

MEETING/PROJECT NAME:		Goffs Quarry Community Liaison Committee – Meeting # 9	
DATE OF MEETING:	Wednesday, Sept 4, 2019	TIME:	6:000 PM – 8:30 pm
MEETING CHAIRPERSON:	Bud Baker, Resident – Waverly, NS		
PREPARED BY:	Angela Freeborn, Scotian Materials Ltd.	LOCATION OF MEETING:	Hilton Garden Inn, Halifax Airport 200 Pratt & Whitney Dr. Enfield, NS B2T 0A2
1.0 MEETING OBJECTIVE			
Updates on The Environmental Assessment as well as status of operations and future planning.			
2.0 ATTENDEES			
Bud Baker, Waverly Resident (Chair)		Mimi LeCain, Goffs Resident	
Anna McCarron, SWEPS		Robert MacPherson, Scotian Materials	
Martin Zwicker, Fletchers Lake Resident		Angela Dicker, Miller Lake West Resident	
3.0 ABSENT FROM MEETING			
Bill Horne, MLA		Jason Crowell, FRABA	
Keri Irwin, Resident		Heather Mackay, Clean Earth	
Dean Bouchard, Halifax Stanfield International Airport		Sean MacLean, Maritimes Northeast Pipeline	
4.0 OTHERS PRESENT			
Trista Dorey, Lower Sackville		Angela Freeborn, Scotian Materials Administration	
5.0 AGENDA AND NOTES, DESCUSIONS AND ISSUES			
TOPIC		DISCUSSION	
1.0	GOFFS QUARRY SITE TOUR	The meeting began with a bus tour through Goffs Quarry. Touring the office site, Asphalt and concrete site as well as the Crushing site. Photographs were approved by Rob. Rob conducted the site tour; providing detailed descriptions on how the site equipment operates, the type of material it produces, and the protective measures when machines are in operation for each site location. Rob answers questions regarding depth of quarry pit, blasting, boundaries, water control quality and remediation.	
2.0	INTRODUCTIONS	Committee members introduced themselves and stated where they were locally from.	
3.0	CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF MINUTES	Bud Baker- chair, led the meeting by addressing questions or concerns from meeting # 8, none addressed. Bud approved the minutes of meeting # 8. Everyone then moves forward.	
4.0	MEETING	The meeting starts with Bud referring to the requested updates on the Environmental Assessment from meeting # 8. Rob indicated there were two items requested to review from last meeting: The Supplementary information from the Environmental Assessment, now submitted; following requested information by the department as well as, the status of operations and future in the upcoming months within the quarry. Mimi questions if there have been any developments from the MEKS study and Rob states there has been, and it's part of the EA and he will go through everything starting with the Environmental Assessment.	
5.0	STATUS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: UPDATE - ROB	Rob starts with cautioning the group about the technical background of the Environmental Assessment and the Mi'kmaq Ecological Knowledge Study; due to the volume of scientific answers based on the specified information that Nova Scotia Environment had requested. He offered a more settle version for better understanding and advised the EA is available	

		<p>for viewing should they want to look at the numbers, calculations and information for personal knowledge.</p> <p>Rob then continues reviewing the results of the supplemental submission information requested by NSE back in September of 2019, touching base on seven components.</p>
5.1	WATER BALANCE	<p>NSE requested additional information regarding the water balance results, Flows of post-development conditions, groundwater seepage and model uncertainty.</p> <p>Rob describes the two ways the Groundwater model and Water balance estimate groundwater seepage differ.</p> <p>The groundwater model uses a geomean of hydraulic conductivities obtained during the baseline field program, and the water balance estimates groundwater seepage into the quarry as infiltration within that radius of influence. The groundwater seepage estimate used in the water balance is within the range presented in the groundwater model. Resulting in the actual groundwater seepage into the quarry and the extent of the groundwater drawdown to be expected less than the conservatively estimated water seepage values and extent of the ROI presented in the EARD.</p> <p>Golder has calculated the ROI based on a range of hydraulic conductivities at the request of NSE. Indicating the upper-bounds seepage and ROI in this range are considered to be unrealistic and not expected to be encountered.</p> <p>The quarry discharge will be controlled using sedimentation ponds designed to meet the water quality and quantity criteria. The discharge rate (L/s) will remain within the range of the observed stream flows which have been collected since 2017.</p>
