



June 9, 2016

Via: Email

Mr. Rob Stovel
Stovel & Associates
297 Briarhill Dr.,
Stratford ON N5A

Dear Rob:

**Re: Tri County Aggregates
Project No.: 300034724.0000**

There has been an ongoing exchange of letters and memoranda between R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited (Burnside) and Groundwater Science pertaining to the hydrogeology of the proposed Tri-County site. This letter provides our reply to their letter of April 28.

- 1. Integrity of Monitor MW7-14** – We could debate what is meant by “physically compromise”, but it would not do anything to advance the project. We had noted two peculiarities about MW7-14. Firstly, it demonstrates hydraulic conductivity that is inconsistent with the borehole log description of the soils surrounding the screened interval, and secondly, it is showing water levels that are much different than Greenwood’s well which is located in close proximity. We felt that it would be prudent to replace MW7-14. It would seem to be a relatively small investment compared with the effects of data that appears unreliable. But there is a difference of opinion and no benefit in prolonging the discussion. We will accept that Tri County is not going to install a replacement. Burnside recommends that water levels on the Greenwood and Tri County sites be collected on the same day and shared by both parties so that the data can be used to establish consistency in final pit floor elevations on the adjacent portions of the two sites.
- 2. Established Water Table** – We find the directional references to be confusing. Groundwater Science Corp considers MW5-14 to represent the south end of the site. We note that this borehole is located near the point that the access road intersects with 17th Line. Long Environmental Consultants follows the local convention of 17th Line being west and 18th Line being east. There should be consistency in directional references.

We appreciate the correction of the typographical error, which was the cause of much concern.
- 3. Water Table Contours** – Our previous letter made reference to an external pond shown on Tri-County’s drawings and having a water level of +/- 473 m. Groundwater Science Corp says that pond does not exist, the elevation as shown is not supportable, and it should in no way be used to assess the accuracy of ground water contours. This would

seem to be an issue that should be sorted out between the consultants representing Tri County. Either the pond exists, as put forward by Long Environmental Consultants, or it does not exist, as suggested by Groundwater Sciences Corp. If in fact the pond does not exist, then we suggest it should be removed from the drawings. Likewise, if the pond elevation is uncertain or cannot be relied on (noting again that the same drawing shows two pond elevations that are different by 2.26 m) then we suggest that Tri County remove this elevation from their drawings.

4. Depth of Excavation – The revisions to the extraction depth address our concerns.

As requested, we hereby recognize that our statement “Site monitoring should continue as planned and adjustment made if necessary” is consistent with Tri-County’s proposal from the beginning.

Please let me know if further discussion is required.

Yours truly,

R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited



Gord Feniak, P.Eng.
GF:mp

cc: Sue Stone, Township of East Garafraxa (Via: Email)
Jeff Wilker, Thomson Rogers (Via: Email)

Other than by the addressee, copying or distribution of this document, in whole or in part, is not permitted without the express written consent of R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited.