

# Memo

---

**To:** Pascal Hamelin, ing., Metanor Resources Inc. **Date:** 17 January 2020  
**From:** Jennifer Boak, MSc, PGeo, Steve Walker, PhD, PGeo  
**CC:** Brigitte Masella, MES  
**Ref:** TX17021601.12000-6  
**Re:** Addendum: Bachelor Project Geochemical Characterization Report

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Subsequent to the completion of the Bachelor Project Geochemical Characterization Report (Wood, 2019b), the Project Impact Assessment (IA) (Wood, 2019a) incorporated the short-term storage of Barry ore in three stockpiles at the Bachelor site. These temporary stockpiles are planned to mitigate mill downtime related to possible transport delays of ore from the Barry mine to the Bachelor mill.

In addition, additional analyses on several tailings samples were made available, including elemental content (total metals) and leachable metals data derived from several leach tests.

This addendum is provided to Metanor to address the mine plan modifications and to document the additional tailings leach data that has been received.

## 2. BARRY ORE STOCKPILES

Three temporary stockpiles of Barry ore are planned to be located at the Bachelor site (Figure 1). Based on the size of the stockpile and the density of the ore, and considering a 30% porosity, it is approximately 4,000 tons per stockpile. All three stockpiles will be located upgradient of a seepage collection ditch, which will redirect ore stockpile runoff and seepage to the tailings storage facility (TSF).

Barry ore is expected to have a generally low potential for metal leaching and acid rock drainage (ML/ARD). The majority of the 103 ore samples collected between 2008 and 2018 had Neutralization Potential Ratios (NPR) > 2 and only aluminium leached in SPLP tests at concentrations above drinking water criteria (Wood 2019a). Based on this information, the proposed ore stockpile designs including redirection of seepage and runoff to the TSF are considered adequate to mitigate potential ML/ARD issues that may arise from temporary storage of Barry ore at the Bachelor site.

PLEASE NOTE: This communication is the property of Wood and/or its subsidiaries and/or affiliates and is intended only for the named recipient(s). Its contents (including any attachments) may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure by law. Unauthorized use, copying, distribution or disclosure of any of it may be unlawful and is strictly prohibited. Wood, its subsidiaries and affiliates assume no responsibility to persons other than the intended named recipient(s) and do not accept liability for any errors or omissions which are a result of transmission. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately and confirm that the original communication and any attachments and copies have been destroyed.



### 3. ADDITIONAL BACHELOR TAILINGS RESULTS

#### 3.1. Elemental Content

Twenty-two samples were collected from the TSF and analyzed for total elemental content (Appendix A). As a screening assessment, solid phase element concentrations (aqua regia) were compared to average continental crust abundances (Price, 1997) as well as criteria presented in Annex 1 and Annex 2 of the Soil Protection and Rehabilitation of Contaminated Sites Policy (Beaulieu, 2016; "Policy"). Three criteria are considered in the Policy:

- Background levels in the Superior Province (Criteria A);
- Residential, commercial, institutional land use (Criteria B); and
- Commercial and industrial land use (Criteria C).

Samples with metals concentrations that are above both the continental crust abundances and criteria presented in the Policy are considered to be higher risk. Generally, metals concentrations were below all screening criteria with a few exceptions. No samples had concentrations that were above Criteria C concentrations of the Policy or 10 times average continental crust abundances. Two separate samples each had manganese or molybdenum concentrations that were above Criteria B of the Policy. One or two samples had concentrations of cobalt, copper, manganese, mercury and lead that were higher than background levels in the Superior Province (Criteria A-Policy). Seventeen of the 22 samples had molybdenum concentrations greater than Criteria A of the Policy.

**Table 1. Summary of Elemental Concentrations for Tailings Facility Samples**

	Co	Cu	Mn	Hg	Mo	Pb
# Tailings Facility Samples with Concentrations above Criteria A of the Policy (n = 22)	1	1	2	1	17	1

#### 3.2. Leachable Metals

Seven tailings samples were collected from various locations in the TSF to represent tailings that were deposited between June 2018 and October 2018. These samples all had NPR > 2; and six of the seven samples had NPR > 3 (Wood, 2019). All seven samples were submitted for a variety of leachate tests including water extraction (two samples) and CTEU-9 (five samples). All seven samples were also subjected to SPLP and TCLP tests. Results are included in Appendix A and are generally consistent with the findings in Wood (2019a).

