

## 398 & 442 KILALY STREET EAST AND 758 KILALY STREET EAST

PORT COLBORNE, ONTARIO

AIR QUALITY STUDY

RWDI # 2105514

October 1, 2021

### SUBMITTED TO

**Rachita Gupta**

Project Manager

[r.gupta@elitegroup.com](mailto:r.gupta@elitegroup.com)

**Elite Developments**

102-3410 S. Service Road

Burlington, ON. L7N 3T2

### SUBMITTED BY

**Dan Bacon**

Manager, Project Delivery

[dan.bacon@rwdi.com](mailto:dan.bacon@rwdi.com)

**Tara Bailey**

Senior Engineer, Air Quality

[tara.bailey@rwdi.com](mailto:tara.bailey@rwdi.com)

**RWDI AIR Inc.**

**Consulting Engineers & Scientists**

600 Southgate Drive

Guelph, ON N1G 4P6

T: 519.823.1311

F: 519.823.1316



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>LAND USE COMPATIBILITY POLICIES AND GUIDELINES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>City of Port Colborne Official Plan.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Provincial Policy Statement.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Provincial Compatibility Guidelines.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>RESULTS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>REPORT SIGNATURES.....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1:</b>	Guideline D-6 Industry Classification Scheme
<b>Table 2:</b>	Guideline D-6 Separation Distances

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 1A:</b>	Kilaly Master Plan
<b>Figure 1B:</b>	Site Location
<b>Figure 2A:</b>	Zoning Within The Study Area
<b>Figure 2B:</b>	City of Port Colborne Official Plan
<b>Figure 3:</b>	Directional Distribution (%) of Winds in m/s (Blowing From) Niagara Central Airport
<b>Figure 4:</b>	Industrial Facilities in the Study Area

## LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>Appendix A:</b>	Industrial Classifications
<b>Appendix B:</b>	Air Quality Impact Assessment Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension. Report #1771656

# 1 INTRODUCTION

RWDI AIR Inc. (RWDI) was retained by *Elite Group* to undertake an air quality study for a proposed residential development consisting of 2 contiguous blocks of property within the Kilaly Masterplan located in Port Colborne, Ontario. The lands in the Kilaly Masterplan are bounded by Elizabeth Street on the west, Main Street East on the north, Lorraine Street on the east and Kilaly Street East on the south side. These lands are shown on **Figure 1A**. The subject lands are located within this masterplan and consist of 2 contiguous parcels referred to as 398 & 442 Kilaly Street East and 758 Kilaly Street East. Their locations are shown in **Figure 1B**. The proposed development at the subject lands will consist of a mixed-use subdivision mainly composed of detached homes and townhouses. The subject lands are currently designated residential development and environmental conservation land uses. These land use designations are presented in **Figure 2a**.

## 2 LAND USE COMPATIBILITY POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

### 2.1 City of Port Colborne Official Plan

Schedule A of The City of Colborne's Official Plan<sup>1</sup> provides a City-wide land use map. This land-use map is presented in **Figure 2B** and indicates that the subject lands are designated as Urban Residential. Section 3.2 of Official Plan defines Urban-Residential which is defined as:

"..lands that are primarily used for residential purposes and represent the existing and planned built-up areas within the Urban Area Boundary. The predominant uses for lands designated Urban Residential shall include, but not be limited to; residential uses; neighbourhood commercial uses such as a convenience store, beauty salon, post office, and doctor's office all of limited size; cemeteries, parks, schools, community facilities and institutional uses normally located in residential areas."

The official plan also requires buffering between industrial/employment areas and sensitive land uses as per Section 3.10.1 of the Corporation of the City of Port Colborne Official Plan which states the following:

"Buffering is required between industrial/employment area uses and sensitive land uses, such as residential, including but not limited to, increased setbacks, berming, a high degree of landscaping, screening and fencing. "

### 2.2 Provincial Policy Statement

Section 1.2.6 of Part V of the Provincial Policy Statement 2014 (<https://www.ontario.ca/document/provincial-policy-statement-2014/part-v-policies-10#section-0>) states the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Port Colborne Official Plan. available online at: <https://www.portcolborne.ca/en/business-and-development/resources/Documents/Planning/2020-Updated-Official-Plan-COMPLETE.pdf>

*"Major facilities and sensitive land uses should be planned to ensure they are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated from each other to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, and to ensure the long-term viability of major facilities."*

Section 1.6.8.3 of Part V of the Provincial Policy Statement 2014 further states that "New development proposed on adjacent lands to existing or planned corridors and transportation facilities should be compatible with, and supportive of, the long-term purposes of the corridor and should be designed to avoid, mitigate or minimize negative impacts on and from the corridor and transportation facilities."

## 2.3 Provincial Compatibility Guidelines

The MECP's D-series guidelines deal with land use compatibility in Ontario. The most relevant guideline in the present case is D-6 (Compatibility between Industrial Facilities, <https://www.ontario.ca/page/d-6-compatibility-between-industrial-facilities>). It provides a classification scheme for industries based their potential for emissions that could cause adverse effects. The classification scheme is summarized in **Table 1**.

**Table 1:** Guideline D-6 Industry Classification Scheme

Class	Descriptors
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale</li> <li>• Self-contained</li> <li>• Packaged product</li> <li>• Low probability of fugitive emissions</li> <li>• Daytime operations only</li> <li>• Infrequent and/or low intensity outputs of noise, odour, dust, vibration</li> </ul>
II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium scale</li> <li>• Outdoor storage of wastes or materials</li> <li>• Periodic outputs of minor annoyance</li> <li>• Low probability of fugitive emissions</li> <li>• Shift operations</li> <li>• Frequent movement of products and/or heavy trucks during daytime</li> </ul>
III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large scale</li> <li>• Outside storage of raw and finished products</li> <li>• Large production volumes</li> <li>• Continuous movement of products and employees during shift operations</li> <li>• Frequent outputs of major annoyance</li> <li>• High probability of fugitive emissions</li> </ul>

For each class of industry, the guideline provides an estimate of potential influence area and a minimum recommended separation distance, which are set out in **Table 2**.



**Table 2:** Guideline D-6 Separation Distances

Industry Class	Potential Influence Area (m)	Minimum Separation Distance (m)
I	70	20
II	300	70
III	1000	300

Guideline D-6 recommends the following:

1. "...no sensitive land uses shall be permitted within the actual or potential influence areas of Class I, II or III industrial land uses, without evidence to substantiate the absence of a problem." (Sec. 4.5.1 of Guideline D-6)
2. "No incompatible development other than that identified in Section 4.10, *Redevelopment, Infilling and Mixed-Use Areas* should occur [within the recommended minimum separation distances]" (Sec. 4.3 of Guideline D-6)
3. "When a change in land use is proposed [in an area of urban redevelopment, infilling or transition to mixed use] for either industrial or sensitive land use, less than the minimum separation distance ... may be acceptable subject to either the municipality or the proponent providing a justifying impact assessment (i.e., a use specific evaluation of the industrial processes and the potential for off-site impacts on existing and proposed sensitive land uses). Mitigation is the key to dealing with less than the minimum to the greatest extent possible." (Sec. 4.10.3)

With respect to how separation distance should be measured, the guideline states that "measurement shall normally be from the closest existing, committed and proposed property/lot line of the industrial land use to the property/lot line of the closest existing, committed or proposed sensitive land use." However, it does allow the measurement to include areas within the lot lines (on-site buffers) where site-specific zoning or site plan control precludes the use of the area for a sensitive use in the case of the sensitive land use, and for an activity that could create an adverse effect in the case of the industrial land use.

When dealing with vacant industrial lands, the guideline states that "determination of the potential influence area shall be based upon a hypothetical worst-case scenario for which the zone area is committed".

### 3 METHODOLOGY

The tasks consisted of reviewing the following items:

- The official plan and zoning by-laws for the surrounding area;
- Published satellite imagery and street-based photography;
- In-person site visit by RWDI personnel on September 14th, 2021 to confirm existing uses and operations;
- MECP Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) and Environmental Sector and Activity Registry (EASR) permits for existing industries within 1000 m of the subject lands;



- Pending applications for amendment to ECA's of any major facilities, posted on the Environmental Registry;
  - Environment and Climate Change Canada's (ECCC) National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI) data for industries within 1000 m of the subject lands;
  - Guidelines D-1 (Land Use Compatibility) and D-6 (Compatibility between Industrial Uses) from the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP);
  - Meteorological data for the study area;
  - Reviewing Air Quality Impact Assessment Report for Port Colborne Quarries Inc.
- 
- Any recent complaint history available from the applicable MECP District Office to determine if there are any air quality within the area.

RWDI reviewed wind data from Niagara Central Dorothy Rungeling Airport, which is the nearest meteorological station to the subject site. A summary of the frequency distribution of winds over a period from 2006-2020 is shown in **Figure 3**. The wind directions in the figure refer to the direction from which the wind blows, while the annual frequency of a given wind direction is shown as a distance radially from the centre. The most frequent winds originate from the west-northwest (WNW) through south (S) and east-northeast (ENE) directions. Winds from the east-south-east (ESE) through south-east (SE) and north-east (NE) through north-west (NW) directions are less frequent, approximately 2-5% of the time.

Historically RWDI have contacted local MECP district offices regarding concerns and/or complaints related to air quality and were advised that the MECP is unable to provide this information directly with such inquiries to be directed via the Ministry's Freedom of Information (FOI) office. While complaint history for the area is a helpful tool in the initial screening of industries, due to the length of time to complete the process, we did not consider this task to be essential in completing the assessment for this site.

## 4 RESULTS

Seven (7) industrial facilities within 1000 m of the subject lands were identified through the review of satellite imagery and the MECP ECA and EASR document search. Table A-1 in **Appendix A** lists all the Class I, II, and III industries within 300 m and Class II and III industries within 1000 m of the subject lands. These facilities are shown in **Figure 4**. Class I industries beyond 300 m away were not documented as their potential influence areas fall far short of the subject lands.

There is one (1) Class I and two (2) Class III facilities within the study area whose respective D-6 assigned potential influence areas of 70m and 1000m respectively overlap with the subject lands. These facilities are discussed in detail below.

### **Corporation of the City of Port Colborne – 550 Elizabeth Street**

The site is a well contained, medium scale non-industrial facility used for community recreation with little or no industrial output. For this reason the facility was designated Class 1 with respect to guideline D-6. The facility lies 21m west (property line to property line) of the subject lands. This separation distance is slightly larger than the 20m D-6 minimum separation distance for a Class I facility. The facility has two EASRs: one for a standby generator and one for a heating system. The emissions from the equipment covered under these approvals are required to meet MECP air quality benchmarks at the facility property line and beyond. The generator and rooftop equipment are located on the



south side of the building greater than 100m away from the subject lands. Therefore the emissions generating equipment at this site located beyond the Class I potential influence area. The activities at the facility are unlikely to generate any fugitive dust or fugitive odour emissions. Potential for fugitive dust is very low since almost all outdoor areas are paved/ have ground cover and recreational activities at the site are not likely to result in dust emissions. The activities at this facility are also not expected to generate odours. This site is not expected to impact air quality at the subject lands given that 1) no fugitive dust or odour impacts are expected from activities at the facility and 2) the standby generator and heating system are required to meet MECP air quality benchmarks at the property line and beyond and are located beyond the Class I potential influence area of 70 m.

### **Vale Canada Limited – 187 Davis Street**

The facility is a large metal refinery with significant industrial operations. An online review of news media revealed that the site has had numerous legal battles with concerned residents which have centered around contamination related to the site's operations<sup>2</sup>. A visit to the area surrounding the facility was conducted on September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2021. During this visit no odour was observed in relation to the site, nor was any fugitive dust observed. A desktop review of satellite imagery indicates the presence of a tall stack. The facility's ECA indicates the presence of scrubber exhausts serving numerous process tanks. Emissions from the facility's equipment are required to meet MECP air quality criteria at the property line and beyond. The facility also appears to have an approved industrial non-hazardous waste disposal operation (landfill) located in the northern section of its property. Based on its scale and equipment the facility meets the criteria for a D-6 Class III facility. However, except for the landfill area, all industrial operations and related emission points at this facility are located well beyond the Class III potential influence area of 1000m from the subject lands, with the tall stack located approximately 1600m away. The proposed residential at the subject lands consist of houses and as such there are no elevated receptors on site that would be impacted by emissions from such a tall stack. Therefore, significant air quality impacts from the operations are not expected at the subject lands.

The northern portion of Vale's property contains the active landfill site complete with unpaved onsite roadways. Operations of vehicles on these unpaved roads and operations at the landfill may have the potential to generate fugitive dust and odours however, the landfill site is located within 60m of existing residential on Colborne Street. This suggests that the actual influence area of the landfill is approximately 60m and as such is not expected to extend to the subject lands which are located at least 515 m away. Based on the above, Vale's current industrial operations and landfill operations are not likely to impact air quality at the subject lands and as such this site is considered to be compatible with them.

### **Port Colborne Quarries Inc - Hwy 140 & Concession 2**

The facility is a large quarry operation which, as described in a recent Air Quality Impact Assessment<sup>3</sup> completed in support of a Category 2 Class "A" Quarry Below Water license application, engages in rock drilling and blasting, aggregate recovery, transfer and processing using rock crushers, screens, conveyors, a wash plant and other equipment. The site can process up to 4500 tonnes of material per day and typically engages blasting rock at a frequency of 1 to 3 blasts per week. The site has unpaved onsite roadways with frequent vehicle traffic that transports aggregate from blasting areas to its onsite processing plant. The size and considerable outputs from

---

<sup>2</sup> Port Colborne Class Action Lawsuit Against Vale, Canada. Available online at: <https://ejatlas.org/conflict/port-colborne-class-action-lawsuit-against-vale>

<sup>3</sup> Golder Associates Ltd. 2020. Air Quality Impact Assessment Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension. Report #1771656.

this facility indicate it is a D-6 Class III facility with the potential to emit considerable dust emissions. Odour is not considered a concern from the operations.

The quarry site is generally bounded by Highway 140 to the west, Second Concession Road to the north, Main Street East to the South. The eastern portion of the site extends approximately 400 to 790m east of Carl Road. As per the above-mentioned impact assessment (presented in **Appendix B**), the quarry has 3 extraction pits, Pit 1, Pit 2 and Pit 3 and has proposed extending its operation to lands east of Pit #3. The Pit 3 extension lands are bounded by Second Concession Rd to the north and Highway 3 to the south. The extension's eastern boundary is proposed to extend approximately 400 to 790m east of Carl Road. At present blasting and extraction occurs at the rock faces in Pit 3 and proceeds in a west to east direction. Blasted rock is loaded onto trucks and taken to the permanent processing plant in Pit 1.

The subject lands' northern boundary between Elizabeth Street and Snider Road is in close proximity to the quarry. This portion of the subject lands are separated by buffer lands consisting of woodlots, fields and existing residential lands that is at least 365m deep. These buffer areas are essential in helping mitigate the impacts of any dusts generated at the quarry. There are also existing residential areas located in closer proximity to the quarry that are located on Snider Road and Berkley Avenue. These sites are approximately 150m southeast and approximately 250m southwest respectively, of the emission generating activities at the quarry. These separation distances indicate that the actual influence area of the quarry is likely to be much less than a typical Class III D-6 potential influence area of 1000m.

The quarry has been the subject of an Air Quality Impact Assessment, related to a proposed expansion. The report is presented in Appendix B. RWDI conducted a high-level review of the methodology and assumptions of the report and found it to be consistent with general practice, with no significant issues or concerns identified. The assessment considered impacts of Total Suspended Particulate Matter (SPM), PM-10, PM-2.5 and Crystalline Silica at receptors along the quarry property boundary and at off site receptors. Contour plots of predicted maximum contaminant concentrations were presented. The plots included the subject property. This assessment indicates that particulate emissions exceed MECP benchmarks but that the exceedances occur in the immediate vicinity of the quarry's property line and not anywhere near the proposed residential areas at the subject lands.

The quarry is not expected to adversely impact air quality emissions at the subject lands given the following:


- 1) the subject lands are located further away compared to existing residential
- 2) the subject lands are separated from the emissions generating area at the quarry by land buffers that are at least 365m deep; and,
- 3) the results of the facility's modelling assessment did not indicate adverse particulate impacts extending to the subject lands.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS


From an air quality perspective, the subject lands are compatible with surrounding industrial uses and no significant air quality impacts from adjacent and nearby industrial properties on the proposed development are expected.

# FIGURES









## Site Location - 398 & 442 & 758 Kilaly Street East

Map Projection: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 17N  
Port Colborne Lands, Port Colborne, ON




Project #: 2105514

Drawn by: LJN	Figure: 1b
Approx. Scale: 1:8,000	
Date Revised: Oct 1, 2021	







## Zoning within the Study Area - 398 & 442 & 758 Kilaly Street East


Map Projection: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 17N  
Port Colborne Lands, Port Colborne, ON

True North  
Project #: 2105514

Drawn by: LJN	Figure: 2a
Approx. Scale: 1:22,000	
Date Revised: Oct 1, 2021	







## Port Colborne Official Plan

### Schedule A: City-Wide Land Use

- Municipal Boundary
- Urban Area Boundary
- EPA
- ECA
- Agricultural
- Hamlet
- Urban Residential
- Rural
- Downtown Commercial
- Commercial Plaza
- Highway Commercial
- Marine Commercial
- Industrial / Employment Area
- Mineral Aggregate Operation
- Gateway Economic Centre
- Rural Employment
- Parks and Open Space
- Private Open Space
- Special Study Area
- Secondary Plan Area
- ⚓ Major Port
- k Former Waste Management Facility

μ

Kilometres  
1:75,000

City of Port Colborne, Engineering and Operations Department.  
This map was compiled from various data sources and is current as of August 2012.

City of Port Colborne Official Plan

Drawn by: ADS Figure: 2B

Approx. Scale: not to scale


Date Revised: September 27 2021

398 & 442 & 758 Kilaly Street East, Port Colborne, ON.

RWDI #: 2105514



Directional Distribution (%) of Winds in m/s (Blowing From)  
Niagara Central Dorothy Rungeling Airport, (2006-2020)



Directional Distribution (%) of Winds in m/s (Blowing From)  
Niagara Central Dorothy Rungeling Airport, (2006 - 2020)

398 & 442 & 758 Kilaly Street East, Port Colborne, ON.

RWDI #: 2105514

Drawn by: ADS


Figure: 3

Approx. Scale: not to scale

Date Revised: September 27 2021







## Industrial Facilities in the Study Area - 398 & 442 & 758 Kilaly Street East

Map Projection: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 17N  
 Port Colborne Lands, Port Colborne, ON

True North  
  
 Project #: 2105514

Drawn by: LJN	Figure: 4
Approx. Scale: 1:26,000	
Date Revised: Oct 1, 2021	



A large decorative graphic on the left side of the page. It features a blue triangular shape at the top left, a white curved line, and a large light gray circular area that dominates the lower half of the page.

