FACT SHEET
Cherry Point Refinery Pipeline Option

Among the 14 alternate long-term fuel delivery options studied by VAFFC was a pipeline connecting YVR and the Cherry Point Refinery in Washington State. This option had a number of weaknesses compared with the proposed project, including:

- **Cost –** A pipeline system of this magnitude would run on the order of $160 - $200 million dollars, before any costs for tankage, dock leasing, and other infrastructure at Cherry Point. The on-going operating and maintenance would be much more complex and costly because of the pipeline length and the differing regulatory regime and standards in the different jurisdictions.
- **Regulatory Framework** – A cross-border pipeline requires a Presidential Permit from the Department of State, and is subject to a federal decision as to whether the project is in the best interest of the United States. With an incoming oil pipeline from Canada, and an existing marine terminal capable of export from the refinery, it would be difficult for VAFFC to justify the benefits of the project to the U.S. On the Canadian side, the pipeline would fall under the jurisdiction of the National Energy Board, which would assess the approval of the pipeline based on public interest.
- **Security –** The Cherry Point refinery is identified as a strategic asset by the Department of Homeland Security. The function and processes of this refinery, in an event which threatens the defences or livelihood of US citizens, could be redirected by the federal government. This would shut down all supply of aviation fuel to YVR.
- **Supply –** Cherry Point is a large refinery that processes crude oil from Canadian sources and Alaska. It is connected to refined products pipelines running south to the Seattle-Tacoma region and is very well positioned to remain at production capacity. VAFFC would require that the refinery open its marine terminal and storage facilities to imported product from competitors. This would be extremely costly, but more likely denied by the refinery.
- **Pipeline risk –** An 80-kilometre pipeline involving two countries, a province, a state, and several counties and municipalities will not only result in a very expensive regulatory and permitting regime (both for construction and operation), but also result in a higher risk profile due to the nature of activities along its greater length.
- **Environmental footprint –** This option has a much larger environmental footprint compared with the proposed project, including more river, stream and wetland crossings, and a longer construction period.
- **Social impact –** The longer pipeline and varying jurisdictions will have a much greater social impact since it will affect more land and communities along the route (Delta included). It will also affect more First Nations communities whose interests must be understood and accommodated.