



74 Berkeley St,, Toronto, Ontario M5A 2W7 t 647-795-8153

Hydrogeological Investigation – Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area B

Bolton, Ontario

Palmer Project # 170163

Prepared For Zancor Homes (Bolton) Inc.

August 23, 2021



74 Berkeley St,, Toronto, Ontario M5A 2W7 t 647-795-8153

August 23, 2021

Zancor Homes (Bolton) Inc. c/o Frank Filippo Senior Executive Vice President Brookvalley Project Management Inc. 137 Bowes Road Concord, ON L4K 1H3

Dear Mr. Filippo:

Re:Hydrogeological Investigation – Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area BProject #:170163

Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc. is pleased to submit the attached report describing the results of our Hydrogeological Investigation for the proposed land development within the Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area B, in Bolton, Ontario. This report has been updated from the version provided during the 1st Submission (dated December 29, 2020) to include the August 2021 Concept Plan. No substantive changes to the hydrogeological report findings or conclusions from the December 29, 2020 report are made in this updated report.

This report is intended to support the proposed urban boundary expansion of the Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area B through the Local Official Plan Amendment (LOPA) process, as well as support a submission to the Town of Caledon for Draft Plan of Subdivision and Re-Zoning.

Please let us know if you have any questions or comments on this submission.

Thank you for the opportunity to work with your team on this project.

Yours truly,

Palmer Environmental Consulting Group Inc.

1. Cle

Jason Cole, M.Sc., P.Geo. Principal, Senior Hydrogeologist



Table of Contents

Letter

| 1. | Introd | luction | .1 | | | |
|----|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 1.1 | Scope of Work | . 1 | | | |
| 2. | Regio | onal Existing Conditions | .3 | | | |
| | 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 | Physiography and Regional Geology Hydrostratigraphy Drainage MECP Water Wells | .3 .3 .4 .4 | | | |
| 3. | Local | Existing Conditions | .7 | | | |
| | 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 3.6 | Site Geology | .7 .7 .8 .8 11 11 | | | |
| 4. | Pre-D | evelopment Water Balance1 | 15 | | | |
| | 4.1 4.2 4.3 | Methodology Pre-Development Water Balance Results Post-Development Water Balance Results | 15 18 19 | | | |
| 5. | Devel | opment Considerations | 24 | | | |
| | 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 | Dewatering Stormwater Pond | 24 25 26 26 | | | |
| 6. | Sumn | nary and Conclusions | 27 | | | |
| 7. | Signatures | | | | | |
| 8. | References | | | | | |



List of Figures

| Figure 1. Site Area | 2 |
|---|----|
| Figure 2. Surficial Geology | 5 |
| Figure 3. MECP Water Wells | 6 |
| Figure 4. Recorded Groundwater Levels in MW-5 and MW-2S | 9 |
| Figure 5. Groundwater Flow | 10 |
| Figure 6. Site Topography | 16 |
| Figure 7. Pre-Development Land Use | 17 |
| Figure 8. Pre-Development Infiltration | 22 |
| Figure 9. Pre-Development Runoff | 23 |

List of Tables

| Table 2. Mini Piezometer Installation Details, Water Levels, and Hydraulic Gradients 11 Table 3. Hydraulic Conductivity Results 12 Table 4. Groundwater Chemistry Results 12 Table 5. Summary of Infiltration Factors (MOEE, 1995) 18 Table 6. Available Water Surplus Values by Pre-Development Land Use 20 |
|---|
| Table 3. Hydraulic Conductivity Results 12 Table 4. Groundwater Chemistry Results 12 Table 5. Summary of Infiltration Factors (MOEE, 1995) 18 Table 6. Available Water Surplus Values by Pre-Development Land Use 20 |
| Table 4. Groundwater Chemistry Results 12 Table 5. Summary of Infiltration Factors (MOEE, 1995) 18 Table 6. Available Water Surplus Values by Pre-Development Land Use 20 |
| Table 5. Summary of Infiltration Factors (MOEE, 1995) |
| Table 6. Available Water Surplus Values by Pre-Development Land Use |
| |
| Table 7. Pre-and-Post Development Water Balance 21 |

List of Appendices

| Appendix A. | Appendix A1: Draft Plan of Subdivision (HPG, 2021) |
|-------------|--|
| | Appendix A2: Preliminary Storm Drainage Area Plan, Infiltration Plan, and Preliminary Servicing Plan (Candevcon, 2020) |
| Appendix B. | Borehole Logs (Soil Engineers Ltd., 2018) |
| Appendix C. | Single Well Response Test Analyses (Palmer, 2018) |
| Appendix D. | Groundwater Chemistry Certificate of Analysis |

Palmer.

1. Introduction

Palmer was retained by Zancor Homes (Bolton) Inc. to complete a Hydrogeological Investigation for the proposed Chickadee Lane residential land development project in Bolton, Ontario (the "project" or the "site"). The property is referred to as the Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area B (**Figure 1**) and is part of the Bolton Residential Expansion Lands (BRES) Official Plan Amendment (ROPA 30). Prior to submission of a Draft Plan, these lands must be brought into the Bolton urban boundary through completion of a Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP), inclusive of a hydrogeological assessment. This report was prepared to support the CEISMP process as part of a Local Official Plan Amendment (LOPA), Draft Plan and Re-Zoning submission to the Town of Caledon.

The site is located on an approximately 10.08 ha parcel of land, with 2.75 ha located within the Provincially designated Greenbelt Lands. The Draft Plan of Subdivision for the proposed Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area B by Humphries Planning Group Inc. (HPG, 2021) is presented in **Appendix A1**. Stormwater Management (SWM) Plan and Site Servicing Plan drawings from Candevcon (2020) are presented in **Appendix A2**.

The subject property is located within the Humber River Watershed, under the jurisdiction of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). The purpose of the hydrogeological investigation is to determine the existing hydrogeological conditions and identify potential impacts of the proposed development to local surface water and groundwater resources. This hydrogeological assessment was undertaken in tandem with the geotechnical investigation completed by Soil Engineers Inc. and includes an assessment of soil and groundwater conditions including groundwater levels, groundwater flow, aquifers and aquitards, local water use, a pre-to-post development water balance, and recommendations for Low Impact Development (LID) mitigation measures.

1.1 Scope of Work

The scope of work for Palmer's Hydrogeological Investigation to support site design and permitting includes the following main tasks:

- Characterize the surface and sub-surface geological and hydrogeological conditions through use of data from six (6) boreholes and four (4) groundwater monitoring wells as installed by Soil Engineers Ltd.;
- Develop and complete hydraulic testing at monitoring wells (response test) to estimate hydraulic conductivity;
- Complete one (1) groundwater chemistry sample for comparison with Ontario Drinking Water Standards (ODWS);
- Installation of one (1) drive-point piezometer to assess surface water/ groundwater interactions in the tributary to the Humber River located north of the site;
- Monthly groundwater and MP water level monitoring over a 1-year period to confirm seasonality of site water levels;
- Instrument two (2) wells with Solinst Leveloggers to continuously record groundwater levels;
- Conduct a pre-to-post-development site water balance and a dewatering assessment; and,
- Provide a Hydrogeological Investigation Report to support site design, permitting and CEISMP reporting.



2. Regional Existing Conditions

2.1 Physiography and Regional Geology

The site is located within the South Slope physiographic region, characterised as a slightly drumlinized region that lies to the south of the Oak Ridges Moraine and north of the Peel Plain (Chapman and Putman, 1984).

The surficial geology of the site, as described by Ontario Geological Survey (OGS) mapping, is characterized as Halton Till with clayey to silt-textured sediments derived from glaciolacustrine deposits or shale (**Figure 2**). The Halton Till overlies the Newmarket Till, and where present, these tills are separated by the sandy deposits of the Oak Ridges Moraine.

Paleozoic bedrock at the site is characterized by the shale and limestone of the Georgian Bay Formation. Bedrock was not encountered during the most recent borehole drilling, and based on Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) water well database information, this formation is encountered at approximately 156 m below ground surface, or 100 meters above sea level (masl) at the site location.

2.2 Hydrostratigraphy

Hydrostratigraphic units can be classified into two distinct groups based on their capacity for permitting groundwater movement: an aquifer or an aquitard. An aquifer is generally defined as a layer of soil permeable enough to conduct a usable supply of water, while an aquitard is a layer of soil that inhibits groundwater movement due to low permeability. The major regional hydrostratigraphic units that control groundwater at the site are described below.

The *Halton Till* and underlying *Newmarket Till* are often grouped together in this area and act as significant regional aquitards of fine textured sediments. The low permeability of the unit limits groundwater recharge and contaminant migration, however the presence of sand and gravel within the tills can also act as confined aquifers on a local scale in some areas. The bulk hydraulic conductivity (K) of these units ranges from approximately $5x10^{-6}$ m/s to $5x10^{-8}$ m/s (CAMC-YPDT, 2006). Groundwater flow within these units is typically downwards towards more permeable units. Within the study area, Halton Till sediments are approximately 20 m to 40 m thick, making it the dominant aquitard unit. Based on location water well records from a series of municipal test wells near the site, the till units are approximately 123.4 m in thickness, overlying a sand aquifer.

The **Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM)** acts as a major aquifer and recharge complex within the region. Near the study area it is expected that the ORM is between approximately 1 m and 15 m in thickness and is confined by the lower permeability Halton Till and Newmarket Till aquitards. Local MECP well records did not identify this unit at the site.

The *Thorncliffe Aquifer* consists of glaciofluvial and glaciolacustrine sediments of stratified sands, silty sand, and silt and clay. This aquifer is confined by the *Newmarket Till* aquitard and is approximately 5 m to 10 m in thickness near to the study area. Overall groundwater flow within this aquifer is south towards Lake Ontario or within discharge areas in major river valleys.

2.3 Drainage

The study area lies within the Main Humber River Subwatershed, which forms the northernmost and largest portion of the Humber River Watershed, contributing 32% of total baseflow to the overall watershed. The subwatershed encompasses three secondary subwatersheds systems, Centreville Creek, Cold Creek, and Rainbow Creek. The subwatershed drains an area of approximately 357 km² and has the highest baseflow to total flow ratios (Baseflow Index, BFI) of the five primary subwatersheds that constitute the Humber River Watershed. This ratio indicates a largely groundwater dominated flow regime and a greater likelihood to contain cold water habitats for aquatic organisms (TRCA, 2008-a).

The subwatershed consists of primarily agriculture (40.8%) and natural (46.3%) land, and of the five primary subwatersheds has the lowest urban use (12.1%) and contains the majority of identified higher quality terrestrial habitat. However, the subwatershed is rated as fair for quality distribution of natural cover, and the lower reach is currently undergoing urbanization as part of municipal growth requirements.

2.4 MECP Water Wells

Based on an updated search of the MECP water well database, 34 water well records were identified within a 500 m radius of the site (**Figure 3**). A roadside water well screening identified up to 14 properties within 500 m of the site that have the potential to still rely on potable groundwater rather than municipal supply, although the municipal water is known to be available along Glasgow Road, Chickadee Lane, Emil Kolb Parkway and King Street. A detailed door-to-door water well survey will be completed at detailed design to document existing potable groundwater use near the site and to collect baseline data on groundwater quality and quantity.

A series of municipal supply test wells (and their associated decommissioning records) are found along Glasgow Road adjacent to the site. These wells are between approximately 135 and 145 m deep, and identified a confined sand aquifer below approximately 123.4 m of clayey silt to sandy silt till. These wells are not utilized for municipal water and confirm that there is a very thick, low permeability confining unit underlying the Chickadee Lane site protecting deep aquifers.



Basemap Service Layer Credits: Content may not reflect National Geographic's current map policy. Sources: National Geographic, Esri, Garmin, HERE, UNEP-WCMC, USGS, NASA, ESA, METI, NRCAN, GEBCO, NOAA, increment P Corp. Contains information licensed under the Open Government Licence - Ontario and Canada.





3. Local Existing Conditions

3.1 Site Geology

3.1.1 Methodology

Borehole drilling at the site for hydrogeological purposes was conducted from February 23 to February 29, 2018. Fourteen boreholes were drilled under the supervision of Soil Engineers Ltd. staff to depths ranging from 6.10 mbgs to 32.0 mbgs. Borehole drilling was completed using solid stem augers, and six boreholes were completed as 51 mm diameter schedule 40 PVC pipe monitoring wells with 1.5 m long screens (MW2-S/N, MW2-D, MW5, MW6, MW12-S/N, and MW12-D). MW2S/D and MW12S/D were installed as nested wells, with S and D indicating shallow or deep well, respectively. The location of each monitoring well is shown on **Figure 1**, and well details are provided in **Table 2**. Borehole logs are presented in **Appendix B**.

A watercourse was noted in the Greenbelt lands to the northwest of the site which contributes to the tributary to the Humber River (**Figure 1**). One mini piezometer (MP1) was installed within the feature to measure the magnitude and direction of the hydraulic gradient within the tributary (**Table 3**).

3.1.2 Results

Surficial geology at the site is consistent with regional OGS mapping (**Figure 2**). The overall lithology of the silty clay till unit is consistent with the Halton Till, containing trace gravel and occasional sand seams, cobbles and boulders. This unit of silty clay till was encountered throughout the length of all boreholes, indicating a very thick aquitard unit stretching across the area. Site stratigraphy encountered during borehole drilling is summarized below.

Topsoil: All boreholes encountered topsoil ranging in thickness from 0.16 m to 0.46 m.

Earth Fill: Five boreholes encountered earth fill beneath the topsoil ranging in thickness from 0.39 m to 1.96 m. This fill is generally described as brown to grey silty clay with pockets of topsoil and occasional rootlets, wood debris, and brick fragments.

Silty Clay Till: Sediments of silty clay till from the Halton Till formation were encountered in all boreholes underlying either topsoil or earth fill. The thickness of this unit ranged from 4.10 m to 31.54 m, and the bottom of this unit was not encountered during drilling. This unit is expected to be approximately 40 m thick in this area.

Based on MECP water well records, underlying the silty clay Halton Till to a depth of 123.4 mbgs, is sandy silt till, interpreted to be part of the Newmarket Till formation, and layered clay, silt and fine sand of the upper Thorncliffe Fm.



3.2 Groundwater Levels

Groundwater levels in the monitoring wells were measured on March 15th and 19th, April 4th, May 17th, June 13th, July 19th, and August 27th, 2018. The shallow groundwater table ranged in depth from 0.12 mbgs (MW2-S on April 4, 2018) to 8.71 mbgs (MW12-S on March 19, 2018), and the deep groundwater table ranged from 11.35 mbgs (MW2-D on May 17, 2018) to 29.12 mbgs (MW12-D on March 19, 2018), as indicated in **Table 1**.

The shallow water levels measured in some wells indicate the presence of perched water table conditions at the site. These conditions arise due to the very poor drainage of the Halton Till aquitard to deeper material that results in slow downward percolation rates and an increased response of shallow soils to surface water inputs. The actual level of the *water table* ranges from approximately 5 m to 8 m below ground surface across the site, indicated by a shift in soil colour from brown (oxidized) to grey (wet, low oxygen) seen in borehole logs for MW2, MW6, and MW12S/D (**Appendix B**). The majority of boreholes were dry on completion and demonstrating the deeper water table and the low permeability of the soils.