# APPENDIX A

Appendix A1 - List of Relevant Industrial Sites  
398 & 442 &758 Kilaly Street East, Port Colborne, Air Quality Study

Table A1 - Relevant Sites Within 1km of the Subject Lands

Map Icon Number	BUSINESS NAME	ADDRESS	TYPE OF FACILITY/EQUIPMENT/APPROVAL	APPROVAL / REGISTRATION NUMBER	Comment on Operations	Tall Stacks Present	Approximate Distance to Site (m)	D-6 Classification
1	1177109 Ontario Ltd.	191 Main St E	Automotive Refinishing facility with an ECA-AIR.	4206-A4MRCA	Site is a small scale automotive refinishing facility. Facility appears to be well contained with low lying exhausts. It has no evidence of outdoor operations that can generate fugitive dust and/or fugitive odour emissions. Facility's approval indicates a painting operation using upto 1.25 L per hour of solvent and waterbased coatings and requires compliance with MECP air quality benchmarks at offsite receptors. The use of solvent coatings may generate some odour emissions. The facility is located approximately 90m from existing residential. This proximity indicates that the facility's influence area is likely close to 90m and is unlikely to extend to the subject lands located further away.	No	107	Class I
2	CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF PORT COLBORNE	550 ELIZABETH STREET	Community Recreation Centre with an EASR-Standby Power System/EASR-Heating System	R-002-8548316798 R-003-3133415468	The site is a well contained, medium scale non-industrial facility used for community recreation with little or no industrial output. For this reason the facility was designated Class 1 with respect to guideline D-6. The site is well contained and the facility has two EASRs, one for a standby generator and another for a heating system. The emissions from the equipment covered under these approvals are required to meet MECP air quality benchmarks at the property line and beyond. The generator itself appears to be located on the south side of the building approximately 100m away from the subject lands. The activities at the facility are unlikely to generate any fugitive dust or fugitive odour emissions. I.e. potential for fugitive dust is very low since almost all outdoor areas are paved/ have ground cover and the activities at the site are not likely to result in odour emissions. This site is not expected to impact air quality at the subject lands given that 1) no fugitive dust or odour impacts are expected from activities at the facility and 2) the standby generator and heating system are required to meet MECP air quality benchmarks at the property line and beyond.	No	20	Class I
3	J. T. L. Machine Limited	857 Reuter Rd	Heavy industrial metal fabrication Shop with an ECA-AIR.	0205-9P7R4M	The site is a medium scale industrial operation engaged in metal fabrication, welding, sand blasting and painting. The facility yard is paved and has minimal outdoor storage; there are no indication of any outdoor operations that could result in fugitive dust or fugitive odour emissions. Emissions from the facility appear to be directed to the atmosphere via low lying point source exhausts. The approval for the facility indicates there is a painting operations utilizing 3.6 L per hour of paint. This activity could generate odour emissions. As per the facility ECA, emissions from the facility need to be in compliance with MECP air quality benchmarks at its property line and beyond. The site is located within 150m of existing residential which suggest that its influence area is less than 200m and is unlikely to extend to the subject lands which are located more than 500m away.	No	517	Class II
4	IMT Partnership / R & G Holdings Corp.	837 Reuter Rd	Commercial Forging Facility with an ECA-AIR.	2346-7NGMG8	Facility is a medium scale industrial site with gas fired billet heating furnaces, dust collection equipment, a cooling tower, forge hammer and other associated equipment. The facility has an unpaved yard with some outdoor storage which gives indication of onsite vehicle traffic and the potential for nuisance dust emissions. The facility approval requires the implementation of a fugitive dust management plan which is likely to minimize these dust impacts. The facility's approval requires compliance with MECP air quality benchmarks at the property line and beyond. This environmental approval does not have any conditions related to odour which gives indication that the MECP is not concerned with odour. The facility is located approximately 230 m from existing residential which suggest that its area of influence is much less than the 300m influence area for a D-6 Class II facility. The subject lands are located further away; beyond the facility's assumed influence area.	No	620	Class II
5	Vale Canada Limited/INCO/CVRD/INCO	187 Davis St	Nickel refining facility with multiple ECAs for air and One ECA for a landfill site.	0672-7RYGTX 3890-6Y9KKL 7110-8T9NNR 9133-7RSH5T A120310 (Landfill)	The facility is a large metal refinery whose ECAs indicate the presence of scrubber exhausts serving various process tanks. The facility also appears to have an approved waste disposal operation (landfill) on site. Emissions from the facility's equipment are required to meet MECP air quality criteria at the property line and beyond. All industrial operations and related emission points at this facility are located well beyond 1000m of the subject lands. These operations are far enough away to not be of any concern with respect to the subject lands since they are well outside of Guideline D-6's potential influence area for a Class III facility. The assumed northern edge of the landfill is approximately 515 m from the subject lands however there is existing residential located much closer, approximately 60 m away which suggests that the influence of the landfill is likely much less than 300m and as such is not expected to extend to the subject lands. The landfill is for solid non-hazardous industrial waste and not used for putrescibles.	Yes	515	Class III
6	Algoma Central Corporation	1 Chestnut St	Ship Repair and Maintenance facility with an ECA-AIR.	2956-8QZPUV	Site is a medium scale industrial facility that engages in metal fabrication, welding cutting, machining, solvent cleaning abrasive blasting. The site consists of several buildings with low lying point sources. It has a yard with significant outdoor storage as well as unpaved roadways. Vehicle traffic on these roadways will generate fugitive dust emissions. The facility's approval does not require any specific measures related to odour control which indicates that the MECP is not concerned with odour emissions from the site. A desktop review of the site did not find any evidence of operations that could result in odour emissions. The facility's approval requires emissions compliance with MECP air quality benchmarks at the property line and beyond. The facility is located approximately 36m to existing residential which suggests its influence area is well below that of the suggested D-6 Class II potential influence area. The subject lands are located much further away and the facility's influence area is not expected to extend to it.	No	758	Class II

Table A1 - Relevant Sites Within 1km of the Subject Lands

Map Icon Number	BUSINESS NAME	ADDRESS	TYPE OF FACILITY/EQUIPMENT/APPROVAL	APPROVAL / REGISTRATION NUMBER	Comment on Operations	Tall Stacks Present	Approximate Distance to Site (m)	D-6 Classification
7	Port Colborne Quarries	Hwy 140 & Concession 2, Port Colborne, ON L3K 5V5	Quarry	None Available	The facility is a large quarry operation that engages in rock drilling and blasting, aggregate recovery, transfer and processing using rock crushers, screens, conveyors, a wash plant and other equipment. The site can process upto 4500 tonnes of material per day and typically engages blasting rock 1 to 3 blasts per week. The site has 3 pits, Pit 1, Pit 2 and Pit 3 and has proposed extending its operation to lands east of Pit #3. The Pit 3 extension lands are bounded by Second Concession Rd to the north, Highway 3 to the south, and approximately 400 to 790m east of Carl road on the eastern end. The site has a permanent processing plant in Pit 1. At present blasting and extraction occurs at the rock faces in Pit 3 and proceeds in a west to east direction. Blasted rocks are loaded onto trucks and taken to the processing plant in Pit 1. The site has unpaved onsite roadways with frequent vehicle traffic that transports aggregate from blasting areas to the processing plant. Operations at the site: blasting, drilling activities, frequent truck traffic on unpaved roads aggregate handling, processing and storage results in significant emisisions of dust. Residential areas in the subject lands have buffer areas between them and the quarry that results in a separation distances of at least 365m. This buffer is essential in helping mitigate the impacts of dust generated at the quarry. The quarry has assessed the impacts of total suspended particulate (Total PM, <44 um in diameter), PM-10, PM-2.5 and Silica emissions at receptors along the property line as well as some sensitive offsite receptors. This assessment revealed that particulate emisisions exceeded MECP benchmarks but these exceedances were in the immediate vicinity of the property line and not near proposed residential areas at the subject lands.	No	113	Class III

A large decorative graphic on the left side of the page, featuring a blue triangle at the top left and a large, light gray curved shape that sweeps across the page.

# APPENDIX B





## REPORT

# Air Quality Impact Assessment

*Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension*

Submitted to:

**Mr. Shawn Tylee**

Manager of Procurement and Corporate Affairs  
222 Martindale Road, P.O. Box 1116  
St. Catharines, Ontario  
L2R 7A3

Submitted by:


**Golder Associates Ltd.**

6925 Century Avenue, Suite #100, Mississauga, Ontario, L5N 7K2, Canada

+1 905 567 4444

1771656

December 2020





## Distribution List

Electronic copy - Port Colborne Quarries Inc.

Electronic copy - Golder Associates Ltd.

# Table of Contents

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Facility Description .....	1
1.1.1 Operating Schedule .....	2
1.2 Indicator Compounds .....	2
1.3 Applicable Guidelines.....	2
<b>2.0 EXISTING AIR QUALITY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Monitoring Data .....	4
2.2 Industrial Emissions Sources .....	6
2.3 Summary of Existing Air Quality .....	7
<b>3.0 EMISSION RATE ESTIMATES .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Extraction Phasing .....	8
3.2 Crushing Plant.....	8
3.3 Wash Plant.....	9
3.4 Stockpiles .....	9
3.5 Vehicles – Paved Road Dust .....	10
3.6 Vehicles – Unpaved Road Dust .....	11
3.7 On Road Vehicles – Exhaust Emissions.....	12
3.8 Non Road Engines – Exhaust Emissions .....	13
3.9 Material Handling .....	14
3.10 Drilling .....	15
3.11 Blasting – Particulate .....	16
3.12 Blasting – Combustion Gases.....	16
3.13 Summary of Emissions .....	17
<b>4.0 DISPERSION MODELLING.....</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1 Model Development .....	18
4.2 Model Calibration .....	18

4.3	Model Validation .....	18
4.4	Model Uncertainty and Sensitivity .....	19
4.5	Model Inputs .....	21
4.5.1	Meteorological Data .....	21
4.5.2	Terrain and Modelling Receptors .....	21
4.5.2.1	Digital Terrain Data .....	21
4.5.2.2	Model Receptors .....	21
4.5.3	Building Downwash .....	22
4.5.4	Emissions and Model Source Configurations .....	22
4.5.4.1	Volume Sources .....	22
4.5.4.2	Area Sources .....	22
4.6	Summary of Model Options .....	23
4.6.1	Dry Deposition/Depletion .....	23
4.7	Special Modelling Considerations .....	24
4.7.1	Variable Emissions by Hour of Day .....	24
4.7.2	Hourly Emission Rate Files .....	25
4.8	Post Processing .....	25
4.8.1	Time Average Conversions .....	25
4.8.2	Conversions of NO <sub>x</sub> to NO <sub>2</sub> .....	26
4.9	Conservative Assumptions in Modelling Approach .....	27
<b>5.0</b>	<b>AIR QUALITY PREDICTIONS .....</b>	<b>28</b>
5.1	Scenario 0 – Existing Operations .....	29
5.2	Scenario 1 – Expansion Phase 1 .....	31
5.3	Scenario 2 – Expansion Phase 1 .....	31
5.4	Scenario 3 – Expansion Phase 2 .....	31
5.5	Scenario 4 – Expansion Phase 3 .....	35
<b>6.0</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>37</b>
6.1	Modelling Refinements .....	37
6.2	Best Management Practices Plan for the Control of Fugitive Dust .....	37

6.3	Air Quality Monitoring.....	37
<b>7.0</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>CURRICULA VITAE.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>9.0</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>40</b>

## TABLES

Table 1:	Ontario and Canadian Regulatory Air Quality Objectives and Criteria.....	3
Table 2:	Location of Air Monitoring Stations.....	4
Table 3:	Summary of Air Quality Station Data.....	5
Table 4:	2018 Air Releases for Industry within 5 km of the Facility.....	6
Table 5:	Existing Air Quality Concentrations.....	7
Table 6:	Particle Size Multipliers for Wind Erosion.....	10
Table 7:	Particle Size Assumptions for Paved Road Dust.....	10
Table 8:	Particle Size Assumptions for Unpaved Road Dust.....	12
Table 9:	Particle Size Multiplier.....	14
Table 10:	Blasting Fugitive Emissions Scaling Factors for Particulate Matter.....	16
Table 11:	Reliability Summary for the AERMOD Dispersion Model.....	20
Table 12:	Options Used in the AERMOD Model.....	23
Table 13:	Particle Size Parameters for model source HAULROAD.....	24
Table 14:	Ozone concentrations used in OLM.....	26
Table 15:	Conservative Assumptions in Modelling Approach.....	27
Table 16:	Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Existing Operations.....	30
Table 17:	Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Expansion Phase 1 (Scenario 1).....	32
Table 18:	Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Expansion Phase 1 (Scenario 2).....	33
Table 19:	Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Expansion Phase 2 (Scenario 3).....	34
Table 20:	Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Expansion Phase 3 (Scenario 4).....	36

## **FIGURES**

Figure 1: Facility Location Plan

Figure 2: Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Stations

Figures 3A – 3E: Dispersion Modelling Plan

Figure 4: Pit 3 Extension: Extraction Phasing

Figure 5: Air Quality Dispersion Modelling Receptors

## **APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX A**

Source Summary Tables

### **APPENDIX B**

Contour Plots

### **APPENDIX C**

Curricula Vitae

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) was retained by Port Colborne Quarries Inc. (PCQ), a division of Rankin Construction Inc. (Rankin), to complete an air quality impact assessment of the proposed extension of the existing Port Colborne Quarry to support a Category 2, Class “A” Quarry Below Water license application under the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA).

The preparation of a detailed air quality assessment is not typically required for a licence application, however, an air quality assessment is a requirement of the following:

- Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, Under the *Planning Act*, Policy 2.5;
- Region of Niagara Official Plan policy 6.C.5; and
- City of Port Colborne Official Plan policy 10.2.

The air quality assessment has been completed to achieve the following:

- characterize the existing air quality in the surrounding area;
- estimate the emissions from current and future quarry operations;
- predict the impact of the current and proposed quarry extension on local air quality through dispersion modelling; and
- recommend best management practices to help mitigate the potential for fugitive dust generation.

For the purpose of this report, the term “Facility” is used to describe the total area owned by PCQ which includes the existing quarry and the area that is proposed for licensing under the ARA (Figure 1 – Facility Location Plan).

### 1.1 Facility Description

The existing Port Colborne Quarry is located in the City of Port Colborne within the Regional Municipality of Niagara. The existing quarry (Pit 1, Pit 2 and Pit 3) is bounded by Second Concession Road to the north, Highway 140 to the west, Main Street East (Highway 3) to the south, and 200 metres west of Carl Road to the east (Figure 1). Current operations at the quarry include: extraction, processing and offsite transport. The extracted material is processed using a permanent processing plant located within Pit 1. The processing plant includes: crushers, screens, conveyors, and a wash plant. Drilling and blasting is carried out at the working face of the quarry to extract material, which is then transported from the working face to the processing plant using haul trucks.

The proposed extension (Pit 3 Extension) is situated directly east of the existing quarry and remains between Second Concession Road to the north and Highway 3 to the south and extends approximately 410 - 790 metres east of Carl Road. The Pit 3 Extension is located in Part of Lots 17, 18 and 19 Concession 2 and Plan 59R-16702, Humberstone Township, Regional Municipality of Niagara and comprises 106.3 hectares (262.67 acres). The property is bordered by Second Concession Road to the north, Main Street East to the south, the existing Port Colborne quarry to the west and agricultural fields and Miller Road to the west.

Current operations at Facility include extraction, processing and offsite transport. Drilling and blasting are used to extract material. The extracted material is transported from the extraction face by haul truck to the crushing plant and wash plant located in Pit 1. Processed material is stored in various stockpiles before being shipped off-site.

### 1.1.1 Operating Schedule

Off-site shipping and related material handling activities occur year round, generally from 7 am to 5 pm, Monday to Friday. Blasting occurs up to three times per week between the hours of 10 am to 4 pm, March through November. Extraction and processing occurs from March through mid-December, generally from 7 am to 5 pm, Monday to Friday and on Saturdays from June through August.

## 1.2 Indicator Compounds

This air quality assessment focuses on predicting changes in the concentrations of Criteria Air Compounds (CACs). These compounds are generally indicative of air quality, and for which relevant air quality criteria exist. The indicator compounds for quarry activities fall into two categories:

- **particulate matter:** suspended particulate matter (SPM), particles nominally smaller than 10 µm in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and particles nominally smaller than 2.5 µm in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>);
- **crystalline silica:** as a fraction of PM<sub>10</sub>; and
- **combustion gases:** nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and carbon monoxide (CO).

In addition to the compounds listed above, ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) was also quantified as it will be used to calculate NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations from the predicted nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) concentrations. Ozone is not emitted directly into atmosphere but is associated with the reaction of NO<sub>x</sub> (MECP 2015).

## 1.3 Applicable Guidelines

The relevant air quality criteria used for assessing the air quality effects of the Pit 3 Extension include the Ontario criteria and federal standards and objectives where provincial guidelines are not available. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) has set guidelines related to ambient air concentrations which are summarized in *Ontario's Ambient Air Quality Criteria* (AAQC) document (MECP 2012). The Ontario AAQCs are characterized as desirable ambient air concentrations. They are not regulatory limits and are frequently exceeded at various locations across Ontario due to weather conditions and long-range transportation but represent an indicator of good air quality. The Ontario AAQCs are used for screening the air quality effects in environmental assessments, studies using ambient air monitoring data, and assessment of general air quality in a community or across the province (MECP 2017).

There are two sets of federal objectives and criteria: the National Ambient Air Quality Objectives (NAAQOs) and the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQSS) (formerly National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)). Similar to the Ontario AAQCs, the NAAQOs are benchmarks that can be used to facilitate air quality management on a regional scale, and provide goals for outdoor air quality that protect public health, the environment, or aesthetic properties of the environment (CCME 1999). The federal government has established the following levels of NAAQOs (Health Canada 1994):

- the maximum **Desirable** level defines the long-term goal for air quality and provides a basis for an anti degradation policy for unpolluted parts of the country and for the continuing development of control technology; and
- the maximum **Acceptable** level is intended to provide adequate protection against adverse effects on soil, water, vegetation, materials, animals, visibility, personal comfort, and well-being.

The CAAQSs have been developed under the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* (CEPA) and include standards for PM<sub>2.5</sub>, ozone, NO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> to be implemented by 2025. Like the Ontario AAQCs, the CAAQSs are not regulatory limits and are used as national targets for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and ozone, excluding Quebec (CCME 2014). The CAAQSs are based on the long-term averages of measurement data not a short-term measurement value.

A summary of the applicable Ontario and federal objectives and criteria as well as the criteria that will be used for this assessment are listed in Table 1. Unless otherwise noted, for compounds that have both provincial and federal criteria, the lower of the two will be used for this assessment. For compounds with federal standards that are not currently in effect, the provincial criteria is also used when available.

**Table 1: Ontario and Canadian Regulatory Air Quality Objectives and Criteria**

Compound	Averaging Period	Ontario Ambient Air Quality Guidelines <sup>(a)</sup> (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards <sup>(b)</sup> (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Objectives <sup>(c)</sup> (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		Assessment Criteria (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )
				Desirable	Acceptable	
SPM <sup>(d)</sup>	24-Hour	120	—	—	120	120
	Annual	60 <sup>(e)</sup>	—	60	70	60
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-Hour	50 <sup>(f)</sup>	—	—	—	50
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24-Hour	30 <sup>(g)</sup>	27 <sup>(g)(h)</sup>	—	—	27
	Annual	—	8.8 <sup>(h)</sup>	—	—	8.8
Crystalline silica (<10 µm)	24-Hour	5	—	—	—	5
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour	400 <sup>(i)</sup>	79 (42 ppb) <sup>(j)</sup>	—	400	79/400
	24-Hour	200 <sup>(i)</sup>	—	—	200	200
	Annual	—	22.6 (12 ppb) <sup>(j)</sup>	60	100	22.6
SO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour	690	170.3 (65 ppb) <sup>(k)</sup>	450	900	170.3/690
	24-Hour	275	—	150	300	275/150
	Annual	55	10.5 (4 ppb) <sup>(k)</sup>	30	60	10.5/55
CO	1-Hour	36,200	—	15,000	35,000	36,200/15,000
	8-Hour	15,700	—	6,000	15,000	15,700/6,000

(a) MECP (2019)

(b) CAAQS published in the Canada Gazette Volume 147, No. 21 - May 25, 2013. Final standard phase in date of 2025 used, except where noted.

(c) CCME (1999)

(d) SPM in Ontario is defined as Suspended Particulate Matter (<44 µm diameter)

(e) Geometric mean

(f) Interim AAQC and is provided as a guide for decision making (MECP 2018)

(g) Compliance is based on the 98th percentile of the annual monitored data averaged over three years of measurements.

(h) Phase in date for standard is 2020.

(i) Standard is for nitrogen oxides (NOX) but is based on the health effects of NO<sub>2</sub>.

(j) Canadian ambient air quality standard for NO<sub>2</sub> is effective from 2025. Standards provided as parts per billion (ppb) were converted to µg/m<sup>3</sup> using a reference temperature of 25°C and pressure of 1 atmosphere (atm). The 1-hour standard is based on the three-year average of the annual 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average concentration.

(k) The 4 ppb standard for SO<sub>2</sub> is effective from 2025, the current standard is 5 ppb. The new 1-hour standard is based on the three-year average of the annual 99th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average concentration.



## 2.0 EXISTING AIR QUALITY

The existing air quality in the area around the Facility can be described by considering publicly available monitoring data in the vicinity. The existing air quality includes the operation of Pits 1, 2 and 3, before operation of the Pit 3 Extension. Other existing sources include industrial facilities, roadways, long range transboundary air pollution, small regional sources and large industrial sources.

### 2.1 Monitoring Data

The existing air quality was characterized using observations from the Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) National Air Pollution Surveillance Network (NAPS) air quality monitoring stations (ECCC 2018). Monitoring stations are typically sited in locations where there are potential concerns about local air quality or in population centres, therefore there are no locations in the immediate vicinity of the Facility and stations located some distance away were used.

The relative locations of each of the air monitoring stations considered to describe the existing air quality is summarized in Table 2 and presented on Figure 2 - Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Stations. Table 2 also includes the monitoring data that is available from each station for the 2014-2018 time period.

**Table 2: Location of Air Monitoring Stations**

Station	Address	NAPS Station ID	Latitude and Longitude	Distance to the Facility (km)	Predominant Wind Direction	Monitoring Data Available
St. Catharines	62 Argyle Crescent	61302	43.16006, -79.23475	27	Northwest, generally downwind	PM <sub>2.5</sub> <sup>(1)</sup> , NO <sub>2</sub> , NO, O <sub>3</sub>
Simcoe	Experimental Farm	62601	42.85685, -80.26964	85	West, generally upwind	PM <sub>2.5</sub> , NO <sub>2</sub> , NO, SO <sub>2</sub> , O <sub>3</sub>
Hamilton	Elgin & Kelly	60512	43.25778, -79.86167	65	Northwest, generally upwind	PM <sub>2.5</sub> , NO <sub>2</sub> , NO, SO <sub>2</sub> , CO, O <sub>3</sub>

(1) Data was not available for the 2014 year for the St. Catharines station; therefore, 2013 was included in the background air quality assessment.

