

Minutes of Meeting of Community Liaison Committee
(Amended October 24, 2002)

Nova Stone Exporters Inc/Global Quarry Products Inc

7.00 p.m. September 25th 2002

Sandy Cove Fire Hall

In attendance: Ms. Cindy Nesbitt, CLC Member
Mr. Mark Jeffrey, CLC Member
Mr. John Ivens, CLC Member
Ms. Judith Carty, CLC Member
Ms. Christine Harnish, CLC Member
Mrs. Marian Angrignon
Ms. Sandra Denton
Mr. Fred Trask
Mrs. Stephanie Trask
Miss Lindsey Trask
Mr. Christopher Tidd
Mr. John Wall, Quarry Manager
Mr. Paul Buxton NSEI/GQPI
Ms. Tammy Sanford NSEI/GQPI

Regrets: Mr. Brian Cullen, CLC Member; David Graham, CLC Member

Ms. Nesbitt welcomed Committee members and guests to the meeting and provided the agenda for the evening.

Mr. Buxton forwarded Mr. Ivens a copy of the questions raised at the August 29th meeting.

Ms. Nesbitt noted several items for revision in the minutes of August 29th 2002.

Amendment 1 - page 1. Amendment 7 - page 1. The amendment referring to her father-in-law should read "Mr. Brian Morton."

Amendment 2 - page 2. Ms. Nesbitt did not feel May ...December would be. This should read Ms. Nesbitt noted the lobster fishermen felt the month of May would not be a problem but December would be a problem for them.

Amendment 3 – Appendix 1, under the heading General. "Parhogen" should read "Pathogen" and Thomas Winetch should read Thomas Wheaton.

The minutes of August 29th 2002 were approved with the above noted amendments.

Ms. Nesbitt welcomed the Quarry Manager, Mr. John Wall to the meeting. She noted he would assist with questions about the quarry, the manpower schedule, and talk about what the plans are for the quarry operation.

Ms. Nesbitt noted she and Mr. Ivens met with David Morse and his assistant on Monday. She felt it had been a good meeting. Mr. Morse and his assistant wanted to know about the CLC and wondered whether the Proponent had been forthcoming with information.

Ms. Nesbitt advised them of the information the Proponent had provided to the CLC and that the committee was very pleased.

Ms. Nesbitt noted Mr. Morse wondered if the committees' questions were being answered. She advised him questions had been well answered and questions that could not be answered at the time were in the process of being answered.

Ms. Nesbitt requested if someone wished to speak to please identify him or herself for the minute taker.

Ms. Nesbitt proceeded to the review of the site plan.

Mr. Buxton noted the site plan shows a block of land in the center. This small block of land is the permitted quarry and he noted it is slightly less than 4 HA.

Mr. Buxton noted various houses along the highway, which had been surveyed and were shown on the site plan in the correct relative positions. He noted Whites Cove Road leading to the shore was shown at 66' wide but the Proponent is unsure of this, the last survey done indicated 33'. The Provincial government designated all highways as 66' by statute.

Mr. Trask asked where is the location of the quarry property.

Mr. Buxton pointed out the quarry property. He indicated the property is about 370 acres.

Mr. Trask asked in which direction would they expand the 10 acres.

Mr. Buxton using the site plan indicated the direction the quarry would expand. As noted in the August 29th 2002 minutes the quarry would move along to the East into the face, and then proceed to the North.

Mr. Buxton noted the one control is that the Proponent cannot blast, for example, within 100' of the highway or the property line. He also noted there is a bigger stipulation, as there are existing houses and therefore there are existing foundations. The permit stipulates the Proponent is not permitted to blast within 800 meters of an existing foundation unless the property owner grants specific permission to do so.

Mr. Buxton using the site plan pointed out areas where the Proponent will not be permitted to blast.

Mr. Trask noted the position of his well and questioned Mr. Buxton about this.

Mr. Buxton noted that at the last meeting the committee had discussed at some length the water supply issue and the potential problems with water supply. He noted the Proponent is currently having a comprehensive hydro-geological study done on site to determine whether there may be problems with blasting and associated wells.

Mr. Buxton noted the drilled wells in the area are a matter of public record and the Proponent is assembling the drill logs for those wells. He noted this information would provide the depth of the wells and the gallons per minute at the time the wells were drilled.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent would like to examine the wells in the area to test for depth, volume and chemical analysis of the water. He noted this information would

enable the Proponent to establish the status of a well, volume per minute when drilled, today and 5 years from now after an extensive series of blasting on site.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent would stipulate very clearly that if they were responsible for damaging any wells in that area they would provide an alternate source of water.

Mr. Buxton asked that if everyone in the area lost their well and the Proponent had to drill new wells at 105' and provide all the hookups, etc. this would cost the Proponent \$40,000.

Mr. Trask asked what if they do not find water at level.

Mr. Buxton stated the hydro-geological studies would state the levels of water throughout the basalt and the question would be which bed the water would be drawn from.

Mr. Buxton compared the cost of drilling new wells to the overall cost of opening the quarry operation at \$25 million.

Mr. Buxton noted the hydro-geologist did not feel water levels would be a problem but he did feel the Proponent may have difficulty with anyone who had a dug well and would not let the Proponent test the dug well. He noted that unless the Proponent was able to do a pre-test report on a dug well he was unsure of what the Proponent could do for them.

Mr. Buxton noted these are technical issues and the company cannot walk away from them. He noted if damage was done to any property the Proponent is required by law to repair it.

Mr. Trask asked if they were going down to sea level.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent is not allowed to go below sea level.

Mr. Trask asked if they would go to sea level.

Mr. Buxton replied they would go somewhat above sea level because they eventually want a slight grade away when they finish the site and remediate it. They want the site to drain.

Mr. Buxton noted an issue had been raised before and stated he wished to readdress it as it was fairly important and had been discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Buxton noted if the site had been in the middle of nowhere and there were no houses within 25 miles and the Proponent wanted to crush large quantities of rock and export them, the Proponent would want to use the most economical blasts he could develop. He would probably use about 1000 pounds of blasting mixtures in each delay, big blasts to get down big walls of rock.

Mr. Buxton indicated in this case, the permitted quarry, which is a small area, and the rest of it is adjacent to the Bay of Fundy, which is a fish habitat and possibly spawning grounds. Hence, there are very strict regulations in place to determine the level of blast (the amount of powder per hole) at various distances from a fish habitat or spawning ground.

Mr. Buxton noted there is a small test blast scheduled for the end of October. He noted that this designed to count 100 pounds per delay and this is about one tenth of the charge that would be used at a large quarry.

Mr. Trask asked how many pounds of dynamite would be used.

Mr. Wall replied typically there would be 5 pounds of toe load in the bottom of a hole; the rest would be ammonium nitrate or slurry. He noted typically very little dynamite is used.

Mr. Trask asked how much the dynamite will blast equal.

Mr. Wall replied 2000 pounds of explosive agent, primarily ammonium nitrate mixed with fuel oil which is a low grade commercial explosive.

Mrs. Trask asked if the fuel oil would get into the water.

Mr. Wall replied the fuel oil is burnt.

Mrs. Trask noted this had happened before.

Mr. Wall noted typically they mix 6% fuel oil with ammonium nitrate. He noted if more than this is used the fuse would not go off and it is a very controlled substance.

Mr. Buxton noted the committee would be getting a technical paper answering this question, as Mr. Harold Theriault had raised it at the last meeting. He noted the question would be answered as to precisely what the explosive is and the consumption of fuel oil.

Mr. Buxton noted the limitation of the size of the blast at this quarry is under the 1998 guidelines adopted by DFO. In order for a blast to take place at the site a blasting plan has to be approved by the DFO.

Mr. Buxton advised the committee the DFO has a blasting plan now for a test blast, which will be a very small blast in an area of 40' by 80'. The primary reason for the test blast is to carry out noise and seismic monitoring at the property lines and to put hydrophones in the water to determine if there is any noise transmitted into the water.

Mr. Buxton noted these will be fairly comprehensive tests and the Proponent is negotiating with the firm of Jacques Whitford from Halifax to monitor the test blast.

Mr. Buxton noted the results of the test blast would be given to the CLC.

Mr. Jeffrey asked if the test blast would be a normal size blast.

Mr. Buxton replied in terms of area and size of delay, yes and he noted for the guests who had not attended previous meetings the blasts do not go off together, they go off sequentially which is why they are called delays.

Mr. Buxton referred to a zipper being ripped and noted the blasts were similar to this. You cannot distinguish between the blasts but each delay will give a shock to the rock and create some noise and disturbance but they do not build on each other because there is a delay between each one going off. He noted this is the reason the DFO controls the amount of blasting material in each hole.

Mr. Wall addressed Mrs. Trask's earlier question. He noted that in order to give her an idea of the blasting mixture if the magnitude of a shot was 10,000 pounds of explosives approximately 600 pounds of shot would be fuel oil. If you were 98% efficient with your explosives you would have less than 2 gallons of fuel unconsumed. He also noted if a 4-wheeler tipped over there would be more hydrocarbon pollution from this than if a shot went terribly bad and the technical information would be made available to the committee.

Mr. Trask asked about other water sources on the property.

Mr. Buxton replied the Proponent does not have the final hydro-geological report.

Mr. Buxton pointed out on the drawing several areas they would look at to determine if there may be a pockets of water in those areas. He noted they are looking at faults, ribbons of quartz and areas of basalt where water can gather and they would look at all water sources because they are concerned about peoples' wells in the area noted on the site plan.

Mr. Trask asked if Mr. Buxton was stating there were no springs in the area being discussed.

Mr. Buxton answered no, and he stated that the hydro-geological report had not been completed. He noted that at one test hole as indicated on the site plan water could be heard but they were unsure of the depth and the water was heading down towards the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent would have the answers to these questions regarding the water supply. The Proponent has interest in what the water supply is as there is need of it for the crushing site for dust suppression and possibly to wash the aggregate and they would need to know that if they are taking water out whether there is sufficient water there for it to recover and not take water from someone else.

Mr. Buxton referred to the designs of the quarry showing wash ponds. He noted water would be collected in the wash ponds, dust drops to the bottom and the water is re-used. He noted some water would evaporate and have to be replenished.

Mr. Trask asked if as you come back into the mountain are you creating a large space where all the water from area will run.

Mr. Buxton replied from the top of the mountain, certainly. He indicated the top of the mountain on the site plan and stated the water that falls on each side of the mountain and will run each way.

Mr. Trask indicated the direction he believes the top of the mountain traveled.

Mr. Trask noted there were five springs and a large brook in the area.

Mr. Buxton noted this would be determined when the hydro-geologist report was completed. He noted this report would be discussed here with this committee.

Mr. Tidd noted 65 dBA was the sound level the permit was issued for and he wondered if he or Mr. Trask would hear a steady roar.

Mr. Buxton replied the level of his voice was about 65 dBA.

Mr. Tidd noted he would not wish to hear Mr. Buxton talk 24 hours per day.

Mr. Buxton reiterated that the CLC was formed because a permit was granted to operate a 4 HA quarry and the committee members are here to gather information on the 4 HA quarry and to ensure people get accurate information. He further noted that while it was fairly clear most people were interested in what happens when the quarry gets bigger than 4 HA, there is no permit in place for a larger quarry and this is the process is now being undertaken.

Mr. Buxton noted he cannot tell the committee or answer questions on what the terms and conditions will be of any future permits, he can only comment on what the terms and conditions are for the existing permit and essentially the noise level not to be exceeded at the property line is 65 dBA during the day, 60 dBA in the evening and 55 dBA at night.

Mr. Buxton referred to the sound level chart (see minutes – August 29th 2002 Appendix 2, page 3) and noted copies could be provided. He noted 65 dBA is loud conversation from a distance of one foot away and he noted the nearest house from where the quarry will actually be operating is approximately 1300 meters.

Mr. Trask asked about wind and weather conditions.

Mr. Buxton replied this did make a difference.

Mr. Trask stated the noise was going to extend to a large area.

Mr. Buxton noted as you move away from one foot to one thousand meters it is doubtful the noise would extend far.

Mr. Trask stated with the winds you would still hear the noise from the excavation.

Mr. Trask questioned whether Mr. Buxton would want to hear noise 24 hours per day. The quarry would work 24 hours per day and they would still hear it 24 hours per day. Mr. Buxton noted they may be able to hear some noise but the Proponent cannot exceed the noise levels set out by the permit, those noise levels are at the property line.

Mr. Trask asked when the tests were going to be done.

Mr. Buxton replied they would be done as soon as the permits were in place. A blasting plan had to be submitted to DFO and when the permit is received the site would be prepared and notification would be given to the consultants so they may set up for monitoring the blasts and the CLC has indicated they want to be apprised and be there.

Mr. Tidd asked if it had been decided how the aggregate was being taken out, either by way of St. Mary's Bay or the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. Buxton replied by way of Bay of Fundy. He noted if it is economical to build a marine terminal it will be built in White's Cove.

Mr. Tidd asked what this would consist of.

Mr. Buxton speculated it would be built of 36" pipe piles with a concrete cap on top.

Mr. Tidd asked if there was any mysterious harbour being built. He had heard rumours a wharf would be built and in ten years time you would be able to take lobster boats in.

Mr. Buxton replied the Proponent would need to get a ship loader out and there would be a line of rock out or a line of supports for the ship loader going out to a very large dolphin in the middle which will be concrete capped and on either side there will be other dolphins. He noted the ship would be approximately 625' long. He noted if a boat got into trouble during a storm it could possibly hide behind a dolphin.

Mr. Tidd asked if there were no plans to build a major harbour.

Mr. Buxton noted there would only be isolated dolphins.

Mr. Tidd asked how much lobster bottom this would take up if it would be one mile of shore.

Mr. Buxton noted he could not answer this question because he was not aware of the route the ship would take at this time and noted the shipping lanes could be moved towards the East. He noted the information on how the ship would come in, tie up, move out and go back into the shipping lanes would be provided to the committee and for the lobster fishermen.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent does have a side-scan sonar and seismic print of the bottom, which he will bring to another meeting. He noted the majority of the bottom immediately around the area of note is bare basalt, there is one patch of erratic boulders and as you go further out to the north and west there is a small patch of silty sand on the bottom.

Mr. Buxton noted this will be part of the design considerations. If a rock base is built to get the ship loader out and the bases of the dolphins are considered destructive to fish habitat the Proponent will have to create fisheries habitat to the satisfaction of the DFO.

Mr. Buxton noted this is not a question of giving them an amount of money. The Proponent will have to recreate the fish habitat destroyed. He noted it might be possible to take rock and spread it on the bare areas there now in order to create fish habitat. The DFO will advise the Proponent of this.

Mr. Wall noted he would like to address the issue of noise. He noted most of the activity would be at the 7-meter level, the quarry floor. The hillside goes up to approximately 100

– 125 meters and as a mitigating factor there would be a hill between the houses and the source of noise.

Mr. Tidd noted he could hear boats sailing up and down the Bay of Fundy from his home up in the hills. Others agreed with this comment.

Mr. Tidd noted this noise comes from sea level.

Mr. Wall noted Mr. Tidd is hearing those boats at a noise level of less than 50 dBA against a background level of approximately 40 dBA. He noted when a car drove by Mr. Tidd could no longer hear the boat.

Mr. Tidd agreed with this statement.

Mr. Wall also noted it had to be absolutely quiet in order for Mr. Tidd to hear these boats and this level of noise is significantly under the night time limit of 55 dBA.

Mr. Tidd stated his point is he likes hearing it once in awhile and half the reason he likes to live here is you like to hear noise once in awhile and then hear nothing but this quarry is going to be 50 dBA, 60 dBA 24 hours per day.

Mr. Buxton noted this is at the property line. He noted as you move away from the property line as Mr. Trask pointed out the weather conditions will determine to a large extent how high it will go on any particular day. He noted as you move away from the property line it clearly has to be less than what it is at the property lines.

Mr. Buxton again noted they were talking about a conversational level in the evening at the property line and he asked the committee and guests to imagine standing 300 – 400 meters from him and whether they could hear his voice.

Mr. Tidd understood this but he is against it.

Mr. Buxton noted this is not a silent operation and no one was trying to pretend one could crush rock and load it into a ship and not make any noise but the limits are set by regulation and those limits cannot be exceeded.

Mr. Tidd asked Mr. Wall if those limits were higher than in other places he had worked.

Mr. Wall replied the limits were the same. He noted in New Jersey the limit is 65 dBA at the property line during the day, 50 dBA at night and 55 dBA in the evening.

Mr. Tidd noted a gentleman at the school a few nights previously, possibly a Mr. Mahtab, mentioned 60 - 65 dBA was high.

Ms. Nesbitt noted a bulletin had been mailed which stated that questions would be answered and she wondered who would be providing the information. Would it be this Mr. Mahtab.

Mr. Tidd thought this was correct.

Mr. Wall asked what was his statement.

Mr. Tidd replied the Mr. Mahtab thought 60 – 65 was quite high boundaries for a noise level. He noted this gentleman was the spokesman for the evening.

Mr. Trask asked if Mr. Wall operated quarries at this time in New Jersey.

Mr. Wall stated at this time Clayton Concrete does not own a quarry in New Jersey. He noted they own three sand operations, produce approximately 38 million blocks per year, 4 million tons of sand at the different operations and they sell approximately 2 million cubic yards of concrete per year.

Mr. Trask asked how many rock quarries are in New Jersey.

Mr. Wall estimated there are a total of 75 – 80 mining permits in New Jersey and over half of them are quarries. He noted New Jersey is a small state but they make a mega amount of stone.

Mr. Wall noted population equals cars and cars equals' traffic and traffic equals roads. He noted he now lives in northern New Jersey and within a 25-mile radius of his home there are probably more than 10 quarries producing 2 million tons per year.

Mr. Trask asked if this was basalt rock.

Mr. Wall replied hard rock but he noted there are a couple of basalt rock quarries.

Mr. Trask asked in what part of New Jersey.

Mr. Wall replied he lives in Flanders, New Jersey, which is 45 miles west of the George Washington Bridge.

Mr. Tidd asked if you are allowed to take coastline along the American shore to bring a ship to shore. He asked if this was being done down there or around where Mr. Wall lives in New Jersey.

Mr. Wall noted there is only one quarry he knows of which loads boats in New England and the mid Atlantic region and it is in Connecticut. He noted the quarry is six miles from the water and they have their own railway from the quarry site to the loading point.

Mr. Tidd asked Mr. Wall if it is legal to do what they wanted to do here as on the American shore.