It is therefore important to consider that groundwater levels are subject to fluctuations due to seasonality and precipitation input. As the monitoring events took place during the pre- and post-spring freshet, these values are unlikely to be representative of the seasonal highs, however late season manual ground water levels are likely indicative of seasonal lows (**Figure 4**).

| Surface | | 0.11 | | • | | | | Water | Level (| mbgs) | | |
|------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| MW ID | Elevation (masl) | Stick Up (m) | Depth (mbgs) | Interval (mbgs) | Screened Geology | Mar 15, 2018 | Mar 19, 2018 | Apr 4, 2018 | May 17, 2018 | Jun 13, 2018 | Jul 19, 2018 | Aug 27, 2018 |
| MW2-S | 256 | 0.79 | 7.60 | 6.10 – 7.60 | Silty Clay Till | 0.85 | 0.97 | 0.12 | 0.95 | 2.62 | 3.87 | 4.72 |
| MW2-D | 256 | 0.73 | 19.80 | 18.30 – 19.80 | Silty Clay Till | 11.94 | 11.88 | 11.98 | 11.35 | 11.81 | 12.72 | 13.70 |
| MW5 | 261 | 0.64 | 5.98 | 4.60 – 6.10 | Silty Clay Till | 0.89 | 0.94 | 0.56 | 0.88 | 0.69 | 1.64 | 2.50 |
| MW6 | 259 | 0.68 | 4.59 | 4.60 – 6.10 | Silty Clay Till | 0.47 | 1.80 | 0.48 | 0.47 | 1.05 | 1.83 | 1.26 |
| MW12- S | 256 | 0.71 | 9.16 | 6.10 – 7.60 | Silty Clay Till | 6.06 | 8.71 | 8.07 | 4.60 | 3.84 | 4.26 | 4.73 |
| MW12- D | 256 | 0.80 | 30.20 | 30.50 – 32.00 | Silty Clay Till | 23.29 | 29.12 | 21.85 | 14.30 | 22.31 | 25.33 | 25.93 |

Table 1. Monitoring Well Installation Details and Groundwater Levels

3.3 Hydraulic Gradients

Groundwater flow at the site generally follows topography and flows either in a northeast direction, or northwest towards the Humber River tributary depending upon site location (**Figure 5**). Based on these results, there is a local groundwater flow divide through the middle of the site. A mean horizontal groundwater water gradient of 0.02 is observed towards both the northwest (MW2) and northeast (MW12) of the site area.





Figure 4. Recorded Groundwater Levels in MW-5 and MW-2S



Basemap Service Layer Credits: Content may not reflect National Geographic's current map policy. Sources: National Geographic, Esri, Garmin, HERE, UNEP-WCMC, USGS, NASA, ESA, METI, NRCAN, GEBCO, NOAA, increment P Corp. Contains information licensed under the Open Government Licence - Ontario and Canada.



A very strong downward hydraulic gradient was observed in the nested monitoring wells on the east (MW2 = -0.86 m/m) and west (MW12 = -1.22 m/m) margins of the site. This is expected due to the steep downwards topography of the Humber River Valley that is immediately adjacent to either of the well locations.

3.4 Groundwater – Surface Water Interactions

The Humber River tributary location northwest of the site showed a mean downward vertical hydraulic gradient of -0.45 m/m based on water level monitoring at MP1 (**Table 2**). Surface water flow was present within the feature on April 4th and May 17th, 2018, and absent during monitoring on June 13th, July 19th, and August 27th, 2018. This suggests that this feature is predominantly runoff supported and may be ephemeral.

| MP ID | Surface Elevation (masl) | Stick Up (m) | Depth to Screen (m) | Water Level (mbtoc)* | Apr 4, 2018 | May 17, 2018 | Jun 13, 2018 | Jul 19, 2018 | Aug 27, 2018 |
|-------|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| | | | | In | 1.50 | 1.11 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| MD4 | 040 | 1.00 | 0.05 | Out | 0.91 | 0.94 | Dry | Dry | Dry |
| WP1 | 243 | 1.00 | 0.85 | m) (mbtoc)* 2018 In 1.50 Out 0.91 0 Hydraulic Gradient -0.69 | -0.20 | - | - | - | |

Table 2. Mini Piezometer Installation Details, Water Levels, and Hydraulic Gradients

*In/Out measurements are expressed in meters below top of casing (mbtoc), Hydraulic gradients are unitless

3.5 Hydraulic Conductivity

On March 19 and April 4, 2018, Palmer personnel conducted single well response tests (i.e., slug tests) at four locations to determine the hydraulic conductivity (K) of the surrounding soils. Both rising head (RH) and falling head (FH) tests were conducted by creating a head change, through the insertion (FH Test) or removal (RH Test) of a 1-m long slug. The rate of recovery in each well was measured using a datalogger to record water levels at a 1 or 2-second frequency. During the tests, manual water level measurements were also recorded to gauge recovery. Tests were terminated when either 30 minutes had elapsed or an 80% recovery in water level was attained.

Hydraulic conductivity (K) values were calculated using the displacement-time data and were analysed using the Hvorslev (1951) method for confined aquifers, modelled using AqtesolvTM software. The analysis results are presented in **Appendix C**, and the range of calculated hydraulic conductivity values are summarized in **Table 3**. Calculated K values ranged from $3.5x10^{-6}$ m/s to $4.4x10^{-8}$ m/s, with a site-wide geometric mean K of $6.1x10^{-7}$ m/s. This value is within the expected range for the Halton Till Aquitard ($5x10^{-6}$ m/s to $5x10^{-8}$ m/s).

Observed variations in K values measured across the site are likely due to spatial variations in soil horizons. For example, MW6 is screened within a sandier unit, resulting in higher K values (10⁻⁶ m/s), while MW5 is within a more continuous silt and clay unit, thus resulting in a lower observed hydraulic conductivity (10⁻⁸ m/s).

| Well | Test | Hydraulic Conductivity, (m/s) | Aquifer Material | Aquifer Type | K Geometric Mean (m s ⁻¹) |
|--------|------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|--|
| MW2-S | FH | 5.1x10 ⁻⁷ | | | |
| | RH | 6.3x10 ⁻⁷ | | | |
| MW2-D | FH | 1.2x10 ⁻⁷ | | | |
| | RH | 1.3x10 ⁻⁷ | | | |
| MW5 | FH | 4.4x10 ⁻⁸ | | | _ |
| | RH | - | Silty Clay Till | Confined | 6.1x10 ⁻⁷ |
| MW6 | FH | 3.5x10 ⁻⁶ | | | |
| | RH | 4.3x10 ⁻⁶ | | | |
| MW12-S | FH | - | | | |
| | RH | - | | | |
| MW12-D | FH | - | | | |
| | RH | _ | | | |

Table 3. Hydraulic Conductivity Results

*Response test data for MW12-S/D, and the RH component of MW5 was unable to be used for determination of K and was thus excluded from geometric mean K value

Infiltration estimates were determined using empirical methods for converting between saturated hydraulic conductivity and percolation from the Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (CVC and TRCA, 2010). Based on this method, the percolation rate of the soils at the Site are calculated to be 40 mm/hr. Site-specific infiltration testing will be completed at a later design stage once the LID locations and design have been finalized.

3.6 Groundwater Chemistry

Groundwater chemistry samples were collected on March 15, 2018 from MW6 and analyzed for a suite of water quality parameters such as turbidity, TSS, pH, metals, and cations and anions. A summary table of the groundwater analysis results is presented on **Table 4**, with the Certificate of Analysis provided in **Appendix D**. Results were compared against Ontario Provincial Water Quality Objectives (PWQO) and indicate that the sample exceeds PWQO criteria for both total aluminum (AI) and total iron (Fe), most likely as a result of high TSS in the collected sample.

| Parameter | Units | Detection Limit | PWQO | Concentration (MW4) |
|------------------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|
| Physical Tests (Water) | | - | | - |
| Colour, Apparent | CU | 2.0 | - | 30.9 |
| Conductivity | umhos/cm | 3.0 | - | 941 |
| Hardness (as CaCO3) | mg/L | 10 | - | 461 |
| рН | pH units | 0.10 | 6.5-8.5 | 7.88 |
| Redox Potential | mV | -1000 | - | 317 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/L | 20 | - | 560 |

| Table 4. | Groundwater | Chemistry | Results |
|----------|-------------|-----------|---------|
|----------|-------------|-----------|---------|



| Parameter | Units | Detection Limit | PWQO | Concentration (MW4) |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Turbidity | NTU | 0.10 | - | 72.0 |
| Anions and Nutrients (Water) | | | | |
| Acidity (as CaCO3) | mg/L | 5.0 | - | 30.0 |
| Alkalinity, Total (as CaCO3) | mg/L | 10 | - | 387 |
| Ammonia, Total (as N) | mg/L | 0.020 | - | 0.022 |
| Bromide (Br) | mg/L | 0.10 | - | <0.10 |
| Chloride (Cl) | mg/L | 0.50 | - | 55.8 |
| Fluoride (F) | mg/L | 0.020 | - | 0.226 |
| Nitrate (as N) | mg/L | 0.020 | - | <0.020 |
| Nitrite (as N) | mg/L | 0.010 | - | <0.010 |
| Orthophosphate-Dissolved (as P) | mg/L | 0.0030 | - | <0.0030 |
| Phosphorus, Total | mg/L | 0.0030 | - | 0.0560 |
| Sulfate (SO4) | mg/L | 0.30 | - | 77.1 |
| Bacteriological Tests (Water) | | | | |
| Escherichia Coli | MPN/100mL | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Coliforms | MPN/100mL | 0 | - | >201 |
| Total Metals (Water) | | | | |
| Aluminum (Al)-Total | mg/L | 0.0050 | 0.075 | 1.24 |
| Antimony (Sb)-Total | mg/L | 0.00010 | 0.02 | 0.00017 |
| Arsenic (As)-Total | mg/L | 0.00010 | 0.005 | 0.00126 |
| Barium (Ba)-Total | mg/L | 0.00020 | - | 0.0943 |
| Beryllium (Be)-Total | mg/L | 0.00010 | 0.011-1.1 | <0.00010 |
| Bismuth (Bi)-Total | mg/L | 0.000050 | - | <0.000050 |
| Boron (B)-Total | mg/L | 0.010 | 0.2 | 0.027 |
| Cadmium (Cd)-Total | ug/L | 0.0000050 | 0.1-0.5 | 0.0000197 |
| Calcium (Ca)-Total | mg/L | 0.50 | - | 108 |
| Cesium (Cs)-Total | mg/L | 0.000010 | - | 0.000180 |
| Chromium (Cr)-Total | mg/L | 0.00050 | CR(VI) 0.001; CR(III) 0.0089 | 0.00296 |
| Cobalt (Co)-Total | mg/L | 0.00010 | - | 0.00168 |
| Copper (Cu)-Total | mg/L | 0.0010 | 0.001-0.005 | 0.0026 |
| Iron (Fe)-Total | mg/L | 0.050 | 0.3 | 2.07 |
| Lead (Pb)-Total | mg/L | 0.000050 | 0.001-0.005 | 0.00144 |
| Lithium (Li)-Total | mg/L | 0.0010 | - | 0.0275 |
| Magnesium (Mg)-Total | mg/L | 0.050 | - | 46.3 |
| Manganese (Mn)-Total | mg/L | 0.00050 | - | 0.114 |
| Molybdenum (Mo)-Total | mg/L | 0.000050 | - | 0.00215 |
| Nickel (Ni)-Total | mg/L | 0.00050 | - | 0.00366 |
| Phosphorus (P)-Total | mg/L | 0.050 | - | 0.083 |
| Potassium (K)-Total | mg/L | 0.050 | - | 3.57 |
| Rubidium (Rb)-Total | mg/L | 0.00020 | - | 0.00324 |



| Parameter | Units | Detection Limit | PWQO | Concentration (MW4) |
|----------------------|-------|------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Selenium (Se)-Total | mg/L | 0.000050 | 0.01 | 0.000282 |
| Silicon (Si)-Total | mg/L | 0.10 | - | 8.78 |
| Silver (Ag)-Total | mg/L | 0.000050 | - | <0.000050 |
| Sodium (Na)-Total | mg/L | 0.50 | - | 39.0 |
| Strontium (Sr)-Total | mg/L | 0.0010 | - | 0.431 |
| Sulfur (S)-Total | mg/L | 0.50 | - | 27.3 |
| Tellurium (Te)-Total | mg/L | 0.00020 | - | <0.00020 |
| Thallium (TI)-Total | mg/L | 0.000010 | - | 0.000028 |
| Thorium (Th)-Total | mg/L | 0.00010 | - | 0.00039 |
| Tin (Sn)-Total | mg/L | 0.00010 | - | 0.00156 |
| Titanium (Ti)-Total | mg/L | 0.00030 | - | 0.0342 |
| Tungsten (W)-Total | mg/L | 0.00010 | - | <0.00010 |
| Uranium (U)-Total | mg/L | 0.000010 | 0.005 | 0.00481 |
| Vanadium (V)-Total | mg/L | 0.00050 | - | 0.00305 |
| Zinc (Zn)-Total | mg/L | 0.0030 | 0.02 | 0.0071 |
| Zirconium (Zr)-Total | mg/L | 0.00030 | - | 0.00054 |

Note: PWQO – Provincial Water Quality Objectives

4. Pre-Development Water Balance

4.1 Methodology

A pre-development water balance was completed for the site using a monthly soil-moisture balance approach (Thornthwaite and Mather, 1957). Water balance calculations use factors such as monthly precipitation, temperature, and latitude to estimate site specific average annual evapotranspiration (ET). Long-term climate data (30-year duration, 1981 to 2010) were obtained from the meteorological station at Albion Field Centre, approximately 7.6 km from to the study area (43°55' N, 79°50' W).

The site was divided into the two respective pre-development land use components of forested and agriculture/rural residential, and the mean annual water surplus (water available for infiltration and runoff processes) for each area was calculated by subtracting the mean annual evapotranspiration from the mean annual precipitation. To represent the silty clay till soils, soil moisture storage values of 250 mm and 400 mm were used to represent the respective agricultural/rural residential and forested components of the site.

The calculated mean annual water surplus was then partitioned using infiltration factors dependent on three components: soil type (**Figure 2**), topography/slope (**Figure 6**), and land use (**Figure 7**) (MOEE, 1995). Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping was used to divide the land use components into discrete sections and assign respective infiltration factors. Total average annual infiltration for each land use component was then determined by multiplying the appropriate water surplus value by the sum of the three individual factors. Infiltration factors used in the assessment are summarized in **Table 5**.

Proposed methods to balance infiltration volumes post-development include a storm water management (SWM) pond, as well as parkland and natural heritage system areas at locations shown in **Appendix A**. It should be noted that according to "Bolton Residential Expansion Study: Phase 3 Technical Memo – Development of a Preliminary Natural System" completed by Douglan and Associates (2014), and Palmer's ecological study, no Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) are found in the study area, and a feature-based water balance assessment is not required. A site wide water balance will address changes to groundwater recharge within the overall watershed.



Basemap Service Layer Credits: Content may not reflect National Geographic's current map policy. Sources: National Geographic, Esri, Garmin, HERE, UNEP-WCMC, USGS, NASA, ESA, METI, NRCAN, GEBCO, NOAA, increment P Corp. Contains information licensed under the Open Government Licence - Ontario and Canada.



