

Sarah Harvey

From: Paul Walsh
Sent: July-25-19 1:35 PM
To: Sarah Harvey
Subject: FW: Proposal for Peer Review Services - Greer Pit Application

Please print.

From: Amarjit Sandhu [mailto:asandhu@mhbcplan.com]
Sent: July 24, 2019 1:07 PM
To: Paul Walsh
Cc: Fuhrmann, Bernie; Paul Greer (paul@paulgreer.ca)
Subject: RE: Proposal for Peer Review Services - Greer Pit Application

Paul:

In discussion with Paul Greer, he will stay with the direction from my email yesterday afternoon that concrete importation for recycling is eliminated as an activity at the proposed Greenridge Farm Pit site. This and the items described below are to ensure Greer is facilitating as much as possible an expedited and reasonable further review by WSP. That in turn ties into your Staff Report being as complete as possible for the August 15 Planning Public Meeting.

Further to the additional WSP Review, and with regards to Bernie's email from yesterday:

- During our call yesterday, you had agreed that there is no cause for 'technical expert review' by WSP on those items in MHBC's June 17 Chart (Disposition of Peer Review Comments) where it is clear and apparent that Greer has agreed to the WSP Peer Review Recommendation (from March 26, 2019).
- We had discussed how you would follow-up with Mark Boone at Quinte Conservation to discuss the hydrogeology/water balance/Waring's Creek issue. I understand Mark is away till August 6 but that still leaves over one week to the Planning Public Meeting.

I trust the above can allow for a clearer description of what 'technical expert review' WSP would undertake at this time ... in my view it would just be traffic, and that is now much different from the original application in that it's been agreed to:

- Build a new entrance onto Ridge Road, which entrance will conform to MTO Standard CSAS-23; and,
- apply for a Commercial Entranceway Permit from the County, which the County has authority to issue with conditions as reasonable/appropriate.

Amarjit

From: Amarjit Sandhu
Sent: July 24, 2019 9:47 AM
To: Paul Walsh
Cc: Fuhrmann, Bernie; Paul Greer (paul@paulgreer.ca)
Subject: RE: Proposal for Peer Review Services - Greer Pit Application

I will discuss this with Paul Greer, to see if we can go with the "Agreement" approach. I'm not in favour of the "Holding" and at the same time we need any additional quickly WSP Review to be reasonable (items to review and cost) and be completed.

Amarjit

From: Paul Walsh [mailto:pwalsh@pecounty.on.ca]
Sent: July 23, 2019 7:24 PM
To: Amarjit Sandhu
Cc: Fuhrmann, Bernie; Paul Greer (paul@paulgreer.ca)
Subject: RE: Proposal for Peer Review Services - Greer Pit Application

Gentleman,

My sense is that if this scale of use has not been a problem to date then we simply need to go forward with a defined scale and location that reflects current operations. Is a scale and location for concrete recycling that can be identified that would be conclusive as representing no concerns? These details could be inserted into an agreement and avoid it being subject to additional review.

Alternatively, we could establish it as a conditional permitted use (Holding provision for this use) in the zoning by-law subject to addressing noise and traffic associated with it at a later date or if ever beyond a defined scale.

Happy to hear your thoughts.

From: Amarjit Sandhu [mailto:asandhu@mhbcplan.com]
Sent: July 23, 2019 3:49 PM
To: Paul Walsh
Cc: Fuhrmann, Bernie; Paul Greer (paul@paulgreer.ca)
Subject: RE: Proposal for Peer Review Services - Greer Pit Application

Paul:

After discussion with Paul Greer; and, with consideration to the degree of concern that concrete importation for recycling is causing and how minor a component it is to the overall pit activity, Greer has decided to eliminate this as an activity at the proposed Greenridge Farm Pit site.

Greer will amend Note 1.23 (Aggregate Stockpiles) as follows:

1.23 - AGGREGATE STOCKPILES

There are no existing stockpiles of aggregate on-site. Product stockpiles will generally consist of stockpile from the Greenridge Farm Pit, and, imported aggregate material, including recyclable concrete, required result of the Licensee's construction business. Any rebar and other structural metal shall be removed from concrete during processing and placed in a designated scrap pile on site which will be removed on an on-site. Removal of recycled aggregate is to be ongoing. Once the aggregate on site has been depleted there will be importation of recyclable materials permitted. Once final rehabilitation has been completed and approved with the site plan, all recycling operations must cease.

