

Canadian Surface Combatant (CSC) Land-Based Testing Facility Community Engagement Session *Unofficial Transcript*

January 31, 2023

MC: Alexandra Evershed

Welcome & land acknowledgement:

Capt(N) Andy MacKenzie, Base Commander, Royal Canadian Navy (RCN), Canadian Forces Base (CFB) Halifax

Opening remarks:

- Darrell Samson, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence
- Rob Chambers, Assistant Deputy Minister Infrastructure & Environment

Presenters:

- Capt(N) Jay Thor Turner, Deputy Project Manager, Canadian Surface Combatant (CSC) Project
- Paul Schauerte, Director Construction Project Delivery, Infrastructure & Environment

Head table (Q/A period):

- Rob Chambers, Assistant Deputy Minister Infrastructure & Environment
 - Paul Schauerte, Director Construction & Project Delivery, Infrastructure & Environment
 - Capt(N) Jay Thor Turner, Deputy Project Manager, CSC Project
 - Capt(N) Douglas Campbell, Director Naval Major Crown Projects, RCN
 - Capt(N) Andy MacKenzie, Base Commander, RCN, CFB Halifax
-

Alexandra Evershed

Good evening and welcome. Thank you for joining us both in person and online. [French]

My name is Alexandra Evershed from Prospectus Associates, and I will be facilitating tonight's session. What this means is that I am going to keep us all moving through the agenda as efficiently as possible so that you get to hear the information that is being presented about the project and you get to ask your questions during the question-and-answer session. I'm going to ask that you hold your questions until the Q&A because hopefully many questions will be answered as we go along. If you think you will forget an idea that comes to mind, jot it down. We will have lots of time for your questions.

[French]

Please note that while my introductory remarks will be in both English and French, the bulk of the presentation will be delivered in English. If you prefer the presentation in French, kindly raise your hand and one of my colleagues will bring you a copy. For online attendees, there's a link to the French version in the chat.

[French]

There are people joining us online. For those tuning in online, please raise your hand to indicate you can hear and see us okay. So, my colleague Keelan Green, who's running the online session over there at the back of the room, will note if there are any problems.

[French]

Before this evening session gets started, I'd like to run through a few housekeeping items. We kindly ask that all persons in attendance remain masked during the session. Masks may be removed briefly if you need a drink of water or while asking questions during the Q&A session. Kindly keep your mobile phones on silent mode. In the event of an emergency, there are two exits on this level. The first is at the front of this room where you came in. And the second is by the kitchen exiting to the side of the building. The washrooms can be found at the back of the room just down those stairs. For those who are tuning in online, we're going to ask that you have your cameras off and your microphones muted.

[French]

You all have a copy of the materials presented tonight. Additionally, for anybody that you know that wasn't here tonight, and you don't feel like copying the presentation for them, they'll be available on the Trident newspaper website at [Trident newspaper.com/LBTF](http://Trident.newspaper.com/LBTF). We're going to be audio and video recording this session tonight we'll be sharing English and French transcripts of this session with all attendees. Please note that there are members of the media present here tonight.

[French]

So, briefly, this is how tonight's session is going to run. We will hear a welcome and land acknowledgement and introductions by Captain Navy Andy MacKenzie, the base commander at Canadian Forces base Halifax. We will hear opening remarks, we will hear presentations from experts, and then following the presentations we will enter into an open question and answer period during which questions or comments can be raised. This will be followed by some brief closing remarks.

[French]

So without any further ado, after all of those introductory remarks, I would like to hand over to Captain Navy Andy McKenzie.

[French]

Captain (Navy) Andy MacKenzie

Thanks, Alexandra. Good evening, everyone. Bonjour. And thank you for attending tonight, both in person here at Hartlen Point and virtually, to learn about the Canadian Surface Combatant Land-Based Testing Facility. It's great to see so many community leaders here as well and community members in attendance for this session. Thanks very much for that.

As Alexandra mentioned, I am Captain (Navy) Andy MacKenzie. I am the Base Commander here for CFB, Halifax and I'd first like to begin by acknowledging that we are conducting today's public engagement session in Mi'kma'ki, ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq people, and that we are all Treaty people.

Before moving into some head table introductions, I want to personally thank you for your interest in this project and your engagement with our team thus far. CFB Halifax's geographical footprint within the region is quite expansive as you know. It means that we are close neighbors to many commercial business districts and residential communities, including yours. The Land-Based Testing Facility is a unique and significant project that's being introduced into the Eastern Passage community. So, we understand how important it is for you to receive information on the project here tonight and as the project moves forward. Sessions like these are a vital component of our continued public engagement

regarding the project as they provide an opportunity for our team to share information while offering you an opportunity to ask questions in an open and accessible forum. We trust the information you receive during the session will be useful to you.

To help deliver the information of this evening, I'm happy to be joined here tonight by a number of leaders within the Department of National Defense and the Canadian Armed Forces who have been working towards the successful completion of this project. Whether executive or operational leaders, engineers or experts in naval operations and capabilities, these individuals all possess further knowledge of the project within their respective areas of responsibility. Tonight's panel of speakers include Mr. Rob Chambers, Assistant Deputy Minister of Infrastructure and Environment, Mr. Paul Schauerte, Director of Construction and Project Delivery, Infrastructure and Environment. Captain (Navy) Jay Thor Turner, Deputy Project Manager with the Canadian Surface Combatant project, Captain (Navy) Douglas Campbell, Director of Naval Major Crown Projects with the Royal Canadian Navy. Paul and Jay Thor will be delivering our main presentation tonight. However, everyone here at the head table will be available for questions during the open question and answer period at the end of the presentation. We look forward to hearing your feedback and answering your questions this evening. But before we begin, I would like to welcome Mr. Darrell Samson, the Member of Parliament for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook to say a few words. In addition to his MP duties, Mr. Samson also serves as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence and has been working diligently to ensure constituents' questions regarding the project are brought to the attention of the Land-Based Testing Facility project team.

Welcome Darrell, thank you for your engagement on this project.

Darrell Samson

Thank you, Captain MacKenzie, and good evening, everyone. I'm not sure why but it's the second meeting we have, and in both meetings, we had a nice snowstorm. Today's is not as bad as yesterday, I have to say, and I was a little smarter as well because last time I flew in and just made it here on time. This time I stayed back and did my Parliament duties virtually today, so I'll be leaving in the morning.

I can't really think of a better site. I'm really happy we came back to the same site because I believe this is a great site for this type of conversation. The community of Eastern Passage and surrounding areas have been well populated with many of the military, and families' involvement, so they are familiar with some of the projects and initiatives that have been going on in the past and continue to go on.

I do want to say, which is really important, is that following the last meeting, there was a commitment made that we would follow up throughout the months that proceeded. It's almost been a year. It was in March. So, we're still in January, but tomorrow will be February 1, of course. And I'm really happy that we're able to gather together to continue to dialogue, a dialogue which is extremely important between of course the community, community leaders, the military, DND and the Canadian Armed Forces.

I'm so happy that we have the individuals here to give us some answers, but also wanting to thank you all for coming out because it's important, when a project of this nature is being discussed, that we have the opportunity, of course to have, to put questions on the table and expect answers which is extremely important and that was part of my task as much as possible. To try to make sure that the lines of communication continue. I know that in November and December there have been some focus meetings as well with a number of groups, interest groups, in the area and concerned groups in the area, that have had some discussions. And some answers were given and more hopefully tonight, but the commitment was also to come here and talk about the traffic concerns, the environment concerns. I know that we have some fishers here and families that have some concerns and very important questions. The bird habitat, the radio frequency, those are all extremely important questions that need

to be addressed and discussed and that's why I'm really happy that we're back together in big numbers so that these conversations can continue. And I understand that there will also be in the fall sometime another follow-up meeting, public meeting as well. So, that is extremely important.

So, I want to thank everybody for being here and the staff as well, so that we can continue that dialogue and have those questions and concerns addressed and find solutions to those questions and concerns. Thank you and good evening and I'm very excited to be able to be here and participate. Thank you.

Rob Chambers

All right, I promise the opening remarks are almost over here. My name is Rob Chambers. As was previously mentioned, I'm the Assistant Deputy Minister of Infrastructure and Environment at National Defence -- that might or might not mean anything to you. There's no reason why it would, so I'll just say I'm the senior defense official responsible for infrastructure and environment issues for National Defence. I work for the Deputy Minister who is responsible for the overall organization. Hopefully that helps situate things a little bit.

Among other things my part of the organization is responsible for making sure that the Canadian Armed Forces have the facilities that they need in order to be able to do the things that they're asked to do. That never happens in a vacuum. Defense teams live, work and train in communities like this one all over the country. And that's why tonight is so important to us. And why I'm grateful to have this chance to sit with you and share information about the project and hear your questions and concerns firsthand.

I think we've put together a pretty good collection of subject matter experts. I'm not including myself in that, trust me, but they'll be able to speak to pretty much any aspect of the project. So, we're going to dig into the presentation in just a second. But also, in the Q&A. Obviously, this isn't meant to be a one-way flow of information so that that session towards the second half will be just as critical as the first part.

Now, that said, that first slide, if we could just move forward. This isn't the start of the exchange that we've been having with you as a community or as was mentioned with individuals and groups within the community. So, we just wanted to start off by reflecting back to you some of what we think we've been hearing. This is not meant to be an exhaustive list. If you don't see your issue here, don't worry. That's, you know, what tonight and future sessions are about, just to get those on the table.

But we did, we wanted to reflect back to you a little bit some of what we've been hearing about, you know, site selection for an example. I don't know if it was dark when you came up, if your headlights picked up the sign "Wrong Location" on the way up, obviously someone who's concerned about site selection. So that's something we'll talk about, why here why not somewhere else? Obviously, environment is on people's mind. What's the impact on habitat? What's the impact on birds, on wildlife? What's the impact on the environment itself and in terms of other issues that you might have in mind? I know sometimes, people, there's been some information out about 'is this a weapons testing facility', which it isn't, but we'll talk about that tonight. That would raise environmental concerns, I'm sure in some people's minds. The radiofrequency emissions, RF emissions, again, from a safety perspective, what does that mean? What does that entail? We'll talk about that. Jay Thor is going to help us with that piece. Traffic. We were just talking about traffic earlier this evening with some folks who are here, safety issues around traffic. So, what does that look like? What would the impact be? Can the roads handle that? What about the sidewalk situation? It's a little hard to see it now for someone like myself who's just coming up here for the first time but, people were, we came up a second time, and we were able to see it's plowed, and I can see where it is where it isn't and so we're getting a better sense of that issue with some of the work that we've been doing on that front. And then the last piece, and again, not meant to be exhaustive, but community engagement. Are we communicating with you enough? Are we being open enough, being transparent enough? I think there was a period there where maybe we

weren't meeting our obligations in that regard. Hopefully we've begun to correct that. And hopefully tonight is another step towards that. But I mean, you tell me. That's not for me to say. That's for us to listen to you say. And of course, we have a whole series of activities here, which, actually, I should mention the access piece. Are you going to be able to continue to do the things here that you've been doing for many years now? The short answer is yes, in many ways, but I don't want to scoop my colleagues. So, I'll let them speak to that in more detail. As we jump into the next slide, which I will turn over to my colleague, Jay Thor, and again thank you. I know it's not a personal favour for me that you're here. It has nothing to do with me but thank you for being here and I look forward to the discussion tonight.

Jay Thor Turner

Hello, I'm Jay Thor. I'm an engineer so please bear with me for all that brings. I'm from the Project Management Office and one of the deputy projects managers. It's a big project. So, there's a bunch of us, but my area of focus is on infrastructure. As was already mentioned, I'm going to speak about a couple of key issues that have been brought up in our discussions that we've discussed with some people and we're going to try to give you better answers. The q&a will tell me whether I was better or worse than predicted. But at the end of the day, we want to make sure you get the information that we have and make sure that we can help clarify those challenges. Next slide.

So, just a brief overview of the project. Essentially, this is the Navy of the future. So, we're building a whole bunch of ships right now. But from our main Surface Combatant fleet, replacing the frigates which are currently in service right now you'll see them coming in and out of the harbor, and our destroyers, which have been retired for some time, this class will replace both those ships, and thus it's a very complex ship and a very important ship to Canada's Navy. With that, we have a contract that was competitively bid with Irving Shipbuilding to design and build that ship. Part of that program means we also have to build a number of other things which I would refer to as support elements, but things that you could probably understand would be training, training facilities, developing how we do the training for all the new systems. And there is also infrastructure. And that's what brings us here today one of those key elements of infrastructure is the Land-Based Test Facility. There are a number of other projects on the go for that infrastructure portfolio. But again, today we're going to focus on Land-Based Test Facility unless it comes up. Next slide.

So, when we talk about why we need a Land-Based Test Facility, again I mentioned that the ship is very complex. Getting it right is very hard, and it takes a lot of effort. And a lot of talented people are working both in DND, through industry, and across Canada to get it right. In order to mitigate risks with that build and the integration we need to test and integrate the systems that are going to go on the ship somewhere that is going to be done at the LBTF. There's no other site in Canada that can do this. It is purpose built for this and it is an essential aspect of our program and project to ensure that we can meet the schedule that the Navy needs and the country needs as far as delivering the Navy of the future. The approach is consistent with our allies. So, when we look at how our allies do major ship programs, we know that they also use these types of facilities in order to do the testing and integration to get it right before you install it on the ship. Once you install it on the ship, get complex to change and fix things in major ways. We want to avoid that as much as possible. And that's another key element to why this facility is essential. On the slide it notes that we essentially call it ship zero while we do call it ship zero because it is essentially going to be, from computers, electronics, sensors, radars, radios, essentially the first of all that put together in an integrated way so we can understand how it all works to make sure it works right before we go to build a ship. And again, because that's an expensive proposition that we won't have to do multiple times or too many changes. Next slide.

