

May 31, 2023

File No. 02210012.000-0100-0102  
Brampton Office

1 Rosetta Street Inc.  
700 Lawrence Avenue West, Suite 375  
Toronto, Ontario  
M6A 3B4

Attention: Ms. Melissa McKay

---

**RE: PRE- AND POST-DEVELOPMENT WATER BALANCE ASSESSMENT AND  
SALT MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE  
1 ROSETTA STREET  
GEORGETOWN, ONTARIO, L7G 3P1**

---

Terraprobe, an Englobe Company (Terraprobe) was retained by 1 Rosetta Street Inc. to conduct a pre- and post-development water balance assessment and propose a salt management plan for the above noted Site. The purpose of the study is to determine and comment on the anticipated changes in water balance components for the post-development Site in comparison with the existing conditions. Additionally, considering the location of the Site within the policy area, a risk assessment, threat analyses and risk management plan will be provided for the post-development Site.

## 1.0 Introduction

The Site is located at the west side of the intersection of Rosetta Street and River Drive in the Town of Halton Hills (Georgetown), Ontario, with the municipal addresses of 1 Rosetta Street, and 6 and 8 Saint Michaels Street, Town of Halton Hills (Georgetown), Ontario (the Site). The Site occupies an irregular shaped parcel of land, which covers an approximate area of 13,615 m<sup>2</sup>. **Figure 1** shows the location of the Site.

The Site is currently occupied with one (1) industrial building along with at-grade parking lots and roadways, as well as two (2) residential dwellings and associated driveways, backyards and front yards. It is understood that the existing structures at the Site are to be demolished in support of constructing two 12-storey and one 8-storey residential buildings resting on a shared two-level of underground parking structure that will extend to the entire Site. The design of the proposed building's footprint will cover the entire Site.

Terraprobe completed a hydrogeological assessment project for the property with the municipal address of 1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown, Ontario, where the current industrial building and associated parking lots and roadways exist. A summary of findings is presented as follows:

- A review of the subsoil profile indicates that beneath fill material, the native soil underlying the Site comprises sand, sand and silt/sand and gravel/sandy silt, and glacial till to the maximum termination depth of investigation at 23.0 meters below the existing ground surface (mbgs);

---

### Terraprobe

#### Greater Toronto

11 Indell Lane  
Brampton, Ontario L6T 3Y3  
(905) 796-2650 Fax: 796-2250

#### Hamilton – Niagara

903 Barton Street, Unit 22  
Stoney Creek, Ontario L8E 5P5  
(905) 643-7560 Fax: 643-7559

#### Central Ontario

220 Bayview Drive, Unit 25  
Barrie, Ontario L4N 4Y8  
(705) 739-8355 Fax: 739-8369

#### Northern Ontario

1012 Kelly Lake Rd., Unit 1  
Sudbury, Ontario P3E 5P4  
(705) 670-0460 Fax: 670-0558

- The highest stabilized groundwater level was recorded at  $253.5 \pm$  meters above sea level (masl) or 6.93 mbgs;
- A groundwater quality assessment was conducted in comparison with the Regional Municipality of Halton Sanitary and Storm Sewer By-Law limits. A review of the results indicates that groundwater quality exceeds the Regional Municipality of Halton Storm Sewer By-Law limits for Total Suspended Solid (TSS). The results review indicates that Regional Municipality of Halton Sanitary Sewer By-Law limits were met.

## 2.0 Scope of Work

The following scope of work was undertaken for this study:

1. A pre- and post-development water balance assessment; and,
2. Salt management plan.

## 3.0 Pre- and Post-Development Water Balance

A pre- and post-development water balance analyses were completed to compare pre-development and post-development hydrological conditions to evaluate potential changes in recharge and runoff volumes due to the proposed development.

The discussion below provides details on the methodology used and the results obtained from the analysis. A summary of the calculations is provided in **Appendix A**.

A site scale water balance analysis was completed using the long-term (30-year average from 1981 to 2010) precipitation records for monthly and annual precipitation at a nearby weather station. The water balance method roughly estimates annual evapotranspiration, infiltration and runoff volumes. The annual evapotranspiration, infiltration and runoff volumes were obtained from Georgetown WWIP weather station (Climate ID. 6152695) located approximately 3.7 km southeast of the Site. The 30-year records for average annual and monthly temperatures were also adopted from this station.

