

WHITES POINT QUARRY AND MARINE TERMINAL PROJECT
JOINT REVIEW PANEL
SCOPING MEETING #1

HEARD BEFORE: Dr. Robert Fournier, Chairperson
Dr. Jill Grant, Member
Dr. Gunter Muecke, Member

PLACE HEARD: Sandy Cove, Nova Scotia

DATE HEARD: Thursday, January 6, 2005

SECRETARIAT: Mr. Stephen Chapman, CEAA
Ms. Lucille Jamault, CEAA
Mr. Peter Geddes, NSEL

Recorded by:
Drake Recording Services Limited
1592 Oxford Street
Halifax, NS B3H 3Z4
Per: Mark Aurini, Commissioner of Oaths

I N D E X O F P R O C E E D I N G S

	PAGE NO.
THE CHAIRPERSON - OPENING REMARKS	3
MR. TONY KELLY - SUBMISSIONS	15
MR. TONY KELLY FOR MS. MARY LYNYAK - SUBMISSIONS . .	26
MR. ANDY SHARP - SUBMISSIONS	35
MR. ASHRAF MAHTAB - SUBMISSIONS	48
MS. MARILYN STANTON - SUBMISSIONS	57
MR. DON MULLIN - SUBMISSIONS	68
MR. LAURENCE OUTHOUSE - SUBMISSIONS	77
MS. PENNY GRAHAM - SUBMISSIONS	87
MR. CHRIS TIDD - SUBMISSIONS	94
MR. KEMP STANTON - SUBMISSIONS	97
MS. CHERYL DENTON - SUBMISSIONS	109
MR. ARTHUR BULL - SUBMISSIONS	116
MR. KEVIN GIDNEY - SUBMISSIONS	123
MS. SHERRY PICTOU - SUBMISSIONS	131
MR. ROGER OUTHOUSE - SUBMISSIONS	139
MR. JAMES GRAHAM - SUBMISSIONS	144

MR. KELLY - SUBMISSIONS

1 culture as well as the residents' sense of place
2 and spiritual values will be included in the
3 Revised Guidelines for the assessment of the
4 impacts of this project in these factors.

5 The fifth point, regarding the
6 sections dealing with human health, human health,
7 issues to do with mental health appear to be
8 understated. It does not need to be said, but this
9 project has already had impacts on the wellbeing of
10 the residents of Little River. Specialists in the
11 area of community mental health should be broadly
12 consulted in order to ensure residents that
13 possible additional impacts will in fact be
14 inventoried and accounted for within the
15 Environmental Impact Statement.

16 The sixth point, which is the
17 final of the six points I'd like to make tonight,
18 without question Little River is an extraordinary
19 example of successful local economies. Certainly
20 there are those of us in Little River who feel at
21 times we should be punished for that. But without
22 question Little River is an extraordinary example
23 of successful local economy.

24 Those who are not directly engaged
25 in the various economic enterprises in the village

MR. SHARPE - SUBMISSIONS

1 EIS Guidelines represent components drawn together
2 from national guidance, from provincial guidance
3 and materials from previous panel reviews, but we
4 feel there's considerable room for improvement with
5 these Guidelines. From this point forward in the
6 process, we encourage the panel members to take
7 ownership of these Guidelines and revise the
8 Guidelines to reflect their considerable expertise
9 and experience with environmental assessments.

10 The Society believes that
11 sustainable development and the fundamental
12 principles of sustainability, particularly the
13 precautionary principle, are missing or absent from
14 the Draft Guidelines at present. Previous panel
15 reviews, particularly the panel review for the
16 Voisey's Bay mine and the panel review for the Red
17 Hill Creek Expressway, have explicitly recognized
18 the importance of sustainable development in the
19 environmental assessment and provided their own
20 interpretation of the role of sustainable
21 development and some of its key principles.

22 The approach that these panel
23 reviews have taken -- has taken have helped provide
24 clear direction to the Proponent on what the panel
25 expected and how the environmental assessment

MR. SHARPE - SUBMISSIONS

1 should be undertaken. I think it's important to
2 note that both the Canadian Environmental
3 Assessment Act and the Nova Scotia Environmental
4 Assessment Regulations include explicit reference
5 to sustainable development, and I think it
6 therefore falls within the remit of this panel to
7 ensure that the Final EIS Guidelines reflect the
8 central nature of sustainable development to this
9 environmental assessment.