Leachable metals can be determined using several methods, including the following (translated from Protocole de lixiviation pour les espèces inorganiques, MA. 100-Lix.com.1.1, Rev 1, (CEAEQ, 2012):

1. Water Leach CTEU-9 – this method is used to determine the concentration of inorganic species likely to be leached in contact with water. This method is derived from method B9 Equilibrium



Extraction from Investigation of Test Methods for Solidified Waste Evaluation – A Cooperative Program (Environment Canada, 1991).

2. Synthetic Precipitation Leaching Procedure (SPLP, US EPA 1312) – this method is used to determine the concentration of inorganic species likely to be leached by weakly acidic rain.
3. Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP, US EPA 1311 – this method is used to evaluate whether an industrial residue is considered leachable according to Article 3 of the Regulation on Hazardous Materials under the Environment Quality Act. The test was designed to simulate leaching from materials in a landfill and primarily used to assess whether an industrial waste would be classified as a hazardous material.

Results of TCLP leachability testing are compared to three criteria as guided by Directive 019:

- Groundwater criteria for consumption purposes from the Policy.
- Criteria for seepage into surface water or infiltration into sewers from the Policy.
- Maximum concentrations of a contaminant in a liquid material or leachate from a solid from Directive 019 Table 1.

According to Directive 019, samples with TCLP leachate concentrations above the Soil Protection and Rehabilitation of Contaminated Sites Policy criteria for seepage into surface water or infiltration into sewers, but below Directive 019 Table 1 in Annex II, are considered to contain leachable metals. Materials with leachate concentrations above Directive 019 Table 1 criteria are considered high risk.

The following sections discuss the results of leach testing.

### 3.2.1. Water Leach and CTEU-9 Results

Two of the tailings samples were leached with water, and the remaining five samples were subjected to the CTEU-9 test. The basis of selecting samples for the different tests was not identified, but was inferred to be on a random basis. The specific method used for the water leach test (solid:liquid ratio, test duration, etc.) is also not known. Regardless, both types of water-based leach tests had leachate concentrations of aluminium, silver and manganese that were above drinking water criteria in one or more samples. Three samples subjected to the CTEU-9 test also had concentrations above drinking water criteria for free cyanide.

**Table 2. Number of Tailings Samples with Water Leach or CTEU-9 Concentrations above Drinking Water Criteria**

	Free CN	Al	Ag	Mn
<b>Water Leach (n = 2)</b>	0	1	1	2
<b>CTEU-9 (n = 5)</b>	3	1	2	2

In comparison to seepage criteria, all samples also had concentrations of total and free cyanide that were above seepage criteria. Three samples also had concentrations of silver that were above seepage criteria.



### 3.2.2. SPLP Test Results

SPLP test results for all seven samples had low metals concentrations with the exception of aluminium, which was above drinking water criteria in all samples. Concentrations of total cyanide were also above seepage criteria in all samples, and concentrations of free cyanide were above seepage criteria in three samples.

**Table 3. Number of Tailings Samples with SPLP Concentrations above Drinking Water or Seepage Criteria**

	Total CN	Free CN	Al
Drinking Water (n=7)	n/a	0	7
Seepage (n=7)	7	3	n/a

n/a = Drinking Water or Seepage Criteria not available for specified parameter

### 3.2.3. TCLP Test Results

Metals concentrations in TCLP leachate were generally above detection, but lower than Directive 019 Table 1 concentrations. Several samples had leachate concentrations of cyanide, fluoride, aluminium, arsenic, copper, manganese, lead, selenium and zinc that were above seepage and/or drinking water criteria.

**Table 4. Number of Tailings Samples with TCLP Concentrations above Drinking Water or Seepage Criteria**

	Total CN	Free CN	F	Al	As	Cu	Mn	Pb	Se	Zn
Drinking Water (n=7)	n/a	1	7	7	7	0	7	4	7	0
Seepage (n=7)	7	6	6	n/a	0	3	7	0	0	5

n/a = Drinking Water or Seepage Criteria not available for specified parameter

### 3.2.4. Summary of Leachate Test Results

Based on the information provided above, the following summary is presented:

- Water leach tests showed that some samples leached concentrations of cyanide, aluminium, silver and manganese at concentrations that were above seepage and/or drinking water criteria.
- SPLP tests showed leaching of cyanide and aluminium above seepage and drinking water criteria, respectively.
- No samples had TCLP leachate concentrations that were above Directive 019 Table 1 concentrations. These samples are therefore not considered hazardous under Directive 019.