### 3.1 Methodology

A Site scale water balance analysis was completed in order to estimate the components of the hydrologic cycle for the Site, and was modelled using the following equation:

$$P = DGS + ET + R + I$$

Where:

$P$  = Precipitation, which represents the sum of all rainfall and snowfall

$DGS$  = Change in groundwater storage

$ET$  = Evapotranspiration

$R$  = Runoff

$I$  = Infiltration

Although groundwater storage experiences both gains and losses on a short-term basis, the net change in groundwater storage (DGS) over the long-term is generally zero. For this reason, the change in groundwater storage (zero (0)) has not been included in the water balance calculations.

Evapotranspiration (ET) refers to the transfer of water from vegetation and the soil surface to the atmosphere in the form of water vapour. The term considers evaporation from the soil surface and from man-made surfaces together with transpiration from plants. Chart 40 from the Climate of the Great Lakes Basin (Environment Canada 1972) suggests that the potential evapotranspiration (PET) for the Georgetown WWIP weather station should be about 558.8 to 609.6 mm/year (22 to 24 in/year). Simulations using Thornthwaite and Mather model developed by US Geological Survey (USGS) indicates that the average PET and actual evapotranspiration (AET) for the study area is about 553 and 539 mm/year, respectively, which generally agree with the mapped PET values for the general area. As such, an AET value of 539 mm/year has been applied to pre- and post-development water balance assessments for the Site.

In accordance with the former Ministry of Environment and Energy Guidance Manual (MOEE 1995), a series of infiltration components can be applied to the Site based on its slope, soil and vegetation coverage. The cumulative value of these components is termed the infiltration factor, with the values ranging from 0 to 1. The difference between the value 1 and the infiltration factor is referred to as the runoff factor.

Slope has an influence on both infiltration and runoff. The topography of the Site is considered flat, based on a review of available regional topographic map of the Site. The maximum elevation relief across the Site is approximately 3 m based on ground surface elevations measured at the boreholes' locations installed for the geotechnical investigation and hydrogeological assessment.

Based on the current conditions, the majority of the Site is paved or it is located within the footprint of the building. However, small portions of the Site are landscaped. Additionally, back yards and front yards of the existing residential lots are grass covered. Surficial soil, vegetation coverage, and cropping practices also contribute to the infiltration and runoff factors. The pervious areas at the Site are grass covered and the surficial soil beneath the fill material consists mainly of sand.

The difference between the average annual precipitation and actual evapotranspiration is termed as the water surplus. The precipitation value is 877 mm/year for the vicinity of the Site. Subtracting the averaged Thornthwaite and Mather derived AET estimate of 539 mm/year from the precipitation gives a water surplus estimate of 338 mm/year. The Site's average annual infiltration is calculated by multiplying the cumulative infiltration factor by the water surplus estimate. The Site's runoff is calculated by applying its difference from 1, or 1 minus the cumulative infiltration factor multiplied by water surplus estimate. Based on the former MOECC factors, a cumulative infiltration factor of 0.7 was considered for this assessment. The average annual depth estimates for infiltration and runoff at the Site are presented in **Table 1**.

**Table 1-** Summary of Water Balance Components

Site Conditions	Infiltration Factors	Estimated Water Surplus (mm/yr.)	Estimated Infiltration (mm/yr.)	Estimated Runoff (mm/yr.)
Soil Type (Sand)	0.3	<b>338</b>	$I = 0.7 \times 338$	$R = (1 - 0.7) \times 338$
Slope (Flat)	0.3			
Vegetation Cover: (Grass covered)	0.1			
Cumulative Infiltration Factor	<b>0.7</b>		<b>237</b>	<b>101</b>

Using the stimulated long-term data from the nearest weather station, and considering the accumulative factor, water balance components for the Site are estimated and summarized in **Table 2**.

**Table 2-** Summary of Water Balance Components

Precipitation (mm/year)	Evapotranspiration (mm/year)	Infiltration (mm/year)	Runoff (mm/year)
877	539	237	101

### 3.2 Site Water Balance

Water balance analyses were completed for pre-development and post-development conditions, separately with the details presented below:

#### 3.2.1 Pre-Development Water Balance

The pre-development water balance for the Site is calculated by multiplying the existing pervious areas by the various, averaged annualized depth estimates for precipitation, ET, infiltration and runoff. Additionally, estimates for runoff and ET for existing impervious surfaces are 90% and 10% of the average annual precipitation, respectively.

