

From: Brian Zeman

Sent: August 22, 2018 9:30 AM

To: Harrow, Justin

Cc: Patrick Townes; Lou Freymond; Dan Freymond; freymondcarson@gmail.com; Becky Freymond; Moreen Miller; James Gordon; Michael Wells (michael@freefieldacoustics.com)

Subject: RE: Freymond - Response to Valcoustics Memo Dated August 9, 2018

Good morning Justin ,

Below is a response to Valcoustics memo dated August 9, 2018. Responses 4, 5 and 6 have been prepared by Michael Wells who is the author of the noise report. I trust this addresses all outstanding items.

No response required.

The noise report recommendations and mitigation measures are included by reference on the ARA site plans. As discussed the Site Plans are being updated to reflect various revisions as a result of the agency review. As per your request we are holding off circulating these plans to the County and MNRF until receipt of the County's water peer review response. Upon receipt of these comments we will circulate a copy of the updated ARA site plans to the County.

The ARA Site Plans will be updated to add a note that requires a noise audit be completed in phase 1 once the quarry is in full operation to ensure MOECC noise limits are being met.

The ARA site plans include the direction of extraction recommended by the noise consultant. The ARA site plans state that extraction will commence in the north-eastern portion of the site (Phase 1) and will proceed west to the north-western portion of the site (Phase 2). Extraction will then proceed south to the south-western portion of the site (Phase 3) prior to proceeding east to the south-eastern portion of the site (Phase 4).

The following provides clarification regarding the maximum number of loaders / excavators:

Modes of Operation

Extraction, processing and shipping operations (07:00 – 17:30, Monday to Friday) -
During this period, all significant noise sources are assumed to be in operation

and include the following:

- One portable crushing and screening plant, may consist of primary, secondary and tertiary crushing and screening units and associated diesel generator;
- One portable standard hydraulic rock drill or low noise rock drill;
- Up to two loaders or excavators;
- A maximum of 10 on-site truck movements per hour are permitted to haul the product off-site.

Shipping operations only (06:00 – 07:00 and 17:30 to 19:00, Monday to Friday and 07:00 to 12:00 on Saturday) – During this period, loading and hauling operations only are to occur and include the following:

- Up to two loaders;
- A maximum of 10 on-site truck movements per hour are permitted to haul the product off-site.

Hours of Operation

The proposed hours of operation for the proposed Freymond Quarry include:

- Monday to Friday: 7:00 am to 5:30 pm for extraction, processing and shipping;
- Monday to Friday: 6:00 am to 7:00 pm for shipping only;
- Saturday: 7:00 am to 12:00 pm for shipping only.

Activities between 06:00 – 07:00 fall under the MOECC defined nighttime period and require compliance with more conservative criteria i.e. require compliance with lower sound level limits than the sound level limits applicable for operations that occur within the MOECC defined daytime period 7 am and 7 pm (07:00 -19:00).

The description of a Class 2 Area as per NPC-300 is as follows: **'an area with an acoustical environment that has qualities representative of both Class 1 and Class 3 areas: sound levels characteristic of Class 1 during daytime (07:00 to 19:00 or to 23:00 hours); and, low evening and night background sound level defined by natural environment and infrequent human activity starting as early as 19:00 hours (19:00 or 23:00 to 07:00 hours).'** POR 4 was assessed as a Class 2 Area receptor primarily due to the existing pattern of development in this section of Bay Lake Road which is characterised by houses in close proximity to each other as well as their proximity to the existing industrial facility (Timber Mill). Noise from the neighbouring residences as well as noise from the existing industrial facility dominates during the daytime period with typically low levels of noise during the evening and nighttime period. As such, the acoustic environment at POR 4 meets the Class 2 Area classification criteria as specified in NPC-300 (summarised above). As such a Class 2 classification is appropriate at this location.

Regards,

BRIAN ZEMAN, BES, MCIP, RPP | President

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 226 | F 705 728 2010 | C 705 627 9004
| bzeman@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

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