Nova Stone CLC File

UNAMENDED MINUTES

Minutes of Meeting of Community Liaison Committee

Nova Stone Exporters Inc/Global Quarry Products Inc

7.00 p.m. November 21st 2002

Rossway Community Hall

In attendance:
Ms. Cindy Nesbitt, CLC Chair
Mr. Brian Cullen, CLC Member
Mr. John Ivens, CLC Member
Ms. Judith Carty, CLC Member
Ms. Christine Harnish, CLC Member
Mr. David Graham, CLC Member
Mrs. Marian Angrignon
Mr. George Gavel
Mr. Harold Rowe
Mr. Dwayne Theriault
Mrs. Linda Graham
Mr. Lawrence Outhouse
Mr. Mark Dittrick
Mr. Dwayne Hogg, Jacques Whitford
Mr. Dave MacFarlane, Jacques Whitford
Mr. Paul Buxton NSEI/GQPI
Ms. Betty MacAlpine NSEI/GQPI
Ms. Tammy Sanford NSEI/GQPI

Regrets: Mr. Mark Jeffrey, CLC Member,

Mr. Buxton introduced Mr. Hogg and Mr. MacFarlane of Jacques Whitford. He noted they had prepared a preliminary hydro-geological report and would be presenting it tonight.
Mr. MacFarlane indicated several drawings they would be using to illustrate the hydrogeology. He noted they would go through what the study involved, what was done and what their findings are.
Mr. MacFarlane noted they would talk about the available well records, the blast point and the post-quarry hydro geological conditions. He noted that he and Mr. Hogg are both hydro geologists and that hydrogeology deals with water and how it flows through the ground.
Mr. MacFarlane noted the main purpose of the preliminary study (this is called a desktop study) is to do a review of the hydrogeology of the area and provide an opinion on how the quarry might affect the water table, ground water and wells in the area. They looked at available geology and topographical reports and gathered other information.
Mr. MacFarlane noted that the first of three maps indicates where Digby Neck is located, shows the waterfront, the property with the quarry site, the North Mountain, the access road to Hwy

#217, and four bore holes. He noted bore holes were drilled to determine the geology of the property.
Mr. Hogg noted they are particularly interested in the water levels as you go over the mountain and he indicated that it is a rare opportunity to have existing holes in the ground.
Mr. MacFarlane noted the geology of the area is typical of the whole peninsula. He noted that based on records of the area and the water well logs there is a thin layer of soil over the bedrock ranging from 2 m - 15 m. The bedrock under the site is basically basalt from the North Mountain formation. He further noted that it is several hundred feet thick and it was deposited millions of years ago. There are three massive basalt flows that make up the basalt and within each of these flows there are several minor flows. Between them there are discontinuities where they suspect a lot of the water moves through the bedrock, i.e.: through the zones where different layers lie over top of each other as well as through fractures and faults.
Mr. Hogg indicated the flow of the basalt on the map. He further noted that several wells had been drilled through the basalt for fish plants.
Mr. MacFarlane noted the second drawing is a geological cross section and it illustrates four boreholes as projected onto that section. He noted that the map is an exaggerated view and indicated the mountain, Hwy #217, the Bay of Fundy, St. Mary's Bay, the position of the quarry property and the proposed quarry site with the 800-metre setback. He noted where the quarry could go in the future.
Mr. MacFarlane noted that the water in the rock comes from rain and snowmelt. He noted that 10 – 40% of the moisture goes into the ground and this builds up the ground water table.
Mr. MacFarlane noted that the ground water is constantly moving to the low point and they have shown the ground water divide that divides the ground water flow direction across the peninsula. He indicated arrows showing how the water moves through the bedrock and towards the Bay. He noted that within the basalt there are discontinuities (zones) between different basalt flows and there is a lot of water moving along these zones. He further noted that wells have probably penetrated these zones and when a driller drills a well that gets a lot of water this is where most of the water comes from. There are a number of these flows and they are hard to map because they are random and the thickness varies.
Mr. Hogg noted that excess water might seep out of the side of the mountain in streams.
It was asked where does the water actually go.
Mr. Hogg replied there is no room in the cracks for the excess water so it comes out the sides.
Mr. MacFarlane noted they were not successful in getting water levels from all four bore holes as some had been blocked with rock. He noted they did obtain a water sample and levels from the deepest hole at the top of the mountain.
Mr. Hogg noted the drawing indicating the boreholes is called a conceptual model.
Mr. MacFarlane noted you can distinctively hear water running in one of the boreholes.
Mr. Hogg noted that the conceptual model illustrates where the water is coming from and where it is going.
Mr. MacFarlane noted that there are three massive basalt flows with discontinuities between. He noted two of the boreholes as interpreted by the geologist intersected discontinuities between flows and these are plotted on the map.
Mr. MacFarlane noted the third drawing is a plan view with details of the ground water flow direction, it does not include topography. He noted the ground water divide and the precipitation flows to each side of the mountain. He indicated the quarry and the ground water that flows towards it.

