



Environmental Managers' Association of BC Journal

May 2005

Volume 24

Canada and Kyoto — what's next?

By Michael Mysak, MBA, Senior Project Manager, PHH ARC Environmental Ltd., Patric Fancott, Project Manager, Pinchin Environmental Ltd.

The Government of Canada has released its Kyoto plan called Project Green – “Moving Forward on Climate Change: A Plan for Honoring Our Kyoto Commitment” as part of a broader initiative on environmental and economic sustainability. There still is uncertainty moving forward as we look to be headed towards a federal election soon, which could alter Canada’s approach to Kyoto.

How did we get to this point and where are we going?

On February 16, 2005, eight years after its conception, the Kyoto Protocol came into force. Canada joins 144 countries representing 61.6% of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions in the effort to address global climate change. Canada is one of 36 countries in Annexe B of the Kyoto Protocol that have ratified and have legally binding emission reductions (the notable exceptions being the US

and Australia). Canada has committed to reduce its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 6% below 1990 levels over the period of 2008-2012.

We have been an active participant in international climate change negotiations and initiatives since ratifying the United Nations Framework Convention Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992 and the Kyoto Protocol in 2002, yet somehow we seemed surprised and flustered that Kyoto was actually here. Perhaps we secretly hoped that the deal would fall through and we could maintain the moral authority of having ratified Kyoto without going through the political and economic

pain of meeting our commitments. Now that the deal is done, it is worth looking at the magnitude of the challenge, the options available to Canada to meet its commitments and the potential impacts on Canadian businesses.

Canada’s total GHG emissions in 1990 were 609 megatonnes (Mt) and our target in the compliance period is 572 Mt (a 6% reduction). The latest official inventory estimated emissions in 2002 at 731 Mt and our projected emissions in the Kyoto compliance period are 809 Mt. The difference between our target and the projected

Continued on page 3

EMA Annual General Meeting

Thursday, May 26, 2005

AGM business: 2:30-4:00 pm

Keynote speaker: 4:00-5:00 pm

The Roof, Fairmont Hotel Vancouver

Refreshments and networking to follow guest speaker presentation



Brian Krieger, General Manager of the 2010 Commerce Centre.

Guest speaker at the EMA Annual General Meeting will be Brian Krieger of the Ministry of Small Business and Economic Development, BC Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, Secretariat, 2010 Commerce Centre General Manager.

Mr. Krieger will present an overview of business opportunities and tools available for BC firms to identify and take advantage of the opportunities presented by the upcoming winter games.

IN THIS ISSUE

President’s message	2
Member profiles – TSI, FSM	4, 8
Upcoming EMA events	5
EMA grant report	5
Key Contaminated Site Decision...	6

President's Report

Hats off to past directors for forming the EMA



Dave Warner, President

With the Annual General Meeting for the Environmental Managers Association of BC (EMA of BC) upon us we will most likely be seeing new faces on the executive as well as new faces in new executive director positions.

The loss of colleagues and friends who are stepping down has caused me to take a moment to reflect back on the history of the EMA of BC, where we have come from, and think about those who have worked so hard to make the association the success it is today.

In 1990 when the association's formation began "there were not a lot of resources to turn to for timely, 'real world tested' environmental information, nor were there many individuals whose mandate was to look after a company's environmental issues." Today the number of resources available is almost limitless and many corporations have dedicated Environmental Departments and Environmental Managers.

However, the original guiding principals of the association "to bring value to the participants through educational sessions that included information that people could walk away with and use in their day to day work"

and "the opportunity to network with other members of the environmental field" are still as applicable today as they were 15 years ago.

Those in the environmental field today must sift through all these resources and constantly keep abreast of the ever changing environmental regulations and issues. The EMA of BC provides an avenue for these people to share their knowledge and meet others in the field who may act as a resource for future projects.

The EMA of BC (originally the Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Environmental Managers Association or iciEMA) was "formed to Share Environmental Concerns".

It is impossible to list all of the directors who have served in various capacities due to the number of positions (20) and the fact that the association has been around for close to 15 years. However, I would like to identify those individuals who were on the original working committee that set the groundwork for the association and the first officially recognized society directors.