Basemap Service Layer Credits: Content may not reflect National Geographic's current map policy. Sources: National Geographic, Esri, Garmin, HERE, UNEP-WCMC, USGS, NASA, ESA, METI, NRCAN, GEBCO, NOAA, increment P Corp. Contains information licensed under the Open Government Licence - Ontario and Canada.

| Area Description | Infiltration Factor | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Surficial Geology | | | | |
| Halton Till: Silty Clay Till | 0.1 | | | |
| Topography/Slope (%) | | | | |
| >10 | 0.001 | | | |
| 10 | 0.05 | | | |
| 5 | 0.1 | | | |
| 2.5 | 0.15 | | | |
| 1 | 0.2 | | | |
| 0.5 | 0.25 | | | |
| 0.1 | 0.3 | | | |
| Pre-development Landuse | | | | |
| Agriculture/Rural Residential | 0.1 | | | |
| Forest | 0.15 | | | |

Table 5. Summary of Infiltration Factors (MOEE, 1995)

A post-development water balance was then conducted using the same monthly soil-moisture balance approach (Thornthwaite and Mather, 1957) based on the Draft Plan land use design provided by Humphries Planning Group (HPG, 2021; **Appendix A1**). As impervious surfaces lack vegetation and prevent infiltration, the transpiration (T) component in the water balance is removed over these areas. Therefore, water available for both runoff and infiltration is considered as precipitation minus evaporation (P-E) in these areas. Evaporation over impervious areas is estimated to be approximately 10% of annual precipitation. Over pervious vegetated surfaces, the available water for infiltration and runoff is considered as precipitation minus evapotranspiration (P-ET).

Available water for infiltration over pervious areas was assumed to be the same from pre- to postdevelopment scenarios as fill composition is not outlined in the proposed site plan.

Proposed methods to balance infiltration volumes post-development include a storm water management (SWM) pond, as well as parkland and natural heritage system areas at locations shown in **Appendix A**. The completed pre- to post-development water balance can be used to determine the appropriateness of these mitigation measures for this site, and whether additional Low Impact Development (LID) structures are recommended.

4.2 **Pre-Development Water Balance Results**

Based on 30-year climate normals from the Albion Field Centre Station, total precipitation at the site is approximately 821 mm/yr. This precipitation will either infiltrate through the unsaturated zone soils or be removed through evapotranspiration (ET). Actual ET (AET) is calculated based on potential evapotranspiration (PET) and soil-moisture storage withdrawal. Based on the Thornthwaite and Mather (1957) model, calculated AET for the Agricultural/Rural Residential and Forested land use areas is 528

mm/yr and 537 mm/yr, respectively (**Table 6**). These results are consistent with those reported by TRCA (2008-b) for the Humber River Watershed, which indicates a mean AET value of 525 mm/yr.

Monthly PET is estimated using monthly temperature data and is defined as water loss through evaporation or transpiration from a homogeneous vegetated area that does not lack water (Thornthwaite, 1948; Mather, 1978). Calculated PET for the total site area is 590 mm/yr (approximately 72% of total precipitation), while the soil moisture deficit is between 53 mm/yr (Forested) and 62 mm/yr (Agricultural/Rural Residential).

Estimated water surplus within the Site ranges from approximately 285 mm/yr (Forested; 35% of total precipitation) to 294 mm/yr (Agricultural; 36% of total precipitation) and is divided into two components: infiltration and runoff (**Table 7**). Using the method outlined in the MOE SWM manual and MOEE (1995), approximately 67% (219 mm/yr) of the surplus runs off, while the remaining 33% (91 mm/yr) infiltrates. Over the entire Site area (100,800 m²), this translates to approximately 9,186 m³/yr of infiltration, and approximately 22,113 m³/yr of runoff (**Figures 8** and **9**). These values are consistent with the reported low permeability of the Halton Till combined with the very steep terrain bordering the northwest and northeast sections of the study area.

4.3 Post-Development Water Balance Results

The development of the subject lands will have an impact on the water balance due to the creation of impermeable surfaces. Impervious surfaces prevent infiltration of water into the soils and the removal of vegetation eliminates the evapotranspiration component of the natural water balance. Evaporation from impervious surfaces are relatively minor component of the water balance compared to the evapotranspiration component that occurs with vegetation. Therefore, the net effect of the construction of impervious surfaces is that most of the precipitation that falls into impervious surfaces becomes surplus water and direct runoff, reducing the natural infiltration.

Based on the Draft Plan land use design provided by Humphries Planning Group (HPG, 2021; **Appendix A1**), without mitigation, the post-development runoff is expected to increase to 46,542 mm/yr and the post-development infiltration is expected to decrease to 4,257 mm/yr (**Table 7**). This represents a 110% increase in runoff and 53% reduction in infiltration. The relatively high change in infiltration is due to the area of proposed medium density land-uses, relative to the existing conditions. Proposed methods to balance infiltration volumes post-development include series of rear-yard catch basin LID measures (at locations shown in **Appendix A2**), as well as increased infiltration within restored passive recreational land use and natural heritage system areas.

The completed pre- to post-development water balance is provided in the Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP) Part B (Palmer, 2020) and provides the LID strategy and design measures to maintain infiltration post-development through adding at least 4,929 m³/yr of infiltration.

Ecological studies completed by Palmer did not identify any groundwater supported natural features (i.e., groundwater supported wetlands or watercourses) on or within 120 m the Site that would specifically rely on groundwater recharge or surface water runoff from the Site. Therefore, a feature-based water balance (FBWB) is not recommended.



| v | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Мау | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Year | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|-------|
| Precipitation (mm) | | | | 50.3 | 67 | 76.1 | 75.5 | 81.8 | 77.4 | 75 | 68.3 | 81.7 | 57.7 | 821.4 |
| Te | -7 | -5.9 | -1.4 | 6.1 | 12.4 | 17.3 | 19.9 | 19.1 | 14.3 | 8.1 | 2.1 | -3.9 | 7.0 | |
| Potential Evap | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 78 | 112 | 132 | 117 | 74 | 37 | 8 | 0 | 590 | |
| P – PET | | | 50 | 50 | 34 | -2 | -36 | -50 | -39 | 1 | 31 | 74 | 58 | 231 |
| | Change in Soil Moisture Storage | 0 | 0 | 0 | -34 | -38 | -31 | -16 | 11 | 33 | 36 | 27 | 0 | -12 |
| Forested | Soil Moisture Storage | 400 | 400 | 400 | 366 | 328 | 297 | 281 | 292 | 325 | 361 | 388 | 400 | - |
| Area | Actual Evapotranspiration (AET) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 114 | 107 | 98 | 66 | 74 | 37 | 8 | 0 | 537 |
| (400 mm) | Soil Moisture Deficit (mm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -36 | 5 | 34 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| | Surplus (P – AET) | 60 | 50 | 50 | 34 | -38 | -31 | -16 | 11 | 1 | 31 | 74 | 58 | 284.7 |
| | - | - | - | - | | | - | | | | | | | |
| | Change in Soil Moisture Storage | 0 | 0 | 0 | -33 | -35 | -26 | -14 | 10 | 27 | 33 | 26 | 0 | -12 |
| Agricultural/ | Soil Moisture Storage | 250 | 250 | 250 | 217 | 182 | 156 | 142 | 152 | 179 | 212 | 238 | 250 | - |
| Rural Residential Area | Actual Evapotranspiration (AET) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 111 | 102 | 96 | 67 | 74 | 37 | 8 | 0 | 528 |
| (250 mm) | Soil Moisture Deficit (mm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -33 | 10 | 36 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| | Surplus (P – AET) | 60 | 50 | 50 | 34 | -35 | -26 | -14 | 10 | 1 | 31 | 74 | 58 | 293.7 |

Table 6. Available Water Surplus Values by Pre-Development Land Use

Table 7. Pre-and-Post Development Water Balance

| Pre-Development Water Balance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Land Use | Total (ha) | Impervious Factor | Impervious area (ha) | Water Surplus on Impermeable Surfaces (m/a) | Run off from Impervious Area (m3/a) | Estimated Pervious Area (ha) | Water Surplus on Vegetated Pervious Areas (m/a) | Runoff Coefficient (MECP values) | Runoff Volume from Pervious Area (m3/a) | Infiltration Coefficient | Infiltration Volume from Pervious Area (m3/a) | Total Runoff Volume (m3/a) | Total Infiltration Volume (m3/a) |
| Woodlot | 1.85 | 0 | 0 | 0.739 | 0 | 1.85 | 0.285 | 0.74 | 3,902 | 0.26 | 1,371 | 3,902 | 1,371 |
| Agricultural/ Rural Residential | 8.23 | 0.05 | 0.41 | 0.739 | 3,041 | 7.82 | 0.294 | 0.66 | 15,171 | 0.34 | 7,815 | 18,212 | 7,815 |
| Total | 10.08 | | 0 | | 3,041 | 9.67 | | 0.67 | 19,073 | 0.33 | 9,186 | 22,113 | 9,186 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | mm/yr | 219 | 91 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Post-Development Water Balance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Land Use | Total (ha) | Impervious Factor | Impervious area (ha) | Water Surplus (m/a) | Run off from Impervious Area (m3/a) | Estimated Pervious Area (ha) | Water Surplus on Vegetated Pervious Areas (m/a) | Runoff Coefficient (MECP values) | Runoff Volume From Pervious Area (m3/a) | Infiltration Coefficient | Infiltration Volume from Pervious Area (m3/a) | Total Runoff Volume (m3/a) | Total Infiltration Volume (m3/a) |
| Single Detached Residential | 0.06 | 0.60 | 0.04 | 0.707 | 255 | 0.02 | 0.287 | 0.66 | 45 | 0.34 | 23 | 300 | 23 |
| Street Townhouses | 3.95 | 0.70 | 2.77 | 0.707 | 19,560 | 1.19 | 0.287 | 0.66 | 2,241 | 0.34 | 1,155 | 21,801 | 1,155 |
| Existing Residential | 0.99 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.707 | 1,751 | 0.74 | 0.287 | 0.66 | 1,404 | 0.34 | 724 | 3,155 | 724 |
| Park | 0.63 | 0.25 | 0.16 | 0.707 | 1,114 | 0.47 | 0.287 | 0.66 | 894 | 0.34 | 460 | 2,008 | 460 |
| SWM Pond | 0.60 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 0.707 | 4,244 | 0.00 | 0.287 | 0.66 | 0 | 0.34 | 0 | 4,244 | 0 |
| Natural Heritage System | 1.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.707 | 0 | 1.75 | 0.284 | 0.74 | 3,673 | 0.26 | 1,290 | 3,673 | 1,290 |
| Restoration Area | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.707 | 0 | 0.46 | 0.287 | 0.66 | 871 | 0.34 | 449 | 871 | 449 |
| Road + Road Widening | 1.60 | 0.90 | 1.44 | 0.707 | 10,187 | 0.16 | 0.287 | 0.66 | 303 | 0.34 | 156 | 10,489 | 156 |
| Total | 10.04 | | 5.25 | | 37,110 | 4.79 | | 0.67 | 9,432 | 0.33 | 4,257 | 46,542 | 4,257 |

| Pre-to-Post Development Change | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--|--|--|
| % Change | 110% | -54% | | | |
| Pre-to-Post Volume Change (m ³ /yr) | 24,429 | -4,929 | | | |







5. **Development Considerations**

5.1 Dewatering

A preliminary construction dewatering assessment was made on the following project components:

- Linear trenches for site servicing;
- House foundations; and
- Stormwater Management Pond.

The groundwater table is expected range between approximately 4.5 m to 8 mbgs across the Site, indicated by a shift in soil colour from brown (oxidized) to grey (wet, low oxygen) in the borehole log records the Site (**Appendix B**). The shallower water levels measured in MW5 and MW6 are interpreted to represent a perched, poorly drained condition related to local infiltration of precipitation. The calculated K values for the till soils ranged from 3.5×10^{-6} m/sec to 4.4×10^{-8} m/sec, with a site-wide geometric mean K of 6.1×10^{-7} m/sec.

Under these conditions, project elements such as site servicing and house foundations are expected to be completed above the water table. Only minor seepage would be expected in an open excavation. No significant dewatering is expected for this project. The radius of influence would also be limited under these conditions.

To assess the maximum dewatering from the installation of site servicing to manage perched seeage, a preliminary dewatering assessment is provided. Under this scenario, the open cut construction is anticipated to be 3 m in depth, 2 m wide, and completed in 30 m long sections.

Based on the geology shown in the borehole logs, the open cut section will encounter Halton Till, which consists of primarily silty clay till. The silty clay till present has a geomean hydraulic conductivity of 6.1×10^{-7} m/s and an observed maximum hydraulic conductivity of 4.3×10^{-6} m/s. Based on the shallowest water level of approximately 0.12 mbgs or 255.88 masl (measured in MW2-S on April 4, 2018) and the open cut anticipated to be 3 m deep, approximately 2.9 m of soil will need to be dewatered under a worst-case conservative, scenario.

Dewatering rate estimates (Q) for the open cut was calculated using the following equation from Powers et. al (2007) and shown below:

$$Q_{open\,cut} = \frac{\pi K(H^2 - h^2)}{\ln\left(\frac{R}{r_o}\right)} + 2\left[\frac{xK(H^2 - h^2)}{2L}\right] \qquad m^3/s$$

| Where K | = | hydraulic conductivity (m/s) – 4.3 x 10 ⁻⁶ m/s |
|---------|---|---|
| Н | = | saturated thickness (m) – 2.9 m |
| h | = | saturated thickness after dewatering (m) – $0 m$ |
| R | = | radius of influence estimated using the Sichardt equation: |
| | | $R = r_e + 3000 * (H-h)^* \sqrt{K}$ (m) – range between 16.6 and 27.9 m |

Palmer.

| r e | = | equivalent radius of influence estimated by: |
|------------|---|---|
| | | $r_e = \frac{a+x}{\pi} (m) - 9.9 m$ |
| | | Where a = trench width (m) – assumed to be 2 m for all |
| | | x = trench length (m) – assumed to be 30 m for all |
| L | = | line source distance (m): |
| | | L = R/2 or 10 m, whichever is greater – range between 10 and 13.9 m |

Using the maximum hydraulic conductivity throughout the subdivision, the dewatering rate (or seepage rate) for a 30 m of open cut section is estimated to be 16,164 L/day. It is expected that most of the water found will be perched water above the Halton Till and will quickly drain. Using the more reasonable geometric mean hydraulic conductivity, a seepage rate of 4,256 L/day would be expected. The Zone of Influence (ZOI) is estimated to rang from 16.6 m to 27.9 m. Based on the well water records mapping (**Figure 3**) and the shallow depth of the dewatering, no private wells or natural features will be impacted by dewatering for this project.

Minor seepage is only expected near the central portion of the site where the water level elevation is highest. Along the site margins, the water table is deep and infrastructure (sewer, watermain, SWM pond, etc.) will be constructed above it. The estimated dewatering rate is expected to be manageable through sump pumping at the base of the excavation and the groundwater retrieved can be discharged to ground surface at a location at least 30 m from a drainage feature. However, the contractor should make their own assessment of dewatering methods based on their proposed construction method and trench lengths.

Based upon the Site conditions, construction dewatering rates on the order of 50,000 L/day or less would be expected for a typical excavation. A registration on the MECP Environmental and Sector Registry (EASR) is required for all construction related water taking between 50,000 and 400,000 L/day. A Permit to Take Water (PTTW) is required for all water construction takings exceeding 400,000 L/day.

Given the ubiquitous presence of low permeability soils present at the site, construction dewatering rates are expected to be low for the installation of site servicing or SWM pond excavations (i.e., <50,000 L/day) and be manageable by sump pumping from the base of the excavation. Under these conditions, a PTTW or a registration on the EASR is not expected to be required. Based on this, the radius of water table drawdown would be minimal, no adverse effects to local water wells or natural features would be expected from the minor dewatering predicted.