There are no monitoring data available for SPM and PM<sub>10</sub>, however, an estimate of the SPM and PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations can be calculated from the available PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring data. The mean levels of PM<sub>2.5</sub> in Canadian locations are found to be about 54% of the PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations and about 30% of the SPM concentrations (Lall et al., 2004). By applying this ratio, it was possible to estimate the SPM and PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations for the monitoring stations.

The air flow into the Facility is predominantly from the southwest. The closest air quality monitoring station is located the St. Catharines station. This station is generally downwind of the Facility and is likely the most representative station of the area due to proximity to the Facility, however not all indicator compounds are monitored at this station. The Simcoe station has SO<sub>2</sub> data and is generally upwind of the Facility, however the station is located approximately 85 km away. Although the Hamilton station is closer to the Facility than the Simcoe Station, the air quality monitoring data from the Simcoe station is likely more representative of air quality in the area of the Facility given its surrounding land use which is a mix of rural, residential and few industrial facilities. CO is not monitored at the St. Catharines or the Simcoe station. Due to decreasing trends in CO levels in the province over the past ten years (MECP, 2018a), there are few stations that currently monitor CO. The closest station to the Facility with monitoring data for CO is the Hamilton station.

Table 3 summarizes monitoring data for the years 2014 through 2018 that were considered for this assessment. The 90th percentile of the 1 hour, 8-hour, and 24-hour measurements are typically used to represent the existing air quality value when conducting an impact assessment and the annual average concentration is used for annual background levels (Alberta Environment 2013) therefore Table 3 provides these values.

**Table 3: Summary of Air Quality Station Data**

Indicator	Averaging Period	Assessment Criteria (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	Concentration (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		
			St. Catharines	Simcoe	Hamilton
SPM	24-hour	120	41.89	44.69	—
	Annual	60	23.11	23.18	—
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-hour	50	23.27	24.83	—
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24-hour	27	12.57 <sup>(b)</sup>	13.41	—
	Annual	8.8	6.93 <sup>(b)</sup>	6.96	—
NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>(a)</sup>	1-Hour	79/400	26.33	11.29	—
	24-Hour	200	22.36	10.97	—
	Annual	22.6	12.84	6.77	—
SO <sub>2</sub> <sup>(a)</sup>	1-Hour	170.3/690	—	2.62	—
	24-Hour	275/150	—	2.62	—
	Annual	10.5/55	—	1.17	—
CO <sup>(a)</sup>	1-Hour	36,200/15,000	—	—	435.19
	8-Hour	15,700/6,000	—	—	553.15
O <sub>3</sub> <sup>(a)</sup>	1-Hour	—	88.31	92.24	—

(a) Data measured in parts per billion (ppb) or parts per million (ppm), were converted to µg/m<sup>3</sup> assuming standard temperature and pressure (25°C and one atmosphere of pressure).

(b) No data was available at the St. Catharines station for 2014, hence the data for 2013, 2015-2018 was assessed instead.

## 2.2 Industrial Emissions Sources

There are eight industrial facilities that reported CACs to the National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI) within a 5 km radius of the Facility in 2018 (ECCC 2020). Of those eight facilities, four reported contaminants in common with the Facility. The 2018 reported data is the most recent data available as the 2019 reported data has not yet been finalized. Reporting facilities and emission totals are summarized in Table 4. These emissions contribute to the local air quality and the consideration of cumulative effects. Overall, the data shows that there are not many industrial sources of air emissions located close to the Facility in comparison to the locations of some of the monitoring stations referenced above. Therefore, the monitoring data described above is likely a conservative representation of the existing air quality in the area of the Facility.

**Table 4: 2018 Air Releases for Industry within 5 km of the Facility**

Company Name	Site Name	Distance to the Site (km)	Direction from the Site	Releases to Air (tonnes)					
				NO <sub>x</sub>	SO <sub>2</sub>	CO	SPM	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
IMT Partnership	Forge Division	2	South southeast	—	—	—	—	0.44	0.44
Vale Canada Limited	Port Colborne Refinery	2.5	South southwest	—	—	—	—	1.37	0.2
ADM Agri-Industries Company	ADM Agri-Industries ADM Milling Co. - Port Colborne.	3.6	South southwest	—	—	—	41.37	38.41	18.95
Jungbunzlauer Canada Inc.	Jungbunzlauer Canada Inc.	2.1	North northwest	225.08	—	55.04	27.29	25.76	25.14
Total (Facilities within 5 km)				225.08	—	55.04	68.66	30.98	44.73
Ontario Total				61,793	140,545	65,181	20,108	13,850	8,104
Emissions from Facilities within 5 km as a Percentage of Ontario Total				<1%	—	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%

## 2.3 Summary of Existing Air Quality

Table 5 summarizes the existing air quality in the area surrounding the Facility, to be added to the dispersion modelling predictions as part of the air quality impacts assessment. The 90th percentile of the 1 hour, 8-hour, and 24-hour measurements are typically used to represent the existing air quality value when conducting an impact assessment and the annual average concentration is used for annual background levels (Alberta Environment 2013) therefore Table 5 provides these values. The St. Catharines station is the only air quality monitoring station located 30 km downwind of the Facility. Due to proximity and general air flow direction, data from the St. Catharines station is considered the most representative of the air quality surrounding the Facility, and therefore is used for indicator compounds monitored at that station. Monitored SO<sub>2</sub> data from the Simcoe station is used as it is more representative of air quality in the area of the Facility given its similar elevation and has fewer industrial influences than the Hamilton station. The CO data from Hamilton is conservatively being used to represent existing air quality since the St Catharines and Simcoe stations do not have CO monitoring data. Existing crystalline silica concentrations were estimated as 6% of the existing SPM concentration (US EPA, 1996).

**Table 5: Existing Air Quality Concentrations**

Indicator	Averaging Period	Assessment Criteria (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	Air Quality Concentration (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )
SPM	24-hour	120	41.89
	Annual	60	23.11
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-hour	50	23.27
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24-hour	27	12.57
	Annual	8.8	6.93
Crystalline silica (<10 µm)	24-Hour	5	2.51
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour	79/400	26.33
	24-Hour	200	22.36
	Annual	22.6	12.84
SO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour	170.3/690	2.62
	24-Hour	275/150	2.62
	Annual	10.5/55	1.17
CO	1-Hour	36,200/15,000	435.19
	8-Hour	15,700/6,000	553.15
O <sub>3</sub>	1-Hour	—	88.31

### 3.0 EMISSION RATE ESTIMATES

The Facility is an active quarry that can process up to 4,500 tonnes of material per day. One to three blasts per week produce approximately 6.2 to 28 thousand tonnes of aggregate per blast. A loader transfers blasted aggregate from the working face of Pit 3 into haul trucks which travel to the processing plant located within Pit 1. The haul trucks travel along haul roads within the Facility property, crossing Snider and Babion roads en-route to Pit 1. Aggregate is processed first through the crushing plant, with smaller sized material passing through to the wash plant. Finished materials are stored in stockpiles before being hauled off-site for distribution. Supporting equipment include diesel dewatering pumps. Figures 3a to 3e illustrate the layout of the Site through the Pit 3 Extension phases.

Activities occur Monday to Friday, for approximately 10 hours per day, from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm. During the busy season (June, July and August), the Facility may operate on Saturdays, from 7:00 am to 3:00 pm. Blasting does not take place on weekends. Shipping can occur year-round, but there are no blasting or aggregate processing activities in the months of January and February.

#### 3.1 Extraction Phasing

During the Pit 3 Extension, the quarry expansion will begin from the existing Pit 3 and proceed from west to east during Phase 1 (refer to Figure 4 – Pit 3 Extension: Extraction Phasing). Upon reaching the extraction boundary at Miller Road, the expansion will return to the edge of the existing Pit 3 and then proceed again from west to east during Phase 2. Phase 3 will be extracted from south to north proceeding from the northern area of Phase 2.

PCQ is planning to relocate the crushing plant and wash plant to Pit 3. However, the air quality assessment of the expansion phases was carried out assuming the crushing plant and wash plant continue to operate in Pit 1 as that results in the maximum distance between the extraction area and the crushing plant and wash plant. This results in the longest haul road lengths for emission rate estimates and dispersion modelling, and thus represents a conservative worst-case scenario.

Emission rate estimates are provided below for each of the main emission sources at the Facility.

#### 3.2 Crushing Plant

The crushing plant can process up to 4,500 tonnes of material per day.

Emission factors for SPM and PM10 were obtained from US EPA AP-42 Chapter 11.19.2 – Crushed Stone Processing, Table 11.19.2-1 (U.S. EPA, 2006). Controlled emission factors were used if available; if controlled emission factors were not available, a control efficiency was applied, where applicable.

The following equation was used to estimate the daily emission rates for particulates:

$$\text{Daily Emission Rate } \left[ \frac{\text{g}}{\text{s}} \right] = \text{Emission Factor } \left[ \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{Mg}} \right] \times \text{Daily Throughput } \left[ \frac{\text{tonne}}{\text{day}} \right] \times \text{Conversion Factors}$$

Daily emission rates were converted to hourly emission rates using the operating hours per day. The following is a sample calculation for the maximum hourly SPM emission rate from haul trucks unloading at the grizzly feeder:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hourly SPM Emission Rate} &= 0.000008 \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{Mg}} \times 4500 \frac{\text{tonnes}}{\text{day}} \times \frac{1000 \text{ g}}{1 \text{ kg}} \times \frac{1 \text{ day}}{10 \text{ hr}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}} \\ \text{ER} &= 1.00\text{E} - 03 \text{ g/s} \end{aligned}$$

### 3.3 Wash Plant

No emissions are expected as material processed in the wash plant is completely saturated with water.

### 3.4 Stockpiles

Material is stored in stockpiles after processing. The U.S. EPA AP 42 emission factors from U.S. EPA Control of Open Fugitive Dust Source (EPA 45/3 88 008), September 1988, Page 4 17 were used to calculate the fugitive dust emissions associated with the storage piles. The following predictive emissions equation was used in determining the emission factors for material handling:

$$EF = 1.9 \times \left(\frac{s}{1.5}\right) \times \left(\frac{f}{15}\right) \times \text{scaling factor} \times (1 - \text{control efficiency})$$

Where:

EF = particulate emission factor (kg/ha/day),

s = silt loading (%),

f = percent of time the wind speed is greater than 5.4 m/s (%),

Scaling factor = a particle size multiplier for particulate matter, and

Control efficiency = reduction of fugitive dust emissions due to implementation of a BMP for fugitive dust.

The emission rate is a function of wind speed, and the equation assumes that there are no emissions generated when the wind speed is lower than 5.4 m/s (19.3 km/h). The percent of time the wind speed is greater than 5.4 m/s (16.52%) was obtained from the MECP pre-processed meteorological data (1996 2000) used for the dispersion modelling assessment.

The following is a sample calculation for the SPM emission factor for emissions that will occur from one of the stockpiles. The silt content for limestone products of 3.9% from Table 13.2.4 1 of the U.S. EPA AP 42 Section 13.2.4 was used.

$$EF = 1.9 \times \left(\frac{3.9}{1.5}\right) \times \left(\frac{16.52}{15}\right) \times 1$$

$$EF = 5.441 \frac{kg}{ha - day}$$

The following is a sample calculation for the SPM emission rate for one of the stockpiles. A control efficiency of 75% (obtained from the Western Regional Air Partnership Fugitive Dust Handbook, Table 9-4) (WRAP, 2006) was selected to represent the implementation of a fugitive dust best management practices plan (BMPP).

$$ER = EF \times A \times \frac{1 \text{ ha}}{10,000 \text{ m}^2} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}} \times \frac{1,000 \text{ g}}{1 \text{ kg}} \times \frac{1 \text{ day}}{24 \text{ hr}} \times (1 - \text{control efficiency})$$

Where:

EF = particulate emission factor (kg/ha/day)

A = exposed area (m<sup>2</sup>)

Control efficiency = reduction of fugitive dust emissions due to implementation of a BMPP

$$ER = 5.441 \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{ha} - \text{day}} \times 347 \text{ m}^2 \times \frac{1 \text{ ha}}{10,000 \text{ m}^2} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}} \times \frac{1,000 \text{ g}}{1 \text{ kg}} \times \frac{1 \text{ day}}{24 \text{ hr}} \times (1 - 75\%)$$

$$ER = 5.45\text{E} - 04 \text{ g/s}$$

The emission rates of PM10 and PM2.5 were calculated as presented above based on scaling factors provided in AP-42 Chapter 13.2.5 Industrial Wind Erosion as summarized in Table 6.

**Table 6: Particle Size Multipliers for Wind Erosion**

Size Range	k
SPM	1
PM10	0.5
PM2.5	0.075

### 3.5 Vehicles – Paved Road Dust

Vehicles (aggregate shipping trucks and passenger vehicles) enter and exit the site along a paved stretch of road that is approximately 92.7 m long. The U.S. EPA AP 42 emission factors from Chapter 13.2.1 – Paved Roads (January 2011) were used to calculate the fugitive dust emissions from paved roadways. The following predictive emissions equation was used to estimate the fugitive dust emission factor for paved roads:

$$EF = (k(sL)^{0.91} \times (W)^{1.02}) (1 - \text{control efficiency})$$

Where:

EF = particulate emission factor (having units matching the units of k),

K = particle size multiplier for particle size range and units of interest (see Table 7),

sL = road surface silt loading (g/m<sup>2</sup>) assumed to be 8.2 (as per U.S. EPA AP 42 Section 13.2.1 3, silt loading for Quarries),

W = average weight (tons) of the vehicles traveling the road, and

control efficiency = reduction of fugitive dust emissions due to implementation of a BMPP for fugitive dust.

**Table 7: Particle Size Assumptions for Paved Road Dust**

Size Range	k (g/VKT)
SPM	3.23
PM10	0.62
PM2.5	0.15

The following is a sample calculation for SPM for the predictive emission factor for vehicles that will travel along the main site access road. It was estimated that the mean vehicle weight on the main site access road is 18.22 tons. A control efficiency of 75% was selected to represent the implementation of a fugitive dust BMPP as per the Australian National Pollutant Inventory Emission Estimation Technique Manual for Mining (Version 3.1, January 2012).

$$EF = (3.23 \times (8.2)^{0.91} \times (18.22)^{1.02})(1 - 75\%)$$

$$EF = 105.81 \text{ g/VKT}$$

The following is a sample calculation for the hourly SPM emission rate for vehicles travelling along the same paved road segment:

$$ER = \frac{105.81 \text{ g}}{\text{VKT}} \times \frac{3.5 \text{ VKT}}{\text{day}} \times \frac{1 \text{ day}}{10 \text{ hr}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3600 \text{ s}}$$

$$ER = 1.04\text{E} - 02 \text{ g/s}$$

The emission rates of PM10 and PM2.5 were calculated as presented above.

### 3.6 Vehicles – Unpaved Road Dust

Roads within the quarry are unpaved. The predictive equation in U.S. EPA AP 42 Chapter 13.2.2 – Unpaved Roads (November 2006) was used to calculate the fugitive dust emissions from unpaved roadways. The equation accounts for a control efficiency for the implementation of dust control measures. The equation is as follows:

$$EF = \left( k \left( \frac{s}{12} \right)^a \times \left( \frac{W}{3} \right)^b \times 281.9 \right) (1 - \text{control efficiency})$$

Where:

EF = particulate emission factor (g/VKT)

k = empirical constant for particle size range (pounds (lbs) per vehicle mile travelled (VMT)) (see Table 8)

s = road surface silt content (%) assumed to be 4.8% (as per U.S. EPA AP 42 Section 13.2.2 for Sand and Gravel Processing Plant Roads)

W = average weight (tons) of the vehicles traveling the road,

a = empirical constant for particle size range (dimensionless) (see Table 8)

b = empirical constant for particle size range (dimensionless) (see Table 8)

281.9 = conversion from pounds per vehicle miles travelled to grams per vehicle kilometres travelled

control efficiency = reduction of fugitive dust emissions of 75% due to implementation of a fugitive dust BMPP (as per the Australian National Pollutant Inventory Emission Estimation Technique Manual for Mining, Version 3.1, January 2012).



**Table 8: Particle Size Assumptions for Unpaved Road Dust**

Size Range	k (lb/VMT)	a	b
SPM	4.9	0.7	0.45
PM10	1.5	0.9	0.45
PM2.5	0.15	0.9	0.45

The following is a sample calculation for SPM for the emission factor for vehicles that will travel along unpaved roads within the quarry. It was estimated that the loaders will have an average weight of 50.06 tons. A control efficiency of 75% was selected to represent the implementation of a BMPP which will include road watering and a speed limit.

$$EF = \left( 4.9 \left( \frac{4.8}{12} \right)^{0.7} \times \left( \frac{50.06}{3} \right)^{0.45} \times 281.9 \right) (1 - 75\%)$$

$$EF = 645.26 \text{ g/VKT}$$

The following is a sample calculation for the hourly SPM emission rate for loaders travelling along the same unpaved road segment:

$$ER = \frac{645.26 \text{ g}}{\text{VKT}} \times \frac{3.0 \text{ VKT}}{\text{hr}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3600 \text{ s}}$$

$$ER = 0.54 \text{ g/s}$$

The emission rates of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> were calculated as presented above.

### 3.7 On Road Vehicles – Exhaust Emissions

Shipping trucks operating at the Facility transport aggregate offsite to various customers. Emission rates for the vehicle exhaust from these shipping trucks were estimated using the U.S. EPA exhaust emission standards for Heavy-Duty Highway Compression-Ignition Engines and Urban Buses (U.S. EPA 2016). There are also some passenger vehicles (e.g., personal cars, company pick-up trucks, etc.) which will travel through the pits along haul roads. Emissions from passenger vehicles were estimated using the U.S. EPA's emission standards for light duty vehicle emissions (U.S. EPA 2019).

Vehicles at the Facility meet Tier 3 emission standards at minimum. Emission standards are not provided for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, therefore it was assumed that SPM emissions from vehicle exhaust consist of PM<sub>10</sub> and that PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are 97% of PM<sub>10</sub> emissions per U.S. EPA 2010a.

The following predictive emissions equation was used to estimate the combustion emission rates for shipping trucks:

$$ER = EF \times \text{engine brake horsepower rating} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}}$$

Where:

ER = emission rate (g/s)

EF = emission factor (g/bhp hr).

The following predictive emissions equation was used to estimate the combustion emission rates for passenger vehicles:

$$ER = EF \times \text{distance travelled per hour} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}}$$

Where:

ER = emission rate (g/s)

EF = emission factor (g/mile travelled).

The following is a sample calculation for the NO<sub>x</sub> emissions for a shipping truck:

$$ER = \frac{2.00E-01 \text{ g}}{\text{bhp} - \text{hr}} \times 310.69 \text{ bhp} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}}$$

$$ER = 1.73E-02 \text{ g/s}$$

The emission rates for SPM, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and CO were calculated using the same general equation.

### 3.8 Non Road Engines – Exhaust Emissions

Emission rates for heavy-duty off-road equipment were estimated using the U.S. EPA NON-ROAD model. NON-ROAD uses the emission factors provided in documents published by U.S. EPA (2010a, 2010b). Emission factors are not provided for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, therefore it was assumed that SPM emissions from vehicle exhaust consist of PM<sub>10</sub> and that PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are 97% of PM<sub>10</sub> emissions per U.S. EPA 2010a.

The following predictive emissions equation was used to estimate the combustion emission rates for on-site non-road vehicles:

$$ER = EF \times \text{engine horsepower rating} \times \text{load factor} \times \text{Number of equipment} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}}$$

Where:

ER = emission rate (g/s)

EF = emission factor (g/hp hr).

The calculation method follows that of the U.S. EPA NON-ROAD model for selecting the appropriate emission factor and load factors for heavy-duty equipment. Non-road vehicles and diesel engines at the Facility meet Tier 3 emission standards at minimum. The loader operating at the face of the extraction area meets Tier 4 emission standards. Emission factors vary depending on the sulphur content of the fuel, the emission type, the equipment type, and the equipment make, model and year. The emission factors are found using the methods in Exhaust and Crankcase Emission Factors for Nonroad Engine Modelling – Compression Ignition – Report No. NR 009d (U.S. EPA 2010a). The load factor is determined by the type of equipment defined in Median Life, Annual Activity, and Load Factor Values for Non-road Engine Emissions Modelling – Report No. NR-005d (U.S. EPA 2010b).

The following is a sample calculation for the SPM emissions for one of the loaders:

$$ER = \frac{1.36E-02 \text{ g}}{\text{hp} - \text{hr}} \times 540 \text{ hp} \times 0.59 \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}}$$

The emission rates for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and CO were calculated using the same general equation.

### 3.9 Material Handling

At the extraction face, loaders are used to load blasted material into haul trucks, which transport the aggregate to the crushing plant. Loaders are also used to load processed aggregate from the Pit 1 stockpiles into shipping trucks. Similar drop operations occur at the crushing plant where processed materials drop from stacker conveyors onto stockpiles. Potential emissions from these drop operations include particulate matter because of the disturbance of material during handling. Extraction face loading and crushing plant operations typically occur Monday to Friday from March to December and on Saturdays from June to August. Loading at the Pit 1 stockpiles can take place year-round.