So, first, probably, issue side. We had an opportunity, or I had an opportunity, in December to talk to a bunch of the community which was great. And we got a lot of feedback. And this was a consistent

theme. There were a lot of questions about site selection. And when looking at how we had communicated site selection in the past I can certainly gain an understanding of why there was confusion, or that what we sent out through the Access to Information process wouldn't necessarily have answered your questions very well. So, this is our reattempt at explaining that site selection and in a more clear way. So, one thing that's not on the slide is just to give you a timeline perspective, because that's also come up in this topic. So, we entered into contract with Irving shipbuilding for the design and build (we were working with them before) but for the design and build, and their subcontract was in 2019. So, in the scale of the complexity of this kind of project, it is not that long ago. And so that's that kind of was the starting point for when you started considering what we were going to do about things like a Land-Based Test Facility and capability. So, from there on the slide, we do see some of the other aspects. So, between then and 2021 we were doing a lot of work to build a business case and understand what we were going to do. Moving into 2021, DND, the Department of National Defence, we provided five options sites for Irving Shipbuilding as our prime contractor to do some analysis and look at as far as trying to find the optimal site. That report also did a number of other things which was analyze how we would do this, what capabilities do you need? What does this kind of thing look like? Being that it was the first of the kind to be built in Canada. After that, we followed up with a DND analysis, which was done internally through the Project Management Office, to look at refining and more precisely locating where the most optimal site was. As you can see in the criteria list, there's a number of criteria that were considered when we looked at this. And unfortunately, it's not an easy decision. But those criteria were a balanced selection of pros and cons for all the sites we looked at. And at the end of the day, Hartlen Point came out as the most optimal site for the capability that we needed to support the program and get the ships delivered and do that schedule of mitigation and integration mitigation that I talked about.

Community member

(Indistinguishable question)

Jay Thor Turner

We can, can we come back to that in the q&a. I'll just take a note, but we can just take a note and get through the rest of the presentation. Some of the other key aspects of the choice, which is the proximity to another range that DND operates at Osborne Head. So, this is important for a number of reasons, technical reasons, but also operational reasons and efficiencies. The open ocean view is important to the kind of testing that we need to do with what will be a brand-new radar system and a number of other systems, enabling us to test that through with our own ships and other ships. Again, we talk about the radio frequency aspect, in this case Hartlen Point is more optimal from an interference with other possible radiofrequency emissions, which will be in some of the other sites we looked at. Those were problematic areas for that. And again, when we talk about impacts to Royal Canadian Navy capabilities, this site poses no impacts to those existing capabilities. At the bottom, we put a note in and this is again based on feedback from the community who were questioning why wasn't Osborne Head kind of the winner for a number of really logical reasons that were brought up. And at the end of the day, there's some key factors that have to do with height above sea level for the radar that are very essential to us being able to do the testing we need to do, as well as distance to the coastline, and as I mentioned, there's an existing range there that we would have to replace and put somewhere else because that having those two sites operate together is also essential for testing. Next slide.

So, what does this mean for site access? And so, I have two slides to speak to this one because the first will be in the construction phase and the second will be in the operational phase, after it's built an operating. So, during the construction phase, we will have to manage safety and security. That's paramount. We want to make sure that everyone around the facility, working at the facility, the materials on site, everything about the construction site is kept safe and secure. So, we will have to put up fencing, we will have to control access to that, but it'll be driven by that health and safety concern

and the construction security concern. The immediate area around the construction site will not be restricted at that time, unless there's movement of material and otherwise that again is a safety concern. Otherwise, land and shoreline and waterways in the area won't be affected during the construction. Our objective will always continue to be to minimize that impact to those activities that Hartlen Point is known for and that you enjoy. Next slide.

Then the construction phase, so the operational phase of the site. This is a little bit more of a nuanced and complex answer because we're still working on the design and development of the systems that are going to go into the site. We don't have all the technical details such that we can give you the granularity that you're asking for. We want to get there. We will get there, and we will share it in those future engagements with you as soon as we have that information. As you can understand security from a class of classified material and classified capabilities perspective will be important at this site. So therefore, there's going to be a fence for that purpose installed at the site. And right now, it will be at least 30 meters around the site. So, we know that to be the starting point. And as things develop, we'll understand more if that changes and we'll communicate it but right now at a minimum it will be 30 meters. Beyond that the area around the site when operating will be managed and monitored for safety. So, this comes back to the end. We'll get to it later in the presentation but the radiofrequency emissions safety requirements. That is very important and again a paramount aspect for us to ensure the health and safety of those at the site operating in it and around it at all times 24/7. And it's very rigorously done and will be rigorously done. That will drive how we manage the access to the surrounding area. Until we have all those details, it is difficult at this time for us to give you specifics of where those out of bounds areas will be how it will be managed but at the end of the day, we're still having the objective to minimize the impact to the surrounding area and enable as many as possible of the activities that have gone on or to continue to go on. A couple of key things that are in there is there's no intent to have a permanent exclusion zone in the inshore and nearshore waters. When we talk about impact to fishing. We will have to use range control procedures if there is a safety issue that would require a temporary zone to be placed out there. And we'll use the traditional methods that we've used for all Navy operations for the many decades of notice to mariners, notice to aviators, and other potential range control procedures that will ensure the safety of everyone in the area. There is a note on the schedule and how much the site will operate. The radar will not be on all the time. In the early days, so that's why we're saying ... I know it's a long period of time but 2026, which is kind of the end of this when we expect to have the radar installed and starting to operate, all the way to the mid 2030s, that takes us to the acceptance of the first ship. That will very likely be our most busy period for the site. Because that's when we're figuring out all the bugs, all the challenges and making sure that we get that first ship completely tested and evaluated and integrated correctly to deliver the capability that Canada needs. That will be the busy period. After that it gets hard to predict but we expect that that will be the busiest period as we move forward. Next slide.

So, radio frequency safety isn't always easy to explain. I've been working in the field in the Navy is one of my main duties for 20, probably close to 22 years. At times my colleagues have challenged my explanations as being a bit too technical. I can accept that challenge and I'll do my best to get better. I have been refining my ability to explain it in ways that kind of everyone can understand without nerding out too much over the last couple of decades. And if you ask my wife and kids they might tell you I'm only moderately successful but I'm going to do my best and I'm happy to take any questions where I leave you confused or don't give you the answers you thought you were asking for in the question and answer period. So, radiofrequency emissions are all around us. Most of you probably have a cell phone in your pocket. It has radiofrequency emissions. There are stringent safety procedures, protocols and testing that are required by law in Canada for all those devices, including the radars that we will eventually operate and the emitters that we will eventually operate at the LBTF. At the end of the day, safety of the local community health and safety of the people at the site, around the site, is paramount. We don't deviate from this in how we operate with radiofrequency emitters today. We have no plans to

deviate. It would be illegal for us to deviate, and we won't deviate. That will always be a primary objective to manage that health and safety risk. Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada, a separate government department, they issue the radio frequency emitter licenses. It's the same rigorous process for CBC or a local radio station to get a permit as it is for us. And we do that for all our emitters, and we will be following that process for all the emitters that are located at the LBTF. All the regulations that start off with Health Canada Safety Code 6 all the way down through the ISED licensing, into the Department of National Defence radiofrequency safety program, and then all the way down to the ship and the Navy radio frequency safety programs, all will continue to apply and continue to be the method by which we manage radio frequency safety in our site and on our ships. Next slide. I might have skipped ahead a little bit. So, this is a little bit more detail about what I mentioned is Health Canada Safety Code 6. This is the world accepted gold standard for radiofrequency safety. It is not new, and it's been around for a very long time. And Department of National Defence has applied the guidance in its own programs and policies for as long as I've been in the Navy and many years before that. One probably key note there that I think is important to everyone here is that in that licensing process that I talked about, there is public consultations. So, as we get further into that process, that will be a part of that we will execute as per ISED's direction Next slide.

So, this is a tougher aspect to talk about because there's no standards for wildlife. So, from a science perspective, the effects that radiofrequency emissions have on organic tissue of animals are the same. They're known, they haven't changed this is not a new discovery. It's something we've lived with and managed for many, many decades. We apply the same due diligence as we do to the protection of human health as we would to animals. Where possible, we're going to prevent any risk that is to health and safety of those things. It is harder because some of the range control procedures we will build and apply and develop to control range safety for fishermen or kayakers or people who are hiking in the area are harder to convey to the birds and the animals. That said, we've looked at similar sites and how they've managed it and noted some of how animals behave. And then we have early indicators that it is a manageable problem. And that birds don't tend to hover in one spot, which would be a problem for us, if that spot was too close to the radar. That doesn't tend to happen they tend to continue to fly through. And important aspects of that are that distance away from the emitter, time of exposure. Those are all key factors and understanding whether or not it's dangerous. That said we do have some work to do to look at this aspect and make sure we work with experts to understand how those impacts need to be understood and managed with the operation of facility. And again, we don't anticipate harmful exposure to birds. There'll be no radar emissions going to the ground where birds might be nesting. That's not useful for us for testing and, and no purpose for it. It's more about the area in in the air. And we will continue to work on analyzing that and understanding and managing that and have better answers as we understand more about the site. And again, at the very bottom there are few key points there. The majority of our effort will be pointed out over the ocean although birds can fly through there. It does come back to that point I made where they don't tend to stay inside the areas that we're concerned about. And the distance that they would have to be, how close they need to be, has a chance to assist in mitigating that risk. The geometry of the land. This is really just talking about radar is line of sight. So, if we point it at a hill it doesn't go very far. That's not very helpful to us. And that means that it has to go over the hill and so it doesn't curve down around from a hazard or from a risk perspective. So, from a safety perspective, there are going to be areas based on the natural geography that are going to be safe by nature of how the site is installed. We won't have those answers until we've precisely oriented the building, have the system installed, and then gone through our rigorous testing. But when we do have that, again, we will be sharing all that information. And the last point I think, just to emphasize that we have we have a legal obligation to avoid harming migratory birds and their nests when they're protected. We do the same for marine mammal mitigation and we'll apply the same kind of standards as how we approach operation of this facility. Next slide.

So, this is my last one and then the nerd talk ends. I just I put this up there as these are a handful of our radiofrequency emission sites that are in the local area that you live with today. That have been operating for a number of years. Here at Hartlen Point we have a high frequency surface wave radar, as well as Coast Guard and Canadian Air Force communications and navigation antennas. Also, we have the navy vessels in the harbor. They're all radio frequency emitters and we restrict and controls emissions depending on where they are in the harbor and what they're doing and what the radar is we manage that and have successfully managed that for decades. We also have emissions from Osborne head at the range and a few other sites in the area. Those are all well managed by formation, safety and environment as part of all those rigorous policies and standards that I listed, and we'll continue to follow that and be the good neighbors that we have been we aim to continue to be the same. That's all I have. I will now turn it over to my colleague Paul Schauerte.

Paul Schauerte

Thanks Jay Thor. As mentioned, my name is Paul Schauerte, I'm the director responsible for the delivery of construction projects and national defense. This obviously being one of my projects in my portfolio. I'm going to speak to you tonight about the number of studies that we've undertaken over the past year. When we met with you last March. There had been a lot of concerns raised around environmental issues. And we committed to going away with that, undertaking a number of studies, and bringing back the results of those studies at our next session. I do remember in March that we had committed to coming back in the fall. But what we had heard at that session meant we had to go back and rewrite a lot of the scope for those studies to expand them to cover some of the issues that we weren't aware of or needed to address. So took a little longer, but I'm here tonight to kind of talk about the results of them. So, an environmental study isn't just one study. It's a number of studies. And I'm going to go through them this evening and end it with kind of the all-encompassing environmental effects study. But we did a soil characterization study, we did a wetland assessment. We did a bird and bat assessment and then of course the overall environmental effects determination. These reports are in their final review phase. It is our hope that we'll have them completed in the next couple of months. And our goal is that we will release all studies that we've conducted around the environment in their entirety to everybody. So that's hopefully starting in March, but that'll depend on us getting them finalized and ready for publication. Next slide please.

So, the first study I want to talk to you is a soil study. This is a study just to understand the characterizations of the soil upon which we'll put the site and understand if there are any contamination or restriction issues that we need to be aware of. Soil study allows us to understand the structure of the soil that's important for when we build upon in terms of loads and how we work with the site. And then of course are there any contaminations in the soil that we need to treat or be aware of and address. The findings that we found with the study, there are contaminants found in the soil all well below applicable guidelines, with the exception of a few like arsenic and iron. Don't be frightened by that. These are naturally occurring contaminants that happen in the soil has nothing to do with human use. But they are there, and we will treat them as if it is a major concern. And the soils we do collect, there are standards that we have to adhere to in how we collect them, how we move them, how we treat them. They're just not dumped off to the side or anywhere. They're handled in accordance with law. So, we'll be taking care of that. Impact to the surrounding environment is minimal. Next slide.