Mr. Wall replied there are several quarries on the Hudson, which load barges not ships.

Mr. Tidd asked if these were not on the salt water.

Mr. Wall noted the salt water goes up past Pokepsee and an Irish owned company loads barges and owns a quarry in Connecticut.

Mr. Tidd asked if this was on the main shoreline. He asked if there were any quarries along here.

Mr. Wall replied he did not think so.

Mr. Tidd noted a man made a statement and he was unsure of whether this man was an American or a Canadian and this man thought you were not allowed to take stone off the American shore.

Mr. Wall noted there are no laws prohibiting it but it's not economically feasible to do it.

Mr. Tidd took it there were laws in place so you couldn't remove the rock.

Mr. Wall noted he worked for a large quarry in New Jersey, Mount Hope Rock Products. He noted they had supplied 5 million tons per year.

Mr. Wall stated in 1988 they supplied a big job in Philadelphia for landfill where they sold 100,000 tons of 3/8 aggregate in one month. He noted they were later beaten out by Construction Aggregates from Nova Scotia for the remainder of the million tons of the 3/8 aggregate.

Mr. Wall noted the rule of thumb in the States is its 10 cents a 10-ton mile US\$ to ship by truck. He noted they were 38 miles from Manhattan and the stone was cheaper at the dockside from Nova Scotia by ship than from the center of New Jersey by truck.

Mr. Tidd asked if aggregate would come from a pit.

Mr. Wall replied from the center of New Jersey.

Mr. Tidd asked where is the Nova Scotia mine.

Mr. Buxton replied Auld's Cove, Port's Hawksbury.

Mr. Wall noted 10 million tons per year is sent by barge down the Hudson River to end users in the New York City area. He noted it is a big market and it is cost effective to come to Nova Scotia with the foreign exchange and labour differences and it is an economic move. There are no laws prohibiting you from doing it.

Mr. Wall noted as difficult as it is to get a permit in Nova Scotia it is truly an order of magnitude of difference in the States. He noted New Jersey is a fraction of the size of Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia has less than 1 million people and there are 17-18 million people in New Jersey.

Mr. Trask asked if there were any plans to go across eventually to St. Mary's Bay.

Mr. Wall replied there is 220 million tons of rock on 380 acres at Whites Cove and at 2 million tons per year this would be more than required. He noted currently there are no plans for this and this would be a totally separate issue, which they are not entertaining.

Mr. Trask asked about the property next to the quarry and wondered if they had been in touch with the owners.

Mr. Wall replied in the event that they were successful with the permit those people could be contacted in order to obtain an option on their property.

Mr. Buxton noted this would be to provide a buffer strip and this had been discussed at a previous meeting. He noted he had been asked if they were going to expand the quarry and he replied if they looked at other properties in the area it would be to provide buffers or possibly to acquire properties they think people might want to sell it at this stage but it is not to expand the 370-acre quarry.

Mr. Buxton noted as Mr. Wall pointed out the market the Proponent is looking at is 2 million tons per year and there is over 200 million tons of rock now, i.e. 100 years supply. He noted no one invests money on a project 100 years down the road, twenty years is an economic life of a project because this is the capital equipment amortization period and then you have to re-capitalize in order to get going again after 20 years. He noted 100 years is not in any economic calculations.

Mr. Trask asked what the wages would be in this quarry.

Mr. Buxton asked if this question could be put on hold as there had been two written questions on this and he wanted to respond to the written questions.

Ms. Harnish noted in reference to Mr. Trask's question about purchasing other property, she was stating for the record she had been asked to represent the Proponent in acquiring other property.

Mr. Trask asked if Ms. Harnish had been asked by the quarry to find more property for them.

Ms. Harnish stated she had been asked to inquire about purchasing from the adjoining properties.

Ms. Nesbitt read the job related questions into the record. (see minutes – August 29th 2002 Appendix 2 and 4).

Mr. Buxton noted Mrs. Measham's question had been partially answered and indicated the Proposed Quarry Manpower Schedule (Appendix 1) is for a quarry bigger than the permitted 4 HA. He noted the schedule indicates the range of wage levels, a job description as well as the number of positions.

Mr. Buxton noted at this time the Proponent has not specified the detailed qualifications, training or experience but he felt most of them speak for themselves.

Mr. Buxton noted there would be 2 shifts and he reviewed the positions on each shift and he noted Mr. Wall would be the quarry manager. He also noted there would be a shift differential of 50 cents per hour for the second shift and the positions would be virtually the same with the exception of the Office Clerk and the Quarry Manager.

Mr. Buxton noted this does not deal with the construction aspect and he noted he could not give the number involved for this because the Proponent does not know exactly what the construction is going to be at this time.

Mr. Trask asked how many excavators would be working on one shift.

Mr. Wall replied there would be one loader loading two trucks and at any given time there may be two other pieces of equipment operating. Stripping, ripping high spots in the floor.

Mr. Trask asked what Mr. Wall meant by stripping.

Mr. Wall replied the soil had to be removed on top of the ground before drilling and blasting occurs because the soil should not be mixed with the rock. He noted the soil would need to be saved in order to reclaim the site.

Mr. Trask asked what soil.

Mr. Wall noted the Proponent wants to pay competitive wages and they do not want to make the rates high so it puts a strain on other businesses in the area nor do they want to make them low and take advantage of people. He noted this type of industry is very capital intensive and they want good qualified people working on a permanent basis.

Mr. Trask asked if they would train the truck drivers.

Mr. Wall replied yes they would train people to give them industry specific training and industry specific safety training for these positions. He noted the goal is to develop a work force who will be with the company on a permanent basis. It is essential to develop a skilled permanent work force to be successful on a long-term basis.

Mr. Tidd asked if local people would gain jobs first or would they hire outside of Nova Scotia.

Mr. Wall stated load people first but judging by the number of applications there would be some disappointed. He noted Ms. Nesbitt is collecting resumes now.

Mr. Wall noted there is not going to be any midnight deals made with people on the side, on opening day it will be fresh faces. It will be people from the community. Jobs will be publicly posted so everybody will get a fair shot. He noted if there are people in the immediate impact area he did not think it would be uncalled for to give preference there.

Mr. Tidd noted he thought the farther away from the site the less people cared whether it comes or goes and he feels the community should be given preference.

Mr. Tidd asked if Mr. Wall was an owner of the quarry.

Mr. Wall replied he is not an owner and it is not a public corporation. He noted that the Claytons had been good successful employers. He noted this is not a surprise attack; they have read the regulations and applied to operate a quarry in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Tidd opposed this statement and noted that 10 years ago someone applied for a quarry in the same area.

Mr. Tidd asked if the Claytons and Mr. Johnson were familiar with each other.

Ms. Nesbitt noted Mr. Johnson had not met the Claytons.

Ms. Harnish noted Mr. Johnson had been looking at buying for investment purposes.

Mr. Trask asked if that was what he had been doing on Eastern Head.

Ms. Harnish replied yes.

Ms. Nesbitt noted there are a lot of rumours.

Ms. Carty replied she had heard a lot of rumours as well.

Ms. Nesbitt noted anyone could ask questions, they are welcome to attend the meetings and overtures had been made. She noted the CLC would give a package to the Concerned Citizens but they do not wish to have the information.

Mr. Tidd noted the Concerned Citizens Group does not want to hear it.

Ms. Nesbitt suggested Mr. Tidd has come to the right source for information.

Mr. Tidd noted the Proponent is on the money making end.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if this did not protect the area. She noted these people were not going to spend all this money for nothing.

Mr. Tidd noted he did not wish to hear an excavator 24 hours for the next 20 years.

Mr. Wall stated he is not saying this isn't something people will not notice but they will mitigate the effects.

Ms. Nesbitt asked about the plans to ship January to April.

Mr. Wall noted this would be determined by the weather, demand in the city. He noted this type of construction stops in December/January but he did not know enough about the schedule to make a determination. He did note the Proponent would work with any concerned party to coordinate activities.

Mr. Trask noted those i.e. December and May are the two most productive months of the lobster season.

Mr. Wall noted he did not know about the lobster season but he would like to talk to someone about this.

Mr. Trask asked if they could not fish in the area while the ship is loading.

Mr. Buxton noted the ship would load in 8 hours.

Mr. Trask asked if the lobster fishermen would have to move all their gear.

Mr. Buxton noted this would not be done everyday. He indicated there might be 2 ships in December and the company would try to arrange something with the lobster fishermen.

Mr. Trask asked if the ship would be tugged in.

Mr. Buxton noted that CSL has not yet stated its requirements.

Mr. Buxton noted no one is saying you can never lobster fish in White's Cove again but there may be 2 occasions in December and 2 or 3 in May when ships will come in and leave and this is something that can be discussed.

Mr. Wall asked how far out from the shore do you put the traps.

Mr. Tidd replied roughly three quarters of a mile.

Mr. Wall asked if he was not any closer.

Mr. Tidd replied he is not what you call an inshore fisherman.

Mr. Trask noted there are other traps.

Mr. Tidd noted half of a mile in the winter time out to 3 or 4 miles.

Mr. Jeffrey noted there are traps from inshore out to the shipping lanes.

Mr. Trask noted there are a large number of traps especially in December.

Mr. Wall noted the widest ship is 105 feet.

Mr. Trask asked how wide was the Weymouth barge.

Mr. Tidd replied 70 – 80 feet wide.

Mr. Trask asked if it caught traps.

Mr. Tidd replied it catches a lot of traps.

Mr. Jeffrey noted it caught several of his traps last December.

Mr. Tidd explained that there is an Irving Oil barge running St. John to pick up wood chips in Weymouth.

Ms. Nesbitt asked what happens with the gear when it is destroyed.

Mr. Tidd replied nothing, you can't prove the barge destroyed it.

Mr. Tidd noted that he had heard if his well happened to go dry he had been told that if it went to court it would be pretty well impossible to prove because it could have been an act of nature.

Mr. Buxton noted that this is why the Proponent would encourage people to allow them to do a pre-blast survey. If you've had water for the last 15 years, the drill log from the original driller who is licensed is registered with the province of Nova Scotia. It is all a matter of public record and anyone can look at the logs. The quantity of water the well driller identified when he drilled the well is known and if three years after the Proponent has been drilling your water has suddenly gone, you have a cast iron case.

Mr. Tidd noted he is working with tens and hundreds and the Proponent is working with millions. He noted he is up against the big boys and he is worried about this.

Mr. Trask noted as an example the Bremner's who live roughly a mile away have a quarry the day after dynamite went off their 200 foot drilled well went dry.

Ms. Nesbitt noted she knew of 3 wells in this same area did go dry and the day it happened the company brought bottled water and made sure the people's water needs were met. She noted within a few days 3 wells were drilled on site. She also noted two of the wells were dug wells and they had gone dry historically every summer and the other well did have some problem. She noted the people did have their water restored and their driveways were paved.

Mr. Trask noted this was one mile away from the blast and it did destroy wells.

Ms. Harnish asked who would perform the tests on the wells.

Mr. Buxton replied Jacques Whitford.

Mr. Buxton asked Mr. Trask if the Proponent came and asked him if they could do a pre-blast well survey on his property and take a chemical analysis of the water would he permit this.

Mr. Trask replied yes.

Mr. Buxton noted they would be very pleased to do this. There you have the evidence and if the water disappears, you have a cast iron case. If someone does not let us on the property then it does become more problematic.

Mr. Trask asked what if he wanted to hire his own contractor to do his well, would the Proponent pay for this.

Mr. Buxton replied yes.

Mr. Wall asked if this was to do the test or to do the well.

Mr. Trask replied to do the well.

Mr. Wall replied yes, if it is within a general range. He noted if the Proponent could do it for \$1000 and Mr. Trask's guy wanted \$5000, then this would be a problem.

Ms. Nesbitt asked about the pre-blast survey for the water test, how much land it would encompass, what area are we talking about.

Mr. Buxton replied the Proponent would do it in an area the hydro-geologist feels may be at risk. He noted he suspects the hydro-geologist and the geologist will tell them Little River will not be at risk. He noted the housing along the road and the immediate area would be at risk.

Mr. Trask asked if the Proponent had hired the geologist.

Mr. Buxton noted that the geologist is from the United States, the hydro-geologist is from Halifax, part of the Jacques Whitford Company, the biggest consulting engineering company this side of Montreal.

Mr. Buxton noted they probably do 90% of all of the environmental assessments in Nova Scotia. He noted Phillip Analytical would do the actual testing of the water in Halifax.

Mr. Buxton noted these are all independent companies.

Mr. Trask asked what were some of the other questions asked.

Ms. Nesbitt read the quarry boundaries question for the record.

Mr. Buxton noted the question was right in the sense the corner of the property on the south-east side is quite close to the road but no blasting can take place in this area.

Blasting cannot take place within 800 metres of any structure.

Mr. Trask asked where is 800 meters from the houses.

Ms. Harnish asked if the Proponent could excavate the southeast corner but they can't blast.

Mr. Buxton replied this was true. The map was reviewed and houses were pointed out on the southeast corner.

Mr. Trask asked if the arcs marking the map were the 800 meter points.

Mr. Buxton replied yes and he reviewed various houses located on the map.

Mr. Trask noted the position of his house, the 800 meters and asked if the Proponent could not come any closer than point referenced.

Mr. Buxton replied that blasting could never be any nearer and noted the area on the map which cannot be blasted.

Mr. Trask noted the quarry is 1000' away from those properties and the chances of draining all the water sources from those properties is very good, very high.

Mr. Buxton replied Mr. Trask could ask him question again after the hydro-geologist report was received.

Mrs. Trask asked if Mr. Buxton could understand their concerns.

Mr. Buxton replied of course he could but he noted the Proponent is trying to give out accurate information. He noted there is no point in giving an opinion at this time. When the professional study is completed this committee will be advised of the results. Mr. Trask can attend further meetings.

Mr. Trask noted he would prefer to attend another meeting.

Mr. Buxton noted Mr. Trask was very welcome to attend.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Mr. Tidd if he would like to look at the map.

Mr. Trask noted many people have concerns about water and noise.

Mr. Tidd noted sound travels in the community and he asked if property values would decrease.

Ms. Harnish replied possibly the adjoining properties but she has seen no indication so far. She noted she has never been involved with selling a property around a quarry.

Ms. Nesbitt noted if there is work in an area then people do tend to move towards those areas where there is employment, so is there a possibility in your opinion the increased work in the area will make those properties more desirable.

Mr. Trask replied he would think anyone working for a quarry would not want to live right next door to it.

Ms. Nesbitt read the question re: Changes, Modifications and Amendments to the Permit into the record. (see minutes - August 29th 2002 Appendix 2)

Mr. Buxton noted the answer to this question had been attached to the minutes of August 29th 2002 and forwarded to CLC members. He noted that this answer was from Bob Petrie, the NSDOEL Regional Manager. He was asked those questions.

Mr. Buxton read Appendix 3 of the minutes of August 29th 2002.

Mr. Buxton noted with the 4 HA permit if there are minor administrative changes Mr. Petrie is suggesting the CLC be made aware of them and the public be made aware of them. Mr. Petrie also noted with respect to a larger quarry if there is a major deviation requested, an amendment to the permit then it would be a requirement to go back and do the process again for that particular item.

Mr. Buxton noted everybody would be made aware of an amendment for a permit for a larger quarry; it would become a public issue.

Ms. Nesbitt read the questions for the Particulate Emissions into the record. (see minutes - August 29th 2002 Appendix 2)

Mr. Buxton replied at the moment he has not been able to come up with a reference for particulate emissions. He noted if he could find something in chart form or transparencies, which give some visual idea of what particulate emissions, are he will do so but he is unaware of any at the present time.

Mr. Buxton noted that there will certainly be stipulations in the approval for a larger quarry with respect to particulate emissions and monitoring. He noted he is unaware of what the stipulations would be and they would certainly be no less onerous than the ones for the 4 HA quarry.

Mr. Buxton noted as he has said with respect to noise that there is no current requirement for the Proponent to carry out testing for particulates emissions at the request of a landowner. He noted this is not to imply testing would not be carried out at the request of a landowner.

Mr. Buxton also noted Mr. Wall would be involved with Occupational Health and Safety Regulations with respect to particulate emissions. He noted if too many particulate emissions get into the air OHS will be there.

Mr. Buxton noted if particulates are not being produced on site they will not be getting off site. He noted there would be water trucks on site to keep the particulate emissions down because of the staff on site but also because the Proponent is not permitted to exceed certain levels at the property line.

Ms. Nesbitt read the questions for Decibel Levels into the record. (see minutes - August 29th 2002 Appendix 2)

Mr. Buxton replied this is much the same as particulate emissions. He noted the Proponent can be requested under the existing permit to carry out monitoring for noise and the NSDOEL can tell the Proponent where to take the noise tests.

Mr. Buxton noted there is nothing in the existing permit requiring the monitoring of sound at the request of landowners.

Mr. Buxton again noted this is not to imply the Proponent would not carry out monitoring at the request of landowners.

Ms. Nesbitt noted the question of abandonment.

Mr. Buxton replied there is no answer at the moment, but it will be supplied in written form.

Mr. Trask asked what the question about abandonment had been.

Ms. Nesbitt read the question into the record. (see minutes - August 29th 2002 Appendix 2)

Mr. Trask asked if there was an answer for at this time.

Mr. Buxton replied he does not have a written answer. He noted this is not a mine it is a quarry and when the permit was issued for a 4 HA quarry there was a requirement that the Proponent put up funds (\$6250 per acre/\$25,000 total) before any work is done. He noted within one year of the permit (April 30th 2003) a comprehensive remediation plan has to be submitted to the NSDOEL and at point the NSDOEL which will be assessed and further remediation bonds may be required.

Mr. Trask asked if the 4 HA quarry would be the working platform.

Mr. Wall agreed this would be a beginning.

Mr. Buxton noted as part of the process, the Registration of Undertaking, the Proponent has to give a very specific remediation plan.

Mr. Trask noted he has seen American companies come in, they work, make promises and then file Chapter 11, and they go bankrupt.

Mr. Buxton noted that Chapter 11 is a protection from creditors, it is not bankruptcy and we don't have the same provisions in Canada. He noted that the NSDOEL has the money. If the company walks away the government has the money to remediate.

Mr. Buxton noted that remediation for a lot of people is a vastly important issue. What is this site going to look like when it is finished?

Mr. Trask noted he has dealt with American companies and they have very good financial records and first thing you know they go out of business.