Mr. Hogg noted that the ground water divide is the point where the water table is the highest and that the water table moves up and down with seasonal changes.
Mr. MacFarlane indicated that this is a summary overview of the ground water flow as they see it based on the information available. He noted that NSDOEL has a database of water well records from registered well drillers. Drillers are required to submit these records to NSDOEL. A review of these records was done in order to determine how water wells were constructed, the depth, and the average yield in the area of Mink Cove and Little River. The 47 records found are a small percentage of the actual number of wells. Wells prior to 1965 were not registered and dug wells are not included in the registry. He further noted the depths of these wells varies from 60' – 900', the fisheries are using the deeper wells.
Mr. MacFarlane noted the average demand is 1/2 – 1 gallon per minute for a typical household.
Mr. Hogg noted that the average use per house is 200 – 250 gallons per day.
Mr. MacFarlane noted that according to the drill logs they found the yield of these recorded wells varies from .2 – 65 gallons per minute with a median yield of 7 gallons per minute.
Mr. MacFarlane noted that in respect to the houses closest to the quarry, they have plotted 19 properties that lie within 1 – 1 1/2 km of the quarry. He noted they are along Hwy #217 and Little River Road and in looking at the 47 records and these 19 properties they found 5 NSDOEL well water records that they were able to match. He further noted that these records are registered according to the original property owner.
Mr. MacFarlane noted of those 5 records the yield is 1 – 10 gallons per minute.
Mr. Hogg noted that for an Environmental Assessment the normal practice is to do a desktop study with the next step being field study, interviews and a well assessment.
Mr. MacFarlane noted that some houses could possibly share wells.
Mr. MacFarlane noted this summarizes what they have done, what they found, the hydrogeology and the well information. He asked if there were any questions.
Mr. Ivens asked if it would be possible to see this on the topographical map.
Mr. Hogg indicated the topographical map they had previously discussed.
Mr. MacFarlane noted on the topographical map that the ground water divide is at the top of the mountain and all of the homes are on the other side of the ground water divide from the quarry.
Mr. Ivens asked if there is a difference in depth depending on how high up you are.
Mr. Hogg replied yes and that the majority of wells are at approximately the same elevation.
Mr. MacFarlane proceeded to explain three possible effects of the quarry and he noted that these would be worse case scenarios. He indicated that the quarry face will cut across the ground water table and what may happen is the water will seep out of the face and the water table will change, it may drop lower and shift in that area. He noted that the water will come out naturally and there will be a lot of seepage, especially in the spring and this will have to be controlled. Overall the water table will start to shift and this will cause the ground water divide to change in direction and move closer to the highway.
Mr. MacFarlane noted it is their opinion that there will be little impact on the wells 800 metres away, within this range it is difficult to say but they may not notice any impact. He noted that some wells are connected to springs, which come from very near by and that flow rate tends to decrease seasonally and these wells will need to be identified.
Mr. MacFarlane noted the second effect of the quarry would be the blasting effect. This is based on the distance of the wells from the quarry. There will be less seismic energy transmitted through the basalt or siltation of wells that are further away. These wells may experience a temporary loss or the quality could drop off but it should be short term and minimal. An option

would be to put in a filter system or buy water but they do not see a big effect. He noted that with most studies it is hard to measure the effects on wells that are quite a distance away. Generally wells producing 1/2 gallon per minute where blasting occurs may increase in yield but if the water flow is adequate no one would notice. There should be no effect on dug wells.
Mr. MacFarlane noted that the basalt is generally massive but that the geological report indicated that the bottom portion of the upper flow may be columnar.
Mr. MacFarlane noted the third effect of the quarry is acid drainage. He noted they do not think this will be a problem because basalt does not typically have a lot of sulfite and this is a significantly important factor for the environment. He further noted that one water sample had been obtained and the quality was very good. He further noted that generally studies done by Nova Scotia Department of Mines and Environment (NSDOEL) indicate ground water from basalt show better quality water throughout the province except for the deeper wells but he did not think there were that many in the area.
Mr. Outhouse noted that there are several deep wells used for the hatchery in Mink Cove; these are not used for drinking water.
Mr. MacFarlane noted two main recommendations for monitoring the wells:

1) A field survey should be conducted on the wells near the quarry and should include details of the wells, samples and quality of the well water.
2) Monitoring of wells should be established between the quarry site and the nearby houses (3 locations were noted on the maps).

Mr. MacFarlane noted that the quarry should move generally away from the residents and it will always stay on the other side of the ground water divide.
Mr. Hogg noted from the geological report that the upper flow at the site is medium dark and the basalt is virtually un-weathered. The bottom 10 meters of the upper flow is fracturing and there may be columnar joining at the bottom. There are vertical pathways and horizontal fractures that slowly move the water down. He noted that it is difficult for geologists to see these fractures and map them.
Mr. MacFarlane noted the conclusion of their preliminary assessment and asked if there were any other questions.
Ms. Nesbitt asked to what extend would they recommend the field study on the wells.
Mr. MacFarlane replied there are 19 residents close to the quarry that would raise the most concerns and that a monitoring barrier should be provided so that what happens there happens in that area first. He noted that typical readings of these houses should be taken and the well design should be noted. He further noted that it is very rare when well concerns are identified.
Mr. Outhouse asked how do you determine what the water table is in solid rock.
Mr. MacFarlane replied that a level had been identified in the upper borehole but that in this type of basalt formation there may be perched water tables. Evidence of a perched water table was noted in one of the boreholes where water could be heard cascading from an upper level to a lower level.
Mr. Outhouse asked where does the basalt become columnar.
Mr. MacFarlane replied that it appeared that the bottom portion of the upper flow may be columnar. However, Mr. MacFarlane further noted that the basalt dips towards the Bay of Fundy at approximately 5° so that the level of the columnar basalt gets deeper towards the Bay of Fundy.
Mr. Buxton noted that of the 4 boreholes that had been drilled for geological sampling, the lower three had been vandalized and will need to be re-drilled in order to collect more details.

Mr. Outhouse noted his experience with the fish hatchery wells at 80 gallons per minute and said that this water comes from below the basalt and salt leaches into the water from St. Mary's Bay. He noted the hydro-geologist for this work was Bill Shaw from Antigonish.
Mr. Hogg replied that granite runs under the Annapolis Valley at great depth, covered by the Wolfville sandstone formation and the Blomidon formation, which is fractured shale.
Mr. Outhouse asked if the water in Little River comes from the basalt and if so is there not a possible source in or on the other side of mountain.
Mr. MacFarlane replied that some of the recharge would come from the mountain.
Mr. Outhouse asked if it would be difficult to say what would happen.
Mr. MacFarlane replied yes but that on a mega scale they would see little effect while on a smaller scale quarries generally reduce the water table.
Mr. Outhouse asked what if it is columnar basalt.
Mr. MacFarlane replied that if the bottom portion of the upper basalt flow is columnar it would be closer to the surface to the east side and there is still a watershed divide on the mountain.
Mr. Outhouse asked where most of the columnar basalt is.
Mr. Hogg replied along the old road and he noted that the best wells in Little River are on the old road and some of these wells get 60 gallons per minute. He noted that there is a major fault there and that the water there is very good.
Mr. Ivens asked if it is siphoned in.
Mr. Hogg replied that throughout Digby Neck there are a number of mega faults that cause offsets.
Mr. Ivens asked how this was determined.
Mr. Hogg replied that they had used older geology maps dating from 1963.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if the fish plant in Little River is likely to be affected.
Mr. Hogg replied that they would probably not be affected based on distance from the quarry and the fact that the quarry will be moving to the north.
Mrs. Graham noted that it is her understanding that the Proponent will monitor the houses closest to the quarry and if these houses experience problems in the water someone will recommend a pre-blast survey.
Mr. Buxton replied that this is a preliminary report and it is his understanding that the consultants have recommended that the Proponent carry out a pre-blast survey on the wells in order to start at a base point. He noted he is unsure as to whether this will be done before the first small test blast is carried out but if that is the recommendation of the consultants then the Proponent will establish a monitoring regime for the 19 wells that may be more at risk than any other wells. He further noted that over a period of time if a problem is found and if the Proponent caused the problem then the Proponent will mitigate the problem by digging new wells, deeper wells or replace the water source.
Mr. Buxton is glad that Mrs. Graham raised this point because he is aware that a very large amount of opposition to the quarry from this immediate area is because of concerns about water supply, firstly yield and secondly water quality. He noted that he would encourage anyone who is concerned about the water supply to ask questions while the hydro-geologists are here because it is a major concern in the area. He further noted that whatever recommendations are made by the consultants they will be followed by the Proponent.
Mrs. Graham stated that she does not live as close but she has heard other people talking and noted this concern and she is asking if they start losing either the quality or quantity of the water