The next study we did was the wetland assessment. There are a number of wetlands in Hartlen Point and we want to understand the scope and nature of the wetlands, how they interact with one another and how the site will interact with the wetlands. We did find that there are a few of the wetlands within the area that do touch on the site on the edges only in the heart of the site. There are no wetlands. There are three in particular that we did note that could be impacted with the construction, both of the site and the road going to the site. So how do we address that in terms of mitigation measures? We're certainly going to orient the infrastructure as much as we can to avoid interaction with the wetlands.

Where that is unavoidable, and we have to interact with them. We're going to try and improve the connectivity between the wetlands around the site. So, we'll actually do some actual environmental work to improve the connectivity between the wetlands so they can move around the site efficiently and not being affected and how they interact with one another. Any de-watering of the of the excavation around the site, it's going to be pumped into areas that aren't affected by the wetlands. But again, if there's any contaminated soils in that, we will treat that differently than just pumping out water that accumulates on the site. Any disturbed wetland areas we will revegetate elsewhere to keep the overall size of the wetlands comparable to what they were before we do any work on the site. Next slide please. One back. There we are.

So, the next study we did was the bird and bat assessment. Obviously, a lot of discussion's taken place to date around how important the site is to migratory birds and a breeding ground. So, we needed to understand that in its entirety of what we were looking at. We looked at a number of bird and bat habitats. We looked at their migration periods, their breeding periods. What were the bat seasons which were different than the birds. Winter residency, nocturnal owls, woodpecker, we tried to cover everything that we could. That knowledge helps us in terms of how we design and build the facility to minimize any impacts to the birds. We did find within Hartlen Point 111 bird species are protected under the Migratory Birds Convention Act. Eight are at risk and 38 are of conservation concern. We did not find any bats or bat presence within the actual footprint although there are some within Hartlen Point just not in that specific footprint. Potential adverse effects that have been noted in alteration of habitats if they do use that particular site as a habitat. There will be sensory disturbance during the construction period, nests disturbance and possible bird strikes to the building. While we can't entirely reduce the risk to zero of the birds' interaction with the site, the goal is to mitigate it as much as possible to get it as close to zero as we can. We're going to do that with how we look at in terms of our mitigation measures. So, a key one, the initial one, one of the first ones will be about site clearing and preparation. That's the first thing we have to do before we do any actual construction. That will only take place outside of the breeding and migratory windows. So, we have those established, we will not do any of that work while there is breeding and migratory activities taking place within certain periods of year. The site will be monitored throughout the construction period by qualified experts we'll hire. They'll be looking for Species at Risk conservation concerns, anything related to the project in terms of adverse effects with the birds. So, we'll have experts on site throughout the project to inform us of anything adverse taking place. The facility is going to be designed to what is called the bird friendly building standard. These are a set of standards that govern the types of materials used on a building, the way you use light in a facility all to mitigate the potential for bird strikes against the building. So, we're going to take all of those factors into place in terms of the materials, whether we use certain types of glass building materials, if it's lighting, it's going to point down load up as much as we can in order to mitigate those issues. Next slide please.

So, the final piece I want to talk to in terms of studies is the Environmental Effects Determination. This is the all-encompassing environmental study that takes place for any project. It's initiated early in the project and takes place through multiple phases, over multiple years. The first piece that everybody saw and many were upset because they thought it was the be-all and end-all of an environmental piece for the project and the community was that initial notice of a project going on the Canadian Impact Assessment registry back in '21. That was just, it's required by law for any project to post to that site to initiate a process. Just to start it, so that's what it was. And since then, we've been on the path working towards getting this Environmental Effects Determination completed. The study itself identifies all possible environmental impacts or consequences that the project may have on its surrounding environment, and then identifies mitigation measures to address those concerns. It is a required by law study that needs to take place for a project under the Impact Assessment Act that was passed in 2019. And it pulls together every other project or every other study I've talked about to be an all-encompassing study. Next slide please.

So, an Environmental Effects Determination looks at a whole suite of factors that cover a multitude of themes including environmental, cultural, transportation, human impact, etc. So, list is there I mean, it looks at you know, air, water, ground, soils, noise and light, wildlife habitat, aquatics, vegetation, wetland, species at risk, and then even to you know, human land use, cultural uses, Indigenous considerations, etc. It has been found with this project that it's not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, and that the project should be able to proceed with application of the mitigation measures specified in the report and I'm going to cover a few of those this evening. All construction activities are going to be limited just to the daytime hours there will be no nighttime construction with this project. Tree Removal on the site is going to be limited to the site itself, not the surrounding area. And anything that needs to be done with the access road. The site itself, the environmental effects report does note it needs to be pushed inland to avoid any interactions, any negative interactions with the surrounding coastline. So, there is a certain distance it says it needs to be moved. There is a natural erosion that occurs with this coastline of a certain few centimeters every year. Even that said we are going to continue to conduct studies around the shoreline interaction. And if there's any other mitigation measures we can do to reduce or eliminate shoreline erosion, we're going to have a look at those as part of the project. But the initial intent is that the facility itself has no interaction with the shoreline. There's also the other mitigation measures that I spoke of in the previous studies in terms of the wetland mitigation and bird friendly design and how it affects how the building operates. Next slide please.

The facility itself will go through an environmental design and construction consideration. This means that we're essentially building a sustainable facility that has low GHG emissions. So, we have a whole suite of standards. We often use the lead silver design package or green globes determine how a building is sustainable, how it minimizes its use of energy and uses sustainable products in the construction of the facility. That includes like low carbon, low carbon emissions, cement, and energy systems that are much more efficient and don't have a large draw of energy in order to function. The intent of all this is to have a healthy balance between the design, construction and operations of the building and the environment and the community around it. Next slide please.

So, to the point I have spoken to the environmental piece, the other piece that had been raised in March was the traffic issues related to concerns of increase of traffic and impact of construction traffic moving down short road [inaudible] road, main roads, in the area. So, the other study that we conducted was a traffic impact statement report. This was meant to study the road networks and assess the impact of the construction and post-construction traffic on the community. In terms of the volume of traffic that would occur both with the construction period and the operation period, the study did find that the existing roadwork had sufficient spare capacity that it could absorb the additional traffic without any major concerns in terms of the volume of traffic moving through the community at any one time. In terms of impact to the roads themselves or the community's interaction with those roads. We are looking, I mean, Shore Road being the main road that we're talking about is the responsibility of the Halifax Regional Municipality to maintain and operate. We're very much committed to working with HRM to initially understand the assessment of the road before we do any work on it. So, what is the current condition? And if anything ever happens to the road itself due to the project, that it is the project's responsibility to, to make repairs to those incidents with the road.

Community member
(Inaudible question)

Alexandra Evershed

We're going to ask you hold your question for the question-and-answer period, ok? Thank you so much.

Paul Schauerte

So, all the roadwork that we would do would be worked, coordinated through with HRM. We remain committed to working with HRM to continue to study the road, its uses of the road and any considerations that still remain in terms of sidewalk additions or roadwork that we will continue to work with HRM being responsible throughout to support that work any way we can. That said, just as I know it's a growing community so anytime new homes are being built, new schools being built, there's always construction. Anybody that's working within that construction, delivery vehicles or construction vehicles, they have to obey the laws of the road. All the rules, regulations, if there's adjustments to load limits based on certain parts of the year, where the road may be more susceptible to damage. We respect those. But we have to go through all of that. To ensure that the road is used as responsibly as possible. Final point I would make is that we know we can't plan for everything. And so, we remain committed to, at any point should the community have feedback or concerns that they want to raise with the road and our interaction with it throughout any period of the project, that they're more than welcome to communicate with the project team. And we want to ensure that we can address those concerns as fast as we can so they don't linger. Next slide please.

So, in terms of the project schedule for the facility, we've been wrapping up the environmental studies and so we're going to get those two out to everybody this spring. We're currently in the design phase, working on the concept design and then moving our way through the design elements towards 100% design that will be completed later this year. Intent is to start construction on the site, late '23. But there can be, as early as this spring, brush clearing taking place to prepare the site for construction. The reason why that date is so early it is a bit of a push but as I had mentioned previously, it's meant to avoid the bird and bat breeding windows that will take place in the summer. As well, any roadwork or municipal work that'll start within the Hartlen Point area may start as well in order to facilitate the flow of construction traffic to the site. Construction is expected to be completed in 2026. There'll be an additional year required for equipment fit up in the site once it's built before it goes operational in 2027. Next slide please.

So, as mentioned, we are committed to working with the community listening to your concerns and trying to address them as best we can. Tonight, again, is a step in a process that we started last March and we're going to continue to work through, through the life of the project. Since we've met with you in March, we've done a number of things to try and get updates around the project and what we're doing with it out to everybody. As mentioned previously we're using the Trident website to post all information around the project events related with the community. We're doing mailers that are mailed out to community members. We've done a number of those in the fall. We're doing specific phone call introductions in meetings with community leaders. And that's not just the political leadership but also community leaders that have expressed interest in various areas from bird, to surf, to fishing community, etc. Trying to reach out to them and holding bilateral discussions. So we reached out to them and then we set up the bilateral discussions with them, face-to-face, that we held just before Christmas in December. As mentioned, we continue to engage with our other levels of government colleagues, city, provincial, and of course federal. We're also engaging with indigenous communities in the area to address any concerns they may have any issues they have or just interest in the project. As always, there is a lot of public interest inquiry into the project. We, and we work to respond to every public query we get. I get a number of letters that we instill, and we try to address every single one of them as fast as we can. This is our latest engagement session. But it won't be our last one. Next slide, please.

So, what are we going to do next in terms of community engagement? As I mentioned previously, we're going to release all the studies info as soon as they're ready, which will be later this spring. In March. We'll send out mailers to advise everybody when the updates go, so hopefully nobody misses out on

when they go live. We're going to schedule another round of community leader meetings later this spring in April and May. As always, we're going to continue to work with everybody to understand current use patterns for the land and the shoreline. As always, we're going to respond to the public queries. And the last point I'll note is that we intend to hold another community engagement session much like tonight, before the project goes into the construction phase. So, we're going to try and avoid doing this in the summertime hopefully shortly after Labor Day. We know we don't want to impact on summer vacations, but the goal is to meet with everybody before we go into construction, give an update on what the design is and continuing the dialogue. And that is the end of my piece. Thank you very much.

Alexandra Evershed

If you can go back, Keelan, one slide. There's an important address ... questions can come to CFB Halifax Public Affairs at forces.gc.ca at all times for answers. But in the immediate, tonight, it's time for your questions. There are a few notes to start and the lady in the pink sweater has a question. So please feel free to ask your questions in the official language of your choice. And we'll make sure that you get an answer in it too. [French translation]

There are a few ground rules for this session. We all need to hear each other. We all need to understand what's happening. So, one person will speak at a time, please. And if we can refrain from having sidebar discussions, everybody will be able to hear what's happening. Okay. I'd also like us to be respectful of one another. We are all here in good faith. We either have information to share from here, from you, or we have questions to ask that we would like answered, but we are here in good faith. So, we'd like to ask for some respect of each other and to that end we'll ask you not to interrupt each other either, and to let people complete their thought. That said in the interest of precision and in the interest of getting as many questions answered as possible tonight, as the facilitator, you may see me, raise my hand when you're asking a question, or making a comment, because you can make a comment too. That purpose may be to ask you to reframe your question so that it's more precise, so it's better understood by everybody. Or it may be to ask you to please get to the point that you're moving towards so that your neighbors can have a chance to ask their questions too. So that's what the hand up is going to mean. You can remove your mask while you're asking your question that too will help us to all understand each other better. So now... [French Translation]

I may in fact raise my hand and ask the people answering your questions to rephrase, be more clear or get to the end of your answer. So that'll be a two-way thing. For those of you who are online, please type your questions into the Zoom chat. And we will come to you. We'll come to... It's roughly.... It's not half and half it's probably about two thirds 1/3 In terms of here versus online. So we'll go.... Oh, and here's another bit of information: I'm going to take questions, you're probably going to want to speak into the mic so people can hear you, right? So, I'm going to ask you to step out of your seat and into either the center corridor or the side corridor. And I'll come to you with the mic, and I'll get your question. Okay? And we'll go.... Question, question. question. All right? Perfect. So that's our housekeeping on the question and answer. If we can begin to, in an orderly way, step out to the middle I'll grab my microphone. I promised this lady, I'd come to her first.

Community member

No, go ahead, I asked out of turn, I'll get in the line.

Community member

Bonsoir, mon nom est Stephane Metivier, I'm a Retired Lieutenant Colonel from the army, served 40+ years in the military, and so I've been also privileged to handle large projects that have lots of criteria to consider so I can feel the pain. I'm with you on that. On that note, my question is centered on the site selection part. Captain Turner, you mentioned that the project was consistent with other nations in

terms of selection of the site, maybe. The need, for sure, of the test facility. So that, I can see that. Earlier asked the uninvited question one of the 5 sites, maybe I should know that already, maybe I should have read that. but that's... I'll let you confirm what these are, but, on site selection in general. You mentioned there's five options. That's all good. There's also a list of criteria. I know criteria can be tricky, because you're going to make sure which one's more important. They're not, probably, all the same. Maybe location like as distance from the base was more critical than other things. Distance to the water and all that. So these are criteria that I think are important, but I'm not sure which one is which. So you mentioned the 130 degree arc of water and all this. I'm not navy, so you tell me and I'll trust you. What doesn't work for me that other navies, our allies, UK, and Australia, the US, so the big 4, with us, their sites, similar to ours, some are 11 kilometers inland, 4 kilometers inland, or 75. Why be on the coast, just like that? For me, doesn't seem to work. And is it because Irving is so close that this needs to be so close? Is it Irving based? Because Irving did the study on the location. Is this a bit of a conflict of interest? So that's my question basically. So why this site versus maybe one of the four others? Why are we not doing like the other nations are doing.