Predictive emission factors for particulate emissions were developed using the drop operation equation from the U.S. EPA AP 42 Section 13.2.4 Aggregate Handling and Storage Piles (November 2006), which is dependent on wind speed. The following predictive emissions equation was used in determining the emission factors for material handling:

$$EF = k \times 0.0016 \times \frac{\left(\frac{U}{2.2}\right)^{1.3}}{\left(\frac{M}{2}\right)^{1.4}}$$

Where:

- EF = particulate emission factor (kg/Mg)
- k = particle size multiplier for particle size range (see Table 9)
- U = mean wind speed (m/s)
- M = moisture content of material (percent) (%).

**Table 9: Particle Size Multiplier**

Size Range	k
SPM	0.80
PM10	0.35
PM2.5	0.053

The following is a sample calculation for the SPM emission factor from the material handling of aggregate in Pit 1. A maximum wind speed of 19 m/s obtained from the MECF pre-processed meteorological data (1996 2000) was used for this sample calculation. A moisture content of 2.1% for various limestone products was obtained from Table 13.2.4.1 of the U.S. EPA AP 42.

$$EF = 0.80 \times 0.0016 \times \frac{\left(\frac{19}{2.2}\right)^{1.3}}{\left(\frac{2.1}{2}\right)^{1.4}}$$

$$EF = 1.97E - 02 \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{Mg}}$$

The following is a sample calculation for the hourly SPM emission rate for a material handling rate of 756 tonnes/day and based on a wind speed of 19 m/s.

$$ER = \frac{1.97E-02 \text{ kg}}{\text{Mg}} \times \frac{756 \text{ Mg}}{\text{day}} \times \frac{1 \text{ day}}{10 \text{ hr}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}} \times \frac{1,000 \text{ g}}{1 \text{ kg}}$$

$$ER = 4.14E-01 \frac{\text{g}}{\text{s}}$$

Since material handling emissions are based on wind speed, they were modelled using hourly emission rate files to account for both varying wind speed and time of day of operations. Therefore, an emission rate for every material handling source was calculated as presented above, for every hour between 7 am and 5 pm using the specific hourly wind speeds from the MECP pre-processed meteorological data. The emission rates of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> were also estimated as presented above and for every hour in the meteorological data. Extraction rates are not anticipated to increase with the proposed pit expansion.

### 3.10 Drilling

There will be drilling in the Pit 3 expansion prior to blasting. This is expected to result in emissions of fugitive dust, consisting of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Emission rates of particulate matter from drilling are based on emission factors obtained from the U.S. EPA AP-42 Chapter 11.9 Western Surface Coal Mining (U.S. EPA 1998). The equation used to estimate the emission rates is as follows:

$$ER = EF \times \text{Holes} \times \left(1 - \frac{C}{100}\right) \times \frac{1000 \text{ g}}{\text{kg}} \times \text{Conversion to g/s}$$

Where:

ER = emission rate of particulate matter (g/s)

EF = emission factor (kg/hole)

Holes = number of holes drilled (holes/hour)

C = emission reduction factor of the control technology

The following is a sample calculation for the hourly SPM emission rate.

$$ER = \frac{0.59 \text{ kg}}{\text{hole}} \times \frac{10 \text{ holes}}{\text{hour}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}} \times \frac{1,000 \text{ g}}{1 \text{ kg}} \times (1 - 0.99)$$

$$ER = 1.64E-02 \frac{\text{g}}{\text{s}}$$

In this equation, drilling emission factors are only available for SPM. For the purpose of the assessment, an emission factor for PM<sub>10</sub> was estimated from the SPM drilling factor based on the ratio between the SPM and PM<sub>10</sub> emission factors for tertiary crushing (uncontrolled) from U.S. EPA AP-42 Chapter 11.19.2 - Crushed Stone Processing and Pulverized Mineral Processing (U.S. EPA 2004). Similarly, an emission factor for PM<sub>2.5</sub> was estimated from SPM based on the ratio between the SPM and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission factors for tertiary crushing (controlled) from U.S. EPA (2004).

A maximum drilling rate of 10 holes/hour was used in estimate the emissions from drilling activities. Emissions are controlled by a vacuum bag dust collector equipped with a fabric filter, therefore a 99% control factor was applied to the calculations, as per the Australian National Pollutant Inventory Emission Estimation Technique Manual for Mining, Version 3.1, January 2012.

### 3.11 Blasting – Particulate

Blasting activities will generate fugitive dust emissions, including SPM, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. An equation from U.S. EPA AP-42 Chapter 11.9 Western Surface Coal Mining (U.S. EPA 1998) was used to calculate the fugitive dust emissions associated with blasting activities. The equation is as follows:

$$E = 0.00022 \times A^{1.5} \times SF$$

Where:

E = emission factor (kg/blast)

A = horizontal area (m<sup>2</sup>)

SF = scaling factor for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> only

The following is a sample calculation for the hourly SPM emission rate.

$$ER = \frac{3.65 \text{ kg}}{\text{blast}} \times \frac{1 \text{ blast}}{\text{day}} \times \frac{1 \text{ day}}{6 \text{ hrs}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}} \times \frac{1,000 \text{ g}}{1 \text{ kg}}$$

$$ER = 1.69\text{E} - 01 \frac{\text{g}}{\text{s}}$$

As the blasting emission factor was only available for SPM, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission factors were estimated using scaling factors ratios obtained from the US EPA Chapter 11.9 (US EPA 1998) summarized in Table 10.

**Table 10: Blasting Fugitive Emissions Scaling Factors for Particulate Matter**

Parameter	SPM	PM10	PM2.5
Scaling factor	1	0.52	0.03

There will be at most one blast per day. There are no emission control measures for blasting considered in the assessment.

### 3.12 Blasting – Combustion Gases

Blasting will result in emissions of combustion gases (CO, NOX, SO<sub>2</sub>) from the detonation of emulsion-ammonium-nitrate and fuel oil (ANFO) blend explosives. Emission factors from the Australian National Pollutant Inventory document “Explosives Detonation and Firing Ranges 3.1, August 2016” were applied. The explosives blend is comprised predominantly of emulsion, and the maximum diameter of the drilled holes at the quarry will be no larger than 102 mm. Therefore, the emulsion emission factors for holes <150 mm were applied. The equation is as follows:

$$ER = EF \times \text{Hourly Throughput} \times \frac{1000 \text{ g}}{\text{kg}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3600 \text{ s}}$$

Where:

ER = emission rate (g/s)

EF = emission factor (kg/tonne explosive)

The following is a sample calculation for the hourly NO<sub>x</sub> emission rate.

$$ER = \frac{0.2 \text{ kg}}{\text{tonne explosive}} \times \frac{6160 \text{ kg explosive}}{\text{blast}} \times \frac{1 \text{ tonnes explosive}}{1000 \text{ kg}} \times \frac{1 \text{ blast}}{\text{hour}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{3,600 \text{ s}} \times \frac{1,000 \text{ g}}{1 \text{ kg}}$$

$$ER = 3.42\text{E} - 01 \frac{\text{g}}{\text{s}}$$

The emission rates SO<sub>2</sub> and CO were calculated using the same general equation.

### 3.13 Summary of Emissions

Table A1 in Appendix A summarizes the 1-hour and 24-hour averaged emission rates used in the Air Quality Assessment, in g/s, which were estimated for each activity as described above.

## 4.0 DISPERSION MODELLING

The likely environmental effects for the air quality indicators were evaluated using the AERMOD air dispersion model developed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). AERMOD is recognized by federal and Ontario regulators as one of the regulatory dispersion models and is suitable to model pit and quarry activities.

AERMOD consists of the model and two pre-processors; the AERMET meteorological pre-processor and the AERMAP terrain pre-processor. The following approved dispersion model and pre-processors were used in the assessment:

- AERMOD dispersion model (v. 19191); and
- AERMAP surface pre-processor (v. 18081).

AERMET was not used since pre-processed meteorological datasets were obtained from the MECP. Dispersion modelling was completed considering guidance from the MECP Guide “*Air Dispersion Modelling Guideline for Ontario*” (ADMGO) dated February 2017 (MECP, 2017).

### 4.1 Model Development

The AERMOD dispersion modelling system was developed by the U.S. EPA as a replacement to the long standing Industrial Source Complex (ISC) model, as the model recommended by the U.S. EPA for regulatory applications in the United States. This model has also been adopted in Ontario as the regulatory model recommended for permitting and regulatory applications (MECP, 2017). The model is generally based on Gaussian plume dispersion theory (U.S. EPA 2004a), but also incorporates a series of specific algorithms to reflect current understanding of dispersion theory (U.S. EPA 2004a).

### 4.2 Model Calibration

Regulatory dispersion models do not readily lend themselves to modification to incorporate site specific characteristics in the equations themselves. However, the model does require site specific meteorological data to operate. Digital terrain data for the site and surrounding area are also required inputs to the AERMAP pre-processor and used to characterize how the local topography could affect the dispersion of air contaminants. If buildings are present at a site, building heights are required inputs to assess building downwash using the BPIP pre-processor.

### 4.3 Model Validation

Part of the rigorous process used by the U.S. EPA prior to adopting AERMOD as a regulatory model (U.S. EPA 2004a) was a significant peer review process to confirm that the model could accurately predict ground level concentrations when compared to monitoring data (U.S. EPA 2003, 2004a).

## 4.4 Model Uncertainty and Sensitivity

Dispersion models employ assumptions that simplify the random processes associated with atmospheric motions and turbulence. While this simplification limits the model's ability to replicate individual events, the strength of the model lies in the ability to predict overall values for a given set of meteorological conditions. The process undertaken by the U.S. EPA ensured that the model predictions can be relied on as reasonable estimates of the likely concentrations. AERMOD is based on known theory and has been proven to reliably produce repeatable results. To limit the uncertainty associated with emissions input to the model, conservative assumptions were made where practical (see Table 11 below). Finally, five years of publicly available meteorological data obtained from the MECP (MECP, 2020) are used as an input to the model so that a full range of possible meteorological conditions is evaluated.



**Table 11: Reliability Summary for the AERMOD Dispersion Model**

Model Name	Developer	Use in Assessment	Development	Calibration	Validation	Uncertainty and Sensitivity
AERMOD (Version 19191)	United States Environmental Protection Agency	Predict air quality concentrations and deposition	<p>AERMOD was developed to replace the long-standing ISC model as the model recommended by the U.S. EPA.</p> <p>AERMOD is based on Gaussian plume dispersion theory (U.S. EPA 2004a) that has been used for more than 30 years.</p> <p>The application of specific algorithms has been updated to reflect current understanding of dispersion theory (U.S. EPA 2004a).</p>	<p>Site-specific meteorological data were used in the modelling (Section 4.5.1).</p> <p>Digital terrain data for the site and surrounding area input to the model (Section 4.5.2).</p>	<p>AERMOD has been adopted by the U.S. EPA as it is preferred and recommended dispersion model (U.S. EPA 2005). Prior to adoption, the U.S. EPA completed a rigorous review of the model performance (U.S. EPA 2003, 2005).</p>	<p>AERMOD is based on known theory, and proven to reliably produce repeatable results.</p> <p>Uncertainty associated with emissions is managed by making conservative assumptions.</p> <p>Model predictions are sensitive to fluctuations in the meteorology, which can be managed by using a five-year data set.</p> <p>Five years of data should include the full range of possible meteorological conditions.</p>

## 4.5 Model Inputs

To predict ambient air concentrations using AERMOD, a series of inputs are required that parameterize the sources of emissions as well as their transport. These inputs can be grouped into the categories listed below:

- Meteorological data;
- Terrain and receptors;
- Building downwash; and
- Emissions and model source configurations.

Each of these input categories are discussed separately in the following sections.

### 4.5.1 Meteorological Data

The MECP, as well as other agencies, recommends that five years of hourly data be used in the model to cover a wide range of potential meteorological conditions (MECP, 2017). In this assessment, the AERMOD model was run using a MECP pre-processed five year dispersion meteorological dataset (i.e., surface and profile files), last updated in 2020, in accordance with paragraph 1 of s.13(1) of O.Reg.419/05. As the Facility is located in the West Central MECP Region – Hamilton, Niagara, Guelph, the meteorological dataset for West Central (“London”) Crops is used (MECP 2020). The data set covers the period of January 1996 to December 2000.

### 4.5.2 Terrain and Modelling Receptors

Terrain elevations have the potential to influence air quality concentrations at individual receptors, therefore surrounding terrain data is required when using regulatory dispersion models in both simple and complex terrain situations (U.S. EPA 2004a). Digital terrain data is used in the AERMAP pre-processor to determine the base elevations of receptors, sources and buildings. AERMAP then searches the terrain height and location that has the greatest influence on dispersion for each receptor (U.S. EPA 2004a). This is referred to as the hill height scale. The base elevation and hill height scale produced by AERMAP are directly inserted into the AERMOD input file.

#### 4.5.2.1 Digital Terrain Data

Digital terrain data was obtained from the MECP (NED GeoTIFF format) (MECP 2020). The GeoTIFF file used in this assessment was cdem\_dem\_030L.tif.

#### 4.5.2.2 Model Receptors

For this air quality impact assessment, a modified version of the receptor placement recommended in Section 7.1 of the MECP ADMGO (MECP 2017) was chosen to reduce computing time, specifically:

- a) 20 m spacing, within an area of 200 m by 200 m;
- b) 50 m spacing, within an area surrounding the area described in (a) with a boundary at 300 m by 300 m outside the boundary of the area described in (a);
- c) 100 m spacing, within an area surrounding the area described in (b) with a boundary at 800 m by 800 m outside the boundary of the area described in (a);

- d) 200 m spacing, within an area surrounding the area described in (c) with a boundary at 1,800 m by 1,800 m outside the boundary of the area described in (a);
- e) Receptors at property line vertices; and
- f) Receptors at sensitive receptors (private dwellings).

This modified receptor placement is expected to provide an accurate representation of the off-property concentrations as the highest concentrations are expected to be off-site, just beyond the property line. The area of modeling coverage is illustrated in Figure 5 – Air Quality Dispersion Modelling Grid Receptors and Figure 6 - Air Quality Dispersion Modelling Sensitive Receptors.

### 4.5.3 Building Downwash

Building downwash was not considered in this assessment since sources are modelled as volume sources and area sources, to which building wake effects do not apply.

### 4.5.4 Emissions and Model Source Configurations

#### 4.5.4.1 Volume Sources

Volume sources are used to model releases from a variety of industrial sources that cannot be classified as a being releases from a dedicated stack or from a large, fixed area, such as a pit or stockpile. The MECP has suggested that roads should be modelled as a series of individual volume sources creating a line that follows the road (MECP 2017). On-site roads were modelled using this volume source approach. The roads were divided into contiguous volume sources with release heights assumed to be half the plume height (plume height is calculated as  $1.7 \times$  vehicle height as per US EPA, 2012)). Road widths varied depending on the route. The emission rate for the entire road segment was divided amongst the total volume sources for the entire segment. There are four paved routes and two unpaved road routes considered in each of the operational scenarios.

Line volume sources were also used to represent emissions from operations of loaders moving around the crushing plant, wash plant, and at the extraction face since these activities are not stationary. This approach accounts for the effects of turbulence from the loader movements on the loader exhaust and dust emissions. The volume source parameters for roads and moving loaders are summarized in Table A2 in Appendix A.

The emissions from the crushing plant, material handling activities and truck loading were modelled as single volume sources. Separate volume sources were also used to model diesel combustion emissions from each of two pit dewatering pumps at the Facility, since exhaust stack information for the pumps was not available. The source parameters for these individual volumes are also summarized in Table A2.

#### 4.5.4.2 Area Sources

Area sources are used to model low level or ground releases of emissions to the atmosphere that are distributed over a fixed area. Emissions from wind erosion of stockpiles located in and around the crushing plant and wash plant, and stockpiles to the east of the crushing plant were modelled as three separate rectangular area sources ("CRUSHWIND", "WASHWIND" and "WESTWIND") as per guidance from the National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association (NSSGA, 2004). Emissions from blasting were modelled as a polygonal area source ("BLAST"). The effective height and initial vertical dimension used for each source are provided in Table A2 in Appendix A.

Locations of the model sources for each scenario are presented in Figure 3A through 3E.

## 4.6 Summary of Model Options

The options used in the AERMOD model are summarized in Table 12.

**Table 12: Options Used in the AERMOD Model**

Modelling Parameter	Description	Used in Concentration Modelling?
DFAULT	Specifies that regulatory default options will be used.	Yes
CONC	Specifies that concentration values will be calculated.	Yes
OLM	Specifies that the non-default Ozone Limiting Method for NO <sub>2</sub> conversion will be used.	No - NO <sub>2</sub> is converted during post processing, as described in Section 4.7.2
DDEP (DRYDPLT)	Specifies that dry deposition will be calculated.	Yes – for particulates, silica
WDEP	Specifies that wet deposition will be calculated.	No - assessment is more conservative if this option is not selected
FLAT	Specifies that the non-default option of assuming flat terrain will be used.	No - the model will use elevated terrain as detailed in the AERMAP output.
NOSTD	Specifies that the non-default option of no stack-tip downwash will be used.	No
AVERTIME	Time averaging periods calculated.	1-hr, 8-hr, 24-hr, annual
URBANOPT	Allows the model to incorporate the effects of increased surface heating from an urban area on pollutant dispersion under stable atmospheric conditions.	No
URBANROUGHNESS	Specifies the urban roughness length (m).	No
FLAGPOLE	Specifies that receptor heights above local ground level are allowed on the receptors.	No

### 4.6.1 Dry Deposition/Depletion

For modelling of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub>, crystalline silica and PM<sub>2.5</sub> the dry deposition option was selected. Particle deposition is the naturally occurring process of removing suspended particles from the air, this process occurs through 'dry deposition' and 'wet deposition'. Dry deposition refers to the gravitational settling of particles, and wet deposition refers to removal from the atmosphere by precipitation. Wet deposition was conservatively not accounted for since the meteorological datasets provided by the MECP did not contain precipitation data.

Use of the AERMOD dry depletion option requires an estimate of the mass fraction of each particle size for each emission source. This was determined using the emission rates of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The following is an example calculation for deposition parameters for modelling SPM from the Facility's main unpaved haul road (source ID HAULROAD), and the results are summarized in Table 13.

$$\text{mass fraction of } PM_{2.5} = \frac{ER_{2.5}}{ER_{SPM}} = \frac{4.10E-01 \frac{g}{s}}{1.20E+01 \frac{g}{s}} = 0.03$$

$$\text{mass fraction of } PM_{10} = \frac{ER_{PM10} - ER_{PM2.5}}{ER_{SPM}} = \frac{3.15 - 4.10E-01 \frac{g}{s}}{1.20E+01 \frac{g}{s}} = 0.23$$

$$\text{mass fraction of } SPM = 1 - \text{mass fraction of } PM_{10} - \text{mass fraction of } PM_{2.5} = 1 - 0.23 - 0.03 = 0.74$$

**Table 13: Particle Size Parameters for model source HAULROAD**

Compound	Emission Rate from Source HAULROAD (g/s)	Mass Fraction
PM	1.20E+01	0.74
PM10	3.15E+00	0.23
PM2.5	4.10E-01	0.03

A particle density of 2.7 g/cm<sup>3</sup>, which is the typical maximum density of soil, was assigned to each material handling source (i.e., crushing plant). A particle density of 1.7 g/cm<sup>3</sup>, which is the maximum density for loose sand or gravel from the US EPA (1985), was assigned to the road dust and vehicle tailpipe sources.

## 4.7 Special Modelling Considerations

### 4.7.1 Variable Emissions by Hour of Day

Blasting, extraction and crushing sources were modelled using the emission factor card for variable month, day of week and hour of day of operation (EMISFACT MHRDOW7).

Blasting (model source BLAST) only occurs between 10 am and 4 pm, and the Facility does not blast during the months of December, January or February. Therefore, the EMISFACT MHRDOW7 card was applied so that blasting emissions were modelled between 10 am to 4 pm seven days per week, but only during the months of March through November. Blasting emissions were set to 0 from December through February.

Extraction and crushing operations occur between 7 am and 5 pm, but only from March through December. No extraction or crushing occurs during January or February. In addition, the crushing plant operates at 50% of its maximum capacity during December. Therefore, the EMISFACT MHRDOW7 card was also applied to the model sources associated with extraction and crushing (sources CRUSH, EXTUG, HAULROAD, PUMP2 and PUMP3). Emissions from these sources were modelled between the hours of 7 am and 5 pm seven days per week from March to November, then a factor of 0.5 was input for the EMISFACT card for the month of December for hours between 7 am and 5 pm, to account for the 50% operating capacity. Emissions were set to 0 for January and February.

Product shipments off-site to customers can occur year-round, but only during daytime; therefore, sources associated with shipping (CRSHLOAD, PR1, PR2, PR3, PR4, SHIPROAD and WASHLOAD) were modelled using the EMISFACT HRDOW7 card, to account for emissions occurring between 7 am and 5 pm seven days per week. Emissions from shipping activities were set to 0 during evening and nighttime (i.e., between 5 pm and 7 am).

