



CBM-Caledon Quarry

CAART COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE RESPONSE #1 – [AIR QUALITY]

Please accept the following as feedback from the Caledon Aggregate Review Team (CAART). Fully addressing each comment will expedite the potential for resolution of the consolidated CAART comments and individual agency objections. **Additional comments may be provided once a response has been prepared to the comments raised below and additional information provided.**

Colour Code	Description
	Resolved
	Resolved subject to additional information being provided to CAART Reviewers (e.g, Implementation Guide, Report Addendums)
(no colour)	Response provided, but no further action taken or required by Project Team

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Air Quality Impact Assessment			Author: INSERT NAME				
1.	Ontario Regulation 244/97, the General regulation under the ARA provides some specific setbacks from sensitive receptors for which dust suppressants are required for both fugitive emissions and direct source emissions with these setbacks being 1000 m and 300 m, respectively [see Conditions of Licence and Permit, 0.12(2)1. and 2.]. Please confirm how these conditions will be met for the proposed activities and that these conditions will be referenced in the appropriate regulatory instruments for the project (e.g., site plans, environmental approval, etc.).	Section 5.8, Page 17					
2.	Please confirm the appropriate Environmental Approval under the Environmental Protection Act, as stipulated in Ontario Regulation 244/97 [0.12(2).2], for the pit and quarry operations of the proposed facility will be sought.						

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Air Quality Impact Assessment			Author: INSERT NAME				
3.	Although not likely a major component of the overall emissions expected from the proposed operations, please confirm what regulatory instrument will reference the drilling related mitigation measures. It has been assumed that fabric filter will be used for the system in order to apply the 99% emission reduction for the activity, as per Section 5.1 which describes drilling operations. There is no mention of the mitigation measure in the Blasting Assessment nor does it appear in the Best Management Practices Plan for the Control of Fugitive Dust (BMPP).	Page 15, Section 5.1					
4.	Section 5.4 of the assessment describes material handling activities. As part of this section, it is mentioned that an estimate of material moisture percentage is used as a factor for estimating particulate. Understanding that materials below the water table would inherently be saturated, the assessment mentions that work faces are dewatered prior to conducting work so that the area of activity is in a 'dry state'. When referring to quarry material handling (Source QUARRYMH in the Emission Summary), please provide further justification as to why the maximum moisture content of 4.8%, which translates to an emission factor that is a third of the emission factor used for other materials on site, is suitable if the working area is in a 'dry state'.	Section 5.4, Page 16					
5.	Mitigation strategies have been referenced and control efficiencies applied in the assessment prepared. This includes but is not limited to 70% control efficiency, assuming best practices will be applied for stockpile management; and a 95% control efficiency for management of un-paved road dust, both assuming water applications will be applied during operations. Please confirm what regulatory instrument(s) these and other mitigation	Section 5.7 & 5.8, Page 17					

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Air Quality Impact Assessment			Author: INSERT NAME				
	strategies to be implemented will be referenced as part of the ARA licence.						
6.	Please provide further discussion on the potential cumulative effects of the other aggregate operations in the area, given the proximity to the community of Cataract and the existence of other operations surrounding that community (particularly to the North and east). Although there may not be a combined effect in the addition of emissions from one operation to the other, as the community is between two operations and never downwind for both operations, there may be a potential for an increase in the frequency of how often the neighbouring community might be affected by surrounding aggregate operations. Please provide a comment on the potential for increased frequency of impacts.	Figure 1, Page 4					
7.	Please clarify the mechanism of how the best management practices plan will become an instrument in the regulation of this facility's operations. It is recommended that this plan be referenced in the formal site plans for this facility and registered with the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (NDMNRF) for the application for the new Class A Quarry Below Water licence, under the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA). Also, this document should be included with the materials submitted for an environmental approval application. Other than the reference in the air quality assessment, this document is not referenced in the other materials referenced above including the blasting assessment and the two plan drawings prepared by MHBC.	Appendix D					