

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
1	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>It is stated that <i>“Fuel oil is stored on site in temporary above ground storage containers.”</i></p> <p>This section notes <i>“There is one above ground diesel tank on site.”</i></p> <p>Suggest this be clarified. Also suggest providing additional details as to location (also show on map), age of the tank(s), type of construction, containment available, inspection details, frequency of filling, incident reports (in particular any that had the potential to impact surface water and/or groundwater), after hours security at the site, spill response plan, location of existing monitoring wells (if they exist) in the area, any test results from the monitoring wells, etc..</p>	<p>There is one above ground fuel storage tank that was installed approximately three years ago and is equipped with a containment berm. The tank is located across from the weight scales at the Panuke Quarry site. This tank is a backup fuel supply to enable the operation to continue should regular fuel delivery be disrupted. Section 2.6 in the EA document has been clarified.</p>
2	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>It is indicated that <i>“Refueling of equipment will be conducted on-site on a regular basis, under contract by a tanker truck.”</i></p> <p>If refueling is carried out by a tanker truck, what is the purpose of the on-site storage tank?</p>	<p>Yes refueling of equipment is conducted on-site on a regular basis under contract by a tanker truck. See response for Comment No. 1.</p>
3	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>The statement is made, <i>“In the event of a leak or spill during refueling, maintenance, or general equipment operation, immediate action will be taken to stop and contain the spilled material.”</i> A further statement is made <i>“A Spill Contingency Plan will be developed in support of the application for amendment to the existing Industrial Approval.”</i></p> <p>Presumably the plan will also address spills resulting from normal operation of the storage tank. Please confirm.</p> <p>Are spill response equipment/materials currently available at the site and if so are they tested/inspected on a regular basis? Are employees trained in their use?</p> <p>It is suggested the spill response plan contain elements related to training of personnel and agreement(s) with local agencies. The agreement should ensure that the initial response to any incident (those involving equipment and materials related to the quarry operation, but occurring outside the quarry boundary), is handled by the closest response group. This will ensure timely response to spills which have the potential to impact surface water and/or groundwater.</p>	<p>The spill response plan will address spills resulting from normal operation of the storage tank and will be consistent with such planning currently in place and approved for the Panuke Quarry site.</p> <p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
4	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>This paragraph states <i>“Due to its location with respect to the local topography, the Project is expected to lie within a local groundwater recharge area. Regional groundwater flow is inferred to be north and northwest from the South Mountain Highlands towards the Avon River and one of its principal tributaries, the St. Croix River. Locally, groundwater should follow the topography generally northwards towards wetlands and streams.”</i></p> <p>Has this been confirmed based on surveys of the existing groundwater monitoring wells or by other means? If not, will any field verification be carried out?</p>	<p>The groundwater evaluation did not include any water well or monitoring well inspections or measurements.</p> <p>Local shallow groundwater is expected to follow topography. Field verification of groundwater flow direction for the quarry extension is not considered necessary since the closest groundwater users are located greater than 800 metres away from the quarry extension area.</p>
5	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>This paragraph notes <i>“Acid generating bedrock is not expected; however should a mineralized zone be encountered the rock will be tested for acid generating potential.”</i></p> <p>Are employees knowledgeable/trained to identify mineralized zones, which could be acid generating? Who will test for acid generating potential? Suggest this be included in the Industrial Approval application.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Because there is a potential to encounter a mineralized zone, we recommend including a sulphide bearing material monitoring program with the Approval application.</p>
6	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>The Approval document notes various surface water sampling locations under Section 7. Groundwater, items d) and h). These are identified as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A - Upstream of Unnamed Brook • B - Downstream of Unnamed Brook • SW-1 • SW-2 <p>The approval document notes various groundwater sampling locations under Section 8 Groundwater. These are identified as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MW-1 • MW-2 • MW-3 <p>Suggest all sample locations and monitoring wells be shown on a map for clarity and to enable evaluation of their future use for the quarry extension project. Comments regarding any problems with the monitoring wells should be provided.</p>	<p>The locations of the surface water sampling and groundwater monitoring wells have been displayed on Figure 3.</p>

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
7	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>The listing for figure 1.2 reads “Hydrologic Survey” and the title on the figure reads “Hydrological Survey”. The two titles should match.</p> <p>The figures listed as “3.1, 3.2, 3.3” should read “2.1, 2.2, 2.3”.</p>	The figure titles have been corrected.
