

CR 2002-146

INRS-GÉORESSOURCES

INRS

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.


| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. REPORT DATE OCT 1996 | | 2. REPORT TYPE | | 3. DATES COVERED 00-00-1996 to 00-00-1996 | |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Preliminary Soil and Groundwater Characterization Study at the CFAD Dundurn Explosives Facility (Saskatchewan) | | | | 5a. CONTRACT NUMBER | |
| | | | | 5b. GRANT NUMBER | |
| | | | | 5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) | | | | 5d. PROJECT NUMBER | |
| | | | | 5e. TASK NUMBER | |
| | | | | 5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) INRS-Georessources, Sainte-Foy, Quebec G1S 2L2, Canada, | | | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER | |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) | | | | 10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) | |
| | | | | 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) | |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited | | | | | |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | | | | |
| 14. ABSTRACT | | | | | |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS | | | | | |
| 16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: | | | 17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT | 18. NUMBER OF PAGES | 19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON |
| a. REPORT unclassified | b. ABSTRACT unclassified | c. THIS PAGE unclassified | | | |

**PRELIMINARY SOIL AND GROUNDWATER CHARACTERIZATION
STUDY AT THE CFAD DUNDURN EXPLOSIVES FACILITY (SASKATCHEWAN)**

Final Report

Presented to
National Defence Department
Defence Research Establishment Valcartier
Energetic Materials Division
Chemistry and Environment Section
P.O. Box 8800 Courcellette, Québec
G0R 1R0

Attention: Dr. Guy Ampleman



by
Richard Martel, René Lefebvre, Karl-Éric Martel and Nathalie Roy
INRS-Géoressources
Sainte-Foy, Québec
October 1996

CONTENTS

i

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| 2. Objectives and work responsibilities..... | 1 |
| 3. Location and geology..... | 1 |
| 4. Hydraulic head and groundwater flow..... | 2 |
| 5. Soil and groundwater sampling | 3 |
| 6. RDX, HMX and TNT analyses in soils and groundwater..... | 3 |
| 7. 0 RDX, HMX and TNT concentrations in soils and groundwater..... | 4 |
| 7.1 Explosives criteria in groundwater..... | 4 |
| 7.2 Explosives concentrations in groundwater..... | 4 |
| 7.3 Explosives criteria in soils..... | 5 |
| 7.4 Explosives concentrations in soils..... | 7 |
| 8. Conclusions and recommendations..... | 7 |
| 9. References..... | 9 |

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Water table elevation map and groundwater flow.....10

Figure 2. TNT concentrations in soil samples..... 11

Figure 3. RDX concentrations in soil samples..... 12

Figure 4. Location of proposed future wells and lysimeters..... 13

Figure 5. HMX concentrations in soil samples..... 14

Figure 6. TNT concentrations in groundwater samples..... 15

Figure 7. RDX concentrations in groundwater samples..... 16

Figure 8. HMX concentrations in groundwater samples..... 17

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Drinking water guideline based on health advisory for TNT and RDX4

Table 2. Concentrations of TNT, RDX and HMX in soil above which cleanup would be recommended based on human risk (Daniels and Knezovich, 1994)..... 6

Table 3. TNT concentrations in soil and potential land use based on human risk (Trépanier and Ayotte, 1991).....7

LIST OF APPENDIX

iv

| | |
|--|----|
| Appendix 1. Grain-size curves..... | 18 |
| Appendix 2. Slug test data and hydraulic conductivity of wells..... | 27 |
| Appendix 3. Table of d_{10} and hydraulic conductivity calculated from grain-size curves ... | 40 |
| Appendix 4. Records of boreholes..... | 41 |
| Appendix 5. TNT, RDX and HMX analysis in soil samples..... | 50 |
| Appendix 6. TNT, RDX and HMX analysis in groundwater samples..... | 58 |

1. Introduction

Defence Research Establishment Valcartier mandated INRS-Géoresources to supervise a preliminary characterization study of the explosive burning site at CFAD Dundurn, Saskatchewan. High energetic materials have been burned at that site for more than 25 years. The environmental impact of this activity on soil and groundwater is unknown and this preliminary characterization study was undertaken in september 1995. More than 16 wells were installed on site at 8 different locations. In addition 72 soil samples and 31 groundwater samples were taken to investigate the site. This report includes technical informations on geology, piezometry (water levels) and groundwater flow, soil and groundwater sampling, energetic materials (RDX, HMX and TNT) analysis and concentrations in soils and groundwater. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are made to help the Ministry of defence better orient future work which would help the management of that site.

2. Objectives and work responsibilities

The objective of this study was to characterize the open burning/open detonation (OB/OD) area of the National Defence training area in CFAD Dundurn, Saskatchewan. This characterization study includes drilling and well installation, groundwater flow and velocity determination, soil and groundwater sampling, soil properties evaluation (grain-size distribution, composition, hydraulic conductivity), RDX and TNT content in groundwater and soil.

Members of INRS-Géoresources, Golder Associates Ltd. employees, National Defence scientists from Valcartier and members of the CFAD Dundurn were involved in field characterization activities. Drilling and observation well installation were achieved by Golder Associates Ltd. under the supervision of INRS-Géoresources members (Golder Associates Ltd., 1995). INRS-Géoresources was responsible of soil and groundwater sampling, permeability tests, data interpretation and writing the final report. Soil and groundwater sampling were done with the help of National Defence scientists, and members of the CFAD Dundurn helped perform the permeability tests. RDX, HMX and TNT in soil and groundwater samples were analyzed by chemists of the Defence Research Establishment in Valcartier, Québec.

3. Location and geology

The CFAD Dundurn is located 30 km south of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. The burning area is located on the CFAD Dundurn base at 3.5 km north-west of the Dundurn camp. Topography is typical of an eolian environment. Surficial sediments are eolian plain and eolian dune (SRC, 1986) as observed in boreholes and are underlain by fluviolacustrine sediments. Two classes of grain-size curves are observed (Appendix 1). 1) a poorly sorted sand with a mean grain diameter (d_{50}) which varies between 40 μm to 70 μm corresponding to a very fine sand; and 2) a well sorted fine sand (d_{50} between 100 μm and 150 μm) which corresponds to layered sand deposits. The proportion of silt-size

material in sand varies from 1 to 10%. The sand is iron stained above the water table which indicates an oxydizing environment. Layers of fine coal fragments were noticed in the sand between 6 and 7 m depth (around elevation 495 and 494 m). The underlying unoxydized till formations as well as the underlying cretaceous rock formation were not drilled. The Bearpaw rock formation in the area is defined as a gray, noncalcareous silt and clay (Christianson and Meneley, 1971).

4. Hydraulic head and groundwater flow

The hydraulic conductivity was evaluated using downward slug tests which were interpreted using the Hvorslev (1951) method. The values measured vary by one order of magnitude i.e. from 1.7×10^{-5} to 1.0×10^{-4} m/s which is usual in stratified sediments (Appendix 2). The geometric mean hydraulic conductivity (5.0×10^{-5} m/s) is typical of a fine sand (Freeze and Cherry, 1979). The mean hydraulic conductivity of the sand was also evaluated from the 10% passing grain diameter (d_{10}) obtained from the grain-size curve (Hazen relation in Freeze and Cherry (1979)). The estimated average permeability (2.5×10^{-5} m/s) from grain-size curves (Appendix 3) agrees with the mean hydraulic conductivity estimated from slug tests. Because there is no low permeability sediment layers on top of the sand unit, the aquifer is unconfined and is vulnerable to groundwater contamination from the soil surface. The water table at the site is located between 5 and 7 m depth which corresponds to an elevation close to 505 m. The horizontal hydraulic gradient (the slope of the water table) is 0.0005 m/m and groundwater flows from east to west (Figure 1). According to the following equation, assuming a porosity of 0.3 for the sand, groundwater flows with an estimated average velocity of 2.6 m/year. Assuming that groundwater flows at the same velocity between the burning area and the closest discharge area (Indian lake), it would take approximately 2000 years to reach Indian lake located at 5700 m west. No significant vertical gradient is observed in the wells. So, there is no significant upward and downward flow in the saturated zone.

$$v = Ki/n$$

where v is the mean groundwater velocity

K is the hydraulic conductivity m/s

i is the horizontal hydraulic gradient m/m

n is the porosity (pore volume fraction of the total volume)

Since most of the wells were aligned to follow potential contamination in soil and groundwater from the burning area, it is recommended to drill nine more sites to confirm groundwater flow directions on a larger area. The hydraulic gradient is so small that it could shift with seasons and the groundwater flow direction needs to be established more firmly.

5. Soil and groundwater sampling

Sixteen (16) boreholes were drilled between 6 m and 15 m deep with a 4.5 inch inside diameter hollow stem auger. Records of boreholes from Golder Associates Ltd. (1995) are included in Appendix 4. Each drilled site is identified on maps with letter P followed by a number indicating the site. Sediments were sampled continuously at each 1.5 m interval with a 2 inch split spoon in eight boreholes. Continuous records of soil conditions were made. All drilling and sampling equipments were decontaminated (washed with warm water and rinsed with acetone, hexane, acetone and distilled water) to reduce cross-contamination between samples and boreholes. Seventy two (72) soil samples were taken and sample recovery was very good most of the time (between 60% and 100%) and there were very few unrecovered samples (2) and a few low recovery samples (14) from 10% to 50%.

One observation well was installed in each borehole. Wells are identified on maps with letters A and B indicating respectively the deep well (A close to 15 m depth) and the shallow well (B close to 6 m depth). Groundwater was sampled using a Waterra pump in november 1995 and in april 1996. To obtain a representative groundwater sample from the aquifer, a volume of groundwater corresponding to 5 times the volume of water inside the tubing and around the screen and the sand filter was removed from the observation well. All observation wells were sampled in november 1995 and in april 1996.