Based on the most updated Site Plan and Project Stats prepared by Icon Architects, dated May 24, 2023, the total Site area is considered as 13,614.4 (~13,615) m<sup>2</sup>. Water balance calculations were estimated based on the total Site area. The pre-development site statistics were established using a survey plan prepared by J.D.Barnes Limited, dated July 2, 2020, and Google Earth to estimate current impervious and pervious areas. The average annual area-based estimates for each water balance component and the estimated breakdown areas are summarized in **Table 3**.

**Table 3-** Summary of Pre-Development Volumetric Water Balance Components

Pre-Development Site Breakdown Areas	Coverage Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Precipitation (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	Evapotranspiration (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	Infiltration (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	Run off (m <sup>3</sup> /year)
Existing Paved Area (paved/parking areas and drive way)	3,720	3,262	326	0	2,936
Existing Rooftop Areas (Industrial and residential buildings)	8,774	7,695	770	0	6,925
Existing Landscaped Areas	1,121	983	604	265	114
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,615</b>	<b>11,940</b>	<b>1,700</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>9,975</b>

#### 3.2.2 Post-Development Water Balance

Based on a review of Site Plan and Project Stats prepared by Icon Architects, dated May 24, 2023, the total Site area is considered as 13,614.4 (~13,615) m<sup>2</sup>. A review of the proposed underground parking plan (drawing no. A202) indicates that the proposed underground parking will extend to the entire Site. The post-development water balance is calculated using the same depth, based components that were used for the pre-development water balance calculations, i.e., average annual precipitation and average annual ET. The estimates for runoff and ET for proposed impervious surfaces are 90% and 10% of the average annual precipitation, respectively. The estimated post-development water balance volumes are provided in **Table 4**.

**Table 4- Summary of Post-Development Volumetric Water Balance Components**

Post-Development Site Breakdown Areas	Coverage Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Precipitation (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	Evapotranspiration (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	Infiltration (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	Run off (m <sup>3</sup> /year)
Proposed Underground Parking (Roof Top)	13,615	11,940	1,194	0	10,746
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,615</b>	<b>11,940</b>	<b>1,194</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,746</b>

### 3.2.3 Water Balance Analysis Results

The volumetric comparisons in evapotranspiration, infiltration and runoff between the pre-developed and post-developed Site are summarized in **Table 5**.

**Table 5- Pre- and Post-Development Volumetric Water Balance Components**

	Precipitation (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	Evapotranspiration (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	Infiltration (m <sup>3</sup> /year)	Run off (m <sup>3</sup> /year)
Pre-Development	11,940	1,700	265	9,975
Post-Development	11,940	1,194	0	10,746
<b>Loss (-) and Gain (+)</b>	0	-506	-265	+771

A review of the findings indicates that development will not impact the water balance components significantly because the proposed buildings will be constructed within the currently paved area, where much of the Site is currently impervious to infiltration. Low Impact Development (LID) measures such as infiltration trenches, and rooftop gardening could be considered to manage the generated runoff and increase infiltration. However, since the entire Site is proposed for construction of the underground parking, considering infiltration trench, may not be feasible.

## 4.0 Salt Management Plan

A review of the Source Protection Information Atlas provided by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) indicates that the Site is located within an area designated as Wellhead Protection Area E (WHPA-E), that is known as Gudi Area, with a vulnerability score of 9. Gudi area is a designated area where groundwater is under direct influence of surface water. It is also mapped within an Issue Contributing Area for chloride. As a such, a salt management plan should be provided.

### 4.1 Risk Assessment Analysis

#### 4.1.1 Previous or Current Environmental Site Assessment Report

Terraprobe completed a Phase One Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) as well as a Phase Two ESA for the 1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown, Ontario. The Phase One ESA identified several on-site and off-site Potentially Contaminating Activities (PCAs) that resulted in multiple Areas of Potential Environmental Concern (APECs) on the Site. The Phase Two ESA was conducted to investigate the quality of soil and groundwater within the APECs. A review of the findings of the Phase Two ESA indicates that apparent exceedances of the applicable Site Condition Standards were identified in soil and groundwater. The apparent exceedances consisted of Electrical Conductivity and Sodium Adsorption Ratio in the earth fill and soil, as well as Chloride in groundwater. The apparent exceedances were reported at boreholes/monitoring wells that were drilled/installed within the existing parking lot and driveway. As such, the Qualified Person attributed these results to the use of de-icing salt and deemed the abovementioned parameters not exceeding the applicable Site Condition Standards. Further details can be found in the Phase One ESA and Phase Two ESA reports.