Alexandra Evershed

Can you tell me your name?

Community member

[Shouting inaudible]... are going to force this down our throat. This is bullshit. Irving did the study. Irving is going to do the work. And now it's going to be shoved down our throat. We're not in Shangri-la. This is more crap. [inaudible] goddamn joke. [inaudible] Any one of you guys would hate it if it was in your back yard and now you are going to stuff it in my back yard. And I live 100 meters from here, for Jesus sake. Wake up! Wake up!

Alexandra Evershed

Right there's a lot of passion. Around this project. And that's evident and that's obvious. We are here to answer questions. We are here to listen to questions, and we are here to answer them as much as possible and where the answer is not immediately available, to get more information to you. Okay. Let's, let's try to have a respectful, cordial session. M. Metivier has a question on the table. We should let that question be answered. And then move to the next question. Okay.

Jay Thor Turner

Good, yeah. So I'll try to go through, I think you had a couple questions. Mic working reasonably well? No. [Inaudible discussion] So I'll try to answer a couple of facts in there. First. So your earlier question on the 5 sites. So that's been released from the report on ATI but if you haven't seen it, I'll just list them for you. So, Bedford Basin, Ferguson's Cove Osborne Head, CFB Halifax Strathcoma and Hartlen Point. So, I can talk to some of the context for that. So to talk about your second question from criteria, so the probably one of the biggest criteria and I'm not certainly, I don't have the report right in front of me to give you the exact weighting by how we did the determination. But one of the most essential criteria is that sight line to the ocean. That enables us to do different types of tracking and testing that you can't do if you're inland. All those other sites at other nations that are under different contexts and different test requirements for their solutions. Although they may be doing the similar type of radar testing or the same radar testing. They're not able to do the things that we have identified and need to do for Canada's program. As a result, that drives us to weigh criteria differently, and that coastline sightline access, a wide open ocean view for the radar is essential.

Community member

So why were they not out there? Thank you.

Jay Thor Turner

I guess just before, you sit down, but I just wanted to know in there, as well as a question about Irving, and the study. And I think it inspired some passionate response from elsewhere, what I would say is we directed Irving, because they were in contract with us to do the work to come up with some analysis. We're the ones that took the analysis away and made the decision. And it's not... at this point, Irving has very little to do with the... Nothing to do with the facility design or construction, they may work on the install of the equipment as the prime contractor but in the management of subcontractors that deliver the actual systems that need to be installed there. So their role to play in this facility is much more minimized then may be read from the fact that we had them do that initial report.

Community member

Thanks. Thank you. I'm Tammy Jakeman I'm a resident of Cow Bay. I'm also a military brat. My father served 33 and a half years with the Navy as a communicator and my husband is a retired vehicle tech, army. So I have a long connection with the military and I have a plethora of questions but in the interest of letting fellow residents have their chance I was going to address the Irving issue because, you know, we know what Irving did with frigates and there was a multitude of delays and cost overruns but your statement that that Irving isn't really involved in part of the process, and that they're more subcontractor than anything but yeah, there is a concern and there is, you know, conflict of interest. At least from my point of view, you know, there was, in the booklet right here and in your information that you presented, said that you know, you're looking from 2026 to approximately mid 2030s. What happens when, you know, things are delayed? What happens when all of a sudden, this isn't the mid 2030s anymore, and it's not 2035, and we're suddenly up into the 2040s. You know, has there been consideration for that? And to the community member who brought up the traffic, because I guess that is my other big one. Actually, there's a few big ones here. There's no way from here to Caldwell Road. The residents that live next door to the golf course here and along the shore road, if something happens catastrophically majorly, they have no way out and therefore EHS has no way in. And I realized and I recognize that it is an HRM matter, but because you're going to be adding traffic to... to this road. You know, there's just concern. There's legit concern, people are going to be trapped. We see it with you know, things like our parades. And to the Indigenous statement, I am, just recently discovered, Indigenous I am Coast Salish from BC. And I would just like to recognize that when you spoke to the hovering you know, that animals don't hover, or birds don't hover. Hummingbird hover, osprey hover, and eagles hover, and the eagles are sacred to all First Nations in the country, when they are hunting, so are the elders of the Mi'kmaq communities notified on how this will affect the ospreys and the eagles. Thank you very much.

Jay Thor Turner

So I think I can take two to three of four questions that you made and then I'll pass off to one of my colleagues to answer. So on the Irving conflict of interest question. So Irving competitively won the contract to be the ship builder.... the shipyard of choice under the National Shipbuilding Program. So when I said that they were in contract with us, they are still in contract with us for the design and build with that of the warship which includes other aspects that we need to have done and that aspect was just do a study based on those five sites that DND offered. And then again, we took away that information and we made our own decision to move out and since then, it's been all DND between the project management office and [inaudible] working through the issues to get us to this point. So they do have a role because they're always going to be involved in this big program. But with respect to the actual construction and building of this facility, the building itself, they very much no longer have any real role. The second one was talking about the dates. So just want to clarify what I intended to say was from 2026 to 2027, when the facility is operating until the mid 2030s will be our busiest period. This building and site will operate for the life of the class. So the ships are expected to last 30 years and the

last ship will be built in 2050. So this site will operate for many decades and continue to operate. That said we don't expect it to be as busy once we get into routine operations of putting ships out once we're done a lot of the really intense first of class testing that occurs both with the install of the new equipment and the facility and with the first ship. That's really what I was trying to say there, is the site will be there for a long period of time. And I'll skip over the third question and clarify what I intended to state with hovering. So I will take your word for it, I'm not a bird expert by any means, and so maybe I misspoke. What I intended to say is that birds don't tend to stay in the exact same spot for a very long time, where the radiofrequency emission safety concerns would not be mitigated. So again, as you get more data about how the site is actually oriented, all the scientific details on the radar and have fulsome and detailed and rigorous testing done on the radar from a safety perspective, very difficult for us to understand that what we have learned from other sites around the world is that they found that birds, even birds of prey, who do hunt in kind of those patterns where they're circling, don't tend to stay in the areas long enough to be exposed or they're doing that outside of the safety concern. So we'll continue to look at that. That's certainly an aspect that we have to get more details on as we move through the project. And as far as consultations out, I would state that what we're seeing today, as far as engagement across communities will continue to go on through the project. And I think the last question I would pass over to Paul, about the traffic question.

Rob Chambers

Maybe if I could, I'll just say. Safety obviously has to be a top priority. We want to be careful that we don't step on the city's toes, if it is an ongoing issue for the city. So what I'd say today is we're happy to continue working with the city. We've got one traffic study going on. We've got a little bit of insight, we've got more work to do. And that's basically, let's keep doing that and see what we come up with. So it's not the end of that story. I don't want to step on my other colleagues' toes but thank you for the traditional knowledge and information about the birds and we are engaging with Indigenous communities and will make a point of, and this is critical for us, tapping into the traditional knowledge and bringing that to bear, in the work that we do whether this project or elsewhere. But I just say absolutely committed to having those conversations and doing that work. So thank you. Paul, did you want to add anything on traffic?

Paul Schauerte

Nothing I mean, too in particular, other than, works to roads, adding new roads. Those are HRM considerations. It has to fit within their, you know, their requirements and whatnot. We can certainly, as Rob said, work very closely with HRM to look at any of these issues in greater detail. Obviously, additions and new roads are not something to be taken lightly in terms of impact to the environment of working through wherever they're going to be put, costs related to them on restricted budgets, etc. So, but we leave all options on the table in terms of working with HRM plus with what's available, and what can we do to help mitigate some of the concerns that are being raised.

Alexandra Evershed

Okay, so we're moving over to the online participants.

Keelan Green

So, we have a couple of questions. Regarding wetlands one from LeeAnn Harvey, and one from Pamela Yates. How large an area of wetlands or other coastal systems will be lost as a result of this development and how close can one legally build near wetlands?

Paul Schauerte

Thank you for the questions. I may have to take a general attempt at it but we may turn to... We do have some environmental experts here that can offer a much more detailed and nuanced response

than I could. In terms of wetland lost, as I mentioned there's only three sections of wetland that are impacted at all by the project, and only the very edges of it. And if we have to devegetate, any of those wetlands our intent is to replace whatever we lose elsewhere in the area so that the overall area of wetland is not lost on the site. If you want to add detail in terms of how close you can...

MARLANT Expert

Hello, I'm Michael [inaudible], I'm Senior Staff Officer Environmental Engineering and Safety at Maritime Forces Atlantic, I work at the dock yard. I'm a resident of HRM and have been working with the Navy for over 20 years, strictly on environmental files. The question with respect to wetland management, it's federal policy to actually have zero loss of wetlands associated with the project. So, the issue with our building construction here, if there's wetland loss, there will be promotion, and recuperation in other areas of the property. If it's not available within the property, we go to another site. So, there is a zero loss of wetlands.

Alexandra Evershed

So, there was a question about setbacks.

MARLANT Expert

So, a setback, there isn't necessarily a clear definition or a requirement as far as setback on wetlands, because, in accordance with policy, there will be zero loss, it will be recuperated in another area of the property.

Alexandra Evershed

Thank you. Coming to you. What's your name?

Community member

My name is Dominic Cormier, I live in Dartmouth and I'm a long-time user of Hartlen Point, a birder, walker, and a biologist. So, it's you know, this whole situation is pretty close to my heart. I just want to first say that, you know, I actually have, I do environmental consulting and I have worked on DND projects elsewhere. So, it's not a, it's not a pile on, but I do want to ask some serious questions about the site selection process and the impacts to the community. I think that, it seems that, DND were caught a little unaware of the importance of this space to the community and how it was used. And of course, you know, I can't say this enough. We're talking about DND land, but of course it's public land, right? And the community's been using it as such so it was a little jarring and shocking to have it kind of come out of nowhere that this defacto community space that we've been using is now turning into something different. And so, a lot of people have these questions, but specifically about the site selection, you know, I only saw where it was going to go just today in that little map, and maybe that's my own fault, I didn't look exactly where the site is going to be. But. We're talking about public land and I know the sites you said are all DND land. But is there any consideration of Crown land or other things, or even here, at Hartlen Point? This is not going to sit well with the golf crew, but you already have a cleared fairway there you have a cleared fairway here, you have a clear fairway behind. I don't know, it just seems kind of crazy to clear... Clear, you're talking about wetland mitigation, and I understand all that process, but it seems crazy to clear habitat when we already have habitat sort of cleared. And yes, you're not going to have an 18-hole golf course but has there been any thoughts of like, how set in stone is that site? I know CBCL is doing this work and looking at the actual site there. Yeah, just, just how much have you guys really thought about the fact that people really use this community space and no matter how much mitigation I agree, like, green building standards that's all great, and for most of that works well for developments and they were, you know, we really cherish the space. You know, it's

kind of like all or nothing kind of thing, where a lot of people I know just don't want to see any sort of development there that takes away from the natural space. So yeah, just going into the site selection, have you considered any other crown lands? Other spots, besides those DND sites?

Jay Thor Turner

As I noted, we looked at those five sites that I listed, and those were all considered against the criteria that we had assigned and found that Hartlen Point continues to be the optimal site for the needs of the capability. I think your comment or question is did we consider the impact to the community. I think it's very clear at this point and through our previous engagements, that there is a strong community sense here and that is why we continue to work very hard to try to understand how we can manage continued access to the site in all ways, shapes, and forms. That said, safety and human health are paramount, and that and security will drive certain restrictions down the road that are to be better understood and developed.

Community member

[inaudible], what about the actual golf course? Has it been considered at all? It's also DND land. Has that been considered at all? A lot of those same criteria, access [inaudible], 130-degree, proximity radio frequencies, I don't know is that has that been discussed and talked about?

Jay Thor Turner

[inaudible] in the original sites that we looked at. And I think we would have to go back and look at it again, which is, something we're not going to do. That said, height above water would pose a significant problem for the golf course, which is a critical factor in why we didn't select other sites. We looked at the five sites, and we're now moving forward with Hartlen Point.

Community member

Hi, my name's Courtney [inaudible] and I live about 800 meters from this location, with my young child and my partner and I'm just looking on page 20 of your presentation, the Environmental Effects Determination. And I am curious, I mean, I'm interpreting environmental here as a social ecological system based on the way that the factors are listed, so you have things related to the ecological components which are, you know, surface water, groundwater but then you list social aspects like cultural resources, Indigenous and traditional land use, human health. So, you know, this sort of relates back to that question about impact to communities. I'm just curious about how much weight these social components have been given and, you know, how much is social life is actually considered? [inaudible]

Paul Schauerte

Thank you for your question. It's not that each one has a weight, but that we look at each one, you know, in its own distinct nature and understand how that element interacts with the site, and how we can respond to it. Yes, it's known that Hartlen Point is, is used as a site in terms of hiking land. And humans do use the site for various purposes. The goal here is to limit, while putting the site in place, being able to ensure that you know you can continue to use the hiking trails around it and do the bird watching. This is a site that's only taking a small portion of the entirety of Hartlen Point and the rest remains available for use. And that entirety was taken into consideration. It's not a zero-sum element of all or nothing, but how do you mitigate? How do you blend it in so that you can continue to use both the land around it and allow the site to be put into place.