6. RDX, HMX and TNT analyses in sediments and groundwater

RDX (hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine) and TNT (2,4,6-trinitrotoluene) concentrations in soils were determined in the field on every soil samples (except for P-8, with one sample out of two) with the DTECH on-site technique and on one sample out of two in the laboratory by the HPLC technique (EPA SW-846 Method 8330). All results of TNT, RDX and HMX analyses in soil samples are included in tables of Appendix 5. HMX (octahydro-1,3,5,7-tetranitro-1,3,5,7-tetrazocine) concentrations in soil as well as TNT concentrations in groundwater were determined only in the laboratory by the HPLC technique (EPA SW-846 Method 8330). All results of TNT, RDX and HMX analyses in groundwater samples are compiled at the Appendix 6.

RDX and TNT were extracted from soils with acetone as described in the DTECH soil extraction Pac (TK-1001S-1). The DTECH method for TNT and RDX determination in soils utilizes immunoassay technology. The minimum detection limit (MDL) of the test for RDX and TNT in soil is 0.5 mg/kg (ppm). For TNT, the minimum quantitative limit in a soil sample occurs at a concentration of 0.6 ppm.

In EPA SW-846 Method 8330, RDX, TNT and HMX in soils are extracted with acetonitrile and estimation of these organic compounds concentrations and identification of their metabolites are made by HPLC with a minimum detection limit of 0.2 mg/kg (ppm). RDX, HMX and TNT concentrations in groundwater were determined by HPLC with a MDL of 0.2 µg/L (ppb).

7.0 RDX, HMX and TNT criteria and concentrations in soils and groundwater

7.1 Explosives criteria in groundwater

A groundwater quality criteria may vary as a function of aquifer classification, groundwater utilization, human health risk or ecotoxicological risk, connection of the contaminated groundwater with surface water or with other aquifer of higher class, and contaminant source location. The Ministry of defence must study or evaluate what groundwater standard should be applied at the Dundurn site. For the moment, because no such prior evaluation was done, we propose the use of a drinking water guideline based on human health (Table 1). Drinking water guidelines exist for TNT and RDX. The most recent data suggest a quality guideline for TNT in groundwater at 2.0 ppb. An Ontario guideline based on a AWWA (American Water Work Association) reference of 1983 proposed 5 ppb. We proposed the 2 ppb criteria because it is conservative and is related to recent literature. EPA published a guideline for RDX in groundwater in 1992. This very strict criteria of 0.3 ppb was based on health advisory and should be used as a preliminary guideline to see extent of groundwater contamination by this high explosive compound. No quality guideline was available for HMX concentrations in groundwater.

Table 1. Drinking water guideline based on health advisory for TNT and RDX

| <i>Drinking water guideline</i> | TNT concentration in groundwater (µg/L) | RDX concentration in groundwater (µg/L) | HMX concentration in groundwater (µg/L) |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | 2.0 ^{a)} 5.0 ^{b)} | 0.3 ^{c)} | no data available |

^{a)} IRIS data bank (revised standard in 1993)

^{b)} Environment Ontario, 1989 (Emergency limit for long-term consumption)

^{c)} Mc Lellan et al., 1992

7.2 Explosives concentration in groundwater

In the fall of 1995 and the spring of 1996, TNT was detected in groundwater of the shallow well (B) of the P-3 site (the main burning area) but not in the deep well (A) (Figure 2). Concentrations of TNT in this well (2.7 and 1.9 ppb) are low but close to the drinking water criteria of 2 ppb. In fall 1995, TNT was detected at a value close to 2 ppb in groundwater in the deep wells of two upgradient sites, P-1 and P-2, but was not detected in the spring of 1996. In the fall, a groundwater sample from the shallow well (B) of the downgradient sampling site P-6 had a measured TNT concentration above 2 ppb but again was not contaminated in the spring. The available data indicate that groundwater contamination by TNT is not persistent (appears and disappears with seasons) and seems to be limited to the burning area.

RDX concentrations measured in groundwater are significant (80-120 ppb) in the shallow well (B) of P-3B in the main burning area (Figure 3) and are persistent throughout seasons. RDX concentrations in groundwater decrease significantly with depth to reach the 5 ppb in the deep well (A). Elsewhere in the burning area, P-4 shows a lower level of RDX in groundwater. A RDX concentration in groundwater which decreases with depth is also observed at this site (from 4.5 ppb to 2.5 ppb). The surrounding sites (P-2 and P-5) have also detected RDX in groundwater but with concentrations less than 2 ppb. In the same way, the downgradient site P-6 showed 2 ppb detected in both levels only last fall. Surprisingly, the upgradient site P-1 has persistent RDX concentrations in groundwater close to 5 ppb in both levels.

Because we don't know the extent of groundwater contamination by RDX, especially from the main burning area (site P-3), we propose to drill additional wells downgradient. Proposed location of future monitoring wells are shown on Figure 4. To better understand RDX and TNT circulation and transformation in groundwater we propose also to install two suction lysimeters in the vadose zone in the main burning area. The lysimeters could indicate the concentration of RDX and TNT in the water held in the soil under the burning areas prior to mixing with the underlying groundwater.

A false positive has occurred in the groundwater sample of the shallow well of P-7. This can be explained by a probable cross-contamination with the drilling equipment. This assumption could be verified with an additional groundwater sampling. If RDX and HMX are still present in P-7 after this sampling, an upgradient well should be installed to verify groundwater flow in this area.

HMX was undetected in most of the sampled wells (Figure 5). Concentrations of HMX in wells of the main burning area increase with depth going from 1 ppb near the water table to 4 ppb at depth. The same trend is observed with the neighbor site P-4. HMX seems not to be used, persistent or mobile in groundwater since no detected concentrations are observed in the downgradient wells of the main burning area (P-5, P-6 and P-8). Since no drinking water standards are available for this organic compound and the concentrations detected are very low, no specific recommendations are made for this explosive.

7.3 Explosives criteria in soil

A soil quality criteria may vary as a function of human health risk or ecotoxicological risk. The Ministry of defence must study or evaluate which soil criteria should be applied at the Dundurn site. For the moment, because no such evaluation was done, we propose to use existing soil criteria based on human health.

Soil criteria were calculated, based on human health, by Daniels and Knezovich (1994) for TNT, RDX and HMX. They evaluated concentrations in soil for carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic compounds. This study, which uses GEOTOX for criteria calculation, cannot be applied at the local scale (J.-P. Trépanier, personal communication). However, it gives an idea of the relative toxicity of these compounds.

TNT and RDX are possible human carcinogens. The criteria for TNT and RDX in soil (for a 10^{-6} excess cancer risk) presented in Table 2 suggest that land contaminated at concentrations above 2.4 ppb and 0.35 ppb respectively, will need to be cleaned up. The very low level of excess cancer risk used in the calculation of these criteria is unrealistic and insignificant compared to the 0.3 background cancer risk in the population. A value of 10^{-4} is more likely to represent the level of risk applied and allowed in our society. U.S. EPA., American policy agencies and Québec ministry of environment are proposing and evaluating the possibility to use 10^{-4} or 10^{-5} as potentially acceptable level of risk in environmental criteria calculation (U.S. EPA, 1991). For a 10^{-4} levels of risk, soil criteria of 0.24 ppm and 0.035 ppm for TNT and RDX respectively would be recommended.

If further toxicological studies show that these compounds are not human carcinogens, then the levels for cleanup would be the ones related to the hazard index: i.e. 0.037 ppm and 0.12 ppm for TNT and RDX respectively. Selecting the more restrictive criteria calculated based on the 10^{-4} level of risk and the hazard index, we obtain 0.037 ppm for TNT and 0.035 ppm for RDX.

HMX has inadequate data on carcinogenicity or no evidence of carcinogenicity. The criteria for HMX in soil (2.2 ppm) is based on the hazard index because HMX is not classifiable as a human carcinogen.

Trépanier and Ayotte (1991) calculated generic soil criteria for TNT based on human health. They evaluated criteria based on potential land use (Table 3). Concentrations of contaminant in soil lower than B criteria allow residential use whereas a land where concentrations of contaminant are lower than C criteria may be used for industrial development. As shown for TNT, criteria may change depending on the proposed land use. The B criteria for TNT, calculated by Trépanier and Ayotte (1991), corresponds to the selected criteria by Daniels and Knezovich (1994).

Table 2. Concentration of TNT, RDX and HMX in soil above which cleanup would be recommended based on human risk (Daniels and Knezovich, 1994)

| Potentially acceptable level of risk and the acceptable index for noncancerogenic hazard | TNT concentration in soil (mg/kg) | RDX concentration in soil (mg/kg) | HMX concentration in soil (mg/kg) |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 10^{-6} excess cancer risk | 0.0024 | 0.00035 | n/a |
| 10^{-4} excess cancer risk | 0.24 | 0.035 | n/a |
| hazard risk | 0.037 | 0.12 | 2.2 |

Table 3. TNT concentrations in soil and potential land use based on human risk (Trépanier and Ayotte, 1991)

| Potential Land Use | TNT concentration in soil (mg/kg) |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Residential (B criteria) | 0.04 |
| Industrial (C criteria) | 1.7 |

7.4 Explosives concentrations in soil

TNT concentrations in soil are low (Figure 6) but the minimum detection limit (0.2 ppm) of the analytical method used is one order of magnitude higher than the selected soil criteria (0.037 ppm) which makes impossible the estimation of the contaminated volume of soil. TNT concentrations in groundwater of some wells are not linked to TNT concentrations in soils (P-3B, P-4A P-6B P7-B). For a better interpretation of this effect, we recommend to analyze soil samples (P-3 15-20, 35-40, 45-50; P-6 25-30, 30-35; P-7 15-20) with the more precise HPLC technique.