Mr. Buxton noted things like that happen in business but this company has been operating for 50 years and its record is a matter of public record. The EPA will confirm that they have an impeccable environmental protection record in the United States. He noted there are people in Nova Scotia who have checked this out quite thoroughly.

Ms. Nesbitt read the questions re: Trucking into the record. (see minutes - August 29th 2002 Appendix 2).

Mr. Buxton quoted from the written answer. The existing permit does not prohibit trucking of aggregates from the site. However, the permit application for a larger quarry will deal with this issue and it is highly probable the approval will set specific terms and conditions with respect to trucking of the aggregates.

Mr. Trask asked what about aggregates being trucked into the quarry.

Mr. Buxton asked Mr. Trask why would the Proponent truck into the quarry.

Mr. Trask replied he did not know, he was just asking. He is aware of aggregates being trucked in to other quarries up the neck.

Mr. Buxton noted this issue has never been raised. He noted he did not think the Proponent would be able to buy rock material and truck it from any other basalt quarry to site cheaper than it can be created on site itself.

Mr. Wall noted it is not economically feasible. He noted that most of the departments the Proponent deals with have specific approval requirements and if aggregate came from an outside source there would have to be another site approval by these departments.

Mr. Wall noted this is a business where you get contracts by nickels and dimes, it is a very cost competitive business, and it's just not feasible to do.

Mr. Trask replied 'at this time'.

Mr. Buxton asked if he was talking about in 40 years time.

Mr. Trask replied yes.

Mr. Buxton said that essentially there is no market for aggregates in the local areas of any magnitude and hence trucking is not in the plan. However, the Proponent has stated that should a request come from a government agency for a specific local project the Proponent would seriously consider the request.

Mr. Buxton noted that if some project in Little River wanted 5000 tons of aggregate and we got a request from the community of Little River or the Municipality of Digby or the Provincial Government we would probably supply it as a good neighbor gesture.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent is talking about shipping 2 million tons per year, to truck a few thousand tons would be a money losing proposition but we would do it as a good neighbour gesture.

Ms. Nesbitt read the questions for access to the quarry site into the record. (see minutes - August 29th 2002 Appendix 2).

Mr. Buxton noted he has said it is possible a different access point to the quarry could be used to the northeast and this is being investigated, there is some potential there.

Ms. Nesbitt read Mr. Theriault questions 10 and 11 into the record. (see minutes - August 29th 2002 Appendix 4).

Mr. Buxton noted read his written response.

Mr. Buxton noted if anyone could produce evidence that the operation of this quarry will lose a job then the Proponent will respond to it. He noted he couldn't respond because he does not think there will be a job lost.

Mr. Tidd noted that he was aware of a business that may close as a result of a quarry operation.

Mr. Buxton noted unless the Proponent knows he cannot respond.

Mr. Tidd noted a fisherman can walk away with his paper in his briefcase and he has all he'll ever need with him. I.e. quotas.

Mr. Trask noted if three of his people leave this would put him out of business.

Mr. Buxton noted anyone hiring for the quarry would take those kinds of things into account. He noted it is clearly not the Proponent's purpose to take people away from the local businesses.

Mr. Trask noted other operations in the area are in the same situation.

Mrs. Carty noted people would probably be applying because there are rumours Irving Sawmill may shut down in November and there are 60 people working there and they do not have a lot of education. She noted a lot of those people could be applying for jobs.

Ms. Nesbitt noted when people do go to other jobs for a better opportunity there is always somebody else to take their place.

Mr. Trask stated he doesn't agree with statement and if someone has done a job for 20 years and then you lose them and you have to retrain.

Ms. Harnish noted if Mr. Buxton sees they already have jobs he may decline their applications.

Mr. Buxton noted that the company will look carefully at the situation. He noted there would be a high degree of sensitivity in the hiring of people.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if anyone else would like to add anything.

Ms. Nesbitt read Mr. Theriault question 12 into the record. (see minutes - August 29th 2002 Appendix 4).

Mr. Buxton read his written response to this question.

Mr. Trask asked Mr. Buxton if he was saying this was going to be a way of life. This noise is going to be a way of life for us.

Mr. Buxton replied no and he noted his first statement. There will be no guarantees there will be no negative effects.

Mr. Trask noted Christine just told them the value of our properties is going to be effected by this.

Mr. Buxton noted in his view whatever you do anywhere there is some sort of effect on property.

Mr. Buxton noted there is no question in his mind there will be an effect. It might be a positive or a negative effect. He can't tell but he can say there will be an effect even if it is neutral. He noted everything you do has an effect on something and we will not pretend you can operate a quarry here without someone complaining and the Proponent will not make guarantees there will be no negative effects.

Mr. Trask asked if it affects the value of our property would there be compensation for us.

Mr. Buxton noted there are ways of handling this situation.

Mr. Trask noted he has a lot of money invested in his property.

Mr. Buxton agreed Mr. Trask has a very nice property.

Mr. Trask noted he does not want to move.

Mrs. Trask noted there is nowhere else they want to move to.

Ms. Harnish noted that property values may be effected when the quarry starts up but it may not be as bad as everybody thinks, it may level out again. She noted she did not know.

Mr. Wall noted if it were something the Trasks would like to discuss he would be happy to meet with them and discuss what he knows of the Principals view

Mr. Trask noted one property; someone looked at it and when they found out about the quarry they turned away from it.

Mr. Tidd asked if a gypsum mine is different.

Mr. Wall noted what is different about a gypsum mine is that they have a railroad going in and out moving the product and there is nothing noisier than a railroad.

Mr. Tidd noted it wasn't about the noise but a man who worked on the railroad said the railroad paints the houses every year because there is so much dust.

Mr. Wall noted he could not envision a scenario where the quarry would make any amount of dust and there are particulate requirements have to be adhered to.

Mr. Tidd asked where does the water go when you wash the stone, it takes a lot of water to wash kind of rock.

Mr. Wall replied it goes around and around, it is a closed circuit system.

Mr. Tidd asked if it wouldn't get back into the water table.

Mr. Wall replied yes it would, its water.

Mr. Tidd asked would it pick up minerals and whatever you are taking off the rock.

Mr. Wall noted it would not pick up any minerals that aren't already there.

Ms. Harnish asked Mr. Buxton if he knew if they were washing the stone in Roxville.

Mr. Buxton replied he didn't know.

Mr. Trask noted a man who is 12 miles from the gypsum mine stated every time they blast his windows rattled at midnight.

Ms. Nesbitt asked is it likely the people who live in Little River will hear or feel the blast.

Mr. Wall noted he does not know how far out it will go. The test blast will answer some of these questions.

Mr. Trask asked if this test blast will be smaller than a normal blast.

Mr. Buxton replied no. In fact it is the biggest blast the company is able to use under the guidelines set out by DFO.

Mr. Trask asked what does the fisheries have to say about noise in the water.

Mr. Buxton replied he does not know what comments DFO will have with respect to noise in the water. However, the Proponent will test for noise transmission in the water during the test blast.

Mr. Buxton noted there were other questions concerning this kind of issue from Harold Theriault. Will the noise have any effect on the herring? This is not known but is being researched by our marine ecologist.

Mr. Trask asked if you don't know you can still go ahead if there is no information on it.

Mr. Buxton noted there is no information on some of these issues anywhere in the world, it is simply not known. He noted the Proponent will give specific answers where there are answers available and if there is no scientific information we can't give an answer.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Tidd asked Ms. Nesbitt if she had any other questions.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that was the end of the questions from Mr. Theriault Jr.

Mr. Tidd asked about other companies in the States, are they going to see you bringing it back cheaper than them and isn't everybody going to rush up along Digby Neck to have a little quarry. He noted competition is competition.

Mr. Trask asked if this is the reason Christine is looking for other property.

Ms. Harnish stated no, she is looking at the adjoining properties.

Mr. Wall noted one thing he could say for the company is that they are looking for one quarry site in this area. With respect to whether everybody will jump into this, he does not think so because there are only so many docks in New York where you can unload the stone.

Mr. Tidd asked Mr. Buxton is there anybody looking for other places up along the neck, on Victoria Beach.

Mr. Buxton replied that the Proponent isn't.

Mr. Tidd asked if there was anyone else.

Mr. Buxton replied he couldn't speak for anybody else.

Mr. Tidd asked Mr. Buxton if he was only working for the Clayton's.

Mr. Buxton replied that his client is Global Quarry Products.

Mr. Tidd noted he is trying to get his point across that we have this on our shoulders down the river, this might be in Centreville, this might be in Gulliver's, it might be in Victoria Beach.

Mr. Trask asked Ms. Harnish if they were looking for another site in Digby.

Mr. Wall noted that the Proponent wants one quarry in this area and the reason they want a quarry in this area is that basalt rock is a good quality aggregate for construction purposes.

Mr. Wall noted if you look at the map from where the market area will be up and down the coast there is the transportation advantage of coming here versus going up to Auld's Cove or going into some of the quarries in Halifax or going to Newfoundland. He noted

there is a disadvantage of being on windward side of the Bay of Fundy because you are going to have expensive dock building costs.

Mr. Trask asked where were you looking.

Mr. Tidd noted the other night at a meeting a lady stood up from Wolfville and said they are concerned about it there.

Mr. Wall asked where.

Mr. Tidd replied Wolfville, above Kentville and New Minas.

Mr. Wall added there are very few places you can offload the stone in the Metropolitan New York area. He noted having a place to land it is pretty much the determining factor.

Mr. Trask asked will they take on ballast water.

Mr. Wall replied typically most of the ships take the stone to the States bring coal up to Nova Scotia.

Mr. Trask asked where do they use it.

Mr. Buxton Auld's Cove is an offload point for coal taken by train to Point Aconi.

Mr. Wall noted years ago in Nova Scotia when there was a coal mining industry in Nova Scotia they built a lot of coal fired power plants. He understood there is more coal coming north than there is stone going south but he is not the authority on this but he is sure information is publicly available from the power authorities here and from Canadian Steamship Lines.

Mr. Wall noted as far as whether they take on ballast water or whatever they do he does not know but he is sure they have a set of regulations they must live with.

Mr. Wall noted the ships would be Canadian Flag vessels.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that it seems with every kind of industry or every kind of economic activity there's noise. She noted in the forestry industry there are chainsaws and we put up with and in the fishing industry.

Mr. Trask replied you can't compare woods work with a quarry.

Ms. Nesbitt noted they did work 24 hours.

Mr. Trask replied but they won't be there for thirty years.

Ms. Nesbitt discussed various industries, noises, levels and effects the community puts up with and accepts it.

Mr. Trask noted these noises are for a few seconds.

Ms. Nesbitt noted what she was saying is for a community to be successful sometimes there has to be diversification.

Mr. Tidd again raised the question about noise and dust.

Ms. Nesbitt noted on these two issues that NSDOEL has restrictions for noise and particulate emissions.

Mr. Tidd noted he has so much riding on this and he was not speaking for just himself. His home is there, his work is there and up until last Friday night he was on the fence; he didn't want the quarry because it was of no benefit to him. However, he heard from a speaker at the Concerned Citizens Group's meeting that it is possible to lose his water, and there will be some noise and dust he thinks it is changing his lifestyle from what he had planned it out. He noted maybe he is the one has to get up and get going.

Ms. Nesbitt won't say but she asked what makes this speaker man more credible than the Proponent.

Mr. Tidd replied nothing but he had heard the negative first.

Ms. Harnish noted it is her understanding this committee is an ongoing committee and so factors such as noise and dust pollution are to be brought to the attention of the committee. If they are exceeding the limits then the committee goes to the NSDOEL with the complaint.

Mr. Buxton noted Mr. Trask should be given a copy of the guidelines for the CLC.

Mr. Trask asked who is on the committee.

It was noted Cindy Nesbitt, Christine Harnish, Mark Jeffrey, Judy Carty, Brian Cullen and John Ivens.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Mr. Tidd if he would like to join the committee.

Mr. Tidd replied he is on the other committee. (I.e. the Concerned Citizens Committee)

Ms. Nesbitt noted that he might like to take information back or bring questions from the Concerned Citizens.

Mrs. Trask replied they don't want us to take information back.

Ms. Nesbitt noted any information the CLC has always been offered to anyone, there is a book at store, all the information, any questions, and Ms. Nesbitt noted she has done a lot of research on Internet.

Mrs. Trask asked if there were any pictures of sites they have reclaimed.

Mr. Wall replied he did not think they had closed any sites but he would check.

Mrs. Trask asked how old are the oldest sites.

Mr. Wall replied they have been mining at two locations in New Jersey for over 20 years. He noted one site in Jackson, New Jersey is where Gliddon Paint had mined titanium dioxide and he is not sure of the other one.

Mr. Buxton noted there are very good examples of reclaimed quarries. He is not sure if there are any examples in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mrs. Trask asked whether the deposit for reclamation is paid and then it becomes our government's responsibility.

Mr. Buxton replied no, it only becomes their responsibility if the Proponent doesn't do it.

Ms. Nesbitt circulated photos of some reclaimed quarries.

Mr. Buxton noted that when the site is remediated it will be a lot more valuable than it is today, it will be accessible, it will be subdivided, and it will be at a 7-metre elevation above the water with a gentle slope.

Mr. Jeffrey asked if any of the rock could be quarried without blasting.

Mr. Wall replied they would see how it turns out.

Mr. Wall noted in terms of cost projections everything is planned to be blasted.

Mr. Tidd asked if the meetings were taped.

Ms. Sanford replied this is the first one to be taped.

Mr. Buxton noted the minutes belong to the CLC and the Proponent is required to provide some one to record the meeting.

Mr. Tidd asked Mr. Buxton if he is a legal representation for the company.

Mr. Buxton noted he speaks for the company in the sense that he is the Project Manager of this particular quarry operation.

Mr. Buxton asked Mr. Tidd if the Concerned Citizens Group had seen the permit to the 4 HA quarry.

Mr. Tidd replied he did not know.

Mr. Tidd asked to get this permit you did not need an environment assessment.

Mr. Buxton replied that no environmental assessment was required for the 4 HA permit.

Mr. Tidd noted on Friday it was said at the Concerned Citizens Group meeting that there is not a permit issued by DFO for a wharf.

Mr. Buxton replied that the Proponent hasn't made an application yet.

Mrs. Trask asked why the application hasn't been yet.

Mr. Buxton responded because the Proponent hasn't completed the conceptual design yet.

Mr. Tidd asked for the big quarry does there have to be public consultation.

Mr. Buxton responded that that is what the CLC is all about.

Mr. Tidd replied yes we are doing it here but how many people are here, I can count them on my fingers. Maybe somebody doesn't want three hundred people in a room.

Mr. Buxton replied no but there have been for example at least six members of this committee who agreed to sit from this community were in fact were threatened to the extent they would not come. He noted other people had been told if they come to this meeting then so and so, that is why there are so few people around the table. He noted the information is readily available, the minutes are sent out to anybody who wants a copy, they are available at the Municipal Building, they are available at Ms. Nesbitt's store, they are available by calling on the telephone, the information is out there.

Mr. Trask noted people are very concerned about what's going to happen to their water supply, they'd like an answer.

Mr. Wall replied the information is not being withheld it is just not been completed at this point.

Mr. Wall noted the partnership was formed in the beginning of May and the studies were commissioned at point and to date over \$100,000 has been spent on studying all of these different aspects and the studies are not complete at this point. He noted information is not being withheld.

Mr. Trask asked what will the pier cost.

Mr. Wall replied there is a range of different designs, anywhere from \$3 million to \$10 million.

Mr. Wall replied those ships are big.

Mr. Trask asked what happens if the ship docks and

Mr. Jeffrey asked if this quarry gets off the ground are you going to block public access to White's Cove, the beach, and the shoreline.

Mr. Buxton replied that access is a safety issue but at the moment it is a public road. He noted that there will be blasting, crushing, and vehicles moving.

Mr. Trask asked if you intend to get control of the road.

Mr. Buxton noted they would like to from a safety perspective.

Mr. Trask asked about the ATVs going through the woods at blasting periods.

Mr. Wall replied that a blasting procedure will be implemented. When there will be a blast in the quarry, quarry personnel will be notified and they will assist in blocking all public entrances and policing the area that would be impacted by the blast.

Mr. Trask noted there are a lot of kids in the area.

Mr. Wall replied before we start blasting the area has to be cleared. It will be visually surveyed, entrances will be blocked off and a visual inspection of the site made.

Ms. Harnish asked if the residents of the village will be notified when the test blast is done.

Mr. Buxton replied the Committee will be notified.

Ms. Harnish wondered if they should put a notice in the store.
Mr. Buxton replied if the Committee wants a notice posted the company will do so.
Mr. Trask asked if the blasts would be a monitored.
Mr. Buxton replied yes they will be.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.
Mr. Tidd asked if the next meeting would be before the test blast.
Mr. Buxton replied yes.
Mr. Tidd asked if it will not touch the shoreline.
Mr. Buxton replied no it is set back.
Mr. Trask asked in which direction is the pier going from.
Mr. Buxton replied northwest.
Mr. Tidd asked how long had Mr. Wall had been in the business.
Mr. Wall replied 25 years.
Mr. Trask asked if you put rock down, how many feet out will it be.
Mr. Buxton replied 600 feet.
Mr. Trask asked if this will create more tide.
Mr. Buxton replied only if we block it off.
It was agreed the next meeting would be set for October 17th, 7.00 p.m. same location.
Meeting was adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Proposed Quarry Manpower Schedule

First Shift	Shift Total 17
1 – plant operator	14.00 – 16.00
1 – quarry operator	15.00 – 17.00
1 – plant manager	Salaried
2 – quarry rock truck drivers	12.00 – 14.00
1 – class A mobile equipment mechanic	16.00 – 18.00
2 – ground man / labor	11.00 – 13.00
1 – electrician (back up plant operator)	16.00 – 18.00
1 – quality control tech	13.00 – 15.00
1 – fuel man / greaser	12.50 – 14.50
1 – water truck driver	12.50 – 14.00
2 – misc. equipment operators (bulldozer, excavator, clean up loader)	14.00 – 16.00
1 – office clerk	12.00
2 – welder repairman	14.50 – 16.50
Second Shift plus \$.50 per hour shift differential	Shift Total 14
1 – plant operator	14.50 – 16.50
1 – electrician (back up plant operator)	16.50 – 18.50
2 – ground man / labor	11.50 – 13.50
2 – welder repairman	15.00 – 17.00
1 – quality control tech	13.50 – 15.50
1 – shift foreman	18.00 – 20.00
1 – mechanic, fuel greaser	13.00 – 15.00
1 – face operator	15.50 – 16.50
1 – misc. operator	14.50 – 16.50
2 – quarry truck drivers	12.50 – 14.50
1 – water truck drivers	13.00 – 14.50
	Plant Total 31

Minutes of Meeting of Community Liaison Committee

Nova Stone Exporters Inc/Global Quarry Products Inc

7.00 p.m. October 24th 2002

Sandy Cove Fire Hall

In attendance: Ms. Cindy Nesbitt, CLC Member
Mr. Mark Jeffrey, CLC Member
Mr. John Ivens, CLC Member
Ms. Judith Carty, CLC Member
Ms. Christine Harnish, CLC Member
Mrs. Marian Angrignon
Ms. Diane Langdale
Mr. Fred Trask
Mr. Kingsley Bilcher
Miss. Mary McCarthy
Mrs. Lynyak
Mr. Dwight Outhouse
Mrs. Angela Outhouse
Mrs. Marcella Towle
Mr. Travis Frost
Mrs. Sarah Frost
Mr. Paul Buxton NSEI/GQPI
Ms. Betty MacAlpine NSEI/GQPI
Ms. Tammy Sanford NSEI/GQPI

Regrets: Mr. Brian Cullen, CLC Member, Mr. David Graham, CLC Member

Ms. Nesbitt welcomed Committee members and guests to the meeting and noted that the meeting would be an open forum and all questions would be welcomed.