Alexandra Evershed

Coming over here to online question land again.

Keelan Green

Another question from Pamela Yates. Two questions. How can you, in good conscience, propose to build this facility in a community does not want it? And how can you, in good conscience, build a site there are only three of the ten criteria as laid out by Irving in their site selection? She goes on to say specifically, this is a highly dense, fast-growing urban community, and has been since 1980. The infrastructure, including poor maintained roads, lack public transit, and an inability to have sewer and as we know from this week, HRM is broke and has no money to address additional infrastructure.

Jay Thor Turner

So, I may need help just going back through the question, in case I missed it, with respect to the criteria and the site only using three of the criteria, I don't necessarily agree with that interpretation of how we evaluated the site. Again, some criteria are more heavily weighted. I mentioned that the shoreline and site access, to be able to do type of testing that we do, is very important. And that criterion is one of the important ones. Height above sea level, as well as a number of other criteria listed in the presentation. Those are all very important and I would say Hartlen Point delivered the most optimized solution out of what was considered at the time and that has continued to be why we move forward with Hartlen Point. I think there was another part of the question that I missed maybe you can repeat it. So, it was that first part. Sorry.

Community member

It was the best of bad options?

Jay Thor Turner

I wouldn't make that characterization.

Community member

[inaudible, crosstalk]

Jay Thor Turner

I don't think I can actually answer that question. What I would say is that this is an essential capability for us to deliver the Canadian Surface Combatant project. Without this site, we will, we face significant risk to the program and having a navy capability is essential to Canada. And therefore, it is very important that we move forward on this project. And as a result, we continue to move forward on this site as it enables us to deliver the future navy.

Community member

So, I want to dig down into the site selection again. So DND put up four comparables, so it's in your magazine, and you talked about four. And you said the UK was the most comparable. Are you saying none of our allies are testing similar equipment or a similar equipment mix as us.

Jay Thor Turner

I can say with certainty, none of our allies are testing very comparable equipment to us, we have a very different capability need, which drives us to very different-

Community member

What? Radar? Which ones? I'm trying to dig down. I've looked into it.

Jay Thor Turner

So there are many combat systems

Community member

You're being really vague, so is it the spy 7 radar?

Jay Thor Turner

So there are two sites that will have the spy seven radar, so, one in the US and one in Canada and so [inaudible] in Canada. The US - yes, and they're also building the Spy 7 for Canada and other nations. That Spy 7 installation is going to be different than what will be at Hartlen Point, and therefore will have different capabilities and we need more capabilities, because we are going to be integrated into a warship that is very different than other warships and there are only two warships programs that are integrating Spy 7 at this point. That is Canada and Spain. And as a result, it's going to be a unique capability globally.

Community member

Spy 6 there, actually. They upgraded in 2020. And Spain is letting them, in Morristown, at Lockheed Martin, do their testing for them, there

Jay Thor Turner

I cannot speak to the full program details of Spain's program.

Community member

That's what I have to find out.

Jay Thor Turner

You'd have to probably go to Spain to find out more details, but I don't know.

Community member

So Australia, the one they're building right now is not similar in any way? You said it was similar.

Jay Thor Turner

Australia uses some similar components on the ships, their radar is a completely different radar developed in Australia and it has different testing parameters that they're looking to achieve.

Community member

Okay, but let's look at where other countries are putting theirs. Portsmouth it's up on a hill in an industrial facility, it's been testing weapons, defense systems for 45 years. They just built a great big beautiful new building next to it for logistics. So, it doesn't have to go on the ocean, could be 11 kilometers inland. In Australia, where they're building their new one, they are, it's also four kilometers inland. And it's next to a power substation and across the street from a garbage dump, in an industrial area outside of Adelaide. None of these places that other countries are putting a lot of money into upgrading and building are doing it in places like Hartlen Point. Now there are other places in Nova Scotia where this could go. You need to look at other places. So... [inaudible]

Alexandra Evershed

A lot of points that come to the same issue of site selection. Why here?

Jay Thor Turner

So, it's really difficult to compare program to program to program, and site to site. So, Portsmouth is installed in an urban area next to a hospital so they have a very different context than us. What they're

testing and the combat system that they're testing is very different than what Canada will deliver. It is not the same. I don't think there are any common components that are the same in the combat system that will be tested at that site. That said we use it as an analogue to understand how they operate the site and how they use it from the integration testing perspective. So it's still useful for us to compare and understand how they do business. When we look in the US where they're building the Spy 7 radar and they'll test it before we get it. Again, they're not putting it together in exactly the same way. It will not have the full combat suite that will be in Canada. And if we go on to Australia, it's... I'll be repetitive. And the answer is that it has to be a Canadian context to test evaluate and integrate the Canadian combat system that will go into the Canadian Surface Combatant which is quite a bit different than these other places. Although there are some aspects that are the same amongst the systems, they're still very different and the context of the testing that we've assessed that we need to do and the capability required to support the program is very different. And therefore, our criteria and selection process are going to be different.

Community member

[inaudible] isn't the same you know, next to the NASA rocket launch Test Center where they build lobbing bombs there before that, like that's the kind of center they're putting it in the US.

Rob Chambers

If I could maybe make a suggestion there's obviously a huge appetite for more information around the site selection and comparables and that sort of thing. So, it's added at a very minimum, we need to go and do some homework to capture that analysis in a clearer way. You obviously have done a lot of homework, which is great. And so what I'd like to suggest is that let's capture the information we have that lines up with some of the expectations you've just expressed. And we'll push it out to you, so can have a second look at what's behind the decision.

Community member

I'm not really interested. I'm just interested in why you don't move it to an industrial area. [inaudible]

Rob Chambers

The information if it's already there, then that's great. I was just trying to suggest if you're looking for more than let's take a second look at how we're communicating that out. If what you just said you're not interested in seeing that or I'm sorry that I don't want to put words in your mouth ma'am.

Community member

No, I'm just suggesting there's a philosophical difference here between what our allies are doing and what Canada's choosing to do to put it on a beautiful place like Hartlen Point but everyone else is putting it next to a NASA rocket launch center or a garbage dump.

Rob Chambers

And I think that the disconnect maybe we're having now is we're trying to explain the operational requirements behind the decision, which I understand that you're not happy with. I get that, and lots of folks here aren't. All we can do is explain it in more detail. Or trying to explain it differently or trying to explain it better.

Community member

It's because you've set it up this way you have you've suggested it has to be really close to the base. Three of those aren't anywhere near the base, where the shipbuilding is going on. The one in Portsmouth is 700 kilometers away the [inaudible] ships being built on the [inaudible]. You're setting it up by saying you have to have it so close to the base so close to the shipyard there.

Jay Thor Turner

So just to extend Mr. Chambers comments, so last time we spoke, I walked in and said to the other members of the community I walked away with a task which I haven't completed yet which is to do something along the lines of what Mr. Chambers suggested, which is an explainer or a bulletin, so my team wrote a bulletin that they gave me and I think it's pretty good at better explaining the whole picture of the site selection in the Canadian context. I didn't get to the review of it, so I wasn't able to get it out through the chain of command to get it out. We can continue to work on that. And certainly, I think you've raised some issues that where we said hey, these other sites exist when you're doing similar things to us. We probably need to better explain the context differences between those to understand it.

Community member

[inaudible]

Jay Thor Turner

I would say, that you know, you've made some interpretations that are different than what I would say about the site. So Portsmouth is actually near to where the type 26 is built. Adelaide is the shipyard where the Australian ship is built. Morristown, New Jersey, is the facility of the OEM designer of the radar systems. And Wallops Island, it's a US navy facility which is 60 kilometers away.

Community member

260 kilometers straight north.

Jay Thor Turner

Right. So, again, the US context is very different in how they operate and test their navy.

Community member

Because they're like, you have a wish list at Hartlen Point exists, and then you're justifying, your rationalizing.

Alexandra Evershed

I'm going to suggest that we should move on to... [inaudible interruption] exactly right and lots of people that want their turn to have their issues addressed. So, we're going to come to this gentleman here.

Community member

So, first of all, thanks for coming tonight. I know this is obviously a really emotional issue for a lot of people, but I certainly speak for myself and I'm sure a few others, that we do appreciate you coming here. Answering some questions. Captain Turner, you mentioned that there's an interaction between the Osborne Head facility and what we'll be at Hartlen Point. I'm a resident of Osborne Head and I'm a very avid surfer. I've surfed in these waters for many years. My question is, I have two questions, but they're related. The first is will there be any impact to people who access the nearshore waters of Cow Bay often for surfing, for example, or kayaking, paddleboarding, fishing in that area, because of that interaction and two, will there be any ability for people who surf in the near shore waters here to access Hartlen Point, I would say Osborne Head is a far busier place for surfing in this province. But Hartlen Point is obviously a spot that is frequented by some people who obviously want access for surfing as well.

Jay Thor Turner

Bear with me as while I take some notes so I don't forget the components of your question. So yeah, so the interaction Osborne Head right now based on the assessment, I wouldn't expect restrictions or

restrictions would be close, close to the LBTF itself. And the interactions over there are far enough away that we're not expecting to have any restrictions that impact that area, outside of any safety restrictions that are already in place for that site which I think are pretty contained to the facility itself. The nearshore waters on Hartlen Point are more difficult as I said. Again, no intent to establish a permanent exclusion zone. We still have to develop range control procedures to ensure the health and safety of everyone around the site. As we get further into the design process and are able to do the testing and evaluation and understand where those safety areas are, that is going to tell us with more certainty than what we have now. Again, because the radar is still in development, we haven't actually oriented the building itself so we don't know because the distance is actually very, very important. The farther you get away the weaker the field gets and that makes it safe. So those are to be determined when we talk around Hartlen Point, but for now, over at Osborne head, we're not expecting to impact that area in any significant ways.

Alexandra Evershed

We're coming over to online questions.

Keelan Green

This question is from Lindsey Lee of the Sierra Club, Canada, Atlantic Chapter, and it relates to a comment by Paul Schauerte, in which he says the goal is to release the studies in their entirety. She asks why is this 'a goal'? Under what circumstances would DND feel it would be acceptable to not release the studies in their entirety.

Paul Schauerte

Sorry if I made that sound like there was a decision to be made that where we would or wouldn't. We are releasing the studies in their entirety.

Alexandra Evershed

Ok. We have a crisp question and a crisp answer we're passing the mic to [inaudible].

Community member

I have a few quick points before I ask my question. One was the respect acknowledgement, which I really appreciate, and I have to say I'm very proud of this community and the respect that they're offering when it hasn't been offered to them from the beginning. So, I just wanted to acknowledge that. We keep circling back to Irving and I hear all the points I just encourage anybody here who still maybe is confused about why Irving shouldn't complete a site selection report on a natural space, to go home and Google Canaport flame incident or urban flights migratory bird act and from there I'm sure you can find many other articles, but those two are very important. In regards to wetlands loss, joining wetlands harms wetlands, and I don't think anybody could argue that a manufactured wetland has the same impact that a natural wetland has. Wetlands are carbon sinks. I'm getting messages from somebody who asked a question online and feels they were censored, so they just want people to know that their question was not asked accurately. And now to my question. In answering your questions, from the beginning, and hearing it tonight, people have very direct questions, and the answers are very non-committal. A lot of sort of language that skirts the actual answers. I don't feel, I feel a lot of very great questions are being asked not a lot of great answers. Very confusing. My question, and please if you don't have an answer to this, I ask that you just say pass, for those of you who don't know, COP15 was held in Canada in the beginning of winter. A statement from the government says the Government of Canada's priority was to ensure that COP15 was a success for nature. There is an urgent need for international partners to halt and reverse the alarming loss of biodiversity worldwide. My question to you, and I also ask that you please do not tell me that you're following all the laws because the laws do

not have the power that they should have, and that is the greater issue here. I think we're all learning that there are some changes that need to be made in federal legislation. My question is how do you justify building on a biodiverse headland at this time, when biodiversity and habitat loss are at the forefront, and on a migratory birds staging area where we cannot mitigate a migratory bird path.

Rob Chambers

I want to respect your request not to blather on meaninglessly, I'm not sure I'm going to be successful, so I apologize in advance. We have environmental folks here who can speak to the details about the extent to which we can mitigate any impact that's identified, or that, to the greatest extent which is probably some of that language that you're objecting to. One thing I will add is that we are actively partnering with the ECCC on OECM designations for some of our military bases in other parts of the country, where we're talking about hundreds of hectares of space that's being designated, biodiversity protected under that OECM designation. But just say, DND [inaudible] are active in this space on a national level and are taking measures that you know, aren't here in Hartlen Point necessarily but are even more meaningful for that target.

Community member

But not in Nova Scotia, like you're speaking outside of this province...

Rob Chambers

I don't want to misspeak but I'm not tracking the examples that we're analyzing right now that are in Nova Scotia, no. But I'll turn to my colleagues in case they have anything specifically about the migratory piece you just mentioned.

Community member

Where's the experts, where's the person who did the assessment? Why aren't they here?

Rob Chambers

I just want to finish with the first question that we just heard. Is there anything else that you want to say about that, Paul, no? So your warning was taken to heart.

Community member

Cool, thank you.