8	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>The statement is made “The estimated truck traffic will be consistent with current truck volume at the existing quarry and will only increase, for a short period of time, if a large aggregate supply contract were awarded.”</p> <p>Suggest documenting the current and predicted truck volume in this section of the Report.</p>	As stated in Section 5.9.1. there was no traffic study conducted as part of this EA. The results of a study conducted in 2007, for the Panuke Quarry Extension EA, however are provided.
9	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>It is noted that “Surface runoff and quarry drainage are collected on the quarry floor, which has the capacity to hold a significant quantity of water.”</p> <p>Suggest defining “significant quantity of water” in more numerical terms, in particular in relation to 1:25 and 1:100 year storm events.</p>	The capacity of the quarry floor is not considered part of the primary stormwater management system, which is designed to convey excess runoff and attenuate peak flows. However, the intention was to indicate that the quarry itself has capacity to act as a secondary containment which adds an extra level of conservatism.
10	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>This section notes that “In the unlikely event that overflow, in the event of a significant rain fall, exceeds final effluent discharge limits as determined through monitoring, contingency measures may include pumping of sediment laden water to vegetated areas (away from watercourses) or through filter bags for additional filtration and/or use of additional filtration devices or structures.”</p> <p>Is equipment (water test kits, pumps, filter bags, etc.) for this purpose currently available at the site and if so are they inspected/tested on a regular basis? Are employees trained in their use? Suggest the stormwater management plan, which will be submitted during the Industrial Approval application process, incorporate these details.</p>	According to the Pit and Quarry Guidelines the maximum TSS concentration allowed in any grab sample to leave the property (towards any stream or beyond property boundaries) is 50 mg/L in one sample and a maximum arithmetic monthly average of 25 mg/L. The detention ponds are designed with the primary objective of decreasing suspended sediment concentrations, at the same time proper monitoring should be conducted and remedial actions taken in the event that these parameters are exceeded. Equipment and training is provided as part of the operational activities of the quarry. The stormwater management plan, to be conducted as part of the Part V Application, will also cover these issues in greater detail.

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
11	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>It is noted that “Since Maple Brook falls outside the PWA boundaries, it is not affected by the land use restrictions enforced within the PWA. Fall Brook is the next closest watercourse that does fall with the PWA. The surface water carried by Maple Brook is not known to connect with Fall Brook either within or downstream of the Project Property area (Figure 3).”</p> <p>From Figure 3 it appears that Fall Brook and Maple Brook are connected via the wetland situated to the south and southwest of the project area. Suggest the interaction between the wetland and both streams should be further investigated and assessed, especially in light of the stream boundary shown, as derived from the client drawing. Further suggest the stream boundary be confirmed through field verification and shown on the maps in the report, for clarity.</p> <p>Drainage patterns and direction seem unclear from text and maps in the report. The large wetland abutting the project area seems to drain in two directions including toward the PWA. Text in the Groundwater section (page 5.25) indicates the “Water Supply Area is located ...generally upstream of the project area” – suggesting that some of the water supply area is downstream of the project area. Clarity of actual drainage patterns is crucial to protecting the municipal supply.</p> <p>Given the close proximity of the proposed operation to nearby watercourses and the Municipal Water supply PWA drainage divide, it would be prudent and advisable not only to clarify flow directions and linkages between the two identified streams through the wetland, but to ensure no off-site influences from the operations to either of the watercourses nearby or the linking wetland area. An alteration of the linking wetland could change flow direction and therefore increase the risk of impacts to the municipal water supply through the PWA. Such impacts must be prevented.