Ian D. Wilson Associates Ltd. *since* 1974

Tel: 519.233.3500 Fax: 519.233.3501 P. O. Box 299 Clinton, Ontario N0M 1L0

November 23, 2023 Updated February 16, 2024

Ms. Katrina Lalonde, P.Eng. Quantum Engineering Inc. 97 Copeland Creek Drive Tiny, ON L9M 0M2 Wilson Associates

Consulting Hydrogeologists

Dear Ms. Lalonde:

Re: Hydrogeological Study and Water Balance Analysis Proposed Commercial Development 120 Pillsbury Drive, Town of Midland, Ontario

It is proposed to develop an existing  $\pm 0.68$ ha property at 120 Pillsbury Drive, in the Town of Midland, as a commercial facility with an office, warehouse, storage and associated parking.

As requested by Quantum Engineering Inc., this report has been prepared to address the requirements of the June 2013 "Hydrogeological Assessment Submissions: Conservation Authority Guidelines for Development Applications" (the CA Guideline).

Provided for this study were the following documentation:

• Proposed Site Plan, August 2023, Quantum Engineering Inc.

A copy of the above Site Plan attached for reference.

As no site-specific information was available from which to characterize subsurface conditions, a test pit program was undertaken within accessible areas of the site on March 26, 2019.

The November 23, 2023 report revision includes content provided to address hydrogeologyrelated comments outlined in the June 17, 2019 Severn Sound Environmental Association review of a previous version of the report. This report update includes the final site plan.

## LOCATION AND HYDROGEOLOGICAL SETTING

The subject lands at 120 Pillsbury Drive occupy a 0.68ha "L" shaped parcel located on the west side of Pillsbury Drive, about 280m north of the intersection with William Street. The site is currently undeveloped, and is entirely forested. The site exhibits a steep topography, being located along the scarp between the uplands of Midland to the west and the lowlands of the Wye River valley to the east. Total site relief is about 15m to 18m, with the proposed commercial facility located within the lower, relatively moderate sloped, eastern half of the site.

No surface water bodies are located on-site, with the Wye River located about 600m east of the site.

Lands surrounding the site are undeveloped forest along the scarp lands to the north and south, urban residential and some woodland on the uplands to the west, and industrial lands and some woodland on the lowlands to the east.

The subject lands are located within the Simcoe Uplands physiographic region of southern Ontario, an area of northern Simcoe County characterized by till upland plains and steep-sided, flat floored valleys.

According to Ontario Geological Survey Map P.975 "Quaternary Geology of the Orr Lake Area (Western Half) and Nottawasaga area (Eastern Half)", shallow soils consist of ice-contact deposits of gravel and sand on the uplands to the west, and glaciolacustrine deposits of sand with minor fine gravel on the lowlands to the east. The on-site test pit program (see below), completed within the lower, relatively moderate sloped eastern portion of the site, encountered mainly a thin veneer of fine sand overlying a stony sandy silt glacial till

As the area is municipally serviced, few deep water well records are available in the close vicinity from which to characterize the sequence of overburden formations. Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) water well records for distant (i.e.  $\geq$ 500m) wells (representative records attached) suggest that the overburden is approximately 53m to 68m deep (depending on surface topography), and apart from some finer-grained deposits in the upper ±6m, mainly consists of coarse-grained deposits.

According to interpretation provided by the 2005 North Simcoe Municipal Groundwater Study (NSMGS), the bedrock surface in the area is situated at an approximate elevation of 140m above sea level (masl) (per Figure 4.5.2 of the NSMGS). The NSMGS reports the majority of the lower overburden to be granular in the vicinity of Midland.

The bedrock beneath the site consists mainly of limestone and dolostone of the Simcoe Group.

Although the area is municipally serviced, municipal and historical water wells will have obtained potable groundwater from aquifers in the lower overburden. The bedrock beneath the site is not locally typically used as a source of potable groundwater due to the likelihood of obtaining lower yields of aesthetically-poorer quality groundwater.

According to the 2015 Severn Sound Source Protection Area Approved Assessment Report (the Severn Sound Report), the site is not located within a well head protection area (WHPA-A through WHPA-E). The Simcoe County Interactive Mapping Website indicates that the site is located within Well Head Protection Zone WHPA-Q2 and that the site is located within a significant groundwater recharge area. The Russell and Heritage municipal well fields are located more than 1km to the northwest and southwest.