#### 4. REFERENCES

BEAULIEU, M. (2016). *Guide d'intervention: protection des sols et réhabilitation des terrains contaminés*, Ministère du Développement durable, de l'Environnement, de la Faune et des Parcs du Québec, 210 pages.

CEAEQ [CENTRE D'EXPERTISE EN ANALYSE ENVIRONNEMENTALE DU QUÉBEC] (2012). *Protocole de lixiviation pour les espèces inorganiques*, Ministère du Développement durable, de l'Environnement, de la Faune et des Parcs du Québec, MA. 100 – Lix.com.1.1, Rév. 1, 17 pages.

ENVIRONMENT CANADA (1991). *Equilibrium Extraction (CTEU-9) – Investigation of Test Methods for Solidified Waste Evaluation – A Cooperative Program, Appendix B: Test Methods for Solidified Waste Evaluation*, Government of Canada, TS-15.

PRICE, W.A. (1997). *Draft Guidelines and Recommended Methods for the Prediction of Metal Leaching and Acid Rock Drainage at Minesites in British Columbia*, B.C. Ministry of Employment and Investment, 141 p. plus appendices. Ministry of Employment and Investment was the former home of the present Ministry of Energy and Mines.

WOOD ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE SOLUTIONS (2019a). *Impact Assessment Volume I: Main Report (Unofficial Translation) - Processing of gold ore from the Barry and Moroy projects at the Bachelor site and increase in the milling rate, Desmaraisville, Québec, Dorval, Québec*, Report # TX17021601-0000-REI-0001-0 delivered to Metanor Resources Inc. 295 p. + 2 appendices.

——— (2019b). *Geochemical Characterization Report - Bachelor Project, Desmaraisville, Québec*, Report # TX17021601.12000.5 delivered to Metanor Resources Inc., 35 pages et 10 annexes. Expertise réalisée pour Ressources Métanor.