5.2 Stormwater Pond

The proposed stormwater pond north of Glasgow Road is expected to be dug to between approximately 3.5 and 7 m in depth below existing grade or to an elevation of 253 masl (**Appendix A**). The large range in depths is due to the natural grade of the land.

Based on the borehole logs (Appendix D), the soils at the SWM pond location are consistently Silty Clay Till of the Halton Till formation to a depth of at least 19.8 mbgs. At this location, the groundwater table is estimated to be at approximately 251 masl (5.5 m below grade at BH1). Based on this, it is interpreted that the SWM pond will be constructed above the water table in low permeability silty clay till soils. It is our



opinion that the existing native Halton Till Aquitard is sufficient to protect groundwater quality at the pond location and a liner is not recommended.

5.3 LID Considerations

The use of Low Impact Development (LID) measures are recommended as part of the overall stormwater management plan to help achieve at least 5 mm of stormwater retention and minimize changes to the existing water budget. As stated in *Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide Version 1.0* (2010) by CVC and TRCA,

"Developing stormwater management plans requires an understanding of the depth to water table, depth to bedrock, native soil infiltration rates, estimated annual groundwater recharge rates, locations of significant groundwater recharge and discharge, groundwater flow patterns and the characteristics of the aquifers and aquitards that underlay the area" (TRCA and CVC, 2010).

For sites with deep water table conditions and high permeability soils, LID practices can significantly improve infiltration and groundwater recharge to maintain the groundwater characteristics of the underlying aquifer. Conversely, for sites with low permeability soils and high-water table conditions, the amount of infiltration is limited by the saturated hydraulic conductivity of the soil (i.e., the rate at which water can infiltrate).

The Chickadee Lane Site has low permeability soils at surface with a calculated percolation rate of 40 mm/hr. The site is poorly drained and the true water table is interpreted to be at a depth ranging from approximately 5 - 8 mbgs. As the site acts as a groundwater recharge area (albeit a poor one), perched water in the poorly drained soils is expected. Under these conditions, infiltration trenches, vegetated swales and bioretention areas can all be effective in low permeability soils to increase infiltration. Increasing topsoil depth can also be effective. It is recommended that site grading and rear yard grading should be directed to the tributaries of the Humber River and the associated supporting areas to maintain the water balance, where applicable.

Details on the use and design of LID measures is provided by Candevcon in the FSR Report (Candevcon, 2020) and detailed in the CEISMP Report (Palmer, 2020).

5.4 Source Water Protection

The Clean Water Act (2006) classifies the hydrogeological vulnerability of areas into categories such as Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (SGRA), Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA), and Wellhead Protection Areas (WHPA). Based on available Source Water Protection Information Mapping compiled by the MECP, the site is not located within a HVA or WHPA. A small portion of the site area that corresponds with Lot 27 (Existing Residential) of the concept plan is characterized as a SGRA with a low vulnerability score of 2. Based on the 2017 Tables of Drinking Water Threats for Pathogens and Chemicals, no activities in these areas have been identified that could pose a threat to groundwater under various circumstances.



In addition, ecological studies completed by Palmer did not identify any groundwater supported natural features (i.e., groundwater supported wetlands and watercourses) on or near the site. It is expected that vertical groundwater movement is restricted at the site due to the presence of the thick silty clay Halton Till aquitard unit (greater than 40 m thick). The low permeability of the till (geometric mean K = 6.1×10^{-7} m/s) greatly limits groundwater recharge and contaminant migration.

6. Summary and Conclusions

The following summarizes the key results of the Hydrogeological Investigation and Water Balance Analyses conducted for the Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area B Land Development:

- The Chickadee Lane study area lies within the South Slope physiographic region, characterized by silty clay loam sediments of the Halton Till. This was confirmed through OGS mapping of the site and borehole drilling results. On a regional scale the Halton Till acts as an unconfined aquitard, limiting groundwater recharge and discharge.
- Based on a search of the MECP water well database, 34 water well records were identified within a 500 m radius of the site. A roadside water well screening identified up to 14 properties within 500 m of the site that have the potential to still rely on potable groundwater rather than municipal supply, although the municipal water is known to be available along Glasgow Road, Chickadee Lane, Emil Kolb Parkway and King Street. A detailed door-to-door water well survey will be completed at detailed design to document existing potable groundwater use near the site and to collect baseline data on groundwater quality and quantity.
- A series of municipal supply test wells (and their associated decommissioning records) are found along Glasgow Road adjacent to the site. These wells are between approximately 135 and 145 m deep, and identified a confined sand aquifer below approximately 123.4 m of clayey silt to sandy silt till. These wells are not utilized for municipal water and confirm that there is a very thick, low permeability confining unit underlying the Chickadee Lane site protecting deep aquifers.
- Based on the single well response tests conducted in the monitoring wells (MW2-S/D, MW5, MW6, and MW12-S/D), the calculated geometric mean hydraulic conductivity value of the silty clay till is 6.1x10⁻⁷ m/s. The highest hydraulic conductivity was calculated to be 4.3x10⁻⁶ m/s.
- Groundwater quality is considered typical for the area and shows an exceedance in PWQO criteria for total iron and total aluminum related to high TSS in the groundwater sample.
- The actual level of the *water table* ranges from approximately 5 m to 8 m below ground surface across the site, indicated by a shift in soil colour from brown (oxidized) to grey (wet, low oxygen) seen in borehole logs for MW2, MW6, and MW12S/D. The majority of boreholes were dry on completion and demonstrating the deeper water table and the low permeability of the soils.
- Based on groundwater monitoring, shallow groundwater levels at the site are expected to be encountered between 0.12 mbgs to 8.71 mbgs, and deep groundwater levels range from 11.35



mbgs to 29.12 mbgs. A groundwater flow divide is present running southeast to northwest through the center of the site, such that groundwater flow east of the divide flows northeast, and west of the divide flows northwest.

- One drive-point piezometer (MP1) was installed within the watercourse in the northwest corner of the site. Based on monitoring in April and May 2018, surface water flow was present within the feature, and there was a mean downward vertical hydraulic gradient within the MP (-0.45 m/m). In June, July, and August 2018 surface water flow was absent. The lack of surface water flow in late season, combined with the downwards hydraulic gradient indicates this feature is runoff supported.
- A pre-development water balance was completed for the site based on data from the Albion Field Centre Station. The estimated water surplus within the site ranges from approximately 285 mm/yr (Forested; 35% of total precipitation) to 294 mm/yr (Agricultural; 36% of total precipitation) and is divided into two components: infiltration and runoff. Using the method outlined in the MOE SWM manual and MOEE (1995), approximately 67% (219 mm/yr) of the surplus runs off, while the remaining 33% (91 mm/yr) infiltrates. Over the entire Site area (100,800 m²), this translates to approximately 9,186 m³/yr of infiltration, and approximately 22,113 m³/yr of runoff These values are consistent with the reported low permeability of the Halton Till combined with the very steep terrain bordering the northwest and northeast sections of the study area.
- No PSWs or groundwater supported features are found in the study area, and therefore, a feature-based water balance assessment is not recommended.
- Without mitigation, the post-development runoff is expected to increase to 46,542 mm/yr and the post-development infiltration is expected to decrease to 4,257 mm/yr. This represents a 110% increase in runoff and 53% reduction in infiltration.
- The use of LID is recommended to increase infiltration post-development. Based on the site geology, depth to water table and proposed development plan, rear yard infiltration trenches are expected to be effective to support infiltration. Additional details on the LID measures is provided in the FSR report (Candevcon, 2020) and the CEIMSP Report (Palmer, 2020).

Minor seepage is only expected near the central portion of the site where the water level elevation is highest (calculated to be up to 16,164 L/day). Along the site margins, the water table is deep and infrastructure (sewer, watermain, SWM pond, etc.) will be constructed above it. The estimated dewatering rate is expected to be manageable through sump pumping at the base of the excavation and the groundwater retrieved can be discharged to ground surface at a location at least 30 m from a drainage feature. A seepage rates are less than 50,000 L/day, a PTTW or EASR would not be required from the MECP.

• The site is not located within a HVA or WHPA. A small portion of the site area that corresponds with Lot 27 (Existing Residential) of the concept plan is characterized as a SGRA with a low vulnerability score of 2. No requirements under source water protection are needed for this site.

Palmer.

7. Signatures

This report was prepared and reviewed by the undersigned.

In recognition of the Practice of Geoscience in Ontario, this report was prepared by Adrian Lo, GIT who is no longer with Palmer. The minor report updates from the December 29, 202€ version of this report to reflect the 2021 Concept Plan was completed by Jason Cole, M.Sc., P.Geo.

Reviewed By:

1. Cle

Jason Cole, M.Sc., P.Geo. Principal, Senior Hydrogeologist



8. References

- Candevcon, 2020. Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area B.
- Chapman, L.J. and D.F. Putnam. 1984. Physiography of Southern Ontario. Ontario Geological Survey, Special Volume 2: 270 p.
- Dougan & Associates. 2014. Bolton Residential Expansion Study: Phase 3 Technical Memorandum Development of A Preliminary Natural Heritage System.
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO). 2017. Aquatic Species at Risk Maps: Ontario South West Map 11. (http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/species-especes/fpp-ppp/onsw-soon-11-eng.htm).
- Kassenaar, J. D. C. and E. J. Wexler. 2006. Groundwater Modelling of the Oak Ridges Moraine Area. (YPDT-CAMC Technical Report No. 01-06).
- Palmer, 2020. Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP), Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area B. Dated Dec, 29, 2020.
- Mather, J.R., 1978. The climatic water budget in environmental analysis. Farnborough, Hants: Teakfield. xxi + 239 p.
- Ministry of the Environment and Energy (MOEE), 1995. Technical Information Requirements of Land Development Applications.
- Thornthwaite, C.W., 1948. An approach toward a rational classification of climate. Geographical Review, Volume 38. 55-94 p.
- Thornthwaite, C.W. and J.R. Mather, 1957. Instructions and tables for computing potential evapotranspiration and water balance. Drexel Institute of Technology, Laboratory of Climatology. Publications in Climatology, Volume X. No. 3, 311p.
- Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). 2008-a. Humber River: State of the Watershed Report.
- Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). 2008-b. Humber River Watershed: Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report.



Appendix A1

Appendix A1 - Draft Plan of Subdivision (HPG, 2021)

Appendix A2 - Preliminary Storm Drainage Area Plan, Infiltration Plan, and Preliminary Servicing Plan (Candevcon, 2020)

Appendix A1

Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area B Concept Plan (HPG, 2021)




Appendix A2

Preliminary Storm Drainage Area Plan, Infiltration Plan, and Preliminary Servicing Plan (Candevcon, 2020)















Appendix B

Borehole Logs



Appendix B

Borehole Logs

LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 1

FIGURE NO.: 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 2

FIGURE NO.: 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 2N

FIGURE NO.: 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)

| | | , | SAMPLES Dynamic Cone (blows/30 cm) 10 30 50 70 90 | | | | | | | | 0 cm) 90 | Atterhera Limits | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|------|---|-------|--------|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|-------------|------------------|------------------|---------|------|---|---|-------|-----|-------|-----------------|
| EI. | 2011 | | | | (L) | X Shear Strength (kN/m ²) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | /EL |
| (m) Dopth | SOIL DESCRIPTION | | | a) | Scale | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 LEV | |
| (m) | | admu | /be | Value | epth 5 | | О | Penetration Resista (blows/30 cm) | | | tance) | | Moisture Content | | | | | nt (% | (%) | | ATEF |
| | | ž | L L | ż | ă | 1(|) | 30 50 | | 0 |) 70 | | | 10 I | 0 20 | | | 30 40 | | | > |
| 255.7 0.0 | Ground Surface | | | | 0 | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | - |
| 010 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | + | | , Ľ |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | etion pletic |
| | | | | | 1- | | | | | | | | | | | - | | _ | | | omple |
| | Direct Auger to Water Table to Install | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | on co |
| | Nested Monitoring Well | | | | 2 - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | m up 4 m (|
| | | | | | _ | | | | _ | | | _ | | | | | _ | \mp | | | 52.7 251. |
| | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | _ | | _ | _ | | Ele. 2 Ele. |
| | | | | | 3 - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>в</u> н |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | W.L Cave |
| | | | | | 4 - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 5 - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| | | | | | 6 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 7 - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | ŀ | |
| 7.6 | | - | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | ШL | |
| | END OF BOREHOLE Installed 50 mm Ø monitoring well to | | | | 8 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 7.6 m completed with 1.5 m screen. Sand backfill from 5.5 m to 7.6 m. | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Bentonite seal from 0 m to 5.5 m. Provided with protective monument | | | | 9 - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | casing. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | 10 - | | | | | | | | | | | + | | _ | + | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 11 - | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | | |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | + | | _ | + | | |
| | | | | | 12 | | | | - | | | _ | | | | | | + | + | | |
| | | _ | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | Sc | Dil | En | ngir | 1e | e | rs | 5 L | _to | d . | | | | | | | Da | ac: | 1 | of 1 |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | rac | ue: | - 1 (| ווכ |

LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 3

FIGURE NO.: 3

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)

| | | Dynamic Cone (blows/30 cm) | | | | | | | | | | | | Τ | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----|------|------|----------------|-----|-----------|----------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------|----------|------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------------|----|--------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | _ | 1 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 0 | 70 | 90 | | А | tterb | | 1 | | | | | | |
| EI. | | | | | L (E | | × · | Shoa | Stro | hath (k | N/m ²) | | | F | ۶L | | LL | | | ,ΈL | | | |
| (m) | SOIL | | | | ale | 50 100 150 200 | | | | | | | | — | | - | | ΕV | | | | | |
| Depth | DESCRIPTION | 5 | | e | Sci | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | R | | | |
| (m) | | a m |) e | /alı | pth | | 0 ' | Pene (| plows | /30 cm | itance i) | | |) Mc | oistur | re Co | ontent | (%) | | ΛTE | | | |
| | | NN | T Y | z | De | 10 30 50 70 90 | | | | | | 10 20 30 40 | | | | | | | W/ | | | | |
| 055.0 | Crowned Sweferer | Ground Surface | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 255.8 0.0 | 260 mm TOPSOII | | | | 0 | - | | | | | | | | | | | 31 | | + | | | | |
| | Brown, very stiff to hard | 1 | DO | 5 | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | ` | • | | _ | tion | | | |
| | weathered | | | | | _ | | | _ | | | | | | + | | $\left - \right $ | | | ple | | | |
| | SILTY CLAY TILL | 2 | | 20 | | - | | ~ | + | | | | | | 17 | | | +++ | _ | що | | | |
| | occ. sand seams, cobbles and boulders | 2 | | 20 | | - | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | o uo | | | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | | 16 | _ | | | _ | ry e | | | |
| | | 3 | DO | 35 | | - | | 0 | > | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 2 - | - | | | _ | | | | | _ | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | 18 | | | | | | | | |
| | | 4 | DO | 38 | | _ | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | $\left - \right $ | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Б | | 20 | | _ | | | | | | | | | 18 | | | | | | | | |
| | | 5 | | 27 | | | | Ť | | | | | | | | _ | | +-+ | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | \square | | | | | |
| | | | | | 4 - | _ | | | - | | | | | — | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | _ | | | _ | | | | | -1 | 15 | | | | | | | | |
| | | 6 | DO | 37 | 5 | - | | (| 2 | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | \square | | \vdash | + | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | - | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 6 - | _ | | | +- | | | | | | 18 | | + | +++ | | | | | |
| | brown grey | 7 | DO | 24 | | - | (| Ъ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.5 | | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | | | _ | | | _ | | | | |
| | END OF BOREHOLE | | | | 7 - | - | | | | | | | | | | _ | | \downarrow | | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | | _ | | _ | | | | | | | $\left \right $ | | $\left - \right $ | + | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | 8 - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | _ | \square | | | - | - | \vdash | | + | $+ \overline{+}$ | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 9 - | | | | | | | | | | \square | - | \square | \square | | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | | | + | $\left \cdot \right $ | + | | \vdash | - | ++ | + | $\left - \right $ | ++ | - | | | | |
| | | | | | - | - | | | | | | | | — | \square | — | | \square | | | | | |
| | | | | | 10 | - | | | | | | | \vdash | _ | ++ | _ | + | ++ | | | | | |
| | | | | | 10 - | - | | | | | | | | | \square | \mp | | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | | | | $\left \cdot \right $ | | | \vdash | + | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \square | 1 | | $\downarrow \downarrow$ | | | | | |
| | | | | | 11 - | - | | | + | $\left \cdot \right $ | + | \vdash | \vdash | + | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | | | | \vdash | | \vdash | \vdash | _ | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ~ | | _ | - | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Sc | Dil | En | ngin | <i>le</i> | e | rs | 5 | _t(| d. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | - | | _ | 5 | | | | _ | | | | | | | | F | °ag∈ |): | 1 of 1 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 4

