



Global Quarry Products

*to file
Nov 13/2003
KGB*

Nova Scotia Department of Environment and Labour,
P.O. Box 697,
Halifax,
N.S.,
B3J 2T8

Nov. 11th 2003

Attention Mr. Chris Daly, Manager, Environmental assessment.

Dear Mr. Daly,

re: Whites Point Quarry and Marine Terminal

Further to our brief telephone conversation of Nov. 5th 2003 and my discussions with Mr. Jean Crepeau of CEEA on Oct. 31st 2003, with respect to the Draft Memorandum of Understanding between the two levels of government, I have the following comments:

1. We regarded the Draft Memorandum of Understanding as a reasonable document and hence did not feel the need for comment.
2. The fact that we did not comment should not be construed as a blanket endorsement of the document or of the fact that a Panel Review is required for this project.
3. We are still of the opinion noted in our meeting with Mr. Steve Chapman and officials of your Department on Aug. 29th that a satisfactory explanation of the reason behind the requirement for a Panel Review has yet to be made. We believe that it is reasonable for us to be advised of the reason for the termination of the Comprehensive Study process and the initiation of the Panel Review process.
4. We are advised by both yourself and Mr. Crepeau that comments regarding the Memorandum of Understanding are being reviewed and that these comments

Tel: 902-245-2567
Fax: 902-245-5614
Mailing Address:
General Interest:
P.O. Box 2113
Digby, NS
BOV 1A0

Billing :
Suite 282,450 LaHave Street, Unit 17
Bridgewater, NS
B4V 4A3

(presumably made by opponents of the quarry) may result in the amendment of the Memorandum of Understanding.

5. If the Memorandum of Understanding is in fact revised then we will insist on the opportunity to review and comment on the revised document.

6. It is clear that the opponents of this project have as their objective the cancellation of this project rather than the objective of ensuring that the project is carried out in an environmentally safe manner. We are not aware of any prohibition of the activity of quarrying or the operation of a marine terminal at Whites Cove and we are following and intend to continue following the various Federal and Provincial Regulations and Guidelines to ensure an environmentally safe project.

7. The Guidelines for a Panel Review Process are clearly set out and we intend to comply with them. At the same time we expect the Federal and Provincial partnership to also comply and to include the Proponent as a major component in this process. To date we are of the opinion that the Proponent has been largely ignored in the process and we have relied on the press and local gossip to inform us of the status of the process.

8. We do not have copies of the comments made with respect to the Memorandum of Understanding and we request that copies of all comments be made available to us.


9. We enclose, for your information, a document which clearly sets out the intent of the group opposing the project.

10. We were advised at the Aug. 29th 2003 meeting that the anticipated timeline for the Panel review process would be 310 days though it was not clear whether that was from June 26th 2003 or Aug. 29th 2003. We note that due to a typographical error the process is now delayed by almost four weeks.

We were also advised that a Draft Scoping Document would be available for review on Oct. 7th 2003. This date has clearly gone by the boards due to the error but we have not yet been advised of a revised date. We would appreciate receiving a new date for the Draft Scoping Document.

As we noted at the Aug. 29th 2003 meeting the Proponent has prepared what we believe to be a comprehensive EIS.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul G. Buxton'. The signature is stylized with a large loop at the top and a long horizontal stroke at the bottom.

Paul G. Buxton P.Eng.