#### **TEST PITS**

To characterize subsurface conditions, three test pits were completed in accessible portions of the moderate sloped portions of the eastern half of the site on March 26, 2019. The soil profiles were logged and representative soil samples were collected for classification and further analysis. The locations of the test pits are shown on the attached diagram. Three representative soil samples from the main identified soil horizons were subjected to grain size analysis, and the following summarizes the results:

Test Pit/ Sample	Depth (m)	G	Brain-Siz	ze Distrib	oution	Estimated Coefficient of	Estimated T- Time
		Clay %	Silt %	Sand %	Gravel %	Permeability (cm/sec)	(minutes/cm)
TP1 S1	0.6	3	20	74	3	3x10⁻⁴	15
TP2 S2	0.5	4	62	33	1	5x10⁻⁵	25
TP2 S3	1.1	4	54	41	1	1x10⁻⁵	30

Note: The above coefficients of permeability and T-times are estimates based on field observation, grain-size analysis, experience with similar soils and guidelines published under the Ontario Building Code. Cobble size and larger not included in analyses.

The following summarizes the observed soil profiles and identified T-times:

#### <u>TEST PIT 1:</u>

Depth (m)	Material
0 - 0.30	dark brown TOPSOIL, stony
0.30 - 0.91	red-brown, lightly compact, dry SAND with some silt and traces of clay and gravel, stony (estimated T-time 15 min/cm)
0.91 - 1.82	grev, compact, dry sandy SILT till with traces of gravel and clay (estimated T-
	time 30 min/cm)

## TEST PIT 2:

Depth (m) Material

0 - 0.30 dark brown TOPSOIL, sandy

- 0.30 0.91 red-brown, lightly compact, dry sandy SILT with traces of gravel and silt, stony (estimated T-time 25 min/cm)
- 0.91 1.82 grey, compact, dry sandy SILT till with traces of gravel and clay (estimated Ttime 30 min/cm)

## TEST PIT 3:

Depth (m)	Material
0 - 0.25	FILL - dark brown topsoil
0.25 - 0.91	FILL - grey-brown, compact, dry sandy silt till, stony

0.91 - 1.21 buried TOPSOIL

1.21 - 1.83 grey, compact, dry sandy SILT till with traces of gravel and clay (estimated Ttime 30 min/cm)

The soil native soil profile at the three test pits consisted of a lightly compact stony sand to stony sandy silt (estimated T-time 15 to 25min/cm) overlying a sandy silt till (estimated T-time 30min/cm).

Copies of the grain size curves are attached.

The watertable surface was not encountered in any of the test pits.

Locally, the NSMGS indicates that shallow groundwater will flow eastwards beneath the site.

#### WATER BUDGET ANALYSIS

The following assumptions are made for this assessment:

- Based on the relatively small site area, the site is assumed to act as one catchment. The entire site is considered to exhibit hilly topography (per the 1995 Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) definitions referenced by the CA guideline) and medium combination of clay and loam soil conditions (per the above test pits).
- According to updated calculations provided by Quantum Engineering Inc., the 6,745.8m<sup>2</sup> site currently exhibits an undisturbed woodland pervious area of 100% (6,745.8m<sup>2</sup>) and an impervious area of 0% (0m<sup>2</sup>). The proposed development of the site will exhibit an undisturbed woodland pervious area of 62.7% (4,228.3m<sup>2</sup>), a grassed pervious area of 13.3% (898.0m<sup>2</sup>), an impervious area (rooftop) of 6.2% (417.1m<sup>2</sup>) and an impervious area (pavement) of 17.8% (1202.4m<sup>2</sup>).
- The water surplus for the site is assumed to be 399mm/year, as identified for the Midland Area subwatershed by the 2015 Severn Sound Report (precipitation 986mm/year, actual evapotranspiration 587mm/year). Normal precipitation for the area is 1040.6mm/year (1981-2010 precipitation normal for the closest Environment Canada weather station - Midland WPCP weather station). For this assessment, the 2015 Severn Sound Report precipitation rate of 986mm/year is assumed.

The following tables provide a water budget analysis following the general guidance of the April 2013 Conservation Authority Guidelines for Hydrogeological Assessments.