FIGURE NO.: 4

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 5

FIGURE NO.: 5

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 6

FIGURE NO.: 6

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 7

FIGURE NO.: 7

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)

| | | Ś | SAMP | LES | | Dynamic Cone (blows/30 cm) 10 30 50 70 90 Atterberg L | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-----|------|--------|--------|---|-----|--------------|-------|-------|----|---|-----|--------|----------|-------|-----|----|----------|--|--|--|--|
| El. (m) | SOIL | | | | le (m) | × | She | ar Stre | ength | (kN/m | 2) | | | PL | <u> </u> | | | | EVEL | | | | |
| Depth | DESCRIPTION | er | | a | Sca | 50 100 150 200 | | | | | | - | | | | | | _ | IR LI | | | | |
| (m) | | qun | ype | I-Valı | Jepth | O Penetration Resistance (blows/30 cm) | | | | | | | • M | oistur | e Co | ntent | (%) | | VATE | | | | |
| | | Z | | Z | | | | | | 10 | 90 | + | | 20 | 3 | | 40 | - | 5 | | | | |
| 260.0 0.0 | 280 mm TOPSOIL | | | | 0 - | | | | | | | - | | | 26 | | | | | | | | |
| | EARTH FILL brown silty clay mixed with topsoil | 1 | DO | 9 | | 0 | | | | | | | | 2. | 1 | | | | Ť | | | | |
| 0.9 | Stiff to hard | 2 | DO | 14 | 1 - | -c |) | | | | | | | | · | | | | tion. | | | | |
| | SILTY CLAY TILL | | | | | | | _ | - | | | _ | | 16 | _ | | - | | mple | | | | |
| | trace of gravel occ. sand seams, cobbles and boulders | 3 | DO | 30 | 2 - | | C | | | | | | | • | | | | | oo uodr | | | | |
| | | 4 | DO | 33 | | | | 0 | | | | | | 17 | | | | | 59.7 m I | | | | |
| | | - | | 40 | 3 - | | | \downarrow | | | | | | 17 | | | - | | le. 2 | | | | |
| | | 5 | DO | 40 | | | | Ο | | | | | | • | | | | | ш (2) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | N.L | | | | |
| | | | | | 4 - | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | brown grey | | | | | | | | _ | | | _ | | 17 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 6 | DO | 21 | 5 - | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 6 - | | | | | | | | | 16 | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | | 7 | DO | 30 | | | |) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | END OF BOREHOLE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | _ | - | | | _ | | | _ | | - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 8 - | | | _ | | | | | | | - | | - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 9 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 10 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 11 - | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | + | _ | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Sc | oil | En | gin | ee | er | S | Lt | ď. | | | | | | F | Pag | e: | 1 of 1 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 8

FIGURE NO .: 8

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)

| | | SAMPLES • Dynamic Cone (blows/30 cm) 10 30 50 70 90 Attempts | | | | | | | | | hora | Limi | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----|------|--------|---|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|---------|---------|---|----|-------|------|-----------|------|------------|--------|--|
| EI. | | | | | (E) | | | | Ctrony | | 1/ma 2) | 1 | | , | PL | berg | LI | | | | |
| (m) | SOIL DESCRIPTION | | | | cale (| | 50 × | near 1 | Strenç 100 | 150 Jun (Kiv | 200 | | | | F | | | | LEVI | | |
| Depth (m) | | lber | ω | alue | th Sc | O Penetration Resistance (blows/30 cm) | | | | | | | | | nisti | | `onte | | | TER | |
| | | Nun | Typ | N-N | Dep | 10 |) | 30 | 50 |) | 70 | 90 I | | 10 | 2 | | 30 | 40 | | WA | |
| 259.5 | Ground Surface | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.0 0.2 | 210 mm TOPSOIL Very stiff to hard | 1 | DO | 5 | 0 | 0 | _ | _ | | | | _ | | | | 25 | | | | ion | |
| | SILTY CLAY TILLweathered | | | | - | | | | | | | _ | | | 17 | | | | | nplet | |
| | trace of gravel | 2 | DO | 23 | 1 - | | þ |) | | | | | | | • | | \square | | | Loo L | |
| | occ. sand scams, cobbies and boulders | | | | | | | _ | | | | - | | | 18 | | | | | Jry oi | |
| | | 3 | DO | 25 | | | C | > | | | | _ | | | • | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 15 | | | | | | |
| | | 4 | DO | 44 | | | | | 0 | | | | | | • | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 3 - | | _ | _ | | | | _ | | | 16 | | | | | | |
| | | 5 | DO | 23 | | | 0 |) | | | | - | | | • | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | _ | _ | | | | - | | | - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 4 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 16 | | | | | | |
| | | 6 | DO | 23 | - 5 - | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | - | | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | brown arev | | | | | | | - | | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | 99 | 7 | | 24 | 6 - | | C | | | | | - | | | 16 | | | | | | |
| 6.5 | | ' | | 24 | | | | - | | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | END OF BOREHOLE | | | | 7 - | | | _ | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 8 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 9 - | | | + | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 10 - | | + | + | | - | | | Ħ | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | + | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 11 - | | | + | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 12 | | \perp | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ~ | | _ | | - | | | | _ | | | • | | | | | | | | |
| | | 50 | DÍ | En | ngin | le | el | ſS | : L | .tc | 1. | | | | | | | Doc | <u>.</u> . | 1 of 1 | |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | Page | e: | | |

LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 9

FIGURE NO.: 9

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 10

FIGURE NO.: 10

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 11

FIGURE NO.: 11

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 12

FIGURE NO.: 12

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 12

FIGURE NO.: 12

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)



LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 12 JOB NO.: 1801-S032 METHOD OF BORING: PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

DRILLING DATE: January 24, 2018



FIGURE NO .: 12

LOG OF BOREHOLE NO.: 12N

FIGURE NO.: 12

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Residential Development

PROJECT LOCATION: Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, Town of Caledon

METHOD OF BORING: Flight-Auger (Solid-Stem)

| | | | SAMPLES • Dynamic Cone (blows/30 cm) 10 30 50 70 90 Attr< | | | | | | | | | | Atterberg Limits | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|------|---|-------|-------|---|-------|---------------|---|------|-----------------|---|----------------------|-------|---|---|--------|------|-----|----------|-----|-----------------|
| El. | SOIL | | | | E | X Shear Strength (kN/m²) 50 100 150 200 | | | | | | | PL LL | | | | | | | | | VEL |
| Depth | DESCRIPTION | 5 | | Ð | Scale | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | R LE |
| (m) | | nmbe | ype | -Valu | epth | (| C I | (blows/30 cm) | | | sistance cm) | 2 | Moisture Content (%) | | | | | | |) | | ATE |
| | | Z | É, | z | | 10 |) | | | 70 9 | | | 10 | 20 30 | | | 30 | 0 40 | | | \$ | |
| 258.3 0.0 | Ground Surface | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | — | - | 11 | = |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | . E |
| | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | etion pletic |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | com |
| | Direct Auger to Water Table to Install | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | uodr |
| | Nested Monitoring Well | | | | 2 - | | | _ | - | - | | | | | | - | - | | + | | | 1 m |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | — | | | 52.2 243. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | le. 25 Ele. |
| | | | | | 3 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | + | _ | | ш (9 Ш |
| | | | | | - | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | W.L ave- |
| | | | | | 4 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | + | | U |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| | | | | | 5 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | <u> </u> | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | 6 - | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | _ | _ | • | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | ١Į. | |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| | | | | | 7 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | H | |
| 7.6 | END OF BOREHOLE | | | | 8 - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Installed 50 mm Ø monitoring well to | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| | Sand backfill from 5.5 m to 7.6 m. | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| | Provided with protective monument | | | | 9 - | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| | casing. | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | 10 | | | | - | | | | | | | - | - | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | 10 - | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | _ | _ | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | 11 - | | | _ | - | | | | | | | _ | | | — | _ | | |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | + | | | |
| | | | | | 12 | | | _ | | | | | | | _ | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | •• | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 50 |) <i> </i> | En | gir | <i>ie</i> | e | rs | 5 | Li | d . | | | | | | | | Par | ne. | 1 (| of 1 |



Appendix C

Single Well Response Test Analyses



Hydrogeological Investigation – Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area $\ensuremath{\mathsf{B}}$

Appendix C

Single Well Response Test Analyses























Appendix D

Groundwater Chemistry Certificate of Analysis


Hydrogeological Investigation – Chickadee Lane Rounding Out Area $\ensuremath{\mathsf{B}}$

Appendix D

Groundwater Chemistry Certificate of Analysis



PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) ATTN: Ryan Polick 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7 Date Received:15-MAR-18Report Date:23-MAR-18 10:45 (MT)Version:FINAL

Client Phone: 647-795-8153

Certificate of Analysis

Lab Work Order #: L2068971 Project P.O. #: NOT SUBMIT Job Reference: 170163 CHI C of C Numbers: 17-622480 Legal Site Desc:

NOT SUBMITTED 170163 CHICKADEE LANE 17-622480

Amanda Faseba

Amanda Fazekas Account Manager

[This report shall not be reproduced except in full without the written authority of the Laboratory.]

ADDRESS: 95 West Beaver Creek Road, Unit 1, Richmond Hill, ON L4B 1H2 Canada | Phone: +1 905 881 9887 | Fax: +1 905 881 8062 ALS CANADA LTD Part of the ALS Group An ALS Limited Company

Environmental 💭

www.alsglobal.com

RIGHT SOLUTIONS RIGHT PARTNER



ANALYTICAL GUIDELINE REPORT

L2068971 CONTD

Page 2 of 5 23-MAR-18 10:45 (MT)

170163 CHICKADEE LANE

| Grouping Analyte | Result | Qualifier | D.L. | Units | Analyzed | | Guidelir | ne Limits | |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------|--------------|-------------|-------|----------|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Sompled By: CLIENT on 15 MAP 18 @ 15:45 | | | | | | | | | |
| Matrix WATER | | | | | | #1 | #2 | | |
| Matrix: WATER | | | | | | | | | |
| Physical Tests | | | | | | | | | |
| Colour, Apparent | 30.9 | | 2.0 | CU | 17-MAR-18 | | *5 | | |
| Conductivity | 941 | | 3.0 | umhos/cm | 17-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Hardness (as CaCO3) | 461 | HTC | 10 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | *80-100 | | |
| рН | 7.88 | | 0.10 | pH units | 17-MAR-18 | | 6.5-8.5 | | |
| Redox Potential | 317 | PEHR | -1000 | mV | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Total Dissolved Solids | 560 | DLDS | 20 | mg/L | 18-MAR-18 | | *500 | | |
| Turbidity | 72.0 | | 0.10 | NTU | 17-MAR-18 | | *5 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Acidity (as CaCO3) | 30.0 | | 5.0 | mg/L | 21-MAR-18 | | 00 500 | | |
| Alkalinity, Total (as CaCO3) | 387 | | 10 | mg/L | 19-MAR-18 | | 30-500 | | |
| Ammonia, Total (as N) | 0.022 | | 0.020 | mg/∟ | 19-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Chloride (CI) | <0.10 | | 0.10 | mg/L mg/l | 19-MAR-18 | | 250 | | |
| Eluoride (E) | 0.226 | | 0.00 | mg/L | 19-MAR-18 | 15 | 250 | | |
| Nitrate (as N) | ~0.020 | | 0.020 | mg/L | 10-MAR-18 | 1.0 | | | |
| Nitrite (as N) | <0.020 | | 0.020 | mg/L | 19-MAR-18 | 1 | | | |
| Orthonhosphate-Dissolved (as P) | <0.010 | | 0.0030 | mg/L | 19-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Phosphorus, Total | 0.0560 | | 0.0030 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Sulfate (SO4) | 77.1 | | 0.30 | mg/L | 19-MAR-18 | | 500 | | |
| Bacteriological Tests | | | | Ŭ | | | | | |
| Escherichia Coli | 0 | | 0 | MPN/100m | 18-MAR-18 | 0 | | | |
| | | | | L | | - | | | |
| Total Coliforms | >201 | | 0 | MPN/100m | 18-MAR-18 | *0 | | | |
| Total Metals | | | | | | | | | |
| Aluminum (Al)-Total | 1.24 | | 0.0050 | ma/l | 20-MAR-18 | | *0.1 | | |
| Antimony (Sh)-Total | 0.00017 | | 0.0000 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | 0.006 | 0.1 | | |
| Arsenic (As)-Total | 0.00017 | | 0.00010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | 0.000 | | | |
| Barium (Ba)-Total | 0.00120 | | 0.00010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | 1 | | | |
| Bervilium (Be)-Total | <0.0040 | | 0.00020 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | 1 | | | |
| Bismuth (Bi)-Total | < 0.000050 | | 0.000050 | ma/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Boron (B)-Total | 0.027 | | 0.010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | 5 | | | |
| Cadmium (Cd)-Total | 0.0000197 | | 0.000005 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | 0.005 | | | |
| | | | 0 | | | | | | |
| Calcium (Ca)-Total | 108 | | 0.50 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Cesium (Cs)-Total | 0.000180 | | 0.000010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Chromium (Cr)-Total | 0.00296 | | 0.00050 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | 0.05 | | | |
| Cobalt (Co)-Total | 0.00168 | | 0.00010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Copper (Cu)- I otal | 0.0026 | | 0.0010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | 1 | | |
| Iron (Fe)- I otal | 2.07 | | 0.050 | rng/L | 20-MAD 40 | 0.04 | *0.3 | | |
| Lead (PD)- I otal | 0.00144 | | 0.000050 | rng/L | 20-IVIAR-18 | 0.01 | | | |
| Lithium (Li)-iotai Magnesium (Mg)-Total | 0.0275 76 2 | | 0.0010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Manganese (Mn)-Total | 40.3 0 114 | | 0.000 | mg/L | 20-101AR-10 | | *0.05 | | |
| Molybdenum (Mo)-Total | 0.00215 | | 0.000050 | ma/l | 20-MAR-18 | | 0.05 | | |
| Nickel (Ni)-Total | 0.00366 | | 0.00050 | ma/l | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Phosphorus (P)-Total | 0.083 | | 0.050 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |

