

## **Green Marine Participants' 2011 Results**

SHIPOWNERS	AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES	AIR EMISSIONS (SOx)	AIR EMISSIONS (NOx)	GREENHOUSE GASES	CARGO RESIDUES	OILY WATER
Algoma Central Corporation	4	4	4	3	4	5
Atlantic Towing Limited	2	5	2	2		2
Canada Steamship Lines	5	4	4	5	4	4
Canfornav Inc.	4	4	3	5	5	5
COGEMA		5	2	2		2
Fednav Ltd.	4	3	3	5	5	4
Groupe CTMA	2	5	2	2		1
Groupe Desgagnés Inc.	4	5	4	5	4	4
Island Tug and Barge Ltd. *		5	2	2		
Lower Lakes Towing Ltd.	2	2	2	2	2	2
McAsphalt Marine Transportation Ltd.	4	2	3	3		2
McKeil Marine Ltd.	3	5	3	2	2	2
Ocean Group Inc.		5	3	5		
Oceanex inc.	3	5	3	3		3
Provmar Fuels Inc.		5	3	2		
Reformar		5	2	3		2
Seaspan Marine Corporation		5	2	3		
SMIT Marine Canada Inc.		5	2	2		
Société des traversiers du Québec		5	3	3		2
Svitzer Canada Ltd. *		2	2	2		
TBS Shipping Service Inc. /Roy- mar Ship Management Inc.	3	2	2	2	2	3



## **Green Marine Participants' 2011 Results**

PORT AUTHORITIES SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY	GREENHOUSE GASES	DRY BULK HANDLING AND STORAGE	CONFLICTS OF USE	ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP
Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority *	2	1		3
Duluth Seaway Port Authority	2	2	2	2
Greater Victoria Harbour Authority	2		3	3
Halifax Port Authority *	4		2	5
Hamilton Port Authority	3		2	2
Illinois International Port District	3		3	3
Montreal Port Authority	4		5	5
Port of Milwaukee	2		2	2
Port of Valleyfield	2	2		3
Prince Rupert Port Authority	3		2	2
Quebec Port Authority	2		2	2
Saguenay Port Authority	2	2		3
Saint John Port Authority *	1	3	2	2
† Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation   Saint Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation	3,7		2,1	3,7
Sept-Îles Port Authority	3		3	5
Thunder Bay Port Authority	1			2
Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority	2	5	2	1
Toronto Port Authority	1	1	1	2
Trois-Rivières Port Authority	2		2	3
Windsor Port Authority	2		3	2

 $= \hbox{not applicable} \qquad {}^* = \hbox{New participants, i.e. participants that publish their results for the first time since they have joined the program.}$ 

<sup>† =</sup> While each Seaway corporation filed a separate self-assessment report to Green Marine, both were motivated 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 corporation.



## **Green Marine Participants' 2011 Results**

TERMINALS, STEVEDORING COMPANIES  AND SHIPYARDS	GREENHOUSE GASES	DRY BULK HANDLING AND STORAGE	CONFLICTS OF USE
Bunge of Canada Ltd.	4	3	3
Ceres Terminals Inc. *	3		
Empire Stevedoring Co. Ltd	3		3
Esso Imperial Oil (Sept-Îles) *	3		2
Federal Marine Terminals Inc.	4	5	4
IOC *	3	3	3
Les Élévateurs de Trois-Rivières Ltée	2	1	3
Logistec Corporation	4	4	3
McAsphalt Industries Ltd. (Eastern Passage, Valleyfield, Oshawa, Hamilton, Port Stanley)*	1	2	3
Mission Terminal Inc.	2	2	
Montreal Gateway Terminals Partnership	4		4
Neptune Bulk Terminals (Canada) Ltd. *	3	4	4
Norcan Petroleum Group Inc. *	3		
Porlier Express Inc.	2	2	
Rio Tinto Alcan (Port Alfred)	5	5	5
Seaspan Marine Corporation	3		3
Sterling Fuels Limited *	1	2	3
Ultramar Ltd. (Jean-Gaulin Refinery)	5		3
Valleytank Inc. *	2		

= not applicable \*= New participants, i.e. participants that publish their results for the first time since they have joined the program.