# Table 1 - Water Budget - Undeveloped Conditions

Catchment	Site			
Designation	Undeveloped	Totals		
Area (m²)	6745.8	6745.8		
Pervious Area (m²)	6745.8	6745.8		
Impervious Area (m²)	0	0		
Impervious Factors (Per MECP Guideli	nes referenced by CA Guideline	)		
Topography Infiltration Factor	Hilly 0.1			
Soil Infiltration Factor	Medium 0.2			
Land Cover Infiltration Factor	Woodland 0.2			
MECP Infiltration Factor	0.5			
Actual Infiltration Factor	0.5			
Run-Off Coefficient	0.5			
Runoff from Impervious Surfaces*	0			
Inputs (per Ur	it Area)			
Precipitation (mm/year)	986	986		
Run-On (mm/year)	0	0		
Other Inputs (mm/year)	0	0		
Total Inputs (mm/year)	986	986		
Outputs (per U	nit Area)			
Precipitation Surplus (mm/year)	399	399		
Net Surplus (mm/year)	399	399		
Evapotranspiration (mm/year)	587	587		
Infiltration (mm/year)	199.5	199.5		
Impervious Area Infiltration (mm/year)	0	0		
Total Infiltration (mm/year)	199.5	199.5		
Runoff Pervious Areas (mm/year)	199.5	199.5		
Runoff Impervious Areas (mm/year)	0	0		
Total Runoff (mm/year)	199.5	199.5		
Total Outputs (mm/year)	986	986		
Difference (Inputs - Outputs) (mm/year)	0	0		

Inputs (Vol	ume)	
Precipitation (m³/year)	6651	6651
Run-On (m³/year)	0	0
Other Inputs (m³/year)	0	0
Total Inputs (m³/year)	6651	6651
Outputs (Vo	olume)	
Precipitation Surplus (m³/year)	2691	2691
Net Surplus (m³/year)	2691	2691
Evapotranspiration (m³/year)	3960	3960
Infiltration (m³/year)	1346	1346
Impervious Area Infiltration (m³/year)	0	0
Total Infiltration (m³/year)	1346	1346
Runoff Pervious Areas (m³/year)	1346	1346
Runoff Impervious Areas (m³/year)	0	0
Total Runoff (m³/year)	1346	1346
Total Outputs (m³/year)	6652	6652
Difference (Inputs - Outputs) (m³/year)	1**	1**

\*\* Minor difference due to rounding.

# Table 2 - Water Budget - Post-Development Conditions

The proposed development of the site will exhibit an undisturbed woodland pervious area of 62.7% (4,228.3m<sup>2</sup>), a grassed pervious area of 13.3% (898.0m<sup>2</sup>), an impervious area (rooftop) of 6.2% (417.1m<sup>2</sup>) and an impervious area (pavement) of 17.8% (1202.4m<sup>2</sup>).

Catchment			Site		
Designation	Pervious Woodland	Pervious Grassed	Impervious Roof	Impervious Paved	Totals
Area (m²)	4228.3	898.0	417.1	1202.4	6745.8
Pervious Area (m²)	4228.3	898.0	0	0	5126.3
Impervious Area (m²)	0	0	417.1	1202.4	1619.5
Impervious Facto	ors (Per MECP G	uidelines referen	ced by CA Guide	line)	
Topography Infiltration Factor	Hilly 0.1	Hilly 0.1	Hilly 0.30	Hilly 0.30	
Soil Infiltration Factor	Medium 0.2	Medium 0.2	Medium 0.2	Medium 0.2	
Land Cover Infiltration Factor	Woodland 0.2	Cleared 0.1	Cleared 0.1	Cleared 0.1	
MECP Infiltration Factor	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	
Actual Infiltration Factor	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	
Run-Off Coefficient	0.5	0.6	1	1	
Runoff from Impervious Surfaces*	0	0	0.8	0.8	
	Inputs (p	er Unit Area)			
Precipitation (mm/year)	986	986	986	986	986
Run-On (mm/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Other Inputs (mm/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Total Inputs (mm/year)	986	986	986	986	986
Outputs (j	per Unit Area)				
Precipitation Surplus (mm/year)	399	399	789	789	493
Net Surplus (mm/year)	399	399	789	789	493
Evapotranspiration (mm/year)	587	587	197	197	493
Infiltration (mm/year)	199.5	160	0	0	146
Impervious Area Infiltration (mm/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Total Infiltration (mm/year)	199.5	160	0	0	146
Runoff Pervious Areas (mm/year)	199.5	239	0	0	157
Runoff Impervious Areas (mm/year)	0	0	789	789	189
Total Runoff (mm/year)	199.5	239	789	789	346