will that problem be addressed immediately or is it going to be something that will not be dealt with until three years from now.
Mr. Buxton replied that the Proponent has made it very clear at several meetings and is prepared to enter into whatever understanding that is required either with the individual home owners or a regulatory agency. A review of the hydro-geological report has not indicated that water quality is an issue because the water is going to go the other way from the quarry.
Mrs. Graham asked if she lived in the area would the Proponent monitor her well.
Mr. Buxton replied yes, it would be in the Proponent's best interest to do so.
Mrs. Graham asked if she would like to have her well monitored would this cost anything.
Mr. Buxton replied no and added that there is no guarantee that any of the 19 residences that are at the highest risk will permit monitoring of their wells.
Mrs. Graham replied that she is saying it would be to her advantage if she were a local resident.
Mr. Buxton replied that is correct. He noted that recently Mr. Fred Trask (closest house to the quarry) had been asked if he would permit monitoring of his property and he replied yes. He further noted whether anyone else will do so is unknown at this time but those who do will have far better evidence should anything occur. Secondly, the Proponent will not do the monitoring of the wells because it could be seen as a conflict of interest and thirdly the Proponent will pay for the monitoring.
Mrs. Graham asked is it going to cost me to have my well monitored.
Mr. Buxton replied no, but if someone from two miles away asked to have their well monitored and the consultants advised that there isn't any possibility the well will be effected then the Proponent would probably not monitor that well. He noted that the wells that are identified as being a potential risk will be monitored and the people involved will get a copy of those records.
Mr. Buxton noted that there is some subjectivity in this because your well produces different amounts of water at different times of the year and a problem is only evident when it drops below the capacity that you are using. I.e.: if you are using 7 gallons per minute and the water drops to 5 gallons per minute there is still sufficient water capacity.
Mrs. Graham noted that quality is an issue.
Mr. Buxton agreed and noted that water samples will be taken and compared with the quality of the sample from the year before and if there is no difference then clearly there is no quality problem.
It was asked if there were going to be any problems with the wells would it occur in year 15 – 20 of the project not in the first or second year.
Mr. MacFarlane replied yes, this is why they are suggesting monitoring points in between the houses so that they can start gathering data now to gain much better control over it. He noted that because wells are used at different times and amounts it is hard to get stable water level and they recover at different times of the day.
Mr. Theriault noted that he lives in Little River; he agrees that the water will not cross the mountain or that it will affect the people on the south side.
Mr. MacFarlane noted the first recommendation was to do baseline sampling of all wells as noted on the map and identify wells that could be more susceptible and recommend further monitoring for those wells. He noted that dug wells unless they were quite close to the quarry would not be monitored. He further noted that from the 19 he is not saying they would all be monitored on a regular basis for quality but that they should get a snapshot of the wells now before anything happens.

Mr. Hogg noted that these surveys generally involve the same procedures regardless of whether it's a highway, quarry or pipeline. He noted that a technician will have a questionnaire asking the type of well, depth, driller (may match it to a drill log), if there has been problems with the well, a sample from the tap is analyzed for general chemistry, total coliform and bacteria. He noted that these parameters allow them to assess the condition of the well and a report would go to the homeowner.

Mr. Outhouse asked how much mineral chemistry of the water would be done. He noted that when mineral chemistry changes this tells you something has happened to the source of your water.

Mr. Hogg replied that the chemistry is referred to as a general chemistry metal scan and this provides all of the parameters and this analysis provides a baseline.

Mr. Buxton noted that the Proponent has taken baseline samples of water from streams coming off the mountain and seawater since May 2002. He noted high levels of coliform present in the bay but not in the streams. This information is available and the CLC has reviewed it.

Mr. Outhouse asked if Mr. Buxton meant the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. Buxton replied yes, the salt water.

Mr. Outhouse asked if everything is basically the same everywhere in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. Hogg noted that total coliform bacteria is naturally occurring but fecal chloroform can depend on how deep the well is and temperatures.

Mr. Buxton asked if there were any other questions or concerns because this is a very critical issue for residents of the area. He noted that there will be other opportunities to ask questions.

Mr. Outhouse noted if something happens to the water he does not see where drilling a deeper well will have much effect and mitigation is very unlikely to be effective.

Mr. Hogg replied that he thinks Mr. Outhouse is referring to a catastrophic loss of water or salt water intersecting a major water bearing zone. He noted this is not likely to happen but it would be a catastrophic loss and mitigation in that case is typically to provide a deeper water supply.

Mr. Outhouse asked if in fact there is columnar basalt present, how close is it and the long-term effects of continued blasting and possibly opening seams in the columnar basalt that would allow salt water into the wells.

Mr. MacFarlane replied that they are proposing monitoring of wells.

Mr. Hogg replied this would be an early warning.

Mr. Outhouse asked if they were speaking of solid basalt but noted that columnar basalt would be susceptible to shockwaves on the existing seams and they may temporarily find more water in the wells because they opened up the seams. He asked where do you go from the solid basalt to the columnar basalt, is it somewhere in the mountain, where does it end.

Mr. Buxton replied that we know according to the drill log that at 66 metres below the top borehole the columnar basalt was intercepted.

Mr. Hogg replied that it dips deeper as it goes north.

Mr. Outhouse asked if they are saying if you look at the map that sulfite is on top of the columnar basalt and according to the geologist it would be the lower 3rd of the upper flow. He asked if the mountain is solid then the columnar is probably over St. Mary's Bay underneath. He noted that this is still a concern because chances are that Little River is sitting on columnar basalt and would be susceptible to the shock of the blasting.