The original working committee consisted of **Kevin Gilligan** (Woodwards), **Ted Roberts** (The Bay), **Jack Petite** and **Steve Krawchuck** (McDonalds), **Bruce Wilson** (BC Hydro), **Rand Mackenzie** (Eatons), **Brenda**

Jagroop (UBC), **Ted Lederer** (EBA), among others. The iciEMA was first recognized as a society on December 27, 1991 with its directors listed as: **Bruce Wilson**, BC Hydro (President); **Ted Lederer**, EBA (Vice President); **Kevin Gilligan**, Woodwards and **Donna Police**, Liquor Distribution Branch (Educational Vice Presidents); **Brenda Jagroop**, UBC (Vice President Technical Strategies); **Gary Foley**, ICBC (Secretary); **Terrance Reagh**, BC Central Credit Union (Treasurer); and **Steve Krawchuck**, McDonalds, (Membership).

I would like to thank all of these individuals for having the foresight to realize that an association like the EMA of BC would be a resource for both current and future professionals working in the environmental field. I would also like to thank everyone who has ever served as a director for the association and put in countless hours to mould the association to what it has become today.

The EMA of BC continues to strive for improvement and would like feedback from the membership as to how we are doing and where we can go in the future. To this end, an online membership survey is currently being developed. Please take the time to fill out the survey.

If any individuals are interested in volunteering as a director for the EMA of BC, please either put your name forward to one of the current directors and/or attend the AGM on May 26 where the call for directors will be placed.

—*Dave Warner*

Coming soon
Watch for EMA's online membership survey. Please take the time to fill it out.

Note: Excerpts from this article are taken from Ted Lederer's iciEMA Journal Volume 17 dated November 2000

Continued from page 1 **The Kyoto Plan and Canada**

emissions, referred to as the “Kyoto Gap”, is 237 Mt. Recent projections have revised the Kyoto Gap to be between 270 and 300 Mt.

How big is 300 Mt? Under the European emissions trading program, in mid-March 2005, emission units were trading at just over 10 Euros per tonne (about \$16 Canadian). If Canada were to buy credits in Europe today to make up the 300 Mt, it would cost \$4.8 billion per year.

Recent World Bank Analysis suggests the price of a tonne of CO_{2e} in 2010 will be \$11 US (+/- 50%). The challenge for the federal government and industry is to find a more cost effective combination of domestic reductions, supported by domestic emissions trading, and lower cost credits using the flexible mechanisms under Kyoto. Many experts have noted that it will extremely difficult for Canada to meet its commitments without purchasing substantial credits on the international market.

What are our options?

If every Canadian implements the One Tonne Challenge, we will achieve 10% of our Kyoto Gap. The 2002 Climate Change Plan for Canada outlined a three step plan to achieve 240 Mt of emissions reductions, which is now 270 Mt in the Green Plan. This plan was soft on regulation, strong on incentives and goodwill action, and has not achieved the expected results in the timeframes anticipated. There have been significant delays in developing a regulatory framework for the Large Final Emitters (LFE), a domestic emissions trading program has yet to materialize, a vague off-set plan has been discussed but details have not been worked out.

Under Project Green, the Large Final Emitters will be responsible for

a significant portion of the reductions under Canada’s commitment, about 45 megatonnes (Mt), which was lowered from the originally proposed 55 Mt.

The Climate Fund (referred to as the Clean Fund in the Budget) is where the real meat of the Kyoto Plan lies and where the government hopes to secure up to 40% of our Kyoto commitment. Through the Climate Fund, the Government of Canada will buy verified emission reductions from Canadian business and project developers. The fund will also have the ability to purchase international emissions reductions that support Canadian objectives. The fund requires projects be approved by the government prior to generating emissions reductions and that all reductions be verified in accordance with a process to be defined.

The Kyoto Plan opens the door to a wide range of potential emission reduction projects which is good news for Canadian businesses who can receive a financial reward for climate friendly actions. More detailed rules for the Climate Fund are expected in the coming months. The initial fund commitment is \$1 billion but is forecast to be as high as \$4-5 billion by 2012.

The other elements that are incorporated into the Plan include 40 Mt for reduction programs such as energy efficiency and fueling switching, 30 Mt for carbon sinks, which include afforestation and agricultural practices, and 15 Mt from new renewable energy initiatives, including wind power, solar, small hydro and biomass.

What should businesses do?

If you don’t know if you fall into the category of LFE, you should find out immediately because you may have emissions reporting obligations and be obligated to meet emission reduction targets. It is difficult to know what will

happen next with Canada’s Kyoto plan or its participation moving forward.