Ian D. Wilson Associates Limited

120 Pillsbury Drive, Town of Midland

Total Outputs (mm/year)	986	986	986	986	985
Difference (Inputs - Outputs) (mm/year)	0	0	0	0	-1**
	Inputs	(Volume)			
Precipitation (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	4169	885	411	1186	6651
Run-On (m³/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Other Inputs (m³/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Total Inputs (m³/year)	4169	885	411	1186	6651
	Output	s (Volume)			
Precipitation Surplus (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	1687	358	329	949	3223
Net Surplus (m³/year)	1687	358	329	949	3223
Evapotranspiration (m³/year)	2482	527	82	237	3328
Infiltration (m³/year)	844	144	0	0	988
Impervious Area Infiltration (m³/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Total Infiltration (m³/year)	844	144	0	0	988
Runoff Pervious Areas (m³/year)	844	215	0	0	1059
Runoff Impervious Areas (m³/year)	0	0	329	949	1278
Total Runoff (m³/year)	844	215	329	949	2337
Total Outputs (m³/year)	4170	886	411	1186	6653
Difference (Inputs - Outputs) (m³/year)	1**	1**	0	0	2**

Note: \* Per guidelines, evaporation from impervious areas assumed to be 20% of precipitation.

\*\* Minor differences attributable to rounding.

# Table 3 - Water Budget - Post-Development Conditions with Mitigation

Based on the above assessment, approximately 358m<sup>3</sup>/year (28%) of the runoff from the impervious areas of the site (100% of the runoff from the roof and 3% of runoff from the paved area) will need to be infiltrated on the site in order to maintain the overall rate of infiltration relative to pre-development conditions. The viability of infiltrating this volume of water is discussed below.

Catchment		Site						
Designation	Pervious Woodland	Pervious Grassed	Impervious Roof	Impervious Paved	Totals			
Area (m²)	4228.3	898.0	417.1	1202.4	6745.8			
Pervious Area (m²)	4228.3	898.0	0	0	5126.3			
Impervious Area (m²)	0	0	417.1	1202.4	1619.5			
Impervious Facto	ors (Per MECP G	uidelines referend	ced by CA Guide	line)				
Topography Infiltration Factor	Hilly 0.1	Hilly 0.1	Hilly 0.30	Hilly 0.30				
Soil Infiltration Factor	Medium 0.2	Medium 0.2	Medium 0.2	Medium 0.2				
Land Cover Infiltration Factor	Woodland 0.2	Cleared 0.1	Cleared 0.1	Cleared 0.1				
MECP Infiltration Factor	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4				
Actual Infiltration Factor	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4				
Run-Off Coefficient	0.5	0.6	1	1				
Runoff from Impervious Surfaces*	0	0	0.8	0.8				
	Inputs (p	er Unit Area)						
Precipitation (mm/year)	986	986	986	986	986			
Run-On (mm/year)	0	0	0	0	0			
Other Inputs (mm/year)	0	0	0	0	0			
Total Inputs (mm/year)	986	986	986	986	986			
Outputs (	per Unit Area)							
Precipitation Surplus (mm/year)	399	399	789	789	493			
Net Surplus (mm/year)	399	399	789	789	493			
Evapotranspiration (mm/year)	587	587	197	197	493			
Infiltration (mm/year)	199.5	160	0	0	146			
Impervious Area Infiltration (mm/year)	0	0	789	24	53			
Total Infiltration (mm/year)	199.5	160	789	24	199			
Runoff Pervious Areas (mm/year)	199.5	239	0	0	157			
Runoff Impervious Areas (mm/year)	0	0	0	765	136			

# 10

Total Runoff (mm/year)	199.5	239	0	765	293
Total Outputs (mm/year)	986	986	986	986	985
Difference (Inputs - Outputs) (mm/year)	0	0	0	0	-1**
	Inputs	(Volume)			
Precipitation (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	4169	885	411	1186	6651
Run-On (m³/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Other Inputs (m³/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Total Inputs (m³/year)	4169	885	411	1186	6651
	Output	s (Volume)			
Precipitation Surplus (m³/year)	1687	358	329	949	3223
Net Surplus (m³/year)	1687	358	329	949	3223
Evapotranspiration (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	2482	527	82	237	3328
Infiltration (m³/year)	844	144	0	0	988
Impervious Area Infiltration (m³/year)	0	0	329	29	358
Total Infiltration (m³/year)	844	144	329	29	1346
Runoff Pervious Areas (m³/year)	844	215	0	0	1059
Runoff Impervious Areas (m³/year)	0	0	0	920	920
Total Runoff (m³/year)	844	215	0	920	1979
Total Outputs (m³/year)	4170	886	411	1186	6653
Difference (Inputs - Outputs) (m³/year)	1**	1**	0	0	2**