Mr. Hogg replied they are looking at a conceptual model and he indicated the columnar basalt area on the south side of Little River and it goes deeper farther north but under the quarry it is 20 – 30 metres below the quarry.

Mr. Outhouse replied the concern is whether it's a real concern or not. He asked will the blasting energy effect the columnar rock and at what distance.
Mr. Buxton replied the level permitted cannot exceed 12.5 millimeters per second peak particle velocity. He noted at 1120 meters from the blast size the Proponent has calculated the peak particle velocity to be 1 millimeter per second and it will clearly be less than that at 1 - 1 ½ km. He further noted at 8% of the permitted maximum peak particle velocity this is minimal and he feels it will have little effect on Little River.
Mr. Outhouse noted that he would like these gentlemen to address this issue.
Mr. Hogg replied that one of their engineers could address this. He asked if the issue is what is the potential displacement in the vicinity of Little River due to the size of the blast at the quarry at 1 millimeter per second and is that or is that not a concern.
Mr. Buxton replied that the Proponent is restricted on the size of blast at this particular site because of the 1998 DFO guidelines and depending upon the distance from fish habitat or spawning grounds and depending upon the bottom of the Bay of Fundy (sand, silt, bare rock) the maximum charge per delay is mandated in the guidelines and those guidelines are in the quarry permit. He noted that a typical quarry blast where there are no restrictions is 1000 pounds per delay and our limit is less than a 100 pounds per delay under the DFO guidelines.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.
Mr. Buxton asked if everyone had a comfort level with these findings apart from the questions asked by Mr. Outhouse.
Ms. Harnish noted that the consultants had provided a good presentation.
Mr. Theriault asked how deep will the quarry go, will it go down to sea level.
Mr. Buxton replied no and that the permit does not permit the Proponent to go below sea level or below the water table at the bottom of the mountain. Any change would require an amendment to the permit. He further noted the Proponent will probably create a slight slope back from the edge towards the face of the quarry to deal with any high unexpected runoff that may come from springs or heavy rainfall and this will give the Proponent a chance to contain it and lead to in a civilized fashion down to the sedimentation pond.
Mr. Buxton noted that this is basically what will happen in the set up.
Mr. Buxton expressed his thanks to Mr. MacFarlane and Mr. Hogg for coming to the meeting.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any questions arising from the minutes of October 24, 2002.
It was decided that the minutes of October 24, 2002 required further review by the committee members and any questions would be tabled until the next committee meeting.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any new questions.
It was asked if the government has guidelines in place for the size of blast, how close to wells, or whether it will be sloped at certain angle.
Mr. Buxton responded that because the quarry is adjacent to fish habitat the Proponent must follow the guidelines established by DFO. The permit issued for the 4 HA quarry clearly indicates that blasting must be carried out in accordance with the DFO guidelines and it is assumed that a permit for a larger quarry would also require adherence to the DFO guidelines. Essentially, these guidelines set out the maximum size of the charge per delay based upon the distance of the charge from fish habitat. Another thing that has to be considered is what sort of bottom the water has whether it's solid rock, sand, silt, etc. In order to ensure that other guidelines such as the concussion guideline are met Proponent intends to conduct a small test blast to determine whether all the parameters set out in the terms and conditions of the permit are being adhered to. In terms of the quarry slope there are several considerations. One would be the

guidelines set out by Occupational Health and Safety Regulations. Secondly, the ability to rehabilitate the quarry site in a manner acceptable to the Provincial Government would need to be taken into account.
Mrs. Graham asked what is in the Federal guidelines that will ensure that the reconstruction of the site will occur. She noted that it is her understanding that the government does not have anyway to monitor that this is done.
Mr. Buxton responded that the Provincial Government does have a mechanism in place to ensure that site rehabilitation takes place. The process is based upon a rehabilitation plan being approved by the Provincial Government and payment by the Proponent to ensure that the rehabilitation takes place. For example, with respect to the permitted 4 HA quarry the Proponent has paid $25,000, an initial payment, and is required to submit a detailed rehabilitation plan for the 4 HA site within one year, by April 30, 2003,of the permit being issued. The Provincial Government will examine the rehabilitation plan and if it is approved will assess the value of the remediation and the Proponent must then pay to the government this amount either in the form of cash or bond. If at the end of the quarry operation the Proponent does not remediate the Provincial Government has the money to do so.
Mrs. Graham asked whether for a 4 or for a 400 HA quarry the money was given to the government.
Mr. Buxton responded that either cash or a bond is provided to the government. A question at a previous meeting asked what does the government do with the money. Mr. Buxton noted that he couldn't say but that it is presumably set aside for cleanup. He noted that in the past there probably have been problems where people said they would clean up and didn't or closed a quarry and walked away and the government did not have the money in hand to remediate. Under the present strategy the government has the money in hand so either the Proponent remediates or the government does it with the Proponent's money.
Mr. Theriault noted that he is a sea urchin fisherman and fishes in that area. He asked how much run off or dirty water will come from the quarry because it could effect visibility along the shore. He noted that when they dive along the shore clean water is needed in order to see.
Mr. Buxton noted that water containing a high level of particulates is not permitted to run off from the quarry site into the bay. He noted that essentially the closed circuit system will be applied. Further the run off from the entire quarry operation will be directed into a sedimentation pond where the particulates will settle out and only clean water will be permitted to run off into the Bay. From time to time the sediments from the wash pond and the sedimentation pond will be cleaned out and placed in the sediment holding area on the site for eventual sale.
Mr. Buxton further noted that the water discharged to the bay must be monitored weekly and the results of the monitoring forwarded to the NSDOEL.
Mr. Buxton noted about White's Cove that most of the area bottom is bare rock and if any sediment appears in the Bay at that point they will know where it came from.
Mr. Theriault replied that his only concern is with visibility.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.
It is noted that Mr. Outhouse left the meeting and Mr. Buxton welcomed Mr. Mark Dittrick.
Mr. Dittrick asked for the hydro-geological report.
Mr. Buxton responded that a preliminary report had been produced by Jacques Whitford Associates and that it had just been presented to the committee.
Mr. Dittrick asked if there was a summary of the preceding presentation.

