

----- Original Message -----

From: Josephine Lowry#ns.aliantzinc.ca
To: Myles,Debra [CEAA]
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2007 5:06 PM
Subject: Panel IR's Item 7 Blasting and Item 8 Community Liaison Committee

Hi Debra.

I have attached Bilcon's responses to IR-7 - Blasting and IR-8 - CLC Community Liaison Committee from the Panel's Information Requests of February 27th, 2007.

Regards,
Josephine

Josephine Monk Lowry
EIS Director
Bilcon of Nova Scotia
902-245-2567
www.bilcon.ca

From: Myles,Debra [CEAA]

To: Josephine Lowry#ns.aliantzinc.ca
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 12:30 PM
Subject: RE: Panel's response

Thank you, Josephine!

Debra

From: Josephine Lowry#ns.aliantzinc.ca [mailto:josephine.lowry@ns.aliantzinc.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 10:54 AM
To: Myles,Debra [CEAA]
Subject: Re: Panel's response

Hi Debra.

I have attached Bilcon's responses to the Panel's Information Requests of February 27th, 2007. As discussed, Bilcon's responses to IR-7 - Blasting and IR-8 - CLC Community Liaison Committee will be forthcoming in due course.

Regards
Josephine

Josephine Monk Lowry
EIS Director
Bilcon of Nova Scotia
902-245-2567
www.bilcon.ca

----- Original Message -----

From: Myles,Debra [CEAA]
To: Josephine Lowry#ns.aliantzinc.ca
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2007 12:10 PM
Subject: RE: Panel's response

Paul

This is to acknowledge receipt of your March 27, 2007 Email.

The Joint Review Panel has been clear about its motivation to move forward with the environmental assessment of the Whites Point Project and will schedule public hearings when it has sufficient information to ensure that the hearings may be conducted in an efficient and effective manner.

With regard to the Panel's February 27th IR-2, Coastal Conditions, I refer you to the EIS Guidelines and the deficiencies identified by Panel members, government reviewers and others in their response to the EIS. Many of those deficiencies remain unanswered and the February 27th IR is a second attempt at recovering information that the panel feels is critical to the review process.

In order to facilitate this process the Panel would appreciate your forwarding the requested response (along with others that remain outstanding) at the earliest possible date.

Debra Myles

Panel Manager

Whites Point Quarry and Marine Terminal Project Joint Review Panel

c/o Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, 160 Elgin Street, Ottawa, ON K1A 0H3

Tel: 613-957-0626 Fax: 613-957-0941

Comments@WPQ-JointReview.ca

From: Josephine Lowry#ns.aliantzinc.ca [mailto:josephine.lowry@ns.aliantzinc.ca]

Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2007 8:29 AM

To: Myles,Debra [CEAA]

Subject: Re:

Debra,

Thank you for your email dated March 23, 2007 and received March 26, 2007.

We would request that the Panel consider fixing the dates of Public Hearings upon receipt of IRs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9, provided Bilcon provides responses to IRs 7 and 8 at least 2 weeks prior to Public Hearings.

If the Panel is not prepared to consider this then there seems to be little value in submitting our responses in two sections. I think this is an important issue which must be resolved because we have serious issues with at least one of the questions. We believe that the Panel is asking for information not required at this stage and which would be extremely expensive and time consuming to provide. I refer of course to IR2 – Coastal Conditions. My point with respect to Public Hearings is that if the Panel does not accept our responses to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9, then there would seem to be little purpose in us dealing with IRs 7 and 8.

I would remind you of my comments during our last telephone conversation. Bilcon would certainly like to follow this process through to the end but Bilcon is not prepared to have this process continue with what we believe are demands for details which add nothing to an environmental assessment process.

I believe that we need to resolve this issue this week so that Bilcon can determine how best to proceed.

Paul Buxton

----- Original Message -----

From: Myles,Debra [CEAA]

To: Josephine Lowry#ns.aliantzinc.ca

Sent: Friday, March 23, 2007 5:04 PM
Subject: RE:

Paul,

Thank you for your note of yesterday which I have discussed with the Panel. The Panel offers the following response and direction:

1. Please submit your response to the Panel's February 27, 2007 information requests #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 without delay.
2. Please submit your response to information requests 7 and 8 at the earliest possible date and in consideration of the following direction from the Panel.

The Panel requires clear concise overviews of the blasting and CLC information. The purpose is to consolidate the information and not simply to cut-and-paste it into a single document. The overviews are intended to address the confusion and, in some cases, inconsistencies around the blasting and CLC information that has been provided to the Panel to date. Part of the confusion is due to the scattered and repetitive presentation of information in the EIS and response to comments document.

The blasting overview must present the important issues, potential effects, mitigation, etc. as detailed in the Panel's information request. The CLC overview must also link the proposed activities to ongoing project management. The Panel anticipates that overviews with an appropriate level of detail should be less than 50 pages in length, each.

I trust that this response from the Panel will allow you to move forward with providing the required information.

Regards,

Debra Myles

Panel Manager

Whites Point Quarry and Marine Terminal Project Joint Review Panel

c/o Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, 160 Elgin Street, Ottawa, ON K1A 0H3

Tel: 613-957-0626 Fax: 613-957-0941

Comments@WPQ-JointReview.ca

From: Josephine Lowry#ns.aliantzinc.ca [mailto:josephine.lowry@ns.aliantzinc.ca]

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2007 10:54 AM

To: Myles,Debra [CEAA]

Subject:

Dear Debra,

Further to Mr. Fournier's letter to us of March 19th, 2007 and our telephone conversation of today's date, we can advise as follows:

1. With respect to Panel questions 1,2,3,4,5,6 and 9 I can advise that responses have been prepared and are currently in review.
2. With respect to questions 7 - Blasting and 8 - Community Liaison Committee, we are unclear as to what precisely is required. It is our current intent to extract the references on blasting from the EIS and the Response Documents and rearrange them generally and where possible into the bullets set out in question 7. We are not sure whether you are aware that this could be a 500 page document. With respect to question 8 - Community Liaison Committee, it would be our intent to assemble all the references to the CLC and then to provide some clarification as to how the CLC will be linked to management decision making - through the adaptive management strategy. Again, we believe this would be a 500 page document.

In the interests of timing, perhaps we could forward the responses to the 7 questions referred to in 1 above in the next few days and await further clarification on questions 7 and 8.

Regards,
Paul Buxton

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.
Version: 7.5.446 / Virus Database: 268.18.18/733 - Release Date: 25/03/2007 11:07 AM

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.
Version: 7.5.446 / Virus Database: 268.18.24/742 - Release Date: 01/04/2007 8:49 PM

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.
Version: 7.5.446 / Virus Database: 268.18.25/744 - Release Date: 03/04/2007 5:32 AM