2016 RESULTS

1

Monitoring of regulations

2

Systematic use of a defined number of best practices

3

Integration of best practices into a documented management plan and a quantitative assessment of environmental impacts 4

New technologies and reduction targets

5

Excellence and leadership

SHIP OWNERS	AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES	AIR EMISSIONS (SOx & PM)	AIR EMISSIONS (NOx)	GREENHOUSE GASES	OILY WATER	GARBAGE MANAGEMENT
Algoma Central Corporation	4	4	4	5	5	4
Atlantic Towing Limited	5	5	3	5	3	4
British Columbia Ferry Services Inc.	n.a.	3	3	3	4	2
Canada Steamship Lines	4	5	4	5	4	5
Canfornav Inc.	5	3	3	5	5	5
COGEMA	n.a.	3	3	2	3	4
Croisières AML	n.a.	3	3	3	3	2
CSL International	5	3	3	3	3	4
Fednav Limited	5	3	4	5	4	3
Groupe CTMA	2	3	2	2	2	2
Groupe Desgagnés Inc.	5	4	4	5	4	5
Ledcor Resources and Transportation LP*	n.a.	1	1	1	2	1
Lower Lakes Towing Ltd.	3	3	3	2	2	2
Marine Atlantic Inc.	n.a.	2	2	2	2	2
McAsphalt Marine Transportation Ltd.	4	3	3	3	3	3
McKeil Marine Limited	3	3	3	3	4	4
North Arm Transportation Ltd.	n.a.	3	3	2	4	3
Ocean	n.a.	4	3	4	4	2
Oceanex Inc.	3	3	3	3	5	4
Owen Sound Transportation Company	2	2	2	2	2	2
Reformar	2	3	3	3	2	3
Saam Smit Canada	n.a.	3	3	3	2	2
Seaspan ULC	n.a.	4	3	3	3	4
Société des traversiers du Québec	n.a.	3	3	3	2	2
Svitzer Canada Ltd.	n.a.	3	3	2	3	2
TBS Ship Management Inc.	3	3	3	3	3	3

n.a.: not applicable

INTERPRETATION NOTES

The term n.a. (not applicable) appears several times in the report's tables because the environmental issues addressed by the program do not necessarily apply to all participants. For example, most tugs and ferries do not discharge ballast water. An n.a. denotation could also refer to a situation in which a participant does not have full control over the operations on its premises. For example, a port cannot apply the Green Marine criteria where a terminal operator is in charge of facilities. Most port authorities oversee the leasing of port property and do not themselves operate terminals. The published results indicate each participant's self-reported and verified performance within the Green Marine program's indicators. While the program's self-evaluation is comprehensive, it is not an exhaustive assessment of all environmental matters related to a participant's maritime operations. Green Marine has not itself evaluated the environmental performance of the participating enterprises. Each participant is required to submit all of the documentation for the performance level claimed for each indicator to an external verifier every two years for verification.

^{*} New participant whose results have not yet been verified.



PORT AUTHORITIES	GREENHOUSE GASES & AIR POLLUTANTS	SPILL PREVENTION	DRY BULK HANDLING AND STORAGE	COMMUNITY IMPACTS	ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP	WASTE MANAGEMENT
Alabama State Port Authority*	1	2	2	1	2	2
Bécancour Waterfront Industrial Park	4	2	n.a.	2	4	2
Canaveral Port Authority	2	5	n.a.	2	1	2
Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority	3	5	3	2	4	2
Duluth Seaway Port Authority	5	5	4	2	5	2
Greater Victoria Harbour Authority	3	5	n.a.	5	3	3
Halifax Port Authority	3	5	n.a.	4	5	4
Hamilton Port Authority	3	3	n.a.	3	3	2
Illinois International Port District	3	2	n.a.	3	3	1
Montreal Port Authority	5	5	n.a.	5	5	3
Nanaimo Port Authority	2	2	n.a.	2	3	2
Northwest Seaport Alliance*	2	2	n.a.	2	3	2
Oshawa Port Authority	2	3	n.a.	3	2	2
Port Alberni Port Authority	1	2	n.a.	1	1	1
Port Everglades	5	2	3	2	5	2
Port of Albany	2	1	n.a.	1	2	1
Port of Corpus Christi*	1	2	1	1	1	1
Port of Gulfport	2	3	2	2	2	2
Port of Hueneme	3	5	n.a.	5	5	4
Port of Indiana - Burns Harbor	2	3	n.a.	3	2	2
Port of Milwaukee	3	2	n.a.	2	3	2
Port of New Orleans	3	3	n.a.	2	5	2
Port of Olympia*	1	2	1	1	1	1
Port of Seattle	4	4	n.a.	5	5	4
Port of Valleyfield	3	2	n.a.	2	3	2
Prince Rupert Port Authority	4	4	n.a.	5	5	3
Quebec Port Authority	5	5	n.a.	5	5	3
Saguenay Port Authority	3	5	n.a.	4	2	2
Saint John Port Authority, NB	2	2	n.a.	2	2	2
Sept-Îles Port Authority	3	3	n.a.	3	4	2
St. John's Port Authority, NL	3	3	n.a.	4	3	2
Thunder Bay Port Authority	4	2	n.a.	2	3	1
Toronto Port Authority	4	2	2	2	4	1
Trois-Rivières Port Authority	2	5	n.a.	4	3	2
Vancouver Fraser Port Authority	5	4	n.a.	5	5	3
Windsor Port Authority	2	2	n.a.	4	3	2

n.a.: not applicable

^{*} New participant whose results have not yet been verified.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY	GREENHOUSE GASES	SPILL	COMMUNITY	ENVIRONMENTAL	WASTE
	& AIR POLLUTANTS	PREVENTION	IMPACTS	LEADERSHIP	MANAGEMENT
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation / St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation †	4,1	5	4,1	5	3,3

[†] Each Seaway corporation filed an individual self-evaluation report to Green Marine and had its results separately verified, but they both opted to publish their results jointly to reflect their allied efforts in achieving environmental excellence. The published results are the weighted average of the individual results based on the number of locks managed by each Seaway corporation..