Mr. Buxton responded that there would be a summary of questions and answers attached to the minutes.
Mr. Dittrick noted he had been invited to attend the meeting and did not wish anyone to think he was barging in. He noted that he had been called by Mr. Buxton's office and asked whether he would attend the meeting.
Mr. Buxton noted that he had understood that the Rev. Dickinson had basically said that there was no information getting out with respect to the quarry and that no one was allowed to attend the CLC meetings.
Mr. Dittrick replied that he did not think that was true.
Mr. Buxton replied that that was the information that came to him so he thought it appropriate that both the Rev. Dickinson and Mr. Dittrick were specifically invited to attend this meeting.
Mr. Dittrick asked for the source of the information i.e., what the press release had said.
Mr. Buxton noted it was in a press release that this was a secret process i.e., the CLC committee meetings and that no one was allowed to come. He noted that it was felt that since there was a meeting tonight we would make it clear that everyone was welcome to attend.
Ms. Nesbitt referred to the Daily News article and quoted Rev. Dickinson.
Mr. Dittrick noted that he had glanced at the previous minutes and noted that Miss McArthy had attended the meeting and had asked who represents the company and that she wanted to deal with the company itself. Miss McArthy was told that Mr. Buxton represents the company and that she would have to deal with Mr. Buxton.
Mr. Dittrick noted that he did not think that there was total misinterpretation in the article because if anyone wants to deal with other principals of the company or other individuals involved with the project they are not able to do so. I.e. that Mr. Buxton is the one they have to talk to and that basically they cannot get beyond Mr. Buxton. He further noted that he thinks that the article has been misinterpreted to say that these meetings are closed and secret and no one is allowed to come to the meetings. He personally did not read that into the article.
Mr. Buxton responded that he had heard from a number of sources that no information is being given out and accordingly he thought it appropriate that the Rev. Dickinson and Mr. Dittrick be specifically invited to the next meeting. He thanked Mr. Dittrick for coming.
Ms. Harnish asked if there had been a notice of this meeting posted.
Ms. Nesbitt replied yes, it had been posted at Centreville Garage, Little River Trading Post.
Mrs. MacAlpine noted that the notice was posted at the office in Digby.
Mr. Buxton noted that it was asked at the previous meeting if the CLC could meet with the hydro geologist and Mr. Buxton had replied that he would arrange that for tonight's meeting.
It was asked where is the rock going to be loaded.
Mr. Buxton replied in White's Cove.
It was asked if there is going to be a permanent wharf there.
Mr. Buxton replied possibly three dolphins with a ship loader going out to the center dolphin.
It was asked if it would be moved or if it will be there year round.
Mr. Buxton replied the dolphins and ship loader will be permanent structures on 36" pipe piles, socket piled into the rock. He noted it will not be a solid finger wharf going out or across, it will be three individual dolphins, the center being 50' by 50' at the top, the other two with 25' by 25' tops. The water flow will be maintained inside these around the cove. There will be piers out to them to support the conveyor that goes out to the ship loader.
Ms. Nesbitt asked how close is the Proponent to finalizing the design of the terminal.

Mr. Buxton replied the conceptual phase possibly within one week, at which time the Proponent would be making application to Navigable Waters.
It was asked how far out into the bay will this go.
Mr. Buxton replied about 600', plus or minus.
It was asked if this is about 20 fathom of water.
Mr. Buxton replied yes, about 46' is needed at low tide. He noted that the ship draws, depending on how much rock is put on, approximately 42', a safety factor is required, 20' tide and the dolphins need to be high enough out of the water that the ship loader can load the ship which makes the dolphin (pipe pile) approximately 85' off bottom.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if the test blasts have been scheduled.
Mr. Buxton replied no. The area in question would be approximately 60' x 40' in the first outcropping of basalt from the flat quarry floor, approximately 40' up where it is virtually bare basalt at the top with a hole depth of 24' at front (west side) and 29' at the back. The load per delay will be approximately 45kg/100 pounds per hole for approximately 56 holes, a total charge of 5600 pounds. The Proponent is hoping to get the blast off before Christmas but he noted there is no urgency to do this. They would like the information to confirm all the calculations on the blast effects. There is no exact date. He further noted that he had promised at a previous meeting of the CLC that anyone who wanted to attend the blast that they could come and stand at various monitoring stations, everyone will know the time it will be scheduled for.
Mr. Dittrick asked if the exact location is noted on the site plan.
Mr. Buxton replied yes.
Mr. Dittrick asked if he could obtain a copy of that.
Mr. Buxton replied that a copy can be made available to Ms. Nesbitt, the chair.
Mr. Dittrick asked if he could obtain a copy of that.
Ms. Nesbitt replied yes.
Mr. Buxton replied that the blast will take place within the 4-hectare site.
Mr. Dittrick asked if this would be within the new or the old boundary.
Mr. Buxton asked if Mr. Dittrick is referring to the 4 HA quarry.
Mr. Dittrick replied yes, and asked is there a new boundary.
Mr. Buxton replied no.
Mr. Dittrick asked if there is another boundary.
Mr. Buxton asked for the 4 HA quarry.
Mr. Dittrick replied yes and asked how far away from the house sites it is.
Mr. Buxton replied that he had just given the plan to the hydro-geologist and he can't say at this time.
Mr. Dittrick noted that he has seen 2 sites for the same basic location with different boundaries.
Mr. Buxton replied that there may have been very minor modifications of the boundaries but the registered plan is available from NSDOEL and indicates when the final plan for the 4 HA quarry was registered.
Mr. Dittrick replied that he has seen a different plan than the original as far as the boundaries are concerned.
Mr. Buxton replied that there is only one plan that has been registered with the NSDOEL.
Mr. Dittrick asked where would the other plan have come from.
Mr. Buxton replied he is unsure of what plan Mr. Dittrick is speaking of. He noted that in the permit there is a requirement to establish by legal survey the boundaries of the 4 HA site. He further noted that this was done.