Alexandra Evershed

So, it's your turn to ask a question.

Community member

It is, I'm excited. My name's Anna Crosby. And I've got a few, so just like we've been asked to hold our questions, I'm going to ask you guys to take a few notes. And just hear me out here because I recently moved back to the community in August. And one of the things that you guys started this session with was a land acknowledgement but then Mr. Chambers you said that you've only been here, this is only your second time. So my question is, is what does this land and the land acknowledgement mean to you. Because to a lot of us in this room, that piece of property means a lot. My family chose to come back to this community because of that waterfront. And that brings me to my second not-so-question, kind of more of a point is I know there's a lot of people that are military families in this room, but in the name of engagement I think there would be trepidations for military members and their families to speak out about this. Because what are the repercussions to them if they do so? I think that's why we don't see more orange signs in our community because there's that potential. So I want to know what you guys are doing to engage military members in a way that allows them to speak out about this,

without fear of repercussions because I know, myself and my former employment I would have been terrified to stand up here as an employee of DND and call you guys out for not choosing the golf course with a simple answer of no. I got one more, one more. Maybe two. What does consultation mean to you guys when we're here talking and bringing this up? What are the actions being taken based off of our questions? Is there anything we can do to move this project? Because it seems wild to me that the simple answer is no to moving it to the golf course and I love golf, man, I love golf, but I'd much rather have that waterfront than the golf course. And who's going to be here out of this panel in 20 to 30 years when we're all still here, who at this panel are still going to be in their jobs, dealing with that facility and whatever was left from it while we're still here living in this community. [inaudible]

Rob Chambers

So just because he addressed the first question, yeah, I don't want to waste time talking about my travel itinerary. You know, in my current job, I've been to CFB Halifax twice, it's true, I have family here, I went to school in the valley. I've been here many more times than that, I know that's not your point, sorry, that's not your argument. But my role in the project, like I'm not full-time focused on this, so I wouldn't worry about me and my travel. It's, you know, there is a project team here. Connections to the community, my Navy colleagues, you know, the Navy has been operating here for decades and decades, etc. etc. I know that's not really where you want to go with this...

Community member

Do any of you live in this community?

Rob Chambers

I do not live in Hartlen Point or in the Eastern Passage. I do not. Your suggestion about making it easier for military members, point taken, we're going to come up with an anonymous feedback mechanism that they'll have access to, and that, so they will be able to--they'll have that option. Great point. We're going to do that, no question. And then on the third one, you know, I don't know what to tell you. My job is to provide and support the Navy in getting the facility that they need, and sort of my opening point about that, and the determination has been made that this is that place. You know, other sites, other options were considered and rejected, and we're sort of we're presenting the information, the evidence that we have today available that's

Community member

Other sites weren't fully, you know, looked at we looked at five, from Irving, who there we brought up enough reasons on why Irving was not sure right company to be selected for a feasibility study. Was there an RFP that went to out to other people, other companies outside of Irving to bid on it to look at different sites?

Jay Thor Turner

So just to quickly and succinctly answer your question no didn't do an RFP to do the site selection analysis, we had a contract with Irving, they did the analysis for us under the contract we have with them, the big contract was delivering and designing

Community member

That was part of the initial contract was a feasibility work for this?

Jay Thor Turner

It was in the definition contract. Yes.

Community member

For contracts [inaudible for 25 seconds]

Jay Thor Turner

Alexandra's probably going to give me heck for doing this, I just answered. So we provide those sites, they did some analysis based on how we wanted it analyzed and looked at, and what factors and there was a number of other things that we looked at that were more to do with the facility and capability itself and that analysis. And really, some of it was the business case of the facility and the capability. And site selection was a portion of that. But again. It was who provided the sites, we said look at these five sites, because from DND's perspective, those were the feasible sites we could look at.

Community member

[Begins to respond]

Alexandra Evershed

Ok, I'm just going to stop you. I'm just trying to be super fair here. We're going middle aisle, side aisle, online people. So we're going to go and we're going to continue our little circle if you don't mind. Ok?

Keelan Green

The next online question is from Sasha [inaudible]. Sasha has a few questions. I'm going to read them all. I'll come back to any for our presenters. First question, will there be any modeled imagery of the site and future development? It would be helpful for the community to have a visual representation of how the LBTF will look from the ground at various visual angles. Is this something is going to be included with further consultation? Next question, are there any plans for long term monitoring of the site in case an impact on wildlife, soil, etcetera, are identified? Who will be the qualified experts doing on-site monitoring of species-at-risk and wetlands? And do you have any plans in place if the site construction or operation seriously harms or destroys wetlands in the area, especially considering these types of ecosystems are highly sensitive and important for ecosystem functions and biodiversity. And then lastly, to what extent did you engage with local Mi'kmaq? You brought up consulting Indigenous people, but no concrete examples of outreach were provided. So perhaps we can start with the first question on the visuals of the facility?

Community member

Sure.

Alexandra Evershed

Thank you.

Paul Schauerte

Yes, and I can, I can speak to those. So, terms of model imagery, currently ahead of design but once we have the design figured out there will be designed concept drawings of the facility done up. And we will be sharing those as part of our next ongoing engagement with the community that has anything to do with construction so those will be shared. In terms of long-term monitoring of the site while I've spoken to the monitoring we will do during the construction period, I would have to turn to my colleagues that work in MARLANT, on the environmental side. Once the facility was operational, it's under, in terms of operations, under the guise of MARLANT. They would be the ones that would speak to any ongoing monitoring of the site from an environmental perspective. I'll just reiterate on the wetland loss; the goal of project is to mitigate that as much as possible in terms of siting the project. If we do have any loss to the site, we will mitigate it 100% by replacing it elsewhere. The final piece I'll probably turn to my Base Commander.

Captain (Navy) Andy MacKenzie

[inaudible] talk about engagement with Indigenous communities. Last year there were numerous engagements, to answer the question, both in person and virtually and through correspondence throughout the year and planned our next one, this coming March, in order to do that. And those engagements were with community leaders including elders.

MARLANT Expert

Just I guess to generally talk about how we're involved in studies at this property, MARLANT safety and environment have a long history at Hartlen Point. We've been involved in several species-at-risk studies and surveys and natural resource reviews and developing pretty detailed knowledge of what's actually at this location and over the past 10 years or so. So, we continue to use the information put together with the studies, especially with the project we're actually we're planning on doing another survey at the time these project related surveys were occurring. So we're able to defer that to a later date and continue to track to see what the viability is associated with species at risk at their location, and also give us more better information in order to inform those who have activities on the site to manage those with respect to those species. I think there is a question related to soil as well, was there? So, with soil management. Same thing. We have a program associated with contaminated sites that we would apply to this location as well. If there's soils that need to be managed on site, they will be actually investigated and continued to track it to ensure that they're contained appropriately or if they have to be removed on site, they will be removed in accordance with the provincial requirements to move those materials.

Paul Schauerte

I think there was specifically a question about ongoing monitoring, and the operational monitoring

MARLANT Expert

For soils? Oh no, for species and everything. That's part of our natural resource management plan for the location. So it's an active program that will continue and it also allows us to better offer recommendations to those involved in site work as well. So they don't impact species that would be on the property.

Alexandra Evershed

Thank you. Okay. Over to you, Tony.

Community member

I'm Tony Rusinak. I live just on the other side of the golf course there. I've been involved with this since we found out about this. I've been quite interested in finding out about what's happening. Trying to get as much information as possible. Thank you for being here tonight and listening to us. I'm going to tell a quick story. I timed myself reading it, it's less than three minutes more than two minutes. But I feel this story ties together a lot of what everyone around us tonight has been saying and what the more than the... close to 18,000 people who signed the petition who don't think it's an appropriate site location have been saying. If you read the comments, dozens and dozens of comments. If I read the hundreds of emails and discussions I've had about this over the last year and a half. I'll just tell this story. Down the hill behind golf course holes five and six -- that hill, that hill over there, is the Silver Sands shoreline. This past century Silver Sands was a top tourist destination in Nova Scotia. A beach that rivaled Rainbow Haven Beach and Clam Harbor Beach for its natural beauty of expansive low tide sands and rolling forested dunes and proximity to this city. In the 1960s, this status halted. Owners of the beach decided sand for construction was more valuable than sand for the beach. Massive beach sand extraction ensued. The extraction sand from this beach was used for various projects around Halifax, like the Cogswell interchange and Hartlen Point battery. Both now are out of use, demolished and being

hauled to the dumpster. One of the largest projects was CFB Shearwater's runway. Mitigating wide public protests and petition for the extraction, the public were assured the sand would eventually drift back. Especially if you look out to sea long enough. I think about this one I'm watching the sunrise just go to their end of the path the only place on Shore Road you can see the horizon sunrise which will be shut down with this project. The beach at Silver Sands has never returned. Furthermore, with no sand as the natural barriers storms eroded public access points and Cow Bay Road was threatened with flooding. Now the shore is a skeleton of what it once was, an eight-foot graded polar dump, blocked seaside drive, restrictive fencing limits access to trees and extensive dunes have washed away. There is no sand. The glorious beach is gone. Last month meeting with Lorne Oram, Project Manager and Director of Construction Project Delivery of this project, I asked if he knew the story of Silver Sands. He didn't even know where Silver Sands was. It's right there. But he and his team certainly do know about the coastline and cutting off access. Hartlen Point Land-Based Testing System project is the same story in this area: ignorance of local history, local contexts, biodiversity and a local consultation in decision-making. Shutting down public access to shoreline and nearshore waters for health and safety along with the destruction of this natural landscape is unacceptable in the second fastest major growing city in Canada. Built up urban environment? A less built-up urban environment? Please tell me more about this less built -up urban environment. This local community's lifeblood is the ocean. We saw how well mitigation promises, adherence to processes, and spins work with Silver Sands this cycle of destruction of our most important natural public lands stops now. Question: how do you justify, to the 18,000 plus signatures, this site selection. Thank you.

Community member

[beginning a chant]

Alexandra Evershed

Remember how I said I'd raise my hand? I'm raising my hand. There are a lot of people in this room who deserve an opportunity to be heard. And chanting is not going to get them heard. They have questions. Let's get those answers. Ok, over here to this lady.

Community member

My question wasn't answered.

Alexandra Evershed

Oh! I'm so sorry. I'm very, very sorry. Sorry.

Community member

I understand.

Rob Chambers

So obviously you know, it's impossible for me to follow what you just said in any way that it will do it justice because of your passion, like, I'm almost in tears. I feel your emotion. I feel your passion. So I thank you for sharing that. And I apologize for my own shaky voice it's you know, I recognize that it's a difficult situation. You know all will continue. My job as it stands right now is to support the Navy and to do best I can to advance the project while engaging with folks in the area. And I'm not going to say the word mitigate because that obviously is not a word that has a good history here. But we'll continue to share the information that we're finding in the studies that we're doing through the third party, professional, unbiased studies. We'll continue sharing that information with you, we'll continue... We're committed to continuing to have these exchanges. And, and we'll do everything we can in along the

lines of what we're talking about tonight across the full range of issues that we're discussing. And there's really not much more that I can promise than that. And I apologize for that, because I know that's not what you wanted to hear.

Community member

Good evening, panel. I want to thank for coming. I want to thank you for being patient and undergoing this because I know it must be extremely stressful for all of you. To Captain Turner, I would apologize especially, because I know the amount of work you must have put it over the last year. But my concern is this work was done, the cart got put before the horse. I can tell you, as a resident on Shore Road, of this community, I can't agree with your traffic study, because from seven in the morning till nine is bumper to bumper at my house already. Well, I haven't been here long in Eastern Passage, I just I arrived from BC. But I can tell you that I don't want to stay. I don't want to stay if this project is to go through and I'm willing to take a loss and sell my home, and I think many others will, because it's become an acrimonious unpleasant situation for us to stay in. I think the panel in their judgment has underrating feelings in this community. When I wanted to come to this meeting, I was looking for the golf course. I talked to my neighbor who's been here for 30 years, and he didn't even know what Hartlen was. There's a disconnect here between the DND and the residents of this community. And I think if this project goes through without reassessing these sites, this chasm is only going to increase and that's why I don't want to stay. I think you're underrating how badly this chasm is going to grow, because it's already there and we haven't even broken ground. I can't imagine what's going to happen in the next 20 years. So, I respectfully ask you, and I'm sorry, Captain Turner, because I know how much work this must have been for you. But there's other people besides me who don't even want to stay in this community if this goes through, and I really hope you listen to us because I am sincere when I tell you the acrimony is palpable. Thank you.

Jay Thor Turner

Thanks for your comment. I, you know, I stated this last time I was here and met with a number of the community members. We do appreciate your feedback and we are listening. It's not just sitting up here, not taking away the emotion and your expression and assessment of the disconnect. That said, this is an essential project to enable us to deliver the ships that we need for the future. And it continues to be my job and effort to move the project forward. But thank you very much for your comment.

Alexandra Evershed

I'm going to move over here to online questions. Oh, I'm coming to front. I'm being instructed. Which means that coming to you. And can I just ask a favor. It's now nine o'clock and I would like to get to all the questions. We'd like to get to all the questions. Can we try to be succinct in asking the questions? And can we please try to be succinct in answering the questions. So more of a question, answer, and we'll try to keep them shorter. And to the point.

Community member

I'll just take my mask off. Well, it's good that I'm up here now because I've actually written down exactly what I want to say and timed it and it's not very fast, but there may be a long answer.

