SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd.
100 Stone Road West, Suite 201, Guelph, ON N1G 5L3

October 21, 2024

Attention: Lance Kaprielian

Studio Lamina Inc.
180 Shaw Street, Suite 315,
Toronto, ON M6J 2W5

SLR Project No.: 241.30640.00000

RE: Response to Peer Review of Environmental Noise Study for 1 Columbia Street West, Waterloo, Ontario

SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. (SLR), was retained by was retained by Studio Limina Inc. to an Environmental Noise Assessment in support of the Site Plan Approval (SPA) for 1 Columbia Street West, in Waterloo, Ontario (Project site).

The findings of the study were presented in the following report:

- Environmental Noise Assessment – 1 Columbia Street West, City of Toronto, Ontario, dated November 18, 2022 (the Noise Study).

A peer review of the above was conducted on behalf of the Region of Waterloo by RWDI, in a letter dated May 10, 2024. The purpose of this letter is to provide responses their comments.

An updated noise study dated October 18, 2024 (Updated Noise Study) has been prepared in response to the received comments as well as changes to the development plans.

In summary the opinions concluded in our original/Updated Noise Study, together with the current response to the peer review, demonstrate that the Project site will be compatible with the inclusions of the recommendations.

Noise Comments

Noise Comment #1

The Noise Study reviews the potential sources of environmental noise in the area.

a. Road traffic noise from Columbia Street West/East and King Street North, which is appropriate.
b. Onsite stationary sources were assessed on the development itself and the surrounding noise sensitive buildings, which is appropriate.
c. Offsite stationary sources were assessed from surrounding commercial and industrial buildings, which is appropriate.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #1

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #2

Development drawings included with the submission package differ in comparison to the appendix drawings in the Noise Study. Although changes appear to be minor, a review is required to confirm the Noise Study assessment is not affected.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #2

The latest drawings have been reviewed and incorporated into the assessment for the Updated Noise Study.

Noise Comment #3

Noise assessment guidance and limits are cited from Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) publication NPC-300 in the Noise Study. The Region and City of Waterloo has developed and published local guidance. Since the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Noise Policy Implementation Guideline and City of Waterloo Terms of Reference (Noise) have some variation from NPC-300, this published local guidance would be applicable in preference to the MECP guidance where there are differences. In general, these variations are minor and have no effect on the technical analysis as the criteria are the same, and application of NPC-300 is considered appropriate, Regardless, reference to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Noise Policy and City of Waterloo Terms of Reference (Noise) are required to be included in revisions or addendums to the N+V Study.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #3

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #4

The Noise Study includes the appropriate Owner’s Declaration Statement and commissioned Consultant’s Declaration Statement.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #4

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #5

The report uses the NPC-300 guideline for assessment of the transportation sources, which is consistent with the current practice in the Region.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #5

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #6

The applicable guidelines for road traffic noise façade levels are summarized in Section 2.2 of the Noise Study and appropriately align with the guidance documents.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #6

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #7

A 10-year future road traffic information for Columbia Street West and King Street North were provided by the Region and summarized in Section 2.3.1 of the Noise Study. The data was valid at the time of this review.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #7

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #8

A review was completed of the roadway noise modelling. The following is noted:

a. Modelling was completed using line sources in Cadna/A with emission rates calculated with ORNAMENT algorithms. This approach is considered acceptable, as a STAMSON v5.04 validation file was provided in the Noise Study.

b. On review of the results in Table 6 and Figure 2 of the Noise Study, the east façade worst-case sound levels are shown to be 65 dBA. However the Noise Study Appendix D validation file indicates at 66 dBA (65.9 dBA) on the east façade sound level. A review/revision of the Cadna/A implementation of ORNAMENT is required. Should the impacts exceed 65 dBA during the daytime, the results and conclusions are to be revised regarding façade construction and warning clause/ventilation recommendations.

c. King Street North, south of Columbia Street, slopes downward and is expected to have a gradient higher than 2%. On review of the ORNAMENT Sound Power Calculation sheet and Appendix D validation file, a gradient adjustment was not considered. A review of the roadway gradient is required to be completed for King Street North, and included, if applicable. If necessary, the results and conclusions are to be revised regarding façade construction and warning clause/ventilation recommendations.

