

WP 85

210#25

Zamora, Phil

From: McDonald, Derek [CEAA] [Derek.McDonald@ceaa-acee.gc.ca]
 Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2003 11:10 AM
 To: 'Mark G McLean'
 Cc: Cheryl L Benjamin; zamorap@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca; Couiter, Bill [CEAA]
 Subject: RE: Digby Neck Quarry agreement

Mark,

The Agency sees no requirement for a MOU. But given that it's a Comp Study and the Minister will have a decision to make, it would be appropriate to have something in writing that lays out the major elements of the harmonized process. From a practical perspective, this will at least ensure everyone has a common understanding of the process to be followed. I think a letter of agreement, signed by DFO (and any other RAs identified via FCR), NS and the Agency, can accomplish that.

Derek

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark G McLean [mailto:MCLEANMG@gov.ns.ca]
 Sent: April 3, 2003 09:15
 To: Derek.McDonald@ceaa-acee.gc.ca
 Cc: Cheryl L Benjamin; zamorap@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
 Subject: Digby Neck Quarry

Derek as discussed, here the letter of agreement between DFO and NSDEL for the Tusket Loadout Facility. You have the Panuke MOU (probably memorized) so let me know if you have a feel for which format would best fit this project. Obviously the wording would have to be somewhat different but I'm more interest in the format.

Phil, let me know if there is a preference at DFO if this should be more "formal" like Deep Panuke or is the Tusket letter OK. I worked with Anita on the Tusket project so you can talk to her and see how she felt it worked. Thanks.

Mark