5.2	SETTLING POND	<p>Rob continued with the Detailed design of settling ponds, and the analysis of how the ponds will manage water discharge for both quality and quantity considering groundwater seepage and rainfall events in spring and summer as per the request of NSE.</p> <p>He explained how sedimentation pond will provide 24 Hrs. of retention time to settle a specific range of particle sizes, providing the required settling to meet the NS pits & quarries guidelines of average TSS concentration of 50 mg/L. with the reduction of suspended solids and associated absorbed metals, will be expected to be representative of background conditions with the total metals concentrations.</p> <p>Rob then detailed the Water quantity by explaining how when pumping is required, parts of the quarry floor will be allowed to flood for water quantity control and once the ponds are at a grade, a hydrological model will be completed to estimate the existing pre-development peak flows and proposed post-development peak flows. Explaining how the outlet of the ponds will be designed to maintain the pre-development peak flows during specific storm events.</p> <p>Anna stated they didn't see a pond in which Rob said the quarry floor was allowed to flood, which allow an additional settling area. Angela Dicker questioned when will other settling ponds be used and Rob said as the quarry expands, the more ponds will be required.</p>
5.3	IMPACTS	<p>Rob moved on to discuss the re-assessment impacts to downstream watercourses such as Holland Brook and describes what measures will be taken to ensure no environmental impact.</p> <p>During the spring discharge events the flow from the quarry will be minimal compared to the flows within Holland Brook. Therefore, if the suspended solids criteria have been met, the water quality at the discharge is not a concern during the spring.</p> <p>During the summer, when Holland Brook is experiencing low flow conditions additional settling within the sedimentation pond will assist in reducing the total metals concentrations at the quarry discharge. It's anticipated that the concentrations of aluminum and iron will be reduced at the discharge and will meet the CCME FWAL or be</p>

		<p>within the range of background concentrations which are naturally occurring in Holland Brook.</p> <p>Rob explains, with proper water management/handling, as outlined in the Water Management Plan, no impacts to Holland Brook are anticipated.</p> <p>Martin asked where Holland Brook was originally, which leads to a small discussion on the location of where Holland Brook runs.</p>
5.4	RECLAMATION PLAN	<p>Rob addresses the discussion on the site bus tour. Where reclamation will be conducted to guard the safety of the environment and promote the reinstatement of the natural habitat using suitable vegetation techniques to promote succession. Areas of the quarry to be reclaimed will have the quarry face backfilled at a 3:1 slope using overburden stored on-site from the original stripping.</p> <p>He then explains how the bedrock will be capped with topsoil and steep outcrops will be suitably sloped. All disturbed areas will be covered with hydroseed and mulch, trees and shrubs native to the area will be planted.</p> <p>This will replicate the process used in the rehabilitation work carried out during the recommissioning/permitting stages for the Industrial approval.</p>
5.5	OFFSITE WETLANDS	<p>Rob directs the group to his map on the projector screen to indicate where the 7 off-site wetlands are that may be indirectly affected by the quarry development. He indicates the four wetlands that have been surveyed based on the radius of possible influence of groundwater drawdown as part of the assessment whereas; the two smaller isolated wetlands located south of Resource Road have not been surveyed.</p> <p>It's Golder's opinion the completed wetland survey provided enough detail to confidently assess potential effects of the quarry and recommend appropriate mitigation measures. Rob states the monitoring off-site wetland habitats during operation is not recommended at this time; however, Scotian maintains a monitoring network to assess for potential changes to groundwater and surface water. If there are any changes observed to groundwater and surface water, monitoring will be expected for off-site wetlands.</p> <p>Mimi then asked Who looked at the four wetlands that's been pointed out. Rob states that it's Golder Consultants who monitor the wetlands. The Dep't of Environment reviews the documented findings once they are sent to them. The Dep't of Environment will then address any concerns or questions within the document and request further information or testing if needed before approving.</p> <p>Mimi questioned who did the testing and Rob replied with it's Golder Associates who does the testing.</p> <p>Martin asked if Golder Associates wrote this report in which Rob informed the group that Golder Associates wrote the report based on their findings and, a small discussion was had, regarding the report.</p> <p>Rob continues with informing the group the current document is just the submission for approval, which has not yet been made public and that it's currently under review by the Dep't of Environment and being reviewed with the committee prior to the set public viewing date of Sept 5th, 2019.</p>