d. Prediction of sound levels with the “building evaluation” feature of Cadna/A is considered acceptable.

e. Inclusion of topography based on City of Waterloo Open Data is considered acceptable.

f. Assessment of intervening grounds as reflective is considered appropriate.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #8

No additional response required for points a, d, e, or f.

b. The point of assessment used in the validation file is located on the east façade of the ground floor which does not contain a noise sensitive area and therefore not part of the building evaluation shown in Table 6 and Figure 2. Regardless, the analysis has been updated and the results and conclusions regarding façade construction and warning clause/ventilation requirements have been revised in the Updated Noise Study

c. A review of roadway gradient has been included and the recommendations have been updated accordingly in the Updated Noise Study.

Noise Comment #9

An assessment of façade sound levels was discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the Noise Study. As the roadway noise modelling results are to be reviewed and have the potential to increase (refer Comment 8.b and 8.c above), comments could not be provided at this time. Should the modelling results increase, an assessment of building components is considered necessary.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #9

See above comment responses 8.b and 8.c. No additional response required.

Noise Comment #10

A discussion of OLA sound levels was included in Section 2.4.2 of the Noise Study. The following is noted:

> a. The at-grade area is publicly accessible and excluded from the assessment, which is considered acceptable.
>
> b. The private terraces were excluded as the depth is less than 4 m, which is considered appropriate. On review of the submission package drawings, private terraces do not appear to be included. Although changes to the development drawings appear to be minor, a review should be completed of current drawings to confirm the results and conclusions of the Noise Study do not change.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #10

a. No additional response required.

b. A review has of the most recent drawings has been conducted and included in th Updated Noise Study.

Noise Comment #11

Ventilation and Warning Clause requirements are summarized in Section 2.5 of the Noise Study. As the roadway noise modelling results are to be reviewed and have the potential to increase (refer Comment 8.b and 8.c above), comments could not be provided at this time. Should the modelling results increase, ventilation and warning clause requirements may need to be revised to include “mandatory air conditioning”.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #11

These have been included in the Updated Noise Study. No additional response required.

Noise Comment #12

The report uses the NPC-300 guideline for assessment of the stationary sources, which is consistent with the current practice in the Region.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #12

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #13

The surrounding area is described as a Class 1 acoustic environment as a conservative assessment of impacts, which is considered acceptable.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #13

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #14

The identification of significant stationary noise sources was reviewed. The following is noted:

a. A site visit was completed on October 22, 2022 to identify significant stationary noise sources within the surrounding area, which is considered appropriate.

b. Sources of Interest include:

i. 354 King Street North commercial building rooftop equipment consisting of HVAC units, which is considered appropriate.

ii. Other Institutional/Commercial Lands surrounding the development were considered to be insignificant based on site visit observations. This is considered acceptable, with the exception of the McDonalds restaurant. As indicated in the City of Waterloo Zoning By-law, drive thrus within 100 m of a noise sensitive building are of interest. Therefore, an assessment of the McDonalds drive thru and rooftop equipment is necessary. In particular, the night-time period historically includes high levels of activity within the drive-thru for a McDonalds restaurant.

iii. Industrial facilities are included in the discussion of the Institutional/Commercial buildings, where an assessment was not considered necessary due to closer intervening noise sensitive buildings. This is considered acceptable.

iv. The adjacent King's Court (345 King St N) appears to have PTAC units long the north façade facing the Project site. As the Project site is expected to have noise sensitive units closer to the King's Court building than the existing house with marginally lower ambient noise, an assessment of PTAC units from this development is necessary to confirm stationary noise is not a concern.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #14

No additional response required for comments a., b.i, or b.iii.

b.

ii. While the McDonalds is anticipated to meet Class I guideline limits at the existing and closer noise sensitive building on the development, an assessment of the noise impacts from the McDonalds has been included in the Updated Noise Study.

iv. PTAC units are expected to meet Class I noise guidelines at its own façade, and pre-existing noise sensitive receptors present at the Project site. Therefore, additional assessment is not warranted.