#### Prepared by:



Jennifer Boak, M.Sc., P.Geo.  
Senior Geochemist

#### Reviewed by:



Steve Walker, Ph.D., P.Geo.  
Associate Geochemist

Enclosure: Figure 1; Appendix A





Table A1 – Elemental Content Results

Sample	Year	Location	Al	Sb	Ag	As	Ba	Be	Cd	Ca	Cr	Co	Cu	Sn	Fe	Mg	Mn	Hg	Mo	Ni	Pb	K	Se	Na	Sr	Te	Ti	U	V	Zn
			µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	
Background levels in Superior province <sup>a</sup>					0.5	5	200		0.9		85	20	50	5			1000	0.3	6	50	40		3						120	
Residential, commercial, institutional <sup>b</sup>					20	20	500		5		250	50	100				1000	2	10	100	500		3						500	
Commercial and industrial <sup>b</sup>					40	50	2000		20		800	300	500				2200	10	40	500	1000		10						1500	
Average Continental Crust Abundance (Price 1997)			82300	0.2	0.075	1.8	425	3	0.15	41500	102	25	60	2.3	56300	23300	950	0.085	1.2	84	14	20850	0.05	23550	370		5650	2.7	120	70
10x Average Continental Crust			<b>823000</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4250</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>415000</b>	<b>1020</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>563000</b>	<b>233000</b>	<b>9500</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>208500</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>235500</b>	<b>3700</b>		<b>56500</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>700</b>
ENV-F1 A	2016	Tailings Area	7010	<0.1	<0.5	0.8	90	0.2	<0.1	25500	30	11	46	<1	31400	7610	692	0.02	7.1	22	45	3180	<0.5	406	65	<1	478	<1	31	59
ENV-F1 B	2016	Tailings Area	6480	<0.1	<0.5	0.9	112	0.3	0.1	18400	39	11	50	2	30100	6760	589	0.45	7.2	34	14	3010	<0.5	392	49	<1	581	1	31	69
ENV-F2 A	2016	Tailings Area	12400	<0.1	<0.5	1.2	87	0.2	<0.1	47100	16	22	39	2	42900	10700	1090	0.03	5.3	27	31	3050	<0.5	361	99	<1	486	<1	74	82
ENV-F2 B	2016	Tailings Area	7450	<0.1	<0.5	0.9	151	0.3	0.1	21600	36	11	45	2	30600	7660	642	0.03	7.2	35	12	3670	<0.5	526	74	<1	680	1	35	71
ENV-F4 A	2016	Tailings Area	7900	<0.1	<0.5	0.8	103	0.3	0.1	36100	22	14	41	2	39100	9910	945	0.02	8.7	20	28	3000	<0.5	632	120	<1	312	<1	29	58
ENV-F4 B	2016	Tailings Area	13700	<0.1	<0.5	1.8	151	0.4	<0.1	4600	85	9	22	2	19000	5740	391	0.03	3.7	24	7	1810	<0.5	629	35	<1	1350	<1	43	44
ENV-F5 A	2016	Tailings Area	6530	<0.1	<0.5	0.7	73	0.2	<0.1	30300	21	11	32	1	31200	8330	810	0.02	7.8	17	7	2170	<0.5	459	80	<1	304	<1	26	51
ENV-F6 A	2016	Tailings Area	6140	<0.1	<0.5	0.8	57	0.3	0.1	24100	34	10	41	3	29700	7160	713	0.05	9.5	17	6	2080	<0.5	351	57	<1	425	<1	27	48
ENV-F6 B	2016	Tailings Area	7770	<0.1	<0.5	0.9	73	0.3	0.1	28700	27	12	42	2	34200	8360	803	0.04	8.8	36	8	2680	<0.5	343	74	<1	510	<1	38	83
ENV-F7 A	2016	Tailings Area	6350	<0.1	<0.5	0.7	66	0.2	<0.1	29600	20	11	34	1	32200	8410	808	0.03	7.6	16	27	2220	<0.5	460	80	<1	282	<1	25	53
ENV-F7 B	2016	Tailings Area	11400	<0.1	<0.5	1.3	88	0.2	0.1	42100	22	23	49	2	41400	9480	1050	0.03	6.6	36	9	2700	<0.5	315	92	<1	524	<1	79	90
ENV-F8 A	2016	Tailings Area	9810	<0.1	<0.5	1.1	83	0.2	<0.1	38300	25	19	52	2	37800	9800	998	0.03	7	25	7	2470	<0.5	466	94	<1	475	<1	56	70
ENV-F8 B	2016	Tailings Area	20200	<0.1	<0.5	1.9	130	0.4	<0.1	25300	21	19	30	2	35900	11000	837	0.03	4.4	34	11	3150	<0.5	610	63	<1	1240	<1	74	97
ENV-F9 A	2016	Tailings Area	4970	<0.1	<0.5	0.8	89	0.2	<0.1	25400	22	10	38	1	28200	6330	677	0.03	5.3	15	10	1640	<0.5	439	69	<1	240	<1	20	46
ENV-F9 B	2016	Tailings Area	5660	<0.1	<0.5	0.7	109	0.2	<0.1	22700	38	9	39	1	27900	7030	639	0.03	5.7	23	9	2580	<0.5	516	73	<1	334	<1	24	48
Mine Bachelor - Résidu Octobre- 1 / 4134822	2018	Tailings Area	-	-	< 0.8	< 1.5	57	-	<1.0	-	24	10	29	<5.0	-	-	602	<0.2	6.8	19	< 10.0	-	< 0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	50
Mine Bachelor - Résidu Octobre- 2 / 4134826	2018	Tailings Area	-	-	< 0.8	< 1.5	53	-	<1.0	-	24	10	36	<5.0	-	-	631	<0.2	6.3	19	< 10.0	-	< 0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	49
Mine Bachelor - Résidu Octobre- 3 / 4134830	2018	Tailings Area	-	-	< 0.8	< 1.5	76	-	<1.0	-	12	13	38	<5.0	-	-	625	<0.2	11.2	14	< 10.0	-	< 0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	43
Mine Bachelor - Résidu Juin-Septembre-1 / 4134842	2018	Tailings Area	-	-	< 0.8	< 1.5	55	-	<1.0	-	19	11	30	<5.0	-	-	596	<0.2	8.3	17	< 10.0	-	< 0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	57
Mine Bachelor - Résidu Juin-Septembre-2 / 4134847	2018	Tailings Area	-	-	< 0.8	< 1.5	59	-	<1.0	-	18	11	32	<5.0	-	-	582	<0.2	9	17	< 10.0	-	< 0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	54
Mine Bachelor - Résidu Juin-Septembre-3 / 4134853	2018	Tailings Area	-	-	< 0.8	< 1.5	74	-	<1.0	-	15	13	32	<5.0	-	-	623	<0.2	10.2	15	< 10.0	-	< 0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	51
Mine Bachelor - Résidu Juin-Septembre-4 / 4134858	2018	Tailings Area	-	-	< 0.8	< 1.5	72	-	<1.0	-	18	14	34	<5.0	-	-	619	<0.2	8.7	17	< 10.0	-	< 0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	48

