

July 20, 2016

Dustin C. Lyttle, BA.Sc, Civil Eng. E.I.T
Triton Engineering Services Limited
105 Queen Street West, Unit 14
Fergus, ON, N1M 1S6

Via Email: dlyttle@tritoneng.on.ca

Ref: Peer Review, Aercoustics Engineering Limited Noise Report Entitled “NOISE IMPACT STUDY , Peyton Pit, Township of Southgate, County of Grey, Ontario”, March 29, 2016

Dear Mr. Lyttle,

As requested, we have completed a peer review of the above referenced Noise Study, prepared by Aercoustics Engineering Limited (AEL) for a proposed gravel pit in the County of Grey Ontario. In addition, we have reviewed an Aercoustics letter dated November 3, 2006, concerning Transport Container Enclosure Mitigation. As part of our review, we also visited the site on June 1, 2016.

In summary, the AEL Noise Study has been completed using the appropriate Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) Guidelines and criteria. It identifies that excessive levels of noise could be caused by some operations in the pit and identifies means of mitigation to maintain those noise emissions within acceptable limits at neighbouring residential receptors.

We generally agree with the methodology used in the report and the recommended physical control measures. We have the following comments, requests for clarification and recommendations. The opinions expressed in this peer review may be supplemented, reconsidered or otherwise revised by the author due to new or previously unknown information.

1. We understand that the annual tonnage limit being sought is 250,000 Tonnes. The report indicates that the maximum number of shipping trucks which could visit the site in a busy hour is 20. In our experience that maximum number of trucks is consistent with an annual tonnage limit of 250,000 tonnes.
2. Section 4.2.1 of the report provides a description of the general operations and the equipment to be used in the pit. If the notes to the operational plans for the proposed Peyton Pit do not contain notes limiting the equipment to be used in the pit to those items stated in this section of the report it should be updated accordingly.
3. We understand that the study was prepared in support of an application to rezone the lands for the proposed use and also to apply for an aggregate license from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR). If the notes to the operational plans do not contain the

recommendations from the approved noise study they should be updated to include them. For example, the notes to the operational plan should clearly state the Reference Sound Pressure Levels for Aggregate Pit Equipment (Table 2), clearly show the operating area of the enclosed processing plant and provide details of the construction and orientation of the enclosed processing plant such that an MNR Officer can verify that those features are in place during their regular inspections.

4. We are concerned that the report allows that an unenclosed processing plant could operate in the pit with further study (Item 5.3.6). If the enclosed processing plant is not implemented, fairly extensive alternative mitigation such as high perimeter berms may be required. Considering the elevated location of R1 and the existing topography in that area mitigation through perimeter berms may not be feasible. The Municipality should consider requiring that details of other noise mitigation options be examined to demonstrate their feasibility before the land use change is approved.
5. The report does not recommend any means of verifying the compliance of the facility with MOECC sound level limits, such as conducting an acoustical audit as per MOECC Guideline NPC-233.
6. A common source of complaint with respect to aggregate operations is back-up beepers. There is no mention of back up beepers in the study. While back up beepers are excluded from assessment since they are “auditory warning devices required or authorized by law or in accordance with good safety practices”, the study should discuss their use and indicate how they will be managed. Sometimes operations can be staged to minimize reverse operations, for example. We also recommend that alternative warning technologies, such as back up alarms utilizing broadband noise, rather than tones, be investigated.
7. Increased truck traffic on public roadways is often a source of public concern related to aggregate operations and offsite truck traffic is not mentioned in the report. Additional information is requested.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this information. We trust it is sufficient for the present purposes. Please call if you have any questions.

Yours truly,

Howe Gastmeier Chapnik Limited




Bill Gastmeier, MAsc, Peng
Principal