Ms. Nesbitt noted one item for revision in the minutes of September 25th 2002.

Amendment 1 - page 5. Mr. Buxton replied by way of St. Mary's Bay. This should read "by way of the Bay of Fundy."

The minutes of September 25th 2002 were approved with the above noted amendment.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any questions arising from the September 25th 2002 minutes. Ms. Nesbitt advised the guests that copies of the minutes are available upon request and she noted that she was pleased to see more people attending the meeting and hopes that this will spark more discussion. She thanked them for attending.

Ms. Nesbitt proceeded to the next agenda item - Answers to previous questions. She noted that Mr. Buxton had provided answers to previous questions which had been put into written form and that the answers are available with the minutes.

Mr. Buxton noted that the answer to the question regarding manpower had been attached to the minutes of September 25th 2002. (See Appendix 1 – Proposed Quarry Manpower Schedule) He noted that each question and response will be recorded on an individual page and will be made available to anyone asking that specific question. These pages will be available at the office in Digby or from the CLC members.

Mr. Buxton noted a question with respect to changes and modifications of a permit had been asked. (See Appendix 2 – August 29th 2002 minutes) He noted Bob Petrie the Regional Manager of NSDOEL answered this question and the answer was circulated at the September 25th 2002 meeting.

Mr. Buxton noted that the question regarding abandonment of a quarry (See Appendix 2 – August 29th 2002 minutes) had not been answered at the previous meeting. He read the question and provided background pertaining to the question for those people attending their first CLC meeting. He noted that when a permit was issued for a 3.9 HA (10 acre) quarry one of the conditions in the permit was that the NSDOEL could require the Proponent to set up a Community Liaison Committee to deal with the 4 HA quarry.

Mr. Buxton noted that the NSDOEL asked the Proponent to set up the CLC approximately 3 ½ months ago and that this is the fifth meeting of the committee. He noted that the CLC is technically to deal with the permitted quarry that is 3.9 HA. He further noted that he had made it clear at the first meeting that most people were interested in the permit application for the larger quarry and that questions could come forward from anyone in regards to the larger quarry even though the CLC was set up to monitor the activities of the smaller quarry.

With respect to the question re: abandonment Mr. Buxton noted that Ms. Measham and Mrs. Wilson were referring to the approval document for the small quarry. There is a requirement to put up money for rehabilitation before any quarrying is done and within twelve months of the issuance of a permit the Proponent must submit a comprehensive rehabilitation plan which is acceptable to the NSDOEL and that plan is then costed. If the NSDOEL thinks that this plan is for example \$200,000 the Proponent has to put up that money up front.

Mrs. Lynyak asked if the Proponent could put up a bond.

Mr. Buxton replied that they could.

Mrs. Lynyak noted this would be cheaper.

Mr. Buxton replied that this is correct and that the result is the same. If the terms and conditions of the bond are not met then the bonding company has to put up the money instead of the Proponent.

Mrs. Lynyak asked what happens if the bonding company is not satisfied with what the Proponent will do. She noted that the Clayton's are in trouble in Florida.

Mr. Buxton replied that the Clayton's do not operate in Florida.

Miss McCarthy asked who told him this.

Mr. Buxton replied that he is aware that the Clayton's do not operate any quarries in the United States.

Miss McCarthy noted that she has a connection with an insurance company and that she is aware that the Clayton's are suing their own insurance company.

Mr. Buxton asked whether this was in connection with a quarry.

Miss McCarthy replied yes.

Mr. Buxton again noted that the Clayton's do not operate a quarry.

Miss McCarthy noted that maybe her tense was incorrect.

Mr. Buxton again noted that they do not operate any quarries at this time.

With respect to bonding Mr. Buxton explained for example, any contract that a contractor performs for the Provincial government, building a school, a highway, is bonded. He noted that it is very difficult to get a bond in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mrs. Lynyak asked how do you get a bond.

Mr. Buxton replied firstly by being a reputable company with a history of completed projects. He noted for example that if you were just starting up a business and bid on a 30-mile highway you could not get a bond.

Ms. Lynyak stated that she thought this was not true in Nova Scotia that it was wrong for people to go on the past history of a company.

Mr. Buxton replied for example if a construction company bid on a small contract and successfully performed that contract, and possibly a second larger contract, a bonding company could be approached and the company receive a bond for a larger contract. Generally, today it is more difficult to get a bond.

Ms. Lynyak asked if she could check with the company that issues the bond. She noted that they have had no assurances of the value of this company.

Miss McCarthy asked who exactly is the Proponent, the bonding company, the contractor.

Mr. Buxton replied the owner of the right to quarry is Nova Stone.

Miss McCarthy requested more information on Nova Stone and noted that the information on Nova Stone is not very credible. She also noted that she has discovered from the Registry of Joint Stock that their e-mail address is a hotmail company and that an e-mail company is not very reliable. She noted it was a fast way of getting in touch but not verifiable information.

Miss McCarthy asked who are the directors of the company. She noted that she is aware of Corinna Kincaid.

Miss McCarthy also noted that she was aware that the treasurer is Shelly Wanbe and asked who else is in the company.

Mr. Buxton replied that there are no other directors.

Miss McCarthy asked what is the address of the company.

Mr. Buxton replied that this can be provided.

Miss McCarthy noted several addresses from previous documents and that the telephone numbers were incorrect. She noted that this is the company and she has no idea of whom she is dealing with, there are two names, no address, and no telephone number. She further noted that she had gone into the office in Digby hoping to get some answers and thought that she would be approaching Nova Stone and that she was told it is Global Quarry Products.

Miss McCarthy asked who is the director of the company and will we ever see the director.

Mr. Buxton replied that he is the Project Manager in the province of Nova Scotia and that he is in charge of getting this project off the ground. He noted that his name is in the telephone book and that he lives in Deep Brook.

Miss McCarthy asked if we have a problem, a court case, can we implicate Mr. Buxton.

Mr. Buxton replied yes.

Miss McCarthy asked where did this company come from, who is this company Nova Stone Inc. She asked if Mr. Buxton was telling her that he is the company.

Mr. Buxton noted that the company is a registered corporation in the province of Nova Scotia and he reminded Miss McCarthy that she had already checked this with the Registry of Joint Stock. It is a legitimate Nova Scotia company.

Miss McCarthy asked why the telephone numbers do not work.

Mr. Buxton noted the number for the 4 HA quarry is 530-2619 in Bridgewater for Corrina Kincaid or Shelly, the secretary.

Mr. Buxton noted that if she would like to find out information about the progress of the application for permits she should come into the Digby office or call him directly.

Miss McCarthy noted that she wants to deal directly with the company.

Mr. Buxton replied that when she talks to him she is dealing with the company.

Miss McCarthy referred to the letter she had received from Corrina Kincaid and that the telephone numbers were incorrect.

Mr. Buxton replied that she was looking at information that is out of date. He noted that if she wanted information to call him and if she wanted extensive information on subjects that we had started to discuss such as the abandonment of a quarry then he recommended that she attend the CLC meetings.

Miss McCarthy replied that she had a question about the abandonment of a quarry. She noted that the bond of \$6250 per hectare would be roughly \$2000 per acre and that this amount would not even cover the cost to drill a well.

Mr. Buxton addressed the chair and noted that he had begun to answer the question when Miss McCarthy interrupted him and he noted that if she had listened to the answer she would have the correct information.

Ms. Nesbitt requested that Miss McCarthy respect the way the meeting is run.

Miss McCarthy asked if she should address the chair to start with.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that this was correct.

Miss McCarthy noted that she is concerned about the out of date information.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that this does happen when you are setting up, temporary addresses, telephone and fax numbers are in place until an office is set up. She noted that this is routine and that it occurs frequently.

Miss McCarthy noted Mr. Petrie advised her that there would be transparency in the process and she was hoping that they would be brought up to date.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that any information they have requested has been received by the CLC and that this was the first meeting that Miss McCarthy had attended. She is most welcome to attend but when we are dealing with a question we finish with the question and we move onto something else. She requested that Miss McCarthy finish listening to Mr. Buxton and then if she had another question she was more than welcome to ask that question.

Miss McCarthy replied that she did not wish to interrupt the meeting but she felt that these things were very important. She noted that the most important thing tonight is to know whom we are dealing with.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that she is finding that out now.

Mr. Buxton noted that the procedure for when a permit is issued is that there is an initial bond or cash which is in the amount of \$6250.00 per hectare; for a 4 HA quarry it is

\$25,000. He noted that before any work is done that amount of money is paid to the Minister of Finance for the province of Nova Scotia.

Ms. Lynyak asked if this is where the bond went.

Mr. Buxton replied that this company paid cash, a certified cheque for \$25,000.

Ms. Lynyak asked why would they do that.

Mr. Buxton replied because they chose to do so. He noted that the second procedure is that within one year from the issuance of the permit, in this case by April 30th 2003, a comprehensive rehabilitation plan for the 4 HA quarry is to be submitted to the NSDOEL. NSDOEL will look at the plan and if they approve of the rehabilitation plan and they think the cost of the rehabilitation is X dollars, the company can then post a bond in that amount or it can pay cash in that amount. If the rehabilitation work is not carried out the province either has the cash or it can call on the bonding company to put up the cash.

Ms. Lynyak asked if the province would have use of that money for thirty years.

Mr. Buxton replied if the cash was put up, yes.

Ms. Lynyak noted that we should have the right to know where that money is kept.

Mr. Buxton replied that she would have to ask the Minister of Finance.

Ms. Lynyak noted that Mr. Buxton had stated the reason this company can work here is that it has a great reputation. She stated that that reputation would have to be translated into actual facts available.

Mr. Buxton replied to the chair that he would like to correct this statement. The operating company is Global Quarry Products and the owner of the permit is Nova Stone. Both are Nova Scotia companies.

Ms. Lynyak noted she stands corrected.

Mr. Buxton noted that the Clayton's hope to buy the rock.

Ms. Lynyak asked if it is the insurance company's responsibility to check them out.

Mr. Buxton replied the insurance company has nothing to do with it. It's a bonding company.

Ms. Lynyak asked if it was especially for bonds, performance bonds.

Mr. Buxton replied that there can be bid bonds, performance bonds, etc.

Ms. Lynyak asked if in this case it is a performance bond.

Mr. Buxton replied that it would be a form of performance bond. He noted that if the rehabilitation is not done the bonding company is required to put up the money.

Ms. Lynyak asked if it would be out of place to ask who the company is that had done this.

Mr. Buxton replied the Proponent has paid cash so there is no bonding company.

Ms. Lynyak replied they didn't have to prove anything to anybody and asked if all they had to do was give the money.

Mr. Buxton noted if the next piece of funding required \$250,000 then bonding would become an option. He noted that for a larger quarry the rehabilitation sum might be in the millions.

Ms. Lynyak replied that he had answered her question. The question she asked was how are they to tell the reputation of Nova Stone and she thinks the answer is that you can't, that there is no way to check it.

Mr. Buxton noted there is no history of Nova Stone and Global Quarry Products as they are recent companies.

Mr. Buxton readdressed the question from Ms. Measham and Mrs. Wilson, which dealt with this very issue. He noted their concern was essentially “when can a quarry be forced to rehabilitate, the point being that as long as the quarry is in operation then perhaps they don’t have to rehabilitate.” He noted the Proponent has said that for a permit for larger quarry they would undertake concurrent rehabilitation, i.e. when a piece of land has been worked it would then be rehabilitated as other parts of the quarry are opened.

Ms. Lynyak noted that the Pits and Quarry Guidelines states 30 years.

Mr. Buxton replied that in the terms and conditions of a larger quarry NSDOEL will make these kinds of conditions and the Proponent must adhere to the rehabilitation plan set out in the permit application. The Proponent intends to do this because they believe it to be good practice and on a practical note it becomes more difficult to manage a large open area of quarry site.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent is required to have settling and wash ponds, and environmental structures in place to prevent any particulate matter entering the Bay of Fundy. If the Proponent has 100 or 200 acres of open quarry, as people have claimed, it would be virtually impossible to control that because there would need to be 5 - 7 sedimentation ponds and it would become an operational nightmare. If you rehabilitate as you go you only have a small open area to control water and direct it into sediment and wash ponds.

Mr. Buxton noted that they have made that statement and the Proponent is prepared to do this. He noted that Ms. Measham and Mrs. Wilson were concerned because this is not stated in the 4 HA permit. A permit has not yet been issued for a larger quarry but the Proponent will state in the application for a larger quarry that this is their intention. NSDOEL will probably include it in the terms and conditions of larger quarry.

Miss McCarthy noted 10 acres is reserved for stockpiling the aggregate, areas for wash ponds and the work area and asked if a lot of that will be in use before recovery begins.

Mr. Buxton replied probably about 30 – 35 acres as has been previously stated in the minutes.

Miss McCarthy noted that this sounded very minimal.

Mr. Ivens requested further review of the minutes and the questions that had been noted.

Mr. Buxton referred to the list of questions written by Carol Measham and Gwen Wilson. He reviewed the questions asked (See Appendix 2 - August 29th 2002 minutes) and noted that these questions have now been answered in writing.

Mr. Buxton referred to the list of questions asked by Harold Theriault (See Appendix 4 - August 29th 2002 minutes) and reviewed them. He noted that some of them had been previously answered in writing and the others will be answered in writing. He noted the Proponent has commissioned a marine ecology expert to answer questions 1 and 5 and an extensive literature search has been done. The answers will be circulated with the minutes.

Mr. Buxton noted that these were specific questions and they will be answered in writing. He noted if anyone else would like to send in their list of questions they will be answered.

Mr. Outhouse asked who is the herring expert.

Mr. Buxton replied Mike Brylinsky from Acadia. He noted Mr. Brylinsky is a marine ecologist.

Mr. Outhouse noted that he already knew the answer to that question.

Miss McCarthy asked why is the community not involved in these studies, why have they not been brought into it before they are started because the Environment Act does allow for the terms of reference to be scrutinized by the public and for their input.

Mr. Buxton noted that in order to get a permit for a quarry larger than 4 HA the Proponent is required to file a Registration of Undertaking document to be examined primarily by the NSDOEL and they will determine if it's complete, if the questions regarding the site have been answered to their satisfaction. If not the permit will be refused.

Mr. Buxton noted that the Proponent knows what is required in broad general terms and has commissioned who they feel are the best experts in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Buxton noted that these studies had been discussed at the CLC meetings and the Proponent has undertaken to go back to the consultants to answer those questions that have been raised by the committee or by the general public. He noted that these questions are basically regarding noise and blasting adjacent to fish habitat and that there are guidelines in place set out by DFO, Guidelines for Blasting Close to Fish Habitat or Spawning Grounds.

Mr. Buxton noted that these are the guidelines the Proponent is required to follow under the terms of the permit issued by NSDOEL and he further noted the guidelines were developed from literature and studies done on the effects of noise and blasting on marine mammals.

Mr. Trask asked if a survey had been done in Massachusetts.

Mr. Buxton noted that there is one being done by Dalhousie currently and that extensive work was carried out in Newfoundland during construction of offshore platforms where there had been extensive blasting.

Mr. Buxton's answer to Mr. Theriault's question is that the Proponent will adhere to guidelines set out by DFO.

Mr. Trask asked if it was true that there were no quarries on the East Coast of the United States because of the effects of dynamite.

Mr. Buxton replied no, there are quarries presently operating along the Hudson River.

Miss McCarthy asked if a study had been done on the herring or if it was an expert's opinion.

Mr. Buxton replied the Proponent has found little in the literature where the effect of noise or blasting on herring has been studied.

Mr. Outhouse noted that the fishermen should be asked about the noise.

Mr. Trask replied that was a good idea.

Mr. Buxton noted one paper, which dealt with the reaction of herring to whale noises. He noted that there is scientific evidence that herring in schools react to the signals that whales emit while feeding.

Mr. Trask asked what effect does the whale noise have on herring.

Mr. Buxton replied they would try to avoid it because they know it is emitted by a predator.

Mr. Buxton noted that it has been said that even low decibel noise affects the hearing of whales. He has read in the literature that whales can emit noise up to 180 dBA and this is far above the pain level for humans.

Miss McCarthy noted that the whales are familiar with these noises.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent has found nothing in the literature that says 50-dBA noises adversely affects whales because they emit noises of 180 dBA. He noted that it is a very poorly researched subject and the most definitive information gathered was in Newfoundland where extensive blasting was done for offshore platforms.

Mr. Buxton noted his understanding is that the DFO guidelines were developed from the experience in Newfoundland.

Miss McCarthy noted the blasting for the bridge in PEI and she had heard it had a disastrous effect on the lobster population. She presumes this to be accurate information and asked are we guaranteed that blasting won't affect lobsters.

Mr. Buxton replied there are no guarantees of any kind in life but that the levels set by DFO for blasting are very specific. He noted that they are very small blasts, which are about one tenth of the size of a normal blast in a quarry. The main concern in the inter-tidal zone seems to be the disturbance of mud to affect spawning grounds.

Mr. Buxton noted that there are two limits the Proponent is allowed to blast under. He noted one is adjacent to fish habitat and the other to spawning habitat. The spawning habitat is more controlled. The blast must be smaller. Presumably the levels set by DFO are from research and studies and the Proponent must and will comply with them.