## 4.7.2 Hourly Emission Rate Files

Emissions of SPM and crystalline silica resulting from material handling activities were calculated using the drop operation equation obtained from the US EPA AP-42 Chapter 13.2.4 Aggregate Handling and Storage Piles, to consider varying wind speeds. As the material handling sources also vary by time of day and month of the year (sources CRSHDRP, SHPTRCK, and EXTLOAD), they were modelled using hourly emission rate files to account for all three variables.

Emission rates for CRSHDRP and EXTLOAD were calculated for every hour between 7 am and 5 pm using the specific hourly wind speeds from the MECP's 5-year pre-processed meteorological data set for London (crops). Emission rates were set to 0 for hours outside of 7 am and 5 pm in the meteorological dataset, and for the months of December, January and February.

Emission rates for SHPTRCK were calculated using the specific hourly wind speeds for every hour between 7 am and 5 pm for all days and months of the year (i.e., including wintertime).

## 4.8 Post Processing

Most air quality concentration predictions are output directly from the model, however there are certain parameters, including averaging periods less than 1 hour and conversion of NO<sub>2</sub> using existing regional ozone concentrations that require post processing. These post processing methods are described in the following sections.

### 4.8.1 Time Average Conversions

The smallest time scale that AERMOD predicts is a 1 hour average value. There are instances when criteria are based on different averaging times, and in these cases the following conversion factor, recommended by the MECP for conversion from a 1 hour averaging period to the applicable averaging period less than 1 hour could be used (MECP 2017). An example is given below for converting from a 1 hour averaging period to a 1/2-hour averaging period:

$$\begin{aligned}
 F &= \left( \frac{t_1}{t_0} \right)^n \\
 &= \left( \frac{60}{30} \right)^{0.28} \\
 &= 1.21
 \end{aligned}$$

Where:

F = the factor to convert from the averaging period t1 output from the model (MECP assumes AERMOD predicts true 60 minute averages) to the desired averaging period t0 (assumed to be 30 minutes in the example above), and

N = the exponent variable; in this case the MECP value of  $n = 0.28$  is used for conversion.

For averaging periods greater than 1 hour, the AERMOD output was used directly.

#### 4.8.2 Conversions of NO<sub>x</sub> to NO<sub>2</sub>

Emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) were used as inputs to the AERMOD model. Predictions of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) can be calculated from modelled NO<sub>x</sub> values using the Ozone Limiting Method (OLM). The OLM compares the maximum modelled NO<sub>x</sub> concentration to the background ozone concentration to assess the limiting factor to NO<sub>2</sub> (Cole et al. 1979). The following equations present the methodology:

If background [O<sub>3</sub>] > 0.90 [NO<sub>x</sub>], total conversion:  $[NO_2] = [NO_x]$

If background [O<sub>3</sub>] < 0.90 [NO<sub>x</sub>], NO<sub>2</sub> is limited by O<sub>3</sub>:  $[NO_2] = [O_3] + 0.10 [NO_x]$

For the air quality assessment, the background concentrations of O<sub>3</sub> used in the OLM are presented in Table 14. The 1-hour background concentration presented in Table 5 was converted to a 24-hour and annual concentration using the method detailed above in section 4.8.1.

**Table 14: Ozone concentrations used in OLM**

Averaging Period	Concentration of O3 [µg/m3]
1-hour	88.31
24-hour	36.27
Annual	6.95



## 4.9 Conservative Assumptions in Modelling Approach

Table 15 outlines the conservative assumptions in the modelling approach which results in an assessment that is not likely to under-predict the air quality associated with the Facility.

**Table 15: Conservative Assumptions in Modelling Approach**

Area	Conservative Assumption
Operations were modelled to be occurring simultaneously	The modelling assessment for the existing scenario and each expansion scenario includes all operations occurring simultaneously at maximum capacity for up to 10 hours per day. This is unlikely to occur in practice.
At grade source elevations	All sources were modelled at grade. In reality, the majority of operations occur at least 20 m below grade, which reduces the amount of particulate matter and silica escaping off-site.
Explosive usage	It was assumed that the same amount of explosive would be used in each blast. In reality, explosive usage varies and would likely be decreased as the extraction face approaches the Facility property line and sensitive receptors. The termination point for the blasting operations will be governed by the results of the on-site blasting monitoring program.
The longest haul road lengths were selected	The haul road emission rates were calculated using the maximum distance between the extraction area and crushing plant/wash plant. For the purposes of this assessment, it was assumed that the crushing plant and wash plant would remain in Pit 1 at all times.
Particle deposition/removal processes	Wet deposition (removal of particles from the atmosphere by precipitation) was not used in the assessment, which results in higher predicted concentrations.

It is assumed that the conservative emission rates, when combined with the conservative operating conditions and conservative dispersion modelling assumptions description herein, are not likely to under predict the modelled concentrations at each of the identified receptors.

## 5.0 AIR QUALITY PREDICTIONS

To assess the overall local air quality effects a given facility, the existing air quality must be combined with the maximum predicted concentrations from the proposed activities. The resulting air quality concentrations are referred to as the cumulative predicted concentration, which is compared to the relevant air quality criteria.

As discussed in Section 2.0 above, the existing air quality for this assessment was described using the 90th percentile of monitoring data from stations located at considerable distances from the Facility as there are no local monitoring stations close by. Additionally, the station data is collected in areas where there are more significant industrial sources of air emissions. As a result, the concentrations representing the existing air quality are conservative. In addition to this, the predicted concentrations that result from the dispersion modelling assessment are also conservative because they take into consideration the worst-case meteorological conditions occurring at the same time as maximum Facility operations. In reality, there is a very low likelihood that the worst-case meteorology, the maximum Facility operations and the conditions that result in 90th percentile of the existing air quality compounds occur simultaneously. As a result, the maximum predicted cumulative concentrations presented in this assessment are very conservative.

It is also important to note that the provincial and federal assessment criteria that is used in this assessment are not regulatory limits and are frequently exceeded at various locations across Ontario due to weather conditions and long-range transportation. Instead of being used for a pass or fail compliance assessment, these criteria are to be used as benchmarks to facilitate air quality management on a regional scale and provide reference desirable levels for outdoor air quality.

The emissions from the Facility were predicted for the current operations as well as for 4 different stages of the development of the Pit 3 extension. Cumulative concentrations were predicted for all five scenarios off-site and at sensitive receptors.

In all scenarios, maximum predicted cumulative concentrations for particulates, including crystalline silica, are above some of the assessment criteria at off-site locations and at sensitive receptors. The largest predicted concentrations are generally located at receptors immediately adjacent to sections of the property line by the Pit #1 crushing plant area and the active extraction face, which changes location in each scenario. The predicted concentrations decrease rapidly with distance, which is why sensitive receptors, located further from the property line, have much lower concentrations. The Facility activities with the highest contribution to the particulate concentrations are the material handling, haul truck traffic and traffic on unpaved areas at the extraction face. These activities generate fugitive dust emissions that can be significantly reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures presented Section 6.0.

When assessing the maximum predicted cumulative concentrations of the combustion gases (NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub> and CO) for the five scenarios, some of the maximum predicted cumulative concentrations at off-site locations and at sensitive receptors are above the CAAQS that will be coming into effect in 2025. However, when these concentrations are compared to the Ontario AAQCs, the majority are below the criteria. The Facility activity that is contributing most to the maximum predicted cumulative concentrations is blasting. Refinement and mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce blasting emissions are discussed in Section 6.0.

The MECP meteorological dataset used for this assessment shows that for the majority of the year, winds blow from westerly directions. As the extraction phasing is proposed to move towards the east, it can be expected that if winds are blowing from the west, the highest concentrations are located immediately downwind to the east. This is reflected in extension scenarios 1 to 4, as the maximum predicted cumulative concentrations are located to the east of the various extraction and blasting locations.

Contour plots for compounds with maximum predicted cumulative concentrations above the Ontario AAQCs are provided in Appendix B. The following sections provide more detailed discussion about the predicted cumulative concentrations for each scenario.

## 5.1 Scenario 0 – Existing Operations

Scenario 0 represents the worst-case existing operations, where extraction and blasting are occurring at the southern extent of Pit 3 in the current licensed area, north of Main Street East (Highway #3). The crushing plant is located at its current location in Pit 1. A Dispersion Modelling Plan for this scenario is provided as Figure 3a.

As summarized in Table 16, maximum cumulative predicted concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and crystalline silica at sensitive receptors are below the assessment criteria, however the maximum cumulative predicted concentration of PM<sub>10</sub> is above the criterion at receptor 10. The maximum off-site predicted cumulative concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub> and crystalline silica are above the assessment criteria (see Appendix B, figures B0a to B0c). These off-site concentrations occur just to the west of the Pit 1 crushing plant and to the west and south of the extraction area.

Maximum predicted cumulative concentrations of combustion gases are below the Ontario AAQCs at all receptors assessed for Scenario 0. However, these concentrations are above some of the CAAQS.

Table 16: Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Existing Operations

Compound	Averaging Period	Criteria [µg/m³]	Existing Concentration [µg/m³]	Sensitive Receptors*			Off-site Receptors		
				Maximum Predicted Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria	Maximum Off-Site Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria
SPM	24-Hour	120	42	77	119	99%	153	195	162%
	Annual	60	25	4.8	30	50%	11	36	59%
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-Hour	50	23	38	61	123%	60	83	166%
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24-Hour	27	13	6.4	19	70%	9.7	22	82%
	Annual	8.8	6.9	0.3	7.2	82%	0.7	7.6	87%
Crystalline Silica	24-hour	5	2.5	2.4	4.9	98%	3.8	6.3	126%
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	400	26	104	131	33%	109	136	34%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	79	26	104	131	165%	109	136	172%
	24-Hour	200	22	21	43	22%	39	62	31%
	Annual	22.6	13	1.2	14	62%	4.4	17	76%
SO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	690	2.6	359	361	52%	175	178	26%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	170.3	2.6	359	361	212%	175	178	104%
	24-Hour (AAQC)	275	2.6	23	25	9%	43	46	17%
	24-Hour (CAAQS)	150	2.6	23	25	17%	43	46	31%
	Annual (AAQC)	55	1.2	0.9	2.1	4%	2.9	4.1	7%
	Annual (CAAQS)	10.5	1.2	0.9	2.1	20%	2.9	4.1	39%
CO	1-Hour (AAQC)	36,200	435	11,321	11,756	32%	14,058	14,493	40%
	1-Hour (NAAQO)	15,000	435	11,321	11,756	78%	14,058	14,493	97%
	8-Hour	15,700	553	2,144	2,697	17%	9,863	10,417	66%
	8-Hour (NAAQO)	6000	553	2,144	2,697	45%	9,863	10,417	174%

\* As per the MECP ADMGO (MECP 2017) meteorological anomalies were removed for modelling done over the entire modelling grid, and not at individual sensitive receptor locations.

## 5.2 Scenario 1 – Expansion Phase 1

Scenario 1 represents the worst-case expansion Phase 1 operations, where extraction and blasting are occurring at the southeastern extent of the Phase 1 area, south of the racetrack and north of Main Street East (Highway #3). The crushing plant is located at its current location in Pit 1. A Dispersion Modelling Plan for this scenario is provided as Figure 3b.

As summarized in Table 17, the maximum predicted cumulative concentration of PM<sub>2.5</sub> is below the assessment criterion at sensitive receptors, however the maximum predicted cumulative concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub> and crystalline silica are above the criteria at sensitive receptor 58. The maximum off-site predicted cumulative concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub> and crystalline silica are above the assessment criteria (see Appendix B, figures B1a to B1c). These off-site concentrations occur just to the west of the crushing plant and to the south and east of the extraction area.

Maximum predicted cumulative concentrations of combustion gases are below the Ontario AAQCs at all receptors assessed for Scenario 1. However, these concentrations are above some of the CAAQS.

## 5.3 Scenario 2 – Expansion Phase 1

A second worst-case scenario was assessed for Expansion Phase 1, as the eastern extent of extraction area is situated between two sensitive receptors. These receptors are located directly north and south of the area to be extracted at the end of Phase 1. The crushing plant is located at its current location in Pit 1. A Dispersion Modelling Plan for this scenario is provided as Figure 3c.

As summarized in Table 18, the maximum predicted cumulative concentration of PM<sub>2.5</sub> is below the assessment criterion at sensitive receptors, however the maximum predicted cumulative concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub> and crystalline silica are above the criteria at sensitive receptor 44. The maximum off-site predicted cumulative concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and crystalline silica are above the assessment criteria (see Appendix B, figures B2a to B2d). These off-site concentrations occur just to the west of the crushing plant and to the east of the extraction area.

Maximum predicted cumulative concentrations of combustion gases are below the Ontario AAQCs at all receptors assessed for Scenario 2. However, these concentrations are above some of the CAAQS.

## 5.4 Scenario 3 – Expansion Phase 2

Scenario 3 represents the worst-case expansion Phase 2 operations, where the eastern extent of extraction area reaches the east property line of the proposed expansion area. The crushing plant is located at its current location in Pit 1. A Dispersion Modelling Plan for this scenario is provided as Figure 3d.

As summarized in Table 19, maximum cumulative predicted concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and crystalline silica at sensitive receptors are below the assessment criteria, however the maximum cumulative predicted concentration of PM<sub>10</sub> is above the criterion at receptor 10. The maximum off-site predicted cumulative concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and crystalline silica are above the assessment criteria (see Appendix B, figures B3a to B3d). These off-site concentrations occur just to the west of the crushing plant and to the east of the extraction area.

Maximum predicted cumulative concentrations of combustion gases are below the Ontario AAQCs at all receptors assessed for Scenario 3. However, these concentrations are above some of the CAAQS.

Table 17: Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Expansion Phase 1 (Scenario 1)

Compound	Averaging Period	Criteria [µg/m³]	Existing Concentration [µg/m³]	Sensitive Receptors*			Off-site Receptors		
				Maximum Predicted Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria	Maximum Off-Site Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria
SPM	24-Hour	120	42	98	140	117%	152	194	162%
	Annual	60	25	5.4	30	51%	16	41	68%
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-Hour	50	23	41	64	128%	65	88	176%
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24-Hour	27	13	6.4	19	70%	10	23	84%
	Annual	8.8	6.9	0.3	7.2	82%	1.0	7.9	90%
Crystalline Silica	24-hour	5	2.5	2.6	5.1	102%	4.0	6.5	130%
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	400	26	99	125	31%	110	136	34%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	79	26	99	125	158%	110	136	172%
	24-Hour	200	22	21	43	22%	39	61	31%
	Annual	22.6	13	1.3	14	62%	4.4	17	76%
SO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	690	2.6	244	247	36%	194	196	28%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	170.3	2.6	244	247	145%	194	196	115%
	24-Hour (AAQC)	275	2.6	28	31	11%	39	41	15%
	24-Hour (CAAQS)	150	2.6	28	31	21%	39	41	27%
	Annual (AAQC)	55	1.2	1.2	2.3	4%	4.2	5.3	10%
	Annual (CAAQS)	10.5	1.2	1.2	2.3	22%	4.2	5.3	51%
CO	1-Hour (AAQC)	36,200	435	7,709	8,144	22%	13,445	13,880	38%
	1-Hour (NAAQO)	15,000	435	7,709	8,144	54%	13,445	13,880	93%
	8-Hour	15,700	553	2,685	3,238	21%	10,095	10,648	68%
	8-Hour (NAAQO)	6000	553	2,685	3,238	54%	10,095	10,648	177%

\* As per the MECP ADMGO (MECP 2017) meteorological anomalies were removed for modelling done over the entire modelling grid, and not at individual sensitive receptor locations.

Table 18: Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Expansion Phase 1 (Scenario 2)

Compound	Averaging Period	Criteria [µg/m³]	Existing Concentration [µg/m³]	Sensitive Receptors*			Off-site Receptors		
				Maximum Predicted Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria	Maximum Off-Site Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria
SPM	24-Hour	120	41.9	95.3	137.2	114%	236.1	278.0	232%
	Annual	60	25.1	7.1	32.1	54%	23.3	48.4	81%
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-Hour	50	23.3	41.7	65.0	130%	92.0	115.2	230%
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24-Hour	27	12.6	6.6	19.1	71%	14.7	27.3	101%
	Annual	8.8	6.9	0.4	7.4	84%	1.4	8.4	95%
Crystalline Silica	24-hour	5	2.5	2.6	5.1	103%	5.8	8.3	167%
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	400	26.3	115.7	142.1	36%	118.2	144.5	36%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	79	26.3	115.7	142.1	180%	118.2	144.5	183%
	24-Hour	200	22.4	31.0	53.4	27%	42.8	65.2	33%
	Annual	22.6	12.8	2.3	15.1	67%	7.6	20.4	90%
SO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	690	2.6	619.8	622.4	90%	540.3	542.9	79%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	170.3	2.6	619.8	622.4	365%	540.3	542.9	319%
	24-Hour (AAQC)	275	2.6	48.6	51.2	19%	113.4	116.0	42%
	24-Hour (CAAQS)	150	2.6	48.6	51.2	34%	113.4	116.0	77%
	Annual (AAQC)	55	1.2	2.9	4.1	7%	13.5	14.7	27%
	Annual (CAAQS)	10.5	1.2	2.9	4.1	39%	13.5	14.7	140%
CO	1-Hour (AAQC)	36,200	435.2	19538.3	19973.5	55%	17037.6	17472.8	48%
	1-Hour (NAAQO)	15,000	435.2	19538.3	19973.5	133%	17037.6	17472.8	116%
	8-Hour	15,700	553.2	4602.0	5155.2	33%	12096.5	12649.7	81%
	8-Hour (NAAQO)	6000	553.2	4602.0	5155.2	86%	12096.5	12649.7	211%

\* As per the MECP ADMGO (MECP 2017) meteorological anomalies were removed for modelling done over the entire modelling grid, and not at individual sensitive receptor locations



Table 19: Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Expansion Phase 2 (Scenario 3)

Compound	Averaging Period	Criteria [µg/m³]	Existing Concentration [µg/m³]	Sensitive Receptors*			Off-site Receptors		
				Maximum Predicted Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria	Maximum Off-Site Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria
SPM	24-Hour	120	42	69	111	92%	243	285	238%
	Annual	60	25	4.4	30	49%	43	68	114%
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-Hour	50	23	38	61	123%	93	117	233%
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24-Hour	27	13	6.4	19	70%	16	28	207%
	Annual	8.8	6.9	0.3	7.2	82%	2.5	9.4	107%
Crystalline Silica	24-hour	5	2.5	2.4	4.9	98%	5.9	8.4	168%
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	400	26	95	121	30%	115	141	35%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	79	26	95	121	154%	115	141	178%
	24-Hour	200	22	21	43	22%	42	64	32%
	Annual	22.6	13	0.7	14	60%	7.9	21	92%
SO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	690	2.6	97	100	14%	365	368	53%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	170.3	2.6	97	100	59%	365	368	216%
	24-Hour (AAQC)	275	2.6	6.1	8.7	3%	99	102	37%
	24-Hour (CAAQS)	150	2.6	6.1	8.7	6%	99	102	68%
	Annual (AAQC)	55	1.2	0.3	1.5	3%	17	18	32%
	Annual (CAAQS)	10.5	1.2	0.3	1.5	14%	17	18	170%
CO	1-Hour (AAQC)	36,200	435	3,837	4,272	12%	14,114	14,550	40%
	1-Hour (NAAQO)	15,000	435	3,837	4,272	28%	14,114	14,550	97%
	8-Hour	15,700	553	1,780	2,333	15%	9,836	10,389	66%
	8-Hour (NAAQO)	6000	553	1,780	2,333	39%	9,836	10,389	173%

\* As per the MECP ADMGO (MECP 2017) meteorological anomalies were removed for modelling done over the entire modelling grid, and not at individual sensitive receptor locations

## 5.5 Scenario 4 – Expansion Phase 3

Scenario 4 represents the worst-case expansion Phase 3 operations, where the eastern extent of extraction area reaches the northeast corner of the proposed expansion area, south of Concession Road 2. The crushing plant is located at its current location in Pit 1. A Dispersion Modelling Plan for this scenario is provided as Figure 3e.

As summarized in Table 20, maximum cumulative predicted concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and crystalline silica at sensitive receptors are below the assessment criteria, however the maximum cumulative predicted concentration of PM<sub>10</sub> is above the criterion at receptor 10. The maximum off-site predicted cumulative concentrations of SPM, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and crystalline silica are above the assessment criteria (see Appendix B, figures B4a to B4d). These concentrations occur just off-site to the west of the crushing plant and to the east of the extraction area.

Maximum predicted cumulative concentrations of combustion gases are above some of the Ontario AAQCs in Scenario 4 (see Appendix B, figures B4e to B4f). These concentrations are also above the CAAQS.