The Conservatives have said in the past that they will get Canada out of Kyoto, but one wonders if we have gone to far (commitment-wise) to withdraw now. Many large companies have invested significantly based on the expectation of Canada’s commitments. The Conference of Parties (COP), which are all the countries that have ratified the Kyoto Accord, are planning to meet in Montreal in December 2005. Also, a Canadian, Ms. Sushma Gera, was recently appointed Chair of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Executive Board which oversees the CDM methodologies.

Further uncertainty and delay in taking action could only set Canada further back, behind most other major industrialized nations in progress on emissions reduction.

The Pinchin Group is involved with emissions monitoring and reporting, strategy development, and CDM project development. The Pinchin Group is aligned with international partners with strong experience on capacity and project development utilizing the flexible mechanisms of the Kyoto Protocol.

If you have any questions about your obligations or potential opportunities under Canada’s Kyoto Plan, contact Patric Fancott, pfancott@pinchin.com, or Mike Mysak, mmysak@pvharcenv.com.

References:

Government of Canada. April 13, 2005. www.climatechange.gc.ca/english/newsroom/2005/plan05_Bgrounder.asp
Environment Canada, Canada’s Greenhouse Gas Inventory. 1990-2002, August 2004.
PCFplus Report 19, prepared for World Bank Carbon Finance Business PCFplus. Research program by Erik Haites, Margaree Consultants, June 2004.

EMA member profile

TSI – the marine terminal operator of choice



TSI Terminal Systems Inc.'s (TSI) corporate history spans nearly a century, and is synonymous with the development of Vancouver and the west coast of North America. From its small beginnings as a remote wharf on a relatively unexplored coast, to the present as a world class terminal operator in a strategic position on the Pacific Rim, TSI has been a leader and industry innovator.

TSI is committed to being the marine terminal operator of choice in North America. Owned by Orient Overseas International Limited (OOIL) of Hong Kong, TSI is the largest terminal employer in the Port of Vancouver. Through its two divisions, Cruise and Container, TSI provides labour, scheduling and baggage handling services and operates Vanterm and Deltaport, the two largest container terminals in the Port of Vancouver. In 2004, TSI serviced 289 cruise ships and handled in excess of 760,000 containers.

TSI's major core interest is its

container terminal operations:

- Vanterm, located on Vancouver's inner harbour, is a 76 acre site with five dock-side gantry cranes. In 2004 Vanterm handled 225,396 containers or 397,328 teu's. With a capacity expansion scheduled for completion in spring of 2005, Vanterm is expected to be able to handle 350,000 units or 600,000 teu's.
- In 2004, Deltaport, located on Vancouver's outer harbour, handled 538,859 containers or 916,161 teu's. The current Deltaport site is 160 acres with two berths and six dock-side gantry cranes. TSI is negotiating with the Vancouver Port Authority for a further expansion at Deltaport with a third berth. This project is anticipated to start in the spring of 2006 for completion in 2008 and would increase the terminal size by approximately 50 acres. This additional space will increase capacity to 750,000 units or 1.3 million teu's. The project is estimated at \$280 million.

TSI is committed to minimising the impacts that its operations have on the environment. In 2004, TSI participated in a study with Vancouver-based Catalyst Energy Inc. to test a fuel additive designed to reduce harmful air emissions. CombustAll, a chemical catalyst, is added to diesel or heavy bunker fuel increasing the combustion efficiency of engines and boilers.

Results of the study indicate the additive significantly reduced particulate matter, nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide emissions and generated improvements in combustion efficiency.

In addition to the continued

use of CombustAll for its diesel-powered equipment at Vanterm, TSI has recently agreed to purchase two prototype low emission Rubber Tired Gantries (RTGs) for its Deltaport and Vanterm container terminals. These are the first RTGs to use technology similar to that in hybrid cars to reduce the amount of energy needed from the diesel engines of the RTGs. This reduction in energy demand is expected to significantly reduce harmful emissions from the RTGs.

With its commitment to environmental protection and focus to the future, TSI is positioned to remain an industry leader and a permanent fixture on the Vancouver waterfront.

For more information on TSI please contact Mr. Morley Strachan, Vice President Business Development and Strategic Planning at (604) 251-9200 or mstrachan@tsi.bc.ca.