A: Baseline for inorganic parameters in the Superior Province. Annex 1 and Annex 2 of the Soil Protection and Rehabilitation of Contaminated Land Policy  
 B: Maximum acceptable limit for residential, recreational and institutional land. Also included are commercial land in a residential area. Institutional use includes uses such as hospitals, schools and daycares.  
 Recreational use brings together a large number of possible cases with different sensitivities. Thus, sensitive uses, such as playgrounds, will have to be managed according to level B.  
 For their part, recreational uses considered less sensitive, such as cycle paths, may be associated with level C.  
 C: Maximum acceptable limit for commercial land, not located in a residential area, and for industrial land.  
 Average continental crust abundance as presented in Price 1997.

Table A2 – Leachable Metals Results



	Drinking Water Criteria <sup>A</sup>	Seepage Criteria <sup>B</sup>	Dir 019 Table 1 <sup>C</sup>	Résidus	Résidus	Résidus Juin-	Résidus Juin-	Résidus Juin-	Résidus	Résidus Juin-	Résidus	Résidus	Résidus	Résidus Juin-	Résidus Juin-	Résidus Juin-	Résidus Juin-	Résidus	Résidus	Résidus	Résidus Juin-	Résidus Juin-	Résidus Juin-	Résidus Juin-	
				Octobre 1	Octobre 2	Sept 1	Sept 2	Sept 3	Octobre 3	Sept 4	Octobre 1	Octobre 2	Octobre 3	Sept 1	Sept 2	Sept 3	Sept 4	Octobre 1	Octobre 2	Octobre 3	Sept 1	Sept 2	Sept 3	Sept 4	Octobre 1
				CTEU-9	CTEU-9	CTEU-9	CTEU-9	CTEU-9	EAU	EAU	SPLP	SPLP	SPLP	SPLP	SPLP	SPLP	SPLP	TCLP	TCLP	TCLP	TCLP	TCLP	TCLP	TCLP	
Total CN	(mg/L)	-	0,022	-	4,29	6,66	0,99	6,78	6,03	1,68	3,28	0,92	1,62	0,34	0,18	1,56	1,02	1,69	0,05	0,23	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,06	0,34
CN (Free)	(mg/L)	0,2	0,022	-	0,19	0,29	0,35	0,13	0,29	0,16	0,15	0,014	0,04	0,014	0,011	0,03	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,13	0,02	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,36
Turbidity	(mg/L)	-	-	-	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,5	0,6	0,2	0,3	0,1	0,1	0,4	0,1	N/A **	N/A **	0,1
Fluoride (F)	(mg/L)	1,5	4	150	1,1	1,3	1,1	1,3	1,2	1,2	1,3	0,47	0,47	0,58	0,59	0,48	0,5	0,5	8,4	7,9	4	7,7	8,7	8,9	7,9
Nitrites (NO <sub>2</sub> )	(mg/L)	1	-	100	<0,1	<0,1	<0,1	0,14	<0,1	<0,1	<0,1	<0,1	<0,1	<0,1	<0,1	<0,1	<0,1	<0,1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Nitrates (NO <sub>3</sub> )	(mg/L)	-	290	-	1,3	1,4	0,18	0,26	0,31	<0,1	0,23	0,42	0,49	0,16	0,2	0,22	0,22	0,22	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Nitrite+Nitrate	(mg/L)	10	-	1000	1,3	1,4	0,18	0,42	0,31	<0,1	0,23	0,42	0,49	0,16	0,2	0,22	0,25	0,22	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
pH	-	-	-	-	8	8	7,9	8,1	7,9	7,7	8	7,6	8,1	7,6	7,9	8,3	8,3	7,9	5	4,9	5	5,1	5	5	5
Aluminium (Al)	(mg/L)	0,1	-	-	0,07	0,08	0,09	0,11	0,09	0,05	0,11	0,43	0,39	0,12	0,37	1	0,3	0,28	8,7	7,9	4,2	6,7	7,8	7,8	6,9
Antimony (Sb)	(mg/L)	0,006	1,1	-	0,0016	0,0018	0,0011	0,0013	0,0008	0,0007	0,0005	0,0015	0,001	0,0005	0,0012	0,0009	0,0006	0,0006	0,0011	0,0011	0,0004	0,0007	0,0008	0,0006	0,0006
