



January 27, 2016

Via: Email

Ms. Kelsey Lang
 Planning Associate
 Township of Guelph/Eramosa
 P.O. Box 700
 Rockwood ON N0B 2K0

Dear Ms. Lang:

**Re: Tri City Lands Ltd. - Spencer Pit
 Second Submission - Acoustic Peer Review
 Zoning By-Law Amendment Application ZBA 01/14 (Township File D14 TR)
 6939 Wellington Road 124, Township of Guelph/Eramosa
 Project No.: 300035544.0000**

We have completed our review of the GHD letter dated January 15, 2016 and the CRA's Acoustic Assessment Report dated January 2016, received as part of the January 18, 2016 submission by Harrington McAvan Ltd.

Page references use the page number shown on the page with the page of the .pdf in brackets. For instance "Page 2 (5 of 58)" indicates that the report numbers this page as 2. It is the page 5 of 58 in the .pdf reviewed.

Our current submission comments are listed in the table below (the "Re" refers to the number in previous submission. Comments on a drawing should be reflected on all drawings.

No.	Re	Comment
2.1	1.	<p><i>Table B.2 calculates the impact of road noise on the Points of Reception (PORs) at varying distances relative to the measured values of 71.6 dBA (day) and 65.6 dBA (night). This impact is then used as the limit which the on-site activities must not exceed.</i></p> <p><i>Secondary Noise Screening Process for S.9 Applications, page 9 (12 of 25), EQUATION 3, says "SL = SLref – 20Log10(DA/Dref) + Ksize – Barrier Adjustment + Tonality Adjustment". Since the last three terms are 0, the equation reduces to "SL = SLref – 20Log10(DA/Dref)". For POR1, "SL = SLref – 20Log10(DA/Dref) = 71.6 – 20Log10(55/9) = 71.6 – 15.72 = 55.9. All the other POR limits have the same discrepancy with the largest difference being at the largest distance.</i></p>
		Burnside accepts CRA/GHD response.

No.	Re	Comment
2.2	2.	<p><i>Table 3 shows the POR impacts of the site-generated noise against their respective limits (generated by measured road noise impacts). The difference in road noise impact is as much as 12 dB (between POR8A at 75 dBA and POR9 at 63 dBA) during the day.</i></p> <p>Burnside accepts CRA/GHD response.</p>
2.3	3.	<p><i>Page 2 (5 of 58), Section 2.0 says "There are no expected sources of impulse noise or vibration at the Facility."</i></p> <p>Burnside accepts CRA/GHD response.</p>
2.4	4.	<p><i>Page 2 (5 of 58), paragraph 2 says "The Site is located in an Acoustical Class 1 area based on heavy traffic observed along Hespeler Road/Wellington Road 124."</i></p> <p>Burnside accepts CRA/GHD response.</p>
2.5	5.	<p><i>Page 3 (6 of 58). The label for POR7 is missing but the building and driveway show in figure 1a and 1b. POR7 and POR7A appear in Table B.2.</i></p> <p>Burnside accepts CRA/GHD response.</p>
2.6	6.	<p><i>Page 2 (5 of 58), Section 2.0 says "One idling truck at scale (Source T6 or T9 depending on operating scenario)". Table 1 does not indicate that the Source ID, T6, is anything other than the "Plant Site Front End Loader Route".</i></p> <p>Burnside accepts CRA/GHD response.</p>
2.7	-	<p>Section 6, last paragraph (p.26 of 82) says "Berm section 2 will be constructed prior to start of operations in Area 3 and will remain until the end of Site operations." Section 8.0, #3 (p. 27 of 82) says "Berm 2 Construction - Constructed to the required height and prior to start of extraction operations in Area 3 and shall remain until the end of Site Operations".</p> <p>Berm 2 is shown in the acoustic model for mitigation of noise from Area 2 on Figure 3A and Figure 3B. The noise contours appear to be influenced by the berm.</p> <p>Should these locations say "Area 2" rather than "Area 3"?</p>

No.	Re	Comment
2.8	-	<p>Section 1.0 (p.19 of 82) says "NPC-300, 'Stationary and Transportation Sources - Approval and Planning', October 2013".</p> <p>The currently available MOECC version of NPC-300 shows "August 2013" on page 2 despite the fact that MOECC did not issue the document until October 2013.</p> <p>Should the referenced say "August 2013"?</p>
2.9	-	<p>Table C.1 shows values of "Height above Roof" for all sources with values between 5.10 and 2.0.</p> <p>Since these sources are not enclosed in a building, should the title say "Height above Ground"?</p>

Yours truly,

R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited



Harvey Watson
Technical Group Leader, Air and Noise
HW:sd

cc: Ms. Meaghen Reid, Township of Guelph/Eramosa (enc.) (Via: Email)
Mr. Dan Currie, MHBC Planning (enc.) (Via: Email)
Ms. Emily Elliott, MHBC Planning (enc.) (Via: Email)