</p>	<p>The wetland in question is located upstream of the Project Property. Typically, potential interactions are assessed in terms of potential downstream effects, thus the Surface Water Resources VEC concluded that the surface water was not known to connect within or downstream of the Project Property. If Project activities are to in the future, spread further south, then the connection between the two streams and the wetland would need to be identified.</p> <p>Revision has been made to the Hydrology Report text to reflect the Water Supply Area as being located upstream of the project area.</p> <p>The flow directions of Maple Brook and Fall Brook have been added to Figure 3.</p>
12	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>It is indicated that “Key in-situ water quality results are outlined for each watercourse, as well.”</p> <p>Suggest this be reworded as only Maple Brook was assessed – or include results for other watercourses.</p>	<p>The text in Section 5.2 has been updated.</p>

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
13	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>The statement is made in reference to Maple Brook <i>“It is expected the watercourse eventually drains into the St. Croix River through one of several potential tributaries to that river, although connectivity to these downstream tributaries was not confirmed.”</i></p> <p>This section states <i>“It was also found during the site visit that the watercourse has a direct connection with tributaries that eventually feed the St. Croix River.”</i></p> <p>The second statement is in a paragraph which initially mentions Maple Brook, Does this statement relate to Maple Brook or some other watercourse? Please clarify.</p>	<p>The statement in question refers to Maple Brook, and the connectivity with the St. Croix River was assessed using GIS mapping. The text in Section 1.2 of Appendix B has been modified to reflect this.</p>
14	P. Nearing, NSE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The table (Table 5.1) identifies Maple Brook as a tributary to the St. Croix River. This should be clarified in conjunction with the above item. • The measured DO values appear to be somewhat low based on the measured water temperature. Please comment. • Baseline water analysis would be useful for Maple Brook, Fall Brook and the large wetland to the south and southeast of the project property. 	<p>Table 5.1 has been updated.</p> <p>The DO probe was calibrated to manufacturer’s specifications prior to use. The DO values recorded are not indicative of anoxic or hypoxic conditions and are anticipated to adequately support aquatic life.</p> <p>The surface water data collected during the field assessment for the current EA provides single-point-in-time baseline conditions for DO and pH. There is limited value in collecting a single point in time water chemistry sample so far in advance of potential quarry extension activities given the highly variable nature of the majority of the parameters included in a general chemistry and metals scan. Additional monitoring can be considered if/when quarry activities are planned to approach the watercourse or even closer to when quarry extension begins (e.g. a week - month before activities).</p>

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
15	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>It is stated that <i>“The nearest water courses include a tributary that drains Mill Lakes reservoir northwest to Lebreau Brook thence northwest to the Avon River near Martock. Some maps show another brook north of the site that flows northeast to St. Croix River at Five Mile Plains (Figure 1). The Mills Lakes/Fall Brook reservoir and Water Supply Area is located 3 km to more than 5 km southwest and generally upstream of the project.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarity it is suggested that the features mentioned in the paragraph (e.g. Lebreau Brook) be shown/identified on the maps presented in the report. Please define <i>“generally upstream”</i> as this term is vague and could lend itself to misinterpretation. If there is uncertainty then field verification should be carried out. 	<p>Map has been updated to show Lebreau Creek Brook and Sams Brook.</p> <p>The text in Section 5.6.1 has been revised to reflect the Mill Lakes/Fall Brook reservoir and Water Supply Area is located upstream of the project. The term ‘generally’ has been removed.</p>