Alexandra Evershed

You can't control that. I'll try.

Community member

So again, this is the site selection. My name is Marnie and I've been involved since we heard about this CBC project... Or no, from CBC, an article in June 2021, even though the public consultation period

was closed with no one knowing about it, in January 2021, so that's why no one commented, no one knew about it. But once we found out about it, we got active, and one of the things that was said to us when I spoke to Mr. Samson here was 'oh, there's going to be a lot of jobs. There's going to be a lot of jobs created.' Yet when I've met with the smaller group. There are going to be 120 military jobs, while these are people primarily from the Halifax space. So, no new military jobs and over 300 construction jobs. Where are those workers going to come from? In Halifax we have such a shortage of skilled workers, they can't even build the houses that are needed for the homeless and for people looking for shelter. So the decision to say it's going to create jobs is dead in the water. It's not creating jobs. If you tried to bring people in they won't have a place to live here. So that argument which is one of the big selling features initially is dead, as far as I'm concerned. And I'm doing this in context. The second part is taxpayers are going to have to pay to maintain your infrastructure. You don't have infrastructure on Hartlen Point. Other sites do, this one doesn't. You are going to build infrastructure, and what happens is, cause I'm spoken to HRM about this, is once you build it, you transfer ownership and maintenance costs onto them. So HRM which is in a horrible financial position right now, with our counselors saying, 'are we going to charge 4% interest or increase in property taxes or 8%', because 8% will help us maintain what we already have. 4% will mean cuts. So, either way, taxpayers in HRM are going to have to pay for this infrastructure and if you picked a site where there was infrastructure, we wouldn't have those additional costs. So, my question is okay, given this, how can we justify building on an unserviced Hartlen Point site, when you have other sites that are already serviced and you're using taxpayers' dollars in a time where there's not enough money to continue keeping our infrastructure. I have to sit down my back is bothering me.

Rob Chambers

Yes, sorry for the wait. The central line is longer... well now they've evened up. Well, now that on the jobs piece, you know, local leaders may know more about the local labor market. I was just having this conversation with Defense Construction Canada, who live here, operate here, work with industry all the time, and they're not, in the projects that we're undertaking or that they're undertaking, not seeing big signs of labor shortages that may be elsewhere. [noise from audience] Not on the industrial projects that we're undertaking. Now, that could be on residential, I'm not that familiar with residential construction, labour markets, I can't comment on that. We're on the industrial side of things and on that front, we're not seeing any big impacts on the quality of our work or the number of days, or the competitiveness, etc. On the ongoing but perhaps others will have more information on that I don't want to speak on their part. In terms of ownership and the ongoing O&M. This would be a DND facility.

Community member

But the infrastructure you pass on to HRM once you build that then pass it on to HRM to take care of the infrastructure that facility needs to or don't have.

Rob Chambers

Okay, so we're using the same word meaning to get things okay so the municipal we will say municipal services that would be brought to... Water, sewer etc.

Community member

Hand yours to HRM to maintain and give ownership to so that we become responsible for your infrastructure they chose to build on site where you have other sites that already have infrastructure on.

Rob Chambers

Yeah, so Paul will be able to speak to this much more intelligently on this than I can. So I'll just shut up, about that one. There are things to be said about that. And HRM's financial situation, obviously I'm not even going to try to comment on that. We have some folks here

Community member

But you should know this it's the context that you're making this decision in.

Rob Chambers

And yeah, in this setting it's not for me to speak to that issue. There are other people here who might want to do that, but I'll leave that to them to decide, but in the meantime, I'll hand it over to Paul.

Paul Schauerte

So yes, drawing municipal services to the site from the point where Hartlen Point begins being on DND property we pay for that both in terms of construction and operations [inaudible]. Tying into the existing services. Yes, we're tying into whatever is existing and I can't speak to the current state of the existing municipal service infrastructure in the area. With the site going in. We do pay [inaudible] which is a payment in lieu of taxes to cover those costs related to, amongst many things, the use of municipal services in the area. So, we are trying to offset if there are any additional costs to that infrastructure, we're offsetting it with the payments and [inaudible]. So, it's trying to be as close to cost neutral we can get it.

Community member

[inaudible], people here are having sewage backup in their basements, they're having flooding, the infrastructure is not capable of handling anything. And we're already having new builds here, there and everywhere. So, this hasn't been a part of the case but it should have been. [inaudible]

Paul Schauerte

I'm just going to turn to my project director. Talking on some of the services we may not fully tie in even.

Andrew

No, certainly, we do have building, we do have studies of the municipality, we've actually looked at it, I think it's a 300mm size pipe that we're connecting to... [Can you speak louder?] Sorry, sorry about that. So, our consultant is looking at the services that we're connecting to, right now I think it's a 300mm size pipe and there seems to be capacity on it. So, the stuff that we are connecting to, there's a whole city sort of thing, we only look at the system that we're looking at, sort of thing. Where we're connecting to. So, there's studies done by a professional engineer that looks at what we're going to connect and does estimates of it, usually it's like, 65%, once we're at 65% of the pipe, it's at capacity, so we're below that right now, for where we're connecting. For what you're saying there's like, multiple pipes and things, but for where we're connecting it, we did studies, sort of thing, and it is being analyzed.

Community member

[inaudible]

Andrew

We'd have to upgrade it. There are codes that we follow.

Community member

[inaudible] Yes, but we can't size for, you size for the time that it is now. We, no, that's the reason you [inaudible]

Peter Sarty

Just to let you know, I'm working with Andrew, and I live here in Halifax, and know some more of the local context. The only municipal services that we're tying into are the existing water line to service the

site for fire protection, and domestic water. We won't be connecting to the city sewer system. That facility will have an onsite septic field so there are concerns. [background chatter] I just want to clarify because you mentioned backups.

Rob Chambers

Alexandra, [inaudible], the councillor, [inaudible]

Alexandra Evershed

Ok, we'll pass to the councillor. And then I'm coming to you. You had the first question and you've been patiently waiting.

Becky Kent

Thank you. Thank you everyone for coming. I just want to clarify the points that were made here. The sewer backup that just happened here on Shore Road, we do not have a conclusive decision or review finished that would determine whether or not there was capacity. That's still not debate that's still to be determined. So it's inaccurate to say that there is not the capacity. The other piece that I want to offer is the tax consideration now from 8% to 4%. is not about a failing economic scenario of the municipality. It is completely and utterly around the need for future infrastructure for future service delivery and whether or not we can go forward with climate action initiatives and such and whether or not now is the time in this economy for each and every one of you as taxpayers to elect to consider a budget for next year and future but an 8% increase or a 4% increase. And that's the difference. We're not talking about service delivery cuts in current scenarios. We're talking about service delivery options that may not be available in the future. So, I just want to clarify that for you.

Alexandra Evershed

Thank you. It's your turn.

Community member

Thanks a lot for coming tonight. My big concern is about access on Shore Road. Just, I just heard there's going to be 300 jobs out here, like how are you going to get these guys out here in their half tons and Road Rally gear. Come on. Let's face it, we know that tradespeople are you know are rushing back and forth all the time. If you get 300 people out here plus you're going to have 125 working here at one point, like it really is going to be outrageous. I don't want to be trapped at my house on Shore Road. Go try to get down Fisherman's Cove and oh, there's a 20-minute lag there. We're trying to go up over Caldwell Road and get out that intersection, lag. You guys need to find your own access and if it's up through the golf course, so be it. And I don't agree with this whole 'Well, it's a budgetary restriction', if DND wants an access road, it will be going in and I think you should do that.

Paul Schauerte

Thank you. The 300 people, job creation for construction. That's not all at the same time for the entire period of construction. Construction happens in phases from foundation to envelope to your subsystems, electrical plumbing, that sort of thing. So, it's never going to be 300, that's wrong. even 120 max at the site in terms of operations, not all at the same time. Obviously working different shifts, they'll have different duties. You just use those kind of metrics to try and establish the maximum range of both job creation and people who come and access the site, but that's not to say on a regular day to day basis, that's what the impact will be.

Community member

Well will you guys have a bus system, to get all these tradespeople out here and then staff and then people that are coming in for training like, you are going to be training people, like what if they want to

go out for lunch? There's 150 people trucking out and trucking back in and then trucking back home. [inaudible] There are no sidewalks.

Rob Chambers

So, I would just say, [crosstalk, inaudible] one of the big takeaways for me today, twofold. One, we've got to make public the initial traffic study we're going to be releasing it so you'll have access to that detail. We can have a separate briefing on that we go through that detail with you. We can look at those sorts of issues if we haven't addressed those issues in this study, we're we've said it before I'll say it again. Absolutely committed to continuing to work with the city to make sure we understand exactly what the impact would be and that we can take steps to address that. Health and safety, top priority said out already. Really want to make sure you understand the flow that you're describing. I don't know how to the general contractor will end up organizing themselves to have people in and out and the parking and all of that but we'll look at it and we'll share that information with you. And we'll continue that conversation.

Alexandra Evershed

Okay, I'm going to take it back, if you don't mind to the people online that need to be heard from as well.

Keelan Green

So, online we had a few questions regarding birds. I'm going to paraphrase them together. So, there was a concern regarding the timing of construction. If it starts in the spring, that would be the worst time for birds who are nesting and other such activities, and if you can comment on whether construction time will take that into account those types of things, and also there was concern about the osprey nest that's currently there, and if it could be taken down or moved to another location.

Paul Schauerte

I can certainly address both of those questions. In terms of the timing of construction. As I mentioned previously in my presentation, our goal is to ensure... sorry bad habit: we will avoid the migratory and nesting periods that occur annually on the site. Whether it's with the clearing of the site, or establishing our footprint, we're going to make sure that it's done outside of those windows.

Community member

I don't believe that. I worked construction my whole life. I know how it works. Get it done. You push your way through. I don't believe that.

Paul Schauerte

That is what we are committing to. We will avoid those periods.

Alexandra Evershed

Will there be an opportunity for people to, is there going to be a phone number, or somewhere where they can call in if they have issues about...

Paul Schauerte

We would certainly, I believe, continue to use the email website to the site we used in the past for communication into the project team, and we receive each one of those emails that come into the project team, they're sent directly to us. So, in terms of the osprey nest, we're aware of it and our goal is to ensure that... we'll make sure that the nest is maintained. We know the access road comes near it, if it's at all possible we're going to try to move the road in order to protect the nest. If that's impossible we will move the nest to ensure it's in a safe spot, ongoing

Community member

[inaudible] Hi, I'm Colleen Tierney. I live in the HRM, I just want to speak to this panel here. I know you're on the hot seat right now, and this is super difficult. But I want to thank you for your time. And this is hard. This is really hard because we have to live here. We get to live here. It's a privilege but you get to leave. I just want to address you as humans. Please listen to the people in this room. This is serious. Mr. Samson, I need you to hear the people. That's your job. This is a breakdown of democratic function. Okay, so horse before the cart the cart before the horse. Do you see the flaw in your design? You didn't talk to people before you made the plan. I don't need to be 65, I don't need to have this [inaudible] to know, there's a flaw in this design. Okay, you can do better. I know you can. I'm asking you. We are asking you to address it. You have stated, fully, in this meeting. "Thank you" but this is a performance. The answers already been made, you've made the decision, Captain Turner. Okay, why are we here? I need to know what we can do. We need to know what feasible actions are possible. Otherwise, this is just a performance piece.

Rob Chambers

Yeah, so I don't know that I have much more to say that I didn't say earlier in response to the gentleman's point, you know, again, it seemed inadequate to say thank you for your commitment. You know, our job right now, like I said before, is to do the best we can to address the issues that are being raised. I know some people right now have already said just don't do it. That's the issue. Don't do it.

Community member

It would solve a lot of problems. Find another place. [inaudible]

Rob Chambers

Sorry what? Oh, solve them all, sorry, I thought you said buy them all. So, you know, we're we have certain parameters that we're working within, and I get that for some of you those parameters are unacceptable. But that's what I have here tonight. And so, we're looking for issues that we can work with you on and you can, you know maintaining access, addressing the impacts on species at risk, the wetland and you've heard it all, I'm not going to repeat it now, but that's our mandate. That's what we can do. And I'm sorry that that, you know,

Community member

I believe you can do more [inaudible] decision makers are the people that actually can make actual tangible change [inaudible].

Rob Chambers

I'd say we can make changes to the approach around the project. This was the site that was identified just for meeting the requirements. And being able to support the facility etc., etc. that you've heard. We got a few points earlier about we need to do a more sharing of information here, and I know that's not going to address all the issues that were raised. But that is one thing for taking away from this is that we need to step up another level in terms of what we're sharing and communicating. Recognizing that, again, I get it, I appreciate your faith. And thank you for that. You know what, I'll leave it there.

Alexandra Evershed

Okay, I'm very conscious of time and questions are long and answers are long. So, I see certain people standing up who have an opportunity to ask questions. I see certain people standing up who have not had an opportunity to ask questions, and this one here. I recognize that you were standing before, and we have people online that we need to get to as well. And I see you back there as well, Angela.