**If you would like your
business or organization**

to be featured

in the EMA Journal,

contact Monica Minto,

Newsletter Editor, at:

**[Monica.Minto@maxxam
analytics.com](mailto:Monica.Minto@maxxamanalytics.com)**

EMA grant supports the protection of watercourses

The EMA of BC grants \$1,500 to a BC based non-profit environmental organization working to enhance or protect the environment.

This year, the grant was awarded to Coquitlam RiverWatch at the EMA of BC workshop.

Coquitlam RiverWatch was founded in 1997 with the mission to bring health and protection to the Coquitlam River Watershed

through education and awareness programs.

This is accomplished by members' attendance at environmental events, newsletters, and inspections of the Watershed to record human activities, litter and pollutants, water quality, and types of wildlife. The goal is to increase the awareness of what people can do to protect the watercourses around them.

Coquitlam RiverWatch will be

using the EMA of BC grant for the construction of a working watershed model. The model will include a reservoir, tributaries, industrial and residential pollution sources, islands, bridges, dikes and wetlands.

The model will assist Coquitlam RiverWatch in the education of the public at various events through the use of a visual aid representing a watershed.

Upcoming EMA events — *plan to attend*



Thursday, June 30 EMA goes to the Burnaby Incinerator

The Burnaby Waste-to-Energy incinerator has been designed as a safe and environmentally sound waste disposal facility. Strict environmental testing and continuous emission monitoring show that it meets all regulatory standards and has no measurable impact on the air, soil or vegetation in the area.

For more information on the Burnaby Incinerator see their website at: www.montenay.com.

Please notify EMA as soon as possible if you plan to attend.



July, 2005: EMA tours the Port of Vancouver.

A new economic impact study shows the Port of Vancouver generates "30,100 direct jobs, \$1.5 billion in direct wages, \$4 billion in total GDP." Not only is The Port a major economic vehicle, it is also recognized globally as a clean port complemented by sound, innovative environmental leadership. In fact, it was first port in Canada to have environmental services (since 1990).

Join the EMA tour and learn more about the Port of Vancouver.

For more information and to register for these tours contact EMA at: info@emaofbc.com

Four reasons to join the EMA of BC

- ✓ The Environmental Managers Association of BC meets on the last Thursday of the month at The Fairmont Hotel Vancouver. These meetings focus on guest speakers.
- ✓ EMA provides networking opportunities for sharing vital communication and practical information.
- ✓ EMA tours facilities during the year. Past tours have included the Vancouver International Airport, Britannia Mine and Clean Harbors Special Waste Treatment Facility.
- ✓ The EMA of BC hosts one day workshops on special issues, for example, Risk Management, Greening Your Business, Buildings and Your Bank Account.

For more information, contact **Herb Locke, Vice-President, Membership**, at hlocke@tri-arrow.com. Membership forms can be downloaded from the EMA website: www.emaofbc.com

KEY CONTAMINATED SITE DECISION

Canadian National Railway Co. v. A.B.C. Recycling Ltd

By Graham Walker and Rick Williams
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP

On April 29, 2005, the British Columbia Supreme Court released its landmark decision in *Canadian National Railway Co. v. ABC Recycling Ltd.* (the “CN decision”).

The CN decision is the first in which the Court has considered many of the provisions of Waste Management Act (now the Environmental Management Act), including the test for determining reasonably incurred “costs of remediation” and whether an innocent property owner is entitled to recover its actual legal costs.

In this article, we provide some background to the case before examining the Court’s finding with respect to legal costs and the Court’s approach to determining reasonably incurred costs of remediation.

BACKGROUND

Legislative Context

In 1993, the British Columbia legislature introduced a statutory scheme to encourage identification and remediation of contaminated sites culminating in the proclamation of the Part 4 of the Waste Management Act in April 1997. The fundamental purpose of Part 4 of the WMA is to promote the expeditious and permanent remediation of contaminated sites. The principle underlying Part 4 of the WMA is that of polluter pays; that is the financial burden of cleaning up contamination is allocated to those responsible for or those who benefit from the contamination and incidental activities.

In the summer of 2004, the legislature consolidated the provisions of the WMA and other legislation in the new Environmental Management Act.

A key feature of the statutory scheme is the private cost recovery action with respect to remediating contaminated sites. A person who incurs costs in carrying out remediation at a contaminated site may pursue in court their reasonably incurred costs of remediation from those responsible. Further, the costs of remediation include the “legal and consultant costs” associated with seeking contributions from those responsible.