16	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>The statement is made <i>“Therefore, the expected increase in the average annual site runoff due to the proposed quarry extension is in the order of 69,917.2 m³ or a 470% increase from the existing condition.”</i></p> <p>The % increase should be confirmed as it appears to be 370.</p>	<p>The increase amount is 370 % of the existing condition. The text in Section 2.3.1 of Appendix B has been updated.</p>
17	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>The text indicates the model estimates are for 6 hours but the hydrographs (Figures 2.1 & 2.2) appear to show flow for more than 6 hours.</p> <p>Please comment on the discrepancy and the potential impact on runoff retention/control facilities.</p>	<p>The model estimations are based on a 6 hour hyetograph (6 hour precipitation input) and on a 12 hour hydrograph which is approximately the time that takes the water to reach the detention facilities (i.e. the water flow continues after precipitation is finished). No negative impacts on the runoff detention/control facilities are expected.</p>
18	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>The statement is made <i>“ It is recommended to size the flow retention structures to retain the volume from the 1:25 year rainfall event.”</i></p> <p>Please provide the rationale for selecting the 1:25 year rainfall event versus the 1:100 year rainfall event for sizing the flow retention structure.</p>	<p>The storage ponds are designed to fully capture the 1:25 year storm and allow some time for peak flow attenuation before any water is discharged into the receiving environment. The excess runoff created by larger storms (including the 1:100 year storm) will be controlled with the appropriate discharge features (orifice and a weir). The orifice will release runoff in a controlled manner to achieve the 24 hour drawdown requirement while the weir will only act to avoid overtopping of the pond(s) by excess runoff. The requirement to fully capture the 1:25 year storm and manage the 1:100 year storm using discharge features is quite common. One of the main reasons for taking this approach is to maintain a feasible volume for the ponds.</p>

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
19	P. Nearing, NSE	<p>The following statements are made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Based on Figure 2.3, the weir structure should be sized as a minimum to convey 0.20 m³/s.” • “A recommended drawdown period of 24 hours is expected to decrease suspended sediment concentrations by as much as 80%. Based on the low flow threshold of 24 hour discharge for runoff events equal or smaller than the 1:25 year rainfall event, the mean discharge capacity should be 0.09 m³/s.” • The 0.20 m³/s flow is considerable higher than the mean discharge flow of 0.09 m³/s. If the outlet weir is to be designed for the 1:100 year storm excess peak flow, should not the storage capacity be designed for the runoff volume of the same magnitude storm event to ensure suspended sediment concentrations are kept as low as possible? 	<p>The storage capacity of the detention pond is designed to fully capture the 1:25 year storm and manage the 1:100 year storm. The pond(s) requires two outlets (an orifice and an emergency weir). The orifice controls the release of water to comply with the 24 hour drawdown requirement while the weir maintains a safe water level by releasing the excess surface runoff. In the case of the 1:100 Y storm, the pond(s) will store water for the first few hours (approximately 6 to 8 hours) only releasing a controlled amount by the orifice, by the time the pond is reaching full capacity some of the volume in the pond(s) will be available again because the orifice discharges continuously, any extra excess will exit the pond using the emergency weir, this approach ensures that a large percentage of the water will be detained and released in a controlled manner.</p> <p>Also, even though it is impossible to treat all surface runoff all the time, this approach ensures that the most common events will receive full treatment while the larger events associated with lower probabilities can be controlled while providing partial treatment.</p>
20	P. Nearing, NSE	Page number is missing (Appendix B Section 5.0).	The page number has been added.
21	Matthew Brufatto, NSE	I have no specific comments on this environmental assessment as there are no anticipated hazardous materials at the site other than those normally used for vehicles and machinery.	Comment acknowledged.
22	Andrew Cameron	There are no agricultural concerns with this proposal.	Comment acknowledged.
23	Kurt McAllister, DFO	What will be the minimum buffer between Maple Brook and the proposed quarry?	The minimum buffer between Maple Brook and the proposed quarry will be 60 m.