Ms. Lynyak advised that she must leave the meeting.

Mr. Buxton replied he could meet with Ms. Lynyak in Digby to answer any questions she may have if that would be suitable to her.

Mrs. Outhouse asked if a notice of the meeting date had been posted.

Ms. Nesbitt replied a notice had been posted at the garage in Centerville.

Mrs. MacAlpine noted a notice had also been placed in the office in Digby.

Mr. Trask noted that a notice should be posted in the Little River store.

Mrs. Outhouse stated she was unaware the meetings were open to the public. She asked if regular meetings are held.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that meetings are usually held every third week on a Thursday evening.

Mrs. Denton asked who is in charge of advertising the meeting dates.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that a notice is placed in her store as the next meeting date is usually scheduled at the conclusion of each meeting.

Mrs. Towle asked if there were any arrangements for people's fire protection or water.

Mr. Buxton replied that he had not considered fire protection but if someone has a particular concern he will address it.

Mrs. Towle noted that this is of high priority.

Miss McCarthy asked what about the explosive material.

Mr. Buxton replied that it is never stored on site.

Miss McCarthy asked if it is brought on site.

Mr. Buxton replied that the explosives are brought in and packed directly into the holes.

Miss McCarthy noted that it is still brought in and that there is fuel oil as well.

Mrs. Towle asked about medicine.

Mr. Buxton asked if she meant for the workers.

Mrs. Towle replied for a catastrophe.

Mr. Buxton replied that the Proponent is required to adhere to all the regulations of the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

Mrs. Towle asked where are they.

Ms. Nesbitt noted a copy of the Occupational Health and Safety Act is available from the NSDOEL.

Mr. Buxton noted that on any job site, there is a requirement for regular safety meetings to be held where any safety issue can be raised and it is a requirement for the employer to deal with them and the worker's safety is highly regulated.

Mrs. Towle stated that there has been a lack of communication.

Mr. Buxton advised that if the questions are asked they will be answered.

Mrs. Towle asked if there is a map of the location of the wells that might be affected.

Miss McCarthy noted Mr. Petrie had told her that a larger map would be available at this meeting indicating where the wells and blasting distances would be shown.

Mr. Buxton noted that the map had been brought to the previous meeting.

Miss McCarthy stated Mr. Petrie told her it would be available tonight.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Miss McCarthy why she had contacted Mr. Petrie about the CLC meetings and wondered why she had not contacted Mr. Buxton or herself, as this information would have been available from them both.

Miss McCarthy replied that Mr. Petrie had called her a few times so she gave him the courtesy of a return call.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that if she had contacted the CLC and advised them that she wanted to review the map it could have been brought to this meeting.

Miss McCarthy noted that she was told it would be at the meeting. She asked if she was supposed to go around and say I want to see this bring it to the meeting.

Ms. Nesbitt replied if she was intending to attend a meeting and it was something that she did want to see to call a committee member and they will arrange with Mr. Buxton to make sure that information is here.

Miss McCarthy replied that is fine but she will get her information elsewhere.

Ms. Nesbitt noted no one was trying to keep information from Miss McCarthy.

Miss McCarthy stated that she found it difficult to obtain copies of the minutes and that she had been to Ms. Nesbitt's store several times trying to get copies.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that she had seen Miss McCarthy on one occasion.

Miss McCarthy disagreed with this and did not wish to discuss it further.

Ms. Nesbitt stated again that she had seen Miss McCarthy on one occasion with no prior notice and that she did not have copies available at that time.

Miss McCarthy wanted to point out that it has been difficult to get information.

Miss McCarthy noted that Mrs. Towle wanted to know about her well.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that Miss McCarthy appears to have communicated with everyone but the Committee.

Mr. Buxton noted in regards to wells that the Proponent is in the late stages of doing a hydro geological report and that the results may be available prior to the next meeting. He noted that this would give information as to whether wells in the immediate vicinity may be at risk.

The Proponent is prepared to replace any well damaged by its' activities.

Mr. Trask asked if this would be if they could prove that it was the fault of the quarry.

Mr. Buxton noted what had been said was if the claim were reasonable the Proponent will not hesitate to act. He noted that if somebody came from Brier Island and stated their well has gone dry this would not be reasonable.

Mr. Trask asked who would do the blasting at this quarry.

Mr. Buxton replied that the first blast would probably be conducted by Archibault's.
Mr. Trask asked where they are from.
Mr. Buxton replied they are located in Halifax. He noted future blasting may be done by other companies.
Mr. Trask asked when is the first blast.
Mr. Buxton replied that this is not known as there are several things to be in place prior to any blasting.
Mr. Trask asked what do you have to get in place.
Mr. Buxton replied the Proponent has to have an approved blasting plan.
Mr. Trask asked if they do not have that yet.
Mr. Buxton replied no, it was submitted one month ago. He noted the Proponent has organized most of the monitoring through Jacques Whitford.
Mr. Trask asked who has to approve the blasting plan.
Mr. Buxton replied DFO and NSDOEL.
Mr. Trask asked if this is Provincial.
Mr. Buxton replied no, Federal and Provincial. Compliance with 1998 Blasting Guidelines for Marine Waters is the main issue. This is the first application on this site and DFO will check this very thoroughly. Subsequently, DFO will know the site and what the Proponent is doing, the check off distances, etc.
Mr. Trask passed around pictures of his house, property and a small lake that borders on the quarry property and he noted that he feels that the noise won't stop at the 800-meter mark.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if the quarry borders his property line.
Mr. Trask indicated the property lines and that he is trying to find this out.
Mr. Denton asked how do you get copies of the minutes.
Ms. Harnish noted that a man had approached her and advised her he could not get copies of the minutes from the Municipal Office.
Mr. Buxton replied the Municipal Office is not required to copy them however; they are available at the office in Digby or from Ms. Nesbitt's store.
Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.
Mr. Buxton noted that he understood Miss McCarthy has information available on gravesites on the property.
Miss McCarthy asked Mr. Buxton what information he would like.
Ms. Nesbitt referred to a letter written to The Digby Courier, which mentioned a lot of material she researched and wondered if Miss McCarthy could provide the committee with that information.
Miss McCarthy noted she would be privileged to as she expected the community should have been brought into this from the beginning. She noted she had started this research after reading information by Mr. Barry Moody and she felt that this information was incorrect.
She further noted there are Irish and Loyalist links and that Little River remained under sway of the native people, as the Mi'kmaq people were here before the Loyalists.
Miss McCarthy noted a letter forwarded to The Digby Courier gave the impression that Whites Cove was always meant to be a quarry so she researched this and discovered that in the Hatfield branch it was talked about but that it referred to the whole of Digby county.

Miss McCarthy further researched and discovered Robert Timpany connected with Whites Cove but did not think this was correct. She visited the deeds office and discovered 15 - 16 families that lived in Whites Cove in the 1800's. She noted Little River people know that there are at least 3 houses possibly 4 that came from Whites Cove.

Miss McCarthy noted Jenny Denton's house came from Whites Cove. She noted that this is the oral tradition and the information she has regarding Whites Cove is documented. In her research she found that over the years the property would be divided into smaller pieces and reunited under a single ownership in 2000 and that this is not correct because it is the property that belonged to Sherman Denton, which belonged previously to Tom Denton, which belonged previously to his mother Evelyn.

Miss McCarthy noted she has discovered 70 children who had been born in Whites Cove. Ms. Nesbitt asked where these children had been born, if there is a map that would show this.

Miss McCarthy noted that it is all overgrown now but she does have photos from Whites Cove in the early 1900's but by that time nearly all of the families had moved from there. She noted his history couldn't be correct and it says that the lots were sold; the amounts paid would indicate that no homes or other substantial buildings had ever been constructed on the properties. She noted that she is quoting from page 4 of this history and a lot of them are upset by this because a whole part of their heritage has gone by. Miss McCarthy noted that the NS museum curator, Robert Ogilvie, has been quoted "preserving shipwrecks and heritage sites on land from souvenir hunters is important. Divers must obtain a permit to explore these locations. Individuals can be fined \$10,000 and companies up to \$100,000 for disturbing such places. This applies to the off shore oil and gas companies. If you damage something during construction the Museum can issue a stop order. Mr. Ogilvie further stated that enlisting the help of the diving crew and community members to care for these archeological sites on land or sea make them less likely for vandals to disturb them. Many people realize that these are truly non-renewable resources and if we allow them to be lost they are lost for good, we can never get them back."

Miss McCarthy thinks this applies to Whites Cove as it was a village and it is a heritage site.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if Miss McCarthy was aware that an archeological study has to be done as part of the environmental study.

Miss McCarthy replied yes she is aware of that.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if she was aware of a map that exists that was put together in 1864 by Mr. Church, a surveyor and published by a New York company in 1870.

Miss McCarthy replied that she is aware of that.

Ms. Nesbitt asked how Miss McCarthy determined her findings.

Miss McCarthy noted the map does not show anything along the Bay of Fundy all the way through for Digby Neck. She assumes the Church did not go over to the Bay of Fundy since written documents show settlement.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that Church was a surveyor.

Miss McCarthy asked if he did a survey or just a map, she read that he just did a map.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that he is listed as a surveyor.

Miss McCarthy noted that she did not use his work but that she has done her own research on deeds and that in 1832 Steven Denton deeded to Charles Jones a Whites Cove lot with all livery for £100 and she asked if this takes precedent over the Church map.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that she did not know but would like to see the documentation. Miss McCarthy does not have copies for the committee. She noted that in 1850 Eliza Jones sold a Whites Cove lot of 220 acres to Samuel Hersey for £100 and she has many of these deeds and the names of people who lived in Whites Cove. She noted they could be gotten off census reports as well.

Miss McCarthy noted Samuel Hersey had nine children. Gail Hersey of Digby has done a family history of her family. People have told her about picking cranberries and going to the graves of children.

Ms. Nesbitt asked where are the graves of the children.

Miss McCarthy asked if she would be allowed to go there.

Mr. Buxton replied that one is not to investigate without a Permit from Nova Scotia Museums.

Miss McCarthy asked if she could show where the graves are.

Mr. Buxton advised that there are fines for operating without a Permit.

Miss McCarthy noted this is how she has done it, from deeds, census reports, and Registry of Births and Deaths. She noted there is an aerial photo of Whites Cove showing that road 442 was an open road right through 1950. She obtained this photo showing that the road always existed because it had been stated that the road had disappeared.

Ms. Nesbitt replied it had been stated that the road had disappeared in undergrowth not that it had disappeared.

Miss McCarthy passed around a photo of Whites Cove with lobster pots, fish house and laundry on the line and noted it is also on the Internet.

Mr. Buxton asked what evidence did Miss McCarthy find of cemeteries on the property.

Miss McCarthy noted a cemetery had been referred to on a deed and the Hersey family have told her some of the names of the children that are buried there.

Mr. Buxton noted that there is no mention of cemeteries on the deed of this property.

Miss McCarthy agreed and noted it is a deed from the 1800's.

Mr. Buxton asked if she meant that it was expunged along the way.

Miss McCarthy replied she did not know. She had set herself up to research this history and this is what she has found.

Mr. Buxton noted that Whites Cove is a much more extensive area than the quarry property.

Miss McCarthy agreed but that this property shown from the photo is the living area...

Mr. Buxton noted that it is known there were houses there and this is not being disputed.

Miss McCarthy replied that it said there were no houses or buildings. She noted that she is not setting herself up as a specialist working for or against the quarry but for the sake of the heritage site and for the truth of the situation.

Mr. Buxton replied that he thought she had documented proof of cemeteries on the property.

Miss McCarthy replied that she is happy to share what she knows but she could not show him the exact place and Mr. Buxton did say she could be fined for digging there. She noted that she was not aware of what Mr. Wattrell found there.

Mr. Buxton replied that Mr. Wattrell did not find anything that he thought had archeological significance but he noted that the studies have not been finished. Miss McCarthy noted that there is an area of concern for the area of blasting and that this is the actual site.

Mr. Buxton replied that the Proponent knows that the buildings were at the head of the slip and he noted that that area has been quarried for 20 years.

Miss McCarthy disagreed; she asked if the quarry was on the level area.

Mr. Buxton replied that the Proponent is not going to quarry the level area, the blasting is on the hillside, and there is no rock in the level area.

Miss McCarthy asked if they are going to disturb it.

Mr. Buxton noted that it has been disturbed for 50 years. He noted that all the level area has been quarried. The maps show it is a quarry and the material to build Highway 217 came from that site.

Miss McCarthy stated that she had talked to people who worked here in 1940-50 and she was told it was only a gravel pit that was used for the local roads.

Mr. Buxton replied that they used it for Highway 217.

Miss McCarthy agreed.

Mr. Buxton noted that you can see where the level area has been disturbed.

Miss McCarthy noted she is not disputing that.

Mr. Trask noted that he has lived there for 50 years and he can't remember anything coming out of that quarry for Route 217. He noted that it is beach rock and went into the wharf; it is round rock and cannot go on the highway.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent was told that a significant amount of material came out of there to build Highway 217.

Miss McCarthy replied this would have been in the 40's or 50's.

It was asked when the archeological studies would be completed.

Mr. Buxton replied they should be completed within six weeks.

It was asked if Mr. Buxton would take advantage of some of the research that had already been done.

Mr. Buxton replied that he will advise Dr. Moody of Miss McCarthy's statements. He noted that he raised the question because he thought there was specific information available with respect to cemeteries on the site.

Miss McCarthy replied that there is, there is mention of it on a deed.

Mr. Buxton asked if Miss McCarthy could provide him a copy of the deed.

Miss McCarthy replied that she had spent many hours and she would not go back to get it.

Mr. Buxton asked if Miss McCarthy had a copy of the Cemetery Act.

Miss McCarthy replied that it has been quoted to her.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.

Mrs. Frost asked how big is the quarry going to be, will it go all the way up the neck.

Mr. Buxton replied this property is about 370 acres. Without the exclusion zones, where blasting may not take place, it may be 100+ odd acres. He noted that he couldn't say if anyone else intends to quarry on Digby Neck.

Mr. Buxton noted the market for which this quarry is intended is 2 million tons per year and in the area that is available to the Proponent there is approximately 70-80 million tons of rock, about a 40-year supply of rock.

It was asked if this was just from Whites Cove.

Mr. Buxton replied yes.

Mr. Outhouse asked what time of year would they ship the rock.

Mr. Buxton replied that this had been discussed at the CLC meetings and it would be shipped as long as the shipper is prepared to come in. He noted that the Proponent does see some complication with December and May.

Mr. Buxton noted that information had been provided by Mark Jeffrey of the number of people that fish in the area and the Proponent does recognize a potential conflict. The Proponent has said that they are prepared to meet with the lobster fishermen and come to some agreement as to how to handle this. He noted that there might be three periods of 10-12 hours in December when there may be a conflict.

Mr. Outhouse asked if they would use the same shipping lanes.

Mr. Buxton replied yes.

Mr. Outhouse asked if they would use tugboats.

Mr. Buxton replied they do not feel they will need a tugboat.

Mr. Outhouse noted that these ships cut off the traps and that this is a loss of income.

Mr. Buxton replied the Proponent understands this and that a resolution to that problem can be found.

Mr. Outhouse asked if they expect them to move their gear.

Mr. Buxton noted that there are shipping lanes out there already and they may be moved to the east to about four miles offshore and that is for the protection of the right whale.

Mr. Outhouse noted that they are only talking about 4 miles at one point.

Mr. Buxton replied that could be and that he has a chart with the proposed new lanes and he noted the Proponent realizes there may be a conflict.

Mr. Outhouse asked who is going to pay us for loss of income.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent is prepared to discuss the issue.

Mr. Outhouse replied he guesses you better discuss it.

Mr. Buxton asked if he was saying it is illegal to bring in a ship.

Mr. Outhouse replied no.

Mr. Buxton noted that he thinks there is a resolution to the issue and that the Proponent is prepared to sit down and discuss the concerns of lobster fishers.

Mr. Buxton noted it was discussed at earlier meetings that there were two months where there would be conflict, in December and May.

Mr. Outhouse noted that the biggest concentration of lobster traps is in January and February.

Mr. Buxton replied that may be but the Proponent may not be shipping then. The Proponent feels there may be a conflict in December and May and they are prepared to sit down and discuss it. He feels they can come to a satisfactory agreement.

Mr. Outhouse asked if they will have the same track for every trip.

Mr. Buxton replied they will come in exactly the same track each time.

Mr. Outhouse asked what if it is blowing 50-60 miles an hour winds.

Mr. Buxton replied he did not think shipping would take place in those conditions.

Mr. Trask asked how much more tide is it going to create off Whites Cove. What if you go off from a 600' rock wall is that going to create more tide?

Mr. Outhouse replied probably.

Mr. Trask asked if that was going to affect the maneuverability to maneuver a ship in there.

Mr. Outhouse replied he didn't know.

Ms. Harnish noted the ship is 625'.

Mrs. Outhouse asked if they had received a permit for the wharf.

Mr. Buxton replied no.

Mr. Trask asked what if you put a 600' rock wall right to the northwest what is the tide going to be out around the end of that rock wall.

Mr. Outhouse replied he had no idea.

Mr. Trask noted that it is going to be a lot of tide there. He noted that he couldn't see a ship of that size without tugs at that much tide.

Mr. Buxton noted they would be advised by the shore captain of CSL. He noted that the wharf is not a solid wall.

Mr. Trask asked what is it going to be.

Mr. Buxton replied he is almost certain it is going to be a broken wall because DFO do not like a solid buffer out to sea because it changes the inter-tidal zone. He noted the only reason it will be going out there is to support the conveyor and a catwalk to get people out. There will be no solid wall at the end. It will be dolphins.

Mr. Outhouse asked if he knows how rough it gets out there.

Mr. Buxton replied the structure that is being designed will reflect local weather conditions.

Mr. Outhouse noted that there was a wharf in Saulnierville that collapsed in its first year.

Mr. Trask asked Ms. Nesbitt if she thought the quarry would have any negative effect on the Little River community.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that Mr. Trask should ask Mr. Buxton that question.

Mr. Trask replied that he was asking Ms. Nesbitt what she thought.

Ms. Nesbitt preferred not to discuss that with him at the meeting.

Mr. Trask again asked Ms. Nesbitt what her opinion is.

Ms. Nesbitt replied with respect to dust and noise, no. As far as visibility from highway 217 they say that it will not be seen from Highway 217.