** Detection Limit for result exceeds Guideline Limit. Assessment against Guideline Limit cannot be made.

* Analytical result for this parameter exceeds Guideline Limit listed on this report. Guideline Limits applied:

Ontario Drinking Water Regulation (ODWQS) JAN.1,2017 = [Suite] - ON-DW-STANDARD+GUIDELINES

#1: Schedule 1 (Microbiological) and 2 (Chemical) Standards (JAN,2017) #2: Ontar

#2: Ontario DW Aesthetic and Operational Guidelines



ANALYTICAL GUIDELINE REPORT

L2068971 CONTD Page 3 of 5

23-MAR-18 10:45 (MT)

170163 CHICKADEE LANE

| Grouping | Analyte | Result | Qualifier | D.L. | Units | Analyzed | | Guidelir | e Limits | |
|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------------|-----------|------|----------|----------|--|
| 1 2068071-1 | MW6 | | | | | | | | | |
| Sampled By: | CLIENT on 15 MAR 18 @ 15:45 | | | | | | | | | |
| Sampled by. | MATER | | | | | | #1 | #2 | | |
| Matrix: | WATER | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Metals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potassium | (K)-Total | 3.57 | | 0.050 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Rubidium | (Rb)-Total | 0.00324 | | 0.00020 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Selenium (| Se)-Total | 0.000282 | | 0.000050 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | 0.01 | | | |
| Silicon (Si) | -Total | 8.78 | | 0.10 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Silver (Ag) | -Total | <0.000050 | | 0.000050 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Sodium (N | a)-Iotal | 39.0 | | 0.50 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | *20 | 200 | | |
| Strontium | (Sr)-Total | 0.431 | | 0.0010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Sultur (S)- | l otal | 27.3 | | 0.50 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Tellunum (| Te)-Total | <0.00020 | | 0.00020 | mg/L mg/l | 20-MAR-10 | | | | |
| Thailium (| Th) Total | 0.000028 | | 0.000010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-10 | | | | |
| Tip (Sp)-T | | 0.00039 | | 0.00010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Titanium (| Fi)-Total | 0.00130 | | 0.00010 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Tungsten (| W)-Total | <0.0042 | | 0.00030 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | | | |
| Uranium (l | J)-Total | 0.00481 | | 0.000010 | ma/L | 20-MAR-18 | 0.02 | | | |
| Vanadium | (V)-Total | 0.00305 | | 0.00050 | ma/L | 20-MAR-18 | 0.02 | | | |
| Zinc (Zn)-1 | otal | 0.0071 | | 0.0030 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | 5 | | |
| Zirconium | (Zr)-Total | 0.00054 | | 0.00030 | mg/L | 20-MAR-18 | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

Detection Limit for result exceeds Guideline Limit. Assessment against Guideline Limit cannot be made.
Analytical result for this parameter exceeds Guideline Limit listed on this report. Guideline Limits applied:

Ontario Drinking Water Regulation (ODWQS) JAN.1,2017 = [Suite] - ON-DW-STANDARD+GUIDELINES

Reference Information

| Qualifier | Description | ואניש אושנים. ו | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| DLDS | Detection I | imit Raised: | Dilution required due to high Disso | lved Solids / Electrical Conductivity |
| PEHR | Parameter | Exceeded Re | ecommended Holding Time On Re | ceipt: Proceed With Analysis As Requested. |
| HTC | Hardness | was calculate | d from Total Ca and/or Mg concen | trations and may be biased high (dissolved Ca/Mg results unavailable). |
| Methods Liste | ed (if applica | able): | | |
| ALS Test Code | e | Matrix | Test Description | Method Reference*** |
| ACIDITY-ED | | Water | Acidity (as CaCO3) | APHA 2310 B - Potentiometric Titration |
| Acidity is the usually 8.3. If titration to p | capacity of a f the sample I 8.3 is perfor | a water sample is colorless at rmed. | e to react with strong base. It can l nd clear, titration with base to the p | be measured by titration with a strong base to a designated pH endpoint, ohenolphthalein endpoint is used. For dark or turbid samples, potentiometric |
| ALK-WT | | Water | Alkalinity, Total (as CaCO3) | EPA 310.2 |
| This analysis colourimetric | is carried ou method. | it using proce | dures adapted from EPA Method 3 | 310.2 "Alkalinity". Total Alkalinity is determined using the methyl orange |
| BR-IC-N-WT | | Water | Bromide in Water by IC | EPA 300.1 (mod) |
| Inorganic ani CL-IC-N-WT | ons are anal | yzed by Ion C Water | hromatography with conductivity a Chloride by IC | nd/or UV detection. EPA 300.1 (mod) |
| Inorganic ani | ons are anal | yzed by Ion C | hromatography with conductivity a | nd/or UV detection. |
| Analysis con Protection Ac | ducted in acc ct (July 1, 201 | cordance with 11). | the Protocol for Analytical Method | s Used in the Assessment of Properties under Part XV.1 of the Environmental |
| COLOUR-APP | PARENT-WT | Water | Colour | APHA 2120 |
| Apparent Col decanting. C adjustment. | lour is measu Colour measu Concurrent r | ured spectropl rements can neasurement | notometrically by comparison to pla be highly pH dependent, and apply of sample pH is recommended. | atinum-cobalt standards using the single wavelength method after sample \prime to the pH of the sample as received (at time of testing), without pH |
| EC-WT | | Water | Conductivity | APHA 2510 B |
| Water sample F-IC-N-WT | es can be me | easured direct Water | ly by immersing the conductivity c Fluoride in Water by IC | ell into the sample. EPA 300.1 (mod) |
| Inorganic ani HARDNESS-C | ons are anal CALC-WT | yzed by Ion C Water | hromatography with conductivity a Hardness | nd/or UV detection. APHA 2340 B |
| Hardness (als Dissolved Ca MET-T-CCMS· | so known as alcium and M -WT | Total Hardne agnesium cor Water | ss) is calculated from the sum of C icentrations are preferentially used Total Metals in Water by CRC | Calcium and Magnesium concentrations, expressed in CaCO3 equivalents. I for the hardness calculation. EPA 200.2/6020A (mod) |
| Water sample | es are digest | ed with nitric | and hydrochloric acids, and analyz | ed by CRC ICPMS. |
| Method Limit | ation (re: Sul | lfur): Sulfide a | nd volatile sulfur species may not | be recovered by this method. |
| Analysis cone Protection Ac | ducted in acc ct (July 1, 20 ⁷ | cordance with 11). | the Protocol for Analytical Method | s Used in the Assessment of Properties under Part XV.1 of the Environmental |
| NH3-WT | | Water | Ammonia, Total as N | EPA 350.1 |
| Sample is me colorimetrical | easured colo lly. | rimetrically. W | hen sample is turbid a distillation | step is required, sample is distilled into a solution of boric acid and measured |
| NO2-IC-WT | | Water | Nitrite in Water by IC | EPA 300.1 (mod) |
| Inorganic ani NO3-IC-WT | ons are anal | yzed by Ion C Water | hromatography with conductivity a Nitrate in Water by IC | nd/or UV detection. EPA 300.1 (mod) |
| Inorganic ani P-T-COL-WT | ons are anal <u>y</u> | yzed by Ion C Water | hromatography with conductivity a Total P in Water by Colour | nd/or UV detection. APHA 4500-P PHOSPHORUS |
| This analysis | s is carried ou | It using proce | dures adapted from APHA Method | 4500-P "Phosphorus". Total Phosphorus is deteremined colourimetrically |
| PH-WT | nate digestio | Water | pH | APHA 4500 H-Electrode |

Water samples are analyzed directly by a calibrated pH meter.

Analysis conducted in accordance with the Protocol for Analytical Methods Used in the Assessment of Properties under Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act (July 1, 2011). Holdtime for samples under this regulation is 28 days

Reference Information

| PO4-DO-COL-WT | Water | Diss. Orthophosphate in Water by Colour | APHA 4500-P PHOSPHORUS |
|--|--|--|---|
| This analysis is carried or colourimetrically on a sar | ut using proced nple that has b | lures adapted from APHA Method een lab or field filtered through a 0. | 4500-P "Phosphorus". Dissolved Orthophosphate is determined 45 micron membrane filter. |
| REDOX-POTENTIAL-WT | Water | Redox Potential | APHA 2580 |
| This analysis is carried or reported as observed oxid | ut in accordanc dation-reductio | e with the procedure described in t n potential of the platinum metal-re | he "APHA" method 2580 "Oxidation-Reduction Potential" 2012. Results are ference electrode employed, in mV. |
| It is recommended that th | nis analvsis be | conducted in the field. | |
| SO4-IC-N-WT | Water | Sulfate in Water by IC | EPA 300.1 (mod) |
| Inorganic anions are anal | vzed by Ion Ch | romatography with conductivity an | d/or LIV detection |
| SOLIDS-TDS-WT | Water | Total Dissolved Solids | APHA 2540C |
| This analysis is carried or (TDS) are determined by TC,EC-QT51-WT | ut using proced filtering a sam Water | lures adapted from APHA Method : ole through a glass fibre filter, TDS Total Coliform and E. Coli | 2540 "Solids". Solids are determined gravimetrically. Total Dissolved Solids is determined by evaporating the filtrate to dryness at 180 degrees celsius. APHA 9223B |
| This analysis is carried or determined simultaneous incubated for 18 or 24 ho positive responses to a p | ut using proced ly. The sample urs and then th robability table | lures adapted from APHA Method is mixed with a mixture of hydrolyz e number of wells exhibiting a posi | 9223 "Enzyme Substrate Coliform Test". E. coli and Total Coliform are zable substrates and then sealed in a multi-well packet. The packet is tive response are counted. The final result is obtained by comparing the |
| TURBIDITY-WT | Water | Turbidity | APHA 2130 B |
| Sample result is based of by a standard reference s | n a comparisor suspension und | of the intensity of the light scatter ler the same conditions. Sample re | ed by the sample under defined conditions with the intensity of light scattered adings are obtained from a Nephelometer. |
| | | | |

*** ALS test methods may incorporate modifications from specified reference methods to improve performance.

Chain of Custody numbers:

17-622480

The last two letters of the above test code(s) indicate the laboratory that performed analytical analysis for that test. Refer to the list below:

| Laboratory Definition Code | Laboratory Location | Laboratory Definition Code | Laboratory Location |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| WT | ALS ENVIRONMENTAL - WATERLOO, ONTARIO, CANADA | ED | ALS ENVIRONMENTAL - EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA |

GLOSSARY OF REPORT TERMS

Surrogates are compounds that are similar in behaviour to target analyte(s), but that do not normally occur in environmental samples. For applicable tests, surrogates are added to samples prior to analysis as a check on recovery. In reports that display the D.L. column, laboratory objectives for surrogates are listed there.

mg/kg - milligrams per kilogram based on dry weight of sample

mg/kg wwt - milligrams per kilogram based on wet weight of sample

mg/kg lwt - milligrams per kilogram based on lipid-adjusted weight

mg/L - unit of concentration based on volume, parts per million.

< - Less than.

D.L. - The reporting limit.

N/A - Result not available. Refer to qualifier code and definition for explanation.

Test results reported relate only to the samples as received by the laboratory. UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED, ALL SAMPLES WERE RECEIVED IN ACCEPTABLE CONDITION. Analytical results in unsigned test reports with the DRAFT watermark are subject to change, pending final QC review.

Application of guidelines is provided "as is" without warranty of any kind, either expressed or implied, including, but not limited to fitness for a particular purpose, or non-infringement. ALS assumes no responsibility for errors or omissions in the information.



Report Date: 23-MAR-18

Page 1 of 12

Client: PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7

Workorder: L2068971

Contact: Ryan Polick

| Test | Matrix | Reference | Result | Qualifier | Units | RPD | Limit | Analyzed |
|---|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------|-----------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|
| ACIDITY-ED | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3993 | 322 | | | | | | | |
| WG2737212-3 DL Acidity (as CaCO3) | JP | L2068891-1 42.0 | 43.0 | | mg/L | 2.4 | 20 | 21-MAR-18 |
| WG2737212-2 LC Acidity (as CaCO3) | S | | 106.0 | | % | | 85-115 | 21-MAR-18 |
| WG2737212-1 ME Acidity (as CaCO3) | 3 | | <5.0 | | mg/L | | 5 | 21-MAR-18 |
| ALK-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R39894 | 453 | | | | | | | |
| WG2735349-3 CF | RM | WT-ALK-CRM | | | | | | |
| Alkalinity, I otal (as (| CaCO3) | | 94.5 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735349-4 DL Alkalinity, Total (as (| JP CaCO3) | L2068981-4 44 | 42 | | mg/L | 4.6 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735349-2 LC Alkalinity, Total (as (| :S CaCO3) | | 97.8 | | % | | 85-115 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735349-1 ME Alkalinity, Total (as (| 3 CaCO3) | | <10 | | mg/L | | 10 | 19-MAR-18 |
| BR-IC-N-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3990 | 051 | | | | | | | |
| WG2735070-14 DU | JP | WG2735070-13 | 3 | | | | | |
| Bromide (Br) | | <0.10 | <0.10 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-12 LC Bromide (Br) | S | | 99.0 | | % | | 85-115 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-11 MB Bromide (Br) | 3 | | <0.10 | | mg/L | | 0.1 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-15 MS | 5 | WG2735070-13 | 3 | | - | | | |
| Bromide (Br) | | | 99.1 | | % | | 75-125 | 19-MAR-18 |
| CL-IC-N-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3990 | 051 | | | | | | | |
| WG2735070-14 DL Chloride (Cl) | JP | WG2735070-1 3 33.3 | 3 33.3 | | mg/L | 0.0 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-12 LC Chloride (Cl) | S | | 99.9 | | % | | 90-110 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-11 ME Chloride (Cl) | 3 | | <0.50 | | mg/L | | 0.5 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-15 MS Chloride (Cl) | 6 | WG2735070-13 | 3 98.6 | | % | | 75-125 | 19-MAR-18 |