RDX was not detected in soil (Figure 7) except at P-4 where 1.3 ppm was analysed by HPLC between 40 and 45 feet depth. This zone contaminated with RDX does not correspond to the major groundwater contamination by RDX at the Dundurn site indicating that soil and groundwater contamination are curiously not directly related. The minimum detection limit (0.2 ppm) of the HPLC method used is one order of magnitude higher than the selected soil criteria (0.035 ppm) which makes impossible the estimation of the contaminated volume of soil by RDX.

No contamination of soil was detected for HMX (Figure 8). HMX concentrations in soil are undetected or are detected at two sites at 0.4 ppm which is far below the proposed 2.2 ppm criteria.

We recommend to the Ministry of defence to make a risk analysis based on health or ecotoxicological data to generate site specific criteria for TNT and RDX in soil and groundwater. From this evaluation, it will be decided if more precise soil analyses are needed. However, the extent of groundwater contamination by RDX and the groundwater flow direction must be better defined before performing the risk analysis. Groundwater usage in the area as well as aquifer classification should also be better known. More wells and a few suction lysimeters must be installed to better understand the behavior of TNT and RDX in soil and groundwater at the site.

8. Conclusions and recommendations

A preliminary characterization study of soil and groundwater has been done at the Dundurn site. The explosive burning area is located on an unconfined fine sand aquifer having a mean hydraulic

conductivity of 5×10^{-5} m/s. The water table is located 6 m deep. Groundwater flows from east to west with a mean velocity of 3 m/year. HMX, RDX and TNT have been detected in groundwater and soil. RDX concentrations in groundwater of the main burning area is high compared to available contamination criteria. However RDX contamination extent outside the burning area is unknown.

HMX was undetected in most of the sampled wells. HMX seems not to be used, persistent or mobile in groundwater since no detected concentrations are observed in the downgradient wells of the main burning area (P-5, P-6 and P-8). Since no drinking water standards are available for this organic compound and the concentrations detected are very low, no specific recommendations are made for this explosive.

TNT was detected in groundwater of the shallow well of the main burning area and periodically in other wells. The available data show that groundwater contamination by TNT is not persistent (appears and disappears with seasons) and seems to be limited to the burning area.

TNT concentrations in soil are low but the minimum detection limit of the analytical method used is one order of magnitude higher than the selected soil criteria which makes impossible the estimation of the contaminated volume of soil. TNT concentrations in groundwater of some wells are not linked to TNT concentrations in soils.

RDX was not detected in soil except in one soil sample at P-4. This RDX contaminated zone does not correspond to the major groundwater contamination by RDX at the Dundurn site which indicates that soil and groundwater contamination seem curiously not directly related. The minimum detection limit of the HPLC method used is one order of magnitude higher than the selected soil criteria which makes impossible the estimation of the contaminated volume of soil by RDX.

No contamination of soil occurred with HMX. HMX concentrations in soil are undetected or are detected at two sites at 0.4 ppm which is far below the proposed 2 ppm criteria.

We recommend to the Ministry of defence to make a risk analysis based on health or ecotoxicological data to generate site specific criteria for TNT and RDX in soil and groundwater. From this evaluation it will be decided if a more precise soil analysis method is needed.

The extent of groundwater contamination by RDX and the groundwater flow direction must be better defined before performing a risk analysis. Also, groundwater usage in the area as well as aquifer classification should be better known. We propose the drilling of additional wells downgradient of the P-3 site. To better understand RDX and TNT circulation and transformation in groundwater we also propose the installation of two suction lysimeters in the vadose zone in the main burning area.

For a better interpretation of the link between TNT in groundwater and soil, we recommend to analyze soil samples (P-3 15-20, 35-40, 45-50; P-6 25-30, 30-35, P-7 15-20) with the more precise HPLC technique.

Additional groundwater sampling is required in the shallow well of the P-7 site to verify if cross-contamination by RDX and HMX occurred during well installation. If contamination persists, an upgradient well should be installed to verify groundwater flow in this area.

9. References

- Christianson, E. A. and W. A. Meneley. 1971. Geology and groundwater resources of the Rosetown area (72-0), Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Research Council, Geology division. Map 1:250,000.
- Daniels, J. I. and J. P. Knezovich, 1994. Human health risks from TNT, RDX, and HMX in environmental media and consideration of the U.S. regulatory environment. In proceedings 1994 Luxembourg International Symposium on the Rehabilitation of Former Military Sites and Demilitarization of Explosive Ordnance Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.
- Department of National defence, 1978. Camp Dundurn, Saskatchewan, Mapping and charting establishment. Department of National defence, Canada Map MCE 3 TR 88.
- Environment Ontario, 1989. Parameters listing system (Palis). Drinking Water Section, water Resources Branch. March 1989. 87 pp.
- Freeze, R. A. and J. A. Cherry, 1979. Groundwater. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 604 pp.
- Golder Associates Ltd., 1995. Drilling and observation well installation at a site contaminated with explosives at CFAD Dundurn (Saskatchewan). Report 952-6384. Prepared for National Defence Department, Defense Research Establishment Valcartier. 15 pp.
- Hvorslev, M. J. 1951. Time lag and soil permeability in groundwater observations: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Waterway Experiment Station. Bulletin no. 36, Vicksburg, Mississippi April 1951. 50 pp.
- McLellan W. L., W. R. Hartly and M. E. Brower, 1992. Hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX) drinking water health advisory: minution. USEPA, Roberts and Hartly (Eds), pp 133-175.
- SRC, 1986. Surficial geology of the Rosetown area (72 O) Saskatchewan Sedimentary resources. Saskatchewan Research Council. Map scale 1:250,000.
- Trépanier, J. P. and P. Ayotte, 1991. Analyse du risque relié à la présence de TNT dans les sols: Élaboration de critère de décontamination. Ministère de l'environnement du Québec. Service d'analyse de risque. Septembre 1991. 16 p.
- USEPA, 1991. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund. Volume 1 Human Health Evaluation Manual (part B, Development of risk-based preliminary remediation goals). U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Report PB92-963333. December 1991 Washington, DC. 54 pp.




Figure 1. Water table elevation map and groundwater flow.




Figure 2. TNT concentrations in soil samples.




Figure 3. RDX concentrations in soil samples.




Figure 4. Location of proposed future wells and lysimeters.




Figure 5. HMX concentrations in soil samples.




Figure 6. TNT concentrations in groundwater samples.




Figure 7. RDX concentrations in groundwater samples.





Figure 8. HMX concentrations in groundwater samples.


APPENDIX 1.

Grain-size curves


Grain-size distribution curve




Grain-size distribution curve




Grain-size distribution curve




Grain-size distribution curve




Grain-size distribution curve




Grain-size distribution curve



Grain-size distribution curve



Grain-size distribution curve



APPENDIX 2.



Slug test data and hydraulic conductivity in wells

Hydraulic conductivity calculated by slug test in wells

| WELL NUMBER | Hydraulic conductivity (m/s) |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| P-1A | 7.7×10^{-5} |
| P-2A | 6.2×10^{-5} |
| P-3A | 1.7×10^{-5} |
| P-4A | 8.1×10^{-5} |
| P-4B | 9.7×10^{-5} |
| P-5A | 2.6×10^{-6} |
| P-5B | 7.5×10^{-5} |
| P-6A | 1.5×10^{-4} |
| P-6B | 4.9×10^{-5} |
| P-7A | 1.0×10^{-4} |
| P-8A | 7.1×10^{-5} |
| P-8B | 5.5×10^{-5} |
| Mean hydraulic conductivity | 5.0×10^{-5} |

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/ho |
|------------------|------------|--------|-------------|-------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0.0 | 1183.6 | -0.10 | -23.8 | 0.00 |
| 1.7 | 1183.7 | 0.00 | -22.1 | 0.00 |
| 3.4 | 1183.7 | 0.00 | -20.4 | 0.00 |
| 5.1 | 1183.7 | 0.00 | -18.7 | 0.00 |
| 6.8 | 1183.7 | 0.00 | -17.0 | 0.00 |
| 8.5 | 1183.8 | 0.10 | -15.3 | 0.00 |
| 10.2 | 1183.8 | 0.10 | -13.6 | 0.00 |
| 11.9 | 1183.8 | 0.10 | -11.9 | 0.00 |
| 13.6 | 1183.7 | 0.00 | -10.2 | 0.00 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 15.3 | 1185.6 | 1.90 | -8.5 | 0.02 |
| 17.0 | 1170.7 | -13.00 | -6.8 | -0.15 |
| 18.7 | 1145.5 | -38.20 | -5.1 | -0.45 |
| 20.4 | 1201.0 | 17.30 | -3.4 | 0.20 |
| 22.1 | 1247.9 | 64.20 | -1.7 | 0.75 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 23.8 | 1268.9 | 85.20 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 25.5 | 1260.3 | 76.60 | 1.7 | 0.90 |
| 27.2 | 1250.7 | 67.00 | 3.4 | 0.79 |
| 28.9 | 1242.6 | 58.90 | 5.1 | 0.69 |
| 30.6 | 1235.3 | 51.60 | 6.8 | 0.61 |
| 32.3 | 1229.1 | 45.40 | 8.5 | 0.53 |
| 34.0 | 1223.4 | 39.70 | 10.2 | 0.47 |
| 35.7 | 1218.5 | 34.80 | 11.9 | 0.41 |
| 37.4 | 1214.7 | 31.00 | 13.6 | 0.36 |
| 39.1 | 1211.3 | 27.60 | 15.3 | 0.32 |
| 40.8 | 1208.4 | 24.70 | 17.0 | 0.29 |
| 42.5 | 1206.0 | 22.30 | 18.7 | 0.26 |
| 44.2 | 1204.0 | 20.30 | 20.4 | 0.24 |
| 45.9 | 1202.3 | 18.60 | 22.1 | 0.22 |