Mr. Trask agreed on that point.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that she was waiting to hear about the hydro geologist report for water. She noted that from anything she has seen she does not think it will have a negative effect on Little River.

It was stated that Ms. Nesbitt would not hear it but they will hear it. i.e. quarry noise.

Ms. Nesbitt replied it's not in anyone's back yard and there is a buffer zone in between and there is a mountain.

Mr. Trask noted that noise does not stop at a mountain. He asked if she had talked to anyone who lives around a quarry.

Ms. Nesbitt replied that she had talked to several people. She noted that she has tried to gather as much information as possible.

Miss. McCarthy asked if she had phoned British companies.

Ms. Nesbitt replied yes.

Miss McCarthy asked if she had compared the amounts of explosive used and she feels the amounts to be used here are higher than Europe and noted that .5 kg was being used here.

Mr. Buxton replied that .5 is the amount used in a firecracker.

Miss. McCarthy noted 1000 pounds of ammonia nitrate and so much fuel and oil for 100 tons of rock but she has brought it down to scale.

Mr. Buxton replied a typical quarry using a typical delay would be about 1000 pounds per delay. He noted this first blast would be about 88.5 pounds per delay.

Miss. McCarthy asked what effect this will have on the whales.

Mr. Buxton replied that the level of blasting will comply with DFO guidelines.

Miss. McCarthy asked what about out in the Bay.

Mr. Buxton replied that sand dampens the effect of blasting.

Miss. McCarthy replied that it has a resonance effect.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that in a community there has to be diversification. Fish, forestry and tourism create noise and inconvenience, we hear trucks all day.

Mr. Trask replied that you hear a truck for 12 seconds not 24 hours.

Ms. Nesbitt noted there is a decibel maximum and health and safety work issues the Proponent has to adhere to for any of these activities.

Mr. Trask noted there is no comparison of traffic to blasting.

Mr. Buxton replied that noise standards are in place and noted they are required under the terms and conditions of the permit to stay within the decibel levels set.

It was asked who is going to check this.

Mr. Buxton replied that the permit document states they cannot exceed the permit levels set out in the permit and if they do exceed them they can be shut down.

Mr. Outhouse noted this would be after awhile maybe.

Mr. Trask asked if the maximum level is 65 dBA.

Mr. Buxton replied the permit states that noise level cannot exceed 65 dBA from 7.00 am to 7.00 pm, 60 dBA from 7.00 pm to 11.00 pm and 55 dBA from 11.00 pm to 7.00 am.

Mr. Outhouse asked if this was for the quarry.

Mr. Buxton replied this is specifically for the quarry.

Mr. Trask asked how many gen sets will be used to operate the lights.

Mr. Buxton replied they hope to put a power line in to cut down on noise.

It was asked how much dust will there be.

Mr. Buxton replied the limits are set out in the permit document.

It was asked if all quarries have different limits in the permits.

Mr. Buxton replied they are standard with respect to noise.

A comment was made that a man from Middleton who lives near a quarry stated that you will not hang out clothes to dry because of the dust.

Mr. Buxton replied there are particulate emissions limits that cannot be exceeded.

Mr. Trask asked how long it will take to prepare a blast.

Mr. Buxton replied perhaps one week.

Ms. Harnish asked if there is any change allowed in the skyline.

Mr. Buxton replied that with the amount of rock that is there it would take 40-50 years to go to top of mountain.

Mr. Trask asked if they are still willing to test wells.

Mr. Buxton replied if he would like to have his well tested, yes.

Mr. Trask stated he would like to have his well tested.

Ms. Nesbitt asked what would be their greatest fear or worry if a quarry is in operation.

Mr. Trask replied water, dust and noise.

Mrs. Outhouse replied fishing and the boats tearing through the traps.
Mr. Trask replied property value. He asked if the results of the hydro geological study would be available for the next meeting.
Mr. Buxton replied that the hydro geologist cannot complete his work until the geologist completes his study.
Mr. Trask asked if he will be here at a meeting.
Mr. Buxton replied that if the chair requested this it could be arranged.
Mr. Trask asked if there is a loss of water where does that leave them.
Mr. Buxton replied he understands the concerns and that is why they are doing the study.
Miss. McCarthy asked if there would be an opportunity to speak to any of the consultants.
Mr. Buxton replied yes.
Miss. McCarthy asked if these are extensive studies.
Mr. Buxton replied that a permit would not be issued if the studies were not adequate.
Miss. McCarthy noted the timing and that she felt if there was more time she could find the graves.
Mr. Buxton asked if she had read the Cemetery Act and noted that it is very specific. They have hired an archeologist to look into the issue of cemeteries.
Miss McCarthy noted she is concerned with what people say we're not doing.
Mr. Buxton replied that she could come to the meetings and ask questions and get answers.
Miss. McCarthy asked how are you doing this.
Mr. Buxton replied they have hired qualified people to carry out the necessary research.
Mrs. Carty referred to the sign made about ground zero and stated that she was very insulted that someone would refer to this quarry in such a disrespectful way.
Mrs. Angrignon asked if there were any rare plants found on the site.
Mr. Buxton replied the botanist had found one very rare plant along the coastline. He noted that an area will be created to preserve and contain it as ATV's are currently overrunning it. He further noted there were several of a less rare category along the coast but not where the quarry will be located.
Mr. Buxton noted they will create a buffer zone. No rare fauna had been found.
It was asked if a four-toed salamander had been found or an eastern panther.
Mr. Buxton replied neither had been found.
It was agreed that the next meeting would be set for November 21st, 7.00 p.m. at Rossway Fire Hall.
Meeting was adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

Minutes of Meeting of Community Liaison Committee

Nova Stone Exporters Inc/Global Quarry Products Inc

7.00 p.m. November 21st 2002

Rossway Community Hall

In attendance: Ms. Cindy Nesbitt, CLC Chair
Mr. Brian Cullen, CLC Member
Mr. John Ivens, CLC Member
Ms. Judith Carty, CLC Member
Ms. Christine Harnish, CLC Member
Mr. David Graham, CLC Member
Mrs. Marian Angrignon
Mr. George Gavel
Mr. Harold Rowe
Mr. Dwayne Theriault
Mrs. Linda Graham
Mr. Lawrence Outhouse
Mr. Mark Dittrick
Mr. Dwayne Hogg, Jacques Whitford
Mr. Dave MacFarlane, Jacques Whitford
Mr. Paul Buxton NSEI/GQPI
Ms. Betty MacAlpine NSEI/GQPI
Ms. Tammy Sanford NSEI/GQPI

Regrets: Mr. Mark Jeffrey, CLC Member

Mr. Buxton introduced Mr. Hogg and Mr. MacFarlane of Jacques Whitford. He noted they had prepared a preliminary hydro-geological report and would be presenting it tonight.

Mr. MacFarlane indicated several drawings they would be using to illustrate the hydrogeology. He noted they would go through what the study involved, what was done and what their findings are.

Mr. MacFarlane noted they would talk about the available well records, the blast point and the post-quarry hydro geological conditions. He noted that he and Mr. Hogg are both hydro geologists and that hydrogeology deals with water and how it flows through the ground.

Mr. MacFarlane noted the main purpose of the preliminary study (this is called a desktop study) is to do a review of the hydrogeology of the area and provide an opinion on how the quarry might affect the water table, ground water and wells in the area. They looked at available geology and topographical reports and gathered other information.

Mr. MacFarlane noted that the first of three maps indicates where Digby Neck is located, shows the waterfront, the property with the quarry site, the North Mountain, the access road

to Hwy #217, and four bore holes. He noted bore holes were drilled to determine the geology of the property.

Mr. Hogg noted they are particularly interested in the water levels as you go over the mountain and he indicated that it is a rare opportunity to have existing holes in the ground.

Mr. MacFarlane noted the geology of the area is typical of the whole peninsula. He noted that based on records of the area and the water well logs there is a thin layer of soil over the bedrock ranging from 2 m - 15 m. The bedrock under the site is basically basalt from the North Mountain formation. He further noted that it is several hundred feet thick and it was deposited millions of years ago. There are three massive basalt flows that make up the basalt and within each of these flows there are several minor flows. Between them there are discontinuities where they suspect a lot of the water moves through the bedrock, i.e.: through the zones where different layers lie over top of each other as well as through fractures and faults.

Mr. Hogg indicated the flow of the basalt on the map. He further noted that several wells had been drilled through the basalt for fish plants.

Mr. MacFarlane noted the second drawing is a geological cross section and it illustrates four boreholes as projected onto that section. He noted that the map is an exaggerated view and indicated the mountain, Hwy #217, the Bay of Fundy, St. Mary's Bay, the position of the quarry property and the proposed quarry site with the 800-metre setback. He noted where the quarry could go in the future.

Mr. MacFarlane noted that the water in the rock comes from rain and snowmelt. He noted that 10 – 40% of the moisture goes into the ground and this builds up the ground water table.

Mr. MacFarlane noted that the ground water is constantly moving to the low point and they have shown the ground water divide that divides the ground water flow direction across the peninsula. He indicated arrows showing how the water moves through the bedrock and towards the Bay. He noted that within the basalt there are discontinuities (zones) between different basalt flows and there is a lot of water moving along these zones. He further noted that wells have probably penetrated these zones and when a driller drills a well that gets a lot of water this is where most of the water comes from. There are a number of these flows and they are hard to map because they are random and the thickness varies.

Mr. Hogg noted that excess water might seep out of the side of the mountain in streams. It was asked where does the water actually go.

Mr. Hogg replied there is no room in the cracks for the excess water so it comes out the sides.

Mr. MacFarlane noted they were not successful in getting water levels from all four bore holes as some had been blocked with rock. He noted they did obtain a water sample and levels from the deepest hole at the top of the mountain.

Mr. Hogg noted the drawing indicating the boreholes is called a conceptual model.

Mr. MacFarlane noted you can distinctively hear water running in one of the boreholes.

Mr. Hogg noted that the conceptual model illustrates where the water is coming from and where it is going.

Mr. MacFarlane noted that there are three massive basalt flows with discontinuities between. He noted two of the boreholes as interpreted by the geologist intersected discontinuities between flows and these are plotted on the map.

Mr. MacFarlane noted the third drawing is a plan view with details of the ground water flow direction, it does not include topography. He noted the ground water divide and the

precipitation flows to each side of the mountain. He indicated the quarry and the ground water that flows towards it.

Mr. Hogg noted that the ground water divide is the point where the water table is the highest and that the water table moves up and down with seasonal changes.

Mr. MacFarlane indicated that this is a summary overview of the ground water flow as they see it based on the information available. He noted that NSDOEL has a database of water well records from registered well drillers. Drillers are required to submit these records to NSDOEL. A review of these records was done in order to determine how water wells were constructed, the depth, and the average yield in the area of Mink Cove and Little River. The 47 records found are a small percentage of the actual number of wells. Wells prior to 1965 were not registered and dug wells are not included in the registry. He further noted the depths of these wells varies from 60' – 900', the fisheries are using the deeper wells.

Mr. MacFarlane noted the average demand is 1/2 – 1 gallon per minute for a typical household.

Mr. Hogg noted that the average use per house is 200 – 250 gallons per day.

Mr. MacFarlane noted that according to the drill logs they found the yield of these recorded wells varies from .2 – 65 gallons per minute with a median yield of 7 gallons per minute.

Mr. MacFarlane noted that in respect to the houses closest to the quarry, they have plotted 19 properties that lie within 1 – 1 1/2 km of the quarry. He noted they are along Hwy #217 and Little River Road and in looking at the 47 records and these 19 properties they found 5 NSDOEL well water records that they were able to match. He further noted that these records are registered according to the original property owner.

Mr. MacFarlane noted of those 5 records the yield is 1 – 10 gallons per minute.

Mr. Hogg noted that for an Environmental Assessment the normal practice is to do a desktop study with the next step being field study, interviews and a well assessment.

Mr. MacFarlane noted that some houses could possibly share wells.

Mr. MacFarlane noted this summarizes what they have done, what they found, the hydrogeology and the well information. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Ivens asked if it would be possible to see this on the topographical map.

Mr. Hogg indicated the topographical map they had previously discussed.

Mr. MacFarlane noted on the topographical map that the ground water divide is at the top of the mountain and all of the homes are on the other side of the ground water divide from the quarry.

Mr. Ivens asked if there is a difference in depth depending on how high up you are.

Mr. Hogg replied yes and that the majority of wells are at approximately the same elevation.

Mr. MacFarlane proceeded to explain three possible effects of the quarry and he noted that these would be worse case scenarios. He indicated that the quarry face will cut across the ground water table and what may happen is the water will seep out of the face and the water table will change, it may drop lower and shift in that area. He noted that the water will come out naturally and there will be a lot of seepage, especially in the spring and this will have to be controlled. Overall the water table will start to shift and this will cause the ground water divide to change in direction and move closer to the highway.

Mr. MacFarlane noted it is their opinion that there will be little impact on the wells 800 metres away, within this range it is difficult to say but they may not notice any impact. He noted that some wells are connected to springs, which come from very near by and that flow rate tends to decrease seasonally and these wells will need to be identified.

Mr. MacFarlane noted the second effect of the quarry would be the blasting effect. This is based on the distance of the wells from the quarry. There will be less seismic energy transmitted through the basalt or siltation of wells that are further away. These wells may experience a temporary loss or the quality could drop off but it should be short term and minimal. An option would be to put in a filter system or buy water but they do not see a big effect. He noted that with most studies it is hard to measure the effects on wells that are quite a distance away. Generally wells producing 1/2 gallon per minute where blasting occurs may increase in yield but if the water flow is adequate no one would notice. There should be no effect on dug wells.

Mr. MacFarlane noted that the basalt is generally massive but that the geological report indicated that the bottom portion of the upper flow may be columnar.

Mr. MacFarlane noted the third effect of the quarry is acid drainage. He noted they do not think this will be a problem because basalt does not typically have a lot of sulfite and this is a significantly important factor for the environment. He further noted that one water sample had been obtained and the quality was very good. He further noted that generally studies done by Nova Scotia Department of Mines and Environment (NSDOEL) indicate ground water from basalt show better quality water throughout the province except for the deeper wells but he did not think there were that many in the area.

Mr. Outhouse noted that there are several deep wells used for the hatchery in Mink Cove; these are not used for drinking water.

Mr. MacFarlane noted two main recommendations for monitoring the wells:

- 1) A field survey should be conducted on the wells near the quarry and should include details of the wells, samples and quality of the well water.
- 2) Monitoring of wells should be established between the quarry site and the nearby houses (3 locations were noted on the maps).

Mr. MacFarlane noted that the quarry should move generally away from the residents and it will always stay on the other side of the ground water divide.

Mr. Hogg noted from the geological report that the upper flow at the site is medium dark and the basalt is virtually un-weathered. The bottom 10 meters of the upper flow is fracturing and there may be columnar joining at the bottom. There are vertical pathways and horizontal fractures that slowly move the water down. He noted that it is difficult for geologists to see these fractures and map them.

Mr. MacFarlane noted the conclusion of their preliminary assessment and asked if there were any other questions.

Ms. Nesbitt asked to what extend would they recommend the field study on the wells.

Mr. MacFarlane replied there are 19 residents close to the quarry that would raise the most concerns and that a monitoring barrier should be provided so that what happens there happens in that area first. He noted that typical readings of these houses should be taken and the well design should be noted. He further noted that it is very rare when well concerns are identified.

Mr. Outhouse asked how do you determine what the water table is in solid rock.

Mr. MacFarlane replied that a level had been identified in the upper borehole but that in this type of basalt formation there may be perched water tables. Evidence of a perched water table was noted in one of the boreholes where water could be heard cascading from an upper level to a lower level.

Mr. Outhouse asked where does the basalt become columnar.

Mr. MacFarlane replied that it appeared that the bottom portion of the upper flow may be columnar. However, Mr. MacFarlane further noted that the basalt dips towards the Bay of Fundy at approximately 5° so that the level of the columnar basalt gets deeper towards the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. Buxton noted that of the 4 boreholes that had been drilled for geological sampling, the lower three had been vandalized and will need to be re-drilled in order to collect more details.

Mr. Outhouse noted his experience with the fish hatchery wells at 80 gallons per minute and said that this water comes from below the basalt and salt leaches into the water from St. Mary's Bay. He noted the hydro-geologist for this work was Bill Shaw from Antigonish.

Mr. Hogg replied that granite runs under the Annapolis Valley at great depth, covered by the Wolfville sandstone formation and the Blomidon formation, which is fractured shale.

Mr. Outhouse asked if the water in Little River comes from the basalt and if so is there not a possible source in or on the other side of mountain.

Mr. MacFarlane replied that some of the recharge would come from the mountain.

Mr. Outhouse asked if it would be difficult to say what would happen.

Mr. MacFarlane replied yes but that on a mega scale they would see little effect while on a smaller scale quarries generally reduce the water table.

Mr. Outhouse asked what if it is columnar basalt.

Mr. MacFarlane replied that if the bottom portion of the upper basalt flow is columnar it would be closer to the surface to the east side and there is still a watershed divide on the mountain.

Mr. Outhouse asked where most of the columnar basalt is.

Mr. Hogg replied along the old road and he noted that the best wells in Little River are on the old road and some of these wells get 60 gallons per minute. He noted that there is a major fault there and that the water there is very good.

Mr. Ivens asked if it is siphoned in.

Mr. Hogg replied that throughout Digby Neck there are a number of mega faults that cause offsets.

Mr. Ivens asked how this was determined.

Mr. Hogg replied that they had used older geology maps dating from 1963.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if the fish plant in Little River is likely to be affected.

Mr. Hogg replied that they would probably not be affected based on distance from the quarry and the fact that the quarry will be moving to the north.

Mrs. Graham noted that it is her understanding that the Proponent will monitor the houses closest to the quarry and if these houses experience problems in the water someone will recommend a pre-blast survey.

Mr. Buxton replied that this is a preliminary report and it is his understanding that the consultants have recommended that the Proponent carry out a pre-blast survey on the wells in order to start at a base point. He noted he is unsure as to whether this will be done before the first small test blast is carried out but if that is the recommendation of the consultants then the Proponent will establish a monitoring regime for the 19 wells that may be more at risk than any other wells. He further noted that over a period of time if a problem is found and if the Proponent caused the problem then the Proponent will mitigate the problem by digging new wells, deeper wells or replace the water source.