Silver (Ag)	(mg/L)	0,1	0,00062	-	0,008	0,004	0,001	<0,001	<0,001	0,002	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001
Arsenic (As)	(mg/L)	0,0003	0,34	5	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	0,006	0,006	0,005	0,006	0,006	0,007	0,007
Barium (Ba)	(mg/L)	1	0,6	100	0,027	0,025	0,021	0,021	0,026	0,022	0,026	0,017	0,014	0,026	0,01	0,015	0,02	0,023	0,37	0,37	0,3	0,38	0,43	0,4	0,46
Boron (B)	(mg/L)	5	28	500	0,17	0,14	0,11	0,11	0,11	<0,05	0,1	<0,05	<0,05	<0,05	<0,05	<0,05	<0,05	<0,05	0,05	<0,05	<0,05	<0,05	<0,05	<0,05	<0,05
Cadmium (Cd)	(mg/L)	0,005	0,0011	0,5	0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	0,0008	0,0007	0,0006	0,0007	0,0007	0,0006	0,0006
Chromium (Cr)	(mg/L)	0,05 (Total)	1 <sup>(M)</sup> 0,016 <sup>(V)</sup>	5	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	0,018	0,02	0,008	0,006	0,017	0,016	0,042
Cobalt (Co)	(mg/L)	-	0,37	-	0,0051	0,0068	0,0008	0,0076	0,0085	0,0021	0,0068	0,0007	0,0009	<0,0005	<0,0005	0,0015	0,001	0,0016	0,015	0,015	0,025	0,013	0,0086	0,015	0,017
Copper (Cu)	(mg/L)	1	0,0073	-	0,001	0,0021	0,0007	0,0023	0,0015	0,0008	0,0012	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	<0,005	0,0025	0,02	0,054	0,0011	0,0021	0,0071	0,012
Manganese (Mn)	(mg/L)	0,05	2,3	-	0,055	0,041	0,037	0,025	0,061	0,2	0,069	0,0056	0,0051	0,017	0,0031	0,022	0,0073	0,0096	18	17	19	21	19	18	19
Mercury (Hg)	(mg/L)	0,001	0,000013	0,1	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005	<0,0005
Molybdenum (Mo)	(mg/L)	0,07	29	-	0,013	0,016	0,0055	0,02	0,023	0,023	0,019	0,0038	0,0039	0,0049	0,0012	0,0054	0,0034	0,0051	0,0026	0,0017	0,0008	0,0007	0,0019	0,0013	0,0013
Nickel (Ni)	(mg/L)	0,07	0,26	-	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	<0,002	0,02	0,024	0,026	0,012	0,011	0,016	0,02
Lead (Pb)	(mg/L)	0,01	0,034	5	0,0003	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	<0,0002	0,028	0,025	0,001	0,014	0,018	0,0092	0,009
Selenium (Se)	(mg/L)	0,01	0,062	1	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	<0,001	0,016	0,015	0,013	0,016	0,016	0,017	0,017
Sodium (Na)	(mg/L)	200	-	-	35	45	7,7	47	47	28	35	6,6	8,7	4,2	1,2	9,9	7,1	10	7	8,7	6,1	2	9	7,2	6,5
Tin (Sn)	(mg/L)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uranium (U)	(mg/L)	0,02	0,32	2	0,0015	0,0013	0,0013	0,0012	0,0011	0,00097	0,00079	0,00053	0,00036	0,00018	0,00019	0,00024	0,00018	0,00016	0,0032	0,0027	0,0014	0,0027	0,0026	0,0025	0,0024
Zinc (Zn)	(mg/L)	5	0,067	-	<0,01	<0,01	<0,01	<0,01	<0,01	<0,01	<0,01	0,01	<0,01	<0,01	<0,01	0,01	<0,01	<0,01	0,08	0,09	0,1	0,05	0,04	0,09	0,11

<sup>A</sup> Groundwater criteria for consumption purposes of the Soil Protection and Contaminated Sites Rehabilitation Policy

<sup>B</sup> Criteria of seepage into surface water or infiltration into sewers of the Soil Protection and Contaminated Sites Rehabilitation Policy

<sup>C</sup> Maximum concentrations of a contaminant in a liquid material or leachate from a solid material, taken from the Regulation respecting hazardous materials and D-019.

\*\* Turbidity not analysed; insufficient sample