Table 20: Maximum Predicted Concentrations for Expansion Phase 3 (Scenario 4)

Compound	Averaging Period	Criteria [µg/m³]	Existing Concentration [µg/m³]	Sensitive Receptors*			Off-site Receptors		
				Maximum Predicted Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria	Maximum Off-Site Concentration [µg/m³]	Maximum Predicted Cumulative Concentration [µg/m³]	% Criteria
SPM	24-Hour	120	42	73	115	95%	347	389	324%
	Annual	60	25	7.2	32	54%	60	85	141%
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-Hour	50	23	37	61	121%	123	146	292%
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24-Hour	27	13	6.3	19	70%	20	32	120%
	Annual	8.8	6.9	0.5	7.4	84%	3.3	10	116%
Crystalline Silica	24-hour	5	2.5	2.3	4.9	97%	7.7	10	204%
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	400	26	116	142	36%	135	162	40%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	79	26	116	142	180%	135	162	205%
	24-Hour	200	22	23	45	23%	48	71	35%
	Annual	22.6	13	2.2	15	67%	8.7	21	95%
SO <sub>2</sub>	1-Hour (AAQC)	690	2.6	325	328	48%	924	927	134%
	1-Hour (CAAQS)	170.3	2.6	325	328	192%	924	927	544%
	24-Hour (AAQC)	275	2.6	34	37	13%	193	196	71%
	24-Hour (CAAQS)	150	2.6	34	37	24%	193	196	130%
	Annual (AAQC)	55	1.2	2.5	3.7	7%	29	30	54%
	Annual (CAAQS)	10.5	1.2	2.5	3.7	35%	29	30	285%
CO	1-Hour (AAQC)	36,200	435	10,257	10,692	30%	29,125	29,560	82%
	1-Hour (NAAQO)	15,000	435	10,257	10,692	71%	29,125	29,560	197%
	8-Hour	15,700	553	3,211	3,764	24%	20,739	21,292	136%
	8-Hour (NAAQO)	6000	553	3,211	3,764	63%	20,739	21,292	355%

\* As per the MECP ADMGO (MECP 2017) meteorological anomalies were removed for modelling done over the entire modelling grid, and not at individual sensitive receptor locations

## 6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

### 6.1 Modelling Refinements

The results presented in Section 5 indicate that maximum cumulative predicted concentrations from the Facility are above some of the assessment criteria. However, the results also indicate that the concentrations are significantly lower at the sensitive receptors. To further reduce the maximum cumulative predicted concentrations, there are several aspects of this assessment that are conservative and have the potential for refinement, as listed below.

- **Blasting** - As discussed in Section 4.9, it was conservatively assumed that the same amount of explosive (6,160 kg) would be used in each scenario. However, it is also understood that the blasting parameters (e.g., amount of explosive, blast area) are subject to change depending on the results of the blast monitoring program, especially as the extraction face approaches the property line and sensitive receptors. More realistic blasting parameters could be used to refine the modelling assessment.
- **Haul Truck Traffic** - As discussed in Section 4.9, it was conservatively assumed that the crushing plant and wash plant would remain in Pit 1, resulting in longer haul routes. However, it is understood that the crushing plant and wash plant may be relocated to Pit 3 in the future, which would significantly decrease the haul distance. Decreasing the haul distance would likely reduce the off-site effects of fugitive dust from haul truck traffic. Road dust sampling could also be completed to provide site-specific particle size and silt content data to refine the modelling assessment.
- **Material Handling** – It was conservatively assumed that the material handling rate at the extraction face was 4,500 kg per day. If this amount were decreased when extraction approaches the property line and sensitive receptors, the off-site effects of fugitive dust from material handling would be reduced. Additional reductions would be possible if the material were watered before being loaded into the haul trucks.
- **Wet Deposition** – Wet deposition (removal of particles from the atmosphere by precipitation) was not used in the modelling assessment, which results in higher predicted concentrations. Including wet deposition and depletion calculations in the model options would reduce the off-site predicted concentrations of particulates (dust).

### 6.2 Best Management Practices Plan for the Control of Fugitive Dust

In addition, the continued implementation of a Best Management Practices Plan for the Control of Fugitive Dust (BMPP) is recommended to assist with controlling fugitive dust emissions. As PCQ is committed to minimizing the effects of fugitive dust off-site and at sensitive receptors, an updated BMPP has been developed for the Facility. The BMPP outlines preventative and control measures in place or under development to reduce the likelihood of high dust emissions from the Facility. Inspections and monitoring procedures are also a part of the BMPP and will allow for continuous improvement of the fugitive dust management practices.

### 6.3 Air Quality Monitoring

The implementation of an air quality monitoring program could be used to verify the predicted off-site concentrations of the indicator compounds as well as to guide the implementation and review of the fugitive dust best management practices. The monitoring program should be developed to follow the guidelines provided in the MECP *Operations Manual for Air Quality Monitoring in Ontario* (2018).

## 7.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of the conservative air quality impact assessment for the proposed Port Colborne Quarry Pit 3 extension indicate that the maximum off-site predicted cumulative concentrations of several indicator compounds are above the assessment criteria. However, these concentrations become significantly lower at sensitive receptors. It is important to note that the assessment criteria are not regulatory limits and are frequently exceeded at various locations across Ontario. Instead, they are to be used as screening criteria to represent an indicator of good air quality. In reality, there is a very low likelihood that the worst-case meteorology, the maximum Facility operations and the conditions that result in the 90th percentile of the existing air quality compounds would occur simultaneously. As a result, the maximum predicted cumulative concentrations presented in this assessment are very conservative.

Refinements to the modelling assessment discussed in Section 6.0 will likely reduce the maximum predicted cumulative concentrations. The continued implementation of best management practices identified in the Facility's updated BMPP can help to control fugitive dust and reduce off-site effects. Off-site impacts from combustion gases, while not directly assessed under the Facility's blast monitoring program, will be influenced by the amount of explosive used and termination point for blasting operations. Implementation of an air quality monitoring program would provide measured, off-site concentrations of the indicator compounds that could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the BMPP and determine whether the modelling assessment requires further refinements to better represent emissions from the Facility operations.

## 8.0 CURRICULA VITAE

Curricula vitae for the authors of the report are provided in Appendix C.



## 9.0 REFERENCES

- Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development (2013). Air Quality Model Guideline – Effective October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014. ISBN: 978-1-4601-0599-3, Edmonton, Alberta
- Brook, J.R., Dann, T.F., Burnett, R.T. (2011). The Relationship Among TSP, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and Inorganic Constituents of Atmospheric Particulate Matter at Multiple Canadian Locations. Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association. Accessed: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/uawm20#.V6JWYU32YiE>
- Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) (1999). *Canadian National Ambient Air Quality Objectives: Process and Status*. Available from [ceqg-rcqe.ccme.ca/download/en/133/](http://ceqg-rcqe.ccme.ca/download/en/133/)
- Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) (2014). *Canada-Wide Standards for Particulate Matter and Ozone, 2012 Final Report*.
- Cole, H.S. and J.E. Summerhays, 1979. A Review of Techniques Available for Estimation of Short-Term NO<sub>2</sub> Concentrations. Journal of the Air Pollution Control Association, 29(8): 812– 817.
- Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) (2018). National Air Pollution Surveillance Program (NAPS). <http://www.ec.gc.ca/rnspa-naps/Default.asp?lang=En&n=5C0D33CF-1>
- Government of Canada (2013). Canada Gazette Vol 147, 21.
- Health Canada (1994). National Ambient Air Quality Objectives for Carbon Monoxide. Executive Summary, Desirable, Acceptable and Tolerable Levels. ISBN 0-662-25642-5
- Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) (2019). Ontario's Ambient Air Quality Criteria, PIBS# 6570e01. Standards Development Branch, Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
- Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MECP) (2015). Air Quality in Ontario 2014 Report, PIBS# 9920e.
- MECP (2018a). Air Quality in Ontario 2016 Report, ISSN# 1710-8136.
- Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). 2017. Air Dispersion Modelling Guideline for Ontario, Version 3.0. PIBS: 5165e03, Toronto, Ontario, MECP (Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change). 2008. *Methodology for Modelling Assessments of Contaminants with 10-Minute Average Standards and Guidelines under O.Reg. 419/05*. Technical Bulletin.
- Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). 2018. Operations Manual for Air Quality Monitoring in Ontario.
- Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). 2020. *Map: Regional Meteorological and Terrain Data for Air Dispersion Modelling*. <https://www.ontario.ca/environment-and-energy/map-regional-meteorological-and-terrain-data-air-dispersion-modelling>
- Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO) (2012). Environmental Guide for Assessing and Mitigating the Air Quality Impacts and Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Provincial Transportation Projects.


- National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association (NSSGA). (2004). Modelling Fugitive Dust Sources. 51.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (2006). Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, AP-42, Fifth Edition, Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources (AP-42). published on-line at <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/index.html>
- U.S. EPA. 2019. Light Duty Vehicle Emissions – Emission Standards. Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/greenvehicles/light-duty-vehicle-emissions#standards>
- U.S. EPA. 2016. Exhaust Emission Standards for Heavy-Duty Highway Compression-Ignition Engines and Urban Buses, EPA-420-B-10-018.
- U.S. EPA. 2010a. Exhaust and Crankcase Emission Factors for Nonroad Engine Modelling – Compression-Ignition, NR-009d.
- U.S. EPA. 2010b. Median Life, Annual Activity, and Load Factor Values for Nonroad Engine Emissions Modelling, NR-005d.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2003. *Comparison of Regulatory Design Concentrations: AERMOD vs. ISCST3, CTDMPPLUS, ISC-PRIME*. Staff Report, EPA-454/R-03-002. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Emissions Monitoring and Analysis Division, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2004a. *AERMOD: Description of Model Formulation*. EPA-454/R-03-004. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Emissions Monitoring and Analysis Division, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2004b. *Users Guide for the AERMOD Terrain Preprocessor (AERMAP)*. EPA-454/B-03-003. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. Emissions, Monitoring, and Analysis Division. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2004c. *AERMOD Deposition Algorithms – Science Document (Revised Draft)*.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2005. *40 CFR Part 51 Revision to the Guideline on air Quality Models: Adoption of a Preferred General Purpose (Flat and Complex Terrain) Dispersion Model and other Revisions*. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Emissions Monitoring and Analysis Division, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
- US EPA (1985). AP-42 – Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors – Fifth Edition, Volume 1, Appendix A: Miscellaneous Data and Conversion Factors.
- U.S. EPA. 1998. AP-42: Compilation of Air Emissions Factors, Chapter 11.9 “Western Surface Coal Mining”.
- U.S. EPA. 2004. AP-42: Compilation of Air Emissions Factors, Chapter 11.19 “Crushed Stone Processing and Pulverized Mineral Processing”.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 1995. *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors*. Volume 1: Stationary Point and Area Sources. AP-42 Fifth Edition (and updates). Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Light Duty Vehicle Emissions.  
<https://www.epa.gov/greenvehicles/light-duty-vehicle-emissions#standards>

Western Regional Air Partnership (WRAP). 2006. Fugitive Dust Handbook.

## Signature Page

### Golder Associates Ltd.



Emily Lau, B.A.Sc., P.Eng.  
*Air Quality Engineer*



Natalie Jones, B.A.Sc., P.Eng.  
*Associate, Senior Air Quality Specialist*

EKL/BSF/NCJ/ly/ng


Golder and the G logo are trademarks of Golder Associates Corporation

[https://golderassociates.sharepoint.com/sites/32998g/deliverables/phase 6000 air and dust/air/aq report/final/1771656-r-rev1 rankin port colborne aqia 15jan2021.docx](https://golderassociates.sharepoint.com/sites/32998g/deliverables/phase%206000%20air%20and%20dust/air/aq%20report/final/1771656-r-rev1%20rankin%20port%20colborne%20aqia%2015jan2021.docx)

## FIGURES



PATH: S:\Clients\Rankin Construction\Port\_Colborne\_ES&M\1771656\_0019\_Air\_Assessment\1771656-0019-RM-001.mxd PRINTED ON: 2025-12-16 AT: 9:25:42 AM



**LEGEND**

- ① Excavation Phase
- Roads
- Railway
- Watercourse
- Waterbody
- Wetland
- Woodland
- Property Boundary
- Proposed Quarry Extension
- Approximate Excavation Phasing Boundary

**KEY MAP**

0 500 1,000  
1:15,000 Meters

**NOTE(S)**

**REFERENCE(S)**

1. BASE DATA: MNRF LIO 2016
2. IMAGERY: SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDNANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
3. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

**CLIENT**  
RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

**PROJECT**  
PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

**TITLE**  
FACILITY LOCATION PLAN


CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
	DESIGNED	PR
	PREPARED	PR
	REVIEWED	BC
	APPROVED	NCJ

PROJECT NO. 1771656 CONTROL 0019 REV. FIGURE 1

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: 25mm



PATH: S:\Clients\Rankin\_Construction\Port\_Colborne\_Quarry\09\_PROJ\1771656\_Ontario\_ES&M\_PROC\0019\_Air\_Assessment\1771656-0019-RK-0002.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-12-16 AT: 9:06:35 AM



★ Project Location

● Air Quality Monitoring Station

0 10 20

1:350,000 Kilometers

NOTE(S)

REFERENCE(S)

1. BASE DATA: MNRF LIO 2016

2. IMAGERY: SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDNANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY

3. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT

RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

PROJECT

PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

TITLE

AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING STATIONS

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
	DESIGNED	PR
	PREPARED	PR
	REVIEWED	BC
	APPROVED	NCJ

PROJECT NO. 1771656

CONTROL 0019

REV.


FIGURE 2

25mm

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM:



PATH: S:\Clients\Rankin Construction\Port\_Colborne\_Quarry\99\_PROJ\1771656\_Ortho\_ESA\40\_PROD\0019\_Air\_Assessment\1771656-0019-RN-002A.mxd PRINTED ON: 2020-12-16 AT: 5:07:37 AM



LEGEND

- ① Excavation Phase
- Roads
- Railway
- Volume Sources
- Line Volume Sources
- Area Sources
- Polygonal Area Sources
- Property Boundary
- Proposed Quarry Extension
- Approximate Excavation Phasing Boundary

0 500 1,000  
1:12,000 Meters

NOTE(S)

REFERENCE(S)

1. BASE DATA: MNRF LIO 2016
2. IMAGERY: ORTHOIMAGE PROVIDED BY IBI GROUP. SITE FLOWN JULY 29TH, 2018
3. ADDITIONAL IMAGERY FROM © 2020 MICROSOFT CORPORATION © 2020 MAXAR © CNES (2020) DISTRIBUTION AIRBUS DS
4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT  
RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

PROJECT  
PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

TITLE  
DISPERSION MODELLING PLAN – EXISTING OPERATIONS

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
DESIGNED	PR	
PREPARED	PR	
REVIEWED	BC	
APPROVED	NCJ	

PROJECT NO.  
1771656

CONTROL  
0019


REV.

FIGURE  
3A


IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: 25mm



PATH: S:\Clients\Rankin Construction\Port\_Colborne\_Quarry\99\_PRC\1771656\_1770265\_Ortho\_ESA\40\_PRC\0019\_Air\_Assessment\1771656-0019-RN-002B.mxd PRINTED ON: 2020-12-16 AT: 5:28:16 AM



- LEGEND
- ① Excavation Phase
  - Roads
  - Railway
  - Volume Sources
  - Line Volume Sources
  - Area Sources
  - Polygonal Area Sources
  - Property Boundary
  - Proposed Quarry Extension
  - Approximate Excavation Phasing Boundary



NOTE(S)

- REFERENCE(S)
1. BASE DATA: MNR LIO 2016
  2. IMAGERY: ORTHOIMAGE PROVIDED BY IBI GROUP. SITE FLOWN JULY 29TH, 2018
  3. ADDITIONAL IMAGERY FROM © 2020 MICROSOFT CORPORATION © 2020 MAXAR © CNES (2020) DISTRIBUTION AIRBUS DS
  4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT  
RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

PROJECT  
PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

TITLE  
DISPERSION MODELLING PLAN – EXPANSION SCENARIO 1


CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
DESIGNED	PR	
PREPARED	PR	
REVIEWED	BC	
APPROVED	NCJ	

PROJECT NO. 1771656 CONTROL 0019 REV. FIGURE 3B

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: 25mm



PATH: S:\Clients\Rankin Construction\Port\_Colborne\_Quarry\99\_PRC\1771656\_170205\_Ortho\_ESA\40\_PRC\2019\_Air\_Assessment\1771656-0019-RN-002020.mxd PRINTED ON: 2020-12-16 AT: 5:08:57 AM



**LEGEND**

- ① Excavation Phase
- Roads
- Railway
- Volume Sources
- Line Volume Sources
- Area Sources
- Polygonal Area Sources
- Property Boundary
- Proposed Quarry Extension
- Approximate Excavation Phasing Boundary

0 500 1,000  
1:12,000 Meters

**NOTE(S)**

**REFERENCE(S)**

1. BASE DATA: MNR F LIO 2016
2. IMAGERY: ORTHOIMAGE PROVIDED BY IBI GROUP. SITE FLOWN JULY 29TH, 2018
3. ADDITIONAL IMAGERY FROM © 2020 MICROSOFT CORPORATION © 2020 MAXAR © CNES (2020) DISTRIBUTION AIRBUS DS
4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

**CLIENT**  
RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

**PROJECT**  
PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

**TITLE**  
DISPERSION MODELLING PLAN – EXPANSION SCENARIO 2

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
DESIGNED	PR	
PREPARED	PR	
REVIEWED	BC	
APPROVED	NCJ	


**GOLDER**

PROJECT NO. 1771656 CONTROL 0019 REV. FIGURE 3C

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: 25mm



PATH:\S\clients\Rankin Construction\Port\_Colborne\_Quarry\99\_PRC\1771656\_1770265\_Ortho\_ESA\40\_PRC\2019\_Air\_Assessment\1771656-0019-RN-003D.mxd PRINTED ON: 2020-12-16 AT: 2:30:47 AM



LEGEND

- ① Excavation Phase
- Roads
- Railway
- Volume Sources
- Line Volume Sources
- Area Sources
- Polygonal Area Sources
- Property Boundary
- Proposed Quarry Extension
- Approximate Excavation Phasing Boundary

0 500 1,000  
1:12,000 Meters

NOTE(S)

REFERENCE(S)

1. BASE DATA: MNR F LIO 2016
2. IMAGERY: ORTHOIMAGE PROVIDED BY IBI GROUP. SITE FLOWN JULY 29TH, 2018
3. ADDITIONAL IMAGERY FROM © 2020 MICROSOFT CORPORATION © 2020 MAXAR © CNES (2020) DISTRIBUTION AIRBUS DS
4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT  
RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

PROJECT  
PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

TITLE  
DISPERSION MODELLING PLAN – EXPANSION SCENARIO 3

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
DESIGNED	PR	
PREPARED	PR	
REVIEWED	BC	
APPROVED	NCJ	

PROJECT NO.  
1771656

CONTROL  
0019


REV.

FIGURE  
3D

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: 25mm



PATH: S:\Clients\Rankin Construction\Port\_Colborne\_Quarry\99\_PR\01171656\_1270205\_Ontario\_ES&M40\_PROD\0019\_Air\_Assessment\171656-0019-PR-00205.mxd PRINTED ON: 2020-12-16 AT: 9:11:27 AM



**LEGEND**

- ① Excavation Phase
- Roads
- Railway
- Volume Sources
- Line Volume Sources
- Area Sources
- Polygonal Area Sources
- Property Boundary
- Proposed Quarry Extension
- Approximate Excavation Phasing Boundary

0 500 1,000  
1:12,000 Meters

**NOTE(S)**

**REFERENCE(S)**

1. BASE DATA: MNRF LIO 2016
2. IMAGERY: ORTHOIMAGE PROVIDED BY IBI GROUP. SITE FLOWN JULY 29TH, 2018
3. ADDITIONAL IMAGERY FROM © 2020 MICROSOFT CORPORATION © 2020 MAXAR © CNES (2020) DISTRIBUTION AIRBUS DS
4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

**CLIENT**  
RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

**PROJECT**  
PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

**TITLE**  
DISPERSION MODELLING PLAN – EXPANSION SCENARIO 4

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
DESIGNED	PR	
PREPARED	PR	
REVIEWED	BC	
APPROVED	NCJ	


**GOLDER**

PROJECT NO. 1771656	CONTROL 0019	REV.	FIGURE 3E
------------------------	-----------------	------	--------------

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: 25mm



PATH:S:\Clients\Rankin\_Construction\Port\_Colborne\_ES&M\_1771656\_1270265\_Ortho\_ESA\40\_PROD\0019\_Air\_Assessment\1771656-0019-RN-004.mxd PRINTED ON: 2025-12-16 AT: 9:12:29 AM



LEGEND

- ① Excavation Phase
- Roads
- ▭ Proposed Quarry Extension
- ▭ Approximate Excavation Phasing Boundary

0 100 200 300 400  
1:7,000 Meters

NOTE(S)

REFERENCE(S)

- 1. BASE DATA: MNR FIO 2016
- 2. IMAGERY: ORTHOIMAGE PROVIDED BY IBI GROUP. SITE FLOWN JULY 29TH, 2018
- 3. ADDITIONAL IMAGERY FROM © 2020 MICROSOFT CORPORATION © 2020 MAXAR © CNES (2020) DISTRIBUTION AIRBUS DS
- 4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT  
RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

PROJECT  
PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

TITLE  
PIT 3 EXTENSION: EXTRACTION PHASING

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
DESIGNED	PR	
PREPARED	PR	
REVIEWED	BC	
APPROVED	NCJ	

PROJECT NO.  
1771656

CONTROL  
0019

REV.