Calibration



| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|----|
| | ho= | 85.2 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 14.0 | s |



$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_0}$$

Conductivité hydraulique
K= 6.2E-03 cm/s

Figure 2. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits P2a

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/ho |
|------------------|------------|--------|-------------|-------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0.0 | 1190.3 | -0.10 | -23.8 | 0.00 |
| 1.7 | 1190.6 | 0.20 | -22.1 | 0.00 |
| 5.1 | 1190.5 | 0.10 | -18.7 | 0.00 |
| 6.8 | 1190.5 | 0.10 | -17.0 | 0.00 |
| 10.2 | 1190.3 | -0.10 | -13.6 | 0.00 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 13.6 | 1190.4 | 0.00 | -10.2 | 0.00 |
| 15.3 | 1183.5 | -6.90 | -8.5 | -0.06 |
| 17.0 | 1258.1 | 67.70 | -6.8 | 0.61 |
| 18.7 | 1298.8 | 108.40 | -5.1 | 0.98 |
| 20.4 | 1302.4 | 112.00 | -3.4 | 1.01 |
| 22.1 | 1300.6 | 110.20 | -1.7 | 1.00 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 23.8 | 1301.0 | 110.60 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 27.2 | 1295.1 | 104.70 | 3.4 | 0.95 |
| 30.6 | 1287.1 | 96.70 | 6.8 | 0.87 |
| 34.0 | 1280.6 | 90.20 | 10.2 | 0.82 |
| 37.4 | 1274.9 | 84.50 | 13.6 | 0.76 |
| 40.8 | 1270.6 | 80.20 | 17.0 | 0.73 |
| 44.2 | 1264.1 | 73.70 | 20.4 | 0.67 |
| 47.6 | 1260.0 | 69.60 | 23.8 | 0.63 |
| 51.0 | 1257.8 | 67.40 | 27.2 | 0.61 |
| 54.4 | 1252.6 | 62.20 | 30.6 | 0.56 |
| 57.8 | 1250.2 | 59.80 | 34.0 | 0.54 |
| 61.2 | 1249.1 | 58.70 | 37.4 | 0.53 |
| 64.6 | 1247.2 | 56.80 | 40.8 | 0.51 |
| 68.0 | 1243.1 | 52.70 | 44.2 | 0.48 |
| 71.4 | 1240.9 | 50.50 | 47.6 | 0.46 |
| 74.8 | 1230.1 | 39.70 | 51.0 | 0.36 |
| 78.2 | 1226.1 | 35.70 | 54.4 | 0.32 |
| 81.6 | 1224.0 | 33.60 | 57.8 | 0.30 |
| 85.0 | 1222.3 | 31.90 | 61.2 | 0.29 |
| 88.4 | 1220.6 | 30.20 | 64.6 | 0.27 |

Calibration



| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|----|
| | ho= | 110.6 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 50.5 | s |

$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_0}$$



Conductivité hydraulique
K= 1.7E-03 cm/s

Figure 3. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits P3a

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/ho |
|------------------|------------|--------|-------------|------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0.0 | 1592.3 | 0.00 | -20.4 | 0.00 |
| 1.7 | 1592.3 | 0.00 | -18.7 | 0.00 |
| 3.4 | 1592.4 | 0.10 | -17.0 | 0.00 |
| 5.1 | 1592.5 | 0.20 | -15.3 | 0.00 |
| 6.8 | 1592.6 | 0.30 | -13.6 | 0.00 |
| 8.5 | 1592.6 | 0.30 | -11.9 | 0.00 |
| 10.2 | 1592.7 | 0.40 | -10.2 | 0.00 |
| 11.9 | 1592.8 | 0.50 | -8.5 | 0.00 |
| 13.6 | 1592.8 | 0.50 | -6.8 | 0.00 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 15.3 | 1593.1 | 0.80 | -5.1 | 0.01 |
| 17.0 | 1598.3 | 6.00 | -3.4 | 0.05 |
| 18.7 | 1666.7 | 74.40 | -1.7 | 0.60 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 20.4 | 1716.0 | 123.70 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 22.1 | 1686.0 | 93.70 | 1.7 | 0.76 |
| 23.8 | 1668.5 | 76.20 | 3.4 | 0.62 |
| 25.5 | 1656.2 | 63.90 | 5.1 | 0.52 |
| 27.2 | 1646.6 | 54.30 | 6.8 | 0.44 |
| 28.9 | 1638.7 | 46.40 | 8.5 | 0.38 |
| 30.6 | 1632.3 | 40.00 | 10.2 | 0.32 |
| 32.3 | 1627.1 | 34.80 | 11.9 | 0.28 |
| 34.0 | 1622.8 | 30.50 | 13.6 | 0.25 |
| 35.7 | 1619.4 | 27.10 | 15.3 | 0.22 |
| 37.4 | 1616.5 | 24.20 | 17.0 | 0.20 |

Calibration

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|----|
| | ho= | 123.7 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 10.7 | s |





$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_0}$$

Conductivité hydraulique
K= 8.1E-03 cm/s

Figure 4. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits P4a

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/ho |
|------------------|------------|--------|-------------|-------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0.0 | 1035.3 | -98.40 | -13.6 | -1.00 |
| 3.4 | 1035.3 | -98.40 | -10.2 | -1.00 |
| 5.1 | 1035.3 | -98.40 | -8.5 | -1.00 |
| 8.5 | 1035.6 | -98.10 | -5.1 | -1.00 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 10.2 | 1038.7 | -95.00 | -3.4 | -0.97 |
| 11.9 | 1111.1 | -22.60 | -1.7 | -0.23 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 13.6 | 1133.7 | 98.40 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 15.3 | 1118.6 | 83.30 | 1.7 | 0.85 |
| 17.0 | 1102.3 | 67.00 | 3.4 | 0.68 |
| 18.7 | 1090.6 | 55.30 | 5.1 | 0.56 |
| 20.4 | 1080.2 | 44.90 | 6.8 | 0.46 |
| 22.1 | 1072.0 | 36.70 | 8.5 | 0.37 |
| 23.8 | 1065.6 | 30.30 | 10.2 | 0.31 |
| 25.5 | 1060.5 | 25.20 | 11.9 | 0.26 |
| 27.2 | 1057.1 | 21.80 | 13.6 | 0.22 |
| 28.9 | 1054.3 | 19.00 | 15.3 | 0.19 |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|----|
| | ho= | 98.4 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 9.0 | s |



$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_0}$$



Conductivité hydraulique

$$K = 9.7E-03 \text{ cm/s}$$

Figure 5. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits P4b

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/ho |
|------------------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0.0 | 1447.5 | 0.00 | -34.0 | 0.00 |
| 5.1 | 1447.3 | -0.20 | -28.9 | -0.01 |
| 11.9 | 1447.5 | 0.00 | -22.1 | 0.00 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 15.3 | 1447.9 | 0.40 | -18.7 | 0.01 |
| 17.0 | 1451.1 | 3.60 | -17.0 | 0.11 |
| 18.7 | 1464.4 | 16.90 | -15.3 | 0.50 |
| 23.8 | 1478.9 | 31.40 | -10.2 | 0.93 |
| 28.9 | 1481.0 | 33.50 | -5.1 | 0.99 |
| 30.6 | 1481.2 | 33.70 | -3.4 | 1.00 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 34.0 | 1481.3 | 33.80 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 35.7 | 1481.1 | 33.60 | 1.7 | 0.99 |
| 40.8 | 1480.6 | 33.10 | 6.8 | 0.98 |
| 49.3 | 1479.6 | 32.10 | 15.3 | 0.95 |
| 54.4 | 1478.8 | 31.30 | 20.4 | 0.93 |
| 56.1 | 1478.4 | 30.90 | 22.1 | 0.91 |
| 83.3 | 1475.9 | 28.40 | 49.3 | 0.84 |
| 88.4 | 1475.3 | 27.80 | 54.4 | 0.82 |
| 95.2 | 1474.7 | 27.20 | 61.2 | 0.80 |
| 105.4 | 1474.1 | 26.60 | 71.4 | 0.79 |
| 130.9 | 1472.4 | 24.90 | 96.9 | 0.74 |
| 136.0 | 1471.5 | 24.00 | 102.0 | 0.71 |
| 149.6 | 1470.9 | 23.40 | 115.6 | 0.69 |
| 164.9 | 1469.9 | 22.40 | 130.9 | 0.66 |
| 181.9 | 1469.0 | 21.50 | 147.9 | 0.64 |
| 200.6 | 1468.2 | 20.70 | 166.6 | 0.61 |

Calibration



| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|----|
| | ho= | 33.8 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.5 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 329.6 | s |