Mr. Buxton is glad that Mrs. Graham raised this point because he is aware that a very large amount of opposition to the quarry from this immediate area is because of concerns about water supply, firstly yield and secondly water quality. He noted that he would encourage anyone who is concerned about the water supply to ask questions while the hydro-geologists are here because it is a major concern in the area. He further noted that whatever recommendations are made by the consultants they will be followed by the Proponent.

Mrs. Graham stated that she does not live as close but she has heard other people talking and noted this concern and she is asking if they start losing either the quality or quantity of the water will that problem be addressed immediately or is it going to be something that will not be dealt with until three years from now.

Mr. Buxton replied that the Proponent has made it very clear at several meetings and is prepared to enter into whatever understanding that is required either with the individual home owners or a regulatory agency. A review of the hydro-geological report has not indicated that water quality is an issue because the water is going to go the other way from the quarry.

Mrs. Graham asked if she lived in the area would the Proponent monitor her well.

Mr. Buxton replied yes, it would be in the Proponent's best interest to do so.

Mrs. Graham asked if she would like to have her well monitored would this cost anything.

Mr. Buxton replied no and added that there is no guarantee that any of the 19 residences that are at the highest risk will permit monitoring of their wells.

Mrs. Graham replied that she is saying it would be to her advantage if she were a local resident.

Mr. Buxton replied that is correct. He noted that recently Mr. Fred Trask (closest house to the quarry) had been asked if he would permit monitoring of his property and he replied yes. He further noted whether anyone else will do so is unknown at this time but those who do will have far better evidence should anything occur. Secondly, the Proponent will not do the monitoring of the wells because it could be seen as a conflict of interest and thirdly the Proponent will pay for the monitoring.

Mrs. Graham asked is it going to cost me to have my well monitored.

Mr. Buxton replied no, but if someone from two miles away asked to have their well monitored and the consultants advised that there isn't any possibility the well will be affected then the Proponent would probably not monitor that well. He noted that the wells that are identified as being a potential risk will be monitored and the people involved will get a copy of those records. Mr. Buxton noted that there is some subjectivity in this because your well produces different amounts of water at different times of the year and a problem is only evident when it drops below the capacity that you are using. I.e.: if you are using 7 gallons per minute and the water drops to 5 gallons per minute there is still sufficient water capacity.

Mrs. Graham noted that quality is an issue.

Mr. Buxton agreed and noted that water samples will be taken and compared with the quality of the sample from the year before and if there is no difference then clearly there is no quality problem.

It was asked if there were going to be any problems with the wells would it occur in year 15 – 20 of the project not in the first or second year.

Mr. MacFarlane replied yes, this is why they are suggesting monitoring points in between the houses so that they can start gathering data now to gain much better control over it. He noted that because wells are used at different times and amounts it is hard to get stable water level and they recover at different times of the day.

Mr. Theriault noted that he lives in Little River; he agrees that the water will not cross the mountain or that it will affect the people on the south side.

Mr. MacFarlane noted the first recommendation was to do baseline sampling of all wells as noted on the map and identify wells that could be more susceptible and recommend further monitoring for those wells. He noted that dug wells unless they were quite close to the quarry would not be monitored. He further noted that from the 19 he is not saying they would all be monitored on a regular basis for quality but that they should get a snapshot of the wells now before anything happens.

Mr. Hogg noted that these surveys generally involve the same procedures regardless of whether it's a highway, quarry or pipeline. He noted that a technician will have a questionnaire asking the type of well, depth, driller (may match it to a drill log), if there has been problems with the well, a sample from the tap is analyzed for general chemistry, total coliform and bacteria. He noted that these parameters allow them to assess the condition of the well and a report would go to the homeowner.

Mr. Outhouse asked how much mineral chemistry of the water would be done. He noted that when mineral chemistry changes this tells you something has happened to the source of your water.

Mr. Hogg replied that the chemistry is referred to as a general chemistry metal scan and this provides all of the parameters and this analysis provides a baseline.

Mr. Buxton noted that the Proponent has taken baseline samples of water from streams coming off the mountain and seawater since May 2002. He noted high levels of coliform present in the bay but not in the streams. This information is available and the CLC has reviewed it.

Mr. Outhouse asked if Mr. Buxton meant the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. Buxton replied yes, the salt water.

Mr. Outhouse asked if everything is basically the same everywhere in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. Hogg noted that total coliform bacteria is naturally occurring but fecal chloroform can depend on how deep the well is and temperatures.

Mr. Buxton asked if there were any other questions or concerns because this is a very critical issue for residents of the area. He noted that there will be other opportunities to ask questions.

Mr. Outhouse noted if something happens to the water he does not see where drilling a deeper well will have much effect and mitigation is very unlikely to be effective.

Mr. Hogg replied that he thinks Mr. Outhouse is referring to a catastrophic loss of water or salt water intersecting a major water bearing zone. He noted this is not likely to happen but it would be a catastrophic loss and mitigation in that case is typically to provide a deeper water supply.

Mr. Outhouse asked if in fact there is columnar basalt present, how close is it and the long-term effects of continued blasting and possibly opening seams in the columnar basalt that would allow salt water into the wells.

Mr. MacFarlane replied that they are proposing monitoring of wells.

Mr. Hogg replied this would be an early warning.

Mr. Outhouse asked if they were speaking of solid basalt but noted that columnar basalt would be susceptible to shockwaves on the existing seams and they may temporarily find more water in the wells because they opened up the seams. He asked where do you go from the solid basalt to the columnar basalt, is it somewhere in the mountain, where does it end.

Mr. Buxton replied that we know according to the drill log that at 66 metres below the top borehole the columnar basalt was intercepted.

Mr. Hogg replied that it dips deeper as it goes north.

Mr. Outhouse asked if they are saying if you look at the map that sulfite is on top of the columnar basalt and according to the geologist it would be the lower 3rd of the upper flow. He asked if the mountain is solid then the columnar is probably over St. Mary's Bay underneath. He noted that this is still a concern because chances are that Little River is sitting on columnar basalt and would be susceptible to the shock of the blasting.

Mr. Hogg replied they are looking at a conceptual model and he indicated the columnar basalt area on the south side of Little River and it goes deeper farther north but under the quarry it is 20 – 30 metres below the quarry.

Mr. Outhouse replied the concern is whether it's a real concern or not. He asked will the blasting energy effect the columnar rock and at what distance.

Mr. Buxton replied the level permitted cannot exceed 12.5 millimeters per second peak particle velocity. He noted at 1120 meters from the blast size the Proponent has calculated the peak particle velocity to be 1 millimeter per second and it will clearly be less than that at 1 - 1 ½ km. He further noted at 8% of the permitted maximum peak particle velocity this is minimal and he feels it will have little effect on Little River.

Mr. Outhouse noted that he would like these gentlemen to address this issue.

Mr. Hogg replied that one of their engineers could address this. He asked if the issue is what is the potential displacement in the vicinity of Little River due to the size of the blast at the quarry at 1 millimeter per second and is that or is that not a concern.

Mr. Buxton replied that the Proponent is restricted on the size of blast at this particular site because of the 1998 DFO guidelines and depending upon the distance from fish habitat or spawning grounds and depending upon the bottom of the Bay of Fundy (sand, silt, bare rock) the maximum charge per delay is mandated in the guidelines and those guidelines are in the quarry permit. He noted that a typical quarry blast where there are no restrictions is 1000 pounds per delay and our limit is less than a 100 pounds per delay under the DFO guidelines.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Buxton asked if everyone had a comfort level with these findings apart from the questions asked by Mr. Outhouse.

Ms. Harnish noted that the consultants had provided a good presentation.

Mr. Theriault asked how deep will the quarry go, will it go down to sea level.

Mr. Buxton replied no and that the permit does not permit the Proponent to go below sea level or below the water table at the bottom of the mountain. Any change would require an amendment to the permit. He further noted the Proponent will probably create a slight slope back from the edge towards the face of the quarry to deal with any high unexpected runoff that may come from springs or heavy rainfall and this will give the Proponent a chance to contain it and lead to in a civilized fashion down to the sedimentation pond.

Mr. Buxton noted that this is basically what will happen in the set up.

Mr. Buxton expressed his thanks to Mr. MacFarlane and Mr. Hogg for coming to the meeting.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any questions arising from the minutes of October 24, 2002.

It was decided that the minutes of October 24, 2002 required further review by the committee members and any questions would be tabled until the next committee meeting.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any new questions.

It was asked if the government has guidelines in place for the size of blast, how close to wells, or whether it will be sloped at certain angle.

Mr. Buxton responded that because the quarry is adjacent to fish habitat the Proponent must follow the guidelines established by DFO. The permit issued for the 4 HA quarry clearly indicates that blasting must be carried out in accordance with the DFO guidelines and it is assumed that a permit for a larger quarry would also require adherence to the DFO guidelines. Essentially, these guidelines set out the maximum size of the charge per delay based upon the distance of the charge from fish habitat. Another thing that has to be considered is what sort of bottom the water has whether it's solid rock, sand, silt, etc. In order to ensure that other guidelines such as the concussion guideline are met Proponent intends to conduct a small test blast to determine whether all the parameters set out in the terms and conditions of the permit are being adhered to. In terms of the quarry slope there are several considerations. One would be the guidelines set out by Occupational Health and Safety Regulations. Secondly, the ability to rehabilitate the quarry site in a manner acceptable to the Provincial Government would need to be taken into account.

Mrs. Graham asked what is in the Federal guidelines that will ensure that the reconstruction of the site will occur. She noted that it is her understanding that the government does not have anyway to monitor that this is done.

Mr. Buxton responded that the Provincial Government does have a mechanism in place to ensure that site rehabilitation takes place. The process is based upon a rehabilitation plan being approved by the Provincial Government and payment by the Proponent to ensure that the rehabilitation takes place. For example, with respect to the permitted 4 HA quarry the Proponent has paid \$25,000, an initial payment, and is required to submit a detailed rehabilitation plan for the 4 HA site within one year, by April 30, 2003, of the permit being issued. The Provincial Government will examine the rehabilitation plan and if it is approved will assess the value of the remediation and the Proponent must then pay to the government this amount either in the form of cash or bond. If at the end of the quarry operation the Proponent does not remediate the Provincial Government has the money to do so.

Mrs. Graham asked whether for a 4 or for a 400 HA quarry the money was given to the government.

Mr. Buxton responded that either cash or a bond is provided to the government. A question at a previous meeting asked what does the government do with the money. Mr. Buxton noted that he couldn't say but that it is presumably set aside for cleanup. He noted that in the past there probably have been problems where people said they would clean up and didn't or closed a quarry and walked away and the government did not have the money in hand to remediate. Under the present strategy the government has the money in hand so either the Proponent remediates or the government does it with the Proponent's money.

Mr. Theriault noted that he is a sea urchin fisherman and fishes in that area. He asked how much run off or dirty water will come from the quarry because it could effect visibility along the shore. He noted that when they dive along the shore clean water is needed in order to see. Mr. Buxton noted that water containing a high level of particulates is not permitted to run off from the quarry site into the bay. He noted that essentially the closed circuit system will be applied. Further the run off from the entire quarry operation will be directed into a sedimentation pond where the particulates will settle out and only clean water will be permitted to run off into the Bay. From time to time the sediments from the wash pond and

the sedimentation pond will be cleaned out and placed in the sediment holding area on the site for eventual sale.

Mr. Buxton further noted that the water discharged to the bay must be monitored weekly and the results of the monitoring forwarded to the NSDOEL.

Mr. Buxton noted about White's Cove that most of the area bottom is bare rock and if any sediment appears in the Bay at that point they will know where it came from.

Mr. Theriault replied that his only concern is with visibility.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.

It is noted that Mr. Outhouse left the meeting and Mr. Buxton welcomed Mr. Mark Dittrick.

Mr. Dittrick asked for the hydro-geological report.

Mr. Buxton responded that a preliminary report had been produced by Jacques Whitford Associates and that it had just been presented to the committee.

Mr. Dittrick asked if there was a summary of the preceding presentation.

Mr. Buxton responded that there would be a summary of questions and answers attached to the minutes.

Mr. Dittrick noted he had been invited to attend the meeting and did not wish anyone to think he was barging in. He noted that he had been called by Mr. Buxton's office and asked whether he would attend the meeting.

Mr. Buxton noted that he had understood that the Rev. Dickinson had basically said that there was no information getting out with respect to the quarry and that no one was allowed to attend the CLC meetings.

Mr. Dittrick replied that he did not think that was true.

Mr. Buxton replied that that was the information that came to him so he thought it appropriate that both the Rev. Dickinson and Mr. Dittrick were specifically invited to attend this meeting.

Mr. Dittrick asked for the source of the information i.e., what the press release had said.

Mr. Buxton noted it was in a press release that this was a secret process i.e., the CLC committee meetings and that no one was allowed to come. He noted that it was felt that since there was a meeting tonight we would make it clear that everyone was welcome to attend.

Ms. Nesbitt referred to the Daily News article and quoted Rev. Dickinson.

Mr. Dittrick noted that he had glanced at the previous minutes and noted that Miss McArthy had attended the meeting and had asked who represents the company and that she wanted to deal with the company itself. Miss McArthy was told that Mr. Buxton represents the company and that she would have to deal with Mr. Buxton.

Mr. Dittrick noted that he did not think that there was total misinterpretation in the article because if anyone wants to deal with other principals of the company or other individuals involved with the project they are not able to do so. I.e. that Mr. Buxton is the one they have to talk to and that basically they cannot get beyond Mr. Buxton. He further noted that he thinks that the article has been misinterpreted to say that these meetings are closed and secret and no one is allowed to come to the meetings. He personally did not read that into the article.

Mr. Buxton responded that he had heard from a number of sources that no information is being given out and accordingly he thought it appropriate that the Rev. Dickinson and Mr. Dittrick be specifically invited to the next meeting. He thanked Mr. Dittrick for coming.

Ms. Harnish asked if there had been a notice of this meeting posted.

Ms. Nesbitt replied yes, it had been posted at Centreville Garage, Little River Trading Post.

Ms. MacAlpine noted that the notice was posted at the office in Digby.

Mr. Buxton noted that it was asked at the previous meeting if the CLC could meet with the hydro geologist and Mr. Buxton had replied that he would arrange that for tonight's meeting. It was asked where is the rock going to be loaded.

Mr. Buxton replied in White's Cove.

It was asked if there is going to be a permanent wharf there.

Mr. Buxton replied possibly three dolphins with a ship loader going out to the center dolphin. It was asked if it would be moved or if it will be there year round.

Mr. Buxton replied the dolphins and ship loader will be permanent structures on 36" pipe piles, socket piled into the rock. He noted it will not be a solid finger wharf going out or across, it will be three individual dolphins, the center being 50' by 50' at the top, the other two with 25' by 25' tops. The water flow will be maintained inside these around the cove. There will be piers out to them to support the conveyor that goes out to the ship loader.

Ms. Nesbitt asked how close is the Proponent to finalizing the design of the terminal.

Mr. Buxton replied the conceptual phase possibly within one week, at which time the Proponent would be making application to Navigable Waters.

It was asked how far out into the bay will this go.

Mr. Buxton replied about 600', plus or minus.

It was asked if this is about 20 fathom of water.

Mr. Buxton replied yes, about 46' is needed at low tide. He noted that the ship draws, depending on how much rock is put on, approximately 42', a safety factor is required, 20' tide and the dolphins need to be high enough out of the water that the ship loader can load the ship which makes the dolphin (pipe pile) approximately 85' off bottom.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if the test blasts have been scheduled.

Mr. Buxton replied no. The area in question would be approximately 60' x 40' in the first outcropping of basalt from the flat quarry floor, approximately 40' up where it is virtually bare basalt at the top with a hole depth of 24' at front (west side) and 29' at the back. The load per delay will be approximately 45kg/100 pounds per hole for approximately 56 holes, a total charge of 5600 pounds. The Proponent is hoping to get the blast off before Christmas but he noted there is no urgency to do this. They would like the information to confirm all the calculations on the blast effects. There is no exact date. He further noted that he had promised at a previous meeting of the CLC that anyone who wanted to attend the blast that they could come and stand at various monitoring stations, everyone will know the time it will be scheduled for.

Mr. Dittrick asked if the exact location is noted on the site plan.

Mr. Buxton replied yes.

Mr. Dittrick asked if he could obtain a copy of that.

Mr. Buxton replied that a copy can be made available to Ms. Nesbitt, the chair.

Mr. Dittrick asked if he could obtain a copy of that.

Ms. Nesbitt replied yes.

Mr. Buxton replied that the blast will take place within the 4-hectare site.

Mr. Dittrick asked if this would be within the new or the old boundary.

Mr. Buxton asked if Mr. Dittrick is referring to the 4 HA quarry.

Mr. Dittrick replied yes, and asked is there a new boundary.

Mr. Buxton replied no.

Mr. Dittrick asked if there is another boundary.

Mr. Buxton asked for the 4 HA quarry.

Mr. Dittrick replied yes and asked how far away from the house sites it is.

Mr. Buxton replied that he had just given the plan to the hydro-geologist and he can't say at this time.

Mr. Dittrick noted that he has seen 2 sites for the same basic location with different boundaries.

Mr. Buxton replied that there may have been very minor modifications of the boundaries but the registered plan is available from NSDOEL and indicates when the final plan for the 4 HA quarry was registered.

Mr. Dittrick replied that he has seen a different plan than the original as far as the boundaries are concerned.

Mr. Buxton replied that there is only one plan that has been registered with the NSDOEL.

Mr. Dittrick asked where would the other plan have come from.

Mr. Buxton replied he is unsure of what plan Mr. Dittrick is speaking of. He noted that in the permit there is a requirement to establish by legal survey the boundaries of the 4 HA site. He further noted that this was done.

Mr. Dittrick asked if there is a copy of that plan.

Mr. Buxton replied he had just given the plan to the Jacques Whitford representatives. He noted that it has been presented to the CLC.

Mr. Dittrick asked if Mr. Buxton has a copy of the original and the slightly revised plan and can he obtain a copy of both of them.

Mr. Buxton noted the modification from the original may be approximately 10' and that there is only one plan registered.

Mr. Dittrick asked what is the general shape of that.

Mr. Buxton replied it is generally a rectangle shape and he referred to the large-scale map.

Mr. Dittrick asked what does the square represent.

Mr. Buxton replied that this is a concrete pad.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.

Ms. Harnish asked if the minutes were being posted on the web.

Ms. Sanford replied that she had provided copies of the minutes to the Municipality of Digby for their website.

Mr. Ivens noted that only the approved minutes are being posted.

Mr. Dittrick noted that Barry Moody had done the cultural study. He noted his surprise to find that Mr. Moody had a relationship with Mr. Buxton.