Stockpiles will be located in various parts of the proposed extraction area, proximal to areas under extraction, rehabilitation, or where (here) processing equipment is set-up.

Stockpiles will not be located within 30 m of the southeast boundary at Ridge Road or within 90 m of the site where it is adjacent to land in use for residential purposes (988 Ridge Road).

See also Note 1.58 - SITE PLAN VARIATIONS FROM OPERATIONAL STANDARDS.]

Note that this email is cc'd to Bernie at WSP for his information.

Amarjit

AMARJIT S. SANDHU, BSc | Aggregate Resource Planner | Associate

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture
10 Davey Crescent | Kingston | ON | K7N 1X6 | T 613 384 7067 | F 613 384 8959 | C 613 539 2352
| asandhu@mnhbcplan.com

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



From: Fuhrmann, Bernie [mailto:bernie.fuhrmann@wsp.com]
Sent: July 23, 2019 12:57 PM
To: Paul Walsh
Cc: Amarjit Sandhu
Subject: RE: Proposal for Peer Review Services - Greer Pit Application

Well, I'm happy to respond to any questions, although I have to admit that the amount of time I'm expending offering various clarifications, draft proposals, and follow-up responses is becoming an issue. I must track that time and ultimately reflect it in our proposal in a proportionate manner.

Your question below again throws some uncertainty as to what you exactly want. I'm copying Amarjit on this email for his assistance.

For example, Paul, in our various email exchanges on Monday, where you embedded various comments in my email/draft proposal (s), you mentioned that you want comments from each respective WSP specialist/reviewer. To get that, I have to send it to my reviewers, have them examine the response (even if it is in some cases not coming directly from the author of an original report), quickly review the peer review comments they provided (back in March), then have them review the applicant's response, and then have them respond back to me so I can summarize that with my Senior Engineer and then provide you with the desired paper-trail you requested.

So, with respect to your question: does a WSP specialists have to peer review the chart, even if the comment in the chart agrees with the WSP peer review recommendation? The answer is, yes, if you want that, or, no, if you feel it is not needed.

In my proposal to you yesterday, I outlined that, for example, since you want a peer review of the Malroz letter RE: Warings Creek, I would then have my ground water specialist also look at the response chart to determine how/if the peer review concern had been addressed. In that way, you get a comprehensive response.

Similarly, you requested some info to clarify if the noise report addressed, or should have addressed, concrete recycling. I read the noise report and it does not appear to. For example, I've generally seen concrete recycling operations where a hammer mounted to an excavator is used to break up the concrete and remove rebar. Then a crusher is used to crush the concrete, and perhaps blend it with native aggregate. Does the noise report address, or need to address these issues, I have to send that to my noise specialist. Sending that request, plus the chart response, back to my noise specialist is needed, if that is what you want. (Importantly: Remember that the WSP noise peer review wanted to see

effective mitigation measures outlined on the Site Plan. I don't have a revised Site Plan, so all I can provide him is the chart).

Does that assist? Again, a mutually agreed upon understanding of what additional services you would require will assist in providing suitable pricing on follow-up peer review costs.

Bernie A. Fuhrmann
Aggregate Development Specialist



M+ 1 705-313-5544

294 Rink Street, Suite 103
Peterborough, Ontario
K9J 2K2 Canada

wsp.com

From: Paul Walsh <pwalsh@pecounty.on.ca>
Sent: July-23-19 11:33 AM
To: Fuhrmann, Bernie <bernie.fuhrmann@wsp.com>
Cc: Amarjit Sandhu <asandhu@mhbcplan.com>
Subject: RE: Proposal for Peer Review Services - Greer Pit Application

Bernie,

Amarjit is looking for some clarification as to the review of the chart items. I am assuming that the matters where MHBC has offered agreement with the WSP comments that additional review is not being undertaken?

Thanks Bernie.

From: Fuhrmann, Bernie [<mailto:bernie.fuhrmann@wsp.com>]
Sent: July 22, 2019 2:27 PM
To: Paul Walsh
Cc: Amarjit Sandhu
Subject: Proposal for Peer Review Services - Greer Pit Application

Paul, please accept this proposal in response to our, now finalized, list of requested follow-up tasks, resulting from our initial peer review.

