

---

*Whites Point Quarry and Marine Terminal Project  
Joint Review Panel*

---

January 8, 2006

Mr. Paul Buxton  
Bilcon of Nova Scotia, Corporation  
P.O. Box 2113  
Digby, NS B0V 1A0

Dear Mr. Buxton:

Further to my letter of December 19, 2006, the Whites Point Quarry and Marine Terminal Joint Review Panel submits the attached 13 additional information requests on the *Revised* Project description for your response.

Yours sincerely,



Robert Fournier, Chair

**000196**

## INFORMATION REQUESTS ON THE REVISED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### IR-11

Although the revised project description discusses alternative regions where the Proponent might have identified appropriate alternative sites, it does not consider extensive areas of New England (such as the Maine coast) which have considerable potential as sources of aggregate. The Proponent is requested to discuss the potential of alternative sites (as requested in the guidelines) for the Maritimes and New England, north of New York and New Jersey.

### IR-12

Revised drawings of the project do not show connections from the access roads on the site to Highway 217 if the Whites Point Road does not become available to the Proponent. Nor does the report identify road access to the sediment disposal areas for most of the project life. The access road to the area south of the Whites Point Road cuts directly through the environmental preservation zone. The Proponent is requested to clarify proposed routing and issues related to these access roads within the site.

### IR-13

An intervener submission, presented by C. Taggart, indicated that Map 4 (page 32) was neither complete nor up to date. The Panel notes that it is unchanged in the Revised Project Description. The Proponent is requested to ensure that the map of shipping routes and designated whale watching areas is accurate.

### IR-14

The Proponent is requested to explain how erosion and run-off will be controlled on the basalt pedestal that will be created to carry the old Whites Point Road.

### IR-15

The Proponent is requested to clarify the comment presented near the bottom of page 52 regarding drainage: "An underground drainage pipe will be installed at this time for conveying any necessary surface water runoff to the coastal bog or to sediment pond 5." How does a single pipe fulfill both purposes?

### IR-16

On page 72 quarry operations are stated to involve 37 full-time job equivalents, while on page 96 the workforce is given as 34. Resolve the difference. Eight weeks during each winter will be reserved for quarry maintenance. How many full-time positions will continue during this period?

**IR-17**

Constructed wetlands can play an important role in treating effluent before it is discharged into the natural environment. They are typically constructed to achieve particular objectives; to do that they require a design that manages the flow of water effectively. The Proponent is requested to clarify the objectives and functioning of its "500 metres of lineal aquatic habitat" to explain how it differs from a conventional ditch. Describe the nature and functioning of the "discharge structure" at its terminus.

**IR-18**

On page 78 the risk of a 100 year storm is projected as "approximately 40%". On page 154, under a scenario of increasing climate change, "the 100 year return period event (115mm) in the base climate period 1961-90 is projected to recur once every 10 years by the 2050's, a reduction in the return period by a factor of about 10." The Proponent is requested to provide an estimate of risk for a 100 year storm event over the life of the project that accommodates the scenario of increasing climate change.

**IR-19**

Map SR-1 (page 104) presents an ideal turning radius for the ship. Given wind patterns and strong tidal currents that are known to exist in the area, the Panel expects that in some sea states the ship will require additional room to manoeuvre. The Proponent is requested to clarify the zone of interference the ship will need to occupy during heightened conditions when it is still possible for it to moor at the terminal. Under extreme conditions when the ship will be forced to stand off, where will it go? (What wind and tidal levels will be considered sufficiently hazardous to prevent docking?)

**IR-20**

Figure 5-R1 (page 112) shows elevations for part of the quarry at reclamation. The Proponent is requested to provide a plan view showing the projected contours of the site after reclamation is complete.

**IR-21**

On page 145 the following information request is addressed: "The proponent should identify whether these areas [sediment stockpiles] are expected to contain water. If so, mitigative measures should be identified to ensure they do not fail or overflow during periods of unusually heavy precipitation." The Proponent is requested to clarify the issue of drainage from sediment disposal areas and to explain all of the planned measures that have been developed to ensure the integrity of the dykes and berms.

**IR-22**

While the Panel accepts the Proponent's suggestion that the engineering design of the marine terminal will come later, it does require additional clarification on the specifications that will be set for the structure. Identify the extremes of wind, waves, tides, and storm surges that the terminal will be required to accommodate.

**IR-23**

The Panel requires additional specific information on the nature and number of pieces of stationary and mobile equipment to be used during the operational phase. For example, what type of crushers will be used (impact or percussion), identify their size (capacity), how many will be needed, will they be enclosed, etc? For each type of equipment provide noise levels when operating at maximum capacity.