24	Kurt McAllister, DFO	As the proposed pit will be in close proximity to the wetland and the watercourse, has the potential interaction on surface water quantity been studied? As the quarry floor will be below the elevation of the wetland and Maple Brook, will surface water have the potential to seep through the fractures into the quarry, potentially causing a decrease in surface water for these systems?	The potential effects of a gradient differential between adjacent waterbodies and the proposed quarry floor are very difficult to predict. Even though seepage thru cracks from Maple Brook towards the quarry floor is possible, the hydraulic conductivity of the materials (i.e. rock and soil) that separate both will prevent large amounts of water from escaping the stream.

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
25	Kurt McAllister, DFO	Related to the above, could the use of explosives adjacent to the watercourse/wetland buffers increase the risk of surface water seepage into the quarry?	The use of explosives could increase the risk of seepage from the stream into the quarry floor due to the possible creation of new cracks in the soil and/or bedrock that separates both, however, there are many factors involved to determine if this could happen and to what level of extent. One way to determine the level of risk is by conducting a geotechnical investigation near the areas of concern. All regulations pertaining to the use of explosives should be followed along with the proper procedures stated in the approval to operate. It is advisable to conduct an inspection in the quarry wall and the buffer areas prior to and after blasting to determine if new fractures were created and if these are conveying water from the stream to the quarry floor.
26	Andrew Murphy, NSE	<p>The Air Quality Branch has reviewed the draft environmental assessment registration document for the proposed Hants County Aggregate project by Municipal Enterprises Limited.</p> <p>We do not believe that the quarry expansion will have a significant negative effect on local air quality.</p> <p>However, we suggest that the proponent identify specific opportunities for dust suppression techniques for rock crushing operations.</p>	Comment acknowledged. Dust suppression opportunities will be identified in the EMP, as part of the Part V Application.
27	Angela Swaine, NSTIR	TIR has reviewed the Draft Registration Report for the Hants County Aggregate Quarry Extension Project. TIR has no comments on the Project at this time.	Comment acknowledged.
28	Stephen Zwicker, Environment Canada	It is recommended that the Proponent review the report and ensure that it reflects applicable regulatory information and best management practices discussed in the attached document, <i>Environmental Canada Guidance Related to the Environmental Assessment of Aggregate Pit Mines and Quarries in the Atlantic Provinces, April 2008</i> .	Comment acknowledged. The proponent is aware of the EC guidance document referenced and has prepared the registration document in consideration of those BMPs.
29	Heather MacMillan, Nova Scotia Tourism, Culture and Heritage	The proposed quarry expansion is in a remote location and there are no existing tourism operations in the area. From a tourism perspective, the main areas of interest regarding the proposed expansion are trucking traffic, visual aesthetics, noise, and a consideration of whether the expansion would negatively affect tourism in the region. It does not appear that the proposed extension will have any negative impact from a tourism perspective. We are also not aware of any future tourism development planned for the area.	Comment acknowledged.

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
30	Bernard Matlock, NSE	The draft EA report outlines a proposal for both the combination two existing and nearby quarries into one larger quarry and the expansion of the two quarries with what appears to be an additional 9.9 hectare area encompassing the Hants County Aggregate quarry. The report is misleading or unclear. It repeatedly tends to address the quarry extension simply as an expansion of the existing 3.9 Hants County Aggregate quarry, but is truly a quarry expansion which will encompass a total area of at least 23.9 hectares including both the Panuke Road quarry and the Hants County Aggregate quarry.	MEL is proposing to combine the operations of the Hants County Aggregates Quarry with the existing Panuke Quarry. The current operation at Hants County Aggregates is 3.9 ha in area. The proposed extension of the existing Hants County Aggregates Quarry will incorporate land north, south and southwest of the existing quarry to increase the total size of the operation to approximately 13.9 ha (not including the adjacent Panuke quarry). The existing Panuke quarry is approximately 4.0 ha in area and has an approved extension area of 6 ha. The combined operations will cover an area of 23.9 ha. Text has been added to Section 2.1 for clarification
31	Bernard Matlock, NSE	Pg 2.1 identifies the community as Panuke and Pg 2.3 identifies the community as Windsor, but I believe it is officially Three Mile Plains, Hants County.	Comment acknowledged and the text has been updated.