Noise Comment #15

Source data is discussed in Section 3.1.4 and summarized in Appendix F of the Noise Study. The following is noted:

a. Sound level data was applied for the HVAC units based on SLR in-house database, which is considered acceptable.

b. HVAC equipment was assessed based on continuous operation during the daytime/evening and 50% duty cycle during the night-time, which considered acceptable.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #15

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #16

Noise impact modelling was completed using CadnaA modelling software, which is acceptable.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #16

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #17

Modelling noise parameters are included in Section 3.1.5 of the Noise Study and are considered appropriate. This includes temperature, relative humidity, ground absorption, reflections and inclusion of terrain.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #17

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #18

Modelled noise impacts are summarized in **Table 9** of the Noise Study for each façade of the development. As the noise modelling does not include the McDonalds restaurant, comments could not be provided at this time.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #18

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #19

The inclusion of an MECP Type E warning clause is considered appropriate, as the McDonalds Drive Thru is anticipated to be audible during the night-time period at the Project site.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #19

No additional response required.

Noise Comment #20

An assessment of stationary noise on the surroundings and itself was not completed for the development mechanical systems, as insufficient information was available at the time of the Noise

Study. However, based on the submission development drawing **A205 – Level MPH&Roof,** sufficient mechanical system information is anticipated to be available. In addition, mandatory AC may be applicable for the development (refer ***Comments 8.b and 8.c*** above). Providing PTAC units are used for cooling, an assessment of mechanical system noise should be completed at this stage to confirm the guideline limits can be met. The Region has experience with the assessment of mechanical noise being left late in the planning process, leading to design challenges. Hence, it is recommended that an appropriate hold or condition be placed on the development until the mechanical design can be verified.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #20

Sufficient mechanical system information is now available, an assessment of stationary noise on the surroundings and itself has been included in the Updated Noise Study. It has been confirmed that PTAC units will not be used in the development.

Noise Comment #21

An assessment/discussion of the existing 1 Columbia Street building mechanical equipment is required to confirm stationary noise is not a concern for the new building. On review of available aerial photography, sources are expected to include an internal cooling tower and a rooftop emergency generator at a minimum.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #21

It is anticipated the mechanical equipment associated with the existing 1 Columbia Street building will meet Class 1 noise guidelines at the existing building, the existing homes at the Project site, and 345 King Street North. Given this, and the height difference between the two buildings, no additional assessment is required.

Noise Comment #22

The Conclusions and Recommendations section summarizes the mitigation requirements in the Noise Study. As the results of the transportation and surrounding stationary noise study may be revised, comments could not be provided at this time.

SLR Response to Noise Comment #22

The Updated Noise study has been modified to address all of the above comments.

Closure

We trust that the above responses as well as the Updated Noise Study has addressed all of RWDI's comments. In summary, the opinions concluded in our original/Updated Noise Study, together with the current responses to the peer review of the Project, demonstrate that the proposed development can be compatible with the surrounding land uses.

Should you or they have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact us. Yours sincerely,

SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd.





Dylan Diebolt, B.Sc.
Acoustics Consultant
ddiebolt@slrconsulting.com

Aaron K. Haniff, P.Eng.
Principal Acoustics Engineer
ahaniff@slrconsulting.com

Attachments A – Peer Review Comments

Attachment A – Peer Review Comments

Peer Review Response

1 Columbia Street West

Studio Lamina Inc.