#### **4.1.2 Anthropogenic Transport Pathways**

Wells and underground services represent potential transport pathways for contamination. It is understood the proposed residential development will be provided by full municipal underground services. The hydrogeological assessment report, prepared by Terraprobe was reviewed for the current assessment. Based on a review of MECP well records completed for the hydrogeological assessment, there are no records of water supply wells within or in close proximity to the Site.

#### **4.1.3 Identification of Vulnerable Areas**

As previously mentioned, the Site is located within an area designated as WHPA-E, that is known as Gudi Area. The Vulnerability Analysis considers the WHPA and the groundwater vulnerability, as well as the potential for the vulnerability to be increased by anthropogenic activities, by means of transport pathways. Vulnerability score of 10, 8, 6, 4, and 2 (10 being most sever) are assigned to areas within the WHPA to provide an indication which activities at the surface present the greatest risk to contaminate the water supply. The Site is assessed as having a vulnerability score of 9.

### **4.2 Threat Assessment Analysis**

A threat assessment analysis review was conducted for the Site and the proposed development. Source Water Protection Tables of Threat and Circumstances 2021 was reviewed for the chemicals and pathogens. Significant Drinking Water (pathogen) table indicates that no significant, moderate or low pathogenic threats are anticipated considering the proposed residential development, which will be fully connected to the existing underground services.

Additionally, a review of the Significant Drinking Water (chemical) table, indicates that handling and storage of salt is considered as a significant threat, and application of road salt is also considered as a significant threat with respect to the proposed residential development.

Furthermore, since the proposed development will consist of residential buildings, there is no concern regarding potential storage, handling or application of agricultural/non-agricultural source material to land; application of commercial fertilizer to land; establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage; the establishment, operation or maintenance of a waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act (waste disposal site,...), handling and storage of fuel, and storage of snow.

### **4.3 Risk Management Plan**

Handling, storage and application of road salt are considered significant threats for the Site.

The risk associated with the presence of proposed municipal servicing (e.g., sanitary sewers) was found to be low. Since sewers have to be installed as per Regional Standards, they are not anticipated to cause any adverse effects. As such, the sewers do not require a monitoring or management plan.

#### **4.3.1 Handling and Storage of Road Salt**

The storage of road salt in an area, where it is not exposed to precipitation or runoff from precipitation or snow melt, with a quantity stored of 250,000 to 500,000 kg or more is considered as a moderate threat within WHPA-E with vulnerability score of 9 (<https://threats.swpip.ca/Threats/TSCs>). Since a residential building complex is considered for future development, no concern is anticipated with respect to handling and storage of road salt.

### 4.3.2 Application of Road Salt

The Site is located within the WHPA-E. In order to prepare risk management and mitigation plan and to conduct a risk management analysis, the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Risk Management Measures Catalogue for applying, handling and storage of road salt was reviewed (<https://data.ontario.ca/dataset/risk-management-measures-catalogue>). Findings of the review are summarized as below:

- Optimizing road salt application efficiency: This measure reduces the negative environmental impacts of salt applications by delivering the correct amount of road salt at the right place and at the right time.
- Implementing road design that minimizes salt application, de-icing, and snow storage requirements: An increase in the roadway and bridge designers' awareness of techniques, configurations, and design parameters will reduce the amount of snow and ice accumulation, which can lead to reduced salt application.
- Stormwater and Combined Sewer Systems Management Modelling
- Monitoring and maintaining stormwater management structures (including grassed channels/wet swales and/or catch basin filters)
- Spill and contaminant reporting and response for stormwater management systems
- Runoff Collection and Diversion Systems
- Decommissioning of abandoned wells

Additionally, hiring winter maintenance contractors who use best management practices for snow and ice control to maintain safe conditions can reduce the potential impacts of road salt on drinking water sources and the environment (Halton Region, Source Water Protection). Details for each road salt application should be provided and documented by the contractor.