COLOUR-APPARENT-WT Water



Report Date: 23-MAR-18

Page 2 of 12

Client: PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7

Workorder: L2068971

Contact: Ryan Polick

| Test | Matrix | Reference | Result | Qualifier | Units | RPD | Limit | Analyzed |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|---------|--------------|
| COLOUR-APPARENT-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987300 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2734505-3 DUP | | L2068994-1 | | | | | | |
| Colour, Apparent | | 9.1 | 8.7 | | CU | 4.3 | 20 | 17-MAR-18 |
| WG2734505-2 LCS | | | | | | | | |
| Colour, Apparent | | | 102.3 | | % | | 85-115 | 17-MAR-18 |
| WG2734505-1 MB | | | | | | | _ | |
| Colour, Apparent | | | <2.0 | | CU | | 2 | 17-MAR-18 |
| EC-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3989048 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2734455-4 DUP | | WG2734455-3 | | | | | | |
| Conductivity | | 3510 | 3480 | | umhos/cm | 0.9 | 10 | 17-MAR-18 |
| WG2734455-2 LCS | | | 400 5 | | 0/ | | | |
| | | | 100.5 | | 70 | | 90-110 | 17-MAR-18 |
| WG2734455-1 MB Conductivity | | | <30 | | umbos/cm | | 3 | |
| Conductivity | | | \0.0 | | unnoo, onn | | 0 | |
| F-IC-N-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3990051 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2735070-14 DUP | | WG2735070-13 | 3 0 042 | | ma/l | 0.0 | 20 | |
| | | 0.042 | 0.042 | | 111g/ E | 0.9 | 20 | 19-WAR-10 |
| Fluoride (F) | | | 101.5 | | % | | 90-110 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-11 MB | | | | | | | 00 110 | 10 111 11 10 |
| Fluoride (F) | | | <0.020 | | mg/L | | 0.02 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-15 MS | | WG2735070-13 | 3 | | | | | |
| Fluoride (F) | | | 101.1 | | % | | 75-125 | 19-MAR-18 |
| MET-T-CCMS-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987814 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2734886-4 DUP | | WG2734886-3 | | | | | | |
| Aluminum (Al)-Total | | 0.172 | 0.169 | | mg/L | 1.5 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Antimony (Sb)-Total | | <0.00010 | <0.00010 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Arsenic (As)-Total | | 0.00056 | 0.00058 | | mg/L | 3.4 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Barium (Ba)-Total | | 0.0431 | 0.0428 | | mg/L | 0.8 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Beryllium (Be)-Total | | <0.00010 | <0.00010 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Bismuth (Bi)-Total | | <0.000050 | <0.000050 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Boron (B)-Total | | 0.031 | 0.031 | | mg/L | 1.6 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cadmium (Cd)-Total | | 0.0000067 | 0.0000090 | J | mg/L | 0.0000023 | 0.00001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Calcium (Ca)-Total | | 87.1 | 87.9 | | mg/L | 0.9 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |



Workorder: L2068971

Report Date: 23-MAR-18

Page 3 of 12

Client: PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) 74 Berkeley Street

Toronto ON M5V 2W7

Contact: Ryan Polick

| Test | Matrix | Reference | Result | Qualifier | Units | RPD | Limit | Analyzed |
|-----------------------|--------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------|------|--------|-----------|
| MET-T-CCMS-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987814 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2734886-4 DUP | | WG2734886-3 | -0.00050 | | mall | N1/A | 20 | |
| | | <0.00050 | < 0.00050 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cesiulii (Cs)-Total | | 0.000017 | 0.00015 | | mg/L | 14 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| | | 0.00019 | 0.00018 | | mg/∟ | 2.0 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Copper (Cu)-1 otal | | 0.0010 | 0.0010 | | mg/L | 0.6 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Iron (Fe)-I otal | | 0.384 | 0.387 | | mg/L | 0.8 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Lead (Pb)- I otal | | 0.000202 | 0.000204 | | mg/L | 1.3 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Lithium (Li)-Total | | 0.0016 | 0.0015 | | mg/L | 1.1 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Magnesium (Mg)-Total | | 17.0 | 16.7 | | mg/L | 2.1 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Manganese (Mn)-Total | | 0.0822 | 0.0816 | | mg/L | 0.8 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Molybdenum (Mo)-Total | | 0.00186 | 0.00184 | | mg/L | 1.4 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Nickel (Ni)-Total | | 0.00065 | 0.00061 | | mg/L | 7.1 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Phosphorus (P)-Total | | <0.050 | <0.050 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Potassium (K)-Total | | 3.08 | 3.05 | | mg/L | 0.9 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Rubidium (Rb)-Total | | 0.00067 | 0.00068 | | mg/L | 1.8 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Selenium (Se)-Total | | 0.000137 | 0.000124 | | mg/L | 9.5 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Silicon (Si)-Total | | 2.92 | 2.94 | | mg/L | 0.5 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Silver (Ag)-Total | | <0.000050 | <0.000050 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Sodium (Na)-Total | | 26.6 | 26.1 | | mg/L | 1.8 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Strontium (Sr)-Total | | 0.267 | 0.274 | | mg/L | 2.7 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Sulfur (S)-Total | | 15.4 | 15.5 | | mg/L | 0.4 | 25 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Thallium (TI)-Total | | <0.000010 | <0.000010 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tellurium (Te)-Total | | <0.00020 | <0.00020 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Thorium (Th)-Total | | <0.00010 | <0.00010 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 25 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tin (Sn)-Total | | <0.00010 | <0.00010 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Titanium (Ti)-Total | | 0.00441 | 0.00444 | | mg/L | 0.5 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tungsten (W)-Total | | <0.00010 | <0.00010 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Uranium (U)-Total | | 0.00109 | 0.00112 | | mg/L | 3.2 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Vanadium (V)-Total | | 0.00061 | 0.00061 | | mg/L | 0.0 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Zinc (Zn)-Total | | <0.0030 | <0.0030 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Zirconium (Zr)-Total | | <0.00030 | <0.00030 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2734886-2 LCS | | | | | - | | | - |
| Aluminum (Al)-Total | | | 101.0 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Antimony (Sb)-Total | | | 107.4 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |



Ryan Polick

Quality Control Report

Workorder: L2068971

Report Date: 23-MAR-18

Page 4 of 12

Client: PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7

Contact:

| Test | Matrix | Reference | Result | Qualifier | Units | RPD | Limit | Analyzed |
|-----------------------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|
| MET-T-CCMS-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987814 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2734886-2 LCS | | | 404.0 | | 0/ | | / | |
| Arsenic (As)-Total | | | 101.8 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Barium (Ba)-Total | | | 101.7 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Beryllium (Be)-Total | | | 99.5 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Bismuth (Bi)- I otal | | | 99.7 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Boron (B)-Total | | | 98.4 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cadmium (Cd)-Total | | | 102.5 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Calcium (Ca)-Total | | | 100.3 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Chromium (Cr)-Total | | | 102.6 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cesium (Cs)-Total | | | 104.4 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cobalt (Co)-Total | | | 99.8 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Copper (Cu)-Total | | | 99.2 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Iron (Fe)-Total | | | 98.5 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Lead (Pb)-Total | | | 102.5 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Lithium (Li)-Total | | | 98.0 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Magnesium (Mg)-Total | | | 103.1 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Manganese (Mn)-Total | | | 102.9 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Molybdenum (Mo)-Total | | | 101.1 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Nickel (Ni)-Total | | | 100.2 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Phosphorus (P)-Total | | | 102.0 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Potassium (K)-Total | | | 102.0 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Rubidium (Rb)-Total | | | 102.5 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Selenium (Se)-Total | | | 102.7 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Silicon (Si)-Total | | | 117.4 | | % | | 60-140 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Silver (Ag)-Total | | | 105.0 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Sodium (Na)-Total | | | 103.7 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Strontium (Sr)-Total | | | 99.7 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Sulfur (S)-Total | | | 98.0 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Thallium (TI)-Total | | | 99.8 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tellurium (Te)-Total | | | 107.1 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Thorium (Th)-Total | | | 101.4 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tin (Sn)-Total | | | 103.1 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Titanium (Ti)-Total | | | 98.3 | | % | | 80-120 | 10-MAR-18 |
| Tungsten (W)-Total | | | 99.5 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |



Workorder: L2068971

Report Date: 23-MAR-18

Page 5 of 12

PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) Client: 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7

Contact: Ryan Polick

| Test | Matrix | Reference | Result | Qualifier | Units | RPD | Limit | Analyzed |
|-----------------------|--------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------|-----|----------|--------------|
| MET-T-CCMS-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987814 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2734886-2 LCS | | | 104.2 | | % | | 80 120 | 10 MAD 19 |
| Vanadium (V)-Total | | | 104.2 | | % | | 80 120 | 19-MAR-10 |
| Zinc (Zn)-Total | | | 97.6 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Zirconium (Zr)-Total | | | 95.4 | | % | | 80-120 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2734886-1 MB | | | 00.1 | | ,,, | | 00-120 | 13-10/212-10 |
| Aluminum (Al)-Total | | | <0.0050 | | mg/L | | 0.005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Antimony (Sb)-Total | | | <0.00010 | | mg/L | | 0.0001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Arsenic (As)-Total | | | <0.00010 | | mg/L | | 0.0001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Barium (Ba)-Total | | | <0.00020 | | mg/L | | 0.0002 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Beryllium (Be)-Total | | | <0.00010 | | mg/L | | 0.0001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Bismuth (Bi)-Total | | | <0.00005 | 0 | mg/L | | 0.00005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Boron (B)-Total | | | <0.010 | | mg/L | | 0.01 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cadmium (Cd)-Total | | | <0.00000 | 50 | mg/L | | 0.000005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Calcium (Ca)-Total | | | <0.50 | | mg/L | | 0.5 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Chromium (Cr)-Total | | | <0.00050 | | mg/L | | 0.0005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cesium (Cs)-Total | | | <0.00001 | 0 | mg/L | | 0.00001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cobalt (Co)-Total | | | <0.00010 | | mg/L | | 0.0001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Copper (Cu)-Total | | | <0.0010 | | mg/L | | 0.001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Iron (Fe)-Total | | | <0.050 | | mg/L | | 0.05 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Lead (Pb)-Total | | | <0.00005 | 0 | mg/L | | 0.00005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Lithium (Li)-Total | | | <0.0010 | | mg/L | | 0.001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Magnesium (Mg)-Total | | | <0.050 | | mg/L | | 0.05 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Manganese (Mn)-Total | | | <0.00050 | | mg/L | | 0.0005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Molybdenum (Mo)-Total | | | <0.00005 | 0 | mg/L | | 0.00005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Nickel (Ni)-Total | | | <0.00050 | | mg/L | | 0.0005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Phosphorus (P)-Total | | | <0.050 | | mg/L | | 0.05 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Potassium (K)-Total | | | <0.050 | | mg/L | | 0.05 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Rubidium (Rb)-Total | | | <0.00020 | | mg/L | | 0.0002 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Selenium (Se)-Total | | | <0.00005 | 0 | mg/L | | 0.00005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Silicon (Si)-Total | | | <0.10 | | mg/L | | 0.1 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Silver (Ag)-Total | | | <0.00005 | 0 | mg/L | | 0.00005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Sodium (Na)-Total | | | <0.50 | | mg/L | | 0.5 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Strontium (Sr)-Total | | | <0.0010 | | mg/L | | 0.001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Sulfur (S)-Total | | | <0.50 | | mg/L | | 0.5 | 19-MAR-18 |



Workorder: L2068971

Report Date: 23-MAR-18

Page 6 of 12

PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) Client: 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7

Contact: Ryan Polick

| Test | Matrix | Reference | Result | Qualifier | Units | RPD | Limit | Analyzed |
|---------------------------------------|--------|-------------|----------|-----------|-------|-----|---------|-----------|
| MET-T-CCMS-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987814 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2734886-1 MB Thallium (TI)-Total | | | <0.00001 | 0 | mg/L | | 0.00001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tellurium (Te)-Total | | | <0.00020 | | mg/L | | 0.0002 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Thorium (Th)-Total | | | <0.00010 | | mg/L | | 0.0001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tin (Sn)-Total | | | <0.00010 | | mg/L | | 0.0001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Titanium (Ti)-Total | | | <0.00030 | | mg/L | | 0.0003 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tungsten (W)-Total | | | <0.00010 | | mg/L | | 0.0001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Uranium (U)-Total | | | <0.00001 | 0 | mg/L | | 0.00001 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Vanadium (V)-Total | | | <0.00050 | | mg/L | | 0.0005 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Zinc (Zn)-Total | | | <0.0030 | | mg/L | | 0.003 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Zirconium (Zr)-Total | | | <0.00030 | | mg/L | | 0.0003 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2734886-5 MS | | WG2734886-6 | | | | | | |
| Aluminum (Al)-Total | | | 96.6 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Antimony (Sb)-Total | | | 102.5 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Arsenic (As)-Total | | | 103.9 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Barium (Ba)-Total | | | 98.3 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Beryllium (Be)-Total | | | 98.7 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Bismuth (Bi)-Total | | | 99.2 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Boron (B)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cadmium (Cd)-Total | | | 100.8 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Calcium (Ca)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Chromium (Cr)-Total | | | 102.3 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cesium (Cs)-Total | | | 99.7 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Cobalt (Co)-Total | | | 99.7 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Copper (Cu)-Total | | | 97.3 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Iron (Fe)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Lead (Pb)-Total | | | 99.2 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Lithium (Li)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Magnesium (Mg)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Manganese (Mn)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Molybdenum (Mo)-Total | | | 100.6 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Nickel (Ni)-Total | | | 97.9 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Phosphorus (P)-Total | | | 110.4 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Potassium (K)-Total | | | 107.6 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Rubidium (Rb)-Total | | | 98.1 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |



Ryan Polick

Quality Control Report

Workorder: L2068971

Report Date: 23-MAR-18

Page 7 of 12

Client: PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7

Contact:

| Test | Matrix | Reference | Result | Qualifier | Units | RPD | Limit | Analyzed |
|--|--------|-------------|---------|-----------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| MET-T-CCMS-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987814 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2734886-5 MS | | WG2734886- | 6 | | | | | |
| Selenium (Se)-Total | | | 82.5 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Silicon (Si)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Silver (Ag)-Total | | | 94.3 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Sodium (Na)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Strontium (Sr)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Sulfur (S)-Total | | | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
| Thallium (TI)-Total | | | 99.2 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tellurium (Te)-Total | | | 94.0 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Thorium (Th)-Total | | | 105.6 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tin (Sn)-Total | | | 101.2 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Titanium (Ti)-Total | | | 104.9 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Tungsten (W)-Total | | | 104.1 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Uranium (U)-Total | | | 107.9 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Vanadium (V)-Total | | | 105.6 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Zinc (Zn)-Total | | | 95.7 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| Zirconium (Zr)-Total | | | 103.0 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| NH3-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3989708 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2735508-7 DUP | | L2068981-4 | | | | | | |
| Ammonia, Total (as N) | | <0.020 | <0.020 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735508-6 LCS | | | 100.0 | | 0/ | | | |
| Ammonia, Totai (as N) | | | 103.9 | | % | | 85-115 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735508-5 MB Ammonia Total (as N) | | | <0.020 | | ma/l | | 0.02 | 10 MAD 19 |
| WG2735508-8 MS | | 1 2068081-4 | \$0.020 | | | | 0.02 | 13-10/211-10 |
| Ammonia, Total (as N) | | L2000901-4 | 94.3 | | % | | 75-125 | 19-MAR-18 |
| NO2-IC-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3990051 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2735070-14 DUP | | WG2735070- | 13 | | | | | |
| Nitrite (as N) | | <0.010 | <0.010 | RPD-NA | mg/L | N/A | 25 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-12 LCS Nitrite (as N) | | | 98.9 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-11 MB Nitrite (as N) | | | <0.010 | | mg/L | | 0.01 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-15 MS | | WG2735070- | 13 | | | | | |



Orthophosphate-Dissolved (as P)

