## Sadaka, Jennifer -JLT

**From:** Zamora, Phil on behalf of Zamora,Phil J: DFO XMAR
**Sent:** August 31, 2004 4:26 PM
**To:** Chapman,Steve [CEAA]
**Cc:** Crepault,Jean [CEAA]
**Subject:** FW: RE : WPQ

Steve:

As discussed, I am forwarding my e-mail sent to Jean on Aug 26, 2004. The telephone conference with yourself and Jean was very helpful in answering these questions. Would you mind summarizing our conversation in an e-mail response?

Thank you.

-----Original Message-----
**From:** Zamora, Phil
**Sent:** August 26, 2004 11:25 AM
**To:** Crepault, Jean: EC
**Cc:** Dean, Stuart; Hood, Bruce
**Subject:** RE: RE : WPQ

Jean, thank you for the clarification on the 3.9 ha quarry. Does this also mean that the blasting plan for the 3.9 ha quarry that was submitted to DFO for review, and all other regulatory considerations associated with the 3.9 hectare quarry are now dead as well?

Also, the original company had asked to meet with us, just before the project headed toward a panel review, to discuss the model DFO had used to determine set back distances for blasting proposed for the 3.9 ha quarry. They asked for a meeting again in December, 2003. As you know, DFO was advised that it would not be appropriate to meet with the company until after the agreement between the Agency and NSDEL was signed, since the agreement would include clarification that the 3.9 ha quarry is part of the larger quarry.

If the 3.9 ha quarry is dead, is it now appropriate for DFO to meet with the new company? The company may want to meet with us to discuss information that was gathered for the review of the blasting plan for the 3.9 ha quarry that could be useful in their environmental assessment of the larger quarry and any proposed blasting plan for the future.

If such a meeting is appropriate would the Agency want to coordinate it? DFO would also be seeking guidance as to what is appropriate for discussion with the proponent as in their last correspondence to us they have asked for a meeting top discuss "various elements of the whites Point project".

Thanks, Jean.

> -----Original Message-----
> **From:** Crepault,Jean [CEAA]
> **Sent:** August 24, 2004 5:23 PM
> **To:** Zamora,Phil J: DFO XMAR
> **Cc:** Chapman,Steve [CEAA]
> **Subject:** RE : WPQ
>
> Phil, I got your voice mail message. Thanks. The whole idea was to remove from the revised draft agreement adding the 3.9 ha quarry as a separate project. This 3.9 ha quarry is now dead as Nova Stone is no longer leasing the property. There is now one project to take place on the 380 acres leased property. Quarrying is to take place on 300 acres (120 ha). Conclusion is that the 3.9 ha was added to the revised agreement, but will now be removed as NoVa Stone provincial permit is no longer valid and

that Bilcon will not request it be transferred.

I have no problem for the end of this week for DFO's comments on the draft Guidelines. Jean

-----Message d'origine-----
**De :** Zamora, Phil
**Envoyé :** August 24, 2004 3:54 PM
**À :** Crepault,Jean [CEAA]
**Objet :** RE: WPQ

Thank you, Jean. I did receive the letter from Bilcon today. I have not read over the revised project description as yet but I will provide comments. Concerning the letter from Bilcon, I did not see a reference to the caveat regarding the 3.9 hectare quarry that DFO recommended be added to the amended MOU agreement between the Agency and the province. Has it been added to the agreement?

Also, DFO has not received all the information needed to complete it's review of the Draft EIS Guidelines for the Review of the Proposed Whites Point Quarry Project. Is it possible to obtain an extension on the deadline until Friday, August 27, 2004.

Thank you, Jean.

-----Original Message-----
**From:** Crepault,Jean [CEAA]
**Sent:** August 24, 2004 2:58 PM
**To:** Crepault,Jean [CEAA]; Chapman,Steve [CEAA]; Harris,Gordon [CEAA]; Bedrossian,Peter [CEAA]; Lemay,Simon [CEAA]; Dodsworth,John [CEAA]; Richard,Francine [CEAA]; McDonald,Derek [CEAA]; Coulter,Bill [CEAA]; Chris A Daly; mcphailh@gov.ns.ca; Zamora,Phil J: DFO XMAR; Hood,Bruce: DFO XNCR
**Subject:** WPQ

Steve et al., I received today a letter from Bilcon of Nova Scotia Corporation indicating it is now the sole proponent of the White Point Quarry and marine Terminal project. A project description is attached to the letter. I haven't notice any change of importance in the project per se. I will read carefully tomorrow.

Phil and Chris, you should have received a similar letter by this time as well. Any comments on the project description? Any comments on the draft EIS Guidelines as well? Today is the deadline I guess for the latter.

I will get back to you shortly with a revised time table for coming announcements. Jean