Location of the snow pile(s), in which collected snow from the ground surface will be piled, should be proposed in advance. The proposed snow piling location(s) should be close to catch basins to prevent any frozen surface that will be developed during snow melting and freezing season. Considering this approach will minimize the application of salt for de-icing. Additionally, designing and distributing the proposed catch basins should consider collecting melted water as fast as possible to prevent developing frozen surfaces and reduce the application of salt for de-icing.

The threat associated with the application of road salt can be managed through optimization of road salt application efficiency. This could be accomplished by retaining a contractor who is certified by Smart About Salt® and trained in the practices identified in the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) *Synthesis of Best Management Practices for Road Salt Management* (TAC, 2013). Practices of road salt management to be considered so as to reduce the amount of salt needed and minimize associated groundwater and surface water impacts include (TAC, 2013):

- The 4 R's of snow and ice control:
  1. Right Material: the right material will depend on the conditions being treated. In situations where the pavement temperature is extremely cold, chemicals with lower working temperatures and sand/salt mixtures may be warranted.
  2. Right Amount: The right amount of material is dependent upon the type of slippery condition being treated, the amount of residual chemical on the pavement surface, the expected pavement temperature and the amount of precipitation that is expected.

3. **Right Place:** Placement of materials is important to keeping it in the right place to be effective rather than wasted to the environment. Proper material placement requires the right equipment and skilled operators.
4. **Right Timing:** The timing of salt placement is important to minimizing waste and maximizing chemical effectiveness. There are times when the pavement temperature is, and is expected to remain, above freezing and therefore may not warrant salt application. Proactive anti-icing is key to achieving safer conditions quickly with less salt.
  - The mechanical removal of snow from the treatment area prior to the application of a freeze point depressant (e.g., salt) to minimize the amount of material needed, and the potential for dilution and re-freeze.
  - The application of freeze point depressants after plowing only when pavement temperatures are below freezing and the remaining snow/ice that could not be removed by mechanical means presents a hazard.
  - The use of liquid rather than solid salt in the right conditions to speed up the melting process.
  - The application of only enough material to do the maintenance.
  - The understanding that salt should not be used to promote rapid melting of stockpiled snow.
  - Salt storage on Site should be kept to a minimum. Any storage units should be kept away from exposure to water and in a system with secondary containment.
  - Application of a Road Salt Alternative – Calcium Magnesium Acetate: Calcium Magnesium Acetate has a low environmental impact but can contribute to biochemical oxygen demand (BOD). It also has a high purchase cost relative to NaCl. In addition, Potassium Acetate (KA) is often used as a base for commercial chloride-free liquid de-icer formulations as a road salt alternative, having low corrosion, relatively high performance, and a low environmental impact. The above risk management and risk mitigation measures should be considered for the proposed development.

#### **4.4 Monitoring Program and Mitigation Plan**

The risk associated with the application of road salt was determined to be significant according to the Source Water Protection Tables of Threat and Circumstances 2021 since the proposed impervious surface area is 8% or more of the total site area. The local surficial soil beneath the Site is primarily comprised of sand. However, the proposed underground parking will extend throughout the entire Site, and the ground surface, where the salt will be applied, is expected to have an asphalt or paved cover on top of the proposed underground parking. As such, it was determined that there is no significant downward pathway into the underlying municipal aquifer.

The nearby surface watercourses are Black Creek and Credit River, which are located approximately 500 m and 700 m to the west/southwest and east/northeast of the Site, respectively. It is anticipated that the generated runoff from the post-development Site will be conveyed to the municipal service. As such, impact of the winter maintenance and using road salt will be low, and a long-term monitoring plan for road salt is not considered necessary.

#### **4.5 Emergency Response Plan**

##### **4.5.1 Salt Spills**

The threats to drinking water quality after the development is completed primarily involve the use of road salt. Given that road salt is typically applied in a solid form, immediate clean-up should be conducted by Site maintenance staff



in the event of a spill. The Halton Region Risk Management Official/Inspector (RMO/RMI) should be notified for any spill incidence.

#### **4.5.2 Review Schedule**

The Emergency Response Plan should be reviewed annually and after any incidents, for as long as it is to remain effective, to ensure that it remains up to date and that it functions as intended.

#### **4.5.3 Implementation and Termination of Plan**

The Risk Management Plan outlined above is to be implemented prior to beginning construction of the development and maintained as long as the currently proposed Site plan is in force. Should the property usage change or be sold, Halton Region's Risk Management Office/Water Resources Department should be notified and this plan is to be amended as necessary.