SLR Project No.: 241.30640.00000

October 21, 2024

600 Southgate Drive
Guelph ON Canada
N1G 4P6

Tel: +1.519.823.1311
Fax: +1.519.823.1316
E-mail: solutions@rwdi.com

May 10, 2024

Susanna Reid, MCIP, RPP
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
sreid@regionofwaterloo.ca

Re: Peer Review – Noise
1 Columbia Street West & 351 and 355 King Street North, Waterloo
RWDI Reference No. 2300540.49

Dear Susanna,

The Region of Waterloo has retained RWDI to conduct a peer review of a noise study for 1 Columbia Street West & 351 and 355 King Street North development in Waterloo, completed in support of a Zoning Bylaw Amendment and Official Plan Amendment application. The applicant is proposing a 7-storey residential building on lands currently occupied by 2 single family homes (311 and 355 King Street North). In addition, a café and renovations are proposed for the existing 22-storey residential building (1 Columbia Street West). The review considered the report titled "Environmental Noise Assessment, 1 Columbia Street West, Waterloo, Ontario", SLR Project Number 241.30640.00000 and dated November 18, 2022 (Noise Study).

This review reflects best practices for land-use planning, as well as guidelines and policies mandated by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (RMOW) and, where applicable, the Province of Ontario. Where differences in guidance may exist, the RMOW has provided direct guidance to this peer reviewer on their expectations. In all cases, the direction and policies of the RMOW take precedence. Comments requiring action by the applicant are highlighted throughout this document for ease of identification.

Assessment Approach

1. The Noise Study reviews the potential sources of environmental noise in the area.
    a. Road traffic noise from Columbia Street West/East and King Street North, which is appropriate.
    b. Onsite stationary sources were assessed on the development itself and the surrounding noise sensitive buildings, which is appropriate.
    c. Offsite stationary sources were assessed from surrounding commercial and industrial buildings, which is appropriate.
2. Development drawings included with the submission package differ in comparison to the appendix drawings in the Noise Study. Although changes appear to be minor, a review is required to confirm the Noise Study assessment is not affected.

CANADA'S BEST MANAGED COMPANIES Platinum member

©2023 RWDI AIR Inc. ("RWDI") ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
This document is intended for the sole use of the party to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately. RWDI aims to accommodate. If you require this document in a different format in order to aid accessibility, please contact the sender of this document, email solutions@rwdi.com or call +1.519.823.1311
®2023 RWDI name and logo are registered trademarks in Canada and the United States of America

3. Noise assessment guidance and limits are cited from Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) publication NPC-300 in the Noise Study. The Region and City of Waterloo has developed and published local guidance. Since the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Noise Policy Implementation Guideline and City of Waterloo Terms of Reference (Noise) have some variation from NPC-300, this published local guidance would be applicable in preference to the MECP guidance where there are differences. In general, these variations are minor and have no effect on the technical analysis as the criteria are the same, and application of NPC-300 is considered appropriate, Regardless, reference to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Noise Policy and City of Waterloo Terms of Reference (Noise) are required to be included in revisions or addendums to the N+V Study.
4. The Noise Study includes the appropriate Owner's Declaration Statement and commissioned Consultant's Declaration Statement.

Surface Transportation Noise

5. The report uses the NPC-300 guideline for assessment of the transportation sources, which is consistent with the current practice in the Region.
6. The applicable guidelines for road traffic noise façade levels are summarized in **Section 2.2** of the Noise Study and appropriately align with the guidance documents.
7. A 10-year future road traffic information for Columbia Street West and King Street North were provided by the Region and summarized in **Section 2.3.1** of the Noise Study. The data was valid at the time of this review.
8. A review was completed of the roadway noise modelling. The following is noted:
    a. Modelling was completed using line sources in Cadna/A with emission rates calculated with ORNAMENT algorithms. This approach is considered acceptable, as a STAMSON v5.04 validation file was provided in the Noise Study.
    b. On review of the results in **Table 6** and **Figure 2** of the Noise Study, the east façade worst-case sound levels are shown to be 65 dBA. However the Noise Study **Appendix D** validation file indicates at 66 dBA (65.9 dBA) on the east façade sound level. A review/revision of the Cadna/A implementation of ORNAMENT is required. Should the impacts exceed 65 dBA during the daytime, the results and conclusions are to be revised regarding façade construction and warning clause/ventilation recommendations.
    c. King Street North, south of Columbia Street, slopes downward and is expected to have a gradient higher than 2%. On review of the ORNAMENT Sound Power Calculation sheet and **Appendix D** validation file, a gradient adjustment was not considered. A review of the roadway gradient is required to be completed for King Street North, and

included, if applicable. If necessary, the results and conclusions are to be revised regarding façade construction and warning clause/ventilation recommendations.

d. Prediction of sound levels with the "building evaluation" feature of Cadna/A is considered acceptable.
e. Inclusion of topography based on City of Waterloo Open Data is considered acceptable.
f. Assessment of intervening grounds as reflective is considered appropriate.

