

PUBLIC HEARING

WHITES POINT QUARRY AND MARINE TERMINAL PROJECT

JOINT REVIEW PANEL

V O L U M E 6

HELD BEFORE: Dr. Robert Fournier (Chair)
Dr. Jill Grant (Member)
Dr. Gunter Muecke (Member)

PLACE HEARD: Digby, Nova Scotia

DATE HEARD: Friday, June 22, 2007

PRESENTERS: -Bilcon of Nova Scotia
Mr. Paul Buxton
-Natural Resources of Canada
Dr. Miroslav Nastev
-Nova Scotia Dept of Environment and Labour
Mr. John Drage
-Atlantic Canada Chapter, Sierra Club of Cda
Mr. Stephen Hazel
-St. Croix Estuary Project (ACAP - St. Croix)
Mr. Arthur MacKay
-Father Danny Mills
-Ms. Jill Klein
-Mr. Rob Buckland-Nicks
-Mr. Lawrence Outhouse

Recorded by: A.S.A.P. Reporting Services Inc.
200 Elgin Street, Suite 1004 Ottawa, Ontario K2P 1L5
130 King Street W., Suite 1800 Toronto, Ontario M5X 1E3
613-564-2727 (Ottawa Office) / 416-861-8720 (Toronto Office)
613-564-7756 (Ottawa Fax) / 416-946-1693 (Toronto Fax)
1-888-661-2727 (Toll Free)

Per: H el ene Boudreau-Laforge, CCR

1 groundwater flow compared to the map you just put on the
2 screen.

3 So it's not just missing one slide.
4 It's one that has been substantially altered.

5 Mr. PAUL BUXTON: Well, I think, as I
6 tried to point out, this has been a moving work for five
7 years, and I'm not sure that we're totally and absolutely
8 convinced that what we've provided in this cross-section is
9 absolutely the final word.

10 And I think I did say in the
11 presentation that we had developed what we would call a
12 conceptual hydrogeological model of the site, and this is
13 our latest version of that model.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Buxton, I think
15 what Dr. Muecke is saying is that the purpose of the
16 hearings is to assess your Environment Impact Statement.
17 The normal procedure is to provide us and others with
18 information to allow us to process it, to reflect on it, to
19 check it, and thereby to reach some kind of conclusion.

20 The purpose of the hearing is to bring
21 experts together so that we can do this. If you present us
22 with information five minutes before the discussion begins,
23 it's a disadvantage to us. It's an unfair disadvantage.

24 It's not providing us with the
25 information in a timely manner. I think that's the issue.

1 Some of these diagrams you've presented
2 to us are different, and the implications of the differences
3 are important.

4 So, in a sense, we can continue the
5 discussion as we planned, but I think it's inappropriate.
6 It should have been forwarded to us and to others so that
7 they could reflect on it. That's the issue.

8 Mr. PAUL BUXTON: I was actually unaware
9 that the hard copy had not gone out to you or had not gone
10 to the Panel Manager on the 6th. I thought that it had
11 gone.

12 I knew that there were problems in
13 formatting this particular diagram, but I did think that it
14 had gone.

15 Dr. GUNTER MUECKE: So my next question
16 is where this new information comes from. Is there a new
17 consultant's report?

18 Mr. PAUL BUXTON: There isn't a new
19 consultant's report in the sense that we certainly have used
20 a number of consultants to answer the questions that were
21 raised by Environment and Labour and by Natural Resources
22 Canada with respect to hydrogeology, and those were
23 submitted and Natural Resources Canada has replied to our
24 responses.

25 We do not, at the present time, have a