### **5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations**

The conclusions of this study are based on the existing conditions and future development at the Site and are as follow:

- A review of the findings of the pre- and post-development water balance indicates a decrease of 506 m<sup>3</sup>/yr, and 265 m<sup>3</sup>/yr for ET and infiltration, respectively, where the generated runoff will increase by 771 m<sup>3</sup>/yr. As such, the proposed development will not impact the water balance components significantly because the proposed buildings will be developed within the currently paved area, where much of the Site is currently impervious to infiltration.
- The proposed development will not impact the water balance components (ET, infiltration and runoff) significantly because the proposed buildings will be constructed within the currently paved area, where much of the Site is currently impervious to infiltration. Low Impact Development (LID) measures such as infiltration trenches, and rooftop gardening could be considered to create opportunities to gain back infiltration and ET loss. However, since the entire Site is proposed for construction of the underground parking, considering infiltration trench, may not be feasible.
- The Site is located within an area designated as Wellhead Protection Area E (WHPA-E), that is known as Gudi Area, with a vulnerability score of 9. The unexposed handling and storage of salt is considered as a moderate threat. Since a residential building complex is considered for future development, no concern is anticipated with respect to handling and storage of road salt.
- As per the Source Water Protection Tables of Threat and Circumstances 2021, the application of road salt is considered as a significant threat with respect to the proposed residential development since more than 8% of the proposed development area will be impervious.
- Road salt application is considered a significant threat for the vicinity of the Site. As such, optimizing road salt application efficiency, and implementing road design that minimizes salt application, de-icing, and snow storage requirements should be considered.
- The proposed underground parking will extend to the entire Site, and the ground surface, where the salt will be applied, is expected to have an asphalt or paved cover on top of the proposed underground parking. As such, it was determined that there is no significant downward pathway into the underlying municipal aquifer.

## 6.0 Closure

Should you have any questions, or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Yours truly,

### Terraprobe



Yousr Hiweish, B.Eng., EIT  
Project Manager



Narjes Alijani, M.Sc., P.Ge.  
Senior Hydrogeologist-Team Lead



R. Baker Wohayeb, M.A.Sc., P.Eng., QP<sub>RA</sub>  
Project Director, Environment

#### *Enclosed:*

- Figure 1 – Site Location Plan
- Appendix A – Pre- and Post-Development Water Balance Analyses

## 7.0 References

1. CTC Source Protection Region, 2015, Approved Source Protection Plan.
2. Government of Ontario, 2017, Drinking Water Threats and Circumstances.
3. Halton Region, Source Water Protection, 2021.
4. Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, 2020. Source Water Protection Information Atlas Interactive Map.
5. Terraprobe Inc., 2020, Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, 1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown, Ontario.
6. Terraprobe Inc., 2021, Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment, 1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown, Ontario.
7. Terraprobe Inc., 2021, Hydrogeological Assessment (Draft), 1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown, Ontario.
8. Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP), 2022, Risk Management Measures Catalogue, Threat Assessment Tool.

## **8.0 Limitations of Liability**

This report was prepared at the request of, and for the exclusive use of 1 Rosetta Street Inc. and its affiliates (“the Intended User”) and is intended to provide a water balance and salt management plan of the Site with the municipal addresses of 1 Rosetta Street, and 6 and 8 Saint Michaels Street, in the Town of Halton Hills (Georgetown), Ontario (the Site). No one other than the Intended User has the right to use and rely on the work without first obtaining the written authorization of Terraprobe, an Englobe Company (Terraprobe) and 1 Rosetta Street Inc.

Terraprobe expressly excludes liability to any party except the Intended User for any use of, and/or reliance upon, the work. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties. Terraprobe accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report, including consequential financial effects on transactions or property values, or requirements for follow-up actions and costs.



The study should not be considered a comprehensive audit that eliminates all risks of encountering private water (groundwater) problems. The information presented in this report is based on information collected during the completion of the foundation drainage study by Terraprobe. It was based on the conditions on the Site at the time of the foundation drainage study by a review of historical information and field investigation to assess the private water (groundwater) conditions of the Site, as reported herein.

There is no warranty expressed or implied by this report regarding the private water (groundwater) conditions for the Site. Professional judgement was exercised in gathering and analysing information collected by reviewing previous reports, data provided by government and are open to public and field work investigation. The conclusions presented are the product of professional care and competence, and cannot be construed as an absolute guarantee.