Per guidelines, evaporation from impervious areas assumed to be 20% of precipitation. Minor differences attributable to rounding. Note: \*

\*\*

#### 120 Pillsbury Drive, Town of Midland

#### Table 4 - Water Budget Summary

Characteristic			Site		
	Current	Post- Development	% Change (Current to Post)	Post Development with Mitigation	% Change (Current to Post with Mitigation)
		Inputs (Volu	mes)		
Precipitation (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	6651	6651	0	6651	0
Run-On (m³/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Other Inputs (m³/year)	0	0	0	0	0
Total Inputs (m³/year)	6651	6651	0	6651	0
Outputs (Volumes)					
Precipitation Surplus (m³/year)	2691	3223	20	3223	20
Net Surplus (m³/year)	2691	3223	20	3223	20
Evapotranspiration (m³/year)	3960	3328	-16	3328	-16
Infiltration (m³/year)	1346	988	-27	988	-27
Impervious Area Infiltration (m³/year)	0	0	0	358	28
Total Infiltration (m³/year)	1346	988	-27	1346	0
Runoff Pervious Areas (m³/year)	1346	1059	-21	1059	-21
Runoff Impervious Areas (m³/year)	0	1278	+1278 m³/year	920	+920 m³/year
Total Runoff (m³/year)	1346	2337	74	1979	47
Total Outputs (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	6652	6653	0	6653	0

Mitigation assumes that 28% of runoff from the impervious areas of the site can be infiltrated on-site, or about 358m<sup>3</sup>/year. It is assumed that most of this will be infiltrated into grass swales, infiltration galleries, or other equivalent Low Impact Development (LID) measures. According to the above test pit and permeability analyses, the native glacial till (i.e. sandy silt till) will exhibit a percolation rate (T-time) in the range of 30min/cm, or about 0.48m/day. Conservatively assuming that the impervious area drainage of 358m<sup>3</sup>/year is to be infiltrated over 30 days throughout the year, approximately 11.9m<sup>3</sup> of water needs to be infiltrated per day. Based on an infiltration rate of 0.48m/day, LID measures (e.g. grass swales, infiltration galleries, etc...) with a total site footprint of at least 24.8m<sup>2</sup> are required.

A management plan to maintain the infiltration facilities has been provided in the SWM report, under separate cover.

#### SUMMARY

- 1. The upper overburden in the accessible, to be developed, portion of the site is indicated to be a lightly compact stony sand to stony sandy silt (estimated T-time 15 to 25min/cm) overlying a sandy silt till (estimated T-time 30min/cm).
- 2. The watertable surface was not encountered at the test pits.
- 3. The site is located within Well Head Protection Area WHPA-Q2 and a significant groundwater recharge area. The Russell and Heritage municipal well fields are located more than 1km to the northwest and southwest.
- 4. Based on known site conditions (i.e. medium soils, hilly relief, woodland cover), an MECP infiltration factor of 0.5 is indicated for the undeveloped wooded site.
- 5. Water budget analysis indicates that the development proposal of the site will reduce overall infiltration by about 27% from pre-development conditions.
- 6. Due to the calculated loss in overall infiltration of the development proposal in comparison to pre-development conditions, infiltration enhancement measures must be adopted to infiltrate approximately 28% of runoff from impervious surfaces. It is assumed that most of this will be infiltrated into grass swales, infiltration galleries, or other equivalent Low Impact Development (LID) measures (see above for minimum LID areas). The infiltration measures need to be maintained in a low-sediment condition to avoid infiltration loss over time, and a management plan to maintain the infiltration facilities has been provided in the SWM report, under separate cover.

Should there be any questions regarding the above information and analysis, please feel free to contact this office.

Yours sincerely. IAN D. WILSON ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Geoffrey Rether, P.Geo.