$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_o}$$



Conductivité hydraulique

$$K = 2.6E-04 \text{ cm/s}$$

Figure 6. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits P5a

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/ho |
|------------------|------------|-------|-------------|------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0 0 | 1016.1 | -0.40 | -28.9 | 0.00 |
| 6.8 | 1016.5 | 0.00 | -22.1 | 0.00 |
| 10.2 | 1016.9 | 0.40 | -18.7 | 0.00 |
| 13.6 | 1017.2 | 0.70 | -15.3 | 0 01 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 22.1 | 1018.1 | 1.60 | -6.8 | 0 02 |
| 23.8 | 1020.9 | 4.40 | -5.1 | 0.05 |
| 25.5 | 1055.3 | 38.80 | -3.4 | 0.43 |
| 27.2 | 1103.8 | 87.30 | -1.7 | 0.97 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 28.9 | 1106.2 | 89.70 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 30 6 | 1088.5 | 72.00 | 1.7 | 0.80 |
| 32 3 | 1073.5 | 57.00 | 3.4 | 0.64 |
| 34.0 | 1064.4 | 47.90 | 5.1 | 0 53 |
| 35.7 | 1057.5 | 41.00 | 6.8 | 0.46 |
| 37.4 | 1051.7 | 35.20 | 8.5 | 0.39 |
| 39.1 | 1046.9 | 30.40 | 10.2 | 0 34 |
| 40.8 | 1043.0 | 26.50 | 11.9 | 0.30 |
| 42.5 | 1040.0 | 23.50 | 13.6 | 0.26 |
| 44 2 | 1037.7 | 21.20 | 15.3 | 0.24 |
| 45.9 | 1035.8 | 19.30 | 17.0 | 0.22 |
| 47.6 | 1034.2 | 17.70 | 18.7 | 0.20 |
| 49 3 | 1033.0 | 16.50 | 20.4 | 0.18 |
| 51.0 | 1032.0 | 15.50 | 22.1 | 0.17 |
| 57.8 | 1029.6 | 13.10 | 28.9 | 0.15 |
| 61.2 | 1028 8 | 12.30 | 32.3 | 0.14 |
| 68.0 | 1028.2 | 11.70 | 39.1 | 0.13 |

Calibration



| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|--------|----|
| | ho= | 89.7 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 11.609 | s |

$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 * L * T_o}$$



Conductivité hydraulique
K= 7.5E-03 cm/s

Figure 7. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits P5b

| Temps (s) | Pression (cm d'eau) | h (cm) | Temps corr. (s) | h/ho |
|------------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------------|------|
| 0.0 | 1431.4 | 0.00 | -15.3 | 0.00 |
| 1.7 | 1431.4 | 0.00 | -13.6 | 0.00 |
| 3.4 | 1431.3 | -0.10 | -11.9 | 0.00 |
| 5.1 | 1431.4 | 0.00 | -10.2 | 0.00 |
| 6.8 | 1431.4 | 0.00 | -8.5 | 0.00 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 8.5 | 1435.7 | 4.30 | -6.8 | 0.12 |
| 10.2 | 1450.0 | 18.60 | -5.1 | 0.53 |
| 11.9 | 1460.3 | 28.90 | -3.4 | 0.82 |
| 13.6 | 1465.3 | 33.90 | -1.7 | 0.97 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 15.3 | 1466.5 | 35.10 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 17.0 | 1458.0 | 26.60 | 1.7 | 0.76 |
| 18.7 | 1450.7 | 19.30 | 3.4 | 0.55 |
| 20.4 | 1445.3 | 13.90 | 5.1 | 0.40 |
| 22.1 | 1441.7 | 10.30 | 6.8 | 0.29 |
| 23.8 | 1439.1 | 7.70 | 8.5 | 0.22 |
| 25.5 | 1437.2 | 5.80 | 10.2 | 0.17 |
| 27.2 | 1435.6 | 4.20 | 11.9 | 0.12 |
| 28.9 | 1434.6 | 3.20 | 13.6 | 0.09 |

Calibration

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|----|
| | ho= | 35.1 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 5.6 | s |





$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_0}$$

Conductivité hydraulique
K= 1.5E-02 cm/s

Figure 8. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits P6a

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/ho |
|------------------|------------|--------|-------------|-------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0.0 | 1012.1 | -39.60 | -15.3 | -0.79 |
| 5.1 | 1011.2 | -40.50 | -10.2 | -0.81 |
| 8.5 | 1010.9 | -40.80 | -6.8 | -0.82 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 10.2 | 1013.2 | -38.50 | -5.1 | -0.77 |
| 11.9 | 1035.3 | -16.40 | -3.4 | -0.33 |
| 13.6 | 1051.7 | 40.50 | -1.7 | 0.81 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 15.3 | 1061.1 | 49.90 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 17.0 | 1056.9 | 45.70 | 1.7 | 0.92 |
| 18.7 | 1052.6 | 41.40 | 3.4 | 0.83 |
| 20.4 | 1048.6 | 37.40 | 5.1 | 0.75 |
| 22.1 | 1045.0 | 33.80 | 6.8 | 0.68 |
| 23.8 | 1041.8 | 30.60 | 8.5 | 0.61 |
| 25.5 | 1039.1 | 27.90 | 10.2 | 0.56 |
| 27.2 | 1036.6 | 25.40 | 11.9 | 0.51 |
| 28.9 | 1034.3 | 23.10 | 13.6 | 0.46 |
| 30.6 | 1032.3 | 21.10 | 15.3 | 0.42 |
| 32.3 | 1030.3 | 19.10 | 17.0 | 0.38 |
| 34.0 | 1028.6 | 17.40 | 18.7 | 0.35 |
| 35.7 | 1027.1 | 15.90 | 20.4 | 0.32 |
| 37.4 | 1025.7 | 14.50 | 22.1 | 0.29 |
| 39.1 | 1024.4 | 13.20 | 23.8 | 0.26 |
| 40.8 | 1023.1 | 11.90 | 25.5 | 0.24 |
| 42.5 | 1022.0 | 10.80 | 27.2 | 0.22 |
| 44.2 | 1021.0 | 9.80 | 28.9 | 0.20 |
| 45.9 | 1020.0 | 8.80 | 30.6 | 0.18 |

Calibration



| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|----|
| | ho= | 49.9 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 17.7 | s |



$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_0}$$

Conductivité hydraulique
K= 4.9E-03 cm/s

Figure 9. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits 6b

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/ho |
|------------------|------------|--------|-------------|------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0 0 | 1294.4 | 68.40 | -23.8 | 0.61 |
| 1.7 | 1295.0 | 69.00 | -22.1 | 0.61 |
| 6.8 | 1294.9 | 68.90 | -17.0 | 0.61 |
| 10.2 | 1294.6 | 68.60 | -6.8 | 0.61 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 13.6 | 1276.9 | 50.90 | -3.4 | 0.45 |
| 15.3 | 1312.5 | 86.50 | -1.7 | 0.77 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 17.0 | 1338.3 | 112.30 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 18.7 | 1318.9 | 92.90 | 1.7 | 0.83 |
| 20.4 | 1299.7 | 73.70 | 3.4 | 0.66 |
| 22.1 | 1284.6 | 58.60 | 5.1 | 0.52 |
| 23.8 | 1270.4 | 44.40 | 6.8 | 0.40 |
| 25.5 | 1261.3 | 35.30 | 8.5 | 0.31 |
| 27.2 | 1254.5 | 28.50 | 10.2 | 0.25 |
| 28.9 | 1249.5 | 23.50 | 11.9 | 0.21 |
| 30.6 | 1247.3 | 21.30 | 13.6 | 0.19 |
| 32.3 | 1242.8 | 16.80 | 15.3 | 0.15 |
| 34.0 | 1241.3 | 15.30 | 17.0 | 0.14 |
| 35.7 | 1238.8 | 12.80 | 18.7 | 0.11 |
| 37.4 | 1236.4 | 10.40 | 20.4 | 0.09 |
| 39.1 | 1234.2 | 8.20 | 22.1 | 0.07 |
| 40.8 | 1233.0 | 7.00 | 23.8 | 0.06 |
| 42.5 | 1231.7 | 5.70 | 25.5 | 0.05 |

Calibration



| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|----|
| | ho= | 112.3 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 8.7 | s |



$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_0}$$

Conductivité hydraulique
K= 1.0E-02 cm/s

Figure 10. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits P7a

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/h ₀ |
|------------------|------------|-------|-------------|------------------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0.0 | 1085.2 | 0.00 | -28.8 | 0.00 |
| 5.0 | 1085.2 | 0.00 | -23.8 | 0.00 |
| 10.1 | 1085.3 | 0.10 | -18.7 | 0.00 |
| 15.2 | 1085.4 | 0.20 | -13.6 | 0.00 |
| 20.3 | 1085.3 | 0.10 | -8.5 | 0.00 |
| 22.0 | 1085.2 | 0.00 | -6.8 | 0.00 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 23.7 | 1089.6 | 4.40 | -5.1 | 0.05 |
| 25.4 | 1136.8 | 51.60 | -3.4 | 0.53 |
| 27.1 | 1181.8 | 96.60 | -1.7 | 0.99 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 28.8 | 1182.7 | 97.50 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 30.5 | 1165.2 | 80.00 | 1.7 | 0.82 |
| 32.2 | 1154.7 | 69.50 | 3.4 | 0.71 |
| 33.9 | 1145.1 | 59.90 | 5.1 | 0.61 |
| 35.6 | 1137.2 | 52.00 | 6.8 | 0.53 |
| 37.3 | 1130.5 | 45.30 | 8.5 | 0.46 |
| 39.0 | 1125.0 | 39.80 | 10.2 | 0.41 |
| 40.7 | 1120.4 | 35.20 | 11.9 | 0.36 |
| 42.4 | 1116.3 | 31.10 | 13.6 | 0.32 |
| 44.1 | 1112.8 | 27.60 | 15.3 | 0.28 |
| 45.8 | 1109.8 | 24.60 | 17.0 | 0.25 |
| 47.5 | 1107.2 | 22.00 | 18.7 | 0.23 |
| 50.9 | 1103.1 | 17.90 | 22.1 | 0.18 |
| 56.0 | 1099.3 | 14.10 | 27.2 | 0.14 |
| 61.1 | 1096.8 | 11.60 | 32.3 | 0.12 |
| 66.2 | 1095.3 | 10.10 | 37.4 | 0.10 |

Calibration



| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------|----|
| | h ₀ = | 97.5 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/h ₀ = 0,37) | T ₀ = | 12.3 | s |