In the event that during future work new information regarding the private water (groundwater) conditions of the Site is encountered, or in the event that the outstanding responses from the regulatory agencies indicate outstanding issues on file with respect to the Site, Terraprobe should be notified in order that we may re-evaluate the findings of this assessment and provide amendments, as required.

Neither possession of the Work, nor a copy of it, carries the right of publication. All copyright in the Work is reserved to Terraprobe. The Work shall not be disclosed, produced or reproduced, quoted from, or referred to, in whole or in part, or published in any manner, without the express written consent of Terraprobe or 1 Rosetta Street Inc.





**References:**  
 ESRI, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus Ds, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community, Basemaps



**Notes:**

**Legend:**  
 Approximate Site Boundary

**Project Title:**  
 Hydrogeological Assessment

**Site Location:**  
 1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown, Ontario

**Figure Title:**  
 Site Location Plan

<b>Designed By:</b> TS	<b>File No.:</b> 1-20-0249-46.1
---------------------------	------------------------------------

<b>Drawn By:</b> SSK	<b>Scale:</b> As Shown
-------------------------	---------------------------

<b>Reviewed By:</b> BW	<b>Figure No.:</b> 1
---------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Date:</b> May 2023	
--------------------------	--



# Appendix A

## Pre- and Post-Development Water Balance

**Pre- and Post Water Balance - 1 Rosetta Street, and 6 and 8 Saint Michaels Street, Georgetown, Ontario****Former MOE Infiltration Factor**

Topography (Average slope not exceeding 0.6 m per km)	0.3
Soil (open sandy loam)	0.3
Cover (Cultivated land)	0.1 Small portions of the Site are currently landscaped
<b>Infiltration Factor</b>	<b>0.7</b>

**1. Climate Information (using USGS Thornthwaite USGS Model)**

Precipitation	877 mm/a	0.877 m/a
Evapotranspiration (Average Lat 43 and 44)	539 mm/a	0.539 m/a
Surplus	338 mm/a	0.338 m/a
Runoff (Pervious Surface)	101 mm/a	0.101 m/a
Infiltration (Pervious Surface)	237 mm/a	0.237 m/a
Runoff (Impervious Surface)	789 mm/a	0.789 m/a
Infiltration (Impervious Surface)	88 mm/a	0.088 m/a

The site development area is mainly underlain by sand/sandy silt fill.

**2. Site Statistics****Pre- Development Site Coverage**

	Subcatchment Areas	
Existing Impervious Area (Paved Area)	3,720 m <sup>2</sup>	0.37 ha
Existing Buildings (Rooftop Area)	8,774 m <sup>2</sup>	0.88 ha
Existing Landscaped Area	1,121 m <sup>2</sup>	0.11 ha
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,615 m<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>1.36 ha</b>

**Post-Development Site Coverage**

	Subcatchment Areas	
Proposed Underground Parking (Roof Top)	13,615 m <sup>2</sup>	1.36 ha
Area Covered by Proposed Landscaped Area	0 m <sup>2</sup>	0.00 ha
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>13,615 m<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>1.36 ha</b>

**3. Annual Pre-Development Water Balance**

Land Use	Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Precipitation (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)	Evapotranspiration (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)	Infiltration (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)	Runoff (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)
Existing Impervious Area (Paved Area)	3,720	3,262	326.00	0.00	2,936.00
Existing Buildings (Rooftop Area)	8,774	7,695	770.00	0.00	6,925.00
Existing Landscaped Area	1,121	983	604	265	114
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,615</b>	<b>11,940</b>	<b>1,700</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>9,975</b>

**4. Annual Post-Development Water Balance**

Land Use	Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Precipitation (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)	Evapotranspiration (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)	Infiltration (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)	Runoff (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)
Proposed Underground Parking (Roof Top)	13,615	11,940	1,194	0	10,746
Proposed Landscaped Area	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,615</b>	<b>11,940</b>	<b>1,194</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,746</b>

	Precipitation (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)	Evapotranspiration (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)	Infiltration (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)	Runoff (m <sup>3</sup> /yr)
<b>Pre-Development</b>	<b>11,940</b>	<b>1,700</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>9,975</b>
<b>Post-Development</b>	<b>11,940</b>	<b>1,194</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,746</b>
<b>Gain/Loss (-)</b>		<b>-506</b>	<b>-265</b>	<b>771</b>