10 We'd further ask that the panel
11 consider inclusion of the precautionary principle
12 within the Final Guidelines. The precautionary
13 principle again has been incorporated into previous
14 panel reviews, and we think it provides an
15 important context of how the Proponent should deal
16 with scientific uncertainty.

17 Section 2 of the Draft EIS
18 Guidelines provides a list of information that the
19 Proponent must provide or include in the EIS
20 Guidelines. Item "B" of that list is the need for
21 the project.

22 We have reviewed the guidance, the
23 Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
24 Operational Policy Statement that addresses the
25 need for the project and found this guidance to be

MR. MULLIN - SUBMISSIONS

1 Without an explicit definition, it appears possible
2 that the environmental effects of the project (vis-
3 a-vis socioeconomic effects) may be deemed
4 acceptable from a federal vantage but unacceptable
5 from a provincial point of view.

6 This would appear to make it
7 difficult for the provincial and federal government
8 to reach a consensus and issue a joint statement
9 concerning the project at the completion of the
10 environmental assessment.

11 This panel needs to consider
12 taking a new, more appropriate and valid approach
13 to the study of social impacts of the proposed
14 project. It needs to identify appropriate social
15 measures (including but not limited to way of life
16 and enjoyment of life or property, and encompassing
17 various elements that comprise quality of life and
18 the social fabric of affected communities). The
19 Proponent must then be required to examine the
20 potential impacts on those measures.

21 (The work of Dr. Colman of
22 Dalhousie University in developing Social Progress
23 Indicators that identify approximately 20 variables
24 related to social impacts might be a good starting
25 point for the panel's deliberation).

MS. DENTON - SUBMISSIONS

1 particular island was covered by the sea. Hence,
2 it was passed down from generation to generation
3 that when you felt a tremor, to run for the hills.
4 That is exactly what these islanders did just a
5 week and a half ago, and their lives were saved.
6 So please, let us not underestimate the great
7 wisdom of folklore.

8 I would like to refer to 9.2.7,
9 "Human Health," in the Draft Guidelines. I was a
10 registered nurse, and it pleases me to say we in
11 Little River have a very healthy thriving
12 community, and the sea has been very good to us.
13 Per capita, we are probably considered a somewhat
14 affluent community. To risk our way of life for a
15 few menial jobs does not make sense to me. Not
16 only is it not economically feasible, it is not
17 advantageous to the health standards of our
18 community nor to the mental health of our
19 residents, always worrying about our water supply.
20 Fresh water is one of the most important
21 commodities on the face of this earth today, and
22 again I say we cannot afford to gamble with this
23 most important commodity. I urge you again to
24 please use the precautionary principle.

25 Thank you for this opportunity to
Drake Recording Services Limited - Certified Court Reporters
(Serving Atlantic Canada Since 1983)

MR. BULL - SUBMISSIONS

1 provide strong evidence that a significant majority
2 of people on Digby Neck want this project to
3 happen.

4 And you may be saying, well, this
5 project -- or thinking, this project is not about
6 -- the guidelines are not about taking referendums
7 or polls and so forth. But again, the logic is, if
8 a key determinant of socioeconomic wellbeing is
9 ability to participate in decision-making process,
10 and if these guidelines address socioeconomic
11 wellbeing, therefore, the Guidelines must address
12 this question and specifically must ask the
13 Proponent to demonstrate that most people want this
14 to happen. Again, a key point for us.

15 And I will just add finally that
16 we strongly believe also that the precautionary
17 principle needs to be clearly embedded in the
18 Guidelines. It needs to be there for the Proponent
19 too. It needs to be there so that they know where
20 the bar is, so that if they come forward and say,
21 "Well, we think perhaps this might be the case,"
22 that is a level of uncertainty which will trigger
23 the precautionary principle. In other words, we
24 don't know. Therefore, we must be cautious. It's
25 in the Oceans Act as one of the three guiding