

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cristal Laanstra, Hastings County
laanstrac@hastingscounty.com

FROM: John Emeljanow

DATE: August 9, 2018

RE: Peer Review of Amended Acoustic Assessment Report
Freymond Quarry

FILE: 117-0167

VIA E-MAIL

A review of the “Acoustic Assessment Report, Freymond Quarry”, amended report issued 16th January 2018, prepared by Hugh Williamson Associates Inc. has been completed. Our comments and recommendations are provided below.

1. Most of the issues identified in our June 26, 2017 peer review memorandum have been appropriately addressed. However, there remain a few issues that need to be addressed.
2. We have not received copies of the latest Site Plans for the quarry. As indicated in Section 7 of the report, the recommended noise mitigation measures are to be included on the ARA Site Plans. We have not been able to confirm that the recommendations have been transferred to the Site Plans.
3. As part of the original peer review, an acoustical audit was recommended to ensure equipment sound emission levels were not being exceeded and that the quarry was operating in compliance with the noise guideline limits. This should be added to the report recommendations and included as a requirement on the Site Plans.
4. The direction of extraction is not shown on the figures within the noise report. Since acoustical screening from the extraction face appears to be relied upon by the assessment, the direction of extraction and the maximum distance equipment is from the extraction face (typically 25 m) is critical. From the general description provided in Section 2.0, it appears that extraction in Phases 1 and 2 will be from east to west and in Phases 3 and 4 will be from west to east. This should be confirmed and clearly described as recommendations in the noise study.
5. Under hours of operation on page 6 of the report, up to two loaders or excavators are permitted to operate as part of the extraction and processing operations and two loaders are permitted as part of the shipping operations. However, mitigation recommendation 4 states that a maximum of two loaders or excavators may operate anywhere in the extraction area. Clarification regarding the maximum number of loaders/excavators is required.
6. Section 5.0 of the report indicates that POR 1, 2, 3 and 4 are considered to be in a Class 2 area due to significant road traffic on Highway 62. Appendix 3 presents a background noise assessment (for POR 2) to justify the use of the Class 2 criteria. Residential dwellings on Bay Lake Road, in the vicinity of POR 4 are almost 500 m from Highway 62. Using the

traffic information in Appendix 3, the minimum hour ambient sound level in the vicinity of R4 is predicted to be 35 dBA or less and does not account for the significant tree screening provided by the intervening dense woods. The classification for POR 4 should be reviewed and additional justification provided for the use of the Class 2 guideline limits at this receptor.

If there are any questions or if additional information is needed, please do not hesitate to call.

JE
J:\2017\1170167\000\Memos\Peer Review of Update (9 August 2018).docx