Before the CN decision, those who remediated sites had minimal guidance as to the scope of costs of remediation they could recover. In particular, it was unclear the approach our courts would take in determining what are reasonably incurred costs of remediation. Also, it was unclear whether, in awarding legal costs as costs of remediation, the courts would award reasonable legal costs actually incurred or partial legal costs normally awarded to successful litigants in most court actions.

Factual Context

The CN decision now provides direction. CN was the owner of an approximately 80 acre parcel located on the north bank of the Fraser River in Burnaby, British Columbia. ABC was a neighbouring property owner and operated a scrap metal and auto wrecking business.

As early as 1997, ABC’s operations had encroached onto CN’s property and caused contamination of CN’s lands including metals, hydrocarbons

The decision
enshrines
the principle
of polluter pays.

and PCB’s. In 1999 and 2000, ABC purported to remove its product from the CN lands and conducted an excavation of the affected soils. In 2000, CN conducted further investigation, as part of its efforts to obtain an instrument from the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection in support of the subdivision and sale of its property. This investigation and analysis revealed that CN’s property was still contaminated.

CN and ABC entered into an agreement to undertake the remediation, whereby ABC would act as excavation contractor and CN’s environmental consultant would oversee the process and take confirmatory samples. Following the remediation of the contamination and the issuance of a Conditional Certificate of Compliance, CN sought recovery of its costs of remediation from ABC. ABC refused to pay and the litigation was commenced by CN.

ABC admitted that the CN property was a “contaminated site”, that ABC was a “responsible person”, that ABC caused the contamination, and that CN incurred “costs of remediation”. The issues to be determined at trial were whether CN’s “costs of re-

Continued on next page

Continued from page 6

mediation” were “reasonably incurred” and whether CN was entitled to recovery of its legal costs on an indemnity basis or a tariff basis as set out in the Rules of Court.

THE COURT’S FINDINGS IN THE CN DECISION

Legal Costs

In its action, CN sought to recover its actual legal costs associated with seeking contribution from ABC. A significant portion of a plaintiff’s costs in any legal proceeding are its legal costs. In a typical legal proceeding, the successful litigant is entitled to recover its legal costs in accordance with a tariff contained in the Rules of Court (usually only 15% to 20% of the legal costs actually incurred). A key finding in the CN decision is that a plaintiff who incurs costs of remediation can recover all its reasonable legal costs *actually incurred* in seeking contribution from those responsible.

The significance of this decision cannot be overstated. Often, the premise of legal costs act as a barrier to a plaintiff wishing to pursue a claim for damages in court, particularly when the amount of money involved is relatively small. The CN decision removes this barrier; those who incur costs remediating a contaminated site and are successful in recovering costs will enjoy more than just a pyrrhic victory.

APPROACH TO DETERMINING REASONABLY INCURRED COSTS

The legal costs, like all the costs of remediation, must be reasonably incurred.

The CN decision establishes the following factors a court will consider in determining what are reasonably incurred costs of remediation:

1. A court will employ a two-step approach to determine whether costs are reasonably incurred. First, the court will examine whether the plaintiff acted reasonably in remediating the contamination. Second, the court will examine whether the costs are themselves objectively reasonable. The court will look at various particular items of cost or expense incurred by the plaintiff to determine whether they are reasonable.
2. All of the circumstances of the case are relevant. The plaintiff can put forward evidence of costs *not* claimed in order to show that the costs claimed are reasonable. Thus, the court will look to what the plaintiff expended globally on remediating a contaminated site in order to determine whether the costs claimed are reasonable.
3. The burden is on the plaintiff to show that the plaintiff incurred reasonable costs. It is not enough to show that the plaintiff incurred costs and expect the defendant to show that the

costs were unreasonable.

4. It is not necessary for the plaintiff to call expert evidence to prove that the costs incurred are reasonable. This can save parties the extra cost of hiring an expert in cases of minor contamination that proceed to trial.

5. Plaintiffs are entitled to adopt a careful, cautious approach in remediating contamination particularly when such an approach is the foundation of a successful application for compliance to the appropriate government ministry.

RESULT

In the result, CN recovered approximately 95% of its costs claimed from ABC as costs reasonably incurred as well as its reasonable legal fees actually incurred through trial.