Mr. Dittrick asked if there is a copy of that plan.
Mr. Buxton replied he had just given the plan to the Jacques Whitford representatives. He noted that it has been presented to the CLC.
Mr. Dittrick asked if Mr. Buxton has a copy of the original and the slightly revised plan and can he obtain a copy of both of them.
Mr. Buxton noted the modification from the original may be approximately 10' and that there is only one plan registered.
Mr. Dittrick asked what is the general shape of that.
Mr. Buxton replied it is generally a rectangle shape and he referred to the large-scale map.
Mr. Dittrick asked what does the square represent.
Mr. Buxton replied that this is a concrete pad.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.
Ms. Harnish asked if the minutes were being posted on the web.
Ms. Sanford replied that she had provided copies of the minutes to the Municipality of Digby for their website.
Mr. Ivens noted that only the approved minutes are being posted.
Mr. Dittrick noted that Barry Moody had done the cultural study. He noted his surprise to find that Mr. Moody had a relationship with Mr. Buxton.
Mr. Buxton replied that Mr. Dittrick may be surprised to learn of this relationship but he and Dr. Moody had been partners in Delta Four, they had consulted in matters regarding Annapolis Royal, Upper Clements Theme Park and on two personal projects. He further noted that Dr. Moody is a personal friend and that this is no secret.
Mr. Dittrick replied this is okay.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if Mr. Rowe had any questions.
Mr. Rowe replied that he is an observer at the meeting but that he is curious about the questions being raised by Mr. Dittrick pertaining to the site boundary differences and the questions in regards to the integrity of Mr. Buxton. He noted that this is an open meeting.
Mr. Dittrick replied that he is not questioning Mr. Buxton's integrity.
Mr. Rowe replied this is what he has observed.
Mr. Dittrick replied that he thought people were unhappy and uncomfortable with his presence.
Mr. Buxton noted that these meetings are so that questions may be asked and issues arising may be dealt with at the next meeting.
Ms. Nesbitt asked at what stage is the economic study.
Mr. Buxton replied over the next few days they will establish the cost of the ship loader and terminal and this will complete the background information necessary to complete the study.
Mr. Dittrick asked who is doing the environmental study.
Mr. Buxton replied there are 15 sections to the environmental assessment. Geologist, John Lisek, Pennsylvania; Archeologist, Charles Watrall; Cultural, Dr. Barry Moody; Aboriginal, Confederation of Mainland Mi'kmaq; Botanical, Ruth Hewell, George Alliston; Marine Ecology, Mike Brylinsky; Marine Mammals, Dalhousie University, etc.
Mr. Dittrick asked who is handling the information regarding marine mammals.
Mr. Buxton replied that David Kern is responsible for this aspect.
Mr. Dittrick asked if he could speak with Mr. Kern regarding this.
Mr. Buxton replied yes.
Mr. Dittrick asked if Mr. Buxton would provide a list of the consultants involved.
Mr. Buxton noted this information is available in previous minutes.

Mr. Dittrick asked if he could get a list without going through the minutes.
Mr. Buxton replied that Mr. Dittrick would need to request this information from the chair.
Mr. Dittrick asked if the office in Digby could provide this information.
Mr. Buxton noted Global Quarry Inc. is a private corporation and that the information can be provided through the Community Liaison Committee.
Ms. Nesbitt noted that information provided at the CLC meetings is based on fact; the committee asks questions and obtains answers to questions asked. She noted that she did not understand why there would be a problem reviewing the minutes for the requested information.
Mr. Dittrick replied that he had not reviewed all of the minutes.
Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent has provided the CLC with information provided by the consultants. He noted that the raw documents cannot be given to the government as is. The raw data is only a third of the process dealing with impact and mitigation. He further noted that every element is looked at for short/long term and positive/negative impacts.
Mr. Buxton noted that the environmental assessment process is under his direction and he will sign the Registration of Undertaking. He noted that there are a lot of people involved and the best people have been hired.
Mr. Dittrick asked if the Environmental Assessment application is for the larger quarry.
Mr. Buxton replied that is correct and noted that it is not a requirement for a 4 hectare quarry. He noted the Environmental Assessment is part of the process of filing for the Registration of Undertaking and the information that is included is prepared by the Proponent and will be rejected by NSDOEL if they are not satisfied with it.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.
Mr. Rowe suggested people should look through the minutes.
Ms. Nesbitt noted that professionals are providing the information.
Mr. Dittrick replied that he does not have a list and would like a list of the various consultants.
Mr. Ivens replied they are noted in the minutes.
Ms. Harnish asked who Mr. Dittrick is.
Mr. Dittrick replied he is the Atlantic director of Sierra Canada.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if Mr. Dittrick would have any information that would assist the CLC to make a more balanced appraisal.
Mr. Dittrick replied feel free to formally ask.
Ms. Nesbitt advised that she will ask for a list of the consultants engaged.
Mr. Buxton replied it will be attached to minutes.
Mrs. Graham noted that she heard discussion of an old cemetery on the site and asked where that information came from, when was it discovered. She noted that approximately 10 years ago she did an inventory of cemeteries and did not come across any cemetery in White's Cove.
Mr. Buxton replied to the best of his knowledge the Proponent heard 5 months ago that there was possibly a cemetery on site. He noted after some investigation it was concluded there was not a cemetery located on the property but people have maintained that graves are on site. Miss McArthy has stated that she has evidence and we have asked her to provide us a copy but we have not received that.
Mr. Buxton noted that there is a procedure to follow on land if graves are uncovered, the coroner is called and a report is made.
Ms. Nesbitt asked Mrs. Graham in what capacity did she perform the cemetery inventory.
Mrs. Graham replied a grant had been given to areas to locate cemeteries, gather information from stones and plot what the churches had on file. She noted that this was done for the museum.

Mr. Buxton asked Mrs. Graham if she found any cemeteries in White's Cove.
Mrs. Graham replied no and that Archer Turnbull asked if there were any hidden on the Neck but no one could tell her any information. She went through the library microfiche of church burials and found one that was located in Joggin Bridge. She further noted she does not recall any in White's Cove and she had inquired in the community but no one knew where it was and some had never heard of White's Cove.
Mr. Buxton replied that there has been no evidence of graves or a cemetery found on site.
It was asked why there would be when there was a community cemetery available.
Mr. Dittrick asked if it is the procedure at this point to do more archeological study on site.
Mr. Buxton replied that the archeological study has not been completed.
Mr. Dittrick asked where the study stands.
Mr. Buxton replied it is 50 – 60% complete.
Mr. Dittrick asked what the first 60% entailed and the last 40%.
Mr. Buxton replied the first part of the cultural survey is to do a reconnaissance and the second part is a class C archeological survey. He noted that they have responded to individual questions from the CLC in regards to a cemetery on site as per newspaper claims.
Mr. Dittrick asked if they are looking to test blast before the permit for the wharf is received.
Mr. Buxton replied they are not tied together.
Mr. Dittrick asked when does the Canadian Environmental Assessment kick in.
Mr. Buxton replied possibly a week from receipt of the application.
Mr. Dittrick noted when you make an application they will require an assessment because you're blasting on site and he asked how long will this take. He asked do you intend to blast before Christmas.
Mr. Buxton replied that this has nothing to do with the wharf.
Mr. Dittrick asked do you intend to blast before the Canadian Environmental Assessment.
Mr. Buxton replied yes.
Mr. Dittrick asked before the archeological study is completed.
Mr. Buxton replied yes.
Mr. Dittrick asked how much of an archeological study has been done on site.