5.6	GAME SANTUARY	<p>Rob carries on with the potential impacts to the Waverley -Salmon River Long Lake Wilderness area assessment that NSE requested, explaining the area is not within the surface water catchment of the proposed project. Due to the distance from the site, no impacts related to groundwater and surface water are anticipated in the Waverley - Salmon River Long Lake area.</p> <p>Based on the distance of the quarry being; 1.2 kms from the closest point of the site to the closest edge of the Waverley Salmon River Long lake Wilderness area, it's been determined the potential for dust related impacts are low, the noise and light impacts are negligible to low as well.</p>

5.7	ELECTROFISHING	<p>Rob states; the NSE had requested a consult with the Dep't of Fisheries & Aquaculture to map out an electrofishing program for watercourses in and outside the project footprint and provide electrofishing survey results to determine any amount of fish species and indicate if salmonids were present.</p> <p>Golder Association conducted the survey and assumed all surrounding waterways were fishing habitats and salmonids were present; therefore, electrofishing is not required. If it's determined, through the monitoring program, that there will be an adverse effect on fish and fish habitat, a watercourse alteration approval/DFO authorization will be required. In that case, additional data will have to be collected in these watercourses. In which Scotian Materials will provide NS Fisheries & Aquaculture the detailed methods for any future assessments to support an authorization or approval.</p> <p>Rob said the only thing the electrofishing would indicate in this case is, if there were no fish or fish habitat present and this was agreed upon by the NS Environment.</p>
5.8	MI'KMAQ ECOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE STUDY (MEKS)	<p>Rob moves forward with the results from the Mi'Kmaq Ecological Knowledge Study that was requested to be done by NSE.</p> <p>Stating the MEKS mandate is to consider land and water areas in which the project is located and identify what Mi'Kmaq traditional use activities have occurred, or are currently occurring within, and what Mi'Kmaq ecological knowledge presently exists regarding the area.</p> <p>Traditional Use – Project site summary Based on the data documented and analyzed, it was concluded that there is no Mi'Kmaq use reported on the project site, nor the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Traditional Use – Study area summary Bass and trout fishing were the most commonly reported activities by informants within the study area. Overall, many activities took place in what is this report categorizes as the Current Use Timeline. There are enough current use activities occurring in the area to suggest current use throughout all three timelines.</p> <p>Recommendations Based on the information gathered & presented in this report, there's potential this project could affect Mi'Kmaq traditional use in both the proposed areas. Although the possible effects of the project could be minimal, considering the number of traditional use activities and the overall size of the project, it is recommended that dialog be initiated with the Assembly of First Nations, Sipekne'Katik, and Millbrook as well the traditional use activities of the Mi'Kmaq be reflected upon in the overall environmental presentation.</p> <p>Rob indicated the study had been a lengthy process because, it had to be extended throughout the seasons to ensure viewing all points of wildlife, flowers, trees within the land; marking various locations for when they came back to see if any changes occurred.</p> <p>Martin questioned how he knew who to go to in the Mi'kmaq Community to get this information and Rob replied there are two companies that do Mi'kmaq Ecological Knowledge Studies; that he has found and he used the Membertou Geomatics Consultants.</p>
6.0	NEXT STEPS	<p>Rob informs the committee of the Public Viewing that is being made available on Thursday September 5th for 30 days.</p> <p>He states the document will be available to view in the following places: The Gordon Snow Community Center, 1359 Fall River Rd, Fall River, NS; The Holiday Inn Express & Suites Halifax Airport, 180 Pratt and Whitney Dr. Enfield, NS; Nova Scotia Environment, 30 Damascus Rd. Suite 115, Bedford NS; and The EA website which is https://www.novascotia.ca/nse.ea.</p>

		Rob also indicates the NSE review and decision will be made within 50 days after.