FIGURE  
4

25mm

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM:



PATH: S:\Clients\Rankin Construction\Port\_Colborne\_ES&M\1771656\_0019\_Air\_Assessment\1771656-0019-RM-0005.mxd PRINTED ON: 2025-12-16 AT: 9:12:27 AM



LEGEND

- Grid Receptors
- ① Excavation Phase
- Roads
- Railway
- ▭ Property Boundary
- ▭ Proposed Quarry Extension
- ▭ Approximate Excavation Phasing Boundary

0 500 1,000  
1:24,000 Meters

NOTE(S)

REFERENCE(S)

1. BASE DATA: MNRFO LIO 2016
2. IMAGERY: ORTHOIMAGE PROVIDED BY IBI GROUP. SITE FLOWN JULY 29TH, 2018
3. ADDITIONAL IMAGERY FROM © 2020 MICROSOFT CORPORATION © 2020 MAXAR ©CNES (2020) DISTRIBUTION AIRBUS DS
4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT  
RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

PROJECT  
PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

TITLE  
AIR QUALITY DISPERSION MODELLING GRID RECEPTORS

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
DESIGNED	PR	
PREPARED	PR	
REVIEWED	BC	
APPROVED	NCJ	


GOLDER

PROJECT NO. 1771656	CONTROL 0019	REV.	FIGURE 5
------------------------	-----------------	------	-------------

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: 25mm



PATH: S:\Clients\Rankin Construction\Port\_Colborne\_ES&M\1771656\_Ortho\_ESA\40\_PROD\0019\_Air\_Assessment\1771656-0019-RM-0006.mxd PRINTED ON: 2025-12-16 AT: 9:41:14 AM



LEGEND

- Sensitive Receptors
- Excavation Phase
- Roads
- Railway
- Property Boundary
- Proposed Quarry Extension
- Approximate Excavation Phasing Boundary

0 500 1,000  
1:24,000 Meters

NOTE(S)

REFERENCE(S)

1. BASE DATA: MNR F LIO 2016
2. IMAGERY: ORTHOIMAGE PROVIDED BY IBI GROUP. SITE FLOWN JULY 29TH, 2018
3. ADDITIONAL IMAGERY FROM © 2020 MICROSOFT CORPORATION © 2020 MAXAR © CNES (2020) DISTRIBUTION AIRBUS DS
4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT  
RANKIN CONSTRUCTION INC.

PROJECT  
PROPOSED PORT COLBORNE QUARRY EXTENSION

TITLE  
AIR QUALITY DISPERSION MODELLING SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2020-12-16
DESIGNED	PR	
PREPARED	PR	
REVIEWED	BC	
APPROVED	NCJ	

PROJECT NO. 1771656 CONTROL 0019 REV. FIGURE 6

GOLDER

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: 25mm



**APPENDIX A**

# Source Summary Tables

Table A1 - Emission Summary Table by Source

Source Identifier	Source Description	Emission Data			
		Contaminant	CAS No.	1-hour Emission Rate [g/s]	24-hour Emission Rate [g/s]
1a	Crushing Plant	SPM	N/A	5.84E-01	—
		PM10	N/A	2.05E-01	—
		PM2.5	N/A	3.12E-02	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	1.35E-02	—
1b	Crushing Plant Drop Operations	SPM <sup>[1]</sup>	N/A	2.75E+00	—
		PM10 <sup>[1]</sup>	N/A	1.20E+00	—
		PM2.5 <sup>[1]</sup>	N/A	1.82E-01	—
		Crystalline silica <sup>[1]</sup>	14808-60-7	7.91E-02	—
2	Wash Plant	SPM	N/A	2.75E-01	—
		PM10	N/A	1.16E-01	—
		PM2.5	N/A	7.72E-02	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	7.64E-03	—
3-1	Crusher Stockpiles Wind Erosion	SPM	N/A	—	1.10E-02
		PM10	N/A	—	5.50E-03
		PM2.5	N/A	—	8.24E-04
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	—	3.61E-04
3-2	Wash Plant Stockpiles Wind	SPM	N/A	—	4.52E-02
		PM10	N/A	—	2.26E-02
		PM2.5	N/A	—	3.39E-03
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	—	1.49E-03
3-3	West Stockpiles Wind Erosion	SPM	N/A	—	6.70E-02
		PM10	N/A	—	3.35E-02
		PM2.5	N/A	—	5.02E-03
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	—	2.20E-03
4-1	Main Site Access	SPM	N/A	1.04E-02	—
		PM10	N/A	1.99E-03	—
		PM2.5	N/A	4.81E-04	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	1.31E-04	—
4-2	Main Site Egress	SPM	N/A	1.08E-02	—
		PM10	N/A	2.07E-03	—
		PM2.5	N/A	5.00E-04	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	1.36E-04	—
4-3	Road to Parking Lot	SPM	N/A	3.04E-03	—
		PM10	N/A	5.83E-04	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.41E-04	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	3.83E-05	—
4-4	Paved Entrance to Pit	SPM	N/A	1.09E-02	—
		PM10	N/A	2.09E-03	—
		PM2.5	N/A	5.05E-04	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	1.37E-04	—
5-1a	Stockpile Area 1 Loader Dust	SPM	N/A	4.53E-01	—
		PM10	N/A	1.15E-01	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.15E-02	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	7.58E-03	—
5-1b	Stockpile Area 2 Loader Dust	SPM	N/A	4.47E-01	—
		PM10	N/A	1.14E-01	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.14E-02	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	7.48E-03	—
5-2	Shipping Road Dust	SPM	N/A	3.41E-01	—
		PM10	N/A	8.68E-02	—
		PM2.5	N/A	8.68E-03	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	5.71E-03	—
5-4	Extraction Face Loader Road Dust	SPM	N/A	5.38E-01	—
		PM10	N/A	1.37E-01	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.37E-02	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	9.01E-03	—
6a-1	Stockpile Area 1 Loader Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	8.02E-02	
		SO2	7446-09-5	2.66E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	1.47E-02	—
		PM10	N/A	1.47E-02	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.43E-02	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	1.42E-01	—
6a-2	Stockpile Area 2 Loader Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	9.17E-02	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	3.04E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	1.68E-02	—
		PM10	N/A	1.68E-02	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.63E-02	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	1.62E-01	—
6a-3	Haul Road Non-Road Tail Pipe	CO	630-08-0	8.90E-01	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	1.98E-03	—
		SPM	N/A	1.09E-01	—
		PM10	N/A	1.09E-01	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.06E-01	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	1.05E+00	—

Table A1 - Emission Summary Table by Source

Source Identifier	Source Description	Emission Data			
		Contaminant	CAS No.	1-hour Emission Rate [g/s]	24-hour Emission Rate [g/s]
6a-4	Extraction Face Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	4.33E-02	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	6.07E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	7.26E-03	—
		PM10	N/A	7.26E-03	—
		PM2.5	N/A	7.04E-03	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	1.15E-01	—
6a-5	Water Pump - Pit 2	CO	630-08-0	1.43E-02	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	6.99E-05	—
		SPM	N/A	3.90E-03	—
		PM10	N/A	3.90E-03	—
		PM2.5	N/A	3.78E-03	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	3.61E-02	—
6a-6	Water Pump - Pit 3	CO	630-08-0	1.67E-02	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	8.15E-05	—
		SPM	N/A	4.55E-03	—
		PM10	N/A	4.55E-03	—
		PM2.5	N/A	4.41E-03	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	4.21E-02	—
6b-1	Shipping Road Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	1.34E+00	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	7.14E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	8.63E-04	—
		PM10	N/A	8.63E-04	—
		PM2.5	N/A	8.37E-04	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	1.73E-02	—
6b-2	Main Site Access Road Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	1.34E+00	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	7.14E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	8.63E-04	—
		PM10	N/A	8.63E-04	—
		PM2.5	N/A	8.37E-04	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	1.73E-02	—
6b-3	Main Site Egress Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	1.34E+00	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	7.14E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	8.63E-04	—
		PM10	N/A	8.63E-04	—
		PM2.5	N/A	8.37E-04	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	1.73E-02	—
6b-4	Road to Parking Lot Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	2.80E-04	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	2.77E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	2.00E-07	—
		PM10	N/A	2.00E-07	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.94E-07	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	1.07E-05	—
6b-5	Paved Entrance to Pit Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	1.34E+00	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	4.37E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	8.63E-04	—
		PM10	N/A	8.63E-04	—
		PM2.5	N/A	8.37E-04	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	1.73E-02	—
7a	Stockpile Material Handling	SPM	N/A	4.14E-01	—
		PM10	N/A	1.81E-01	—
		PM2.5	N/A	2.74E-02	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	1.19E-02	—
7b	Extraction Face Material Handling	SPM	N/A	2.46E+00	—
		PM10	N/A	1.08E+00	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.63E-01	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	7.09E-02	—
8	Blast Hole Drilling	SPM	N/A	1.64E-02	—
		PM10	N/A	7.28E-03	—
		PM2.5	N/A	1.37E-03	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	4.79E-04	—
9	Quarry Blasting - Fugitives	SPM	N/A	1.69E-01	—
		PM10	N/A	8.78E-02	—
		PM2.5	N/A	5.06E-03	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	5.77E-03	—
10	Quarry Blasting - Combustion	CO	630-08-0	2.91E+01	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	9.24E-01	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	3.42E-01	—
Scenario 0 - Existing Operations					
5-3	Haul Road Dust	SPM	N/A	1.19E+01	—
		PM10	N/A	3.04E+00	—
		PM2.5	N/A	3.04E-01	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	2.00E-01	—
6b-6	Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	8.35E-04	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	2.77E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	5.97E-07	—
		PM10	N/A	5.97E-07	—
		PM2.5	N/A	5.79E-07	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	3.18E-05	—

Table A1 - Emission Summary Table by Source

Source Identifier	Source Description	Emission Data			
		Contaminant	CAS No.	1-hour Emission Rate [g/s]	24-hour Emission Rate [g/s]
Scenario 1 - Expansion Phase 1					
5-3	Haul Road Dust	SPM	N/A	1.47E+01	—
		PM10	N/A	3.75E+00	—
		PM2.5	N/A	3.75E-01	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	2.47E-01	—
6b-6	Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	1.032E-03	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	2.774E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	7.374E-07	—
		PM10	N/A	7.374E-07	—
		PM2.5	N/A	7.152E-07	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	3.933E-05	—
		Scenario 2 - Expansion Phase 1			
5-3	Haul Road Dust	SPM	N/A	1.56E+01	—
		PM10	N/A	3.97E+00	—
		PM2.5	N/A	3.97E-01	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	2.61E-01	—
6b-6	Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	1.093E-03	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	2.774E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	7.806E-07	—
		PM10	N/A	7.806E-07	—
		PM2.5	N/A	7.571E-07	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	4.163E-05	—
		Scenario 3 - Expansion Phase 2			
5-3	Haul Road Dust	SPM	N/A	1.52E+01	—
		PM10	N/A	3.87E+00	—
		PM2.5	N/A	3.87E-01	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	2.55E-01	—
6b-6	Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	1.065E-03	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	2.774E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	7.610E-07	—
		PM10	N/A	7.610E-07	—
		PM2.5	N/A	7.382E-07	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	4.059E-05	—
		Scenario 4 - Expansion Phase 3			
5-3	Haul Road Dust	SPM	N/A	1.39E+01	—
		PM10	N/A	3.55E+00	—
		PM2.5	N/A	3.55E-01	—
		Crystalline silica	14808-60-7	2.33E-01	—
6b-6	Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	CO	630-08-0	9.754E-04	—
		SO2	7446-09-5	2.774E-04	—
		SPM	N/A	6.967E-07	—
		PM10	N/A	6.967E-07	—
		PM2.5	N/A	6.758E-07	—
		Nox	10102-44-0	3.716E-05	—

Note: [1] Emission rates vary by hour of day and by wind speed. This table presents only the maximum possible emission rate, based on the maximum hourly wind speed of 19 m/s obtained from the "Crops" meteorological data set for West Central ("London").



**Table A2 - Dispersion Modelling Source Parameter Summary Table**


Modelling ID	Included Source(s)	AERMOD Source Type	Modelling Source Data				
			Length [m]	Width [m]	Initial Vertical Dimension	Area	Release Height [m]
CRSHWIND	Crusher Stockpiles Wind Erosion	Area	88.5	37.44	2.09	3313.44	4.50
WASHWIND	Wash Plant Stockpiles Wind Erosion	Area	162.02	93.94	2.09	15220.2	4.50
WESTWIND	West Stockpiles Wind Erosion	Area	184.8	104.81	2.09	19368.9	4.50
BLAST	Quarry Blasting - Fugitives, Quarry Blasting - Combustion Emissions	Areapoly	N/A	N/A	N/A	12509.1	1.00
Modelling ID	Included Source(s)	Source Type	Number of Volume Sources	Initial Lateral Dimension	Initial Vertical Dimension	Length of Side [m]	Release Height [m]
CRUSH	Crushing Plant	Volume	1	10.33	7.77	44.44	8.35
CRSHDRP	Crushing Plant Drop Operations	Volume	1	10.33	7.77	44.44	8.35
WASHPL	Wash Plant	Volume	1	5.20	5.67	22.34	6.10
SHPTRCK	Stockpile Material Handling	Volume	1	0.47	0.40	2.00	2.60
PR1	Main Site Access, Main Site Access Road Tailpipe	Volume Line	11	4.01	2.13	N/A	2.30
PR2	Main Site Egress, Main Site Egress Tailpipe	Volume	11	4.01	2.13	N/A	2.30
PR3	Road to Parking Lot, Road to Parking Lot Tailpipe	Volume	14	6.33	1.52	N/A	1.63
PR4	Paved Entrance to Pit, Paved Entrance to Pit Tailpipe	Volume	3	8.18	2.74	N/A	2.95
SHIPROAD	Shipping Road Dust, Shipping Road Tailpipe	Volume	26	8.18	2.74	N/A	3.47
PUMP2	Water Pump - Pit 2	Volume	1	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.75
PUMP3	Water Pump - Pit 3	Volume	1	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.75
CRSHLOAD	Stockpile Area 1 Loader Dust, Stockpile Area 1 Loader Tailpipe	Line Volume	7	12.09	2.82	20.00	3.57
WASHLOAD	Stockpile Area 2 Loader Dust, Stockpile Area 2 Loader Tailpipe	Line Volume	9	12.09	2.82	20.00	3.57
EXTLOAD	Extraction Face Material Handling	Volume	1	0.93	0.77	4.00	3.33

Modelling ID	Included Source(s)	Source Type	Number of Volume Sources	Initial Lateral Dimension	Initial Vertical Dimension	Length of Side [m]	Release Height [m]
<b>Scenario 0 - Existing Operations</b>							
HAULROAD	Haul Road Dust, Haul Road Non-Road Tail Pipe, Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	Line Volume	177	7.57	3.51	N/A	4.44
EXTFUG	Extraction Face Loader Road Dust, Extraction Face Tailpipe, Blast Hole Drilling	Line Volume	8	12.09	3.16	20.00	4.00
<b>Scenario 1 - Expansion Phase 1</b>							
HAULROAD	Haul Road Dust, Haul Road Non-Road Tail Pipe, Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	Line Volume	219	7.57	3.51	N/A	4.44
EXTFUG	Extraction Face Loader Road Dust, Extraction Face Tailpipe, Blast Hole Drilling	Line Volume	8	12.09	3.16	20.00	4.00
<b>Scenario 2 - Expansion Phase 1</b>							
HAULROAD	Haul Road Dust, Haul Road Non-Road Tail Pipe, Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	Line Volume	231	7.57	3.51	N/A	4.44
EXTFUG	Extraction Face Loader Road Dust, Extraction Face Tailpipe, Blast Hole Drilling	Line Volume	3	12.09	3.16	20.00	4.00
<b>Scenario 3 - Expansion Phase 2</b>							
HAULROAD	Haul Road Dust, Haul Road Non-Road Tail Pipe, Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	Line Volume	226	7.57	3.51	N/A	4.44
EXTFUG	Extraction Face Loader Road Dust, Extraction Face Tailpipe, Blast Hole Drilling	Line Volume	8	12.09	3.16	20.00	4.00
<b>Scenario 4 - Expansion Phase 3</b>							
HAULROAD	Haul Road Dust, Haul Road Non-Road Tail Pipe, Haul Road Passenger Tailpipe	Line Volume	207	7.57	3.51	N/A	4.44
EXTFUG	Extraction Face Loader Road Dust, Extraction Face Tailpipe, Blast Hole Drilling	Line Volume	2	12.09	3.16	20.00	4.00


**APPENDIX B**

# Contour Plots

Figure B0a - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Plot - Scenario 0, 24-hr SPM  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 162.5 [ug/m^3] at (645795.48, 4751318.00)



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

SPM 24-hr AAQC = 120 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:30,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30



1771656



Figure B0b - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 0, 24-hr PM10  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 64.4 [ug/m³] at (644115.48, 4751878.00) ug/m³



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

PM10 24-hr AAQC = 50 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:30,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30




1771656









Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 4.0 [ug/m^3] at (645795.48, 4751318.00)

 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 

### LEGEND

-  Property boundary
-  Discrete Sensitive Receptor
-  Volume Source
-  Area Source
-  Line Volume Sources
-  Polygon Area Source

**Crystalline Silica 24-hr AAQC = 5 ug/m3**

**Made by: SC**

**Checked by: EKL**

**SCALE:** 1:30,000




**DATE:**  
**2020-11-30**




**1771656**



Figure B1a - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 1, 24-hr SPM  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL ug/m<sup>3</sup>  
Max: 161 [ug/m<sup>3</sup>] at (647055.48, 4751002.76)



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

SPM 24-hr AAQC = 120 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:32,600  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30




1771656



Figure B1b - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Plot - Scenario 1, 24-hr PM10  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 65 [ug/m^3] at (644115.48, 4751862.76)



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

PM10 24-hr AAQC = 50 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:33,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30




1771656









Figure B1c - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 1, 24-hr Crystalline Silica  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 4.1 [ug/m^3] at (647055.48, 4751002.76) ug/m^3



LEGEND

-  Property boundary
-  Discrete Sensitive Receptor
-  Volume Source
-  Area Source
-  Line Volume Sources
-  Polygon Area Source

Crystalline Silica 24-hr AAQC = 5 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:31,000  



DATE:  
2020-12-01




1771656



Figure B2a - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 2, 24-hr SPM  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension




PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 252 [ug/m³] at (647455.48, 4751270.06) ug/m³




LEGEND			SPM 24-hr AAQC = 120 ug/m3	
	Property boundary		Made by: SC	
	Discrete Sensitive Receptor		Checked by: EKL	
	Volume Source		SCALE: 1:32,000	
	Area Source		0 1 km	
	Line Volume Sources		DATE: 2020-11-30	1771656
	Polygon Area Source			



Figure B2b - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 2, 24-hr PM10  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL ug/m<sup>3</sup>  
Max: 101 [ug/m<sup>3</sup>] at (647455.48, 4751270.06)



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

PM10 24-hr AAQC = 50 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:32,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30




1771656



Figure B2c - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 2, 24-hr Crystalline Silica  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 6.3 [ug/m³] at (647455.48, 4751270.06) ug/m³



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

Crystalline Silica 24-hr AAQC = 5 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:32,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-12-01




1771656



Figure B2d - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 2, 24-hr PM2.5  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 16 [ug/m^3] at (647455.48, 4751270.06) ug/m^3



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

PM2.5 24-hr AAQC = 27 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:32,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30




1771656



Figure B3a - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 3, 24-hr SPM  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL ug/m<sup>3</sup>  
Max: 269 [ug/m<sup>3</sup>] at (647035.48, 4751715.63)



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

SPM 24-hr AAQC = 120 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:33,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30




1771656



Figure B3b - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 3, 24-hr PM10  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 94 [ug/m^3] at (647035.48, 4751875.63)



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

PM10 24-hr AAQC = 50 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:33,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30




1771656



Figure B3c - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Plot - Scenario 3, 24-hr Crystalline Silica  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 6.0 [ug/m³] at (647035.48, 4751875.63) ug/m³



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

Crystalline Silica 24-hr AAQC = 5 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:34,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-12-01



1771656



Figure B3d - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 3, 24-hr PM2.5  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL ug/m<sup>3</sup>  
Max: 16.1 [ug/m<sup>3</sup>] at (647035.48, 4751875.63)



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

PM2.5 24-hr AAQC = 27 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:34,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-12-01




1771656



Figure B4a - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 4, 24-hr SPM  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 381 [ug/m^3] at (647035.48, 4752315.05) ug/m^3



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

SPM 24-hr AAQC = 120 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:32,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30




1771656



Figure B4b - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 4, 24-hr PM10  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 142 [ug/m^3] at (647035.48, 4752315.05) ug/m^3



**LEGEND**

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

**PM10 24-hr AAQC = 50 ug/m3**

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:32,000  
0 1 km


DATE:  
2020-11-30



**1771656**



Figure B4c - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 4, 24-hr Crystalline Silica  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 8.9 [ug/m^3] at (647035.48, 4752315.05) ug/m^3




LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source


Crystalline Silica 24-hr AAQC = 5 ug/m3	
Made by: SC	
Checked by: EKL	
SCALE: 1:32,000	1771656
0 1 km	
DATE: 2020-12-01	



Figure B4d - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 4, 24-hr PM2.5  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 24-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL ug/m<sup>3</sup>  
Max: 22.2 [ug/m<sup>3</sup>] at (647035.48, 4752315.05)







<b>LEGEND</b>		<b>PM2.5 24-hr AAQC = 27 ug/m3</b>	
Property boundary		<b>Made by: SC</b>	 <b>GOLDER</b>
Discrete Sensitive Receptor		<b>Checked by: EKL</b>	
Volume Source		<b>SCALE:</b> 1:33,000	
Area Source		0  1 km	
Line Volume Sources		<b>DATE:</b>	<b>1771656</b>
Polygon Area Source		2020-12-01	



Figure B4e - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot-Scenario 4, 1-hr SO2  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension




PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 1-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 1844 [ug/m^3] at (647035.48, 4752295.05) ug/m^3



<b>LEGEND</b>		<b>SO2 Annual AAQC = 690 ug/m3</b>	
	Property boundary	<b>Made by: SC</b> <b>Checked by: EKL</b>	
	Discrete Sensitive Receptor		
	Volume Source	<b>SCALE:</b> 1:33,000 	
	Area Source		
	Line Volume Sources	<b>DATE:</b> 2020-11-30	
	Polygon Area Source		
		<b>1771656</b>	



Figure B4f - Maximum Cumulative Predicted Concentration Contour Plot - Scenario 4, 8-hr CO  
Port Colborne Quarries Inc., Pit 3 Extension



PLOT FILE OF HIGH 1ST HIGH 8-HR VALUES FOR SOURCE GROUP: ALL  
Max: 20739 [ug/m³] at (647035.48, 4752295.05) ug/m³



LEGEND

- Property boundary
- Discrete Sensitive Receptor
- Volume Source
- Area Source
- Line Volume Sources
- Polygon Area Source

CO 8-hr AAQC = 15,700 ug/m3

Made by: SC  
Checked by: EKL

SCALE: 1:32,000  
0 1 km

DATE:  
2020-11-30



1771656



**APPENDIX C**

# Curricula Vitae

## Education

P.Eng. Chemical Engineering, Engineering Management, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, 2003

## Languages

English – Fluent

## Golder Associates Ltd. – Sudbury

### Associate/Senior Air Quality Specialist

Natalie is an Associate and Senior Air Quality Specialist with the Golder Sudbury office. Over the past fifteen years, Natalie has directed, managed and been involved in numerous air quality projects that include air emissions inventories, dispersion modelling, fugitive dust assessment and management plans, air monitoring programs, atmospheric components relating to both provincial and federal Environmental Assessments, National Pollutant Release Inventory and Greenhouse Gas reporting and Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) applications, Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR) registrations and ongoing compliance assessments, including Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling (ESDM) Reports and Annual Written Summaries. Natalie was a part of team that created the Fugitive Dust Best Management Plan guidance documents for the Ontario Mining Association. Natalie was also on the industry working group that developed the Technical Standard under O.Reg.419/05 for the Mining industry in Ontario.