Mr. Buxton replied that a preliminary archaeological reconnaissance and a preliminary cultural report had been completed and that further extensive archaeological work was currently underway.
Mr. Dittrick asked if there will be blasting in that vicinity. I.e. of the cellar holes.
Mr. Buxton replied no.
Mr. Dittrick asked where will blasting take place in respect to the cellar holes.
Mr. Buxton replied 200 – 300 meters.
Mr. Dittrick asked if there is an overlap view available.
Mr. Buxton replied not at this stage.
Mr. Dittrick asked could they be made available.
Mr. Buxton replied it will be the same scale, digitized on the same base drawing.
Mr. Dittrick asked if a digitized form is available can it be superimposed over the cellar holes and blasting area.
Mr. Buxton replied no it cannot be overlapped.
Mr. Dittrick asked why it cannot be overlapped.
Mr. Buxton replied that it is bare rock in that area and there is no relevance.

Mr. Dittrick asked does the plan show where the cellar holes are on the map.
Mr. Buxton replied they are not plotted on the map at this time
Mr. Dittrick replied he is confused about this.
Mr. Buxton replied it is easier to see in the field.
Mr. Dittrick asked if it hasn't been put to paper yet.
Mr. Buxton replied it is not yet on paper. Mr. Watrell's report having not been received.
Mr. Dittrick asked if Mr. Watrell has it. He noted that it is relative to blasting but nothing is available yet.
Mr. Buxton asked available from whom.
Mr. Dittrick replied anyone who is interested.
Mr. Buxton replied if the CLC asked for the information it will be provided. He noted the Proponent has a 4 HA permit, the CLC was set up to monitor the 4 HA quarry and it was made clear at that first meeting that people were far more interested in the larger quarry. He further noted that he would answer questions for the larger quarry.
Mr. Dittrick replied that people say there are graves on the 4 HA site; the archeological study has not been completed besides looking at the ground and church registers to rule out a cemetery. He noted that individuals are concerned with the 4 HA quarry.
Mr. Buxton replied he will make the information available.
Mr. Dittrick noted there are people who are concerned.
Mr. Buxton replied that he heard the implication.
Mr. Dittrick noted that there is anecdotal evidence that people are buried there.
Ms. Nesbitt noted that Miss McArthy had presented a photograph at a previous meeting and represented this as factual information, as being laundry and in White's Cove. She noted there are concerns about this. See page 11 - October 24, 2002 minutes.
Mr. Dittrick replied he is aware that the hanging items are buoys and not laundry. He noted that people are concerned with any work being done on site as it has the potential to do damage.
Mr. Dittrick asked if Dr. Moody has determined there was ever a community with permanent residents in White's Cove.
Mr. Buxton replied there were certainly residents on the side of the hill close to White's Cove Road and it was supposedly occupied as farms.
It was stated there was sheep on the land.
Mr. Buxton noted that he has heard that there was a community there but there is no evidence.
Mr. Dittrick replied that Mr. Buxton or Dr. Moody do not have any evidence. He asked who else has looked at this and come to the conclusion that there was no village.
Mr. Buxton replied that the archeologist has done a preliminary reconnaissance; he has looked at deeds, maps and carried out fundamental research. He further noted that the site of the proposed test blast is basically bare rock and that there is no possibility that graves could be located in that area. He further noted that he has been led to believe that at the head of the wharf this is the area of a previous pit where apparently large quantities of material were taken out in the 1940 – 50's for the construction of Hwy #217 and it certainly appears that this area has been largely worked over by heavy equipment.
Mr. Buxton noted that Miss McArthy had advised the committee that she had found specific evidence of graves. Miss McArthy was asked if she would present the evidence to the committee but she responded that she did not have the time to go back and get it.
Mr. Dittrick asked if she said this, is it in the minutes.

Refer to page 13 – October 24, 2002 minutes "Miss McCarthy replied that she had spent many hours and she would not go back to get it."
Mr. Buxton noted if anyone knows where graves are it would make a difference, no one has said this and there is no evidence of graves there. He noted that there is anecdotal evidence of fish shacks but none of anyone living there.
Mr. Dittrick asked if it is their conclusion that no one lived there, that there was no village.
Mr. Buxton replied no, Miss McArthy provided us with evidence of farms but they were not in White's Cove they were on the hillside.
Mr. Dittrick noted that Mr. Buxton said on the hillside and asked on which side of the road.
Mr. Buxton replied from the top down to White's Cove.
Mr. Dittrick asked on the higher area.
Mr. Buxton replied yes.
Mr. Dittrick asked if this is approaching where the blasting would be and noted it would be nice to see a map in order to see where blasting will take place.
Mr. Buxton replied he has no problem making it available.
Mr. Dittrick asked in what time frame.
Mr. Buxton replied perhaps 3 weeks.
Mr. Dittrick asked before the pre-blast.
Mr. Buxton replied possibly.
Mr. Dittrick asked what good is this.
Mr. Buxton replied he doesn't have concerns about damage. He noted it is bare rock, a tiny area.
Mr. Theriault noted he will ask his neighbor about a village in White's Cove.
Mr. Dittrick replied it would be nice to settle the issue of community, no community before the pre-blast.
Mr. Buxton replied there is no evidence to date of a community and each time he has asked for evidence to be shown there is none. He noted there has been nothing in 5 months except for people saying there was a community sometime around 1910.
Mr. Dittrick asked what about before 1910.
Mr. Buxton replied he has been told 1910.
Ms. Nesbitt replied there is Mr. Church's map of 1864.
Mr. Buxton replied there is nothing in White's Cove according to that map.
Mr. Dittrick noted that there are homes in Little River that were once located in White's Cove.
Mr. Buxton agreed that people have said this but Mr. Church's map shows nothing, there is a gap between 1864 and 1910. He noted that people say there was a village but they have seen only blank maps.
Ms. Harnish noted that Mr. E. Hall had a small farm, he went back to the original deed but no one could identify any homes. She noted that Stuart Carty's father in Mink Cove spoke of farms but he didn't know where they were.
Mr. Buxton replied presumably post grant, 1878, possibly somewhere up the hill. Mr. Hall thought higher up hill.
Mr. Graham noted that they put sheep on the land because it was grown up.
Mrs. MacAlpine noted that residents have family trees and she wondered why it seems so difficult to come up with some evidence of a village in White's Cove.
Mr. Theriault noted that his grandfather claimed boats fished out of White's Cove but no one lived there.