7.0	STATUS OF OPERATIONS: UPDATE	<p>Rob starts with the work & blasting activity on site indicating, the quarry has conducted three blasts to date, with an approximate 150,000 tonnes of blast & crush; without any issues reported.</p> <p>Mimi said she didn't hear or feel anything from the blast but seen a bunch of dust off the highway.</p> <p>Rob then explains the dust wouldn't be from the blast; however, some products such as sand being crushed can create dust and in this case we use water suppression and, depending on where you are as well as the elevation level you may see a small dust cloud from that particular product being crushed at that time. He also stated the dust is being regulated around the quarry property, and always monitored for any environmental impact which this may have and has not been an issue so far.</p> <p>Rob moves on to inform the committee 6 more blasts will be conducted this year and the asphalt plant is set up on site and will commence production in September.</p> <p>Angela Dicker asked when we see bidding on the jobs, why do we see Northern Construction on them in which Rob said Scotian supplies rock to multiple contractors including Northern Construction which is a related company. Scotian only supplies rock and does not build roads.</p> <p>Martin states how Scotian Materials have established a name quite quickly.</p> <p>Rob then explains how well we have been received throughout the local contracting community due to our location, cleanliness, the service and staff as well as our competitive rates.</p> <p>A small discussion regarding how they have been set up to supply the local contractors, future deliveries and the captive market vicinity then took place.</p> <p>Rob goes into the Environmental monitoring, indicating the sampling remains consistent with baseline, and there are no adverse environmental impacts to report and how the monitoring will continue as required.</p>
8.0	OPEN DISCUSSION	<p>Martin asked what had happened to the office plan and Rob says that the current plan in place for the office was shelved and A more extensive building plan is now in the works, a two-storey concrete tilt top with an attached service shop and garage in it. Maritime Fence and Scotian Materials will be sharing the same building. He also informed the group the location has not yet been confirmed but it will be between the same vicinity as the current Scotian Materials office trailer and the Maritime Fence building.</p> <p>Bud then asked if there where any communications in which we should be made aware of and Rob indicated the only one he could think of is, the outstanding court challenge which went in the favor of Scotian Materials. We have been granted the approval to move forward as no issues had been raised.</p>
9.0	FUTURE MEETING	<p>Bud asked what would be the next big step in which a meeting should be held then questioning regarding future meetings was discussed with a further small discussion on when meetings should be in place for the upcoming year; based on when test results and reports were out, everyone agreed the meetings should continue; to review and discuss within.</p> <p>Martin asked what the importance of creating the CLC meetings were and, the lifespan of the continuous meets. Rob then informed the group; the understanding of the opposition during the initial application process was to address any question or concerns the community may have during operations and, it was up to the NSE to determine the lifespan of the meetings.</p>

		<p>Anna then explains the importance of continuous CLC meetings to follow up on strategies and up-dates.</p> <p>Rob then said its up to the committee to determine how often they choose to meet and suggests at least twice a year, one being in February when the annual tests and planning reports are out to, discuss providing opportunity to review the documents and discuss any plans. Rob also suggested an end of year meeting around September to review operations that took place throughout the year. He advised the group, should any issues arise throughout; the committee can call a meeting at anytime.</p> <p>Martin requested the blasting notifications to be sent to the committee members and all the committee members agreed. The next meeting date had been agreed upon by all members with tea and coffee.</p>	
MEETING ADJOURNED:	Martin adjourned the meeting at 7:52 Pm.		
NEXT MEETING DATE:	Wed. March 4 th 2020	TIME:	6:30 Pm