$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_0}$$

Conductivité hydraulique
K= 7.1E-03 cm/s

Figure 11. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, puits P8a

| Temps | Pression | h | Temps corr. | h/ho |
|------------------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| (s) | (cm d'eau) | (cm) | (s) | |
| 0.0 | 998.9 | -1.30 | -30.5 | -0.01 |
| 11.8 | 999.9 | -0.30 | -18.7 | 0.00 |
| 15.2 | 1000.2 | 0.00 | -15.3 | 0.00 |
| Injection d'eau | | | | |
| 27.1 | 1009.5 | 9.30 | -3.4 | 0.10 |
| 28.8 | 1091.9 | 91.70 | -1.7 | 0.95 |
| Début de l'essai | | | | |
| 30.5 | 1097.1 | 96.90 | 0.0 | 1.00 |
| 32.2 | 1079.4 | 79.20 | 1.7 | 0.82 |
| 33.9 | 1070.7 | 70.50 | 3.4 | 0.73 |
| 35.6 | 1063.6 | 63.40 | 5.1 | 0.65 |
| 37.3 | 1057.9 | 57.70 | 6.8 | 0.60 |
| 39.0 | 1053.4 | 53.20 | 8.5 | 0.55 |
| 40.7 | 1049.9 | 49.70 | 10.2 | 0.51 |
| 42.4 | 1047.0 | 46.80 | 11.9 | 0.48 |
| 44.1 | 1044.6 | 44.40 | 13.6 | 0.46 |
| 45.8 | 1042.6 | 42.40 | 15.3 | 0.44 |
| 47.5 | 1040.9 | 40.70 | 17.0 | 0.42 |
| 49.2 | 1039.4 | 39.20 | 18.7 | 0.40 |
| 50.9 | 1038.0 | 37.80 | 20.4 | 0.39 |
| 59.4 | 1032.6 | 32.40 | 28.9 | 0.33 |
| 78.1 | 1025.2 | 25.00 | 47.6 | 0.26 |
| 105.3 | 1018.3 | 18.10 | 74.8 | 0.19 |
| 125.7 | 1014.9 | 14.70 | 95.2 | 0.15 |
| 188.6 | 1010.3 | 10.10 | 158.1 | 0.10 |

Calibration



| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|----|
| | ho= | 96.9 | cm |
| (Rayon du puits) | r= | 2.54 | cm |
| (Long. crépine) | L= | 152.4 | cm |
| (Temps à h/ho = 0,37) | To= | 15.8 | s |

$$K = \frac{r^2 \ln(L/r)}{2 \cdot L \cdot T_0}$$

Conductivité hydraulique
K= 5.5E-03 cm/s

Figure 12. Essai de perméabilité à niveau descendant, Puits P8b

APPENDIX 3.

Table of d_{10} and hydraulic conductivity calculated from grain-size curves

| Sample no. (depth in feet) | d_{10} (mm) | Hydraulic conductivity (m/s) |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| P-1 (5-10) | 8.90×10^{-2} | 7.92×10^{-5} |
| P-1 (20-25) | 6.50×10^{-2} | 4.23×10^{-5} |
| P-1 (40-45) | 1.04×10^{-1} | 1.08×10^{-4} |
| P-2 (22.5-25) | 2.70×10^{-2} | 7.29×10^{-6} |
| P-2 (40-45) | 9.60×10^{-2} | 9.22×10^{-5} |
| P-3 (15-20) | 7.60×10^{-2} | 5.78×10^{-5} |
| P-3 (40-45) | 2.70×10^{-2} | 7.29×10^{-6} |
| P-4 (5-10) | 9.90×10^{-2} | 9.80×10^{-5} |
| P-4 (25-30) | 5.70×10^{-2} | 3.25×10^{-5} |
| P-4 (40-45) | 1.07×10^{-1} | 1.14×10^{-4} |
| P-5 (10-15) | 8.90×10^{-2} | 7.92×10^{-5} |
| P-5 (25-30) | 8.00×10^{-2} | 6.40×10^{-5} |
| P-5 (40-45) | 1.40×10^{-2} | 1.96×10^{-6} |
| P-6 (5-10) | 1.02×10^{-1} | 1.04×10^{-4} |
| P-6 (25-30) | 1.00×10^{-2} | 1.00×10^{-6} |
| P-6 (30-35) | 7.40×10^{-2} | 5.48×10^{-5} |
| P-7 (15-20) | 1.30×10^{-2} | 1.69×10^{-6} |
| P-7 (25-30) | 1.04×10^{-1} | 1.08×10^{-4} |
| P-8 (15-20) | 8.00×10^{-3} | 6.40×10^{-7} |
| P-8 (25-30) | 5.80×10^{-2} | 3.36×10^{-5} |
| Mean hydraulic conductivity | | 2.5×10^{-5} |

APPENDIX 4

Records of boreholes

PROJECT: 952-6384

RECORD OF BOREHOLE P1

SHEET 1 OF 1

LOCATION: Dundurn

BORING DATE: TUE NOV 14/95

DATUM: Geodetic

DIP:

SAMPLER HAMMER

kg. DROP, mm



| DEPTH SCALE METRES | BORING METHOD | SOIL PROFILE | | SAMPLES | | | | GAS CONCENTRATION (%) | | HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (cm/s) | | INSTALLATIONS | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|--|-------------|-------------------|--------|------|---------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | DESCRIPTION | STRATA PLOT | ELEV DEPTH (m) | NUMBER | TYPE | BLOW/3m | RECOVERY % | LAB TESTING | % LEL | WATER CONTENT, PERCENT Wp | W | W | A | B | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | | Ground Surface | | 512.13 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.02 | | SANDY TOPSOIL-thin layer, trace rootlets, dark brown/light black | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | SAND-light brown, damp, fine grained | | | 1 | DO | 80 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | - layered grey and brown - trace Fe staining | | | 2 | DO | 65 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | - Fe staining at 4 m - salts | | | 3 | DO | 87 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | 4 | DO | 60 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | - water at 7.01 m | | | 5 | DO | 73 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | 6 | DO | 53 | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | - trace coal fragments at 10 m | | | 7 | DO | 80 | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | 8 | DO | 65 | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | 9 | DO | 68 | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | 10 | DO | 65 | | | | | | | | | |
| 15.24 | | | | 496.89 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA INPUT AL


DEPTH SCALE (ALONG HOLE)

1 to 100

Golder Associates

LOGGED: A.L.

CHECKED:



PROJECT: 952-6384

RECORD OF BOREHOLE P2

SHEET 1 OF 1

LOCATION: Dundurn

BORING DATE: Wed Nov 15/95

DATUM: Geodetic

DIP:

SAMPLER HAMMER,

kg; DROP, mm



| DEPTH SCALE METRES | BORING METHOD | SOIL PROFILE | | SAMPLES | | | | GAS CONCENTRATION (%) | | HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (cm/s) | | INSTALLATIONS | |
|--------------------|---------------|---|-------------|-------------------|--------|------|---------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---|
| | | DESCRIPTION | STRATA PLOT | ELEV DEPTH (m) | NUMBER | TYPE | BLOW/3m | RECOVERY % | LAB TESTING | % LEL | WATER CONTENT PERCENT | A | B |
| 0 | | Ground Surface | | 511.82 | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.6 | | SAND-light brown, frozen to 0.6 m, damp, fine grained | | | 1 | DO | 87 | | | | | | |
| 1.0 | | -thin 0.02 m organic layer at 1 m | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.0 | | | | | 2 | DO | 90 | | | | | | |
| 3.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.66 | | -Fe staining starts at 3.66 m | | | 3 | DO | 98 | | | | | | |
| 3.66 | | -grey at 3.66 m | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.66 | | -moister | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.49-6.1 | | -layered at 5.49-6.1 m | | | 4 | DO | 90 | | | | | | |
| 5.49 | | -dark grey sand lens at 5.49m | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.4 | | -water at 6.4m | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.55 | | -layered at 6.55m | | | 5 | DO | 100 | | | | | | |
| 6.55 | | -thin silt seams and coal seams | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8.0 | | -trace coal fragments on free water in sample | | | 6 | DO | 57 | | | | | | |
| 7.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8.0 | | | | | 7 | DO | 97 | | | | | | |
| 9.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.0 | | | | | 8 | DO | 85 | | | | | | |
| 11.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.0 | | | | | 9 | DO | 80 | | | | | | |
| 13.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14.0 | | | | | 10 | DO | 17 | | | | | | |
| 15.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15.24 | | | | 496.38 | | | | | | | | | |
| 15.24 | | | | 15.24 | | | | | | | | | |

DATA INPUT: AL

DEPTH SCALE (ALONG HOLE)

1 to 100

Golder Associates

LOGGED: A.L

CHECKED:

PROJECT: 952-6384
 LOCATION: Dundurn
 DIP.