Community member

Not so much a question. It's, I guess, an observation. I just found out about this through CBC last year. I don't live in Eastern Passage; I'm not related to anybody in the military. How the hell would I find out about this? Like, really, you say public consultation, why wasn't this in a newspaper? Why wasn't this covered more? Why did you wait so long to have something like this? And that's right, why am I here? I should have been here in 2019 when this all started. Why did you go that route? And how am I supposed to find out from here, more information? I don't read Trident. I don't. It reaches 105,000 people. 3000 online a month. I don't read it. Neither does... I live in downtown Dartmouth. I've been walking these shores for 45 years. My grandparents went to Silver Sands. You could do so much better. You really should be ashamed of yourselves.

Rob Chambers

I don't get the impression that there's anything more I can say in response to that, so I'll just leave it at that.

Community member

Hi there, my name is Brooke. Thank you for being here and answering my questions. I'm a structural engineer professionally licensed in several provinces across Canada, work for an amazing company. I'm the CEO we have 55 people. Part of our mandate, our obligation as structural engineers is to protect the public. We know that. We also have an obligation to be stewards of our environment, and our communities the places we impact with our designs because we have the opportunity to shape the built world, and I love a good selection criteria. Perfect to hone in on what you need to do with your projects. But your selection criteria lost the important part of a really particular part that's going to impact communities. You miss that stewardship for environmental sustainability, and for community consultation. How can you justify your criteria in 2019 to 2020, to 2021, to 2022. We already environmental crisis. And you just missed that. It's shameful. How do you justify that?

Jay Thor Turner

So just to clarify the selection criteria that we talked about in finding the site was finding the optimum site for the capability that the Canadian Navy required to move the program forward. The other aspects we talked about are considered outside of that study and the project as it's moved forward, but the part I've kept speaking about is all around figuring out where's the best site. That gives us the capability that we need to keep the program moving forward so we can deliver the Canadian Surface Combatant ships for the future Navy.

Alexandra Evershed

So, I have a question here and then I'm coming over there, then I'm going to the back of the room for online questions. Do you have a question?

Community member

Hi there, hi. I'm with the Signal, and my question is, I've just been listening to everybody here, I've heard Indigenous consultation mentioned a few times. The answers you gave were 'an elder' or 'the community'. So that was kind of vague, but as a journalist, it's my responsibility to ask for specifics. So can you give me specific names of Mi'kmaq people you've consulted with? And what are the organizations? Thank you.

Captain (Navy) Andy MacKenzie

Thank you very much for your question, what I'll do is if we can close afterwards, I will reach out to the Mi'kmaq elder and we consulted with as well as the other community leaders and ask that they would be comfortable to, maybe share their information with you. And I promise you hand on heart and if

they're comfortable to do so I'll share that information. Okay. Yeah, most of them are working out of the Mi'kmaq friendship centre. No, I'm not saying it is, but most of the representatives are associated with the centre, and like I mentioned just a moment ago, I will reach out to them and ask for their permission to relay their names to you, if they're comfortable to do so.

Community member

[inaudible]

Alexandra Evershed

Okay, I have a question over here and then I'm going to the online questions.

Community member

[inaudible]. So Hartlen Point has a big golf course there now and I live close. I've lived in the community for 14 years. And in the winter I can walk onto the golf course and look out, and there's an armament that is I guess that might not be what they're called, but parts of the military installment that used to be there. It's actually that was a battery, so it protected our harbor. I don't really understand why it's not a National Historic Site. The Halifax Defence Force complex consists of five national historic sites placed along the shores of Halifax Harbour the Halifax Citadel, George's Island, Fort McNabb, Prince of Wales tower, and York Redoubt. But we don't actually have the site protected that is the mouth of the harbour. And if you were in St. John's, Newfoundland, what would it be like if you couldn't go to Signal Hill? So why isn't it being considered?

Rob Chambers

So, I do not have the specific information about the history of that site and why it was or was not assessed or was or was not considered, absolutely committed though, to providing that information to you and making that publicly available. So whatever way folks tell me is the best way to do that, we will absolutely follow up and, and give you everything that we have on that.

Alexandra Evershed

I'm going to jump in now. The questions online have been answered. They they're the same questions that have been asked by people in the room. I'm going to come to you. You haven't spoken yet.

Community member

My name is [inaudible] and I grew up overlooking Silver Sands beach, my question is, when you selected those five sites that you gave to Irving, were those DND owned properties, because when I look at Nova Scotia, we're a province of coast lands, and I can't believe there isn't another site that doesn't have the significance to the community, the significance to the wildlife -- top 10 site in Canada for birding. I just can't believe this wasn't another site that would have met your criteria. The second part of my question is if you're going to use the Trident communicate with us, could you put a dropdown at the top of something, I mean, I couldn't even find the site. It took me some you know, I googled Trident, sitting here tonight, couldn't find it. Took some time, and it's a bunch of articles. If this is the biggest project that's going on that DND is doing in the community, it should be easy for the community to find it. Or, create a designated site.

Jay Thor Turner

Okay. So easy question first. It wasn't me answering, but my colleagues have said yes to the making the Trident site more findable etc. and organizing it to make sure we communicate better through those means. The first question was, are they, were the five all DND sites. I can answer. So, four of the five yes, certainly where most of my colleagues see if the Bedford Basin one was as well? Right. Those five

sites were all DND properties. So, although I was in the project, it was incomplete at that time when they were developing those criteria, I was in a completely different role and job, so I can't speak specifically to how they decided to not consider sites that weren't DND owned. But I will. We'll look to include that in our bulletin explainer as we expand it to make sure we address that question.

Community member

[inaudible]

Alexandra Evershed

Okay. We need to be conscious of the time it's 9:33. I'm coming to Mr. Metivier, who started us off, and then I am going, back online because apparently there are some questions, I'm going back online and then we will conclude. Okay. All right.

Community member

Thank you for having me again. I mentioned earlier being part of the army for a long time. Part of my career I went to the staff college in Kingston, and we used a process called the estimate process. I'm sure all of you are familiar with that, and you know when you're told that you situate the estimate when you finally on site and the rest of it is basically you put your ideas on paper say well, I'm going to answer my own question, it should be rather easy. That's what situation the estimate is. We talked about putting the cart before the horse, same stuff. If I was in Kingston, being given a mission to install, install this one I mean Kingston is the college, my mission is to establish this site and I situate the estimate, like you did, I would get a fail: wrong answer. So, you've been told a few times already being here tonight, listening to our questions, acknowledging the shaky voice and all this, it's not enough. You ask what you can do at your level, sir? You're ADM. Within DND. I've been up the ranks and all this and I tried to do as much as I could. And I know there's things we can, and cannot do. But just to tell us: sorry for your loss, I feel bad for you and all that stuff. It's just not enough. We don't want to become anybody's pain, but if we have to, we will. And that's sad. We want to help you help us and vice versa. In that light then I would like to offer some information about the traffic. We live on the exact corner of Caldwell and Shore Road, so we see our fair share of traffic. For example, public transit, not as frequent as we'd like, but still there. School buses, lots of them. Not just schools, all around the seniors' residences. And then the standard good old traffic every day. So, it's going to be tight squeeze. I don't know if any of you have ever driven a car up Caldwell, but when there's cars parked on the school sides there, it's a really tight squeeze. I can only imagine with construction vehicles and the crews. Whatever vehicles they will drive, I'm predicting accidents and I hate to think that but that's what I'm predicting. So, my question: previous roll-outs of fleets that you've had before, did need a site here before? If not, why? And why is this one so different? RF, radio frequencies, as we said earlier, they're everywhere. You can have that somewhere else too. Thank you.

Jay Thor Turner

When we look at the frigate project, which is probably the most comparable, most comparable, but significantly less complex of systems, they did not have the same type of site. When we consulted allies who have built more complex warships, they said you must have a site to do this kind of testing. Otherwise, you can risk failure and non-delivery of the capability. Based on that it was very clear that we absolutely needed a site. We determined that we needed a site that was close to the shore had the wide access view for the radar testing that we needed to do for a new radar in a new context when we consider the combat systems that we're planning to deliver as part of that.

Community member

[inaudible]

Jay Thor Turner

I can add some context there. When you compare us it's a very difficult comparison to compare the Canadian Department of National Defence, US DoD or even the UK MOD in size, capacity, number of test sites and ability to do testing all over their country to support the needs of a much larger, much larger navy. So, it's very difficult to compare that context, what we always have to consider is, does it work in the Canadian context. And for us, this solution works with the Canadian context and those other sites although they're comparable, would not work for Canada to deliver the program that we need to do. Thank you.

Alexandra Evershed

Sorry, we have to move on to online. Sorry technical difficulty.

Keelan Green

There's a few more questions online. Some of them were answered earlier but some of them are quick. So maybe we can get quick responses. Was the Milbrooke First Nation consulted?

Captain (Navy) Andy MacKenzie

Thank you for the question. I don't know honestly right now that most of those engagements that are referred to occurred before my arrival and late last year, but I will ask if that was the case or not. I'm sorry I don't have that answer.

Keelan Green

The next question: what specific window are you using for migratory native bird nesting periods?

MARLANT Expert

So for all issues associated with potential impact on migratory birds or native birds, we consult the Canadian Wildlife Service through Environment Canada, and our window that we're operating in is a March to September window for outside, that's the window where there'll be no work, construction work on the site or work that would impact removal of vegetation, where habitat for nesting occur, or disturb breeding avian species.

Community member

[inaudible]

Paul Schauerte

I mean, I can't speak to, he may not be referring to March 1st, I mean when we say March it may be the early portion where the date starts later, but if the date is we only go up to the date and not beyond it.

Keelan Green

One, criteria was there had to be no overhead road obstructions. How will this project deal with the railway overpass on Pleasant Street and Main Road?

Paul Schauerte

Can you repeat the question?

Keelan Green

One, criteria was there had to be no overhead road obstructions. How will this project deal with the railway overpass on Pleasant Street and Main Road?

Community member

[inaudible]

Paul Schauerte

Sorry just a second. Just to say it needs to be consideration to ensure if there are any overhead structures that they're high enough that there will be an impact in any of the equipment coming into the site. And when you said it passed, it means they're high enough that there won't be any interaction in terms of the loads and the heights of the equipment and coming in and the height of the structure.

Keelan Green

Ok. Two questions that are similar: why specifically can't the proposed project be moved and how can a project go ahead without the results of all the studies. Why do we have environmental guidelines if you can jump them? You don't know where the wind direction is on site, or the direction of groundwater flows. There's no groundwater monitoring wells on site, so how did your study assess this? The community downstream of your facility is less than 800 meters from the corner of your building and hasn't been considered. I haven't been asked by a single rep 'what's your opinion regarding this project'? So, did you want to respond to those concurrently?

Paul Schauerte

Specific to the question related to the studies. We can't proceed with any form of construction, including clearing of the site until the studies are complete and approved. So we have to wait for them to be completed before we can start. Any form of construction work, including clearing the site. So you can't jump those results of it, we have to wait for them to come. And we have to show how we're going to implement mitigation measures to address any concerns raised.

Keelan Green

And then the other question was why specifically can't the project be moved.

Rob Chambers

We've talked about that one. And that's where obviously there's a disconnect with some folks in the room and some folks online. I'm not sure there's much more that I could add to that. You know, we've looked at the alternatives. We looked at the alternatives within the DND portfolio. We've assessed the site against those alternatives. And we've talked about the importance of the site, the facility, we have talked about the importance of the facility to the ships, the program and the role the program plays for the Navy.

Community member

[inaudible]

Rob Chambers

So, for those online I don't know if you could hear that or not, a member of the public, ma'am, sir, I don't know your name, was saying that, not disputing the importance of the ships in the Canadian Armed Forces it's more this particular site and how we arrived at the decision for this particular site. So, all I'll say to that is that we've undertaken to provide more information, and then you can decide more information about the decision process and the criteria and how it's arrived at, etc. And then we'll be meeting again I hope and having this conversation again.

Alexandra Evershed

Which is a great segue to some closing housekeeping. Information about future public engagement sessions and general updates on the Land-Based Testing Facility project will be added to the Trident newspaper website at [Trident newspaper.com/lbtf](http://Tridentnewspaper.com/lbtf) as they become available, so we're also taking away

we've also heard loud and clear that other information means are important. We have also been sending mailers out into the community and we can consider some other means of communication. [French Translation]

For those of you who have indicated your willingness and desire to be on our email distribution lists, we're going to be pushing information out to you through that channel as well. [French Translation]

And now I'd like to invite Captain (Navy) MacKenzie to say a few words in closing

Captain (Navy) Andy MacKenzie

Thanks to everyone in this room and for those online for your participation. The community members and our engagement, we acknowledge, in the past, wasn't what it needed to be, and we are working to make it better. We vow to you that we will put our efforts into that with regards to updates of information that we have as well as posting that information online looking for better ways to do that. So, thank you again for coming and participating personally here and for those that did so from afar online. Want to thank also the municipal, provincial and federal representatives we have here for your attendance as well, in this public engagement, the folks on the head table that came here that had the expertise to address some of your questions, but not all. And for all of us to hear your questions, your observations and your thoughts. Those are all appreciated. I want to thank the staff that put this together. There were a lot of folks that came in the background to put this engagement together, both on our site and also within the community and the folks here at Hartlen Point that are allowing us to host here this evening. A reminder if you have questions or comments from you if you have them to continue to post them to CFB Halifax public affairs@forces.gc.ca That's a primary link in. And we will look at the Trident website to see if that's the best means for sharing information. So, if we do develop that or make that better, we'll make sure to advertise that early and as loud as we can in order to have potentially a better avenue for sharing information. With that, thank you very much. Please drive safe and have a good evening. Thank you.