta, moderate impacts in Burnaby and Vancouver, but a high level of impacts in New Westminster. Municipalities to the far east of the region, Chilliwack, Mission and Abbotsford, and to some extent Langley (city and township located in the mid-east), reported low levels of impact. This suggests that the expansion of port-logistics activity into such exurban locations is not yet associated with high levels of impact; indeed, they may still be welcomed by some in these jurisdictions.

**Table 5: Municipal impacts: greatest to the south and east**

Municipality	Average impact score	Location
Tsawwassen First Nation	1.58	South
Delta	1.50	South
Surrey	1.25	South-East
Coquitlam	1.17	North-East
New Westminster	1.17	Central
White Rock	1.00	South-East
Langley Township	0.88	Mid-East
Burnaby	0.88	Central
Langley City	0.83	Mid-East
Vancouver	0.82	Central
North Vancouver (city)	0.80	North
Chilliwack	0.75	Far East
Richmond	0.67	Central
Port Moody	0.58	North-East
Mission	0.50	Far East
North Vancouver (district)	0.33	North
Abbotsford	0.17	Far East

Table 6 provides further evidence that as the footprint of the port-logistics industry has extended from the waterfront into metropolitan space, the connective infrastructures between zones of activity are becoming more important as a source of conflictual impacts with local communities. For this analysis, we attempted to classify each impact category as to whether it was more route- or site-related, where route-related impacts occur along transportation corridors and site-related impacts occur at nodes of activity. In some instances, this classification is readily achieved; traffic impacts are route-related, views are site-related. In other cases, this calls for a subjective assessment of the narratives, and many categories of impact combine route- and site-related aspects. For example, noise impacts may be experienced at port terminal expansions (site) or along designated truck routes (route). Hence these are shown as Route/Site impacts, with the <, = and > signs providing some assessment of which class of impact, if any, predominates (i.e. noise impacts are more route-related, hence Route > Site).

The overwhelming conclusion of Table 6 is that route-related impacts such as traffic, noise and air quality impacts are felt by more intensely by municipalities than site-related impacts such as land, lighting, parking and view impacts. At the same time, route- and site-related impacts such as public consultation (more site-related), quality of life and property values also received high rankings. Hence the conclusion that route-related impacts are felt more intensely than site-related impacts should not be interpreted as saying that there are no site-related impacts.

**Table 6: Municipal impacts: route over site?**

Impact category (12)	Average score	Classification
Traffic	1.47	<b>Route</b>
Noise	1.18	<b>Route</b> >Site
Public consultation	1.12	Route< <b>Site</b>
Quality of Life	1.06	Route=Site
Air Quality	1.03	<b>Route</b>
Property Values	1.03	Route=Site
Land ownership, jurisdiction, use	0.94	Route< <b>Site</b>
Wildlife, habitat, ecosystem	0.84	Route=Site
Public Health	0.63	Route=Site
Lighting	0.47	Site
Parking	0.41	<b>Site</b>
Views	0.26	<b>Site</b>

Instead, there are indications that governance mechanisms to address site-related impacts are better developed. This would be consistent with a general point of this chapter, namely that governance arrangements have not kept pace with the expansion of port activities across the city-region. The combination of the narratives of each instance of conflict and the data provided by municipal respondents allow us to make some preliminary comments about which types of conflict were more easily resolved. Table 7 shows that high degrees of implementation were achieved in mill site conversions and port expansions, as well as with highway expansions. However, half of farmland conversions (site), and half of rail-related (route) conflicts remained unresolved in 2010. Truck routes also remained a source of intractable conflict. It should also be noted in Table 7 that although many of the infrastructure projects implemented under the APCGI were a source of controversy and conflict, a majority of the port-community conflicts we identified in 2010 pre-dated 2000; indeed, some of these long-standing conflicts became caught up in the roll-out of the APCGI.