Mrs. MacAlpine noted that if someone lived in Meteghan evidence is passed down but in White's Cove in this point there seems to be no evidence.
Mr. Ivens noted that we are not here to debate the issue and if there is proof bring it to the meeting. He noted if you can find information against the company he would like to know so they can review it.
Ms. Nesbitt provided pictures of fish houses in White's Cove for review and asked if there were any other questions.
Mr. Ivens noted we can try to contact people to come to meeting if they have proof of burials.
Mr. Theriault replied he could talk to his relative, he might come.
Mr. Buxton indicated he would be welcome.
Mr. Ivens noted the CLC is not set up for debate, we ask questions.
Mr. Theriault noted his grandfather has told him stories but not that anyone lived there.
Mr. Buxton replied if there is evidence it would be nice to see it at a meeting.
Mr. Dittrick noted that he recalled in the minutes a port facility would be in St. Mary's Bay.
Ms. Sanford noted that this had been amended at the meeting of October 24, 2002. It was amended to read the Bay of Fundy.
Mr. Buxton noted there are no plans to quarry in St. Mary's Bay.
Mr. Theriault noted that a rock quarry would not do as much damage as fish draggers.
Mr. Rowe wonders if the Sierra Club knows that.
Ms. Nesbitt asked Mr. Dittrick why he wants to see this quarry stopped.
Mr. Dittrick replied there is no evidence of more jobs or that eco-tourism might benefit, ballast water from the 45-ton ship causes problems with invasive species and how will they deal with this.
Mr. Ivens asked if there isn't a Canadian company shipping out of the Bay already.
Mr. Buxton replied Bayside.
It was asked if gypsum boats were blamed for the oyster dying off.
Mr. Dittrick noted the ship's impact on the right whale and talk of shifting the lanes to protect the right whales and 53% of collisions occur from ship impact. He noted adding 50-panamax ships does change the likelihood that they will be hit. There are lots of environmental concerns, such as the 24-hour noise level. He further noted if there is any hydro-geological information he would like it to be passed along.
Mr. Buxton replied that extensive environmental assessment is being carried out.
Mr. Dittrick replied he has seen lots of studies done and is glad to see that Jacques Whitford is not doing all of the studies.
Mr. Buxton asked Mr. Dittrick what his technical degree is.
Mr. Dittrick replied he has worked with technical information for 30 years.
Mr. Buxton asked if he has had formal training.
Mr. Dittrick replied no.
Mr. Ivens asked what job losses Mr. Dittrick referred to.
Mr. Dittrick replied the tourist industry.
Mr. Ivens noted he is of the opinion that tourists have ruined the area.
Mr. Dittrick noted he feels the quarry will add to that.
Mr. Ivens noted he does not believe it will.
Mr. Dittrick asked if the quarry will operate 24 hours.
Mr. Buxton replied no, 6 am – 10 pm.
Mr. Dittrick asked what will the annual quantity be.

Mr. Buxton replied 2 million ton per year.
Mr. Dittrick asked if there is water draw down, monitor wells, if it does you'll pack up, go away.
Mr. Buxton replied the committee sees this as one of the major issues.
Mr. Dittrick asked if he could see a copy of this.
Mr. Buxton replied it is in minutes.
Ms. Nesbitt asked what jobs he is referring to in eco-tourism.
Mr. Dittrick replied fish plants.
Mr. Ivens replied they are provided by draggers. He noted that most plants don't process.
Ms. Nesbitt noted that the quarry won't be visible from Hwy #217. For diversification we look to fishing, forestry, tourism and they all make noise. She noted the quarry is behind the mountain and will be monitored for noise and dust. She further noted Mr. Buxton has spoken about all of this and she asked Mr. Dittrick what is his biggest concern.
Ms. Nesbitt noted for us jobs are badly needed in this area, this is sustainable 30 – 35 years work. She noted that she wants to understand Mr. Dittrick's viewpoint. Tourism has to be looked at and these studies should come to the committee.
It was noted that most of the opposition comes from the people who have money from raping the resources and those who want to turn Digby Neck into a retirement community.
Mrs. Angrignon noted she is concerned about the lack of young people in Digby Neck.
It was noted that those people who have themselves looked after financially are not worried about the jobs.
Mrs. Angrignon noted that we need more young people.
Mr. Ivens noted that tourism and eco-tourism jobs pay minimum wages.
Mr. Graham noted he had heard a comment that the quarry is not putting money in his pocket because the quarry is paying higher money.
Ms. Nesbitt replied jobs are needed and she asked if Mr. Graham had any experience working in a quarry.
Mr. Graham replied yes, but nothing compared to what he's heard this quarry will be. He noted they are not as noisy or as much dust in the air, they pay the best wages. He stated they are a nice place to work.
Mr. Ivens asked if there were any other questions.
Mr. Rowe replied he is just here for information and he noted that he hears things that are not based on facts. He heard at the other committee meetings that they have an expert who is going to help them stop the quarry, there has been no information from the other side and they have their mindset. He noted he hasn't made up his mind for or against the quarry but he wants to hear information, to find out as much as he can because he doesn't believe in manufacturing information to stop it. He further noted that it is wrong to keep the opposition meetings closed, that's the reason he is here and objects to Mr. Dittrick coming in mid-meeting and asking for things covered in the minutes, if he wants all this information he should study the minutes. This is an open meeting (public) and the other meetings are closed.
Ms. Nesbitt replied it is important to have all the information available.
Mr. Rowe noted that the Proponent has the right to blast and asked if it's bare rock how can graves be in bare rock. He noted we've seen the cellar holes and the minutes are available.
Mr. Ivens noted that when any questions have been asked of the Proponent, Mr. Buxton and Ms. Nesbitt have tried to get answers for the next meeting.

Mr. Theriault noted that comments about ground zero had been made and others had asked them to put signs on their lawns. He is looking for honesty in the information and a quarry is not $1/10^{th}$ as bad as a fish dragger.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.
Meeting adjourned at 10:30 pm.
Next meeting date and time in January at Rossway Community Center to be advised.