## Employment History

### Golder Associates Ltd. – Sudbury, Ontario

#### Senior Air Quality Specialist (2006 to Present)

Responsible for managing air quality projects in the Sudbury office. These projects involve air emissions inventories, acoustic audits, air monitoring programs, National Pollutant Release Inventory/ O.Reg.127/Greenhouse Gas reporting and Environmental Compliance Approval (Air and Noise) applications for various clients in Ontario. Responsibilities include proposal preparation and project initiation, project management, day-to-day client liaison, project work, and preparation of reports. Also involved in business development and marketing.

### DST Consulting Engineers Inc. – Sudbury, Ontario

#### Environmental Field Technician/Project Manager (2004 to 2005)

Assisted in and managed projects, including conducting and supervising field work and reporting for Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs), landfill assessments and design projects, preparing supporting documentation for Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) Certificates of Approval (CofA) (Air and Noise) and conducting air emissions studies for land use planning. Also was involved in corporate advertising and marketing.

### Natural Resources Canada – Ottawa, Ontario

#### Co-op Engineering Student (2003)

Created model of a flare/coil heat exchanger system using Hysys. The model was used to perform sensitivity analyses of various process inputs. Made recommendations and brainstormed with supervisors and peers regarding future developments.



***Vale Canada Limited (formerly Inco Limited) – Sudbury, Ontario***

*Co-op Engineering Student (2002)*

Part of Copper Cliff Copper Refinery Process Technology group involved in developing a process water balance for the tankhouse operations.

***Natural Resources Canada – Ottawa, Ontario***

*Co-op Engineering Student (2002)*

Part of the Mining and Material Sciences laboratory Underground Mine Environment group involved in testing that determined the efficiencies of equipment used in diesel engine emissions testing, as well as conducting the emissions tests in an ISO 9002 environment.

***Natural Resources Canada – Ottawa, Ontario***

*Co-op Engineering Student (2001)*

Part of the Material Technology Laboratories Advanced Materials group. Prepared metal alloy powders through mechanochemical milling and assisted in preparing and testing metal hydride batteries of varying compositions.

## PROJECT EXPERIENCE – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Argonaut Gold Inc.**  
Reno, NV

A member of the Atmospheric component team for the Environmental Assessment (EA) of the Magino Gold Project in Northern Ontario. Work involved collection of baseline ambient air quality data, the development of emission inventory, dispersion modelling and EA technical support document writing.

**Newmont Ghana Gold Ltd.**  
Ghana

Directed the Air Quality component of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) of the Ahafo North Project in Ghana. Work involved summarizing baseline ambient air quality data, the development of emission inventory, dispersion modelling and EIS technical support document writing.

**Canada Fluorspar (NL) Inc.**  
St. Lawrence, NL

Managed the creation of the emissions inventory in support of the Environmental Assessment for the St. Lawrence Fluorspar Project. The Project included construction, operation, rehabilitation and closure of a surface and underground mine, a mill, a Tailings Management Facility (TMF), and ancillary infrastructure.

**BHP Billiton**  
Chile

Carried out review and provided technical support for the air quality component of EIA regulatory review process for the Spence Expansion Project. This work included a thorough review of the air quality component as well as overview of the EIA process in Chile.

**KGHM International**  
Sudbury, Ontario

Managed the provincial Environmental Screening Assessment for the proposed diesel power plant for the Victoria Project in Sudbury, Ontario. The ESA involved potential impacts due to noise and air emissions. Was involved in the public consultation as well as summarizing baseline ambient air quality data, emissions inventory development and dispersion modelling.

**Canadian Malartic**  
Toronto, Ontario

A member of the Atmospheric component team for the Environmental Assessment of the Hammond Reef Gold Mine Project in Northern Ontario. Work involved summarizing baseline ambient air quality data, the development of emission inventory, dispersion modelling and EA technical support document writing.

**Cliffs Natural Resources**  
Thunder Bay, Ontario

A member of the Atmospheric component team for the Environmental Assessment of the Cliffs Chromite Project in Northern Ontario. Work involved summarizing baseline ambient air quality data, the development of emission inventory, dispersion modelling and EA technical support document writing for the mining, processing and the transportation components of the Project.

## PROJECT EXPERIENCE – APPROVALS AND COMPLIANCE

**Ivaco Rolling Mills**  
L'Orignal, Ontario

Project Director for managing ongoing ECA compliance, including air quality assessments and ESDM report updates for manufacturing facility in L'Orignal, Ontario

**Roseburg Forest Products Canada Ltd.**  
Pembroke, Ontario

Project director for the preparation an application for ECA (Air and Noise), including supporting documents, for the Pembroke MDF Facility as well as preparation of an Odour Abatement Plan.



<b>EACOM Timber Corporation</b> Elk Lake, Ontario	Project director for the preparation an application for ECA (Air and Noise), including supporting documents, for the Elk Lake Sawmill.
<b>EIDCA Speciality Products Company (Dupont)</b> Kingston, Ontario	Project Director for managing ongoing ECA compliance, including air quality assessments and ESDM report updates for chemical manufacturing facilities in Kingston, Ontario
<b>Glencore Sudbury Integrated Nickel Operations</b> Throughout Ontario	Directed the preparation of support documents for numerous applications for ECA (Air and Noise) for mining and milling facilities and directs ongoing compliance. Created Fugitive Dust Best Management Practices Plans for various operations.
<b>Alamos Gold Inc.</b> Throughout Ontario	Directed the preparation of support documents for applications for ECA (Air and Noise) for sites in Ontario and managed ongoing compliance.
<b>Newmont Porcupine Gold Mines</b> Timmins, Ontario	Directed the preparation of support documents for numerous applications for ECA (Air and Noise) for mining and milling facilities and directs ongoing compliance.
<b>Vale Canada Limited</b> Sudbury, Ontario	Directs ongoing ECA compliance for Vale mining operations in Levack, Ontario. Also managed the preparation of a Technology Benchmarking Report for Copper Cliff Smelter Facility.
<b>KGHM International</b> Sudbury, Ontario	Directed the preparation of support documents for numerous applications for ECA (Air and Noise) for mining facilities and directs ongoing compliance.
<b>Kirkland Lake Gold</b> Throughout Ontario	Directed the preparation of support documents for multiple applications for ECA (Air and Noise) for mining facilities and directs ongoing compliance.
<b>Imerys Talc</b> Timmins, Ontario	Directed the preparation of support documents for multiple applications for ECA (Air and Noise) for mining and milling facilities and managed ongoing ECA compliance.
<b>LifeLabs LP</b> Throughout Ontario	Project director for the ECA applications for air and noise (renewal of Limited Operational Flexibility or new), EASR Eligibility Assessments and EASR registrations we all as annual reporting requirements for multiple facilities located in Ontario since 2013. This work has involved the organization of large databases of facility information including product usage and facility configurations.
<b>Health Sciences North</b> Sudbury, Ontario	Managed and directed in the preparation of support documents for applications for approvals for multiple hospital locations.
<b>Cushman &amp; Wakefield</b> Throughout Ontario	Project director for the completion of EASR Eligibility Assessments and EASR registrations for over 20 facilities in Ontario. To date, this work has resulted in the registration of four facilities under the EASR and submission of one electronic ECA application and work in progress for multiple other sites.
<b>DECAST Ltd.</b> Utopia, Ontario	Project Director for the preparation of support documents for an ECA (Air and Noise) for concrete products manufacturing facility and managed ongoing compliance.

**Thomas Cavanagh  
Construction Limited**  
Ottawa, Ontario

Project director for the preparation of support documents for an application for ECA (Air and Noise) for a proposed ready-mix concrete facility.

**Tomlinson Ready Mix**  
Ottawa, Ontario

Project director for the preparation of support documents for ECA (Air and Noise), including ESDM Report, for multiple ready-mix concrete facilities.

**McCann Redi-Mix Inc.**  
Throughout Ontario

Project director for the preparation of support documents for ECA (Air and Noise), including ESDM Reports, for numerous ready-mix concrete facilities in Ontario.

**Pioneer Construction  
Inc.**  
Throughout Ontario

Directed and assisted in the preparation of support documents for numerous applications for ECAs (Air and Noise) for a ready-mix concrete and asphalt facilities throughout Ontario and manages ongoing compliance.

**Fisher Wavy Inc.**  
Throughout Ontario

Directed the preparation of support documents for numerous applications for ECA (Air and Noise) for ready-mix concrete facilities and mobile plants and directs ongoing compliance.

**William Day  
Construction Ltd.**  
Sudbury, Ontario

Managed and directed the preparation of support documents for numerous applications for ECAs (Air and Noise) for mobile equipment, including crushing and screening equipment.

## PROJECT EXPERIENCE – NATIONAL POLLUTANT RELEASE INVENTORY/GREENHOUSE GAS RREPORTING

**Catalent Pharma  
Solutions**  
Ontario

Directs preparation of National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reports on an annual basis for pharmaceutical facilities in Strathroy and Windsor, Ontario.

**Helmitin Inc.**  
Toronto, Ontario

Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for adhesive manufacturing facility. Also involved in ongoing ECA compliance for this facility.

**Cargill Cocoa &  
Chocolate**  
Georgetown, Ontario

Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for food products facility. Also involved in ongoing ECA compliance for this facility.

**Celestica International  
Inc.**  
Mississauga, Ontario

Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for electronic manufacturing facility. Also involved in ongoing ECA compliance for this facility.

**Honeywell Limited**  
Mississauga, Ontario

Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for electronic manufacturing facility. Also involved in ongoing ECA compliance for this facility.

**DECAST Ltd.**  
Utopia, Ontario

Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for concrete products manufacturing facility.

**Cam Tran Co. Ltd.**  
Throughout Canada

Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for facilities across Canada.

**Ivaco Rolling Mills**  
L'Orignal, Ontario

Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for the steel mill.



<b>Coeur Silvertip Holdings Ltd.</b> British Columbia	Directs the preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for Silvertip Mine. This work includes technical support with BC's CleanBC Industry Incentive Program.
<b>Glencore Sudbury Integrated Nickel Operations</b> Sudbury, Ontario	Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for Sudbury and Timmins area mines and mill.
<b>KGHM International Inc.</b> Sudbury, Ontario	Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for Sudbury area mines. Also prepared annual sustainability reporting under the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) for KGHM International global operations.
<b>Newmont Porcupine Gold Mines</b> Timmins, Ontario	Directs preparation of NPRI and GHG reports on an annual basis for Timmins area mines and mill.

## PROJECT EXPERIENCE – AIR MONITORING AND FIELD SAMPLING PROGRAMS

<b>Glencore Sudbury Integrated Nickel Operations</b> Sudbury, Ontario	Directed the Portable In-situ Wind Erosion Laboratory (PI-SWERL) sampling of tailings areas associated with Strathcona Mill.
<b>Ivaco Rolling Mills</b> L'Orignal, Ontario	Directed the annual road sampling program at the steel mill which involves sampling of numerous paved and unpaved road segments.
<b>Glencore Sudbury Integrated Nickel Operations</b> Sudbury, Ontario	Directed the annual road sampling program at the Levack area site which involves sampling of over 20 paved and unpaved road segments.
<b>Glencore Sudbury Integrated Nickel Operations</b> Sudbury, Ontario	Managed the ambient air sampling program for the collection of baseline data for the Norman West Project.

## PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Professional Engineers of Ontario  
 Air and Waste Management Association - Ontario Section Board of Directors  
 Women in Mining Association of Canada - Sudbury Chapter Board Member  
 Ontario Mining Association

**Education**

*Bachelor of Applied  
Science Chemical  
Engineering, Environmental  
Option, University of  
Toronto, Toronto, 2004*

**Languages**

*English – Fluent*

**Golder Associates Ltd. – Mississauga*****Emily Lau, B.A.Sc., P.Eng., Air Quality Engineer***

Emily Lau is an Air Quality Engineer based in Golder's Mississauga office with more than 14 years of air quality consulting and government experience with the MECP. At Golder, Ms. Lau has successfully managed and completed numerous ECA applications and regulatory reporting projects for a variety of sectors including aggregate processing, municipal, mining, power generation, pharmaceuticals, automotive and general manufacturing.

Her other responsibilities include various client services such as: preparation of proposals, maintaining project budgets and schedules, client liaison, conducting site visits, preparation of reports and review of work prepared by junior staff.

As a Senior Air Engineer at the MECP, Ms. Lau was responsible for reviewing ECA applications to ensure their compliance with environmental legislation, regulations and established MECP standards and guidelines. She then made recommendations on the approval of the ECA applications.

Ms. Lau is also experienced in air dispersion modelling, emissions assessment and inventory development, preparation of ECA applications for air and emissions reporting for various industries. She has worked extensively with the air dispersion models approved by the MECP, such as the SCREEN 3 and AERMOD models. Ms. Lau has an in-depth knowledge of the MECP's air quality guidelines and policies, and frequently acts as liaison with the MECP on the applicability and interpretation of these to her various clients.

**Employment History**

***Golder Associates Ltd. – Mississauga, Ontario***  
*Air Quality Engineer (2017 to Present)*

***Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks – Toronto, Ontario***  
*Senior Air Engineer (2016 to 2017)*

***Golder Associates Ltd. – Mississauga, Ontario***  
*Air Quality Engineer (2004 to 2015)*



---

**PROJECT EXPERIENCE – MINING AND AGGREGATE**

**Tomlinson Group of Companies**  
Ottawa, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead of numerous projects for the completion of Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling reports to support Environmental Compliance Approval applications. The facilities and equipment assessed include mobile crushers, stationary and mobile ready-mix plants and aggregate extraction pits.

**Thomas Cavanagh Construction Limited**  
Ottawa, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead for the completion of an Environmental Compliance Approval application for a ready-mix concrete plant. Follow up work on this project included responding to public comments regarding the assessment results and methodology.

**Ecopave Asphalt Recycling Inc.**  
Thunder Bay, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead for the completion of an Environmental Compliance Approval application for a mobile asphalt plant with a tight deadline. The application was subsequently granted priority review status and an Environmental Compliance Approval was issued in less than 90 days.

**Dufferin Construction Company**  
Oakville, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead for the completion of the Bronte Asphalt Plant Health Protection Air Quality By-law annual emissions report submitted to the Town of Oakville.

**Lafarge Canada Inc.**  
Various locations,  
Ontario

Preparing supporting documentation for CofA (Air and Noise) applications for six (6) aggregate and / or asphalt facilities across southern Ontario, including the Fonthill, Brechin, Woodstock, Stouffville, Kitchener and Stratford locations.

**Barrick Gold Corporation**  
Pascua-Lama, Chile

Prepared a site-wide emission inventory and assisted with report preparation as part of a study of the effect of mining activities on glaciers in the vicinity of the Pascua-Lama mine.

**PROJECT EXPERIENCE – MANUFACTURING**

**Rain Carbon Canada Inc.**  
Hamilton, Ontario

Project manager for ongoing work to assist with Site Specific Standard compliance. Project scope includes maintaining up-to-date Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling Report, analyzing ambient monitoring data trends, support for Environmental Monitoring Team meetings.

**Piramal Healthcare (Canada) Inc.**  
Aurora, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead providing on-going support for maintaining current Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling Report, Acoustic Assessment Report and preparing annual written summary reports, as per requirements of the facility's Environmental Compliance Approval.

**Sanofi Pasteur**  
Toronto, Ontario

Air quality lead for completion of a Comprehensive Certificate of Approval (Air and Noise) application for the human vaccines manufacturing and research facility in Toronto, Ontario. Provided on-going support for maintaining current Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling Report and for annual NPRI emissions reporting.

**Cameco Corporation**  
Port Hope, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead for completing an Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling Report for the uranium conversion facility located in Port Hope, Ontario. The scope of work also involved multiple site visits to locate and document hundreds of emission sources.

**Western Waffles  
Corporation**  
Brantford, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead providing on-going support for maintaining current Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling Report and preparing annual written summary reports, as per requirements of the facility's Environmental Compliance Approval.

## PROJECT EXPERIENCE – REAL ESTATE AND COMMERCIAL

**Oxford Properties  
Group**  
Multiple Provinces,  
Canada

Project manager and air quality lead for completing National Pollutant Release Inventory and/or Ontario Regulation 127 emissions calculations and submissions for more than 80 of Oxford's commercial and retail facilities across Canada for seven years.

**Primaris Real Estate  
Investment Trust**  
Multiple Provinces,  
Canada

Project manager and air quality lead for completing National Pollutant Release Inventory and/or Ontario Regulation 127 emissions calculations and submissions for 26 of Primaris' commercial and retail facilities across Canada for three years.

**Oxford Properties  
Group**  
Multiple Locations,  
Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead for completing Certificate of Approval (Air) applications for 20 of Oxford's commercial and retail facilities across Ontario.

## PROJECT EXPERIENCE – MUNICIPAL

**New Oakville Hospital**  
Oakville, Ontario

Project manager managing the completion of applications for both an Environmental Compliance Approval and a Town of Oakville Health Protection Air Quality By-Law Approval for the proposed New Oakville Hospital.

**Disco Road Biogas  
Utilization Project**  
Toronto, Ontario

Air quality lead for completion of a Renewable Energy Approval for a proposed 2.8 megawatt power generation facility located in Toronto, Ontario. The facility would be fuelled by biogas collected from an adjacent organics processing facility.

**Durham Police  
Training Facility**  
Whitby, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead for the completion of an Certificate of Approval application for a police training facility.

## PROJECT EXPERIENCE – POWER

**Northland Power**  
Kingston, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead for the completion of an Environmental Compliance Approval application for natural gas fired co-generation facility.

**purEnergy - Kawartha  
Biogas**  
Havelock, Ontario

Project Manager and air quality lead for the completion of air, noise and surface water assessments in support of a Renewable Energy Approval application for the Kawartha Biogas facility.



**Atikokan Generating  
Station**

Atikokan, Ontario

Project manager and air quality lead for assisting Ontario Power Generation in the acquisition of Certificates of Approval from the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for the re-fuelling of the Atikokan Generating Station (GS) as a biomass fired generating station.

## PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Air and Waste Management Association

Professional Engineers Ontario



**[golder.com](http://golder.com)**