**Table 7: Timing and outcomes of port-community conflicts, 2010**

	Began before 2000	Part of APCGI	Classification		Outcome	
			Site	Route	Implemented, mitigated	Deferred, withdrawn or pending
ALR Farmland Conversion (3)	33%	0%	100%	0%	50%	50%
Highway expansions (10)	80%	100%	0%	100%	80%	20%
Mill Site Conversions (3)	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Parks, Habitat and Access (4)	75%	25%	100%	0%	75%	25%
Port Expansion (5)	40%	40%	80%	20%	100%	0%
Rail (6)	33%	67%	17%	83%	50%	50%
Truck routes (8)	75%	13%	0%	100%	57%	43%
Other (3)	100%	0%	.	.	0%	100%
All conflicts	60%	43%	41%	59%	70%	30%

## Conclusion: Responses to conflict and looking to the future

It should be noted that this research was conducted in 2010. Since that time, public interest and concern about port activities has increased dramatically as a result of proposals to ship increased volumes of controversial commodities, oil and coal, through Vancouver area terminals. In one recently approved proposal, coal from mines in the United States will be brought by rail to Fraser Surrey Docks, transloaded onto barges and shipped to Texada Island in the Georgia Strait, and from there loaded onto freighters for trans-Pacific carriage. The proposal was opposed by residents along the route of the rail corridor, and a coalition of environmental and community health activists. Several municipalities, Metro Vancouver and the district medical officer of health also expressed opposition to the project. Hence approval of this project permit has come at some cost to public support for port-logistics activities more generally.

An equally controversial proposal is one that would see a more than doubling of the capacity of an oil pipeline between Alberta and a facility in the inner waters of the Burrard Inlet. Public and policy attention has focused on the regulatory and permitting process around the pipeline expansion, but the prospect of increased oil tanker traffic and dredging in the Inlet has also raised public concern. The Cities of Vancouver and Burnaby have formally opposed the proposal, and a large coalition of environmental organizations, First Nations and residents have expressed opposition. Both of these instances of conflict combine route-related concerns that extend across the city-region, with newer concerns about global climate change and more traditional maritime-centric port-community concerns.

How are the port authority and municipalities responding to the increasingly regional, route-related conflicts identified in this chapter? Responses from municipalities can be classified in three groups. Some are striking back, opposing port activities through a variety of tactics; from not acting to protect industrial lands, to opposing specific commodities, to attempting to change truck route designations. Others have a more mixed response, supporting industrial lands protection, but raising concerns about specific port-related impacts. There are also examples of municipalities engaged in proactive attempts to mitigate the impact of port activity. For example, the Corporation of Delta has joined with a small municipality in the interior of the Province, and the operator of an inland rail terminal, to propose a strategy to reduce truck trips in the region by developing transloading facilities at the inland location. What is remarkable about this effort is that unlike inland terminals in Europe and elsewhere, the lead is being taken by municipal governments and not the port authority or a terminal operator.

From the port side, whereas the 2000s were a period of rapid expansion of connective infrastructure, land has been a focus of the first part of the current decade. The port is engaged in a land use planning exercise, developing a detailed parcel-level guide to permitted uses. This approach entails a permissive approach to commercially leased port lands, and a protective stance towards other port lands. The port authority has devoted considerable resources to consultation in the planning process, without giving up any real decision-making authority. PMV has also become a more active role-player in the region's industrial land market. The port lobbied municipal governments in support of the industrial land use protection provisions included in the Regional Growth Strategy. It has also acted to purchase industrial lands that have come onto the market. Federal ownership of these lands protects them against municipal rezoning for residential and commercial uses, but leaves communities feeling they cannot control unwanted land uses and impacts.

This erosion of legitimacy and support for future expansions and developments is a growing challenge for Vancouver's port-logistics industry. Although Canadian ports have considerable autonomy in how they use their waterfront lands, the efficiency of these marine terminals depends upon facilities and connections that extend right across the metropolitan region. It is there where the conflicts and impacts are being felt most intensely, and it is there where governance mechanisms for timely, legitimate and accountable decision-making are weakest. It is time for local and regional governments to be given both a stronger stake and a stronger voice in the governance of the port.

### *Acknowledgements:*

This paper was made possible by generous funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the excellent research assistance of Laura Benson, and the willingness of municipalities to share their perspectives. The work also draws on academic literature and official reports; references are available on request. The opinions expressed are those of the author, and the usual caveats apply.