32	Bernard Matlock, NSE	The report does not identify the current footprint of the approved Panuke Road quarry operated by Municipal Enterprises Ltd.	Comment acknowledged and the EA report figures have been updated.
33	Bernard Matlock, NSE	The report fails to identify the small unnamed brook in the project area which flows south to north through the Panuke Road quarry site and is located immediately adjacent to the existing disturbed Panuke Road quarry. None of the report plans or narrative recognizes it.	The unnamed stream falls outside of the current proposed Project boundaries. The location of this stream has however been added to the figures for convenience.
34	Bernard Matlock, NSE	The report fails to identify building features which are situated on the active Panuke Road quarry site.	There are two structures located on the Panuke Road Quarry site which are not evident in the Project mapping. They include the scale house and a structure located in the southeast corner of the property. There are no structures on the Hants County Aggregate Quarry site.
35	Bernard Matlock, NSE	The proposed expansion lies in an elevated area. What are the anticipated visual impacts from the entire quarry disturbance?	While a visual impact assessment has not been conducted for the expanded Hants County quarry, it is noted that the current Hants County quarry has little or no visibility from the Panuke Road and is located across a viewshed that is currently affected by the Panuke quarry.
36	Bernard Matlock, NSE	Pg. 2.9 NSE suggests reclamation slopes of a minimum 2.5:1 on site with a minimum 2:1 for rock slopes.	Comment acknowledged and the text has been updated.
37	Bernard Matlock, NSE	Pg. 5.4 Maple Brook watercourse survey should include a map which identifies the location where photos in Appendix D were taken.	Comment acknowledged and a map has been added to Appendix D.

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
38	Bernard Matlock, NSE	What are the anticipated radiation levels in the area of the site and associated with product aggregate?	Based on the bedrock type (Goldenville Formation) and review of the Nova Scotia Department of Health, " <i>Potential Occurrence – Radon Gas in Nova Scotia</i> " map, little or no radiation levels are expected in the area of the site. According to the Potential Occurrence - Radon Gas in Nova Scotia, the site is located in an area described to have little or no uranium, thorium or other naturally occurring radioactive elements in the soil. Because the presence of radioactive elements in soil is associated with the underlying bedrock, little to no issues associated with potential radiation are inferred for this location.
39	Bernard Matlock, NSE	The report should detail the potential impact which the quarry extension will have on the hydraulic characteristics and chemistry of Maple Brook, the wetland to the south of the extension and the unnamed brook within the Panuke Road quarry.	<p>In terms of potential impacts to the chemistry of Maple Brook refer to Section 5.2.2.</p> <p>The proposed quarry expansion is expected to increase site runoff due to a decrease in evapotranspiration and infiltration amounts. All runoff originating from site will be controlled using detention ponds and other methods to minimize any potential effects on downstream receptors. No major changes in the hydraulic characteristics of Maple Brook are expected since the contribution from the site is small when compared to the contribution of the entire catchment area, and the detention ponds are designed to control and minimize the discharge of runoff from the site that could cause detrimental effects downstream of the quarry. The wetland to the south is located upstream of the site and therefore receives runoff from upper sections of the watershed, hence it is unlikely that the proposed quarry expansion will affect the wetland.</p> <p>An ideal way to ensure that Maple Brook and the adjacent wetland maintain their normal conditions is to conduct site inspections combined with flow monitoring.</p>
40	Bernard Matlock, NSE	Pg. 5.11 suggests the company consider including the results of the proposed spring/summer 2010 plant survey in the final EA report.	The results of the 2010 plant survey have been included in the final EA report.