JUNITY UI UILLUUG - VIGN INIAP

IAN D. WILSON ASSOCIATES LIMITED



PERCENT RETAINED

IAN D. WLSON ASSOCIATES LIMITED



PERCENT RETAINED

IAN D. WILSON ASSOCIATES LIMITED



WATER RESOURCES DIVISION UT.M 690950 17 MAY 2:5 1966 4954530 ONTARIO WATER tario Water Resources Commission Act Famil RESOURCES COMMIS RECOR WF DLAND Township, Village, Town or City County or District Lot & Kan 9, 18 3 10 966 Date completed Con month ess **Pumping Test** Casing and Screen Record TECA TIV Inside diameter of casing 10 Static level Wed out case G.P.M Test-pumping rate Total length of casing Type of screen Pumping level Duration of test pumping. Length of screen Water clear or cloudy at end of test Depth to top of screen G.P.M. Recommended pumping rate Diameter of finished ho feet below ground surface with pump setting of. Water Record Well Log Kind of water Depth(s) at From ft. To ft. (fresh, salty, sulphur) which water(s) found Overburden and Bedrock Record 0 Į. NEGATIU For what purpose(s) is the water to be used? TES I WELL Location of Well In diagram below show distances of well from road and lot line. Indicate north by arrow. Is well on upland, in valley, or on hillside? Vates Drilling or Boring Firm Address ALL I Licence Number Name of Driller or Bo Address 300/ Date Marigle No. 12. HIGH WAY (Signafire of Lifensed Drilling or Boring Contractor) Form 7 10M-62-1152 4 4 4 4 4 OWRC COPY

Min Env	istry of the vironment		WAT		Intario Wa	ater Resourc	es Act REC	ر الر 0:	R
Intario	I. PRINT ONLY IN ST	PACES PROVIDED CT BOX WHERE APPLICABLE		57154	51	57012	PR	ELL	
Sincoe		TOWNSHIP, BOROUGH, CI	TV. TOWN. VILLAGE	E P.F		TRACT SURVEY	ETE		·
		You	ne St M	idland		9	GATE COMPLETE	07	8-53 YB
		253	800	0630	5			1×1	1 1
	к. <u>1</u>	G OF OVERBURDE		OCK MATERIA	LS (SEE INST	RUCTIONS)	11		
GENERAL COLOUR	MOST COMMON MATERIAL	OTHER M	ATERIALS		GENERAL	DESCRIPTION		DEPTH	FEET
	stones	orave1						0	5
	clay							5	11
	gravel					-		11	70
	coarse sand							70	76
	gravel	clay, str	eaks of m	ed. sand				76	88
	coarse sand	anna ann an Anna an An	~					88 177	133
	Tine Sand							122	138
		······							
			K		8				
		total depth:	132 feet						
20-23 - 2 21-22 23-24 - 1 23-24 - 1 23-24 - 1 24-2 25-24 - 1 24-2 25-24 - 1 24-2 25-24 - 1 24-2	SALTY 4 MINERAL FRESH 3 SULPHUR SALTY 4 MINERAL SALTY 4 MINERAL FRESH 3 SULPHUR SALTY 4 MINERAL FRESH 3 SULPHUR SALTY 4 MINERAL SALTY	10-11 1 € STECL 26 4 0 OPEN HOLE 17-11 5 STECL 2 GALVANCE 2 0 OPEN HOLE 2 0 0PEN HOLE 2 0	12 0.188   35 0   24 0   25 12   26 12   27 12   28 12   29 12   20 12   21 12   22 24   32 34   32 34   32 34   32 34   32 34   32 34   32 34   32 34   32 34   32 34   35 35   7627 7627   400 05 YEST 40	+ 1 0129 28-23 27/36	LO AGRAM BELOW	PLUGGING A1 FELI 10 0138 2225 30-33 40 CATION O SHOW DISTANCES NTE NORTH BY AR	E & SEALING ATERIAL AND TYPE drill cu F WELL 5 OF WELL FROM ROW.	2126 3 RECC tting	
LJ SHALLO	A Ances Istrina	120 7.61 [****	0003 **		F Te		112		
FINAL STATUS OF WELL WATER USE METHOD OF DRILLING	1 WATER SUPPLY   2 OBSERVATION WELT   3 TEST HOLE   • RECHARGE WELT   3 TRST HOLE   • RECHARGE WELT   35.54 MOMESTIC   • INFIGATION	S AGANGORED. IN   Image: Constraint of the state	NDITIONING KOT USED LICENCE NUMBER		01 700	HW The Court			