9. An assessment of façade sound levels was discussed in **Section 2.4.1** of the Noise Study. As the roadway noise modelling results are to be reviewed and have the potential to increase (refer ***Comment 8.b and 8.c*** above), comments could not be provided at this time. Should the modelling results increase, an assessment of building components is considered necessary.
10. A discussion of OLA sound levels was included in **Section 2.4.2** of the Noise Study. The following is noted:
    a. The at-grade area is publicly accessible and excluded from the assessment, which is considered acceptable.
    b. The private terraces were excluded as the depth is less than 4 m, which is considered appropriate. On review of the submission package drawings, private terraces do not appear to be included. Although changes to the development drawings appear to be minor, a review should be completed of current drawings to confirm the results and conclusions of the Noise Study do not change.
11. Ventilation and Warning Clause requirements are summarized in **Section 2.5** of the Noise Study. As the roadway noise modelling results are to be reviewed and have the potential to increase (refer ***Comment 8.b and 8.c*** above), comments could not be provided at this time. Should the modelling results increase, ventilation and warning clause requirements may need to be revised to include "mandatory air conditioning".

Surrounding Stationary Noise

12. The report uses the NPC-300 guideline for assessment of the stationary sources, which is consistent with the current practice in the Region.
13. The surrounding area is described as a Class 1 acoustic environment as a conservative assessment of impacts, which is considered acceptable.
14. The identification of significant stationary noise sources was reviewed. The following is noted:
    a. A site visit was completed on October 22, 2022 to identify significant stationary noise sources within the surrounding area, which is considered appropriate.
    b. Sources of Interest include:
        i. 354 King Street North commercial building rooftop equipment consisting of HVAC units, which is considered appropriate.

ii. Other Institutional/Commercial Lands surrounding the development were considered to be insignificant based on site visit observations. This is considered acceptable, with the exception of the McDonalds restaurant. As indicated in the City of Waterloo Zoning By-law, drive thrus within 100 m of a noise sensitive building are of interest. Therefore, an assessment of the McDonalds drive thru and rooftop equipment is necessary. In particular, the night-time period historically includes high levels of activity within the drive-thru for a McDonalds restaurant.

iii. Industrial facilities are included in the discussion of the Institutional/Commercial buildings, where an assessment was not considered necessary due to closer intervening noise sensitive buildings. This is considered acceptable.

iv. The adjacent King's Court (345 King St N) appears to have PTAC units long the north façade facing the proposed development. As the proposed development is expected to have noise sensitive units closer to the King's Court building than the existing house with marginally lower ambient noise, an assessment of PTAC units from this development is necessary to confirm stationary noise is not a concern.

15. Source data is discussed in **Section 3.1.4** and summarized in **Appendix F** of the Noise Study. The following is noted:
    a. Sound level data was applied for the HVAC units based on SLR in-house database, which is considered acceptable.
    b. HVAC equipment was assessed based on continuous operation during the daytime/evening and 50% duty cycle during the night-time, which considered acceptable.
16. Noise impact modelling was completed using CadnaA modelling software, which is acceptable.
17. Modelling noise parameters are included in **Section 3.1.5** of the Noise Study and are considered appropriate. This includes temperature, relative humidity, ground absorption, reflections and inclusion of terrain.
18. Modelled noise impacts are summarized in **Table 9** of the Noise Study. for each façade of the development. As the noise modelling does not include the McDonalds restaurant, comments could not be provided at this time.
19. The inclusion of an MECP Type E warning clause is considered appropriate, as the McDonalds Drive Thru is anticipated to be audible during the night-time period at the proposed development.