RECORD OF BOREHOLE P3

BORING DATE: Wed Nov 15/95

SHEET 1 OF 1
 DATUM: Geodetic
 SAMPLER: HAMMER, kg; DROP, mm




| DEPTH SCALE METRES | BORING METHOD | SOIL PROFILE | | SAMPLES | | | | GAS CONCENTRATION () | | HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY, k cm/s | | INSTALLATIONS | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|--|-------------|----------------|--------|------|------------|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|----|----|---|---|---|
| | | DESCRIPTION | STRATA PLOT | ELEV DEPTH (m) | NUMBER | TYPE | BLOWS/0.3m | RECOVERY % | LAB TESTING | % LEL | WATER CONTENT, PERCENT | Wp | Wl | Wu | A | B | 3 |
| 0 | | Ground Surface | | 511.01 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | SAND-light brown, frozen to 0.6 m, damp, fine grained -Fe staining at 4.27m -small piece of wood at 4.57m -coarser sand at 5.64 m -layering at 5.79m -water at 6.4 m -black streaking at 7.32m -0.051 m coal layer at 8.84m -finer sand to depth -trace coal particles floating on free water on samples to depth | | 1 | DO | 70 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | 2 | DO | 78 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | 3 | DO | 87 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | 4 | DO | 87 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | 5 | DO | 85 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | 6 | DO | 73 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | 7 | DO | 72 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | 8 | DO | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | 9 | DO | 100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | 487.29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | 13.72 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA INPUT AL

DEPTH SCALE (ALONG HOLE)
 1 to 100

Golder Associates

LOGGED: A.L
 CHECKED:



PROJECT: 952-6384
 LOCATION: Dundum
 DIP:

RECORD OF BOREHOLE P4

BORING DATE: Thur Nov 16/95

SHEET 1 OF 1
 DATUM: Geodetic
 SAMPLER HAMMER, kg; DROP, mm



| DEPTH SCALE METRES | BORING METHOD | SOIL PROFILE | | | SAMPLES | | | | GAS CONCENTRATION (%) | | HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (k cm/s) | | INSTALLATIONS | | |
|--------------------|---------------|---|-------------|-----------|---------|------|------------|------------|-----------------------|-------|---------------------------------|----|---------------|---|---|
| | | DESCRIPTION | STRATA PLOT | ELEV | NUMBER | TYPE | BLOWS/0.3m | RECOVERY % | LAB TESTING | % LEL | WATER CONTENT PERCENT | Wp | W | A | B |
| | | | | DEPTH (m) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | | Ground Surface | | 511.23 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | SAND-brown, damp, fine grained | | 0.00 | 1 | DO | 67 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | -Fe staining at 2.44m -finer sand | | | 2 | DO | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | -Fe staining at 3.81m -salts at 3.96m -black streaking at 3.66 and 4.27m | | | 3 | DO | 97 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | -sand moist at 5.64m | | | 4 | DO | 97 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | -water at 6.5m -black streaks from 6.55 to 7.32m -reddish free water at 7.01 to 7.62m | | | 5 | DO | 97 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | -alternating thin layering of sand and coal seams -coarser sand at 8.69 to 8.84m | | | 6 | DO | 65 | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | -coal fragments floating on free water in samples | | | 7 | DO | 73 | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | 495.99 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | 15.24 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DEPTH SCALE (ALONG HOLE)
 1 to 100

Golder Associates

LOGGED: A.L.
 CHECKED:

PROJECT: 952-6384

RECORD OF BOREHOLE P5

SHEET 1 OF 1

LOCATION: Dundurn

BORING DATE: Fri Nov 24/95

DATUM: Geodetic

DIP:

SAMPLER HAMMER,

kg; DROP, mm



| DEPTH SCALE METRES | BORING METHOD | SOIL PROFILE | | SAMPLES | | | | GAS CONCENTRATION (%) | | HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY, k_{ov} | | INSTALLATIONS | |
|--------------------|---------------|--|-------------|-------------------|--------|------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| | | DESCRIPTION | STRATA PLOT | ELEV DEPTH (m) | NUMBER | TYPE | BLOWS/30 cm | RECOVERY % | LAB TESTING | % LEL | WATER CONTENT, PERCENT $W_p \rightarrow W \rightarrow W_l$ | A | B |
| 0 | | Ground Surface | | 511.51 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | SAND-light brown, damp, fine grained -dark grey streaks at 1.07m | | 0.00 | 1 | DO | 77 | | | | | Bentonite Seal | |
| 2 | | -0.08m organic layer at 1.83m -Fe staining 1.98m to 2.59m | | | 2 | DO | 100 | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | 3 | DO | 90 | | | | | Grout | |
| 4 | | -black streaks from 4.11m to 4.57m | | | 4 | DO | 95 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | -layered black/brown/grey -0.025m black seam at 5.94m | | | 5 | DO | 90 | | | | | | |
| 6 | | -water at 6.71m | | | 6 | DO | 85 | | | | | Bentonite Seal | |
| 7 | | -black streaking from 6.4 to 7.62m | | | 7 | DO | 75 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | -layering of sand and coal seams at 8.7m | | | 8 | DO | 97 | | | | | | |
| 9 | | -black streaks at 8.94m | | | 9 | DO | 95 | | | | | | |
| 10 | | -fine grey sand at 9m (unoxidized) | | | 10 | DO | 83 | | | | | 12-20 Sand and Slough | |
| 15 | | | | 498.27 | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | 15.24 | | | | | | | | | |

DEPTH SCALE (ALONG HOLE)

1 to 100

Golder Associates

LOGGED: A.L

CHECKED:

PROJECT: 952-6384

RECORD OF BOREHOLE P6

SHEET 1 OF 1

LOCATION: Dundum

BORING DATE: Fri Nov 24/95

DATUM: Geodetic

DIP:

SAMPLER HAMMER,

kg; DROP, mm



| DEPTH SCALE METRES | BORING METHOD | SOIL PROFILE | | SAMPLES | | | | GAS CONCENTRATION (%) | | HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY, k_f cm/s | | INSTALLATIONS | | |
|--------------------|---------------|--|-------------|---------|------|-------------|------------|-----------------------|-------|------------------------------------|----|---------------|---|---|
| | | DESCRIPTION | STRATA PLOT | NUMBER | TYPE | BLOWS/30 cm | RECOVERY % | LAB TESTING | % LEL | WATER CONTENT PERCENT | Wp | W | A | B |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | | Ground Surface | | 511.42 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | SAND-light brown, damp, fine grained, uniform | | | 1 | DO | 70 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | 2 | DO | 42 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | 3 | DO | 35 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | -Fe staining from 3 to 4.5m | | | 4 | DO | 43 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | 5 | DO | 100 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | -water between 5.2 and 6.1m | | | 6 | DO | 43 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | -water at 6.71m | | | 7 | DO | 50 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | -coal layers and coarser sand from 7.5 to 7.62m | | | 8 | DO | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | -trace Fe staining from 8.84 to 9.14m | | | 9 | DO | 0 | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | -trace coal particles floating on free water on sample | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | 487.70 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | 13.72 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 64 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 68 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 86 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 87 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 89 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 92 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 93 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 94 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 96 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 97 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 98 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 99 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DEPTH SCALE (ALONG HOLE)

1 to 100

Golder Associates

LOGGED: A.L

CHECKED:

PROJECT: 952-6384

RECORD OF BOREHOLE P7

SHEET 1 OF 1

LOCATION: Dundurn

BORING DATE: Sat Nov 25/95

DATUM: Geodetic

DIP:

SAMPLER HAMMER

kg; DROP, mm



| DEPTH SCALE METRES | BORING METHOD | SOIL PROFILE | | SAMPLES | | | | GAS CONCENTRATION (%) | | HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (k cm/s) | | INSTALLATIONS | |
|--------------------|---|--|---------------|-----------|--------|------|----------|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|--|
| | | DESCRIPTION | STRATA PLOT | ELEV. (m) | NUMBER | TYPE | BLOWS/3m | RECOVERY % | LAB TESTING | % LEL | WATER CONTENT, PERCENT | | |
| 0 | | Ground Surface | | 510.27 | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.00 | | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Earth Drilling Bore 22 Hollow Stem Auger | SAND-light brown, damp, fine grained -Fe staining from 1.22 to 1.37m -black streak at 1.37m -water at 4.27m -unoxidized at 5.64m -black streaks at 5.49m and 5.79m -Fe staining at 5.79m | [Strata Plot] | | 1 | DO | 53 | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | 2 | DO | 38 | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | 3 | DO | 53 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | 4 | DO | 53 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | 5 | DO | 12 | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | 6 | DO | 52 | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | 7 | DO | 78 | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | 489.60 | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.67 | | | | 10.67 | | | | | | | | | |

DEPTH SCALE (ALONG HOLE)

1 to 100

Golder Associates

LOGGED: A.L

CHECKED:

DATA INPUT: AL

PROJECT: 952-6384

RECORD OF BOREHOLE P8

SHEET 1 OF 1

LOCATION: Dundum

BORING DATE: Sat Nov 25/95

DATUM: Geodesic

DIP:

SAMPLER HAMMER,

kg: DROP, mm



| DEPTH SCALE METRES | BORING METHOD | SOIL PROFILE | | SAMPLES | | | | GAS CONCENTRATION (%) | | HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (k cm/s) | | INSTALLATIONS | | |
|--------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------|------|------------|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------|----------------|
| | | DESCRIPTION | STRATA PLOT | ELEV. DEPTH (m) | NUMBER | TYPE | BLOWS/30cm | RECOVERY % | LAB TESTING | % LEL | WATER CONTENT, PERCENT (Wp) | A | B | |
| 0 | | Ground Surface | | 509 06 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Earth Drilling Bit 22 Hollow Stem Auger | SAND-light brown, damp, fine grained, Fe stained, -decreasing Fe staining with depth -water at 4.57m -layering at 4.88m -coal specks on free water from samples | [Strata Plot: Dotted pattern] | 1 | DO | 62 | | | | | | Bentonite Seal | | |
| 2 | | | | 2 | DO | 52 | | | | | | | Grout | |
| 3 | | | | 3 | DO | 52 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | 4 | DO | 52 | | | | | | | | Bentonite Seal |
| 5 | | | | 5 | DO | 48 | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | 6 | DO | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | 7 | DO | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | 498 39 10 67 | | | | | | | | 12-20 Frac Sand | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA INPUT: AL

DEPTH SCALE (ALONG HOLE)

1 to 100

Golder Associates

LOGGED: AL

CHECKED:

APPENDIX 5.