TERMINALS AND STEVEDORING COMPANIES	GHG AND AIR POLLUANTS	SPILL PREVENTION	DRY BULK Handling and Storage	COMMUNITY IMPACTS	ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP	WASTE MANAGEMENT
British Columbia Ferry Services Inc.	2	3	n.a.	2	3	2
Ceres Terminals Inc. (Baltimore, Charleston, Halifax, Houston, and Savannah)	3	5	n.a.	3	4	3
DP World Prince Rupert Inc.	3	2	n.a.	2	2	2
Empire Stevedoring Co. Ltd. (Montreal)	3	3	n.a.	3	2	2
Federal Marine Terminals Inc. (Burns Harbor, Cleveland, Hamilton, Milwaukee,	5	5	5	5	4	2
Thorold, Albany, Eastport, Port Manatee, Tampa, Lake Charles)			3		7	
Fraser Surrey Docks	5	5	5	5	4	2
G3 Canada Limited (Trois-Rivières)	3	2	2	2	3	2
G3 Canada Limited (Quebec)	4	3	3	3	3	1
GCT Global Container Terminals Inc. (GCT Bayonne)	5	5	n.a.	5	5	4
GCT Global Container Terminals Inc. (GCT Deltaport)	5	5	n.a.	5	5	4
GCT Global Container Terminals Inc. (GCT New York)	4	5	n.a.	5	5	4
GCT Global Container Terminals Inc. (GCT Vanterm)	4	5	n.a.	5	5	4
Glencore (Quebec)	3	3	5	4	4	2
Groupe Desgagnés Inc. (Relais Nordik, Sept-Îles)	3	3	n.a.	2	3	3
Iron Ore Company of Canada	3	5	5	5	4	3
Kinder Morgan Canada (Westridge Terminal)	3	3	3	3	4	3
Logistec Corporation (Montreal, Contrecoeur, Halifax, Saint John, Sydney, Trois-Rivières, Rideau Bulk, Sept-Îles, Thunder Bay, Toronto)	5	3	5	3	3	2
Marine Atlantic Inc.	2	2	n.a.	4	3	2
McAsphalt Industries Ltd. (Eastern Passage, Valleyfield, Oshawa, Hamilton, Port Stanley)	2	3	n.a.	4	3	3
Montreal Gateway Terminals Partnership	5	3	n.a.	5	5	2
Neptune Bulk Terminals (Canada) Ltd.	5	5	5	5	5	4
New Orleans Terminal LLC	2	5	n.a.	2	3	2
Norcan Petroleum Group Inc.	3	3	n.a.	2	3	2
Northern Stevedoring Company Inc. (Sept-Îles)	3	3	4	3	3	2
Pacific Coast Terminals Co. Ltd.	3	3	5	5	4	3
Pinnacle Renewable Energy Inc.	3	2	2	3	2	1
Porlier Express	3	3	n.a.	3	3	3
QSL (Anse au Foulon)	2	2	2	2	3	2
QSL (Beauport)	3	2	2	2	3	2
QSL (Bécancour)*	3	1	2	2	3	1
Richardson International (Hamilton)	5	5	5	4	4	3
Ridley Terminals Inc.	5	5	5	5	4	2
Rio Tinto (Port Alfred)	5	5	5	5	5	5
Squamish Terminals Ltd.	3	3	n.a.	5	4	2
Sterling Fuels Limited	3	5	n.a.	3	4	3
Termont Montréal Inc.	2	2	n.a.	2	2	n.a.
Tidal Coast Terminals Ltd.	3	2	2	2	2	2
Tymac Launch Service Ltd.	2	2	2	3	2	2
Valero Energy Inc. (Jean-Gaulin Refinery)	5	5	n.a.	5	3	5
Valleytank Inc.	3	4	n.a.	2	2	1
Valport Maritime Services Inc.	3	2	2	2	2	2
Waterfront Petroleum Terminal Company	1	2	1	1	1	1
West Coast Reduction Ltd.	3	5	n.a.	3	2	2
Westshore Terminals Ltd.	3	2	2	3	2	2
Yellowline Asphalt Products Limited	3	5	n.a.	5	4	2

n.a.: not applicable

 $[\]ensuremath{^{\star}}$ New participant whose results have not yet been verified.

SHIPYARDS 🔝	GHG AND AIR Polluants	SPILL PREVENTION	COMMUNITY IMPACTS	ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP	WASTE MANAGEMENT
British Columbia Ferry Services Inc.	1	2	2	2	2
Ocean Industries Inc.	3	2	2	3	1
Seaspan Shipyards and Terminals	4	4	4	4	4