Development Stationary Source Noise

20. An assessment of stationary noise on the surroundings and itself was not completed for the development mechanical systems, as insufficient information was available at the time of the Noise Study. However, based on the submission development drawing **A205 – Level MPH&Roof,** sufficient mechanical system information is anticipated to be available. In addition, mandatory AC may be applicable for the development (refer ***Comments 8.b and 8.c*** above). Providing PTAC units are used for cooling, an assessment of mechanical system noise should be completed at this stage to confirm the guideline limits can be met. The Region has experience with the assessment of mechanical noise being left late in the planning process, leading to design challenges. Hence, it is recommended that an appropriate hold or condition be placed on the development until the mechanical design can be verified.
21. An assessment/discussion of the existing 1 Columbia Street building mechanical equipment is required to confirm stationary noise is not a concern for the new building. On review of available aerial photography, sources are expected to include an internal cooling tower and a rooftop emergency generator at a minimum.

Conclusions

22. The Conclusions and Recommendations section summarizes the mitigation requirements in the Noise Study. As the results of the transportation and surrounding stationary noise study may be revised, comments could not be provided at this time.

Summary

The environmental noise study provided for 1 Columbia Street West & 351 and 355 King Street North development in Waterloo presents an assessment for road traffic and stationary noise sources. The Region of Waterloo seeks assurance that the sound levels and impacts are accurate and complete. Comments provided in this review have the potential to change the outcomes and conclusions of the Noise Study. Revised analysis, additional information, clarification and supporting justification is required.

Key items with the potential to affect the results and conclusions of the Noise Study include the following:

- A comparison of the development submission drawings with the drawings applied in the assessment is required to confirm the noise study assessment is not affected.

- Regarding the transportation noise assessment, the following is noted:
    - A review/revision of the Cadna/A implementation of ORNAMENT is required, as the appendix's validated STAMSON and Cadna/A results are predicted to be higher than the results included in the body of the report.
    - A review of the roadway gradient is required to be completed for King Street North, and included, if applicable.
    - As modelled noise impacts have the potential to exceed 65 dBA during the daytime following the above roadway modelling review (ie. validation confirmation and gradient), the inclusion of a building component assessment and revised ventilation/warning clauses may be required.
- Regarding the surrounding stationary noise assessment, the following is noted:
    - The potential impacts from the McDonalds drive-thru and restaurant are required.
    - An assessment of mechanical equipment noise from the adjacent King's Court (345 King St N) building is required.
- An assessment of development mechanical equipment should be completed, particularly if PTAC units have the potential to be used.
- An assessment/discussion of the existing 1 Columbia Street building mechanical equipment is required to confirm stationary noise is not a concern for the new building.

Without addressing these items, it is not possible to provide assurance that the values, results, and conclusions are reasonable.

A letter addendum may be considered sufficient regarding the above, providing the results and conclusions are unchanged. Otherwise, a revised Noise Study is considered necessary.

Yours truly,

RWDI

Marcus Li

Marcus Li, P.Eng.
Technical Director, Noise & Vibration

Statement of Limitations

This report entitled "Peer Review – Noise, 1 Columbia Street West & 351 and 355 King Street North, Waterloo", dated May 10, 2024, was prepared by RWDI AIR Inc. ("RWDI") for the Region of Waterloo ("Client"). The findings and conclusions presented in this report have been prepared for the Client and are specific to the peer review described herein ("Project"). The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based on the information available to RWDI when this report was prepared. Because the contents of this report may not reflect the final design of the Project or subsequent changes made after the date of this report, RWDI recommends that it be retained by Client during the final stages of the project to verify that the results and recommendations provided in this report have been correctly interpreted in the final design of the Project.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report have also been made for the specific purpose(s) set out herein. Should the Client or any other third party utilize the report and/or implement the conclusions and recommendations contained therein for any other purpose or project without the involvement of RWDI, the Client or such third party assumes any and all risk of any and all consequences arising from such use and RWDI accepts no responsibility for any liability, loss, or damage of any kind suffered by Client or any other third party arising therefrom.