Quality Control Report

Workorder: L2068971 Report Date: 23-MAR-18 Page 8 of 12 PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) Client: 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7 Contact: Ryan Polick Test Matrix Reference Result Qualifier Units RPD Limit Analyzed NO2-IC-WT Water Batch R3990051 WG2735070-13 WG2735070-15 MS % Nitrite (as N) 93.0 70-130 19-MAR-18 NO3-IC-WT Water Batch R3990051 WG2735070-14 DUP WG2735070-13 Nitrate (as N) 4.99 4.98 mg/L 0.1 25 19-MAR-18 WG2735070-12 LCS Nitrate (as N) 99.3 % 70-130 19-MAR-18 WG2735070-11 MB Nitrate (as N) < 0.020 mg/L 0.02 19-MAR-18

| WG2735070-15 MS Nitrate (as N) | V | NG2735070-13 | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 19-MAR-18 |
|--|-----------|-----------------------------|---------|------|----------|------|---------|-----------|
| P-T-COL-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3988985 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2735183-3 DUP Phosphorus, Total | L | -2068891-1 1.56 | 1.52 | | mg/L | 2.9 | 20 | 20-MAR-18 |
| WG2735183-2 LCS Phosphorus, Total | | | 91.0 | | % | | 80-120 | 20-MAR-18 |
| WG2735183-1 MB Phosphorus, Total | | | <0.0030 | | mg/L | | 0.003 | 20-MAR-18 |
| WG2735183-4 MS Phosphorus, Total | L | -2068891-1 | N/A | MS-B | % | | - | 20-MAR-18 |
| PH-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3989048 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2734455-4 DUP | v | NG2734455-3 | | | | | | |
| рН | 7 | 7.60 | 7.62 | J | pH units | 0.02 | 0.2 | 17-MAR-18 |
| WG2734455-2 LCS рН | | | 6.97 | | pH units | | 6.9-7.1 | 17-MAR-18 |
| PO4-DO-COL-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987616 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2735008-3 DUP Orthophosphate-Dissolve | ed (as P) | _2068487-1 D.0176 | 0.0151 | | mg/L | 15 | 30 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735008-2 LCS Orthophosphate-Dissolve | ed (as P) | | 100.2 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735008-1 MB | | | | | | | | |

< 0.0030

mg/L

0.003

19-MAR-18



Report Date: 23-MAR-18

Page 9 of 12

Client: PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7

Workorder: L2068971

Contact: Ryan Polick

| Test | Matrix | Reference | Result | Qualifier | Units | RPD | Limit | Analyzed |
|---|-----------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987616 WG2735008-4 MS Orthophosphate-Dissolv | ed (as P) | L2068487-1 | 101.9 | | % | | 70-130 | 19-MAR-18 |
| REDOX-POTENTIAL-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3991168 | | | | | | | | |
| WG2735834-1 DUP Redox Potential | | L2068891-1 336 | 333 | | mV | 0.9 | 25 | 20-MAR-18 |
| SO4-IC-N-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3990051 WG2735070-14 DUP Sulfate (SO4) | | WG2735070-1 3 15.5 | 3 15.4 | | mg/L | 0.8 | 20 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-12 LCS Sulfate (SO4) | | | 100.8 | | % | | 90-110 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-11 MB Sulfate (SO4) | | | <0.30 | | mg/L | | 0.3 | 19-MAR-18 |
| WG2735070-15 MS Sulfate (SO4) | | WG2735070-13 | 3 100.8 | | % | | 75-125 | 19-MAR-18 |
| SOLIDS-TDS-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3988269 WG2734727-3 DUP Total Dissolved Solids | | L2068327-2 635 | 638 | | mg/L | 0.4 | 20 | 18-MAR-18 |
| WG2734727-2 LCS Total Dissolved Solids | | | 97.9 | | % | | 85-115 | 18-MAR-18 |
| WG2734727-1 MB Total Dissolved Solids | | | <10 | | mg/L | | 10 | 18-MAR-18 |
| TC,EC-QT51-WT | Water | | | | | | | |
| Batch R3987530 WG2734483-2 DUP | | L2068440-1 | 0 | | MBNI/100ml | 0.0 | 65 | |
| Escherichia Coli | | 0 | 0 | | MPN/100mL | 0.0 | 65 65 | 18-MAR-18 |
| WG2734483-1 MP | | v | 5 | | | 0.0 | 00 | 10-IVIAR-10 |
| Total Coliforms | | | 0 | | MPN/100mL | | 1 | 18-MAR-18 |
| Escherichia Coli | | | 0 | | MPN/100mL | | 1 | 18-MAR-18 |
| TURBIDITY-WT | Water | | | | | | | |



 Workorder:
 L2068971
 Report Date:
 23-MAR-18
 Page
 10
 of
 12

 Client:
 PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill)
 74 Berkeley Street
 74 Berkeley Street</td

Contact: Ryan Polick

| Test | | Matrix | Reference | Result | Qualifier | Units | RPD | Limit | Analyzed |
|---------------------------------|---------|--------|---------------------------|--------|-----------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|
| TURBIDITY-WT Batch R3 | 3987229 | Water | | | | | | | |
| WG2734457-3 Turbidity | DUP | | L2068994-1 1.39 | 1.34 | | NTU | 3.7 | 15 | 17-MAR-18 |
| WG2734457-2 Turbidity | LCS | | | 104.0 | | % | | 85-115 | 17-MAR-18 |
| WG2734457-1 Turbidity | MB | | | <0.10 | | NTU | | 0.1 | 17-MAR-18 |

Report Date: 23-MAR-18 Workorder: L2068971

| Client: | PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) |
|----------|--|
| | 74 Berkeley Street |
| | Toronto ON M5V 2W7 |
| Contact: | Ryan Polick |

Legend:

| Limit | ALS Control Limit (Data Quality Objectives) |
|-------|---|
| DUP | Duplicate |
| RPD | Relative Percent Difference |
| N/A | Not Available |
| LCS | Laboratory Control Sample |
| SRM | Standard Reference Material |
| MS | Matrix Spike |
| MSD | Matrix Spike Duplicate |
| ADE | Average Desorption Efficiency |
| MB | Method Blank |
| IRM | Internal Reference Material |
| CRM | Certified Reference Material |
| CCV | Continuing Calibration Verification |
| CVS | Calibration Verification Standard |
| LCSD | Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate |

Sample Parameter Qualifier Definitions:

| Qualifier | Description |
|-----------|--|
| J | Duplicate results and limits are expressed in terms of absolute difference. |
| MS-B | Matrix Spike recovery could not be accurately calculated due to high analyte background in sample. |
| RPD-NA | Relative Percent Difference Not Available due to result(s) being less than detection limit. |

| Quality | Control | Report |
|---------|---------|--------|
|---------|---------|--------|

Workorder: L2068971

Report Date: 23-MAR-18

PALMER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING GROUP INC. (Richmond Hill) Client: 74 Berkeley Street Toronto ON M5V 2W7 Ryan Polick

Contact:

Hold Time Exceedances:

| ALS Product | Description | Sample ID | Sampling Date | Date Processed | Rec. HT | Actual HT | Units | Qualifier |
|--|---|--|--|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Physical Tes | ts | | | | | | | |
| Redox Pot | ential | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 15-MAR-18 15:45 | 20-MAR-18 21:00 | 0.25 | 125 | hours | EHTR-FM |
| Legend & Qu | alifier Definition | S: | | | | | | |
| EHTR-FM: EHTR: EHTL: EHT: Rec. HT: | Exceeded ALS re Exceeded ALS re Exceeded ALS re Exceeded ALS re ALS recommended | ecommende ecommende ecommende ecommende ed hold time | ed hold time prior to san ed hold time prior to san ed hold time prior to ana ed hold time prior to ana e (see units). | nple receipt. Field Mea nple receipt. Ilysis. Sample was rec Ilysis. | asurement ceived less | recommendeo than 24 hours | d. prior to ex | piry. |

Notes*:

Where actual sampling date is not provided to ALS, the date (& time) of receipt is used for calculation purposes. Where actual sampling time is not provided to ALS, the earlier of 12 noon on the sampling date or the time (& date) of receipt is used for calculation purposes. Samples for L2068971 were received on 15-MAR-18 17:00.

ALS recommended hold times may vary by province. They are assigned to meet known provincial and/or federal government requirements. In the absence of regulatory hold times, ALS establishes recommendations based on guidelines published by the US EPA, APHA Standard Methods, or Environment Canada (where available). For more information, please contact ALS.

The ALS Quality Control Report is provided to ALS clients upon request. ALS includes comprehensive QC checks with every analysis to ensure our high standards of quality are met. Each QC result has a known or expected target value, which is compared against predetermined data quality objectives to provide confidence in the accuracy of associated test results.

Please note that this report may contain QC results from anonymous Sample Duplicates and Matrix Spikes that do not originate from this Work Order.



Chain of Custody (COC) / Analytical

Request Form



COC Number: 17 - 622480 Page of

Canada Toll Free: 1 800 668 9878

| | www.aisgiopal.com | | | <u>n</u> | | | and the local data | | | | | | | | | ` | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|----------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| Report To | Contact and company name below will appea | r on the final report | Report Format / Distribution : | | | | Select Service Level Below - Contact your AM to confirm all E&P TATs (surcharges may apply) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Company: | PECG - PALHER ENUTRONHENTAL Select Report Format: X PDF X EXCEL EDD (DIGITAL) | | | | | Regular [R] X Standard TAT if received by 3 pm - business days - no surcharges apply | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contact: | Nava Pecg. Ca | Quality Control | Quality Control (QC) Report with Report X YES NO | | | | | د الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الل | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Phone: | 604-790-6051 | Compare I | Results to Criteria on Report - | - provide details below | f box checked | LINE . | 3 day [P | 3-25%] | | MERG | Same | Day, We | ekend o | r Statu | itory ho | liday [E2 | :-200% | , | _ |
| | Company address below will appear on the final | report Select Distribution | Select Distribution: 🕅 EMAIL MAIL 🗌 FAX | | | | | 2 day [P2-50%] | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Street: | 74 Berkeley St | Email 1 or Fa | (Nan@ Pe | 29.04 | | | Date and Time Required for all E&P TATs: dd-mmm-yy hhimm | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City/Province: | Torente Ontorie | Email 2 | Coriune@ 7809 | | | For tests | sta that can not be performed according to the service level selected, you will be contacted. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Postal Code: | HSA ZW7 | Email 3 | Jasan@ pecg. | <u>(9</u> | | | Analysis Request | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| nvoice To | Same as Report To | NO | Invoice Di | istribution | | Indicate Filtered (F), Preserved (P) or Filtered and Preserved (F/P) below | | | | | | | | | | | | taits | |
| | Copy of Invoice with Report X YES | NO Select Invoice | Distribution: 🛛 🕅 | EMAIL MAIL | FAX | | | | | | | | | | | | | - de | |
| Company: | | Email 1 or Fa | Journe PE | 209.04 | | | | | 5 S | | | | | | | · | | f | |
| Contact: | | Email 2 | | | | . | ES. | • | 四 | | | • | | | | | | le fu | |
| | Project Information | | Oil and Gas Require | ed Fields (client u | se) | | -7 | | Š | | | | | | | | | 0 N | |
| ALS Account # | / Quote #: | AFE/Cost Center | · · · · · | PO# | | | à | | å | | | | | | | | | D D | |
| Job # 176 | >163 Chickardee Lane | Major/Minor Code | | Routing Code: | | i ' | ~ | ľ | Ŧ | | | | | | · . | | | leas | ERS |
| PO/AFE: | | Requisitioner | | • | . • . • | | | | | | | | | | . | | | 5 D | Ž |
| LSD: * | | Location: | · · · | | | | - <u>a</u> | | $[\omega]$ | · | · 1 | | | · | · · | | Ξ | ğ | E I |
| | | | | Complex | ÷ • • | ુર્સ | E ! | ミチ | િર્સા | <u>~</u> | | | | | | | Ż | aza | ŏ |
| ALS LAD WO | Sink Order # (lab use onsy): L2069 | BUTTIEB ALS CONTACT | | Sampler. | · . | -9 | - [| ीत्ते | 3 | | | | | . I | | · · · | S S | 5 | ы С Н |
| ALS Sample # | Sample Identification | and/or Coordinates | Date | Time | Sample Type | דֿ | 1 5 | <u>5</u> 5 | <u>→</u> | ∄. , | | | | ŀ | | | 1 | 퉡 | MB |
| (lab use only) | (This description will a | ppear on the report) | (dd-mmm-yy) | (hh:mm) | Sample Type | × . | , | | Y | ~ | | | | | | | S A | Sar | ĩ |
| | × MWG | | 15-101-18 | 15:45 | Gardiete | $ \times $ | $\times \times$ | $\langle X \rangle$ | $ \mathbf{X} $ | X _ | • | | | | | | | | Ś |
| · · · · · · | | · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \square | |
| | | • •• • • • • • • | | | | | | | 1 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| · · · · | | ····· | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | ······································ | | + | | ++ | | + | · · | _ | _ | | · | | ·· , | | \vdash | ┟╌╼╂ | { |
| | | | · · · | | · · · · · | + | | _ | | | | | | | | | ┢──┤ | ⊢╂ | |
| ·. | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | ۰ | - | | | + | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | 4 | ┝──┨ | |
| | | · | | | · | | | | | | | • • | | | | | | \square | |
| | | | | | · • | ٤. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | · · · · · | | ļ | | | | | | | | | | | | | · |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | + - + | - + | <u> </u> | t | | | | | <u> ·</u> − | | _ | ┢─┦ | | |
| | | ···· | | · | <u> </u> | + + | | | ╀╌╂╴ | -+- | + | ┝╌┼╾ | | ┝┈┥ | | -+ | ╂─┦ | ┟──┨ | |
| _ | | | ·· . | | · · · | ╆╌╄ | | | SAN SAN | | | | | l leb (i | co only | | | | |
| Drinki | ng Water (DW) Samples ¹ (client use) | Special Instructions / Specify Criteri | a to add on report by cli selectronic COC only} | cking on the drop- | lown list below | Erozar | | <u></u> | | SIF | Ohserv | ations | Yes | u can) T | ae only | No | | — | |
| Are samples take | en from a Regulated DW System? | 1 11 - 1 | | | <u> </u> | lice Pa | he h | λί _{ιce} ι | Cubes | | stody se: | al intact | Yes | Ē | 1 | No | | Ē | i I |
| | YES 🔀 NO | Compose with Out | 510 dinklig | s nater. | stendards | Coolin | g Initiate | 2 1 | | | , | | | - | | | | | 1 |
| Are samples for | human consumption/ use? | | - | | | — | INIT | IAL COOL | ER TEMPE | RATURE | s≏¢ | | 20 | FINAL | COOLERT | EMPERAT | URES °C | ; | |
| - 1 1 - | YES I I (NO | · · | • | - : | • . | 41 | 5 | | | Τ | | | 1.8 | $\langle \neg \rangle$ | | - <u> </u> | | | |
| <u> </u> | SHIPMENT RELEASE (client use) | · | INITIAL SHIPME | NT RECEPTION (| ab use only) | <u> </u> | <u>-</u> +- | | ±, | FIN | AL SHI | MENT R | ECEPTI | ON (la | b use o | ıly) | | L | |
| Released by | Date: | Time: Received by | _ () | Date: | 8 | Time: | R | eceived | by: | 11- | | Date: | | 1 | 1 | 10 | Tinge: | 51 | -57 |
| Ryon Ke | olick March 15,7 | 2018 17:00 M | <u>ex</u> | mar-1 | 5 2018 | <u> </u>] | 00 | | | 117 | <u> </u> | \square | q_{Λ} | <u>, (</u> | <u>\9</u> | <u>/ð</u> | <u></u> | <u>) مر</u> | <u>_</u> |
| REFER TO BACK | PAGE FOR ALS LOCATIONS AND SAMPLING INF | ORMATION | WH WH | HITE - LABORATOR | COPY YELLO | W - CLIE | NT COP | / | | | | 1 | | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | Juy 20 | 17 580047 |

EVENT to complete all points of this form may delay analysis. Please fill in this form LEGIBLY, By the use of this form the user acknowledges and agrees with the Terms and Conditions as specified on the back page of the white - report copy. 1. If any value samples are taken from a Regulated Drinking Water (DW) System, please submit using in Authorized DW COC form.