

---

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

---

June 28, 2006

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

Dear Mr. Buxton:

The Whites Point Quarry and Marine Terminal Project Joint Review Panel submits the attached document to you as a request for additional information pursuant to Part II, Section 7 of the Terms of Reference appended to the Joint Panel Agreement. The Panel will submit additional information requests to you as we proceed with our review of the Environmental Impact Statement and in consideration of comments or other information that we receive from the public and interested parties.

The attached document details a series of initial issues from the EIS that the Panel has identified as requiring further information or clarification by you. Each information request has been assigned a sequential code of IR-1 through IR-10. Please use these identifiers in your response to the Panel. As always, your responses will be posted to the Public Registry for the project.

Thank you for your attention to this important task in the environmental assessment process.

Yours sincerely,

Original signed by:

Robert Fournier, Chair

*Whites Point Quarry and Marine Terminal Project*  
*Joint Review Panel*  
IR-1 TO IR-10

**ISSUE**

The term "adaptive management" and its application to this project must be clarified.

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-1)**

- a. Define the term 'adaptive management'
- b. Why is the concept embodied in the term appropriate for use in the Whites Point Quarry project?
- c. Explain how the adaptive management concept will be implemented?
- d. Given that it is necessary for all stakeholders in adaptive management to cooperate, describe the intention concerning the establishment of a community liaison committee in the Whites Point Quarry case.

**ISSUE**

Chapter 5, Concordance Table, is described as a cross reference of issues and concerns raised and where they are dealt with in the EIS. Two sources of issues and concerns do not appear to have been included, namely, government department submissions and the public registry.

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-2)**

Explain the omission of government department submissions and public registry information from the Concordance Table. Supply this information, if applicable.

**ISSUE**

The planned settling ponds will receive fine basalt that will contain an elevated copper content. The resulting sediments will leach into the overlying water which can then migrate into the ground water below or spill into the nearby intertidal zone.

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-3)**

Provide the details and results of leaching tests on finely ground basalt (grain size equivalent to the material in the settling ponds) with a composition typical of the quarried material and dissolution rates of metals (particularly copper) for this material to allow the potential for the transfers outlined above to be quantified. Proposed mitigation measures to minimize the risks of adverse effects.

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-4)**

Identify the individual who provided the information regarding NAFTA that was presented on pages 71 to 73 of Chapter 6.

**ISSUE**

Page 15 of Chapter 7 states that blasting will not be done in the fog yet the Bay of Fundy coast is often foggy.

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-5)**

Describe the feasible alternatives to blasting under foggy conditions and explain how production levels will be maintained under these conditions. Provide information on the expected days of fog in the area.

**ISSUE**

It is frequently stated that 2,000,000 tons of aggregate will shipped out at the rate of 40,000 tons per week yet production will occur only 44 weeks a year. This suggests that the rate will be 45,000 tons per week

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-6)**

Confirm the rate of shipment per week and the annual total.

**ISSUE**

The figure presented on page 17 of Chapter 7, shows an overview of the physical plant. It appears that the 20 m rock face illustrated is inconsistent with the accompanying contours. This inconsistency is repeated in Figure 1 of Appendix Volume 3/Tab 17.

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-7)**

Explain whether the 20 m elevation refers to a distance from the base up or if it is recessed. Provide an elevation drawing (side view) showing the relative elevation of each of the components shown in the Quarry Infrastructure Plan on page 17 of Chapter 7. Provide the depth of the sediment ponds.

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-8)**

Regarding the Concept Quarry Plans (years 1-50) beginning with page 21 in Chapter 7, provide elevations for the active quarry area at each stage (i.e., show the expected elevation of the quarry floor).

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-9)**

Explain how dust will be controlled in the planned sediment disposal areas.

**ISSUE**

A contradiction appears to exist between statements made by Jacques-Whitford, the Pennsylvania consultant and some of the water table drawings presented.

**INFORMATION REQUEST (IR-10)**

Provide a clear delineation of the vertical placement of the water table throughout the project site. Explain the apparent contradictions concerning the water table and provide the data used to reach conclusions about where the water table resides. Provide detailed profiles showing the relationship between the working quarry face at each development phase and the water table.