CONCLUSION

The CN decision establishes that a plaintiff can recover legal costs actually incurred in seeking contribution from those responsible and provides a framework for determining whether the plaintiff’s costs were reasonably incurred.

The decision enshrines the principle of polluter pays. The decision also ensures that a cost recovery action is an effective and practical means of recovering costs of remediating a contaminated site.

Graham Walker and Rick Williams are litigators in the Vancouver firm of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP and were co-counsel in this case on behalf of CN.

A key finding is that a plaintiff who incurs costs of remediation can recover all its reasonable legal costs.

Submission to this newsletter are welcome. For information contact Newsletter Editor, Monica Minto at Monica.Minto@maxxamanalytics.com

FSM Management Group contracted to provide national aviation fuel management services

As of March 1, FSM Management Group (FSM) assumed an administrative role for eight fuel consortia locations in Canada. Carriers worldwide are keeping a close eye on this venture to assess if this structure could be modeled for other fuel consortia. Currently there are a number of operators providing fuelling services for a consortium of aviation industry members within Canada.

FSM is handling a variety of duties on behalf of the executive committee at each of the eight consortiums, essentially performing the role formerly undertaken by the consortia chair. FSM provides a wider support network of staff with technical expertise than the consortia was able to maintain. FSM's staff has been selected from the aviation industry with experience in a variety of topics including engineering, environmental, fleet service, plant maintenance, project management and equipment related issues.

In addition to reducing the workload of the consortia chairs and fuel committees, FSM is expected to achieve cost savings through the disciplines outlined above. These savings will be realized by standardizing equipment and practices across the country, as well as initiating strategic purchasing and negotiating national consultant agreements.

Environmentally, FSM will be tendering and awarding national consultant contracts for cathodic protection, tank integrity testing, risk minimization, groundwater monitoring as well as analytical services. In addition, FSM will keep operators abreast of new regulatory information and industry standards.

Fueling systems will be assessed to ensure the system and equipment

are maintained in compliance with applicable environmental laws, engineering regulations and codes as well as maintaining the principles established in the ISO 14001 standard and the Fuel Committee's Environmental Policies. In general, FSM will accomplish this by providing guidance with regards to standardization and optimization of environmental management systems.

EMA OF BC EXECUTIVE 2004-2005

President

David Warner, Lehigh Cement
dwarner@lehighcement.com

Vice-President

Courtney Marsh, BC Hydro
membership@emaofbc.com

Vice-President, Communications

Nelson Gourlay, Imperial Oil

Vice-President, Education

Kevin Pendreigh, Seacor
kpendreigh@secorcanada.com

Vice-President, Information Services

Don Bryant, Keystone Environmental
dbryant@keystoneenviro.com

Vice-President, Membership

Herb Locke, Tri-Arrow Industrial Recovery Inc.
hlocke@tri-arrow.com

Newsletter Editor

Monica Minto, Maxxam
Monica.Minto@maxxamanalytics.com

Secretary

Peter Borgmann
Coast Mountain Bus Co. Ltd.
Peter_Borgmann@TransLink.bc.ca

Treasurer

Stephen Custeau,
Quantum Environmental Group
stephenc@quantumgroup.ca

Past President

Stephanie Dixon,
TSI Terminal Systems

Directors-at-Large

Rob Beleutz, URS Corp
rob_beleutz@urscorp.com
Christopher Boys, Chevron Canada Ltd.
cbys@chevrontexaco.com
Carrie Brown, Vancouver Port Authority
carrie.brown@portvancouver.com
Alix Drapack, Translink
Alix_Drapack@TransLink.bc.ca
Michael Herald,
Jacques Whitford Environmental Ltd.
Brent Makelki, ALS Environmental
brent.makelki@alsenviro.com
Patrick Novak, Cantest
pnovak@cantest.com
Lyle Thompson, CH2M Hill
Carleigh Whitman,
Bordner Ladner Gervais LLP
Laurel Wilson, Clean Harbours
wilson.laurel@cleanharbors.com

Office:

Eniko Wilkie, Executive Administrator
Tel: 604-507-0537
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 3741
Vancouver, B.C., V6B 3Z1
E-mail: *info@emaofbc.com*

Plan to attend

The EMA of BC Annual General Meeting

Thursday, May 26, 2005
AGM business: 2:30-4:00 pm
Keynote speaker: 4:00-5:00 pm
The Roof, Fairmont Hotel Vancouver