Mr. Buxton replied that Mr. Dittrick may be surprised to learn of this relationship but he and Dr. Moody had been partners in Delta Four, they had consulted in matters regarding Annapolis Royal, Upper Clements Theme Park and on two personal projects. He further noted that Dr. Moody is a personal friend and that this is no secret.

Mr. Dittrick replied this is okay.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if Mr. Rowe had any questions.

Mr. Rowe replied that he is an observer at the meeting but that he is curious about the questions being raised by Mr. Dittrick pertaining to the site boundary differences and the questions in regards to the integrity of Mr. Buxton. He noted that this is an open meeting.

Mr. Dittrick replied that he is not questioning Mr. Buxton's integrity.

Mr. Rowe replied this is what he has observed.

Mr. Dittrick replied that he thought people were unhappy and uncomfortable with his presence.

Mr. Buxton noted that these meetings are so that questions may be asked and issues arising may be dealt with at the next meeting.

Ms. Nesbitt asked at what stage is the economic study.

Mr. Buxton replied over the next few days they will establish the cost of the ship loader and terminal and this will complete the background information necessary to complete the study.

Mr. Dittrick asked who is doing the environmental study.

Mr. Buxton replied there are 15 sections to the environmental assessment. Geologist, John Lizak, Pennsylvania; Archeologist, Charles Watrall; Cultural, Dr. Barry Moody; Aboriginal, Confederation of Mainland Mi'kmaq; Botanical, Ruth Newell, George Alliston; Marine Ecology, Mike Brylinsky; Marine Mammals, Dalhousie University, etc.

Mr. Dittrick asked who is handling the information regarding marine mammals.

Mr. Buxton replied that David Kern is responsible for this aspect.

Mr. Dittrick asked if he could speak with Mr. Kern regarding this.

Mr. Buxton replied yes.

Mr. Dittrick asked if Mr. Buxton would provide a list of the consultants involved.

Mr. Buxton noted this information is available in previous minutes.

Mr. Dittrick asked if he could get a list without going through the minutes.

Mr. Buxton replied that Mr. Dittrick would need to request this information from the chair.

Mr. Dittrick asked if the office in Digby could provide this information.

Mr. Buxton noted Global Quarry Inc. is a private corporation and that the information can be provided through the Community Liaison Committee.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that information provided at the CLC meetings is based on fact; the committee asks questions and obtains answers to questions asked. She noted that she did not understand why there would be a problem reviewing the minutes for the requested information.

Mr. Dittrick replied that he had not reviewed all of the minutes.

Mr. Buxton noted the Proponent has provided the CLC with information provided by the consultants. He noted that the raw documents cannot be given to the government as is. The raw data is only a third of the process dealing with impact and mitigation. He further noted that every element is looked at for short/long term and positive/negative impacts.

Mr. Buxton noted that the environmental assessment process is under his direction and he will sign the Registration of Undertaking. He noted that there are a lot of people involved and the best people have been hired.

Mr. Dittrick asked if the Environmental Assessment application is for the larger quarry.

Mr. Buxton replied that is correct and noted that it is not a requirement for a 4 hectare quarry. He noted the Environmental Assessment is part of the process of filing for the Registration of Undertaking and the information that is included is prepared by the Proponent and will be rejected by NSDOEL if they are not satisfied with it.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Rowe suggested people should look through the minutes.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that professionals are providing the information.

Mr. Dittrick replied that he does not have a list and would like a list of the various consultants.

Mr. Ivens replied they are noted in the minutes.

Ms. Harnish asked who Mr. Dittrick is.

Mr. Dittrick replied he is the Atlantic director of Sierra Canada.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if Mr. Dittrick would have any information that would assist the CLC to make a more balanced appraisal.

Mr. Dittrick replied feel free to formally ask.

Ms. Nesbitt advised that she will ask for a list of the consultants engaged.

Mr. Buxton replied it will be attached to minutes.

Mrs. Graham noted that she heard discussion of an old cemetery on the site and asked where that information came from, when was it discovered. She noted that approximately 10 years ago she did an inventory of cemeteries and did not come across any cemetery in White's Cove.

Mr. Buxton replied to the best of his knowledge the Proponent heard 5 months ago that there was possibly a cemetery on site. He noted after some investigation it was concluded there was not a cemetery located on the property but people have maintained that graves are on site. Miss McCarthy has stated that she has evidence and we have asked her to provide us a copy but we have not received that.

Mr. Buxton noted that there is a procedure to follow on land if graves are uncovered, the coroner is called and a report is made.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Mrs. Graham in what capacity did she perform the cemetery inventory.

Mrs. Graham replied a grant had been given to areas to locate cemeteries, gather information from stones and plot what the churches had on file. She noted that this was done for the museum.

Mr. Buxton asked Mrs. Graham if she found any cemeteries in White's Cove.

Mrs. Graham replied no and that Archer Turnbull asked if there were any hidden on the Neck but no one could tell her any information. She went through the library microfiche of church burials and found one that was located in Joggin Bridge. She further noted she does not recall any in White's Cove and she had inquired in the community but no one knew where it was and some had never heard of White's Cove.

Mr. Buxton replied that there has been no evidence of graves or a cemetery found on site.

It was asked why there would be when there was a community cemetery available.

Mr. Dittrick asked if it is the procedure at this point to do more archeological study on site.

Mr. Buxton replied that the archeological study has not been completed.

Mr. Dittrick asked where the study stands.

Mr. Buxton replied it is 50 – 60% complete.

Mr. Dittrick asked what the first 60% entailed and the last 40%.

Mr. Buxton replied the first part of the cultural survey is to do a reconnaissance and the second part is a class C archeological survey. He noted that they have responded to individual questions from the CLC in regards to a cemetery on site as per newspaper claims.

Mr. Dittrick asked if they are looking to test blast before the permit for the wharf is received.

Mr. Buxton replied they are not tied together.

Mr. Dittrick asked when does the Canadian Environmental Assessment kick in.

Mr. Buxton replied possibly a week from receipt of the application.

Mr. Dittrick noted when you make an application they will require an assessment because you're blasting on site and he asked how long will this take. He asked do you intend to blast before Christmas.

Mr. Buxton replied that this has nothing to do with the wharf.

Mr. Dittrick asked do you intend to blast before the Canadian Environmental Assessment.
Mr. Buxton replied yes.
Mr. Dittrick asked before the archeological study is completed.
Mr. Buxton replied yes.
Mr. Dittrick asked how much of an archeological study has been done on site.
Mr. Buxton replied that a preliminary archaeological reconnaissance and a preliminary cultural report had been completed and that further extensive archaeological work was currently underway.
Mr. Dittrick asked if there will be blasting in that vicinity. I.e. of the cellar holes.
Mr. Buxton replied no.
Mr. Dittrick asked where will blasting take place in respect to the cellar holes.
Mr. Buxton replied 200 – 300 meters.
Mr. Dittrick asked if there is an overlap view available.
Mr. Buxton replied not at this stage.
Mr. Dittrick asked could they be made available.
Mr. Buxton replied it will be the same scale, digitized on the same base drawing.
Mr. Dittrick asked if a digitized form is available can it be superimposed over the cellar holes and blasting area.
Mr. Buxton replied no it cannot be overlapped.
Mr. Dittrick asked why it cannot be overlapped.
Mr. Buxton replied that it is bare rock in that area and there is no relevance.
Mr. Dittrick asked does the plan show where the cellar holes are on the map.
Mr. Buxton replied they are not plotted on the map at this time
Mr. Dittrick replied he is confused about this.
Mr. Buxton replied it is easier to see in the field.
Mr. Dittrick asked if it hasn't been put to paper yet.
Mr. Buxton replied it is not yet on paper. Mr. Watrell's report having not been received.
Mr. Dittrick asked if Mr. Watrell has it. He noted that it is relative to blasting but nothing is available yet.
Mr. Buxton asked available from whom.
Mr. Dittrick replied anyone who is interested.
Mr. Buxton replied if the CLC asked for the information it will be provided. He noted the Proponent has a 4 HA permit, the CLC was set up to monitor the 4 HA quarry and it was made clear at that first meeting that people were far more interested in the larger quarry. He further noted that he would answer questions for the larger quarry.
Mr. Dittrick replied that people say there are graves on the 4 HA site; the archeological study has not been completed besides looking at the ground and church registers to rule out a cemetery. He noted that individuals are concerned with the 4 HA quarry.
Mr. Buxton replied he will make the information available.
Mr. Dittrick noted there are people who are concerned.
Mr. Buxton replied that he heard the implication.
Mr. Dittrick noted that there is anecdotal evidence that people are buried there.
Ms. Nesbitt noted that Miss McArthy had presented a photograph at a previous meeting and represented this as factual information, as being laundry and in White's Cove. She noted there are concerns about this. See page 11 - October 24, 2002 minutes.

Mr. Dittrick replied he is aware that the hanging items are buoys and not laundry. He noted that people are concerned with any work being done on site as it has the potential to do damage.

Mr. Dittrick asked if Dr. Moody has determined there was ever a community with permanent residents in White's Cove.

Mr. Buxton replied there were certainly residents on the side of the hill close to White's Cove Road and it was supposedly occupied as farms.

It was stated there was sheep on the land.

Mr. Buxton noted that he has heard that there was a community there but there is no evidence.

Mr. Dittrick replied that Mr. Buxton or Dr. Moody do not have any evidence. He asked who else has looked at this and come to the conclusion that there was no village.

Mr. Buxton replied that the archeologist has done a preliminary reconnaissance; he has looked at deeds, maps and carried out fundamental research. He further noted that the site of the proposed test blast is basically bare rock and that there is no possibility that graves could be located in that area. He further noted that he has been led to believe that at the head of the wharf this is the area of a previous pit where apparently large quantities of material were taken out in the 1940 – 50's for the construction of Hwy #217 and it certainly appears that this area has been largely worked over by heavy equipment.

Mr. Buxton noted that Miss McArthur had advised the committee that she had found specific evidence of graves. Miss McArthur was asked if she would present the evidence to the committee but she responded that she did not have the time to go back and get it.

Mr. Dittrick asked if she said this, is it in the minutes.

Refer to page 13 – October 24, 2002 minutes "Miss McCarthy replied that she had spent many hours and she would not go back to get it."

Mr. Buxton noted if anyone knows where graves are it would make a difference, no one has said this and there is no evidence of graves there. He noted that there is anecdotal evidence of fish shacks but none of anyone living there.

Mr. Dittrick asked if it is their conclusion that no one lived there, that there was no village.

Mr. Buxton replied no, Miss McArthur provided us with evidence of farms but they were not in White's Cove they were on the hillside.

Mr. Dittrick noted that Mr. Buxton said on the hillside and asked on which side of the road.

Mr. Buxton replied from the top down to White's Cove.

Mr. Dittrick asked on the higher area.

Mr. Buxton replied yes.

Mr. Dittrick asked if this is approaching where the blasting would be and noted it would be nice to see a map in order to see where blasting will take place.

Mr. Buxton replied he has no problem making it available.

Mr. Dittrick asked in what time frame.

Mr. Buxton replied perhaps 3 weeks.

Mr. Dittrick asked before the pre-blast.

Mr. Buxton replied possibly.

Mr. Dittrick asked what good is this.

Mr. Buxton replied he doesn't have concerns about damage. He noted it is bare rock, a tiny area.

Mr. Theriault noted he will ask his neighbor about a village in White's Cove.

Mr. Dittrick replied it would be nice to settle the issue of community, no community before the pre-blast.

Mr. Buxton replied there is no evidence to date of a community and each time he has asked for evidence to be shown there is none. He noted there has been nothing in 5 months except for people saying there was a community sometime around 1910.

Mr. Dittrick asked what about before 1910.

Mr. Buxton replied he has been told 1910.

Ms. Nesbitt replied there is Mr. Church's map of 1864.

Mr. Buxton replied there is nothing in White's Cove according to that map.

Mr. Dittrick noted that there are homes in Little River that were once located in White's Cove.

Mr. Buxton agreed that people have said this but Mr. Church's map shows nothing, there is a gap between 1864 and 1910. He noted that people say there was a village but they have seen only blank maps.

Ms. Harnish noted that Mr. E. Hall had a small farm, he went back to the original deed but no one could identify any homes. She noted that Stuart Carty's father in Mink Cove spoke of farms but he didn't know where they were.

Mr. Buxton replied presumably post grant, 1878, possibly somewhere up the hill. Mr. Hall thought higher up hill.

Mr. Graham noted that they put sheep on the land because it was grown up.

Ms. MacAlpine noted that residents have family trees and she wondered why it seems so difficult to come up with some evidence of a village in White's Cove.

Mr. Theriault noted that his grandfather claimed boats fished out of White's Cove but no one lived there.

Ms. MacAlpine noted that if someone lived in Meteghan evidence is passed down but in White's Cove in this point there seems to be no evidence.

Mr. Ivens noted that we are not here to debate the issue and if there is proof bring it to the meeting. He noted if you can find information against the company he would like to know so they can review it.

Ms. Nesbitt provided pictures of fish houses in White's Cove for review and asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Ivens noted we can try to contact people to come to meeting if they have proof of burials.

Mr. Theriault replied he could talk to his relative, he might come.

Mr. Buxton indicated he would be welcome.

Mr. Ivens noted the CLC is not set up for debate, we ask questions.

Mr. Theriault noted his grandfather has told him stories but not that anyone lived there.

Mr. Buxton replied if there is evidence it would be nice to see it at a meeting.

Mr. Dittrick noted that he recalled in the minutes a port facility would be in St. Mary's Bay.

Ms. Sanford noted that this had been amended at the meeting of October 24, 2002. It was amended to read the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. Buxton noted there are no plans to quarry in St. Mary's Bay.

Mr. Theriault noted that a rock quarry would not do as much damage as fish draggers.

Mr. Rowe wonders if the Sierra Club knows that.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Mr. Dittrick why he wants to see this quarry stopped.

Mr. Dittrick replied there is no evidence of more jobs or that eco-tourism might benefit, ballast water from the 45-ton ship causes problems with invasive species and how will they deal with this.

Mr. Ivens asked if there isn't a Canadian company shipping out of the Bay already.

Mr. Buxton replied Bayside.

It was asked if gypsum boats were blamed for the oyster dying off.

Mr. Dittrick noted the ship's impact on the right whale and talk of shifting the lanes to protect the right whales and 53% of collisions occur from ship impact. He noted adding 50-panamax ships does change the likelihood that they will be hit. There are lots of environmental concerns, such as the 24-hour noise level. He further noted if there is any hydro-geological information he would like it to be passed along.

Mr. Buxton replied that extensive environmental assessment is being carried out.

Mr. Dittrick replied he has seen lots of studies done and is glad to see that Jacques Whitford is not doing all of the studies.

Mr. Buxton asked Mr. Dittrick what his technical degree is.

Mr. Dittrick replied he has worked with technical information for 30 years.

Mr. Buxton asked if he has had formal training.

Mr. Dittrick replied no.

Mr. Ivens asked what job losses Mr. Dittrick referred to.

Mr. Dittrick replied the tourist industry.

Mr. Ivens noted he is of the opinion that tourists have ruined the area.

Mr. Dittrick noted he feels the quarry will add to that.

Mr. Ivens noted he does not believe it will.

Mr. Dittrick asked if the quarry will operate 24 hours.

Mr. Buxton replied no, 6 am – 10 pm.

Mr. Dittrick asked what will the annual quantity be.

Mr. Buxton replied 2 million ton per year.

Mr. Dittrick asked if there is water draw down, monitor wells, if it does you'll pack up, go away.

Mr. Buxton replied the committee sees this as one of the major issues.

Mr. Dittrick asked if he could see a copy of this.

Mr. Buxton replied it is in minutes.

Ms. Nesbitt asked what jobs he is referring to in eco-tourism.

Mr. Dittrick replied fish plants.

Mr. Ivens replied they are provided by draggers. He noted that most plants don't process.

Ms. Nesbitt noted that the quarry won't be visible from Hwy #217. For diversification we look to fishing, forestry, tourism and they all make noise. She noted the quarry is behind the mountain and will be monitored for noise and dust. She further noted Mr. Buxton has spoken about all of this and she asked Mr. Dittrick what is his biggest concern.

Ms. Nesbitt noted for us jobs are badly needed in this area, this is sustainable 30 – 35 years work. She noted that she wants to understand Mr. Dittrick's viewpoint. Tourism has to be looked at and these studies should come to the committee.

It was noted that most of the opposition comes from the people who have money from raping the resources and those who want to turn Digby Neck into a retirement community.

Mrs. Angrignon noted she is concerned about the lack of young people in Digby Neck.

It was noted that those people who have themselves looked after financially are not worried about the jobs.

Mrs. Angrignon noted that we need more young people.

Mr. Ivens noted that tourism and eco-tourism jobs pay minimum wages.

Mr. Graham noted he had heard a comment that the quarry is not putting money in his pocket because the quarry is paying higher money.

Ms. Nesbitt replied jobs are needed and she asked if Mr. Graham had any experience working in a quarry.

Mr. Graham replied yes, but nothing compared to what he's heard this quarry will be. He noted they are not as noisy or as much dust in the air, they pay the best wages. He stated they are a nice place to work.

Mr. Ivens asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Rowe replied he is just here for information and he noted that he hears things that are not based on facts. He heard at the other committee meetings that they have an expert who is going to help them stop the quarry, there has been no information from the other side and they have their mindset. He noted he hasn't made up his mind for or against the quarry but he wants to hear information, to find out as much as he can because he doesn't believe in manufacturing information to stop it. He further noted that it is wrong to keep the opposition meetings closed, that's the reason he is here and objects to Mr. Dittrick coming in mid-meeting and asking for things covered in the minutes, if he wants all this information he should study the minutes. This is an open meeting (public) and the other meetings are closed.

Ms. Nesbitt replied it is important to have all the information available.

Mr. Rowe noted that the Proponent has the right to blast and asked if it's bare rock how can graves be in bare rock. He noted we've seen the cellar holes and the minutes are available.

Mr. Ivens noted that when any questions have been asked of the Proponent, Mr. Buxton and Ms. Nesbitt have tried to get answers for the next meeting.

Mr. Theriault noted that comments about ground zero had been made and others had asked them to put signs on their lawns. He is looking for honesty in the information and a quarry is not 1/10th as bad as a fish dragger.

Ms. Nesbitt asked if there were any other questions.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 pm.

Next meeting date and time in January at Rossway Community Center to be advised.