We understand that you wish each WSP specialist to respond to the response to the WSP peer review. Specifically, you wish WSP to review and respond to the following:

1. Response to Comments Disposition Chart as prepared by MHBC on June 17 and the accompanying Jewel Engineering letter, dated May 28/19, regarding the TIS .
2. Review of comments provided by Malroz Engineering in response to potential impacts onto Warings Creek i.e. the Water Balance and Stormwater Management from Malroz dated February 9, 2018
3. Regarding traffic and dust control related to concrete recycling on the site, a note on the ARA Site Plan is found that denotes it as a proposed use. However, I am not aware of these activities to have been spoken to in the

submitted technical materials, and so it appears to be an omission. This appears to be an item that should be included in the general peer review. Although the scale of these activities have been described as incidental or ancillary and not one of general concern, some record of the maximum scale should be made. WSP's review and comments are requested.

In this regard, WSP proposes to re-engage our original peer review team to review and respond to the above requirements. We note the following:

1. The disposition chart contains responses provided by the applicant's aggregate consultant/coordinator and generally responds to each WSP peer reviewer's comments. This will assist in streamlining the review by our specialists
2. WSP's traffic specialist will review the Jewel response, in point #1, in detail. Our Noise specialist will review and briefly comment on the noise response component (Note: Our original peer review comments stemmed from ensuring appropriate wording on the Site Plan. Receiving an updated Plan may be useful.
3. WSP's ground water specialist will first review the response to the peer review comments provided for in the Comments Disposition Chart, as it contains a sufficient response to the minor items originally identified in the hydrog Tech Memo. Second, the letter dated February 2, 2018 from Malroz, in response to the issue concerning Warings Creek will be reviewed. This is a new technical item which our ground water specialist will review and is considered new work, outside of the original peer review. Simply stated, we did not have this letter during our initial peer review of the Malroz Report. However, we generally note that this is not a lengthy document.
4. WSP's Aggregate Development Specialist will provide input into point #3, offer general coordination and project administration.
5. When completed, our Senior Engineer will again provide a general oversight, so that the County can be assured of a senior reviewer.

To conduct the above, our cost estimate is \$4,000, and will be subject to the same terms and conditions as our original retainer for the initial peer review.

An email to proceed is necessary. We propose to commence work as soon as received. Please note, as is typical this time of year, my staff are on vacation or about to leave on vacation. However, we will endeavor to complete our review as soon as possible.

Bernie A. Fuhrmann
Aggregate Development Specialist



M+ 1 705-313-5544

294 Rink Street, Suite 103
Peterborough, Ontario
K9J 2K2 Canada

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies. You are receiving this communication because you are listed as a current WSP contact. Should you have any questions regarding WSP's electronic communications policy, please consult our Anti-Spam Commitment at www.wsp.com/cas. For any concern or if you believe you should not be receiving this message, please forward this message to cascompliance@wsp.com so that we can promptly address your request. Note that not all messages sent by WSP qualify as commercial electronic messages.

AVIS : Ce message, incluant tout fichier l'accompagnant (« le message »), peut contenir des renseignements ou de l'information privilégiés, confidentiels, propriétaires ou à divulgation restreinte en vertu de la loi. Ce message est destiné à l'usage exclusif du/des destinataire(s) voulu(s). Toute utilisation non permise, divulgation, lecture, reproduction, modification, diffusion ou distribution est interdite. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, ou que vous n'êtes pas un destinataire autorisé ou voulu, veuillez en aviser l'expéditeur immédiatement et détruire le message et toute copie électronique ou imprimée. Vous recevez cette communication car vous faites partie des contacts de WSP. Si vous avez des questions concernant la politique de communications électroniques de WSP, veuillez consulter notre Engagement anti-spam au www.wsp.com/lcap. Pour toute question ou si vous croyez que vous ne devriez pas recevoir ce message, prière de le transférer au conformitelcap@wsp.com afin que nous puissions rapidement traiter votre demande. Notez que ce ne sont pas tous les messages transmis par WSP qui constituent des messages électroniques commerciaux.