41	Bernard Matlock, NSE	Pg. 5.20 suggests the company consider including the results of the proposed June 2010 bird survey in the final EA report.	The results of the June 2010 bird survey have been included in the final EA report.
42	Bernard Matlock, NSE	Pg. 5.23 should make mention of the NSE approval requirements for wetlands alteration.	The text in Section 5.5.2 has been updated.
43	Bernard Matlock, NSE	Pg. 5.31 The report was lacking in identification of potential surface water impacts, mitigation and monitoring as outlined in Section 5.6.2 for groundwater.	Section 5.2 has been updated.
44	Bernard Matlock, NSE	Proposed reclamation plans should consider protection of Maple Brook and the small unnamed stream.	Reclamation plans will consider protection of Maple Brook and the small unnamed stream.

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
45	Bernard Matlock, NSE	The Hydrology Study also does not consider the unnamed stream.	The Hydrology Study assessed the property within which the Hants County Quarry is located. The unnamed stream is not located within these boundaries.
46	Bernard Matlock, NSE	It is strongly advised that the quarry proposal meet the separation distance of 30 metres from Maple Brook to be consistent with the Pit and Quarry Guidelines. Pg. 1.3 identifies it as only 22 metres.	Comment acknowledged and the text has been updated.
47	Bernard Matlock, NSE	The report should consider the cumulative environmental impact resulting from added pit and quarry activity in the Panuke Road district.	There will be no added activity in the Panuke Road district as both quarries are already in operation and neither quarry is increasing their production levels.
48	Sarah MacKay, NS Department of Natural Resources	It is unclear which Appendix in the report provides a list of plants found on site during field surveys. The last paragraph on page 5.9 indicates that this list is given in Appendix F; however, Appendix F lists birds. The cover page for Appendix E indicates "vascular plant (sic) recorded in the study area", but the title of table E-1 states "...plants potentially in project area". Elsewhere on page 5.9 (second last paragraph); this is how Appendix E is described. It appears as though the cover page for Appendix E needs to be revised; references to this appendix in the report, including the Table of Contents, should be reviewed.	The appendix titles and references have been revised.
49	Sarah MacKay, NS Department of Natural Resources	A similar issue exists for Appendix G, which is given as "Plants Recorded within Wetlands". See title for Table G-1	See response to comment no. 48.
50	Sarah MacKay, NS Department of Natural Resources	The geo-locations of all RED and Yellow species (under the General Status of NS Wildlife) are to be provided as described in the "Guide to Addressing Wildlife Species and Habitat in an EA Registration Document". Although not required at this time, DNR requests a table of geo-locations for species ranked between S1-S3S4, by the Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre if such information was obtained during field surveys.	This information will be provided to NSDNR under a separate cover.
51	Sarah MacKay, NS Department of Natural Resources	The actual list of plants observed in the study area is either missing or mislabeled the report. DNR requests this list be provided. Some of the plants (e.g., Actaea pachypoda, Maianthemum racemosum, Polygonatum pubescens, and Polystichum acrostichoides) in Table G-1 indicate the presence of moderately rich to rich forest habitat. Inc. DNR is expanding the scope of our reviews of EAs to assess status of ecosystems, e.g. uniqueness and rarity. The information from General Status and S1-S3S4 species will be assessed with information on species assemblages and biophysical parameters. These data will assist in evaluation of the project and whether there are unique or uncommon ecosystems within the project area.	Refer to Appendix F for a list of plants present in the Study Area.

Table H-1 Summary Table

Comment No.	Comment Issuer	Comment Received	Comment Response
52	Sarah MacKay, NS Department of Natural Resources	DNR suggests a minimum buffer of 60 meters on Maple Brook to maintain wood turtle habitat. Although this watercourse does not exist in the project area (as stated on pages 5.19-5.20), the Maple Brook riparian zone, and embedded wood turtle habitat values, extends through the southwestern corner.	A 60 m buffer on Maple Brook has been incorporated into the Project, as presented in Figure 3.