TNT, RDX and HMX analysis in soil samples

FORAGE DURDUN AUTOMNE 1995

| ECHANTILLON | RDX | | TNT | | HMX |
|-----------------|-----------|------|-----------------------|------|------|
| | DTECH | 8330 | DTECH | 8330 | 8330 |
| | | | | | |
| <i>P1 5-10</i> | LOW (352) | - | LOW (314) | - | - |
| <i>P1 10-15</i> | LOW (348) | nd | LOW (302) | nd | 0,4 |
| <i>P1 15-20</i> | LOW (327) | - | LOW (282) | - | - |
| <i>P1 20-25</i> | LOW (360) | nd | LOW (320) | nd | nd |
| <i>P1 25-30</i> | LOW (347) | - | LOW (307) | - | - |
| <i>P1 30-35</i> | LOW (361) | nd | LOW (245) 1% (247) | 0,3 | nd |
| <i>P1 35-40</i> | LOW (354) | - | LOW (249) | - | - |
| <i>P1 40-45</i> | LOW (336) | - | LOW (247) | - | - |
| <i>P1 45-50</i> | LOW (336) | nd | 2% (243) | 0,2 | nd |
| | | | | | |

FORAGE DURDUN AUTOMNE 1995

| ECHANTILLON | RDX | | TNT | | HMX |
|--------------------|-----------|------|------------------------|------|------|
| | DTECH | 8330 | DTECH | 8330 | 8330 |
| | | | | | |
| <i>P2 0-5</i> | LOW (351) | nd | 3% (236) 2% (230) | nd | nd |
| <i>P2 5-10</i> | LOW (350) | - | LOW (260) | - | - |
| <i>P2 10-15</i> | LOW (351) | nd | LOW (246) | nd | nd |
| <i>P2 15-20</i> | LOW (336) | - | 1% (251) | - | - |
| <i>P2 20-22.5</i> | LOW (347) | nd | 1% (233) | nd | nd |
| <i>P2 22.5-25</i> | LOW (349) | nd | LOW (251) LOW (241) | nd | nd |
| <i>P2 25-27'8"</i> | LOW (346) | - | LOW (286) | - | - |
| <i>P2 25-30</i> | LOW (360) | nd | 3% (276) | nd | nd |
| <i>P2 30-35</i> | LOW (372) | - | LOW (293) | - | - |
| <i>P2 35-40</i> | LOW (381) | nd | 3% (230) | 0,4 | nd |
| <i>P2 40-45</i> | LOW (360) | - | LOW (320) | - | - |
| | | | | | |

FORAGE DURDUN AUTOMNE 1995

53

| ECHANTILLON | RDX | | TNT | | HMX |
|-----------------|------------------------|------|------------------------|------|------|
| | DTECH | 8330 | DTECH | 8330 | 8330 |
| | | | | | |
| <i>P3 0-5</i> | LOW (350) | nd | LOW (248) | nd | nd |
| <i>P3 5-10</i> | LOW | - | LOW | - | - |
| <i>P3 10-15</i> | LOW (375) LOW (352) | nd | LOW (262) LOW (249) | nd | nd |
| <i>P3 15-20</i> | LOW (357) | - | 2% (249) | - | - |
| <i>P3 20-25</i> | LOW (358) | nd | LOW (254) | nd | nd |
| <i>P3 25-30</i> | LOW (362) | - | LOW (250) | - | - |
| <i>P3 30-35</i> | LOW (366) | nd | LOW (254) | nd | nd |
| <i>P3 35-40</i> | LOW (357) | - | 1% (242) | - | - |
| <i>P3 40-45</i> | LOW (343) | nd | LOW (250) | nd | nd |
| <i>P3 45-50</i> | LOW (346) | - | 8% (248) | - | - |
| | | | | | |

FORAGE DURDUN AUTOMNE 1995

| ECHANTILLON | RDX | | TNT | | HMX |
|-----------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|------|
| | DTECH | 8330 | DTECH | 8330 | 8330 |
| | | | | | |
| <i>P4 0-5</i> | LOW (351) | nd | LOW (254) | nd | nd |
| <i>P4 5-10</i> | LOW (352) | - | LOW (247) | - | - |
| <i>P4 10-15</i> | LOW (350) | nd | LOW (252) | nd | nd |
| <i>P4 15-20</i> | LOW (362) | - | LOW (241) | - | - |
| <i>P4 20-25</i> | LOW (365) | nd | LOW (247) | nd | nd |
| <i>P4 25-30</i> | LOW (362) | - | LOW (249) | - | - |
| <i>P4 30-35</i> | LOW (355) | nd | 1% (202) | 1,0 | 0,4 |
| <i>P4 35-40</i> | LOW (355) | - | LOW (217) | - | - |
| <i>P4 40-45</i> | LOW (343) | 1,3 | 3% (243) | 0,8 | nd |
| <i>P4 45-50</i> | LOW (345) | - | 1% (201) | - | - |
| | | | | | |

FORAGE DURDUN AUTOMNE 1995

55

| ECHANTILLON | RDX | | TNT | | HMX |
|-----------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|------|
| | DTECH | 8330 | DTECH | 8330 | 8330 |
| | | | | | |
| <i>P5 0-5</i> | LOW (335) | nd | 5% (231) | nd | nd |
| <i>P5 5-10</i> | LOW (339) | - | 1% (220) | - | - |
| <i>P5 10-15</i> | LOW (341) | nd | LOW (246) | nd | nd |
| <i>P5 15-20</i> | LOW (326) | - | LOW (259) | - | - |
| <i>P5 20-25</i> | LOW (278) | nd | 1% (231) | nd | nd |
| <i>P5 25-30</i> | LOW (300) | - | LOW (246) | - | - |
| <i>P5 30-35</i> | LOW (273) | nd | LOW (252) | nd | nd |
| <i>P5 35-40</i> | LOW (320) | - | LOW (276) | - | - |
| <i>P5 40-45</i> | LOW (388) | nd | LOW (241) | nd | nd |
| <i>P5 45-50</i> | LOW (388) | - | LOW (243) | - | - |
| | | | | | |

FORAGE DURDUN AUTOMNE 1995

| ECHANTILLON | RDX | | TNT | | HMX |
|-----------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|------|
| | DTECH | 8330 | DTECH | 8330 | 8330 |
| | | | | | |
| <i>P6 0-5</i> | LOW (367) | nd | LOW (267) | nd | nd |
| <i>P6 5-10</i> | LOW (386) | - | 5% (243) | - | - |
| <i>P6 10-15</i> | LOW (352) | nd | LOW (279) | nd | nd |
| <i>P6 15-20</i> | LOW (349) | - | 6% (250) | - | - |
| <i>P6 20-25</i> | LOW (334) | nd | LOW (241) | nd | nd |
| <i>P6 25-30</i> | LOW (334) | - | 2% (234) | - | - |
| <i>P6 30-35</i> | LOW (351) | nd | 4% (238) | nd | nd |
| | | | | | |

FORAGE DURDUN AUTOMNE 1995

| ECHANTILLON | RDX | | TNT | | HMX |
|------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|------|
| | DTECH | 8330 | DTECH | 8330 | 8330 |
| | | | | | |
| <i>P7A 0-5</i> | LOW (354) | nd | LOW (220) | nd | nd |
| <i>P7A 5-10</i> | LOW (351) | - | 2% (228) | - | - |
| <i>P7A 10-15</i> | LOW (354) | nd | LOW (258) | nd | nd |
| <i>P7A 15-20</i> | LOW (360) | - | 4% (247) | - | - |
| <i>P7A 20-25</i> | LOW (335) | nd | LOW (262) | nd | nd |
| <i>P7A 25-30</i> | LOW (353) | - | LOW (291) | - | - |
| <i>P7A 30-35</i> | LOW (347) | nd | LOW (341) | nd | nd |
| | | | | | |

| ECHANTILLON | RDX | | TNT | | HMX |
|------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|------|
| | DTECH | 8330 | DTECH | 8330 | 8330 |
| | | | | | |
| <i>P8B 5-10</i> | LOW (372) | nd | 1% (248) | nd | nd |
| <i>P8B 15-20</i> | LOW (362) | - | LOW (250) | - | - |
| <i>P8B 25-30</i> | LOW (403) | nd | 2% (245) | nd | nd |
| | | | | | |

APPENDIX 6

TNT, RDX and HMX analysis in groundwater samples

RÉSULTATS D'ANALYSES DES ÉCHANTILLONS D'EAU SOUTERRAINE

59

| ÉCHANTILLONS | DATE | [RDX] | [TNT] | [HMX] |
|--------------|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | ppb ± 0,2 | ppb ± 0,2 | ppb ± 0,2 |
| P1A | nov-95 | 5,3 | 2 | <0,3 |
| P1A | avr-96 | 4,9 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P1B | nov-95 | 5,1 | <0,3 | 2,2 |
| P1B | avr-96 | 3,6 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P2A | nov-95 | 0,8 | 1,6 | <0,3 |
| P2A | avr-96 | 0,5 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P2B | nov-95 | 1,7 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P2B | avr-96 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P3A | nov-95 | 5,6 | <0,3 | 5,7 |
| P3A | avr-96 | 3,4 | <0,3 | 2,9 |
| P3B | nov-95 | 77,9 | 2,7 | 0,9 |
| P3B | avr-96 | 120,8 | 1,9 | 0,9 |
| P4A | nov-95 | 2,8 | <0,3 | 1,1 |
| P4A | avr-96 | 2,0 | <0,3 | 1,1 |
| P4B | nov-95 | 5,8 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P4B | avr-96 | 3,0 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P5A | nov-95 | 1,4 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P5A | avr-96 | 0,9 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P5B | nov-95 | non échant. | non échant. | non échant. |
| P5B | avr-96 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P6A | nov-95 | 1,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P6A | avr-96 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P6B | nov-95 | 2,0 | 2,4 | <0,3 |
| P6B | avr-96 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P7A | nov-95 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P7A | avr-96 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P7B | nov-95 | 1,8 | <0,3 | 1,2 |
| P7B | avr-96 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P8A | nov-95 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P8A | avr-96 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P8B | nov-95 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |
| P8B | avr-96 | <0,3 | <0,3 | <0,3 |

518504

CA021780